

1 Preprint

2 Fuzzy Autocatalytic analysis of Covid-19 outbreak in Malaysia

3 Tahir Ahmad,¹ Azmirul Ashaari,² Siti Rahmah Awang,² Siti Salwana Mamat,¹ Wan Munirah
4 Wan Mohamad,¹ Amirul Aizad Ahmad Fuad,¹ and Nurfarhana Hassan¹

5 ¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, Faculty of Science, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia,
6 81310 Skudai, Johor, Malaysia.

7 ²Azman Hashim International Business School, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310
8 Skudai, Johor, Malaysia.

9 Correspondence should be addressed to Tahir Ahmad; tahir@ibnusina.utm.my

10 Abstract

11 The objective of this research is to demonstrate a mathematical technique to analyze the Covid-
12 19 outbreak, particularly with respect to Malaysia. The technique is able to accommodate
13 scarcity, quantity, and availability of the data set. The obtained results can offer descriptive
14 insight for reflecting and strategizing actions in combating the pandemic.
15

16 1. Introduction

17 The public panic and discomfort on the ongoing Covid-19 outbreak remind us of the history of
18 the 1918 Spanish Flu pandemic, whereby over 50 million people died worldwide. It was a
19 deadly pandemic, indeed. The ongoing outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) has
20 claimed 105 952 lives worldwide as of 12 April 2020, 08:00 GMT, according to the World
21 Health Organization (WHO) (<https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>). Since the first case of pneumonia of unknown cause detected in Wuhan reported to the
22 WHO Country Office in China on 31 December 2019 and followed by its declaration as a
23 Public Health Emergency by the international body on 30 January 2020, researchers, scientists,
24 and mathematicians have been racing in their efforts to stop the potential devastating assault
25 by the coronavirus.
26

27
28 These efforts include Zhou et al. [1] alerted the world the menace of the virus through their
29 publication in Nature. However, the researchers did not employ any specific mathematical tools
30 in their work. Hamzah et al. [2] utilized a system of ordinary differential equations for
31 Susceptible-Exposed-Infected-Removed (SEIR) in their predictive modeling of the Covid-19
32 outbreak. Similarly, Lin et al. [3] adopted a system of ordinary differential equations that
33 previously used to model the pandemic 1918 Spanish Flu for describing the current Covid-19
34 outbreak. Recently, Forster et al. [4] analyzed the coronavirus genomes using the phylogenetic
35 network, a special type of graph that has been primarily used in archaeological studies.
36

37 There are three main problems with respect to the Covid-19 outbreak, namely, the scarcity,
38 quantity, and availability of data that are essential to produce a good reliable mathematical
39 model. This is due to the fact that the outbreak is about six months old since the first case was
40 reported. Therefore, a mathematical technique must be flexible and robust enough to deal with

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

41 such identified shortcomings is needed to model the outbreak. In this paper, a suitable
 42 mathematical method is proposed, namely a fuzzy autocatalytic set, which is able to
 43 accommodate such constraints to analyze the current pandemic.


44 2. Methods

45 Generally, a graph represents a relationship between objects. Objects are represented as
 46 vertices and the relations by edges. Formally, the definition of a graph is as follows

47
 48 *Definition 1* (see [5]). A graph is a pair of sets (V, E) where V is the set of vertices, and E is
 49 the set of edges.

50
 51 Furthermore, another way to represent a graph is by its adjacency matrix. The definition of an
 52 adjacency matrix for a graph is given in Definition 2 below.

53
 54 *Definition 2* (see [5]). An adjacency matrix of graph $G(V, E)$ with n vertices is an $n \times n$ matrix
 55 denoted by $A(a_{ij})$, where $a_{ij} = 1$ if E contains a directed edge (j, i) . It is an arrow pointing
 56 from vertex j to vertex i , and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.



58 FIGURE 1: A directed graph with its adjacency matrix.

60 2.1 Fuzzy Autocatalytic Set

61 The concepts of graph and fuzzy set have given ‘birth’ to a new mathematical structure,
 62 namely, a fuzzy graph. Definition 3 indicates that vertices and edges are both fuzzy. In other
 63 words, the vertices and edges have values between 0 and 1. FIGURE 2 illustrates a fuzzy graph
 64 and its adjacency matrix.

65
 66 *Definition 3* (see [6]). A fuzzy graph $G(\sigma, \mu)$ is a pair of function $\sigma: S \rightarrow [0,1]$ and $\mu: S \times S \rightarrow$
 67 $[0,1]$ such that $\forall x, y \in S, \mu(x, y) \leq \sigma(x) \wedge \sigma(y)$.

68
 69 An adjacency matrix of a fuzzy graph is defined as follows:

70
 71 *Definition 4* (see [6]). An adjacency matrix, A of a fuzzy graph $G = (V, \sigma, \mu)$ is an $n \times n$ matrix
 72 defined as $A = (a_{ij})$ such that $a_{ij} = \mu(v_j, v_i)$.

73
 74
 75




FIGURE 2: A fuzzy graph and its adjacency matrix.

76

77

78 The concept of autocatalysis was originated in chemistry, in particular, for the description of
 79 catalytic interaction between molecules [7], [8]. Further, Jain and Krishna [9] formalized the
 80 concept of an autocatalytic set (ACS) as a directed graph in which its vertices represent species
 81 and edges represent catalytic interactions among them. The formal definition of an ACS is
 82 given as follows.

83

84 *Definition 5* (see [9]). An autocatalytic set is a subgraph, each of whose vertices has at least
 85 one incoming link from vertices belonging to the same subgraph.

86

87 Some examples of ACSs are illustrated in FIGURE 3. The simplest ACS is a vertex with 1-
 88 cycle.

89




FIGURE 3: Some examples of ACS

90

91

92 The merger of the fuzzy graph and autocatalytic set has led to the idea of the fuzzy autocatalytic
 93 set (FACS) by Ahmad et al. [10]. The concept of FACS Covid-19 outbreak in Malaysia is
 94 depicted in FIGURE 4. The formal definition of FACS is laid as follows.

95

96 *Definition 6* (see [10]). A fuzzy autocatalytic set is a subgraph each of whose vertices has at
 97 least one incoming link with membership value, $\mu(e_i) \in (0,1], \forall e_i \in E$ from any other vertices
 98 are belonging to the same subgraph.

99



FIGURE 4: Fuzzy Autocatalytic Set of Covid-19 outbreak in Malaysia.

100

101

102

103

104

105 2.2 Dynamics of FACS

106 The adjacency matrix in FIGURE 1(b) and FIGURE 2(b) are then processed by the procedure
 107 outlined in [10], [11] and improved by [12], respectively. The outcomes of the process are
 108 determined via the following steps.

109
 110 Step 1: Keeping $C(s \times s)$ matrix fixed, x evolved according to the following equation.

$$111 \quad x'_i = \sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij}x_j - x_i \sum_{j,k=1}^n c_{kj}x_j,$$

112 for time t , which is large enough for x to get reasonably close to its attractor \mathbf{X}
 113 (Perron Frobenius Eigenvector). We denoted $X_i \equiv x_i(t)$.

114 Step 2: The set L of nodes i with the least value of X_i is determined, i.e.

$$115 \quad L = \left\{ i \in S \mid X_i = \min_{j \in S} X_j, S = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, s\} \right\}.$$

116 This is the set of “least fit” nodes, identifying the relative concentration of a variable
 117 in the attractor (or, more specifically, at t) with its “fitness” in the environment
 118 defined by the graph. The least fit node is removed from the system along with its
 119 links, leading a graph of $s - 1$ variables.

120 Step 3: C is now reduced to $(s - 1) \times (s - 1)$ matrix. The remaining nodes and links of C
 121 remained unchanged. All these $x_i (0 \leq x_i \leq 1)$ are rescaled to keep


$$122 \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i = 1.$$

123 Repeat all the steps until the 2×2 matrix is attained.

124

125 FIGURE 5 illustrates the initial step (Step 1). Then one of the nodes with the least eigenvector
 126 is removed from the graph (Step 2). The node is removed along with its links, and the graph is
 127 left with a reduced number of nodes and links (Step 3). This process is then repeated until a
 128 graph with at least two nodes is attained.

129




130

131

FIGURE 5: Schematic portrayal of the graph dynamics.

132

133 The procedure to transform the graph into 2D-Euclidean space is adopted from [13], which is
134 based on the Laplacian matrix and solving a unique one-dimensional optimization problem in
135 order to determine their coordinates. The general overview of the transformation is depicted in
136 the following FIGURE 6.
137



138
139

140 FIGURE 6: Schematic illustration transformation of the graph from vertex space to Euclidean space


141 3. Implementation

142 The technique described in Section 2 is implemented on two sets of data; Malaysia and its
143 neighboring countries and states in Malaysia.

144 3.1 Malaysia and its Neighboring Countries


145 The daily new reported cases of Covid-19 for Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Indonesia, and
146 Brunei are obtained (publicly available) from European Centre for Disease Prevention and
147 Control's website (see <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publicationsdata>) from 1 February 2020
148 until 27 March 2020 (see FIGURE 7). In order to determine the pandemic signature of Covid-
149 19 for these countries, we sampled the data from 12 to 27 March only. This is due to the fact
150 that the plotted lines are clearly erratic for the sampled countries (refer FIGURE 7 and FIGURE
151 8) during that period.

152



153
154
155
156

FIGURE 7: New cases with respect to Malaysia and its neighbors from 12 March to 27 March 2020.



157
158

FIGURE 8: New cases with respect to Malaysia and its neighbors from 12 March to 27 March 2020

159 3.2 States of Malaysia

160 A set of data from 10 March to 10 April is obtained from the Ministry of Health, Malaysia
161 (www.moh.gov.my), and presented in FIGURE 9.

162

KES HARIAN COVID-19 DI MALAYSIA 10 MAC - 10 APRIL




FIGURE 9: New cases from 10 March to 10 April 2020.

163
164

165

166 The breakdown of reported new cases between states in Malaysia from 28 March to 5 April is
167 considered in our study (refer to FIGURE 10). The period is selected due to the erraticness of
168 the data, as depicted in FIGURE 9 earlier.

169




FIGURE 10: New cases in states of Malaysia from 28 March to 5 April 2020.

170
171


172 4. Analysis

173 Similarly, the fuzzy analysis of the graphs is divided into two identified demographic areas and
174 presented in the following subsections.

175 4.1 Malaysia and its Neighbouring Countries

176 The graph and its adjacent matrix for data from 12 to 27 March are constructed and exhibited

177 in FIGURE 11(a) and FIGURE 11(b), respectively. There are 16 days during the identified
 178 erratic interval. Hence the graph contains 16 vertices altogether. The impurities are considered
 179 as another vertex whereby it represents unidentified or undiscovered or unreported cases during
 180 the erratic period. This particular vertex acts as a buffer
 181



182
 183 FIGURE 11: (a) Graph C with its (b) adjacency matrix for data from 12 March to 27 March 2020.

184
 185 The dominance of each country (outcome) is identified for each day of the erratic interval and
 186 presented in the following TABLE 1.

187
 188 TABLE 1: Output Matrix.

	Results: 2×2 Variables Output Matrix (Represent dominant dates)
System 1 (Malaysia)	$\begin{bmatrix} 11 & 12 \\ 15 & 16 \end{bmatrix} = 22/3, 23/3, 26/3, 27/3,$
System 2 (Singapore)	$\begin{bmatrix} 11 & 12 \\ 15 & 16 \end{bmatrix} = 22/3, 23/3, 26/3, 27/3,$
System 3 (Thailand)	$\begin{bmatrix} 11 & 12 \\ 15 & 16 \end{bmatrix} = 22/3, 23/3, 26/3, 27/3,$
System 4 (Indonesia)	$\begin{bmatrix} 11 & 12 \\ 15 & 16 \end{bmatrix} = 22/3, 23/3, 26/3, 27/3,$
System 5 (Brunei)	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 \\ 13 & 16 \end{bmatrix} = 12/3, 15/3, 24/3, 27/3,$

189
 190
 191 Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, and Indonesia dominate on 03/22/2020, 03/23/2020,
 192 03/26/2020, and 03/27/2020. This simply indicates that the outbreak has been spreading
 193 among the four countries with average daily reported cases of more than 60. On the other hand,
 194 Brunei recorded less than 10 cases daily during the erratic period.

195
 196 Furthermore, the transformed graph into the 2D-Euclidean space reveals the nodes for each
 197 country are dispersed and scattered (see FIGURE 12: Clusters of assigned countries). However,
 198 Malaysia (S1) and Singapore (S2) nodes are closer to each other. This characteristic hint that
 199 daily reported cases for these two countries are quite similar, followed by Thailand (S3) and
 200 Indonesia (S4), whereas Brunei (S5) is isolated from the rest.
 201




FIGURE 12: Clusters of assigned countries

202
203

204

205 To justify the obtained clusters, an ordinary graph for a daily rate of reported new cases over
 206 populations for each country is plotted in FIGURE 13: The daily rate of new cases over the
 207 population from 12 March to 31 March 2020. Clearly, the gap between lines for Malaysia and
 208 Singapore are closed, similarly Thailand and Indonesia. The line that represents Brunei is quite
 209 erratic. Nevertheless, the line represents Brunei seems stable after 24 March due to the country
 210 lockdown measure taken with respect to its border.

211
212




FIGURE 13: The daily rate of new cases over the population from 12 March to 31 March 2020.

213
214

215

216 4.2 States of Malaysia

217 Using FACS for sampled data 28 March to 5 April 2020, 16 states are identified and clustered,
 218 namely, **Cluster 1** contains Perlis, Kedah, Pulau Pinang and Perak. **Cluster 2** includes
 219 Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, Melaka and Johor whereas **Cluster 3** is made of Pahang,

220 Trengganu, Kelantan and Sabah. Finally, Sarawak, WP Kuala Lumpur, WP Labuan and WP
221 Putrajaya formed **Cluster 4**.

222

223 These clusters are then classified into three zones; zones 1, 2, and 3. Zone 1 is named as an
224 **Under Control Zone** that comprises of Perlis, Kedah, Pulau Pinang, and Perak. These 4 states
225 are scattered in Zone 1 (see FIGURE 14: Two phases of FACS clustering for states in Malaysia
226 from 28 March to 5 April 2020.) that reflects their distinctness with low reported new cases.


227

228 Zone 2 in the **Medium Zone** which consists of Pahang, Terengganu, Kelantan, and Sabah.
229 Reported on increased new cases in these particular states only happened after 31 March. Even
230 though Zone 2 is dominated by Cluster 3 but it is not total domination since there were a couple
231 of instances where Cluster 2 and 4 popped up in the zone. Hence, the government has to pay
232 attention to states in Cluster 3 because these states have the potential to move into Zone 3. On
233 top of that, Zone 2 is clearly closed adjacent to Zone 3.

234

235 Zone 3 is the **Danger Zone** that is totally dominated by states in the west and south of Malaysia,
236 such as Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, Melaka, Johor, WP Kuala Lumpur, WP Putrajaya,
237 including Sarawak and WP Labuan. In fact, the government has gazetted 23 districts in these
238 states as the red zone, namely, Putrajaya, Jasin, Negeri Sembilan, Hulu Langat, Petaling, Johor
239 Bahru, Kuching, and Tawau. The district of Hulu Selangor in the state of Selangor has
240 announced another red zone on 10 April. Our FACS analysis (refer to FIGURE 14) concurred
241 with the list of states in red zones released by Crisis Preparedness and Response Centre
242 (CPRC), Ministry of Health of Malaysia. Furthermore, we have predicted that WP Putrajaya is
243 in Zone 3 with respect to data up to 5 April. True enough, WP Putrajaya was announced in the
244 danger zone on 6 April by the government.

245



246
247

248 FIGURE 14: Two phases of FACS clustering for states in Malaysia from 28 March to 5 April 2020.

249 **5. Conclusions**

250 In this paper, we demonstrated a fuzzy autocatalytic analysis for the Covid-19 outbreak
251 associated with Malaysia. The method is able to identify some significant features of the
252 pandemic outbreak as well as some important predictions. The method can be used to model
253 any future pandemic.

254 **Data Availability**

255 The data are obtained from the Ministry of Health (MOH) Malaysia and National Institutes of
256 Health Malaysia (NIH) (publicly available).

257 **Acknowledgments**

258 We gratefully acknowledge the Ministry of Health (MOH) Malaysia and National Institutes of
259 Health Malaysia (NIH) for allowing us to use their published data (publicly available). We
260 thank the Faculty of Science and Azman Hashim International Business School, Universiti
261 Teknologi Malaysia, for its tremendous support for this work.
262

263 **Conflicts of Interest**

264 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

265 **References**

- 266 [1] P. Zhou *et al.*, “A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin,”
267 *Nature*, vol. 579, no. 7798, pp. 270–273, 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7.
- 268 [2] F. A. Binti Hamzah, C. Lau, H. Nazri, D. V Ligot, G. Lee, and C. L. Tan, “CoronaTracker: World-wide
269 COVID-19 Outbreak Data Analysis and Prediction,” *Bull World Heal. Organ. E-pub*, vol. 19, 2020.
- 270 [3] Q. Lin *et al.*, “A conceptual model for the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in Wuhan,
271 China with individual reaction and governmental action,” *Int. J. Infect. Dis.*, 2020.
- 272 [4] P. Forster, L. Forster, C. Renfrew, and M. Forster, “Phylogenetic network analysis of SARS-CoV-2
273 genomes,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2004999117.
- 274 [5] S. S. Mamat, S. R. Awang, and T. Ahmad, “Preference graph of potential method as a fuzzy graph,”
275 *Adv. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 2020, 2020.
- 276 [6] A. Rosenfeld, “Fuzzy Graphs, Fuzzy Sets and their Applications to Cognitive and Decision Process, M.
277 Eds.” Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- 278 [7] S. A. Kauffman, “Cellular homeostasis, epigenesis and replication in randomly aggregated
279 macromolecular systems,” *J. Cybern.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 71–96, 1971, doi: 10.1080/01969727108545830.
- 280 [8] O. E. Rössler, “Ein systemtheoretisches Modell zur Biogenese / A System Theoretic Model of
281 Biogenesis,” *Zeitschrift für Naturforsch. B*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 741–746, 1971, doi:
282 <https://doi.org/10.1515/znb-1971-0801>.
- 283 [9] S. Jain and S. Krishna, “Autocatalytic sets and the growth of complexity in an evolutionary model,”
284 *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 81, no. 25, pp. 5684–5687, Dec. 1998, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.5684.
- 285 [10] T. Ahmad, S. Baharun, and K. A. Arshad, “Modeling a clinical incineration process using fuzzy
286 autocatalytic set,” *J. Math. Chem.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1263–1273, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10910-009-9650-
287 1.
- 288 [11] A. Ashaari, T. Ahmad, S. Zenian, and N. A. Shukor, “Selection Probe of EEG Using Dynamic Graph of

- 289 Autocatalytic Set (ACS) BT - Soft Computing in Data Science,” 2016, pp. 25–36.
- 290 [12] N. Hassan, T. Ahmad, and N. Mohd Zain, “A novel chemometrics fuzzy autocatalytic set (FACS) with
291 fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy for halal authentication of gelatins,” *Sains Malaysiana*
292 (*In Press.*, 2020).
- 293 [13] S. Abu Bakar, T. Ahmad, and S. Baharun, “Coordinated transformation for Fuzzy Autocatalytic Set of
294 fuzzy graph type-3.,” *J. Math. Stat.*, vol. 4, no. 11, pp. 119–127, 2015.
- 295