

# Supplementary Material

## European lockdowns and the consequences of relaxation during the COVID-19 pandemic

David H. Glass

School of Computing, Ulster University, Shore Road,  
Newtownabbey, Co. Antrim, BT37 0QB, UK

Email: [dh.glass@ulster.ac.uk](mailto:dh.glass@ulster.ac.uk)

19th May, 2020

### S1 Data

All data used in this paper were obtained from publicly available sources. The daily number of cases and deaths in the five countries were obtained from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) website [1]. We have used data up to 13th May, 2020. In terms of identifying day zero for each country, we have assumed that the numbers reported correspond to those reported in the country on the previous day. A negative number of cases was reported for Spain on 19th April, 2020, so this was set to zero in this study. The UK hospital data used were the data made available as part of the daily press conferences [2]. Data were used from 18th March to 11th May. For the period from 18 - 26 March there were no data available for Scotland and Wales, but the data for the rest of the UK was scaled appropriately for this period to take this into account.

### S2 Methodology

It is not immediately obvious how the initial number of exposed ( $E_0$ ) and infected ( $I_0^c$  and  $I_0^u$ ) cases should be specified.  $I_0^c$  cannot be set to the number of confirmed new cases (nor the cumulative number of cases) at the start of the period since it should correspond to the total number of confirmed cases at that time. The approach adopted here is to treat  $E_0$  as a further parameter to be fitted to the data and then to set  $I_0^c = \rho E_0$  and  $I_0^u = (1 - \rho)E_0$ , where  $\rho$  is the proportion of confirmed cases out of the total number of cases (confirmed and unconfirmed) for a given country as discussed in the main text. The initial value of  $S$ , denoted  $S_0$ , is set to  $N - E_0 - I_0^c - I_0^u$  and  $R_0$  is set to zero.

As noted in the main paper, the reproduction number  $R_0$  is given by  $\rho\beta/\gamma + (1-\rho)\alpha\beta/\gamma$ . This expression is obtained from finding the dominant eigenvalue of the next generation matrix [3]. Recall that  $\alpha$  allows for a reduction in the transmission rate for the unconfirmed cases or alternatively for asymptomatic or sub-clinical cases if the infectious group is divided up differently. Since our focus is on confirmed and unconfirmed subgroups it does not seem reasonable to set  $\alpha$  to the same value for each country since the number of tests carried out varies from one country to another. However, as a result of keeping the ratio of confirmed to unconfirmed cases fixed,  $\alpha$  does not play a crucial role in our calculations. Different values of  $\alpha$  will result in different values of  $\beta^{pre}$  and  $\beta^{post}$ . To see this, note that since  $\rho = I^c/(I^c + I^u)$ , then in equation (1),

$$\beta(t)\frac{SI^c}{N} + \alpha\beta(t)\frac{SI^u}{N} = \beta(t)\frac{SI^c}{N} \left(1 + \alpha\left(\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\right)\right). \quad (\text{S1})$$

Hence, different values of  $\alpha$  amount to rescalings of  $\beta^{Pre}$  and  $\beta^{Post}$  such that for different  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ , we have

$$R_0^{Pre} = \beta_1 (\rho + \alpha_1(1 - \rho)) / \gamma = \beta_2 (\rho + \alpha_2(1 - \rho)) / \gamma \quad (\text{S2})$$

and similarly for  $R_0^{Post}$ . So  $\alpha$  is important if one is interested in the values of  $\beta^{Pre}$  and  $\beta^{Post}$ , but the constraints mean that it has no effect on the corresponding  $R_0$  values and hence on the dynamics. Since we focus on the  $R_0$  values in the results, we set  $\alpha = 1$  and hence do not distinguish between confirmed and unconfirmed cases in terms of transmission rates. Nevertheless, the model permits different transmission rates to be explored.

In terms of fitting the two-stage SEIR model to data, we fit  $\gamma I_t^c$  to the number of newly confirmed cases on a given day since the cumulative sum of both terms must be equal and the number of newly confirmed cases on a given day can be assumed to be proportional to the number in group  $I^c$  on that day. When considering the number of deaths rather than new cases, we scale  $\gamma I_t^c$  by the ratio of the total number of deaths to the total number of confirmed cases in a given country and then fit this quantity to the number of reported deaths. In the case of UK hospital numbers, we first of all apply the model to the number of confirmed cases in the UK as discussed in the context of figure 1 in the main paper. Scaling the resulting values for  $I_0^c$  by 0.9 (as well as translating it in time) gives a reasonable approximation to the hospital data. Hence we use this scaling of  $I_0^c$  when fitting the model to the hospital data.

When fitting the model to the newly confirmed cases this means that  $t_{lockdown}$  represents the number of days after day zero that the lockdown is reflected in the number of confirmed cases. As noted in the main document, we obtain this value by finding which day gives the best fit to the data. We achieve this by setting  $t_{ld}$  to a particular value, say seven days, then integrate the differential equations to find the best fitting parameters for the parameters  $E_0$ ,  $\beta^{Pre}$  and  $\beta^{Post}$ . When carrying out the integration,  $\beta^{Pre}$  is used before  $t_{ld}$  and  $\beta^{Post}$  afterwards as specified in (2). We then repeat this process for a range of values of  $t_{ld}$  to find  $t_{lockdown}$  by determining the value which together with the corresponding values of the other parameters gives the best overall fit to the data. The number of days between the actual lockdown and  $t_{lockdown}$  corresponds to delay between onset of infection and subsequent confirmation.

The predictive accuracy of the models was evaluated using the root mean squared error (RMSE):

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{n_t}} \quad (S3)$$

and mean absolute error (MAE):

$$MAE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} |y_i - \hat{y}_i|}{n_t}. \quad (S4)$$

where  $y$  represents the data,  $\hat{y}$  the predicted values and  $n_t$  the number of test cases.

The calculations have been carried out using MATLAB and a non-linear curve-fitting function has been used to find the best fitting parameters  $E_0$ ,  $\beta^{Pre}$  and  $\beta^{Post}$  simultaneously.

### S3 Parameter estimates based on the number of deaths

As discussed in the main paper, the results obtained from the number of cases were compared with those obtained by fitting the two-stage model to the number of deaths in a given country for validation purposes. Results are presented in table S1.

Table S1: Estimates for the pre- and post-lockdown reproduction numbers with 95% confidence intervals. These estimates are based on the recorded number of deaths due to COVID-19.

	$R_0^{Pre}$	$R_0^{Post}$	$R^2$
France	3.44 (2.18-4.69)	0.66 (0.57-0.76)	0.68
Germany	1.63 (1.39-1.86)	0.67 (0.56-0.78)	0.56
Italy	2.26 (2.05-2.47)	0.83 (0.81-0.86)	0.90
Spain	3.29 (2.73-3.85)	0.77 (0.73-0.80)	0.90
UK	2.43 (1.97-2.90)	0.85 (0.79-0.91)	0.78

### S4 Sensitivity of parameter estimates

The results in the main paper are based on a mean latent period,  $d_l$ , of 3.8 days, a mean infectious period,  $d_i$ , of 3.4 days and a mortality rate,  $m$ , of 0.66%. As discussed, these are reasonable values in light of the literature, but given that there is also disagreement about these values, several other variations have also been considered. In particular, we consider  $d_l = 4.8$ ,  $d_i = 5.0$ ,  $m = 0.33\%$  and  $m = 1.32\%$ , in each case keeping the other parameters as they were. Results are presented in table S2. The changes in  $d_l$  and  $d_i$  result in higher values of  $R_0^{Pre}$  and lower values of  $R_0^{Post}$ , while in most cases the changes in  $m$  have little effect. Overall, the results are similar to those adopted in the main paper, particularly in the case of  $R_0^{Post}$ .

Table S2: Estimates for the pre- and post-lockdown reproduction numbers for different values of the latent period,  $d_l$ , the infectious period,  $d_i$ , and the percentage mortality rate,  $m$ , based on the recorded daily number of confirmed cases. <sup>†</sup>UK results are based on hospital data.

		$d_l = 3.8$	$d_l = 4.8$	$d_l = 3.8$	$d_l = 3.8$	$d_l = 3.8$
		$d_i = 3.4$	$d_i = 3.4$	$d_i = 5.0$	$d_i = 3.4$	$d_i = 3.4$
		$m = 0.66$	$m = 0.66$	$m = 0.66$	$m = 0.33$	$m = 1.32$
France	$R_0^{Pre}$	2.08	2.37	2.68	2.12	2.07
	$R_0^{Post}$	0.67	0.64	0.63	0.70	0.65
Germany	$R_0^{Pre}$	2.50	2.68	2.79	2.50	2.50
	$R_0^{Post}$	0.67	0.63	0.60	0.68	0.67
Italy	$R_0^{Pre}$	2.35	2.77	2.88	2.58	2.35
	$R_0^{Post}$	0.82	0.80	0.78	0.88	0.80
Spain	$R_0^{Pre}$	2.82	3.53	3.68	3.30	2.80
	$R_0^{Post}$	0.68	0.65	0.62	0.75	0.66
UK <sup>†</sup>	$R_0^{Pre}$	2.27	2.43	2.51	2.28	2.26
	$R_0^{Post}$	0.91	0.89	0.86	0.96	0.88

## S5 Sensitivity of predictive accuracy

Results for predictive accuracy are also considered for the same parameters used in section S4. Although not shown here, these alternatives give similar goodness of fit results when applied to the whole dataset. Furthermore, as the table indicates the results are similar in terms of predictive accuracy, so changing the parameters does not change the results dramatically in most cases. In several cases, a lower mortality rate results in much better accuracy, while a higher mortality rate gives worse results. It would be interesting to see whether data from other countries would show the same trend. We also see how these parameters affect relaxation in the next section.

## S6 Sensitivity of results for relaxation

Again, we consider how the results are affected by changing the parameters as in the previous two sections. To keep the plots less cluttered, we only consider the scenarios where there is no relaxation and where there is 50% relaxation.

All of the models fit the actual data well and give results that are almost indistinguishable when there is no relaxation. For 50% relaxation, the different parameter settings have different effects in different countries, but all are fairly similar to the results presented in the main paper. In all cases, a higher mortality rate


Table S3: Results for  $k$ -step ahead prediction for the number of confirmed cases on the last 10 days. <sup>†</sup>UK results are based on hospital data.

		$d_l = 3.8$	$d_l = 4.8$	$d_l = 3.8$	$d_l = 3.8$	$d_l = 3.8$
		$d_i = 3.4$	$d_i = 3.4$	$d_i = 5.0$	$d_i = 3.4$	$d_i = 3.4$
		$m = 0.66$	$m = 0.66$	$m = 0.66$	$m = 0.33$	$m = 1.32$
France	RMSE	1119	1115	1102	1120	1118
	MAE	603	625	642	596	607
Germany	RMSE	399	378	362	395	401
	MAE	298	288	282	295	299
Italy	RMSE	672	662	649	572	720
	MAE	628	618	605	522	679
Spain	RMSE	839	828	819	818	864
	MAE	642	621	601	600	652
UK <sup>†</sup>	RMSE	1667	1632	1626	1237	1856
	MAE	1601	1612	1609	1203	1799


results in a greater number of cases compared to the original results, though for some countries the difference is very small. A lower mortality rate gives lower numbers for four of the five countries, but in most cases the difference is relatively small. Overall, increasing the infectious period to 5.0 yields the greatest increase in numbers and so it will be compared with the original parameter settings in more detail below.

In the main paper, the consequences of relaxation were only investigated during a six week period, but here we let the models run for 400 days from day zero to get an idea what the longer term consequences might be if there were no further interventions. Based on the results from figure S1, we only consider the original setting of parameters along with the alternative setting where the infectious period is set to  $d_i = 5.0$ . The results are shown in figure S2 for both 25% and 50% relaxation.


Of course, a lot of caution is needed with these results and confidence intervals have not been displayed to keep the plots simpler. However, the results reinforce the point from the main paper of the dramatic difference between 25% and 50% relaxations. In all cases, 50% relaxation leads to a higher peak than the earlier peak in each country, in most cases much higher, for both values of  $d_i$ . Needless to say, lockdowns would be reintroduced before any of these extremely serious scenarios could occur, but the results highlight that numbers could increase very quickly in some cases, particularly the UK. The results in Germany and the UK are particularly high (note the different scale for these countries). The high numbers of cases in the UK results has been discussed in the main paper. The extremely high result for Germany arises from the assumption that far few people have had COVID-19 so far in Germany based on the much lower number of deaths and so the effective reproductive number remains higher in Germany for longer. For 25% relaxation,




a) France




b) Germany



c) Italy



d) Spain



e) UK

Figure S1: The effect on the daily number of confirmed cases (hospital numbers for the UK) of relaxing the lockdown by 50% with parameters as described in the main paper (—), or as in the main paper but with  $d_l = 4.8$  (—),  $d_i = 5.0$  (—),  $m = 0.33\%$  (—) and  $m = 1.32\%$  (—), or no relaxation (---). Note that the results for the UK are on a different scale.




Figure S2: The effect on the daily number of confirmed cases (hospital numbers for the UK) of relaxing the lockdown with parameters as described in the main paper for 50% (—) and 25% (- - -), or with parameters as in the main paper but with  $d_i = 5.0$  for 50% (—) and 25% (- - -). Note that the results for Germany and the UK are on a different scale from the other countries.

the numbers of cases are much lower in all countries, though in some cases this leads to a second peak comparable in height to the earlier peaks, but spread out over a much longer period. These results again suggest that relaxations should be kept well below 25%.




Figure S3: The effect on daily numbers of hospital patients in the UK of relaxing the lockdown by 15% with parameters as described in the main paper (—), or as in the main paper but with  $d_l = 4.8$  (—),  $d_i = 5.0$  (—),  $m = 0.33\%$  (—) and  $m = 1.32\%$  (—), or with the parameters in the main paper and no relaxation (---).

To explore this further, we also consider the effect of a 15% relaxation. Results are presented in figure S3 for the UK since from figure S1 it is clear that the increases in the UK are greater than for the other countries. The same variations in parameter settings considered in figure S1 are used again. For the parameter settings used in the main paper, the numbers of patients remains more or less constant, though when the model is run for longer the numbers quickly start to decrease again. Similarly, even for the parameter settings that give a slight increase in numbers, the numbers soon start to decline again. Although not shown here, for a 10% relaxation, there is no increase for any of the parameter settings. Hence, a relaxation of around 10-15% is needed if COVID-19 is to be kept under control. Similar calculations suggest that such a relaxation would also be adequate for the other countries.



## References

- [1] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/download-todays-data-geographic-distribution-covid-19-cases-worldwide>, 2020, Last accessed: 18/05/20.
- [2] Gov.UK, <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/slides-and-datasets-to-accompany-coronavirus-press-conferences>, 2020, Last accessed: 18/05/20.
- [3] O. Diekmann, J. Heesterbeek, and M. Roberts, “The construction of next-generation matrices for compartmental epidemic models,” *Journal of the Royal Society, Interface / the Royal Society*, vol. 7, pp. 873–85, 11 2009.