

# Dynamic Modeling COVID-19 for Comparing Containment Strategies in a Pandemic Scenario

Min Lu

Department of Public Health, University of Miami

May 11, 2022

## Abstract

Since instances of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) community spread emerged in the United States, federal and local governments have implemented multiple containment measures. However, in order to satisfy the needs of citizens, the strictest containment measures can be only executed for short period. This article compares two types of containment strategies: a constant containment strategy that could satisfy the needs of citizens for a long period and an adaptive containment strategy whose strict level changes across time. When to implement the strictest measures is also of interest. A prediction model is proposed and a simple tool is developed for policy makers to compare different containment strategies. As an example, a county with 2.8 million population with initial 200 infectious cases is considered, where about 0.15% people died during the pandemic. Compared with a constant containment strategy, adaptive containment strategies shorten the outbreak length and executing the strictest measures earlier will cause less mortality.

*Keywords:* Survival function, containment measures, pandemic, period of communicability, infectious period

# 1 Introduction

To prevent the spread of a new respiratory disease - coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), policy makers rely on prediction models to foresee the number of infectious cases and prepare for adopting containment measures including patient quarantine, active monitoring of contacts, border controls, and community education and precautions (1–4). There are many prediction models available for the COVID-19 pandemic (5–14). To apply them for predicting local COVID-19 spread, there are two major challenges. Firstly, number of actual infected cases is usually unconfirmed and could be far larger than confirmed cases because there are significant number of infected cases in incubation period and test kits may be insufficient. On the other hand, regions that experienced earlier outbreaks can provide valuable information, such as the distribution of cure time, death time, and mortality rate (15), but it is not easy to integrate these dynamic parameters into most of the current models.

This article provides a simple and robust model framework whose parameters are dynamically adjustable and generally interpretable for policy makers. Survival analysis is integrated in it to borrow information from regions that experienced earlier outbreaks. Moreover, the model enables containment measures to change over time (16) through introducing a novel reproduction number which incorporates containment measures and the basic reproduction number ( $R_0$ ).

## 2 The model

Assume the disease of interest has a  $M$ -day period of communicability so that infected people are either cured or dead within  $M$  days. Denote the mortality rate within an infectious period as  $m_{death}$  and the cure rate will be  $1 - m_{death}$ . On day  $t$ , denote the number of people that have been infected for  $d$  days as  $p_{t,d}$  and the total number of infectious cases is  $P_t = \sum_{d=1}^M p_{t,d}$ .  $P_t$  is determined by the following factors:

- mortality rate for people that have been infected for  $d$  days, denoted as  $m_d$ ,
- cure rate for people that have been infected for  $d$  days, denoted as  $c_d$ ,

- number of people that an infectious person can communicate on day  $t$  averagely, denoted as  $R_t$ ,
- and the number of travelers from other areas who have been infected for  $d$  days, denoted as  $p_{t,d}^{\text{imp}}$ .

When moving forward from day  $t$  to  $t + 1$ , number of infectious cases,  $P_{t+1}$ , is the sum of the number of survived but uncured cases from day  $t$ , the number of newly infected cases and the number of imported cases, denoted as  $P_{t+1}^{\text{imp}} = \sum_{d=1}^M p_{t,d}^{\text{imp}}$  (17–19):

$$P_{t+1} = \sum_{d=1}^M p_{t+1,d} = \sum_{d=1}^{M-1} p_{t,d}(1 - m_d - c_d) + P_t R_t + P_{t+1}^{\text{imp}}.$$

Note that people who have been infected for  $M$  days on day  $t$  ( $p_{t,M}$ ) won't affect  $P_{t+1}$  since their period of communicability will be over and they will be either dead or cured on day  $t + 1$ . We have  $p_{t+1,1} = P_t R_t$ , which counts newly infected cases and for  $d = 1, \dots, M - 1$ , we have  $p_{t+1,d+1} = p_{t,d}(1 - m_d - c_d)$ .

### 3 Parameter specification

To specify mortality rate  $m_d$ , a survival function  $S(t) = \mathbb{P}(T > t)$  is defined in interval  $[0, M]$  for death time  $T$  and  $S(M) = 1 - m_{\text{death}}$ . A lognormal survival function is used as  $S(t) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erf} \left[ \frac{\ln t - \mu}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right]$ , where  $\operatorname{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt$ . Here, parameters are set as  $\sigma = 0.8$  and  $\mu = \ln(M) - \sqrt{2}\sigma \operatorname{erf}^{-1}(2m_{\text{death}} - 1)$ , where  $\operatorname{erf}^{-1}(x)$  denotes the inverse function of  $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ . A patient has the probability of dying from day  $d$  to  $d + 1$  as

$$m_d = P(d < T < d + 1) = S(d) - S(d + 1).$$

Similarly, cure rate  $c_d$  is modeled as  $c_d = C(d) - C(d + 1)$ , where cure function  $C(t) = \mathbb{P}(T_c > t)$  is defined in interval  $[0, M]$  for cure time  $T_c$  and  $C(M) = m_{\text{death}}$ . After specifying  $C(t) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erf} \left[ \frac{\ln t - \mu_c}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_c} \right]$ , we set  $\sigma_c = 0.4$  and  $\mu_c = \ln(M) - \sqrt{2}\sigma_c \operatorname{erf}^{-1}(1 - 2m_{\text{death}})$ . For initial time, set  $S(0) = C(0) = 1$ .

Reproductive numbers  $R_t$  is determined by the basic reproduction number  $R_0$ , the containment measures on day  $t$  and the percentage of uninfected people. It is assumed that cured cases won't get infected again since they are immune to the disease. Since  $R_0$  is a constant, we only need to set  $R_t = r_t \frac{P_{pop} - P_t - \sum_{i=1}^t (D_i + C_i)}{P_{pop}}$ , where  $D_i = \sum_{d=2}^M p_{i-1,d} m_d$  is the number of deaths on day  $i$ ,  $C_i = \sum_{d=2}^M p_{i-1,d} c_d$  is the number of cured patients on day  $i$ , and  $P_{pop}$  denotes the number of total population.

For initialization, infected durations are generated from Poisson distribution to mimic the individual variation (20), where  $p_{1,d} = \sum_{i=1}^{P_1} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=d}$  and  $p_{t,d}^{\text{imp}} = \sum_{j=1}^{P_t^{\text{imp}}} \mathbf{1}_{X_j=d}$ .  $X_i$ s and  $X_j$ s are identically and independently distributed from Poisson distribution  $\text{Pois}(\lambda)$ . When  $X_i = 0$  or  $X_i > M$ , it is set as 1 or  $M$ .

## 4 Results and conclusion

To compare different containment strategies, suppose a county is going to experience a COVID-19 outbreak in the scenario illustrated in Table 1. After monitoring 100 simulation replications, the dynamic of number of infectious cases does not change much from random initialization. In total, numbers of deaths from strategies A, B and C are  $5.01 \times 10^3$ ,  $3.71 \times 10^3$  and  $4.96 \times 10^3$ ; numbers of infected cases are  $1.75 \times 10^5$ ,  $1.30 \times 10^5$  and  $1.74 \times 10^5$ . The number of infectious cases,  $P_t$ , reaches its peak on the 47th, 39th and 40th day and the number of deaths,  $D_t$ , reaches its peak on the 70th, 61th and 63th day from strategies A, B and C. After the peak of  $P_t$ , containment strategy does not make much difference on the trend of  $P_t$  or  $D_t$ .

As a conclusion, compared with a constant containment strategy, adaptive containment strategies shorten the outbreak length. Adaptive strategy is less strict at the beginning, which results in more severe spread. However, the following stricter measures effectively shorten the outbreak length. When to choose the strictest measures is critical to achieve minimum death rate. Implementing the strictest measures early will cause less mortality.

Table 1: Necessary inputs for policy makers to compare different containment strategies.

Domain	Value	Description
Disease	$M = 40$	Infected cases will be either cured or dead within $M$ days.
	$m_{death} = 4\%$	Within $M$ days, $m_{death}$ of infected cases will be dead.
	$\sigma = 0.8$	Parameter to shape the survival function.
	$\sigma_c = 0.8$	Parameter to shape the cure function.
People	$P_{pop} = 2.8 \times 10^6$	On day 1, $P_{pop}$ people are never infected within the county.
	$P_1 = 200$	On day 1, $P_1$ people are infectious within the county.
	$P_{15}^{imp} = P_{48}^{imp} = 2$	On day 15, 29, 48 and 63, there are two, four, two and four infectious people who travel into the county.
	$P_{29}^{imp} = P_{63}^{imp} = 4$	
	$\lambda = 10$	Initial infectious cases, counted in $P_1$ and $P_t^{imp}$ , have been infected for $\lambda$ days averagely.
Policy	$r_t$ is in Figure 1(c)	Smaller value represents stricter containment measures*.

\* $r_t$  can be interpreted as the average number of newly infected case communicated *per infectious person per day* on day  $t$ , if nearly all the population are uninfected. The model will adjust these inputs with percentage of infected cases across time, which produces  $R_t$ .




Figure 1: Containment strategy comparison from inputs illustrated in Table 1. Survival and cure functions with 4% mortality rate within 40 days are plotted in sub-figures (a) and (b). Sub-figure (c) demonstrates the strict levels of different containment strategies across time. Strategy A (black) has constant strict level while level of strictness can change weekly from strategies B (blue) and C (red). Strategy B implements the strictest measures two weeks earlier than strategy C. The averages of  $r_t$  for strategies A, B and C are all 0.21, which means that these three strategies have the same overall strict level. From sub-figure (d) and (e), we can see that strategy B results in the smallest number of infected patients and deaths. More adaptive containment strategies, B and C, end the outbreak faster.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [grant numbers R01 CA200987 and R01 HL141892].

## References

1. F. M. Shearer, R. Moss, J. McVernon, J. V. Ross, J. M. McCaw, *PLoS Medicine* **17** (2020).
2. Y. Ng, *et al.* (2020).
3. D. J. Hunter, *New England Journal of Medicine* (2020).
4. K. Kupferschmidt, J. Cohen, Will novel virus go pandemic or be contained? (2020).
5. C. Dye, N. Gay, *Science* **300**, 1884 (2003).
6. C. T. Bauch, J. O. Lloyd-Smith, M. P. Coffee, A. P. Galvani, *Epidemiology* pp. 791–801 (2005).
7. C.-Y. Huang, C.-T. Sun, J.-L. Hsieh, H. Lin, *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* **7** (2004).
8. V. Colizza, A. Barrat, M. Barthelemy, A.-J. Valleron, A. Vespignani, *PLoS medicine* **4** (2007).
9. H. Rahmandad, J. Sterman, *Management Science* **54**, 998 (2008).
10. A. Gray, D. Greenhalgh, L. Hu, X. Mao, J. Pan, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **71**, 876 (2011).
11. V. Capasso, G. Serio, *Mathematical Biosciences* **42**, 43 (1978).
12. V. Capasso, *Mathematical structures of epidemic systems*, vol. 97 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2008).

13. W.-m. Liu, S. A. Levin, Y. Iwasa, *Journal of mathematical biology* **23**, 187 (1986).
14. J. Zhang, J. Lou, Z. Ma, J. Wu, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* **162**, 909 (2005).
15. D. L. Wilson, *Mechanisms of ageing and development* **74**, 15 (1994).
16. J. Cohen, K. Kupferschmidt, Strategies shift as coronavirus pandemic looms (2020).
17. M. Chinazzi, *et al.*, *Science* (2020).
18. S. P. Layne, J. M. Hyman, D. M. Morens, J. K. Taubenberger, New coronavirus outbreak: Framing questions for pandemic prevention (2020).
19. G. Pacheco, J. Bustamante-Castañeda, J.-G. Caputo, M. Jiménez-Corona, S. Ponce-De-León (2020).
20. J. O. Lloyd-Smith, S. J. Schreiber, P. E. Kopp, W. M. Getz, *Nature* **438**, 355 (2005).