

# 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)

9th June, 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 2nd June, 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. In several cases, a negative number of cases was reported, so these were set to zero for the purpose of learning the model. The UK hospital data used were the data made available as part of the daily press conferences [2]. Data were used from 20th March to 2nd June. For the period from 20 - 26th 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  $I_t^c$  by 0.9 (as well as translating it in time) gives a reasonable approximation to the hospital data. Hence we use this scaling of  $I_t^c$  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 (i.e. when a person becomes infectious) and

subsequent confirmation. Similarly, when the two-stage model is fitted to the number of deaths in a given country it is able to identify the time delay between the onset of infection and death.

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 Results on identifying the lockdowns and time delays

As discussed above, the two-stage model enables the time delay between the onset of infection and subsequent confirmation to be identified. This time delay, denoted  $t_c$ , is given by the difference between  $t_{lockdown}$  and the actual date of the lockdown. When the two-stage model is fitted to the number of deaths, this difference represents the time delay between the onset of infection and death, denoted  $t_d$ . Results are presented for both quantities in table S1. Since these results depend on identifying the actual date of the lockdown (see table 2 in the main paper) there could be some variation due to ambiguity in identifying this date and time taken to implement the lockdown.

Table S1: The time delay between onset of infection and subsequent confirmation  $t_c$  as well as that between onset of infection and death  $t_d$ .

|         | $t_c$ | $t_d$ |
|---------|-------|-------|
| France  | 10    | 15    |
| Germany | 2     | 21    |
| Italy   | 9     | 14    |
| Spain   | 8     | 11    |
| UK      | 14    | 13    |

Results for  $t_c$  are similar for France, Italy and Spain, but noticeably shorter for Germany and longer for the UK. This finding is consistent with the intensive testing strategy adopted by Germany during the early stages of the outbreak. The longer delay for the UK may also be related to testing. Note from figure 1 in the main paper that the peak for the UK is less pronounced than it is for other countries. This could be explained by the substantial increase in testing carried in the UK in April after the lockdown, so that the

real impact of the lockdown is masked to some extent by increased testing. This possibility and a related question about the  $R_0^{Post}$  value motivate the application of the model to UK hospital data in section S9.

Results for  $t_d$  are similar for all the countries apart from Germany, which has a time delay from onset of infection to death of 21 days. While this could reflect a real difference, it should be noted that in terms of fitting the model to the number of deaths, the goodness of fit is worse for Germany than the other countries ( $R^2 = 0.66$ , see table S2) and there is a local minimum six days earlier in the German results, which would give it a value of  $t_d = 15$  in line with the other countries.


## S4 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 results obtained by fitting the two-stage model to the number of deaths in a given country for validation purposes. Results are presented in figure S1 corresponding to figure 1 from the main paper. It is noticeable that the two-stage model also fits the data on the number of deaths reasonably well and the impact of the lockdown is evident with the peak clearly visible for each country.


The pre- and post-lockdown reproductive numbers corresponding to figure S1 are presented in table S2. As noted in the main paper, the reproductive numbers obtained from the number of deaths are similar to those from the number of cases, particularly post-lockdown. The largest differences are found for the pre-lockdown values for France and Germany which have larger and smaller  $R_0^{Pre}$  values respectively based on the number of deaths. This can be partly explained by the difference at the earliest stage of the pandemic in each country. Note that the model fits the French data very well during this period in figure S1, which gives rise to the higher  $R_0^{Pre}$  value, but overestimates it for the German data, which gives rise to the lower  $R_0^{Pre}$  value. We should also note that the fit for Germany is worse than for the other countries ( $R^2 = 0.66$ ).

Table S2: 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  | 3.45 (2.36-4.55) | 0.66 (0.58-0.73) | 0.73  |
| Germany | 1.64 (1.44-1.84) | 0.66 (0.59-0.73) | 0.66  |
| Italy   | 2.28 (2.09-2.48) | 0.83 (0.81-0.85) | 0.92  |
| Spain   | 3.27 (2.46-4.07) | 0.77 (0.73-0.82) | 0.79  |
| UK      | 2.44 (2.01-2.88) | 0.84 (0.80-0.88) | 0.77  |




a) France,  $R^2 = 0.73$




b) Germany,  $R^2 = 0.66$



c) Italy,  $R^2 = 0.92$



d) Spain,  $R^2 = 0.79$



e) UK,  $R^2 = 0.77$

Figure S1: Two-stage SEIR models fitted to the number of deaths for each of the five countries. Dates correspond to the first day in each of the countries when there were ten or more deaths.

## S5 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 S3. The changes in  $d_l$  and  $d_i$  result in higher values of  $R_0^{Pre}$  and lower values of  $R_0^{Post}$ , while  $m = 0.33\%$  has little effect on  $R_0^{Pre}$  and increases  $R_0^{Post}$ , and  $m = 1.32\%$  has little effect on either quantity. Overall, the results are similar to those adopted in the main paper, particularly in the case of  $R_0^{Post}$ .

Table S3: 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.

|         |              | $d_l = 3.8$ | $d_l = 4.8$ | $d_l = 3.8$ | $d_l = 3.8$ | $d_l = 3.8$ |
|---------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|         |              | $d_i = 3.4$ | $d_i = 3.4$ | $d_i = 5.0$ | $d_i = 3.4$ | $d_i = 3.4$ |
|         |              | $m = 0.66$  | $m = 0.66$  | $m = 0.66$  | $m = 0.33$  | $m = 1.32$  |
| France  | $R_0^{Pre}$  | 2.21        | 2.56        | 2.65        | 2.24        | 2.19        |
|         | $R_0^{Post}$ | 0.69        | 0.67        | 0.64        | 0.73        | 0.68        |
| Germany | $R_0^{Pre}$  | 2.50        | 2.68        | 2.78        | 2.50        | 2.49        |
|         | $R_0^{Post}$ | 0.68        | 0.63        | 0.61        | 0.68        | 0.67        |
| Italy   | $R_0^{Pre}$  | 2.39        | 2.56        | 2.65        | 2.40        | 2.39        |
|         | $R_0^{Post}$ | 0.81        | 0.78        | 0.76        | 0.86        | 0.78        |
| Spain   | $R_0^{Pre}$  | 2.70        | 2.90        | 3.45        | 2.75        | 2.68        |
|         | $R_0^{Post}$ | 0.67        | 0.62        | 0.61        | 0.72        | 0.65        |
| UK      | $R_0^{Pre}$  | 1.90        | 2.01        | 2.08        | 2.20        | 1.89        |
|         | $R_0^{Post}$ | 0.92        | 0.90        | 0.89        | 1.00        | 0.89        |

## S6 Results on predictive accuracy

In the main paper, results were presented for  $k$ -step ahead prediction for  $k = 5$  and  $10$ . Here we extend those results to include  $k = 1$  and  $k = 20$ . We also compare the results with a two-stage SIR model. This has been implemented with two infectious groups and pre- and post-lockdown reproductive numbers just as for the SEIR model, but it excludes the exposed group. For comparative purposes, we can combine the latent and infection periods used earlier to give an average duration of infection of 7.2 days and so set the

parameter  $\gamma$  to  $1 - e^{-1/7.2}$  in the SIR model.

Table S4: Results for  $k$ -step ahead prediction for the number of confirmed cases on the last 10 days. †These results exclude two outliers.

|         | $k$ -step<br>prediction | SEIR |      | SIR  |      |
|---------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|
|         |                         | RMSE | MAE  | RMSE | MAE  |
| France† | 1                       | 130  | 97   | 139  | 103  |
|         | 5                       | 145  | 109  | 146  | 109  |
|         | 10                      | 145  | 108  | 146  | 109  |
|         | 20                      | 142  | 115  | 137  | 108  |
| Germany | 1                       | 179  | 131  | 180  | 150  |
|         | 5                       | 178  | 129  | 179  | 150  |
|         | 10                      | 179  | 131  | 182  | 153  |
|         | 20                      | 176  | 131  | 181  | 157  |
| Italy   | 1                       | 312  | 287  | 337  | 315  |
|         | 5                       | 324  | 301  | 350  | 330  |
|         | 10                      | 347  | 325  | 376  | 356  |
|         | 20                      | 452  | 435  | 489  | 473  |
| Spain   | 1                       | 345  | 246  | 322  | 224  |
|         | 5                       | 347  | 249  | 324  | 225  |
|         | 10                      | 350  | 249  | 325  | 226  |
|         | 20                      | 355  | 256  | 328  | 230  |
| UK      | 1                       | 860  | 788  | 794  | 708  |
|         | 5                       | 957  | 931  | 908  | 868  |
|         | 10                      | 1254 | 1188 | 1202 | 1127 |
|         | 20                      | 1971 | 1863 | 1994 | 1888 |

It is interesting to note that there is very little difference at all between the two-stage SEIR and SIR models in terms of predictive accuracy. This would certainly merit further investigation, but there are merits to using the SEIR model since it provides a more realistic model and enables us to distinguish between parameters relating to the latent period and infectious period, which is relevant for the sensitivity analysis presented in this document. Also, the SIR model gives different  $R_0$  values and so may not be the best tool to use for investigating the effect of relaxing the lockdowns.

Note that for the range of  $k$  values considered here the values for RMSE and MAE remain lower than those for the whole dataset for France, Germany, Italy and Spain. In the case of the UK, day zero occurred later than in other countries (see table 2 in the main paper) and the peak in the UK data is not as pronounced as it

is for the other countries. For both of these reasons, more post-lockdown data is needed for good predictions, but going to higher values of  $k$  restricts the number of data points for training and so affects the predictions (note that the results get worse as  $k$  increases). Hence, when all the post-lockdown data available so far are used, as they are when it comes to investigating the relaxation of the lockdowns, the predictions should be more reliable. However, we also explore the application of the model to UK hospital data in section S9 to provide further validation.


## S7 Sensitivity of predictive accuracy

Results for predictive accuracy are also considered for the different parameter settings used in section S5. Although not shown here, these alternatives give similar goodness of fit results when applied to the whole dataset. Furthermore, as table S5 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 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.


Table S5: Results for  $k$ -step ahead prediction for the number of confirmed cases on the last 10 days. <sup>†</sup>These results exclude two outliers.

|                     |      | $d_l = 3.8$ | $d_l = 4.8$ | $d_l = 3.8$ | $d_l = 3.8$ | $d_l = 3.8$ |
|---------------------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     |      | $d_i = 3.4$ | $d_i = 3.4$ | $d_i = 5.0$ | $d_i = 3.4$ | $d_i = 3.4$ |
|                     |      | $m = 0.66$  | $m = 0.66$  | $m = 0.66$  | $m = 0.33$  | $m = 1.32$  |
| France <sup>†</sup> | RMSE | 145         | 148         | 154         | 145         | 145         |
|                     | MAE  | 108         | 110         | 119         | 108         | 108         |
| Germany             | RMSE | 179         | 181         | 183         | 180         | 179         |
|                     | MAE  | 131         | 123         | 119         | 129         | 133         |
| Italy               | RMSE | 347         | 365         | 373         | 304         | 376         |
|                     | MAE  | 325         | 342         | 353         | 277         | 356         |
| Spain               | RMSE | 350         | 357         | 338         | 367         | 342         |
|                     | MAE  | 249         | 256         | 238         | 266         | 242         |
| UK                  | RMSE | 1254        | 1259        | 1264        | 1062        | 1321        |
|                     | MAE  | 1188        | 1193        | 1196        | 1014        | 1237        |







a) France




b) Germany



c) Italy



d) Spain



e) UK

Figure S2: The effect on the daily number of confirmed cases of relaxing the lockdown by 50% with parameters as described in the main paper (—), or as in the main paper but with  $d_i = 4.8$  (—),  $d_i = 5.0$  (—),  $m = 0.33\%$  (—) and  $m = 1.32\%$  (—), or no relaxation (---).

## S8 Sensitivity of results for relaxation


In figure S2, we consider how the results are affected by changing the parameters as in earlier 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 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 results in a greater number of cases compared to the original results while a lower mortality rate gives lower numbers, though for some countries the difference is very small. Overall, increasing the mortality rate to 1.32% yields the greatest increase in the number of cases.

## S9 Results for UK hospital data


This section explores the application of the two-stage model to the number of patients in hospital in the UK due to COVID-19 on a given day. This provides further validation of the model and also enables us to address some questions about the UK. Recall from the main paper, that the peak in the number of cases was not as pronounced in the UK as in the other countries and that the post-lockdown reproductive number was  $R_0 = 0.92$ , which was higher than the other countries. Does this reflect the actual number of cases in the UK or could this be explained by the substantial increase in testing carried in the UK in April after the lockdown, so that the real impact of the lockdown is masked by increased testing to some extent? The results from applying the two-stage model to the number of deaths gave a higher pre-lockdown value of  $R_0^{Pre} = 2.44$  compared to 1.90 and lower post-lockdown value of  $R_0^{Post} = 0.84$ . However, the goodness of fit was  $R^2 = 0.77$  for fitting the model to the number of cases and the number of deaths. By contrast, when the two-stage model is fitted to the number of hospital patients in the UK (see figure S3a), the goodness of fit is much better with  $R^2 = 0.987$ . Using the standard parameters (latent period of 3.8 days and infectious period of 3.4 days) gives  $R_0^{Pre} = 2.24$  (95% CI: 2.17 - 2.31) and  $R_0^{Post} = 0.905$  (95% CI: 0.90 - 0.91), thus confirming that the reproductive number is indeed closer to one than would have been hoped.

The rest of figure S3 presents results for the effect of relaxation on hospital numbers. Figure S3b) presents results corresponding to figure 2 in the main paper. There is a greater increase in the hospital numbers for a 25% relaxation compared to estimates based on the number of cases and the increase at 50% relaxation is particularly concerning. It gives the number of patients by the end of August to be close to 40,000, almost twice what they were at the earlier peak.


Figure S3c) presents results for different parameter settings corresponding to figure S2. Note that for 50% relaxation all the parameter settings considered give a higher number of patients by the end of August than there were at the earlier peak. Figure S3d) presents results over a longer period of time corresponding to the parameters used in figure 3 of the main paper. Here we see that for 50% relaxation the second peak is much higher than the earlier peak and lasts for a longer period of time. Of course, a lot of caution is appropriate




a)




b)



c)



d)



e)

Figure S3: Results for UK hospital data. a) Two-stage model fitted to the data; b) Results corresponding to figure 2 in the main paper with no relaxation (.....), 25% relaxation (---) and 50% relaxation (—); c) Results corresponding to figure S2; d) Results corresponding to figure 3 in the main paper based on a mortality rate of  $m = 0.66\%$  for 25% (---) and 50% (—) relaxations, or  $m = 1.32\%$  for 25% (- - -) and 50% (—) relaxations; e) As for c) but now with a relaxation of 15%. Note that the results are on different scales.

for results over such a long period of time, but even in the short term the results are very concerning. Also, it should be borne in mind that the goodness of fit is very high and that hospital data should be more robust than the number of confirmed cases since the latter depends on the level of testing. So arguably these results are more reliable than the earlier results.

To explore what level of relaxation would be required to ensure the numbers do not increase, we also consider the effect of a 15% relaxation. Results are presented in figure S3e for the same variations in parameter settings considered in figure S3c and figure S2. 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 start to decrease again. Similarly, even for the parameter settings that give a slight increase in numbers, the numbers 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 number of cases in all five 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: 03/06/20.
- [2] Gov.UK, <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/slides-and-datasets-to-accompany-coronavirus-press-conferences>, 2020, Last accessed: 06/06/20.
- [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.