

APPENDIX – SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A. Model equations

Equations for the general population model (i =current, discrete time step):

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta S_{GP,i} &= -S_{GP,i} \cdot \beta_{0,i} \left(\sum_{j=1}^6 \beta_{a,j} \cdot I_{a,j,i} + \sum_{j=1}^6 \beta_{s,j} \cdot I_{s,j,i} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{N_{GP,i}} \\ \Delta E_{GP,i} &= -\Delta S_{GP,i} - \frac{1}{t_{latency}} E_{GP,i} + E_{inject,i} \\ \Delta I_{a,1,i} &= r_{asympt} \frac{1}{t_{latency}} E_{GP,i} - \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,1}} I_{a,1,i} \\ \Delta I_{s,1,i} &= (1 - r_{asympt}) \frac{1}{t_{latency}} E_{GP,i} - \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,1}} I_{s,1,i} \\ \text{For } j=2 \text{ to } 6: \quad \Delta I_{a,j,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,j-1}} I_{a,j-1,i} - \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,j}} I_{a,j,i} \\ \Delta I_{s,j,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,j-1}} (1 - CFR_{j-1} - r_{hospital,GP,j-1}) \cdot I_{s,j-1,i} - \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,j}} I_{s,j,i} \\ \Delta D_{GP,i} &= \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,j}} I_{s,j,i} \cdot (CFR_{GP,j}) \\ \Delta R_{GP,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,6}} (I_{a,6,i} + I_{s,6,i} \cdot (1 - CFR_{GP,6}))\end{aligned}$$

Equations for the care home model:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta S_{CH,i} &= -S_{CH,i} \cdot \beta_{CH,i} \cdot \left(\alpha_{EXT} \cdot \lambda_{GP,i} + \alpha_{INT} \cdot \frac{I_{CH,i}}{N_{CH,i}} \right) \\ \Delta E_{CH,i} &= -\Delta S_{CH,i} - \frac{1}{t_{latency}} E_{CH,i} \\ \Delta I_{1,CH,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{latency}} E_{CH,i} - \frac{1}{t_{CH,delay,1}} I_{1,CH,i} \\ \Delta I_{2,CH,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{CH,delay,1}} I_{1,CH,i} (1 - r_{hospital,CH}) - \frac{1}{t_{CH,DELAY,1}} I_{2,CH,i} \\ \Delta D_{CH,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{CH,delay,2}} I_{2,CH,i} (CFR_{CH}) \\ \Delta R_{CH,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{CH,delay,2}} I_{2,CH,i} (1 - CFR_{CH})\end{aligned}$$

Equations for the hospital model:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta H_{1,i} &= \frac{1}{t_{CH,delay,1}} I_{1,CH,i} \cdot r_{hospital,CH} + \sum_{j=1}^6 \frac{1}{t_{GP,delay,j}} I_{s,j,i} \cdot r_{hospital,GP,j} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{t_{ICU,delay,1}} \cdot r_{ICU} \cdot H_{1,i} - \frac{1}{t_{hospital,delay,1}} \cdot H_{1,i} \\ \Delta ICU_i &= \frac{1}{t_{ICU,delay,1}} \cdot r_{ICU} \cdot H_{1,i} - \frac{1}{t_{ICU,delay,2}} \cdot ICU_i\end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta H_{2,i} = \frac{1}{t_{ICU, delay, 2}} (1 - CFR_{ICU}) \cdot ICU_i - \frac{1}{t_{hospital, delay, 2}} \cdot H_{2,i}$$

$$\Delta D_{hospital+ICU,i} = \frac{1}{t_{ICU, delay, 2}} ICU_i \cdot CFR_{ICU} + \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{1}{t_{hospital, delay, j}} H_{j,i} \cdot CFR_{hospital, j}$$

$$\Delta R_{hospital+ICU,i} = \frac{1}{t_{ICU, delay, 2}} ICU_i \cdot (1 - CFR_{ICU}) + \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{1}{t_{hospital, delay, j}} H_{j,i} \cdot (1 - CFR_{hospital, j})$$

Equations for next time step, general population:

$$N_{GP,i+1} = N_{GP,i} - \Delta D_{hospital+ICU,i} - \Delta D_{GP,i} + E_{inject,i}$$

$$S_{GP,i+1} = S_{GP,i} + \Delta S_{GP,i}$$

$$E_{GP,i+1} = E_{GP,i} - \Delta E_{GP,i}$$

For j=1 to 6: $I_{a,j,i+1} = I_{a,j,i} + \Delta I_{a,j,i}$ and $I_{s,j,i+1} = I_{s,j,i} + \Delta I_{s,j,i}$

$$D_{GP,i+1} = D_{GP,i} + \Delta D_{GP,i} + \Delta D_{hospital+ICU,i}$$

$$R_{GP,i+1} = R_{GP,i} + \Delta R_{GP,i}$$

Equations for next time step, hospital model:

For j = 1 to 2: $H_{j,i+1} = H_{j,i} - \Delta H_{j,i}$

$$ICU_{i+1} = ICU_i + \Delta ICU_i$$

Equations for next time step, care home population:

$$N_{CH,i+1} = N_{CH,i} - \Delta D_{CH,i}$$

$$S_{CH,i+1} = S_{CH,i} + \Delta S_{CH,i}$$

$$E_{CH,i+1} = E_{CH,i} - \Delta E_{CH,i}$$

$$I_{1,CH,i+1} = I_{1,CH,i} + \Delta I_{1,CH,i}$$

$$I_{2,CH,i+1} = I_{2,CH,i} + \Delta I_{2,CH,i}$$

$$D_{CH,i+1} = D_{CH,i} + \Delta D_{CH,i}$$

$$R_{CH,i+1} = R_{CH,i} + \Delta R_{CH,i}$$

Explanation of variables, general population (GP) model:

N_{GP}	size of host population
S_{GP}	susceptible population
E_{GP}	exposed population
D_{GP}	deceased
R_{GP}	recovered
β_0	time-variant transmission-matrix scaling factor, used to implement the social-distancing effectiveness function
$\beta_{a,j}$	transmission-rates of individual compartments, asymptomatic branch
$\beta_{s,j}$	transmission-rates of individual compartments, symptomatic branch
$I_{a,j}$	infectious compartments, asymptomatic branch
$I_{s,j}$	infectious compartments, symptomatic branch
r_{asympt}	proportion of individuals moving into the asymptomatic branch
$r_{hospital,GP,j}$	proportion of individuals moving from the compartments of the symptomatic branch into hospital
$t_{latency}$	latency time

$t_{GP, delay, j}$	delay times infectious compartments
$CFR_{GP, j}$	death rates (case fatality ratio), for compartments of symptomatic branch

Explanation of variables, care-home (CH) model:

N_{CH}	size of host population
S_{CH}	susceptible population
E_{CH}	exposed population
$I_{CH, j}$	infected compartments population
D_{CH}	deceased
R_{CH}	recovered
β_{CH}	time-variant transmission-rate scaling factor
α_{EXT}	scaling factor external transmission rate
λ_{GP}	force of infection from GP model (coupling link between the models)
α_{INT}	scaling factor internal transmission rate
$r_{hospital, CH}$	proportion of individuals moving from the I_1 compartment into hospital
$t_{CH, delay, j}$	delay times infectious compartments
$CFR_{CH, j}$	death rate (case fatality ratio), for compartment I_1

Explanation of variables, hospital model:

r_{ICU}	proportion of individuals moving from hospital ward H_1 compartment to ICU
$t_{hospital, delay, j}$	delay times hospital general-ward compartments
$t_{ICU, delay}$	delay time ICU compartment
$CFR_{hospital, j}$	death rates (case fatality ratio), for general-ward hospital compartments
CFR_{ICU}	death rate, ICU
$R_{hospital+ICU}$	recovered from hospital general-ward compartments and ICU
$D_{hospital+ICU}$	deceased from hospital general-ward compartments and ICU

B. Additional information on the error functions, residual error calculation, real-world data mapping

The model outcome is benchmarked by minimum mean square error functions using the following real-world data:

- (1) the number of patients in critical care in Region Stockholm (daily situation reports by Region Stockholm, 70 data points until June 10, 2020) (error function 1)
- (2) the number of patients in intensive care in Region Stockholm (daily situation reports by Region Stockholm, 80 data points until June 10, 2020) (error function 2)
- (3) the date-adjusted (method, see following section) cumulative number of COVID-19 confirmed deaths reported for Stockholm (daily situation reports by Region Stockholm, 76 data points until June 10, 2020) (error function 3)
- (4) the date-adjusted (method, see following section) cumulative number of COVID-19 confirmed deaths reported for the care homes in Stockholm (daily situation reports by Region Stockholm, 47 data points until June 10, 2020) (error function 4)
- (5) the proportion of positives from two PCR studies conducted in Stockholm by FHM: randomly selected 738 (March 26 to April 4; 2.5% positive; 95%CI=1.4-4.2%) and 679 (April 21 to 24; 2.3% positive; 95%CI=1.3-3.8%; references in the main paper) participants; throat and nasal

swabs and saliva samples taken, inconsistent results are not included in the statistics; representative participants were selected in the population and if they did not confirm participation, other persons of same representative group were chosen;^{34,35} (error function 5)

The proportion of positives from four weekly antibody analyses of (non-COVID-19) patients seeking ambulatory care in Stockholm, conducted by FHM (April 27-May 3: 7.9% 95%CI=5.04-11.77%; May 4-10: 7.4% 95%CI=4.64-11.00%; May 11-17: 10.2% 95%CI=7.06-14.18%; May 18-24: 10.0% 95%CI=6.71-14.20%),³⁶ was not included for the model optimization, since a significantly lower number of participants were sampled for Region Stockholm, as compared the above PCR studies, and since on May 26, 2020, FHM stated a potential bias towards persons with a lower risk of infection of this way of sampling. Furthermore, recent publications suggest that in particular mild/asymptomatic people do not have a robust antibody response.^{26,37} An underestimation of the infected people found in these studies is confirmed by the model results matching the antibody test results at the upper quartile of their test results distribution.

The situational reports by Region Stockholm were issued daily starting from March 19, and from May 2 on not available on weekends and holidays.

The internally studentized residuals and the adjusted R-squared values of the model fitting to the real-world data are shown in in the inserts in Figure 6 in the main document; more detailed given in Figure 14.

The internally studentized residuals are calculated as follows:

$$\hat{r}_i = \frac{y_i - f_i}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{N-P} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - f_i)^2}}$$

with y_i the data points, f_i the function values, N the number of available data points, and P the number of variables randomized in the model. The adjusted R-square values are calculated by:

$$\bar{R}^2 = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - f_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \right) \left(\frac{N-1}{N-P-1} \right)$$

with $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i$.

C. Calculation of date-adjusted numbers of deaths for Stockholm

The number of COVID-19 confirmed deaths for Stockholm, both for the care homes and in total, is published in the daily situational reports by Region Stockholm. These daily reported deaths do not take into account any reporting delay. For Sweden as a whole, both the daily new reported numbers and the date-adjusted numbers are published. In order to get the date-adjusted death numbers for Stockholm, the reporting delay was calculated on a daily base for Sweden, and applied to the data for Stockholm, as shown in Figure 7.

D. Parametrized logistics functions used in the model

Three-parameter logistics functions are used to model certain time-variant and non-linear features of the model. The parameters describing the functions are: magnitude scaling of the end value, 50% transition between start and end value, time stretching (between deviation of 3% from start and end values). The three parameters are randomized in the Monte-Carlo simulation study. A general, parametrized logistics function is plotted in Figure 8. The functions are used to model the (1) social distancing effectiveness function (SDEF) of the care homes (CH); (2) the non-linear hospital (and ICU) death rate; (3) the time-variant hospital to ICU transfer rate; and (4) the time-variant hospital and ICU death rate. The final model parameters for the logistics functions, determined by the Monte-Carlo simulation analysis, are:

- (1) care homes social-distancing effectiveness function: $y_1=0.2051$; $x_0=2020-03-21\ 14:47:09$; $\Delta x=21.4346$ days
- (2) non-linear hospital (and ICU) death rate: $y_1=1.18$, $x_0=1273.8$, $\Delta x=1852.4$
- (3) hospital to ICU transfer rate: $y_1=0.58$; $x_0=2020-04-19$; $\Delta x=120$ days
- (4) time-variant hospital (and ICU) death rate: $y_1=0.391$, $x_0=2020-04-12$, $\Delta x=30$ days

E. Additional information on the starting sequence

The model is started by injecting infected people to the latency compartment at a rate and dates specified in a lookup table. The starting sequence is shown in Figure 3:B of the main document. It is based on the reported confirmed cases by contact tracing. It is assumed that the number of actual daily new infections is 5-10 larger than the numbers reported by contract tracing, since contract tracing was limited to transmission chains started by self-reporting individuals returning only from Italy and having symptoms. The number of daily new infections of the model is matched by case injections to the 5-10x larger dark figure on top of the reported cases, by overlapping the contagious phase of the new infected people in the model with that dark figure numbers, taking also into account an assumed 5-day delay in testing and reporting confirmed cases (assumed average both for the initial starting cases of transmission chains and the tracked people from those starting cases). Furthermore, the injections of new infections have been adapted to happen primarily in the window of the Stockholm winter school vacation week ('sportlovet'), to which the majority of imported cases has been attributed according to the daily press briefings by FHM. According to a report of 2018 analysing this winter vacation week (Sifo report "Så reser svenskarna på sportlovet," 2018-02-15), 50% of families travel for skiing vacation, and 17% travel abroad, primarily the skiing regions in the alps which turned out to be significant accelerometers of the spread of COVID-19 into several countries in Europe. The confirmed cases from contract tracing in Stockholm are sharply increasing after this vacation event with a short expected delay. A few isolated cases are injected into the model during the middle of February, including a case in the beginning of February, which is not unlikely since Sweden reported its first confirmed case, a woman returning from Wuhan which did not trigger any transmission chain, already on January 31. Injecting further new infections after March 1 has no significant impact on the model, which indicates that community spread was already dominating by the beginning of March. Due to a change in test strategy shifting from contact tracing to testing cases admitted to hospital only, adapted on March 12, no data mapping of new infections is done to confirmed cases after that date.

F. Additional information on the model setup and initial parameter variation

As starting values, β_0 is chosen so that R_0 is 2.6, the hospitalization-rate scaling factor is taken from a hospital requirement analysis by FHM of May 13. A three-parameter logistics function (see Section D) is chosen for the initial social-distancing effectiveness function for the general population. The starting values of the parameters are found by multi-dimensional parameter variation, shown in Figure 9 A-D, with the initial criteria to match the number of expected PCR-positive testing individuals, and to match the basic shape of the rising and the falling edges of the reported hospitalization curve.

The care home model creates a feedback loop to the hospital model, since a minor proportion of infected individuals transfers from the care homes to the hospital. As this fraction, according to the model, contributes to the hospital admissions by only 3.5%, this feedback loop was considered as negligible so that the parameters of the social-distancing function of the general-population model were determined independent on the care home model, once the care home model matched the number of deaths.

Though the model allows for individual death rates of the sickness phases I_4 - I_6 , they are set to zero as it is assumed that only a negligible number of the confirmed COVID-19 deaths in Stockholm occur neither in hospital nor in care homes.

The time delay between the SDEF of the care homes to the SDEF of the general population was determined by the time difference between the 50% transition point of the slopes of both functions, with the 50% transition point being the average between their starting value (as of February 1), and the minimum the function reaches.

For determining the effective reproduction number R_{eff} , the initial starting injection sequence was replaced by a single equivalent injection (6.28 incidences on 2020-02-01) resulting in same model outcome (error threshold: 25 ppm of cumulative hospital person-days), since the starting sequence has an overlap with the initial phase of the SDEF which causes a discontinuous R_{eff} as shown in Figure 6:F of the main paper.

The antibody development distribution after infection, used for determining the probability of an infected individual to test positive in antibody tests, is shown in Figure 10.

G. Supplementary material to the Monte-Carlo simulations

After initial model setup using a three-parameter logistics function for the SDEF, the SDEF of the GP was mapped by 15 randomization points and determined by three Monte-Carlo simulation batches, with 3 million runs each, using the hospitalization data as error function, with details of the model convergence, complementing Figure 4, shown in Figure 11. The 95% confidence interval of the randomization of the first batch was 0.1 for the two points before and the 4 points after the slope, 0.2 for the 3 points on the slope, and interpolated for the points in between. The randomization confidence interval is doubled along the slope as the randomization only happens in the y -axis; for an improved randomization algorithm it is suggested to randomize each point in the direction normal to the initial logistics function, which should result in a more uniform distribution of the final confidence intervals determined for each optimization point (compare Figure 5 in the main document: larger confidence intervals for the points along the slope). After each batch, the 95% confidence interval calculated from the corrected sample standard deviation of the 100 best runs of a previous batch was used as the 95% confidence interval for the randomization of the points of a subsequent batch. The starting 95% confidence intervals for the randomization, and the standard

deviations of the 100 best runs, with the mean of the 100 best runs, is shown in the figure for all batches. The figure also shows the convergence of selected points (one before the slope, one on the slope, one after the slope, and the point in the end of May) over the three million runs. The point in the beginning (March 7) is converging the slowest, since underdetermined as hospitalization data is only available from March 19. The point on the slope has the highest initial standard deviation (after first 1000 runs), due to the nature of the randomization only on the y-axis and not on the time-axis. The point in the end of May also converges slower since less reference data points were available after that time. The figure also shows the spread of the values of the 100 best runs of the error function, evolving over time. After the three million runs, the minimum/maximum error function value is within 2.8% of the mean. Using 15 optimization points was found as a good compromise for the model converging well within one to a few million simulation runs. Therefore, the optimization of the SDEF and the other model parameters was done (almost, except for a SDEF scaling factor) independently, to not exceed the number of variables beyond 15. For refinement of the SDEF around the Easter week, three optimization points were added, and randomized together with one preceding and all following points (total of 8 points), and two simulation batches of one million runs each were run. The results of the two batches are shown in Figure 12. Figure 5 (main document) shows in an insert the final 95% confidence intervals of the optimization points. As the confidence intervals of the 15 optimization points of the 3-million run are of comparable size as for the 8 points randomized in the 2-million run, it is indicated that the resolution limit achieved by this model and the quality of the real-world data tracked is in the order of $\pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$ (95%CI), and it is reached faster (2-million runs) for 8 randomized parameters as compared to 15 parameters (3 million runs). The inserts in Figure 5 show the confidence intervals for both when using the best 100 functions and for the best-1000 functions as estimator for the optimization point values, and they are in very good agreement (worst-case point: 9% larger CI for 1000-best functions) which also indicates that the model has converged to its resolution limit.

The fine adjustment with the other model parameters was done by a combined Monte-Carlo analysis (1 million runs in a single batch), randomizing all parameters, but only using a randomized scaling factor for the already determined social distancing functions of the two pre-optimized sub-population social-distancing functions.

H. Additional information to the verification tests of the social-distancing function

The correctness of the determined social-distancing effectiveness function (SDEF), and the degree of independency of the SDEF results on the choice of the time-axis position of the randomization points was investigated by additional Monte-Carlo simulation batches (500000 runs each) re-determining the SDEF with the randomized starting points shifted ± 3 days in time. The final SDEF determined in this study (without the Easter-week detail) is compared to the 95% confidence intervals estimated from the 100 best functions of each new starting-point parameter set, as shown in Figure 13. The SDEF function shape was confirmed by all test functions in detail, with the local minimum (April 5) and local maximum (May 13) of the original SDEF lying for 5 out of 6 verification functions within their 95%CI estimated by the 100 best functions each. The average deviation of the 50% transition point in time is 0.32 days (95%CI[0.28 0.36]).

I. Confidence intervals of final model results

The randomization of all parameters is following a normal distribution. The 95% confidence intervals of the final results are determined by using the standard error of the mean of the 100 best runs of the Monte-Carlo analysis for the estimation:

$$95\% C. I. = \bar{x} \pm 1.96 \times \frac{S_x}{\sqrt{N}}$$

with \bar{x} and S_x the mean and the corrected sample standard deviation of the N best functions, respectively. For the Social distancing function, the 95% confidence intervals of the optimized points are given in Figure 5 of the main paper both for the 100 and the 1000 best runs as estimator, which are very well matching (for the worst case point: the 95%CI from 1000 best runs is 9.0% larger than estimated from the 100 best runs) which shows good convergence of the model.

For results which refer to the number of infected people, the confidence intervals are given including the intervals of the PCR-test reference values, which are by far dominating the results.

J. Supplementary material: Analysis of the Eurovision Song Contest national final in Stockholm

The potential influence of the Eurovision Song Contest (ESC) national final in Stockholm, Sweden, on March 7, 2020, as a potential super-spreader event with 27 000 participants (according to media reports) was analysed, by: (1) injecting an average number of transmission events $N=1..50$ per contagious person; (2) scaling the initial starting sequence of the model so that the model maintains the same outcome (using a Newton root-finding algorithm, with an error threshold of 1 cumulative hospital person-day, which is an error of 25 ppm); (3) simulating the outcome without the ESC by removing the injected ESC incidences. For determining the number of present contagious people, it was assumed that all asymptomatic and presymptomatic people would participate, and 25% of all first-day symptomatic people of that day. For the calculation of the number of contagious people, the probability of testing PCR-positive (Figure 2:A, main paper) was taken into account as a measure for how contagious an individual is. Table I summarizes the outcome of the model had the ESC taken place without public or been cancelled, for $N=1..50$. Figure 15:A shows the model outcome for the hospitalization requirements and the cumulative deaths for these scenarios. Figure 15:B shows the anomaly in number of hospital patients identified by the model, relative to a linear-regression curve, created by the ESC in the model for $N=1..50$. The anomaly is not visible in the real world hospitalization data, as the standard deviation of the 17 data points (from March 19, start of reporting, to April 3, beginning of Easter break) of the rising slope is 11.4 patients, whereas even for $N=50$ the anomaly is only 4.6 patients.

K. Source code

The source code of the model, implemented in MATLAB script language, is enclosed at the end of this appendix.




Figure 7. Date-correction of death numbers reported for Stockholm.




Figure 8. Three-parameter logistics function for modelling time-variant and nonlinear model parameters.




Figure 9. Initial model setup using a logistics function for the social distancing effectiveness function: (A) determination of the starting value for β_0 , determining R_0 ; (B) initial determination of the timing of the social distancing function; (c) initial determination of the end level of the social distancing function; (D) two-dimensional parameter analysis with minimum mean square error function, for fine adjustment of the β_0 / social-distancing scaling factor combination of the logistics function.




Figure 10. Antibody development distribution, utilized to estimate the probability of individuals having had the infection for testing antibody-positive.




Figure 11. Convergence of Monte-Carlo simulations for determining the social-distancing effectiveness function (SDEF) of the general population model, three batches with 1 million runs each: (left) convergence of the standard deviation of selected points (see Figure 4); (right) convergence of error function value of 100 best functions, over run numbers.




Figure 12. Monte-Carlo simulation of the three additional points refining the social-distancing effectiveness function during the Easter week; two batches with 1 million runs each; error function values of the 100 best functions shown in the inserts (bottom-right; same scale both); error function values of the best 100 functions over the course of the two simulation batches shown in the insert (top-right).




Figure 13. Verification tests re-determining the social-distancing functions with time-shifted starting points, with the 95% confidence intervals of the test functions derived from the 100 best functions of each new starting-point parameter set: A: 95% CI of social distancing verification functions compared to original function; B: close-up views of local minimum and local maximum.




Figure 14. Internally studentized residuals of the model fitting to the real-world data.




Figure 15. Analysis of Eurovision Song Contest (ESC) final in Stockholm, March 7, 2020. A: model outcome had the ESC been without public, for every present contagious person infecting N people; B: anomaly in number of hospital patients identified by the model, relative to linear-regression curve, created by the ESC in the model for $N=1..50$ (blue curves), as compared to the reported cases (black dots; standard deviation red highlighted area; hospital data shown in the subfigure to the right, showing the data points used as reference, from March 19, start of reporting, to April 3, beginning of Easter break).

Table I. Investigation of the influence of the Eurovision Song Contest national final in Stockholm, on March 7, 2020, on the COVID-19 outbreak.

<i>Transm. per contagious person at ESC (N)</i>	<i>Cumulative infected in Stockholm up to ESC</i>	<i>Daily new infections in Stockholm w/o ESC</i>	<i>Contagious people present at ESC</i>	<i>New infections at ESC (in parenthesis: proportion compared to new regular infections that day)</i>	<i>Results if ESC would have been cancelled or without public</i>				
					<i>Cum. deaths w/o ESC</i>	<i>Peak hosp. beds w/o ESC</i>	<i>Peak ICU beds w/o ESC</i>	<i>Cum. hosp. person-days w/o ESC</i>	<i>Cum. ICU person-days w/o ESC</i>
0	6674	1449	23.3	0(0.00%)	2194(-0.00%)	1084(-0.00%)	228(-0.00%)	66254(-0.00%)	12252(-0.00%)
1	6654	1444	23.2	23(1.61%)	2188(-0.18%)	1081(-0.27%)	227(-0.28%)	66108(-0.22%)	12223(-0.24%)
2	6633	1440	23.1	46(3.21%)	2182(-0.36%)	1078(-0.54%)	227(-0.56%)	65963(-0.44%)	12194(-0.47%)
5	6573	1427	22.9	115(8.03%)	2165(-0.90%)	1069(-1.35%)	225(-1.39%)	65533(-1.10%)	12107(-1.19%)
10	6475	1406	22.6	226(16.07%)	2136(-1.81%)	1055(-2.70%)	222(-2.78%)	64829(-2.20%)	11967(-2.37%)
20	6286	1365	21.9	439(32.13%)	2080(-3.60%)	1028(-5.40%)	216(-5.57%)	63463(-4.39%)	11694(-4.74%)
50	5782	1256	20.2	1009(80.32%)	1932(-8.86%)	956(-13.46%)	200(-13.92%)	59703(-10.97%)	10949(-11.83%)

SOURCE CODE (Matlab R2018b script)

```
function SEIRD_model_soc_dist_multi_inf6_FKT( SEIRD_data_in, SEIRD_data_out ),
% SEIRD model v.6, implemented in MATLAB script language
% last update 2020-06-24 (C) Joachim Oberhammer
% contact: joachimo@kth.se

% load model database, containing all model parameters
load SEIRD_data_in;

% determine the time vector
date_t=[datenum(start_date, 'yyyy-mm-dd'):datenum(end_date, 'yyyy-mm-dd')];
anz=length(date_t);

kk_run=1;
```

Appendix: Supplementary material

Manuscript: Social-distancing effectiveness tracking of the COVID-19 hotspot Stockholm

```
kk_socdistset=sds_sel(kk_run);           % get the data set number for the current model to be simulated now

% default model is model(1)
sel=1;
mymodel=model(sel);           % load the model parameter set

% initialize model variables before simulating individual data sets
R=0;
D=0;
H=[0;0;0];
ICU=0;
E=mymodel.E0;
Ia=zeros(size(mymodel.delay_t,2),1);
Is=zeros(size(mymodel.delay_t,2),1);

% initialize variables for the SB model
I_SB=[0;0];
E_SB=mymodel.E0_SB;
R_SB=0;
D_SB=0;

% read out all the model parameters for the model of this run
S=mymodel.N;
N=mymodel.N;
latency_time=mymodel.latency_time;
presymYesNo=mymodel.presymYesNo;
beta0 = mymodel.beta;
inf_asympt_ratio = mymodel.inf_asympt_ratio;
env_trans = mymodel.env_trans;
PCR_pos=mymodel.PCR_pos;
delay_t=mymodel.delay_t;
hosp_s0 = mymodel.hosp_s;
CFR_s = mymodel.CFR_s;
hosp_times=mymodel.hosp_times;
icu_delay=mymodel.icu_delay;
icu_times=mymodel.icu_times;
soc_dist_model_fac = mymodel.soc_dist_model_fac;

S_SB = mymodel.N_SB;
```

Appendix: Supplementary material

Manuscript: Social-distancing effectiveness tracking of the COVID-19 hotspot Stockholm

```
N_SB = mymodel.N_SB;
beta0_SB_ext_fac = mymodel.beta_SB_ext_fac;
beta0_SB_int = mymodel.beta_SB_int;
delay_t_SB = mymodel.delay_t_SB;
hosp_s_SB = mymodel.hosp_s_SB;
CFR_SB = mymodel.CFR_SB;

% calculate the nonlinear hospital and ICU death rate functions for the current model set
CFR_h_NL_fac_x=[0:1:30000]; % x = number of people in hospital
% logistics functions
CFR_h_NL_fac_y = logistics_fkt( (mymodel.drh_x1+mymodel.drh_x0)/2 , mymodel.drh_x1-mymodel.drh_x0 ,
1,1+mymodel.NLfac_DR_hi,CFR_h_NL_fac_x);

% calculate the daily social-distancing effectiveness scaling for the current run, for regular population
x0=[datenum(start_date, 'yyyy-mm-dd')
datenum(social_distance_dates{sds_dates_sel(kk_run)}(1:length(social_dist_scale{kk_socdistset})), 'yyyy-mm-dd')'];
y0=[social_dist_scale{kk_socdistset}(1) social_dist_scale{kk_socdistset}(:)'];
social_dist_scale_ = interp1(x0,y0,date_t, 'PCHIP');
% now same for people in care homes
tlf0 = [round(mymodel.sds_ts_SB-mymodel.sds_dt_SB):1:round(mymodel.sds_ts_SB+mymodel.sds_dt_SB)];
x0=[datenum('2019-01-01', 'yyyy-mm-dd') (tlf0+dt0_SB) datenum('2022-01-01', 'yyyy-mm-dd')];
y0=[1.0 logistics_fkt(mymodel.sds_ts_SB,mymodel.sds_dt_SB,1.0,mymodel.sds_y2_SB,tlf0) mymodel.sds_y2_SB];
social_dist_scale_SB_ = interp1(x0,y0,date_t, 'PCHIP');

% calculated the injecting cases for current run: mapping of the old, specific point injections to the calendar
E_inject=zeros(1,length(date_t));
if E_add_sel(kk_run)>0, % simply switch off the injection by using 0 as selection index
    for i=1:length(E_add{E_add_sel(kk_run)}),
        ind0=datenum(E_add_dates{E_add_dates_sel(kk_run)}{i}, 'yyyy-mm-dd')-datenum(start_date, 'yyyy-mm-dd')+1;
        if ind0<1,
            error('E_add_dates must be after starting date');
        end;
        E_inject(ind0) = E_inject(ind0) + E_add{E_add_sel(kk_run)}(i); % this allows also that a date is
present twice in the lookup-table; for instance if injected cases should be added arbitrarily without changing the
initial startup sequence
    end;
end;

% calculate the variable-time icu hospitalization rate from regular ward H1
```


Appendix: Supplementary material

Manuscript: Social-distancing effectiveness tracking of the COVID-19 hotspot Stockholm

```
x0=[datenum('2019-01-01','yyyy-mm-dd') datenum(mymodel.icu_t1,'yyyy-mm-dd') datenum(mymodel.icu_t2,'yyyy-mm-dd')
datenum('2022-12-01','yyyy-mm-dd')];
y0=[ mymodel.icu_s1 mymodel.icu_s1 mymodel.icu_s2 mymodel.icu_s2 ];
icu_s_var = interp1(x0,y0,date_t,'PCHIP');

% calculate the variable-time hospital death-rate (used for the general ward and for the icu)
x0=[datenum('2019-01-01','yyyy-mm-dd') datenum(mymodel.CFR_h_fac_t1,'yyyy-mm-dd')
datenum(mymodel.CFR_h_fac_t2,'yyyy-mm-dd') datenum('2022-12-01','yyyy-mm-dd')];
y0=[ 1.0 1.0 mymodel.CFR_h_fac_s2 mymodel.CFR_h_fac_s2 ];
CFR_h_s_var_fac = interp1(x0,y0,date_t,'PCHIP');

% now simulating time sequence for individual data set
for i=1:anz,

    beta = beta0;          % this needs to be reset for every day, since for every day a social-distancing/seasonal
    correction factor is applied individually
    beta_SB_int = beta0_SB_int;
    beta_SB_ext_fac = beta0_SB_ext_fac;

    % at specific, given times: scale the basic transmission matrix with a time dependent scaling factor (for
    adjusting individual matrix elements by time)
    ind0 = min(find( datenum(beta_dates,'yyyy-mm-dd') >= date_t(i) ));
    if ~isempty(ind0)      % if a date is found
        if length(beta_dates_fac)>=ind0,      % if the beta scaling matrix of the current data set is defined for
        this date in the scaling vector (should always be the case)
            beta = beta0 .* beta_dates_fac{beta_dates_on(kk_run)}{ind0};
        end;
    end;

    % now the transmission rates scaling factor is determined; let's scale the transmission matrixes now
    % scaling of transmission rates for asymptomatic phases to current social-distancing value
    beta = social_dist_scale(i) * beta;
    beta_SB_ext_fac = social_dist_scale_SB(i) * beta_SB_ext_fac;
    beta_SB_int = social_dist_scale_SB(i) * beta_SB_int;

    % hospitalization rates
    hosp_s = hosp_s0;
    icu_s = icu_s_var(i);          % icu rate is time-dependent
```

Appendix: Supplementary material

Manuscript: Social-distancing effectiveness tracking of the COVID-19 hotspot Stockholm

```
% determine the current death rate for hospital and for ICU: nonlinear death-rate model
if CFR_NL_on(kk_run)==1 && i>1,
    % determine the non-linear rates by mapping to the pre-determined non-linearity function
    cf = CFR_h_s_var_fac(i) * CFR_h_NL_fac_y( round(sum(H(:,i))+ICU(i) ) +1 );
    CFR_i(i) = mymodel.CFR_i * cf;
    CFR_h(:,i) = mymodel.CFR_h(:) * cf;
end;

%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
% actual differential equations of the SEIRD model
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

% equations for care home model (Swedish: särskilt boende, SB)
dS_SB(i) = -S_SB(i) * ( (beta(2,:) * Ia(:,i) + beta(1,:) * Is(:,i)) * beta_SB_ext_fac / N(i) +
beta_SB_int * I_SB(1,i) / N_SB(i) ) );
dE_SB(i) = -dS_SB(i) - E_SB(i) / latency_time;
dI_SB(1,i) = E_SB(i) / latency_time - I_SB(1,i) / delay_t_SB(1);
dI_SB(2,i) = I_SB(1,i) / delay_t_SB(1) * (1 - hosp_s_SB) - I_SB(2,i) / delay_t_SB(2);
dD_SB(i) = I_SB(2,i) / delay_t_SB(2) * CFR_SB;
dR_SB(i) = I_SB(2,i) / delay_t_SB(2) * (1 - CFR_SB);
dN_SB(i) = -dD_SB(i);
admitted_hosp_from_SB(i) = I_SB(1,i) / delay_t_SB(1) * hosp_s_SB;

% equations for general population
dS(i) = -S(i) * (beta(2,:) * Ia(:,i) + beta(1,:) * Is(:,i)) / N(i) ;

dE(i) = -dS(i) - E(i) / latency_time + E_inject(i);

dIa(1,i) = inf_asympt_ratio * ( E(i) / latency_time ) - Ia(1,i) / delay_t(2,1);
for ii=2:size(delay_t,2),
    dIa(ii,i) = Ia(ii-1,i) / delay_t(2,ii-1) - Ia(ii,i) / delay_t(2,ii);
end;

dIs(1,i) = (1 - inf_asympt_ratio) * ( E(i) / latency_time ) - Is(1,i) / delay_t(1,1);
dH(1,i) = Is(1,i) / delay_t(1,1) * hosp_s(1) + admitted_hosp_from_SB(i);
dD(i) = Is(1,i) / delay_t(1,1) * CFR_s(1);
for ii=2:size(delay_t,2),
    dIs(ii,i) = Is(ii-1,i) / delay_t(1,ii-1) * (1 - CFR_s(ii-1) - hosp_s(ii-1)) - Is(ii,i) / delay_t(1,ii);
    dD(i) = dD(i) + Is(ii,i) / delay_t(1,ii) * CFR_s(ii);
end;
```

Appendix: Supplementary material

Manuscript: Social-distancing effectiveness tracking of the COVID-19 hotspot Stockholm

```
    dH(1,i) = dH(1,i) + Is(ii,i)/delay_t(1,ii)*hosp_s(ii);
end;

admitted_icu(i) = H(1,i)*icu_s/icu_delay;           % daily new admitted to ICU
admitted_hosp(i) = dH(1,i);                       % daily new admitted to hospital this includes all who are admitted to
hospital, including those from care homes; those returning from ICU to the recovery ward are not included
dH(1,i) = dH(1,i) - H(1,i)/hosp_times(1) - admitted_icu(i); % all in/out to/from hospital compartment H1
compartment H2
dICU(i) = admitted_icu(i) - ICU(i)/icu_times;           % all in/out of the ICU compartment
dH(2,i) = ICU(i)/icu_times*(1-CFR_i(1,i)) - H(2,i)/hosp_times(2); % all in/out hospital compartment H2
(which is used as the recovery compartment from ICU)

daily_deaths_in_hosp_excl_icu(i) = H(1,i)/hosp_times(1)*CFR_h(1,i) + H(2,i)/hosp_times(2)*CFR_h(2,i);
daily_deaths_in_icu(i) = ICU(i)/icu_times*CFR_i(1,i) ;
daily_deaths_home(i) = dD(i); % all deaths not in hospital and not in s?rskilt boende are those at home
(very few)
daily_deaths_SB(i) = dD_SB(i);
dD(i) = dD(i) + daily_deaths_in_hosp_excl_icu(i) + daily_deaths_in_icu(i); % new deaths for general
population; DOES NOT INCLUDE THE care home deaths!!
dR(i) = Is(end,i)/delay_t(1,end)*(1-CFR_s(end)-hosp_s(end)) + Ia(end,i)/delay_t(2,end) +
H(1,i)/hosp_times(1)*(1-CFR_h(1,i)) + H(2,i)/hosp_times(2)*(1-CFR_h(2,i)); % new recovered for general
population
dN(i) = - dD(i) + E_inject(i); % change in general population: those who return with the disease from
abroad, are added to the population; all deaths are deducted

S_SB(i+1) = S_SB(i) + dS_SB(i);
E_SB(i+1) = E_SB(i) + dE_SB(i);
I_SB(:,i+1) = I_SB(:,i) + dI_SB(:,i);
N_SB(i+1) = N_SB(i) + dN_SB(i);
D_SB(i+1) = D_SB(i) + dD_SB(i);
R_SB(i+1) = R_SB(i) + dR_SB(i);

S(i+1) = S(i) + dS(i);
E(i+1) = E(i) + dE(i);
Ia(:,i+1) = Ia(:,i) + dIa(:,i);
Is(:,i+1) = Is(:,i) + dIs(:,i);
R(i+1) = R(i) + dR(i);
D(i+1) = D(i) + dD(i); % note: only general population; does not include care-home deaths!
H(:,i+1) = H(:,i) + dH(:,i);
```

Appendix: Supplementary material

Manuscript: Social-distancing effectiveness tracking of the COVID-19 hotspot Stockholm

```
    ICU(i+1) = ICU(i) + dICU(i);  
    N(i+1)   = N(i)   + dN(i);  
  
end;    % end loop of time sequence for simulating individual pandemic for individual data set  
  
save SEIRD_data_out;  
%%%%%%%%%%%%%% End Of File
```