

Supplementary Material - Percolation across households in mechanistic models of non-pharmaceutical interventions in SARS-CoV-2 disease dynamics

Caroline Franco^{1,2,3}, Leonardo Souto Ferreira^{1,3}, Vítor Sudbrack^{1,3,4}, Marcelo Eduardo Borges³, Silas Poloni^{1,3}, Paulo Inácio Prado^{4,3}, Lisa J. White², Ricardo Águas⁶, Roberto André Kraenkel^{1,3}, and Renato Mendes Coutinho^{7,3}

¹*Institute of Theoretical Physics, São Paulo State University, São Paulo, Brazil*

²*Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK*

³*Observatório Covid-19 BR*

⁴*Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland*

⁵*Instituto de Biociências, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*

⁶*Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK*

⁷*Centro de Matemática, Computação e Cognição - Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo André, Brazil*

I. INTRODUCTION

This model framework was first introduced in Águas et al. (1). The code is available at https://github.com/francocarol/covid_perc. In Section II we introduce our modifications for the CoMo model structure (1) to account for particularities in the Brazilian health system. Nevertheless, modifications to better reflect other localities should be easily included in the model. Section II-A describes the equations, along with the explanation and sources of the parameters used. Section II-B describes how non-pharmaceutical interventions work in the model. Section II-C thoroughly describes our modifications to model hospital burden in Brazil. Section III lists the interventions used in the main paper. Finally, Section IV shows the procedure used to fit the model to data.

II. MODEL STRUCTURE

A. Model equations

The model consists in an expanded SEIR model to account for asymptomatic individuals and detailed structure of the Brazilian health system. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\mathbf{S}}{dt} &= -\lambda\mathbf{S} + \omega\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{S} + \mu_b - \mu_d\mathbf{S} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{E}}{dt} &= \lambda\mathbf{S} - \gamma\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{E} - \mu_d\mathbf{E} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{I}}{dt} &= \gamma(1 - P_{clin})(1 - IHR)\mathbf{E} - \nu_i\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{I} - \mu_d\mathbf{I} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{CL}}{dt} &= \gamma P_{clin}(1 - P_{selfis})(1 - IHR)\mathbf{E} - \nu_i\mathbf{CL} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{CL} - \mu_d\mathbf{CL} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} &= \gamma P_{selfis}P_{clin}(1 - IHR)\mathbf{E} - \nu_i\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{X} - \mu_d\mathbf{X} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{H}}{dt} &= \gamma IHR(1 - P_{icu})(1 - H_c)\mathbf{E} - \nu_s\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{H} - \mu_d\mathbf{H} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{HC}}{dt} &= \gamma IHR(1 - P_{icu})H_c\mathbf{E} - \nu_{sc}\mathbf{HC} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{HC} - \mu_d\mathbf{HC} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{ICU}}{dt} &= \gamma IHRP_{icu}(1 - ICU_c)\mathbf{E} - \nu_{icu}\mathbf{ICU} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{ICU} - \mu_d\mathbf{ICU} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{ICUH}}{dt} &= \gamma IHRP_{icu}ICU_c(1 - ICUH_c)\mathbf{E} - \nu_{icuh}\mathbf{ICUH} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{ICUH} - \mu_d\mathbf{ICUH} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{ICUC}}{dt} &= \gamma IHRP_{icu}ICU_cICUH_c\mathbf{E} - \nu_{icuc}\mathbf{ICUC} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{ICUC} - \mu_d\mathbf{ICUC} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{R}}{dt} &= \nu_i\mathbf{I} - \omega\mathbf{R} + \nu_i\mathbf{X} + \nu_i\mathbf{CL} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{R} - \mu_d\mathbf{R} + \nu_s(1 - P_dI_{fr})\mathbf{H} \\
&\quad + \nu_{icu}(1 - P_{dicu}IHFR)\mathbf{ICU} + \nu_{icuc}(1 - P_{dicuc}IHFR)\mathbf{ICUC} + \nu_{sc}(1 - P_{dhc}IHFR)\mathbf{HC} \\
&\quad + \nu_{icuh}(1 - P_{dicuh}IHFR)\mathbf{ICUH} + \nu_{icuc}(1 - P_{dicuc}IHFR)\mathbf{ICUC}
\end{aligned}$$

code and equations	description
S	Susceptible population
E	Infected and presymptomatic population
I	Infected population, asymptomatic and not isolated
CL	Infected population, mildly symptomatic and not isolated
X	Infected population, mildly symptomatic and self-isolated at home
H	Infected population, hospitalized in simple bed.
HC	Infected population that require hospital treatment but but are denied, due to healthcare system overload
ICU	Infected population, hospitalised in Intensive Care Units (ICU).
ICUH	Infected population that require ICU but are hospitalised in simple beds, due to unavailability in ICU beds.
ICUC	Infected population that require ICU but are denied both an ICU or hospital simple bed, due to healthcare system overload.
R	Recovered population
C	Cumulative reported cases
C_M	Cumulative death cases
C_{MC}	Cumulative death cases of critical patients, i.e., those who hospitalization was denied.

TABLE I: List of model variables in equations on supplementary material and in the code. Variables written in the main text may be different for readability, here, we stick to the nomenclature used throughout the code to help reproducibility.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\mathbf{C}}{dt} &= r\gamma(1 - IHR)(1 - P_{clin})\mathbf{E} + r_c\gamma(1 - IHR)P_{clin}\mathbf{E} + r_h\gamma IHR\mathbf{E} \\
\frac{d\mathbf{CM}}{dt} &= \nu_s P_{dh} I H F R \mathbf{H} + \nu_{sc} P_{dhc} I H F R \mathbf{H} \mathbf{C} + \nu_{icu} P_{dicu} I H F R \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} + \nu_{icuc} P_{dicuc} I H F R \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{C} \\
&\quad + \nu_{icuh} P_{dicuh} I H F R \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{H} + \mu_d (\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{H} \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{C} \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{X}) \\
\frac{d\mathbf{CMC}}{dt} &= \nu_{sc} P_{dhc} I H F R \mathbf{H} \mathbf{C} + \nu_{icuc} P_{dicuc} I H F R \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{C} \\
&\quad + \nu_{icuh} P_{dicuh} I H F R \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{H} + \mu_d (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{C})
\end{aligned}$$

where each of the dynamic variables (corresponding to the compartments shown in Table I) is further subdivided in 19 age classes consisting of 5 years age bins (0-4,5-9, up to 90+). Thereby, each of the parameters written in the model, aside from \mathbf{A} (ageing matrix), should be thought of as diagonal matrices containing parameter values corresponding to each age class. Take, as an example, the natural mortality rate, given by

$$\hat{\mu}_d = \text{diag}(\mu_{d1}, \mu_{d2}, \dots, \mu_{dD}) = \text{diag}(\vec{\mu}_d).$$

Note that, in the system of equations presented above, we drop the hats/bolds from all diagonal matrices to avoid an overloaded notation, but choose to keep them in all variables. Thus, each of them actually represents $D = 19$ different ODEs, and therefore the number of equations is D multiplied by the number of compartments. A description of each parameter from the model is available at table II.

B. Contact matrices and the force of infection

The model has over 300 equations, but the main mechanisms regarding infection and NPI effects are encoded in its force of infection, λ , which is describe in this subsection. Basically, a Susceptible individual in the n -th age class, written as S_n , can have contact with any of the infected groups of all age classes, so we would have

$$\frac{dS_n}{dt} \propto -S_n \sum_j c_{n,j} (a_j^I I_j + a_j^E E_j + a_j^{CL} CL_j + \dots) \quad (1)$$

where $c_{n,j}$ measures the contact strength between people of n -th and j -th age classes, forming the contact matrix \hat{c} , of dimension $D \times D$. The $a_j^I, a_j^E, a_j^{CL}, \dots$ measures how infectious these different model compartments are. For example, asymptomatic people, \mathbf{I} , may be more infectious than the symptomatic ones, \mathbf{CL} , since they may not be isolating themselves, given they are unaware of their infectious state. The NPIs are considered as modifications on both \hat{c} , reducing contacts between people, and also on the different a_j^I, a_j^{CL}, \dots , accounting for behavioural aspects, such as increased hand hygiene.

Given the definitions above, we are finally able to breakdown the general structure of \hat{c} . It is mainly composed of 4 matrices, \hat{c}_{home} - which measures the amount of contacts of people at home, \hat{c}_{work} - for contacts at work, \hat{c}_{school} - for contacts at school and \hat{c}_{other} - for other kinds of human interactions, such as going to restaurants, movies and churches. Therefore, in absence of any NPIs, the resultant contacts matrix would be simply

$$\hat{c} = \hat{c}_{home} + \hat{c}_{work} + \hat{c}_{school} + \hat{c}_{other}$$

But as NPIs are inserted, the contact matrix is modified. Suppose the simple case of home-office policies, that is, people should work at home for a period of $work_{dur}$ weeks. A fraction $work_{cov}$ of the population is able to adhere to such policies, and they have an effectiveness $work_{eff}$ in reducing this kind of contact, then we have that the contact matrix becomes

$$\hat{c} = (1 - f_{perc})\hat{c}_{home} + (1 - work_{cov} work_{eff} \theta_{work}(t))\hat{c}_{work} + \hat{c}_{school} + \hat{c}_{other}$$

Code	Equation	Description	Value	Source
lam	λ	force of infection	Variable	Eq. (5)
mort	μ_d	natural mortality ($days^{-1}$)	Age dependent	IBGE (7)
ageing	A	speed of population ageing ($days^{-1}$)	-	-
birth	μ_b	birth rate ($days^{-1}$)	-	IBGE (8)
gamma	γ	Inverse of incubation period ($days^{-1}$)	1/5.8	Wei et al. (13)
ihr	IHR	Infection hospitalisation rate	Age dependent	Salje et al. (10)
omega	ω	Rate of which recovered people become susceptible again ($days^{-1}$)	0	Assumed
rho	ρ	Relative infectiousness of presymptomatic individuals	0.105	Wei et al. (12)
rhos	ρ_s	Relative infectiousness of hospitalised individuals (reduced due to hospitalisation)	0.10	Assumed
pclin	P_{clin}	Proportion of symptomatic individuals	0.30 (0-19) 0.56 (20-59) 0.69 (60+)	SMSSP Sun et al. (11) Sun et al. (11)
selfis	P_{selfis}	Proportion of symptomatic individuals who self-isolate	Variable	Section II-B
prob_icu	P_{icu}	Proportion of hospitalised individuals who need ICU beds	Age dependent	SIVEP
critH	H_c	Proportion of hospitalised individuals who have not received attendance	Variable	Section II-C
critICU	ICU_c	Proportion of hospitalised individuals who need ICU beds and have not received one	Variable	Section II-C
critICUH	ICU_h	Proportion of hospitalised individuals who need ICU beds and have not received one and also not have received simple beds	Variable	Section II-C
nui	ν_i	Recovery rate of mild symptomatic/asymptomatic individuals ($days^{-1}$)	1/9	Cevik et al. (3)
nus	ν_s	Recovery/death rate of hospitalised individuals ($days^{-1}$)	1/8.3	SIVEP
nusc	ν_{sc}	Recovery/death rate of hospitalised individuals who have not received attendance ($days^{-1}$)	1/11	Assumed
nu_icu	ν_{icu}	Recovery/death rate of hospitalised individuals in ICU beds ($days^{-1}$)	1/14.7	SIVEP
nu_icuh	ν_{icuh}	Recovery/death rate of hospitalised individuals who need ICU beds but received simple beds ($days^{-1}$)	1/11	Assumed
nu_icuc	ν_{icuc}	Recovery/death rate of hospitalised individuals who need ICU beds and have not received attendance ($days^{-1}$)	1/11	Assumed
ifr	IHFR	In hospital fatality rate	Age dependent	Portella et al. (9)
pdeath_h	P_d	Maximum probability of death for a hospitalised infection requiring common bed	45.9	SIVEP
pdeath_icu	P_{dicu}	Maximum probability of death for a hospitalised infection requiring ICU	69	SIVEP
pdeath_hc	P_{dhc}	Maximum probability of death for a hospitalised infection requiring common bed but not receiving attendance	80	Assumed
pdeath_icuh	P_{dicuh}	Maximum probability of death for a hospitalised infection requiring ICU but receiving common bed attendance	97	Assumed
pdeath_icuc	P_{dicuc}	Maximum probability of death for a hospitalised infection requiring ICU but not receiving attendance	99	Assumed
report	r	Report rate of asymptomatic cases	0.00	Assumed
reportc	r_c	Report rate of symptomatic cases	0.01	Assumed
reporth	r_h	Report rate of hospitalized cases	0.95	Assumed

TABLE II: List of model parameters in equations on supplementary material and in the code. These variables are restricted to epidemiological variables (not the NPI-related ones).

Here, f_{perc} is as defined as in section 2.2 of the main paper, whilst $\theta_{work}(t)$ is a function that measures if either home office policies are being applied or not, and is usually a step function, being 1 during the period $work_{dur}$, defined by starting and finishing dates of such policies, and 0 out of said period. We could apply this same mathematical form for other interventions, such as school closing, commerce and restaurants functioning in reduced periods or not functioning at all, and many other NPIs we have seen being tried out in order to contain virus spread. We would get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c} = & (1 - f_{perc})\hat{c}_{home} + \\ & (1 - work_{cov}work_{eff}\theta_{work}(t))\hat{c}_{work} + \\ & (1 - school_{cov}school_{eff}\theta_{school}(t))\hat{c}_{school} + \\ & (1 - dist_{cov}dist_{eff}\theta_{dist}(t))\hat{c}_{other}\end{aligned}$$

With this final form of contact matrix we can add yet another possible NPI, cocooning the elderly. That means they are more isolated and protected, since they are one of the most vulnerable to COVID-19 death. When cocooning is applied, the contacts of people above a certain age, let's say age_{cocoon} , are reduced in $cocoon_{cov}cocoon_{eff}$, implying that \hat{c} values from the D^\dagger to D lines and rows must be reduced. Here, D^\dagger is the index from which cocooning starts, for example, if cocooning is applied in people over 65 years old, then $D^\dagger = 13$. Defining $\eta = 1 - cocoon_{cov}cocoon_{eff}\theta_{cocoon}(t)$ we write

$$\hat{g}_{D^\dagger}(\eta) = \text{diag}(\vec{1}_{D^\dagger}, \eta\vec{1}_{D-D^\dagger}) \quad (2)$$

and with it, make the final contacts matrix

$$\bar{c} = \hat{g}_{D^\dagger}(\eta)\hat{c}\hat{g}_{D^\dagger}(\eta) \quad (3)$$

Note that

$$\hat{g}_{D^\dagger}(\eta)\hat{c}\hat{g}_{D^\dagger}(\eta) = \begin{bmatrix} c_{1,1} & c_{1,2} & \dots & c_{1,D^\dagger-1} & \eta c_{1,D^\dagger} & \dots & \eta c_{1,D} \\ c_{2,1} & c_{2,2} & \dots & c_{2,D^\dagger-1} & \eta c_{2,D^\dagger} & \dots & \eta c_{2,D} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \eta c_{D^\dagger,1} & \eta c_{D^\dagger,2} & \dots & \eta c_{D^\dagger,D^\dagger-1} & \eta^2 c_{D^\dagger,D^\dagger} & \dots & \eta^2 c_{D^\dagger,D} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \eta c_{D,1} & \eta c_{D,2} & \dots & \eta c_{D,D^\dagger-1} & \eta^2 c_{D,D^\dagger} & \dots & \eta^2 c_{D,D} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

so the elderly are more isolated among themselves, since $\eta < 1 \implies \eta^2 < \eta$, whilst still having reduced contacts with the other age classes.

Summarising the interventions implemented, we have:

- **Self-Isolation:** Self-isolation of not hospitalised symptomatic individuals, either being tested or not. It receives starting and ending date of intervention that models $\theta_{selfis}(t)$. Also receives coverage $selfis_{cov}$ and efficacy $selfis_{eff}$ values, giving $P_{selfis} = selfis_{cov}selfis_{eff}\theta_{selfis}(t)$;
- **Physical Distancing:** Reduction in contacts in other than home, school and work environments. It comprises interventions such as churches closure, maximum occupation in supermarkets and others. It receives starting and ending date of intervention, that models $\theta_{dist}(t)$. Also receives coverage ($dist_{cov}$) and efficacy ($dist_{eff}$) values;
- **Handwashing:** This intervention comprises individual protection measures, such as personal hygiene and mask usage. It receives starting and ending date of intervention, that models $\theta_{hand}(t)$. Also receives coverage ($hand_{cov}$) and efficacy ($hand_{eff}$);

- *Work from home*: This intervention models workers working from home. It receives starting and ending date of intervention, that models $\theta_{work}(t)$. Also receives coverage ($work_{cov}$) and efficacy ($work_{eff}$);
- *School closure*: This intervention models closing schools in the location. It receives starting and ending date of intervention, that models $\theta_{school}(t)$. Also receives coverage ($school_{cov}$) and efficacy ($school_{eff}$);
- *Cocoon elderly*: This intervention models the isolation of a proportion of the elderly population, given a minimum age D^\dagger . It receives starting and ending date of intervention, that models $\theta_{cocoon}(t)$. Also receives coverage ($cocoon_{cov}$) and efficacy ($cocoon_{eff}$).
- *Travel ban*: This intervention models the closure of frontiers of the location. It also models isolation at entrance of cases from outside. It receives the mean value of imported cases ($mean_imports$) and an efficacy value ($travel_{eff}$) of this restriction. This gives $imports = (1 - travel_{eff})mean_imports$, the value of new cases inserted by day in the model.

Taking into account that Self-Isolated (**X**) individuals are only able to infect through home and “other” matrices, we can wrap everything in a force of infection given by:

$$\lambda = (1 - hand(t))p\bar{c}[\rho\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{CL} + imports + \rho_s(\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{ICU} + \mathbf{ICUH})]/P \\ + (1 - hand(t))p(\bar{c}_{home} + \bar{c}_{other})(\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{HC} + \mathbf{ICUC})/P \quad (5)$$

where $hand(t) = hand_{cov}hand_{eff}\theta_{hand}(t)$.

C. Hospital burden

We slightly change the way hospital burden is added to the model from Aguas et al. (1). We assume that, if the occupation of beds is under some threshold value the health system infrastructure is able to handle correctly any new entrance to the hospital. After this threshold q , some of the patients might not find the needed support due to hospital overload, until full capacity, where patients are not accepted anymore. This is modelled by the following function:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < q, \\ 1 - (x(b - ax) + c), & \text{if } q \leq x \leq 1 \\ 1, & \text{if } x > 1 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Where x is the ratio between number of patients and available beds and a , b , c are computed in a way to ensure continuity of the function and its first derivative:

$$a = \frac{1}{q(q-1) + (q^2-1)} \\ b = 2aq \\ c = a - b$$

We have then ICU_c being computed using \mathbf{ICU} /number of ICU beds, H_c computed using $(\mathbf{ICUH} + \mathbf{H})$ /number (as \mathbf{ICUH} uses common beds). Finally, to model priority of common beds to ICU needing individuals compared to \mathbf{H} we simply assume that $ICU_h = H_c^2$, since these values are between 0 and 1, therefore $ICU_h \leq H_c$. The figure 1 shows these values assuming that $q = 0.65$.

III. LIST OF INTERVENTIONS

Here we show the list of interventions used as input of the model. Table III comprises all interventions used in the fitting of the standard model, which are equal to those used in the model with percolation. Figure 2 shows the timeline of these interventions. We also supplement with an additional table with the interventions used in the model with stronger interventions (Table IV).




Fig. 1: Probability of not finding a bed as function of the current occupancy. $q = 0.65$.




Fig. 2: Diagram of coverage, efficiency and their product for each of the considered non-pharmaceutical interventions considered in the standard model and the model with percolation. The diagrams for the standard model with 30% more NPI coverage would be similar, only 30% higher values.

Self Isolation			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-24	2020-08-31	0.70	0.80
Social Distancing			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-18	2020-05-31	0.70	0.95
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.59	0.95
2020-07-01	2020-08-31	0.45	0.95
School Closure			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-21	2020-08-31	0.95	1.00
Use of Mask			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-19	2020-05-31	0.20	0.85
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.35	0.85
2020-07-01	2020-08-31	0.42	0.85
Work from Home			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-16	2020-05-31	0.60	0.95
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.48	0.95
2020-07-01	2020-08-31	0.36	0.95
Cocoon Elderly			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-14	2020-05-31	0.10	0.95
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.40	0.95
2020-07-01	2020-07-31	0.50	0.95
2020-08-01	2020-08-31	0.60	0.95
Travel Ban			
Start date	End date	Mean imports	Efficiency
2020-02-19	2020-03-18	0.20	0.0
2020-03-19	2020-08-31	0.20	0.70

TABLE III: List of interventions used for model fitting in the case of Standard and Percolation model.

IV. MODEL FITTING

To fit the model onto epidemiological data, we used consolidated 2020 time series from Severe Acute Respiratory Infection (SARI) hospitalisations and deaths in São Paulo from the SIVEP-Gripe database (4) between 15 March and 31 August 2020. In Brazil, SARI case notification is compulsory (leading to high reporting rates) and SARS-CoV-2 is included as a SARI category. Though, due to the lack of extensive testing, we assume using only SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases would lead to an underestimation of the actual number of cases. Hence, we assume that SARI cases are a better approximation to the number of SARS-CoV-2, rather than only cases confirmed by PCR tests. Also, note that this are severe cases and, therefore, hospitalised. Hence, we are fitting SARI cases to the sum over all hospitalised compartments of the model.

We specifically chose to use weekly time series for new cases and new deaths to avoid carrying past information into current values, as could happen if we used time series of cumulative data.

To perform a nonlinear least squares fitting of the free parameters (p , T_{perc} , h_{steep} , $startdate$) to the data, we used the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm implemented in the `minpack.lm` R package (5).

Self Isolation			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-24	2020-08-31	0.91	0.80
Social Distancing			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-18	2020-05-31	0.91	0.95
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.767	0.95
2020-07-01	2020-08-31	0.585	0.95
School Closure			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-21	2020-08-31	1.00	1.00
Use of Mask			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-19	2020-05-31	0.20	0.85
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.35	0.85
2020-07-01	2020-08-31	0.42	0.85
Work from Home			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-16	2020-05-31	0.78	0.95
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.624	0.95
2020-07-01	2020-08-31	0.468	0.95
Cocoon Elderly			
Start date	End date	Coverage	Efficiency
2020-03-14	2020-05-31	0.13	0.95
2020-06-01	2020-06-30	0.52	0.95
2020-07-01	2020-07-31	0.65	0.95
2020-08-01	2020-08-31	0.78	0.95
Travel Ban			
Start date	End date	Mean imports	Efficiency
2020-02-19	2020-03-18	0.26	0.0
2020-03-19	2020-08-31	0.26	0.70

TABLE IV: List of interventions used for model fitting with stronger interventions.

In order to fit both new cases (C) and new deaths (D), we had to account for residuals in different scales. One way to do that was by normalising each of the variables in respect to their total sum. The resulting residual (R) is, therefore:

$$R = \frac{\sum(C_{model} - C_{observed})}{\sum C_{observed}} + \frac{\sum(D_{model} - D_{observed})}{\sum D_{observed}}$$

The algorithm minimise the square of this quantity, while evaluating the respective negative log-likelihood and minimising it.

To perform this kind of non-linear optimisation, we need to input the algorithm with a series of initial guesses. We tested a wide range of *startdate* values (from 2020 – 10 – 01 to 2020 – 02 – 24) and for each one we ran the fitting algorithm using several reasonable initial guesses for the other free parameters. Hence, this method gives us fitted p , T_{perc} and h_{steep} for each *startdate* considered.

With the goal to find a probability distribution for the fitted parameters (2), we selected the run which returned the lowest residual for each *startdate*, with its respective (p, T_{perc}, h_{steep}) set. We then computed the negative log-likelihood for each start date, L_t :

$$L_t = N \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N R_{i,t}^2 \right)$$

from which we can therefore derive the probability for each startdate, given by

$$P_t = \frac{\exp(-L_t + \min(\{L_t\}))}{\sum_t \exp(-L_t + \min(\{L_t\}))}.$$

Finally, maximising the probability (equivalent to minimising the negative log-likelihood), we find sets of best fitted parameters for each of the model versions considered (See Table V).

V. MODEL COMPARISON

In order to be able to compare the three different nested model versions plausibilities, we calculated their Akaike Information Criteria (*AIC*) (6). Using the results from the best fitting to data, for each model version i , the AIC_i is

$$AIC_i = 2NLL_{min} + 2n_{par} \quad (7)$$

where NLL_{min} is the negative log-likelihood from the best fitting run (which will be the minimum for that version) and n_{par} is the number of fitted parameters for that version (which will be 2 for the standard models and 4 for the model with percolation).

To make the comparison even easier, we also calculate *AIC* differences, defined as

$$\Delta AIC_i = AIC_i - AIC_{min} \quad (8)$$

where AIC_{min} is the minimum over all *AIC* values obtained.

The resultant *AIC* and ΔAIC obtained for each model version can be found in Table 1, in the main paper.

Model	Parameter	Mean	SD	Quartile 2.5	Quartile 50	Quartile 97.5
Percolation	startdate	2020-01-30	-	2020-01-30	2020-01-30	2020-01-30
Percolation	p	0.0461	0.0002	0.0461	0.0461	0.0462
Percolation	T_{perc}	0.516	0.003	0.513	0.516	0.520
Percolation	h_{steep}	4.83	0.02	4.81	4.83	4.84
Standard	startdate	2020-01-15	-	2020-01-15	2020-01-15	2020-01-15
Standard	p	0.0294	≈ 0	0.0294	0.0294	0.0294
Standard + 30% NPIs	startdate	2020-01-30	-	2020-01-30	2020-01-30	2020-02-01
Standard + 30% NPIs	p	0.0402	0.0003	0.0401	0.0401	0.0411

TABLE V: List of parameters values for the three models with mean, standard deviation (SD), and 2.5th, 50th and 97.5th percentiles.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Aguas, L. White, N. Hupert, R. Shretta, W. Pan-Ngum, O. Celhay, A. Moldokmatova, F. Arifi, A. Mirzazadeh, H. Sharifi, K. Adib, M. N. Sahak, C. Franco, and R. Coutinho. Modelling the COVID-19 pandemic in context: an international participatory approach. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(12), 2020. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003126. URL <https://gh.bmj.com/content/5/12/e003126>.
- [2] K. P. Burnham and D. R. Anderson. *Model Selection and multi-model inference: A practical information-theoretic approach*. Springer New York, 2013.
- [3] M. Cevik, M. Tate, O. Lloyd, A. E. Maraolo, J. Schafers, and A. Ho. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding and infectiousness – a living

- systematic review and meta-analysis. July 2020. doi:[10.1101/2020.07.25.20162107](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.25.20162107). URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.25.20162107>.
- [4] Datasus. Srag 2020 - banco de dados de síndrome respiratória aguda grave - incluindo dados da covid-19, 2020. URL <https://opendatasus.saude.gov.br/dataset/bd-srag-2020>.
- [5] T. V. Elzhov, K. M. Mullen, A.-N. Spiess, and B. Bolker. *minpack.lm: R Interface to the Levenberg-Marquardt Nonlinear Least-Squares Algorithm Found in MINPACK, Plus Support for Bounds*, 2016. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=minpack.lm>. R package version 1.2-1.
- [6] F. J. Fabozzi, S. M. Focardi, S. T. Rachev, and B. G. Arshanapalli. *Appendix E: Model Selection Criterion: AIC and BIC*, pages 399–403. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2014. ISBN 9781118856406. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118856406.app5>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118856406.app5>.
- [7] IBGE. Tábuas completas de mortalidade, 2019. URL <https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/populacao/9126-tabuas-completas-de-mortalidade.html?=&t=resultados>.
- [8] IBGE. Pesquisas estatísticas do registro civil - tabela 2679 - nascidos vivos, por ano de nascimento, idade da mãe na ocasião do parto, sexo e lugar do registro, 2021. URL <https://sidra.ibge.gov.br/tabela/2679>.
- [9] T. P. Portella, S. R. Mortara, R. Lopes, A. Sánchez-Tapia, M. R. Donalísio, M. C. Castro, V. R. Venturieri, C. G. Estevam, A. F. Ribeiro, R. M. Coutinho, M. A. de Sousa Mascena Veras, P. I. Prado, and R. A. Kraenkel. Temporal and geographical variation of COVID-19 in-hospital fatality rate in brazil. Feb. 2021. doi:[10.1101/2021.02.19.21251949](https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21251949). URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21251949>.
- [10] H. Salje, C. T. Kiem, N. Lefrancq, N. Courtejoie, P. Bosetti, J. Paireau, A. Andronico, N. Hozé, J. Richet, C.-L. Dubost, Y. L. Strat, J. Lessler, D. Levy-Bruhl, A. Fontanet, L. Opatowski, P.-Y. Boelle, and S. Cauchemez. Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in france. *Science*, 369(6500): 208–211, May 2020. doi:[10.1126/science.abc3517](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abc3517). URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abc3517>.
- [11] W. W. Sun, F. Ling, J. R. Pan, J. Cai, Z. P. Miao, S. L. Liu, W. Cheng, and E. F. Chen. Epidemiological characteristics of COVID-19 family clustering in Zhejiang Province. *Chinese journal of preventive medicine*, 54(6):625–629, 2020. ISSN 02539624. doi:[10.3760/cma.j.cn112150-20200227-00199](https://doi.org/10.3760/cma.j.cn112150-20200227-00199).
- [12] W. E. Wei, Z. Li, C. J. Chiew, S. E. Yong, M. P. Toh, and V. J. Lee. Presymptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 — singapore, january 23–march 16, 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69(14):411–415, Apr. 2020. doi:[10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e1](https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e1). URL <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e1>.
- [13] Y. Wei, L. Wei, Y. Liu, L. Huang, S. Shen, R. Zhang, J. Chen, Y. Zhao, H. Shen, and F. Chen. A systematic review and meta-analysis reveals long and dispersive incubation period of COVID-19. June 2020. doi:[10.1101/2020.06.20.20134387](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.20.20134387). URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.20.20134387>.