

To: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>; EPI-MOD <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>
Cc: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@gmail.com>; (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@gmail.com>
From: (10)(2e)
Sent: Tue 9/29/2020 3:58:17 PM
Subject: RE: update Literatuursignalering 2020
Received: Tue 9/29/2020 3:58:21 PM

Hi (10)(2e),

Thanks a lot for your constructive suggestions, I read through the edited document.

I will revise the 'relevance for policy maker' part to reflect your comments, and also will write down answers to your questions in the next document.

Best regards,

(10)(2e)

From: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>
Sent: dinsdag 29 september 2020 17:00
To: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>; EPI-MOD <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>
Cc: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@gmail.com>; (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: update Literatuursignalering 2020

Hi (10)(2e),

Thanks for this review report. I think you reviewed it really well.

I changed the abstract somewhat, because I think it now stepped over the reason why this study was conducted. I was not sure if a policy maker without preknowledge would be able to get the context without reading the manuscript. Take a look on it whether you agree, or change it partly back if you don't agree.

I agree with your discussion points. I put some questions in the sideline that popped up during reading, but not sure how that exactly would work out in the model

I think the relevance for policymakers looked now a bit too much like a relevance for modellers. We need some further thinking on that, I put some suggestions in a comment. This is open for discussion of course.

Best regards,

(10)(2e)

From: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>
Sent: dinsdag 22 september 2020 12:48
To: EPI-MOD <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>
Cc: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@gmail.com>; (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: update Literatuursignalering 2020

Dear all,

Please find the attached document, this is a first draft of the literature review.

If anyone could give your comments or thoughts on it, that would be very appreciated!

My personal opinions on this paper are briefly (my comment below became a bit long, sorry):

- I agree with their formulation part. Their argument on the herd immunity threshold is also supported by previous theoretical work (Katriel 2012 Math Bio, etc.)
- I do not fully agree with their estimation. By fitting their model to case count data, they estimated the heterogeneity in susceptibility as a "fixed property of individuals"; however, the assumption may absorb all the effect of changes in contact rates (or other possible changes in exposures) only into the target parameter (i.e. CV in susceptibility). This overestimates the effect of the heterogeneity on herd immunity.
- Thus, especially in COVID-19 context, I do not recommend relying on their estimates when we discuss how to target the herd immunity threshold. We can use their method for scenario analysis, to see the effect of homogeneous assumptions of common dynamic modeling approaches.

Best regards,
(10)(2e)

From: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>
Sent: maandag 14 september 2020 11:19
To: EPI-MOD <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>
Subject: update Literatuursignalering 2020

Dear all,

(10)(2e) and (10)(2e) have volunteered to write reports. That leaves only 2 more 'slots' to fill :)
(10)(2e) article is:

Gomes et al. (2020) MedRxiv 'Individual variation in susceptibility or exposure to SARS-CoV-2 lowers the herd immunity threshold' <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.27.20081893v3>

Discussants/coauthors for both (10)(2e) and (10)(2e) reports please let me know or just put your name on the wikipage.

(10)(2g)

(10)(2e) is available to write her report at end of Oct/begin Nov and will send the article title around then.

Greetings
(10)(2e)