

Original Research Article

**Title: Prospective Prediction of Future SARS-CoV-2 Infections Using Empirical Data on a National Level to Gauge Response Effectiveness**

Natalia Blanco<sup>1</sup>, Kristen Stafford<sup>1,2</sup>, Marie-Claude Lavoie<sup>1</sup>, Axel Brandenburg<sup>3</sup>, Maria W. Górna<sup>4</sup>, Matthew Merski<sup>4,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for International Health, Education, and Biosecurity, Institute of Human Virology - University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland USA

<sup>3</sup>Nordita, KTH Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>4</sup>Structural Biology Group, Biological and Chemical Research Centre, Department of Chemistry, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

**Corresponding author(s):** Matthew Merski, Maria Gorna

Address: Biological and Chemical Research Centre, Żwirki i Wigury 101

02-089 Warsaw, Poland

Telephone: (+48) 22 55 26 642

Email: merski@gmail.com; mgorna@chem.uw.edu.pl

**Running head:** Prediction of Future SARS-CoV-2 Infections

**Conflict of interest:** None

**Sources of funding:** The work was supported by the National Science Centre, Poland [grant agreement 2014/15/D/NZ1/00968 to M.W.G.] & the EMBO Installation Grant, European Molecular Biology Organization to M.W.G.

**Data availability:** All data used in this manuscript are publically available at <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/download-todays-data-geographic-distribution-covid-19-cases-worldwide>

**Acknowledgements:** We thank Dr. Marcin Ziemniak for useful discussions.

## **ABSTRACT:**

**Background:** Predicting an accurate expected number of future COVID-19 cases is essential to properly evaluate the effectiveness of any treatment or preventive measure. This study aimed to identify the most appropriate mathematical model to prospectively predict the expected number of cases without any intervention.

**Methods:** The total number of cases for the COVID-19 epidemic in 28 countries was analyzed and fitted to several simple rate models including the logistic, Gompertz, quadratic, simple square, and simple exponential growth models. The resulting model parameters were used to extrapolate predictions for more recent data.

**Results:** While the Gompertz growth models (mean  $R^2 = 0.998$ ) best fitted the current data, uncertainties in the eventual case limit made future predictions with logistic models prone to errors. Of the other models, the quadratic rate model (mean  $R^2 = 0.992$ ) fitted the current data best for 25 (89 %) countries as determined by  $R^2$  values. The simple square and quadratic models accurately predicted the number of future total cases 37 and 36 days in advance respectively, compared to only 15 days for the simple exponential model. The simple exponential model significantly overpredicted the total number of future cases while the quadratic and simple square models did not.

**Conclusions:** These results demonstrated that accurate future predictions of the case load in a given country can be made significantly in advance without the need for complicated models of population behavior and generate a reliable assessment of the efficacy of current prescriptive measures against disease spread.

**Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, expected number of cases, exponential growth, logistic model, mathematical model

## INTRODUCTION:

On March 11, 2020 the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the novel coronavirus outbreak (SARS-CoV-2 causing COVID-19) as a pandemic<sup>1</sup> more than three months after the first cases of pneumonia were reported in Wuhan, China in December, 2019<sup>1</sup>. From Wuhan the virus rapidly spread globally, currently leading to ten million confirmed cases and half a million deaths around the world. Although coronaviruses have a wide range of hosts and cause disease in many animals, SARS-CoV-2 is the seventh named member of the *Coronaviridae* known to infect humans<sup>2</sup>. An infected individual will start presenting symptoms an average of 5 days after exposure<sup>3</sup> but approximately 42% of infected individuals remain asymptomatic<sup>4,5</sup>. Furthermore, almost six out of 100 infected patients die globally due to COVID-19<sup>6</sup>.

Currently, treatment and vaccine options for COVID-19 are limited<sup>7</sup>. There is currently no effective or approved vaccine for SARS-CoV-2 although a report from April 2020 noted 78 active vaccine projects, most of them at exploratory or pre-clinical stages<sup>8</sup>. As the virus is transmitted mainly from person to person, prevention measures include social distancing, self-isolation, hand washing, and use of masks. Strict measures of quarantine have been shown as the most effective mitigation measures, reducing up to 78% of expected cases compared to no intervention<sup>9</sup>. Nevertheless, to evaluate the actual effectiveness of any mitigation measure it is necessary to accurately predict the expected number of cases in the absence of intervention.

While there has been some early concern about the ability of SARS-CoV-2 to spread at an apparent near exponential rate<sup>10</sup>, real limitations in available resources (*i.e.* susceptible population) will reduce the spread to a logistic growth rate<sup>11</sup>. Logistic growth produces a sigmoidal curve (Figure 1) where the total number of cases ( $N$ ) eventually asymptotically approaches the population carrying capacity ( $N_M$ ), which for viral epidemics is analogous to the fraction of the population that will be infected before “herd immunity” is achieved<sup>12,13</sup>. This is represented in derivative form by the generalized logistic function (**Equation 1**):

$$\text{Eqn. 1)} \quad \frac{dN}{dt} = rN^\alpha \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{N}{N_M} \right)^\beta \right]^\gamma$$

where  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , &  $\gamma$  are mathematical shape parameters that define the shape of the curve, and  $r$  is the general rate term, analogous to the standard epidemiological parameter,  $R_0$ , the reproductive number, which is a measure of the infectivity of the virus itself<sup>13,14</sup>. For a logistic curve where  $\alpha = 1/2$  and  $\beta = \gamma = 0$ , one gets quadratic growth<sup>15</sup> with  $N = (rt/2)^2$ , while for  $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 1$ , this equation can be rearranged to quadratic form (**Equation 2**)<sup>11</sup> and integrated (**Equation 3**):

$$\text{Eqn. 2)} \quad \frac{dN}{dt} = \frac{-rN^2}{N_M} + rN$$

$$\text{Eqn. 3)} \quad N(t) = \frac{N_0 N_M}{(N_M - N_0)e^{-rt} + N_0}$$

where  $N_0$  represents the initial number of cases within the population. The shape parameters of logistic functions magnify the uncertainty in fitting these curves especially during the early part of the epidemic. These difficulties are further exacerbated by the additional uncertainty in estimation of  $R_0$  for SARS-CoV-2, which is directly linked to the current uncertainty in the population carrying capacity  $N_M$ . And while the basic logistic function gives rise to a symmetrical sigmoidal curve, asymmetrical curves such as the Gompertz growth function (**Equation 4**)<sup>16,17</sup>:

$$\text{Eqn. 4)} \quad N(t) = N_0 e^{\left( \ln\left(\frac{N_M}{N_0}\right) (1 - e^{-rt}) \right)}$$

which emerges<sup>11</sup> from **Equation 1** for  $\alpha = \gamma = 1$ , where  $r$  is replaced by  $\beta r$  and  $\beta$  approaches 0. With this function the rate of spread slows significantly after passing the mid-point resulting in long-tailed epidemics (Figure 1).

Traditionally the number of cases that will occur in an epidemic like COVID-19 is modeled with an SEIR model (**S**usceptible, **E**xposed, **I**nfectious, **R**ecovered/**R**emoved), in which the total population is divided into four categories: susceptible - those who can be infected, exposed – those who in the incubation period but not yet able to transmit the virus to others, infectious - those who are capable of spreading disease to the susceptible population, and recovered/removed – those who have finished the disease course and are not susceptible to re-infection or have died. For a typical epidemic, the ability for infectious individuals to spread the disease is proportional to the fraction of the population in the susceptible category with “herd immunity”<sup>12,13</sup> and extinction of the epidemic occurs

once a limiting fraction of the population has entered into the Recovered/Removed category<sup>13</sup>. However, barriers to transmission, either natural<sup>18</sup> or artificial (*i.e.* quarantines, vaccines)<sup>13</sup> can extinguish the epidemic before the community is fully infected. Artificial barriers such as mandatory quarantining in China<sup>19,20</sup> or aggressive contact tracing in South Korea<sup>21</sup> currently seem to have largely stemmed the spread of SARS-CoV-2. Numerous political, social, and material factors prevent the implementation of either of these responses in many other countries<sup>22</sup>, but it should be possible to find alternative approaches which can be equally effective. For an epidemic as serious as COVID-19, it behooves medical, scientific, and policy experts to determine as rapidly as possible which community responses are effective and achievable within different populations. However, gauging the effectiveness of these responses requires an accurate prediction<sup>23</sup> of the number of future cases, and overestimation of the expected number of cases will make neutral or even harmful responses appear to be effective when those overestimated cases fail to occur. Thus, accurate prospective predictions (*i.e.* before knowing the actual outcome) are preferable to retrospective analysis in which effectiveness is gauged after the results of the prescriptive actions are known<sup>24,25</sup>.

This study aimed to evaluate if a simple model was able to correctly prospectively predict the total number of cases at a future date. We found that fitting the case data to a quadratic (parabolic) rate curve<sup>15</sup> for the early points in the epidemic curves (before the mitigation efforts began to have effects) was easy, efficient, and made good predictions for the number of cases at future dates despite significant national variation in the start of the infection, mitigation response, or economic condition.

**METHODS:** Data on the number of COVID-19 cases was downloaded from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) on June 1, 2020<sup>26</sup>. Countries that had reported the highest numbers of cases in mid-March 2020 (and Russia) were chosen as the focus of our analysis to minimize statistical error due to small numbers. The total number of cases for each country was calculated as a simple sum of that day plus all previous days. Days that were missing from the record were assigned values of zero. The early part of the curve was fit and statistical parameters were generated using Prism 8 (GraphPad) using the non-linear regression module using the program standard centered second order polynomial (quadratic), exponential growth, and the Gompertz growth

model as defined by Prism 8, and a simple user-defined simple square model ( $N = At^2 + C$ ) where  $N$  is the total number of cases,  $A$  and  $C$  are the fitting constants, and  $t$  is the number of days from the beginning of the epidemic curve. The beginning of the curve (SI Table 1) was defined empirically among the first days in which the number of cases began to increase regularly. Typically, this occurred when the country had reported less than 100 total cases. The early part of the curve was defined by manual examination looking for changes in the curve shape and later confirmed by  $R^2$  values for the quadratic model. Prospective predictions for the number of cases were done by fitting the total number of COVID-19 cases for each day starting with day 5 and then extrapolating the number of cases using the estimated model parameters to predict the number of cases for the final day for which data was available (June 1, 2020) or to the last day before significant decrease in the  $R^2$  value for the quadratic fit. Fit parameters for the Gompertz growth model were not used to make predictions if the fit itself was ambiguous. Acceptable predictions were defined as being within a factor of two from the actual number (*i.e.* predictions within 50-200% of the actual total).

## **RESULTS:**

### **A simple exponential growth model is a poor fit for the SARS-COV-2 pandemic:**

The total number of cases for each of 28 countries was plotted with time and several model equations were fit to the early part of the data before mitigating effects from public health policies began to change the rate of disease spread. In total, 20 (71 %) countries showed mitigation of disease spread by June 1 (Figure 2). When the early, pre-mitigation portion of the data was examined for all 28 countries, the Gompertz growth model had the best statistical parameters (mean  $R^2 = 0.998 \pm 0.0028$ , Table 1) although a fit could not be obtained for the data from 2 countries and many of the fit values for  $N_M$  were unrealistic compared to national populations (*e.g.* China and India had predicted  $N_M$  values corresponding to 0.014 % and 0.33 % of their populations respectively<sup>26</sup> (SI Table 2)). Fitting was also incomplete for the generalized logistic model for all 28 countries underlining the difficulty in applying this model. On the other hand, the simple models were able to robustly fit all the current data, with the quadratic (parabolic) model performing the best (mean  $R^2 = 0.992 \pm 0.004$ ) and the exponential model the worst (mean  $R^2 = 0.957 \pm 0.022$ )(Table 1). In only three (11 %) countries did

the exponential model have the best overall  $R^2$  value among the simple models. Furthermore, the trend of the overall superiority of the Gompertz model followed by the quadratic was also observed in the standard error of the estimate statistic as well. The mean standard error of the estimate ( $Sy.x$ , analogous to the root mean squared error for fits of multiple parameters) value for the 28 countries was 1699 for the Gompertz model, 5613 for the quadratic model, 8572 for the simple square model and 11257 for the exponential model (Table 1). Likewise, plots of the natural log of the total number of cases in the early parts of the epidemic ( $\ln N$ ) with time are significantly less linear (as determined by  $R^2$ ) than equivalent plots of the square root of the total number of cases ( $N^{1/2}$ ) (SI Table 3, SI Figs 1, 2).

### **Quadratic growth models provide improved fits to the early portion of the epidemic courses:**

While logistic growth models have been widely used to model epidemics<sup>16,27</sup>, uncertainties in estimates of  $R_0$  (and therefore the population carrying capacity  $N_M$ ) make prospective predictions of the course of the epidemic difficult<sup>14,27</sup>. (Figure 3, Table 2, SI Table 4). Here we define predictions as accurate when they are within a factor of two (50-200%) of the actual outcome. For most countries, the simple exponential model massively overpredicts the number of future cases. Predictions generated more than 14 days prior were more than double the actual number of cases for 17 (61 %) countries examined. In fact, for 15 (54 %) countries, the exponential model made at least one overprediction by a factor of greater than 10,000 fold, while the quadratic and simple square models make no overprediction by more than a factor of 3.3 and 2.1, respectively (*i.e.* using the first 10 days of data from Portugal the exponential model predicts 34 million cases while the quadratic, simple square, and Gompertz growth models predict 24957, 20358 and 18953 cases respectively while 23683 total cases were observed while the total population of Portugal in 2018 was 10.3 million<sup>26</sup>).

Predictions using the quadratic and simple square models were much more accurate. Only in four (14 %) countries does the quadratic model ever overpredict the final number of cases by more than a factor of two while the simple square model overpredict by a factor of two for only one (4 %) country (SI Table 4). For the quadratic model, the mean maximum daily overprediction was a factor of 1.6-fold (median 1.3 fold) while for the simple square model the mean maximum daily overprediction

was 1.3-fold (median 1.1 fold). Both of these models produced much more accurate predictions than the simple exponential model (Table 2).

## **DISCUSSION:**

The start of the global SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has resulted in an unprecedented set of national responses. These responses have varied considerably from a strict lockdown in China<sup>10</sup>, to aggressive contact tracing in South Korea<sup>28</sup>, to mandatory shelter in place restrictions in France<sup>29</sup>, to giving citizens information and allowing them more freedom to make choices as in Sweden<sup>30</sup>, and to other countries attempting to accelerate their progress towards herd immunity<sup>31</sup>. The variety in these national prescriptions is a result of the different socioeconomic situations in individual countries which have to take into account not only the costs of these efforts both monetarily and in terms of lives, but also what can be reasonably achieved depending on the relationship between individual governments and their citizenry. Additionally, the spread of SARS-CoV-2 has been putatively linked to several inherent factors within a country, such as average population density<sup>32</sup>, normal social behaviors<sup>22</sup>, and even weather may have an effect<sup>33</sup>. The efficacy of similar prescriptions can vary in pairs of neighboring countries (*i.e.* the UK or Ireland). Therefore, it behooves every nation to review the results of its own policy prescriptions in order to make necessary course adjustments as quickly and accurately as possible.

While predictions about the future course of an epidemic, especially one as novel as COVID-19 are difficult under the best of circumstances, the severity of the pandemic has resulted in an unprecedented amount of epidemiological data being produced with daily frequency. Because logistic epidemic models have been in use for more than a century<sup>16</sup> it is almost tautological that the rate of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 cannot be well-modeled by simple exponential growth equations, further demonstrated by statistical analysis of and the poor predictions made by the exponential model for the future number of cases as compared to the quadratic (parabolic) model<sup>15</sup>. However, simple exponential models do not generate entirely terrible fit statistics (Table 1), and this may account for the conflation of the course of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic with truly exponential growth. That the exponential growth constant term,  $k$ , is constantly decreasing after day 10 in 10 (68 %) countries (SI Fig. 3) further



indicates the overall utility of logistic models, which were explicitly developed to model the a constantly decreasing rate of growth due to consumption of the available resource (*i.e.* the susceptible population pool of the SIR model)<sup>16</sup>. But, while logistic models are implicitly the correct model, they are difficult to accurately fit during the early portion of an epidemic due to inherent uncertainties in the mathematical shape parameters (Equation 1) of the curve itself and the population carrying capacity for SARS-CoV-2,  $N_M$ , which still has a significant uncertainty as the virus has only recently moved into the human population. Herd immunity is defined as  $1 - 1/R_0$ , and since current estimates for  $R_0$  vary from 1.5 – 6.5<sup>14</sup>. This implies that 33 – 85% of the population will need to have contracted the disease and developed immunity in order to terminate the epidemic. A discrepancy of this size will significantly affect predictions based on logistic growth models.

Here we note the utility of the quadratic (parabolic) and simple square models in predicting the course of the pandemic more than a month in advance. The simple exponential model vastly overpredicts the number of cases (Fig. 2, Table 2). The Gompertz growth model, while often making largely correct predictions often generates wildly inaccurate estimates of the population carrying capacity  $N_M$  (SI Table 2), and the generalized logistic model simply fails to produce a statistically reliable result with the currently available data. Overestimation of the future number of cases will cause problems because the failure of the number of predicted cases to materialize may be erroneously used as evidence that poorly implemented and ineffective policy prescriptions are reducing the spread of SARS-CoV-2, which may lead to political pressure for premature cessation of all prescriptive measures and inevitably an increase in the number of cases and excess, unnecessary morbidities. Fortunately, the quadratic model produces accurate, prospective predictions of the number of cases (Fig. 3, Table 2). Use of this model is simple as it is directly implemented in common spreadsheet programs and can be implemented without much difficulty or technical modeling expertise. In theory, this model can also be applied to smaller, sub-national populations, although the smaller number of total cases in these regions will undoubtedly give rise to larger statistical errors.

In no way does the empirical agreement between the quadratic model and empirical data negate the fact that the growth of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic is logistic in nature in all 28 countries (Table 1, SI Table 2). We expect the suitability of these empirical quadratic fits is related to either the

fact that quadratic form of the slope of the generalized logistic function or the limitation of the virus to a physical radius of infectivity around infectious individuals, or that it is still early in the pandemic as no country has yet officially logged even 1% of its population as having been infected, or all three. Of course, the true number of COVID-19 cases is a matter of debate as there is speculation that a significant fraction of infections are not being identified<sup>34</sup>. However, because this method is focused on the rate of case growth over time, the errors that lead to any undercounting within a given country are likely to remain largely unchanged over the short time periods observed here and still provide a reasonable estimate of the number of positively identified cases. While despite their similar predictive power we largely focus on the quadratic model rather than the simple square model for the aforementioned reasons, we must also note that quadratic curve fitting is natively implemented in most common spreadsheet software while the simple square model is not. By monitoring the  $R^2$  values for the quadratic models, it is a simple task to identify when the epidemic is beginning to subside within a country (*i.e.* “bending the curve”). Here we recommend the use of an  $R^2$  value of 0.985 for identifying when the rate of infection is beginning to subside, but more conservative estimates can also be made by lowering this threshold.

Examination of the data collected here suggests that early, aggressive measures have been most effective at reducing disease burden within a country. Countries that initially adopted less stringent measures (such as the US, UK, Russia, and Brazil) are currently more heavily burdened than those countries that started with more intense prescriptions (such as China, South Korea, Australia, Denmark, and Vietnam)<sup>35</sup>. Vietnam was not analyzed here as it does not currently have a large number of COVID-19 cases likely due to its early aggressive action against viral spread<sup>7,35</sup>. The effectiveness of aggressive measures may also be due to the apparent quadratic rate of growth of total cases with time (Equation 2); while growth in proportion to the square of the number of days is fast, it is not as fast as exponential growth. Early reductions in the number of infected individuals and the number of interactions they have with susceptible individuals clearly pays compounded dividends in future case reductions as advantage can be taken of this slower spreading rate.

Quadratic modeling of the increases of COVID-19 cases within national boundaries currently gives a more accurate prospective prediction of the growth in the number of total cases. This allows

for near real time adjustments to policy prescriptions and obviates the need to estimate the effect of human behaviors on these predictions and instead focus on the available empirical data and fine tune the needed responses and efficiently guide the direction of health care resources. Until an effective vaccine or cure is available, social distancing, contact tracing, and other aggressive quarantine measures are the most effective tools to combat the spread of SARS-CoV-2 and it is imperative to monitor whether these measures are being effectively implemented. Accurate prospective modeling of the future number of cases within countries will help to minimize the social costs and financial burdens of these necessary mitigation measures.

**TABLES:****Table 1:** Statistical fit parameters for the quadratic, simple square, simple exponential, and Gompertz growth models for the early course of the epidemic in each country.

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>Strd. Dev</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>Quadratic<sup>a</sup></b> (N=28)	<b>R squared</b>	0.9917	0.0044	0.9930
	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	21916684140	1.05689E+11	87110317.5
	<b>Sy.x</b>	5612.9	15068.7	1250.0
<b>Simple Square</b> (N=28)	<b>R squared</b>	0.9780	0.0159	0.9821
	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	44700980001	2.02519E+11	174119853
	<b>Sy.x</b>	8572.1	21235.6	1591.5
<b>Simple Exponential</b> (N=28)	<b>R squared</b>	0.9568	0.0215	0.9548
	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	1.0317E+11	5.23176E+11	466907869.5
	<b>Sy.x</b>	11257.0	32734.8	3067.0
<b>Gompertz growth</b> (N=26)	<b>R squared</b>	0.9978	0.0028	0.9991
	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	2048425776	9767369361	11600080
	<b>Sy.x</b>	1699.2	4598.3	459.7


<sup>a</sup>Because fit parameters were unable to be obtained for the Gompertz model for two countries, the statistical parameters were calculated from the remaining 26 countries (indicated by  $N = 26$ ). The generalized logistic model failed to adequately determine fit parameters in every cases so is not included in this table.

**Table 2:** Results of prospective predictions of total case load made using the various models.



















	<b>Mean<sup>b</sup> Acceptable Predictive Length (Days)</b>	<b>Mean Minimum Normalized Prediction (Observed/Actual Total Cases)</b>	<b>Mean Maximum Normalized Prediction (Observed/Actual Total Cases)</b>
<b>Simple Exponential</b>	14.6 ± 8.0 (11)	1.11 ± 0.09 (1.14)	8.9 x 10 <sup>14</sup> ± 4.7 x 10 <sup>15</sup> (5 x 10 <sup>4</sup> )
<b>Quadratic (Parabolic)</b>	35.6 ± 15.8 (31.5)	0.25 ± 0.29 (0.09)	1.55 ± 0.64 (1.33)
<b>Simple Square</b>	36.9 ± 21.6 (31)	0.42 ± 0.34 (0.24)	1.26 ± 0.35 (1.12)
<b>Gompertz Growth</b>	28.2 ± 17.9 (25.5)	0.14 ± 0.24 (0.02)	3.8 x 10 <sup>8</sup> ± 2.0 x 10 <sup>9</sup> (2 x 10 <sup>2</sup> )


<sup>b</sup> All data given are mean results ± the sample standard error. Median values are given in parentheses.

**FIGURES:**





















**Figure 1:** Illustrative comparison of exponential, quadratic, generalized logistic and Gompertz growth curves. The Gompertz growth curve (Equation 4, solid black line) representing the progress of a theoretical epidemic for a disease with an arbitrarily chosen  $R_0$  value of 3.4 ( $r = 0.045$ ,  $N_0 = 1$ ,  $N_M = 70\%$ , dotted line). The solid grey line is an equivalent logistic curve, note that while the midpoint for both logistic curves is the same, the Gompertz curve reaches the population carrying capacity more slowly, resulting in a long tailed epidemic. The initial part of the Gompertz curve (including time points until 5% of the population has been infected) was fit to the simple exponential (red dashes), quadratic (blue dashes) and simple square (green dashes) models. It is apparent from these curves how quickly the exponential curve overestimates the rate of growth for the epidemic as compared to the quadratic and simple square fit curves and how the quadratic model more closely follows the Gompertz growth curve, evidenced by the smaller  $Sy.x$  value for the quadratic fit in Table 1.






**Figure 2:** The development of COVID-19 cases over time in 28 nations. The total number of cases as of June 1, 2020 is indicated by black circles while the early part of the curve is indicated by orange triangles. A quadratic fit curve based on the early part of the curve extrapolated into the future is shown as an orange dashed line. The black circles are obscured in those countries which had not begun to effectively reduce SARS-CoV-2 spread by June 1, 2020.







**Figure 3:** Comparison of the errors in prospective predictions for COVID-19 case numbers for different growth models for 28 countries for the simple exponential model (red triangles), the simple square model (green squares), the quadratic model (black circles), the Gompertz growth model (blue triangles), and the basic logistic growth model (purple diamonds). Note the log scale for the vertical axis which indicates the ratio of the predicted to observed number of cases. In each graph the fit values for each model using only data up to that day are used to predict the number of expected cases for the last day for which data is available (or the last day before significant curve deviation is observed, see figure 2). Days on which the fit was not statistically sound were omitted from the graph.

## REFERENCES:

1. Organization WH. Coronaviruse disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report - 51. [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200311-sitrep-51-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=1ba62e57\\_10](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200311-sitrep-51-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=1ba62e57_10): World Health Organization, 2020.
2. Sun J, He W-T, Wang L, Lai A, Ji X, Zhai X, Li G, Suchard MA, Tian J, Zhou J, Veit M, Su S. COVID-19: Epidemiology, Evolution, and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives. *Trends in molecular medicine* 2020;**26**(5):483-495.
3. Rothan HA, Byrareddy SN. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. *Journal of autoimmunity* 2020;**109**:102433.
4. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin* 2020;**25**(10).
5. Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Miyama T, Suzuki A, Jung S-M, Hayashi K, Kinoshita R, Yang Y, Yuan B, Akhmetzhanov AR, Linton NM. Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases* 2020;**94**:154-155.
6. Baud D, Qi X, Nielsen-Saines K, Musso D, Pomar L, Favre G. Real estimates of mortality following COVID-19 infection. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* 2020.
7. Cowling BJ, Ali ST, Ng TWY, Tsang TK, Li JCM, Fong MW, Liao Q, Kwan MY, Lee SL, Chiu SS, Wu JT, Wu P, Leung GM. Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions against coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in Hong Kong: an observational study. *The Lancet Public health* 2020;**5**(5):e279-e288.
8. Thanh Le T, Andreadakis Z, Kumar A, Gomez Roman R, Tollefsen S, Saville M, Mayhew S. The COVID-19 vaccine development landscape. *Nature reviews Drug discovery* 2020;**19**(5):305-306.
9. Koo JR, Cook AR, Park M, Sun Y, Sun H, Lim JT, Tam C, Dickens BL. Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* 2020;**20**(6):678-688.
10. Roosa K, Lee Y, Luo R, Kirpich A, Rothenberg R, Hyman JM, Yan P, Chowell G. Real-time forecasts of the COVID-19 epidemic in China from February 5th to February 24th, 2020. *Infectious Disease Modelling* 2020;**5**:256-263.
11. Tsoularis A. Analysis of Logistic Growth Models. *Res. Lett. Inf. Math. Sci.* 2001;**2**:23-46.
12. Anderson RM, May RM. Herd-Immunity to Helminth Infection and Implications for Parasite Control. *Nature* 1985;**315**(6019):493-496.
13. Fine P, Eames K, Heymann DL. "Herd Immunity": A Rough Guide. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2011;**52**(7):911-916.
14. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2020;**27**(2).
15. Brandenburg A. Piecewise quadratic growth during the 2019 novel coronavirus epidemic. *arXiv:2002.03638* 2020.
16. Tjorve KMC, Tjorve E. The use of Gompertz models in growth analyses, and new Gompertz-model approach: An addition to the Unified-Richards family. *PLoS One* 2017;**12**(6):e0178691.
17. Laird AK. Dynamics of Tumor Growth. *Br J Cancer* 1964;**13**:490-502.
18. Vora A, Burke DS, Cummings DAT. The impact of a physical geographic barrier on the dynamics of measles. *Epidemiology and Infection* 2008;**136**(5):713-720.
19. Kupferschmidt K, Cohen J. Can China's COVID-19 strategy work elsewhere? *Science (New York, N Y)* 2020;**367**(6482):1061-1062.
20. Maier BF, Brockmann D. Effective containment explains subexponential growth in recent confirmed COVID-19 cases in China. *Science (New York, N Y)* 2020;**368**(6492):742-746.

21. Covid-19 National Emergency Response Center E CMTK, Prevention. Contact Transmission of COVID-19 in South Korea: Novel Investigation Techniques for Tracing Contacts. *Osong Public Health Res Perspect* 2020;**11**(1):60-63.
22. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M, Crockett MJ, Crum AJ, Douglas KM, Druckman JN, Drury J, Dube O, Ellemers N, Finkel EJ, Fowler JH, Gelfand M, Han S, Haslam SA, Jetten J, Kitayama S, Mobbs D, Napper LE, Packer DJ, Pennycook G, Peters E, Petty RE, Rand DG, Reicher SD, Schnall S, Shariff A, Skitka LJ, Smith SS, Sunstein CR, Tabri N, Tucker JA, Linden Svd, Lange Pv, Weeden KA, Wohl MJA, Zaki J, Zion SR, Willer R. Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature human behaviour* 2020;**4**(5):460-471.
23. Cohen JP, Morrison P, Dao L, Roth K, Duong TQ, Ghassemi M. COVID-19 Image Data Collection: Prospective Predictions Are the Future. *arXiv:2006.11988* 2020.
24. Euser AM, Zoccali C, Jager KJ, Dekker FW. Cohort studies: prospective versus retrospective. *Nephron Clinical practice* 2009;**113**(3):c214-7.
25. Yang W, Zhang D, Peng L, Zhuge C, Hong L. Rational evaluation of various epidemic models based on the COVID-19 data of China. *medRxiv* 2020.
26. Control ECfDPa. Accessed June 1, 2020, 2020.
27. Liu W, Tang S, Xiao Y. Model Selection and Evaluation Based on Emerging Infectious Disease Data Sets including A/H1N1 and Ebola. *Computational and mathematical methods in medicine* 2015;**2015**:207105.
28. Oh J, Lee J-K, Schwarz D, Ratcliffe HL, Markuns JF, Hirschhorn LR. National Response to COVID-19 in the Republic of Korea and Lessons Learned for Other Countries. *Health systems and reform* 2020;**6**(1):e1753464.
29. Moatti J-P. The French response to COVID-19: intrinsic difficulties at the interface of science, public health, and policy. *The Lancet Public health* 2020;**5**(5):e255.
30. Sjodin H, Johansson AF, Brannstrom A, Farooq Z, Kriit HK, Wilder-Smith A, Astrom C, Thunberg J, Soderquist M, Rocklov J. COVID-19 healthcare demand and mortality in Sweden in response to non-pharmaceutical (NPIs) mitigation and suppression scenarios. *medRxiv* 2020.
31. Altmann DM, Douek DC, Boyton RJ. What policy makers need to know about COVID-19 protective immunity. *Lancet (London, England)* 2020;**395**(10236):1527-1529.
32. Rocklov J, Sjodin H. High population densities catalyse the spread of COVID-19. *Journal of travel medicine* 2020;**27**(3).
33. Wang J, Tang K, Feng K, Lin X, Weifeng L, Chen K, Wang F. High Temperature and High Humidity Reduce the Transmission of COVID-19. *arxiv* 2020.
34. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, Shaman J. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science (New York, N Y)* 2020;**368**(6490):489-493.
35. Gibney E. Whose coronavirus strategy worked best? Scientists hunt most effective policies. *Nature* 2020;**581**:15-16.

**Supporting Information for “Prospective Prediction of Future SARS-COV-2 Infections Using Empirical Data on a National Level to Gauge Response Effectiveness” Blanco *et al.***

**SI Table 1:** The start date (day 1, in 2020) of the fit curves for the 28 analyzed countries.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Date</b>
Australia	Mar. 10	Italy	Feb. 22
Austria	Mar. 5	Malaysia	Mar. 10
Belgium	Mar. 5	Norway	Mar. 5
Brazil	Mar. 12	Philippines	Mar. 14
Canada	Mar. 8	Poland	Mar. 13
China	Jan. 18	Portugal	Mar. 12
Denmark	Mar. 13	Russia	Mar. 14
France	Feb. 28	S. Korea	Feb. 19
Germany	Feb. 28	Spain	Feb. 28
Holland	Mar. 5	Sweden	Mar. 5
India	Mar. 17	Swiss	Mar. 5
Iran	Feb. 22	Turkey	Mar. 16
Ireland	Mar. 13	UK	Mar. 4
Israel	Mar. 12	US	Mar. 2

**SI Table 2:** The fit parameters for the development of the early portion of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic

in 28 countries for the exponential, quadratic, simple square, simple exponential, Gompertz growth models as calculated for each individual day during the early portion of the epidemic.<sup>a</sup>

	Exponential			Parabolic (Quadratic)									
	$N_0$	k	Days	$R^2$	Sum of Sq.	Sy.x	A	B	C	Days	$R^2$	Sum of Sq.	Sy.x
Australia	179	0.1513	20	0.9697	1425602	267	13.37	-90.68	239.2	19	0.9922	366492	138.9
Austria	337.8	0.1236	27	0.9659	12519859	681	19.58	-189.3	401.2	26	0.9943	2085220	283.2
Belgium	2142	0.06171	49	0.9511	520986359	3261	19.28	-57.99	-864.4	48	0.9917	88470385	1358
Brazil	4256	0.05894	80	0.9969	4958718241	7873	127.9	-5475	45150	79	0.9783	34416594185	20872
Canada	7125	0.0332	78	0.931	4749609383	7803	8.584	554.8	-6616	77	0.9881	817501344	3258
China	2268	0.1174	28	0.973	396258176	3762	106.7	-897	1697	27	0.9934	97656280	1902
Denmark	590.7	0.07944	26	0.9979	115592	66.68	7.066	-39.85	915.5	25	0.9966	186104	86.28
France	2803	0.07993	44	0.9631	1712988947	6240	71.19	-1116	3219	43	0.9939	281922809	2561
Germany	2493	0.09302	40	0.9644	1890621844	6875	104	-1773	5387	39	0.9947	279852332	2679
India	2864	0.05511	75	0.9949	1111015939	3849	49.77	-1712	12620	74	0.99	2195383041	5447
Iran	17024	0.02264	99	0.9188	18388322453	13629	2.445	1363	-13506	98	0.9874	2848350547	5391
Ireland	503.7	0.09082	36	0.9912	6518863	425.5	13.55	-149.8	686	35	0.9942	4253336	348.6
Israel	852.5	0.07983	33	0.9384	36190773	1047	8.56	87.1	-555.6	32	0.9853	8641844	519.7
Italy	6869	0.0645	48	0.946	6870075125	11964	74.09	-438.2	-2215	47	0.9887	1434602095	5525
Malaysia	594.7	0.06073	35	0.9434	5207926	385.7	1.131	104.1	-268	34	0.9959	376542	105.2
Netherlands	2433	0.05498	50	0.9473	412829380	2873	12.08	158	-1648	49	0.9918	63939110	1142
Norway	375.5	0.08815	29	0.9685	2642459	301.9	4.622	31.92	-62.81	28	0.9965	289515	101.7
Philippines	1773	0.02925	78	0.951	100592449	1136	0.9324	142.5	-775	77	0.9949	10527292	369.8
Poland	2510	0.0293	79	0.9416	269292285	1846	1.284	215.8	-1582	78	0.9959	18900782	492.3
Portugal	2266	0.05429	44	0.9239	225040953	2262	5.106	356.9	-2129	43	0.9865	39799359	962.1
Russia	10951	0.04698	78	0.9621	53229872738	26123	100.9	-2839	13209	77	0.9947	7389136781	9796
South Korea	446.3	0.1577	16	0.9513	4604176	536.4	20.11	47.27	-179.3	15	0.9892	1025210	261.4
Spain	4200	0.09283	38	0.9583	4155042694	10457	149.9	-2126	5154	37	0.9926	737759799	4465
Sweden	3227	0.02907	87	0.9453	717453607	2872	2.874	207.7	-2081	86	0.9935	85750250	998.5
Switzerland	1053	0.09459	31	0.9599	64146352	1438	22.55	-63.51	-159.6	30	0.9943	9138733	551.9
Turkey	4164	0.08443	37	0.9649	1435404688	6229	82.09	-532	-64.87	36	0.997	123006298	1848
UK	9411	0.04888	64	0.9503	15356148331	15490	56.77	-360.4	-3859	63	0.9917	2550481471	6363
USA	149327	0.0288	90	0.9205	2.77214E+12	175504	123.2	11347	-164607	89	0.9839	5.60161E+11	79334

	Simple Square			Gompertz									
	A	C	Days	$R^2$	Sum of Sq.	Sy.x	$N_0$	$N_1$	r	Days	$R^2$	Sum of Sq.	Sy.x
Australia	9.655	-162.3	20	0.9834	781794	197.7	94.12	2.116	0.1114	19	0.9946	254929	115.8
Austria	13.64	-685.4	27	0.9828	6331251	484.2	19048	0.2013	0.1041	26	0.9985	556075	146.2
Belgium	18.23	-1437	49	0.9915	90706366	1361	60816	3.066	0.06539	48	0.9994	5988360	353.2
Brazil	65.94	-40693	80	0.9252	1.18501E+11	38487	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Canada	15.01	1875	78	0.9765	1618735064	4556	107690	66.56	0.04306	77	0.9995	31367493	638.3
China	79.49	-3621	28	0.9862	203485104	2696	196544	89.89	0.06696	27	0.9928	105567598	1977
Denmark	5.772	694.2	26	0.9935	355042	116.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
France	48.87	-6743	44	0.9809	886761649	4489	157199	0.2668	0.0721	43	0.9989	53127885	1112
Germany	65.21	-9111	40	0.9729	1436844105	5993	176314	0.02011	0.08326	39	0.9994	33044849	920.5
India	29.16	-12625	75	0.9588	8996060726	10952	4520256	512.2	0.01367	74	0.9997	56663182	875.1
Iran	14.99	12720	99	0.9442	12629718373	11295	168414	1000	0.03245	98	0.9899	2291948974	4836
Ireland	9.934	-426.6	36	0.986	10338724	535.9	207497	158	0.02653	35	0.9979	1584982	212.8
Israel	10.84	42.4	33	0.9826	10242445	557.1	15802	3.447	0.09749	32	0.9978	1285165	200.4
Italy	66.01	-6457	48	0.9878	1554850288	5691	196177	0.6338	0.0756	47	0.9996	44675513	975
Malaysia	3.708	485.6	35	0.9665	3085369	296.9	6837	81.38	0.06997	34	0.9991	84400	49.82
Netherlands	14.88	-59.91	50	0.9896	81537845	1277	51192	25.42	0.05972	49	0.9996	3208366	255.9
Norway	5.561	132.4	29	0.9948	437677	122.9	11096	55.28	0.06296	28	0.9975	208669	86.33
Philippines	2.585	1406	78	0.9691	63405902	901.6	25661	384.4	0.0274	77	0.9904	19675484	505.5
Poland	3.754	1761	79	0.9686	144754602	1354	31792	265.5	0.03332	78	0.9968	14757805	435
Portugal	12.25	1058	44	0.9656	101689588	1520	28171	27.63	0.07722	43	0.999	2858438	257.8
Russia	67.96	-30237	78	0.9798	28369487572	19071	635427	0.3143	0.04345	77	0.9997	456703595	2435
South Korea	22.46	-5.497	16	0.9885	1085625	260.5	10392	6.096	0.1595	15	0.9969	293277	139.8
Spain	101.1	-11435	38	0.9782	2171487122	7559	223586	0.01913	0.09264	37	0.9992	75137515	1425
Sweden	5.041	1448	87	0.9816	240743441	1663	51084	148.9	0.0322	86	0.9994	7670122	298.6
Switzerland	20.79	-571.9	31	0.9938	9849358	563.7	33855	7.933	0.08685	30	0.9993	1091085	190.7
Turkey	69.58	-4117	37	0.995	206131636	2360	174393	32.93	0.06972	36	0.9998	8442355	484.3
UK	51.72	-8430	64	0.9911	2739402810	6542	281089	5.477	0.05277	63	0.9995	156794091	1578
USA	237.8	34575	90	0.9693	1.07155E+12	109115	2069510	455.9	0.04205	89	0.9986	49886079970	23675

<sup>a</sup> The fit equations for each are as follows:

Simple exponential:  $N = N_0 e^{kt}$

Quadratic:  $N = At^2 + Bt + C$

Simple square:  $N = At^2 + C$

Gompertz growth:

$$N(t) = N_0 e^{\left(\ln\left(\frac{N_M}{N_0}\right)(1 - e^{-rt})\right)}$$

where  $N$  is the total number of cases,  $t$  is the time in days,  $N_0$  is the initial seeding population of the epidemic,  $N_M$  is the population carrying capacity (the amount of the population that must be infected to achieve herd immunity),  $A$ ,  $B$  &  $C$  are the standard quadratic terms (or for the simple square model equation). Additionally, the number of days of data used in the fitting, the  $R^2$ , sum of squares, and  $Sy.x$  statistical values are given. For the Gompertz growth model, an adequate fit could not be achieved for Brazil or Denmark and this is indicated by  $N/A$ .




**SI Table 3:** Summary of the statistical parameters of linear fits to the plots of  $N$  and  $\ln N$  with time.


<b>Square root of</b>			
<b>total cases</b>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Str. Dev.</u>	<u>Median</u>
Slope	5.639464	3.648843	4.355
Y-intercept	-21.7129	35.10683	-8.081
X-intercept	1.442404	5.604858	1.8695
1/slope	0.261796	0.166244	0.2302
R squared	0.977639	0.012277	0.98075
Sy.x	14.90246	17.01295	7.7295
<b>Natural log of</b>			
<b>total cases</b>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Str. Dev.</u>	<u>Median</u>
Slope	0.1353	0.057693	0.1251
Y-intercept	5.492857	0.82118	5.435
X-intercept	-51.5525	30.04849	-42.905
1/slope	8.937607	4.159834	8.014
R squared	0.891386	0.068346	0.9139
Sy.x	0.624629	0.278802	0.63595
SQRT	Mean	Str. Dev.	Median

**SI Table 4:** The range of prediction results for the quadratic, simple square, simple exponential, and Gompertz growth models based on days of good predictions before the target, last day of observed data, inclusive.<sup>b</sup>
















	Days of Good predictions				Minimum prediction for final day				Maximum prediction for final day			
	Quad	Square	Exp	Gompertz	Quad	Square	Exp	Gompertz	Quad	Square	Exp	Gompertz
Australia	18	13	6	5	0.503135	0.447172	0.906785	0.854725	1.137994	0.989844	2.616133	2.49387
Austria	19	15	6	12	0.018475	0.221903	1.136357	0.012025	1.140042	1.008156	18.8278	12.83739
Belgium	36	33	11	23	0.004606	0.261187	1.164721	0.006302	1.352821	1.121602	545971.6	46.25027
Brazil	29	20	33	0	0.053807	0.065547	1.038249	0.004144	0.886084	0.782147	84868805	3162318
Canada	69	62	17	56	0.066305	0.15024	1.183832	0.013318	1.885461	1.397585	1028465	69300.79
China	20	18	8	17	0.099579	0.199368	1.119746	0.019578	1.091488	0.990578	121.6988	54.96871
Denmark	22	24	24	16	0.353108	0.848565	0.785263	0.180618	0.98842	1.445902	1.015964	1.012428
France	29	23	9	30	0.049381	0.110337	1.161091	0.004466	1.161717	1.015195	3700.744	272.5381
Germany	21	18	8	16	0.011451	0.068763	1.146057	0.00225	1.103203	0.978905	1681.327	728.2376
India	49	31	28	29	0.122032	0.137928	1.046921	0.014592	0.923097	0.84113	45051.62	15874.13
Iran	49	92	28	59	0.243367	0.2113	1.106169	0.062826	2.623699	1.902998	2.5E+16	1.07E+10
Ireland	34	34	15	25	0.50281	0.605517	1.076376	0.251619	0.98657	0.943088	288.961	133.1887
Israel	29	31	8	19	0.394938	0.583151	1.15689	0.070816	1.411518	1.254275	278.7508	164.3773
Italy	34	30	10	27	0.088719	0.184861	1.170778	0.004432	1.328466	1.121679	6024962	2.046924
Malaysia	25	33	11	27	0.869549	0.887035	1.128035	0.613072	3.326014	1.991332	462.0647	352.2444
Netherlands	43	48	12	26	0.209439	0.512291	1.161619	0.017553	1.493027	1.222879	1262766	2.636326
Norway	25	27	11	15	0.027648	0.701103	1.108444	0.050512	1.856421	1.301392	154.4844	124.6376
Philippines	51	53	28	36	0.182541	0.865493	1.01769	0.01217	3.117964	2.091286	68502.97	25666.16
Poland	48	77	23	68	1.022539	1.109518	1.132566	0.087518	2.135791	1.826874	1.02E+08	1.501466
Portugal	42	42	11	27	0.789265	0.698348	1.16253	0.743868	1.870177	1.538472	49310.62	1746.688
Russia	45	37	15	38	0.045172	0.045302	1.157039	0.004147	1.142701	0.997201	98785.97	3507.749
South Korea	14	14	5	7	0.688575	0.86664	1.127247	0.175176	1.656852	1.163943	363.2386	3.659551
Spain	24	19	8	21	0.071136	0.071543	1.166177	0.014662	1.172864	1.022933	2952.447	137.1358
Sweden	82	85	23	55	0.040168	1.051266	1.142619	0.006843	1.837028	1.534142	1.87E+10	634746.5
Switzerland	24	24	8	13	0.009232	0.446694	1.136035	0.021558	1.228293	1.083152	449.3075	32.22993
Turkey	27	26	9	24	0.320459	0.21737	1.135899	0.028505	1.153008	1.040987	20923327	139.9341
UK	44	39	14	34	0.054658	0.103414	1.14639	0.003097	1.327534	1.09207	196650.8	1463.103
USA	45	66	20	65	0.043499	0.027806	1.180173	0.502715	2.084341	1.49119	3.92E+08	3906578


<sup>b</sup> Good predictions are defined as the predicted result being within a factor of 2, predictions from 50 – 200% of the actual total number of cases). Thus, the quadratic model was able to predict the total number of cases in the United states in each of the 45 days before that day, while the exponential model was only within the defined good range for the 20 days preceding that day. The range of minimum predictions (under predictions) and maximum predictions (overpredictions) is also given
























**SI Figure 1:** Plots of the square root of the total number of cases ( $\sqrt{N}$ ) for the early portion of the COVID-19 epidemic in each of the 28 countries (black circles) along with a linear fit line.





**SI Figure 2:** Plots of the natural log of the total number of cases ( $\ln N$ ) for the early portion of the COVID-19 epidemic in each of the 28 countries (black circles) along with a linear fit line.





**SI Figure 3:** The change of the exponential rate term ( $k$ ) over time for each of the 28 countries. It can be clearly seen that  $k$  is generally decreasing over time, often on each day but sometimes after an initial bit of increasing. This indicates that the exponential rate is regularly decreasing, as expected for a situation where growth resource is decreasing, as is expected for the logistic models family of models, including the generalized logistic and Gompertz growth models.