

Supplementary Information: A data-driven semiparametric model  
of SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics in the United States

2022-08-09

John M. Drake, Andreas Handel, Éric Marty, Eamon B. O'Dea, Tierney O'Sullivan, Giovanni Righi, and Andrew T. Tredennick,

## Model diagram




Figure S1: Model diagram.

# Model parameters

Table S1: Fixed model parameters.

Parameter definition	Parameter symbol	Value	Source
Reproduction number	$\mathcal{R}_0$	7	Sanche et al. (2020)
Baseline transmission rate of symptomatic individuals	$\beta$	$\mathcal{R}_0 \times 0.1 \times \frac{1}{N}$	Assumption
Fraction of infected individuals that are asymptomatic	$a$	0.18	Mizumoto et al. (2020);
Fraction of diagnosed cases that are hospitalized	$h$	0.12	Verity et al. (2020)
Relative transmissibility of $L$ to $I_{su/sd}$	$b_L$	0.12	Li et al. (2020)
Relative transmissibility of $I_a$ to $I_{su/sd}$	$b_{I_a}$	0.5	Li et al. (2020)
Relative transmissibility of $C$ to $I_{su/sd}$	$b_C$	0.27	Assumption
Relative transmissibility of $H$ to $I_{su/sd}$	$b_H$	$4.5 \times 10^{-5}$	Moghadas et al. (2020)
Duration of time in $L$ stages	$1/\gamma_L$	4 days	Li et al. (2020)
Duration of time in $I_a$ stage	$1/\gamma_{I_a}$	3.5 days	Li et al. (2020)
Duration of time in $I_{su}$ stages	$1/\gamma_{I_{su}}$	6 days	Li et al. (2020)
Duration of time in $I_{sd}$ stage	$1/\gamma_{I_{sd}}$	$0.5 \times 1/\gamma_{I_{su}}$	Assumption
Duration of time in $C$ stages	$1/\gamma_C$	$0.5 \times 1/\gamma_{I_{su}}$	Assumption
Duration of time in $H$ stages	$1/\gamma_H$	6 days	Ohsfeldt et al. (2020)
Minimum detection probability	$q_{\min}$	0.1	Assumption
Maximum detection probability	$q_{\max}$	0.4	Assumption
Day at which detection probability is halfway between $q_{\min}$ and $q_{\max}$	$q_{\text{half}}$	30	Assumption
Rate of increase from $q_{\min}$ to $q_{\max}$	$q_r$	1.1	Assumption
Maximum factor by which diagnosis speed increases	$s_{\max}$	1.0	Zhang et al. (2020)
Day at which diagnosis speed-up factor ( $s$ ) is halfway between 0 and $s_{\max}$	$s_{\text{half}}$	30	Assumption
Rate of increase from 0 to $s_{\max}$	$s_r$	1.1	Assumption
Initial size of susceptible pool	$S(t=1)$	$N_{\text{state}}$	Assumption



Table S2: Estimated parameters and starting ranges for MIF estimation procedure. The “expit” function refers to back-transforming the parameter from the logit scale, which was used for estimation.

Parameter definition	Parameter symbol	Start range
Baseline fraction of hospitalizations that result in death	$m_{\text{base}}$	[expit(-6), expit(6)]
Minimum fraction of hospitalizations that result in death	$m_{\text{min}}$	[expit(-6), expit(6)]
Day at which death fraction is halfway between $m_{\text{base}}$ and $m_{\text{min}}$	$m_{\text{half}}$	[exp(-5), exp(5)]
Extra-demographic process noise	$\sigma$	[exp(-5), exp(5)]
Case reporting dispersion	$\theta_c$	[exp(-5), exp(5)]
Death reporting dispersion	$\theta_d$	[exp(-5), exp(5)]
Initial size of latent compartment	$L(t = 0)$	[exp(0), exp(10)]
Initial size of asymptomatic infectious compartment	$I_a(t = 0)$	[exp(0), exp(10)]
Initial size of undetected infectious compartment	$I_{su}(t = 0)$	[exp(0), exp(10)]
Initial size of detected infectious compartment	$I_{sd}(t = 0)$	[exp(0), exp(10)]
B-spline coefficients	$g_i$	[-10, 10]

## Detection probability and diagnosis speed-up functions

The fraction of exposed individuals that are detected and flow into the  $I_{sd}$  compartments ( $q$ ) starts at a low level of 0.1 and increases sigmoidally towards a maximum of 0.4, reaching the half way point of 0.25 on the 30th day since the first case notification. The time to diagnosis ( $1/s$ ) decreases sigmoidally over time from 3 days on day 0 towards a minimum of 1.5 days, reaching the half way point of 2.25 days on the 30th day since the first case notification.

Both  $q$ ,  $s$  follow a Hill function with Hill coefficient 1.1 and time to half maximum of 30 days:



## Mean absolute scaled errors (MASE)

The MASE is a ratio of mean absolute error (MAE) in the model to MAE of an in-sample naïve model (a random walk forecast from the last observation, adjusted for weekly seasonality). MASE values were calculated for each of the 500 particle filter replicates for each state using the **yardstick** package in R. Most states had a mean MASE less than one for cases, while MASE was greater than one for deaths for most states. Thus, our model does not always outperform the benchmarking model, but it does offer mechanistic insight that the random walk model does not.






Figure S2: Mean and 95% intervals of mean absolute scaled errors (MASE) for each state. MASE was calculated for each of the 500 particle filter replicates for each state, yielding a distribution of MASE values. The point shows the mean of the MASE distribution and the errorbars show the 95% interval (lower 0.025 quantile to upper 0.975 quantile). States are ranked approximately from lowest MASE to highest MASE across both cases and deaths.

## Time series of incident case and death reports


In the following plots, orange points are the reported daily cases or deaths, white line shows the median of the smoothed filtering distributions, and the grey ribbon bounds the 95% prediction interval.




### Arkansas




### California




### Colorado




### Connecticut



### Delaware




### Florida







## Georgia




## Hawaii




## Idaho




### Illinois




### Indiana




### Iowa




### Kansas




### Kentucky




### Louisiana




### Maine




### Maryland




### Massachusetts




### Michigan




### Minnesota




### Mississippi




### Missouri




### Montana




### Nebraska




### Nevada




### New Hampshire




### New Jersey




### New Mexico



### North Carolina




### North Dakota







### Ohio




### Oklahoma




### Oregon




### Pennsylvania




### Rhode Island




### South Carolina




### South Dakota




### Tennessee




### Texas




## Utah




## Vermont




## Virginia



## Washington





## West Virginia




## Time series of mobility, estimated latent trend, and $\mathcal{R}_e$


The following plots show the estimated latent trend, relative mobility, and estimated  $\mathcal{R}_e$  over time for each state. The latent trend is estimated using the maximum likelihood parameter estimates for the  $g_i$  coefficients of the B-spline (see Materials and Methods in main text).




## Arizona




## Arkansas



## California




## Colorado







## Connecticut




## Delaware




## Florida




## Georgia




## Hawaii




## Idaho




## Illinois




## Indiana




## Iowa




## Kansas




## Kentucky




## Louisiana




## Maine




## Maryland



## Massachusetts




## Michigan







## Minnesota




## Mississippi




## Missouri




## Montana




## Nebraska




## Nevada




## New Hampshire




## New Jersey




## New Mexico




## North Carolina




## North Dakota




## Ohio




## Oklahoma




## Oregon



## Pennsylvania




## Rhode Island







## South Carolina




## South Dakota




## Tennessee




## Texas




## Utah




## Vermont




## Virginia



## Washington



## West Virginia



## References

- Li, Ruiyun, Sen Pei, Bin Chen, Yimeng Song, Tao Zhang, Wan Yang, and Jeffrey Shaman. 2020. “Substantial Undocumented Infection Facilitates the Rapid Dissemination of Novel Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2).” *Science* 368 (6490): 489–93. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb3221>.
- Mizumoto, Kenji, Katsushi Kagaya, Alexander Zarebski, and Gerardo Chowell. 2020. “Estimating the Asymptomatic Proportion of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Cases on Board the Diamond Princess Cruise Ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020.” *Eurosurveillance* 25 (10): 2000180. <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180>.
- Ohsfeldt, Robert L., Casey Kar-Chan Choong, Patrick L. Mc Collam, Hamed Abedtash, Kari A. Kelton, and Russel Burge. 2021. “Inpatient Hospital Costs for COVID-19 Patients in the United States.” *Advances in Therapy* 38 (11): 5557–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12325-021-01887-4>.
- Sanche, Steven, Yen Ting Lin, Chonggang Xu, Ethan Romero-Severson, Nick Hengartner, and Ruian Ke. 2020. “High Contagiousness and Rapid Spread of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 - Volume 26, Number 7—July 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases Journal - CDC.” <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.200282>.
- Verity, Robert, Lucy C. Okell, Ilaria Dorigatti, Peter Winskill, Charles Whittaker, Natsuko Imai, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, et al. 2020. “Estimates of the Severity of Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Model-Based Analysis.” *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 20 (6): 669–77. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30243-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7).
- Zhang, Juanjuan, Maria Litvinova, Wei Wang, Yan Wang, Xiaowei Deng, Xinghui Chen, Mei Li, et al. 2020. “Evolving Epidemiology and Transmission Dynamics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Outside Hubei Province, China: A Descriptive and Modelling Study.” *The Lancet. Infectious Diseases* 20 (7): 793–802. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30230-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30230-9).