

1 **S1 Appendix. Additional details on forecast methods.**

2

3 **1 Model structures**

4 SIR model structure:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\frac{\beta(t)IS}{N} - \alpha \quad (\text{S1})$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \frac{\beta(t)IS}{N} + \alpha \quad (\text{S2})$$

5

6 SEIR model structure:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\frac{\beta(t)IS}{N} - \alpha \quad (\text{S3})$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{\beta(t)IS}{N} - \frac{E}{Z} + \alpha \quad (\text{S4})$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \frac{E}{Z} \quad (\text{S5})$$

7 where E is the number of exposed people, and Z is the mean latent period.

8

9 SEIRS model structure:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{N - S - E - I}{L} - \frac{\beta(t)IS}{N} - \alpha \quad (\text{S6})$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{\beta(t)IS}{N} - \frac{E}{Z} + \alpha \quad (\text{S7})$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \frac{E}{Z} - \frac{I}{D} \quad (\text{S8})$$

10 We assume a fixed α of 0.1 infections per day, and use a population size of 100,000 people.

11

12 **2 Filter methods**

13 Each of the model-filter forecast systems described in the main text uses one of the four
14 possible mathematical models of disease transmission (SIR, SEIR, SIRS or SEIRS), and one of
15 five filter, or data assimilation, methods. The main features of the five filter methods are
16 described here. For full descriptions of the filter algorithms and implementations, we refer
17 readers to the original publications.

18

19 **2.1 Ensemble filter methods**

20 Ensemble filter methods use an ensemble of model simulations, in this study 300, with
21 parameters and state variables randomly initialized and iteratively optimized following
22 each weekly ILI+ observation in a prediction-update cycle. In the prediction step, state
23 variables are propagated forward in time by the disease transmission model until the next
24 ILI+ observation becomes available. In the update step, the filter algorithms adjust
25 ensemble members in order to better match the observation. The updates applied to
26 unobserved state variables are linear mappings from the update applied to the observed
27 variable based on the prior ensemble covariance between the observed and unobserved
28 variables.

29 The three ensemble filter methods differ in the calculation of the update of the observed
30 variable (ILI+). In the ensemble Kalman filter (EKF)[1], the posterior of each model
31 ensemble member is computed as the weighted average between the ensemble member
32 and the ILI+ observation, with Gaussian random noise around the observation consistent
33 with the observational error variance. The weights are determined according to the ratio of
34 the overall ensemble prior variance to the observational error variance.

35 The ensemble adjustment Kalman filter (EAKF)[2] deterministically computes the update
36 step such that the posterior ensemble mean and variance match the mean and variance
37 predicted by Bayes theorem, assuming a Gaussian distribution.

38 While the EKF and the EAKF assume a Gaussian structure in prior and posterior ensemble
39 distributions and observations, the rank histogram filter (RHF)[3] relaxes these
40 assumptions and allows for non-Gaussian structures. Instead, an approximate continuous
41 prior distribution is constructed using a rank histogram of ensemble prior values of ILI+.

42 This non-Gaussian prior is multiplied by the observational likelihood at each point and
43 normalized, resulting in a continuous non-Gaussian posterior distribution.

44 A multiplicative inflation factor of 1.02 is added to the three ensemble filters to counter
45 filter divergence. [2]

46

47 **2.2 Particle filter methods**

48 Particle filters represent state space with a set of particles, in this case 10,000. As with the
49 ensemble filters, we couple the filter with a disease transmission model, which propagates
50 the particles forward in time in a prediction step. The filter then assimilates the next ILI+
51 observation in an update step. The update step in the basic particle filter (PF)[4] weights
52 particles according to their likelihood. Resampling and regularization improve the
53 performance of the PF by expanding the range of parameter and state space, and decreasing
54 redundancies.

55 The second particle filter is the particle Markov Chain Monte Carlo filter (pMCMC),
56 specifically the particle marginal Metropolis-Hasting sampler described in Andrieu et al.[5],
57 which combines Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) and sequential Monte Carlo (SMC)
58 methods. While traditional SMC methods require sampling the entire state-parameter
59 space of a model, the pMCMC simplifies the problem to sampling only parameter space. The
60 pMCMC proposes a set of set of parameters, and then estimates state variables given the
61 parameter proposal. The acceptance probability of the proposal is a function of the joint
62 likelihood of the observed ILI+ data. Unlike the other four filters, in which parameters may
63 be non-stationary in time, the pMCMC optimizes a fixed set of parameters over the entire
64 observational time series.

65 **References**

- 66 1. Burgers G, Jan van Leeuwen P, Evensen G. Analysis scheme in the ensemble
67 Kalman filter. Monthly weather review. 1998;126(6):1719-24.
- 68 2. Anderson JL. An ensemble adjustment Kalman filter for data assimilation.
69 Monthly weather review. 2001;129(12):2884-903.
- 70 3. Anderson JL. A non-Gaussian ensemble filter update for data assimilation.
71 Monthly Weather Review. 2010;138(11):4186-98.
- 72 4. Arulampalam MS, Maskell S, Gordon N, Clapp T. A tutorial on particle filters
73 for online nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian tracking. IEEE Transactions on signal
74 processing. 2002;50(2):174-88.
- 75 5. Andrieu C, Doucet A, Holenstein R. Particle markov chain monte carlo
76 methods. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology).
77 2010;72(3):269-342.
- 78

79