Covid-19 dynamics in Albania: first estimates and projections

Erida Gjini [1,*]

[1]Mathematical Modeling of Biological Processes, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, Oeiras, Portugal
[*]egjini@igc.gulbenkian.pt

20 March 2020

Abstract

Albania reported the first confirmed case of COVID-19 on the 9th of March 2020. Given very close travel connections with Italy, the most affected country in Europe from this virus so far, with a fast growing epidemic over the previous month of February, the concern over a major similar outbreak in Albania was significant. Immediately following the first confirmation, country-wide measures were taken to reduce transmission such as university and school closures, closure of bars and restaurants, prohibition of public gatherings, leading to the second-quickest major social distancing measure in any European country after Italy. The parameters governing the epidemic course of COVID-19 in Albania remain unknown, in particular the initial number of imported cases from Italy or elsewhere, but as more data are becoming available, some first estimates and projections can be made. The aim of this report is to develop a mathematical epidemiological framework for data interpretation and comparison, as they accumulate, for exploring epidemiologic and demographic aspects specific to this country, and for making preliminary projections based on the current and growing understanding of COVID-19 in Albania and around the world. Using a classical SEIR epidemiological model, fitted to the initial dynamics of cases up to March 18, I show how the estimate for initial number of exposed individuals varies between 65 and 166, depending on values of symptomatic transmission $(50-60\%)$and incubation time $(6-14)$ days. Quantitatively, these factors together determine the future course of number of cases, and the relative effectiveness of control efforts. In model projections, the peak of the outbreak in Albania is expected towards the end of March or first week of April, with as of yet, large uncertainty with respect to its magnitude. The results highlight that maintaining transmission-reducing measures is extremely critical to control.

1 Current data and situation

The first confirmed case of COVID-19 was reported in Albania on the 9th of March 2020. On this day many measures to contain the epidemic were taken in a number of major cities, including university and school closures, suspension of public gatherings, closure of bars and cafes, and gradually a lockdown of the population. The first week after the first detected case, official numbers started to emerge with counts amounting to a total 59 confirmed cases on March 18, with two fatalities (Albanian Institute of Public Health). So far, the exponential growth rate of the number of cases in Albania is $r = 0.17$, coming from a doubling time of 4 days (Max Roser and Ortiz-Ospina, 2020).

It is not known what will be the trajectory of the epidemic in this country. Following the diagnosis of the first cases, the borders with Italy, Greece, Kosovo were rapidly closed and many flights to other European destinations have been limited or cancelled. To this date, it remains unknown how many imported cases could have started this epidemic in Albania. The aim of this report is to provide some first estimates for this number and consequently for the anticipated dynamics of COVID-19 in this country under different hypothetical scenarios of intervention measures and their efficacy.

2 Mathematical model

The mathematical model is based on SEIR dynamics (Figure 1, simplifying the model by (Riou et al., 2020) to a version without age structure. We model the number of **susceptible** individuals S, **exposed** individuals E whose

transmission may be considered negligible, **infected symptomatic** I_S and **infected asymptomatic** I_A individuals, as well as **fatalities** F and **recovered** individuals R. The total population size is given by $N = S+E+I_S+I_A+R+F$. At the beginning of the epidemic we have $S(0) \approx N$.

The ordinary differential equations describing the transmission dynamics are as follows:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta \frac{S}{N}(I_S + I_A) \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \beta \frac{S}{N}(I_S + I_A) - \tau E \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{dI_S}{dt} = \tau \phi E - \gamma I_S \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{dI_A}{dt} = \tau(1-\phi)E - \gamma I_A \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{dF}{dt} = \gamma f I_S \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma(1-f)I_S + \gamma I_A \tag{6}$$

For the parameters, average values were assumed based on the existing literature on COVID-19 (Bi et al., 2020; ECDC, 2020; Riou et al., 2020). The basic reproduction number R_0 for COVID-19 transmission, denoting the number of new infections generated from a typical infected individual during the period of infectiousness, is expected to be between 1.7 and 2.6, (Kucharski et al., 2020), and is the key target of control measures.

The incubation time from exposure to infection, informing the progression rate τ has been shown to be around 6.4 days, and up to 14 days (Backer et al., 2020). There is a percentage of infections that are symptomatic given by ϕ in the model. The duration of infection from infected people in Wuhan has been observed to be around 11 days, leading to $\gamma = 1/11$ in the model, but larger values have also been reported such as 30 days (Bi et al., 2020).

Symptomatic individuals can progress to recovery or death with relative probability $1-f$ and f. It is assumed that asymptomatic individuals only experience mild infection and progress to recovery. The contribution to transmission of symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals is assumed equal at baseline. Exposed individuals instead are assumed to not be infectious.



Figure 1: **Epidemiological model schema.** Transmission dynamics from Susceptible (S) to Exposed (E) to Infected symptomatic (I_S) or Infected Asymptomatic (I_A) and then finally to Recovered (R) or Fatality (F) cases. The transitions between compartments are modeled with ordinary differential equations. I follow the structure in (Riou et al., 2020) but without age structure. Confirmed cases in the data are assumed to reflect the magnitude of the symptomatic compartment in the model.

Parameter	Meaning	Value	Reference
β	Transmission rate	*Estimated* (per day)	
γ	Clearance rate	$1/30 - 1/11$ (per day)	Bi et al. (2020) ECDC (2020)
τ	Progression rate to infection	$1/14 - 1/5$ (per day)	Bi et al. (2020) Backer et al. (2020)
ϕ	Probability of symptomatic cases	$50 - 60\%$	Riou et al. (2020) ECDC (2020)
k	Rate of reduction in transmission	Assumed	$k = 0, 0.1, 0.2$
f	Case-fatality ratio	0.01	Riou et al. (2020)
$S(0)$	Number of susceptible population at day 0	$N = 2.87 \times 10^6$	Albania
$I_S(0)$	Number of symptomatic cases confirmed at day 0	2	Albania ISHP
$E(0)$	Number of exposed individuals at day 0	E_0 *Estimated*	
$I_A(0)$	Number of asymptomatic individuals at day 0	Assumed	$I_A(0) = 0$
$F(0)$	Number of fatalities at day 0	Assumed	$F(0) = 0$
$R(0)$	Number of recovered individuals at day 0	Assumed	$R(0) = 0$

Table 1: **Parameter values used for scenario simulation in Albania. Day 0 corresponds to March 9, 2020.**

3 Estimating initial number of exposed cases E_0

With variation in some of the above parameters, I fitted the model above to the data from the first observations of confirmed cases between 9th of March and 18th of March 2020 to estimate the number of exposed individuals at day 0, E_0, and transmission rate β. Using a nonlinear least squares routine in MATLAB, it was estimated that under parameter values as in Table 1, with proportion of symptomatic infection 60%, the number of exposed individuals at the onset of the epidemic is $E_0 = 65$ with 95%CI= $(45, 86)$. This estimate for initial number of exposed individuals is sensitive to the assumed proportion of symptomatic infection ϕ and assumed incubation period $(1/\tau)$. Results for four cases, are shown in Figure 2. In the figure, I also plot the model predictions for epidemiological variables such as number of symptomatic cases (I_S) as 'confirmed cases' and fatalities (F). Notice that under the lower proportion of symptomatic infection $(\phi = 0.5)$ and longer incubation period (14 days) in D, we estimate a higher number of exposed individuals starting the epidemic in Albania $E_0 = 166(116, 217)$.

While the initial dynamics are very similar independently of ϕ and δ (Figure 2), the final epidemic size and duration will be sensitive to such parameters (see Figures 4B, 5B), as the exposed number at time $t = 0$ and transmission rate estimate β consistent with the initial dynamics, will be different.

4 Independent estimate of imported cases from Italy

A big unknown is the initial number of imported cases from Italy to Albania during the month of the epidemic outbreak in Italy (8th of February until 8th of March), just prior to the first case detected in Albania. Using the data available from INSTAT (Panorama, 2020), about the yearly travel fluxes between Albania and Italy via air (1.7 million passengers) and by sea (1.6 million passengers), we obtain a total of 1.65 million arriving passengers on average from Italy to Albania in one year. This translates to 0.13 million passengers in one month. Thus, during the month prior to the first case in Albania, about 130.000 thousand passengers are expected to have arrived to Albania from Italy via air and sea. What is the prevalence of infection expected in such passengers over this month?

We must account for the exponential disease dynamics in Italy during the same period. The prevalence of infection in travelers arriving to Albania from Italy can be assumed to be roughly the same as the prevalence of infection in the Italian population itself during this period (Niehus et al., 2020). I used the publicly available data for the epidemics in Italy (Max Roser and Ortiz-Ospina, 2020), starting with 3 cases in February 8 and counting 5883 cases on the 8th of March, following an exponential growth at rate $r = 0.25$ (Remuzzi and Remuzzi, 2020). The population of Italy is 60.48 million. This leads to:

$$Prev_{infection} = \frac{1}{60.48 \times 10^6} \int_{Feb.8}^{Mar.8} 3e^{0.25t} dt = 3.87 \times 10^{-4} \quad (7)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
E[N_{imported}] &= Nr.travelers \times Prev_{infection} \\
&= 130.000 \times 3.87 \times 10^{-4} \\
&= 50.3
\end{aligned} \tag{8}
$$

is the number of expected imported Covid-19 cases during one month in Albania from Italy, computed from travel statistics and epidemics in Italy.

This number (≈ 50) is close to the number exposed estimated with the model for symptomatic percentage of 60-50% and incubation period of 6 days (Figure 2A-C), but is lower than the number of exposed individuals ($\approx 144-166$) estimated from the model fitting under higher assumed incubation time (Figure 2 B-D). When the incubation period is longer, we expect a higher number of imported cases from the model. This difference by a factor of 3-4 is perhaps more realistic, and can be explained by the fact that the real number of exposed individuals E_0 counts also possible imported cases via other countries communicating with Albania (e.g. Greece, Germany, UK), or other routes with Italy (e.g. land travel), as well as possible secondary local contacts of any primary infected travelers who have arrived.



Figure 2: **Four fits to data in Albania - consistent with initial number of confirmed cases up to March 17.** In each scenario, a different proportion of symptomatic infection and incubation period is assumed. The estimate of initial number of exposed individuals $E(0) = E_0$ is sensitive to these parameters, and varies between 65 and 165 exposed individuals from A to D. The future course of epidemics depends critically on this number and the corresponding transmission rate that is estimated. Other parameters assumed as in Table 1, with $\gamma = 1/11$, corresponding to a mean duration of infection of 11 days.

Regarding the latter interpretation, for the initial number of exposed cases $E(0) = E_0$, to be 3-4 times higher than the expected number of purely imported cases from Italy, the reason may be that each primary infected case that has arrived in Albania during this month, may have exposed a minimum of 3-4 other people in their contact network during the period from their arrival until March 9, 2020, (leading to a lower end $E_0 \approx 50 \times 3$) a very probable estimate, given the family and social contacts of typical individuals in Albania. This may even be on the conservative side, if one considers that each infected case may have exposed different numbers of people via superspreading events.

5 Projections with and without control

While each infected individual is expected to cause on average 2.6 new infections, in a totally susceptible population, over the entire period of his infectiousness (Kucharski et al., 2020), the epidemic could grow very fast without any control. The control measures in Albania however, were implemented very quickly, remarkably starting at the first day of case detection, and scaling up to country-wide quarantine by March 14.

To implement the effect of control measures in the model, I included a time-varying (decreasing) β, assuming this started to be effective at day 2 after the first detected case

$$\beta(t) = \beta \frac{2}{1 + e^{k(t-2)}}, \quad t \geq 2$$

where the parameter k reflects the speed of reduction in transmission (see Figure 3).



Figure 3: **Effect of control measures on transmission** The effective reduction in transmission, modeled as starting from day 2 after first confirmed case, is plotted for two values of assumed efficacy (medium: $k = 0.1$, and high: $k = 0.2$). In the best case, transmission is reduced by 50% in 2 days post-implementation ($k = 0.2$). The magnitude and speed of reduction is key to control of the epidemic.

Under the estimated parameters, from the initial number of reported cases (Fig.2), I simulated scenarios of different efficacy of intervention k, where higher k means higher efficacy of the intervention, thus faster reduction in transmission rate (Figure 4-5). Just looking at the curves, without associated confidence intervals, these projections show that the deviation from the initial exponential trend should start to be noticed already in the first week following drastic measures. For this it is important to check very carefully how the new data fall onto the dynamics anticipated with and without intervention. As can be seen from this figure, case data from March 9 - March 18 are rising exponentially fast, but there is a possibility that March 19 data, reflecting the latest data point, with only 5 new cases, compared to the previous day, might already vaguely suggest a deviation from the initial exponential trend, thus indicating some sign of the effectiveness of whole-country lockdown to limit transmission. It is however too early to tell for sure the signature of social distancing measures on the current dynamics of this virus in Albania.



Figure 4: **Scenario 1 in Albania: 6 day incubation time, 60% symptomatic** - consistent with initial number of confirmed cases (case A in Figure 2). Predicted dynamics over short term **(A)** and long term without intervention **(B)**. In A, two efficacy values for the intervention have been used for simulation $k = 0.1$ and $k = 0.2$ besides the no-intervention scenario ($k = 0$). The expectation for the number of confirmed cases (I_S) under transmission-reduction intervention is plotted in the dashed and dotted lines. In B, I plot the whole epidemic trajectory under no intervention, where blue and red lines depict symptomatic infected people and fatalities. The dots in blue (March 9 - March 18) reflect the data used in the model fit, and the dot in red (March 19) reflects the subsequent data point, which could suggest a curbing of transmission away from the initial exponential trend.



Figure 5: **Scenario 2 in Albania: 14 day incubation time, 50% symptomatic** - consistent with initial number of confirmed cases (case D in Figure 2). Predicted dynamics over short term **(A)** and long term without intervention **(B)**. In A, two efficacy values for the intervention have been used for simulation $k = 0.1$ and $k = 0.2$ besides the no-intervention scenario ($k = 0$). The expectation for the number of confirmed cases under transmission-reduction intervention is plotted in the dashed and dotted lines. The dots in blue (March 9 - March 18) reflect the data used in the model fit, and the dot in red (March 19) reflects the latest data point. In B, I plot the whole epidemic trajectory under no intervention, where blue and red lines depict symptomatic infected people and fatalities.

Integrating uncertainty into onward predictions, I used the 95% CI in the estimates for E_0 and β (Figure 2A and D) obtained initially, and simulated the model varying the efficacy of the transmission-reducing intervention. In Figures 6-7, I plot the uncertainty region around the model prediction, the 95% confidence interval, for medium and high efficacy ($k = 0.1$ and $k = 0.2$) respectively. These plots also show that there is a large uncertainty in prediction, especially in the magnitude of the peak, this due to the large variation in the estimated number of exposed individuals, transmission rate, contributing to the final effectiveness of intervention. The 95% confidence



Figure 6: **Scenarios of control and associated uncertainty, medium efficacy** ($k = 0.1$) Here I plot confidence intervals associated with dynamics under control measures. I consider the lower efficacy of intervention $k = 0.1$, meaning slower reduction in transmission. **A.** $\phi = 0.6, \tau = 6$ (continuation to Figure 4, $k = 0.1$) **B.** $\phi = 0.5, \tau = 14$ (continuation of Figure 5,$k = 0.1$). The predictions with the uncertainty interval for number of symptomatic cases I_s (blue shaded region) and fatalities F (pink shaded region) extrapolate from initial number of confirmed cases up to 60 days. The confidence region gives bounds for worst-case and best-case scenario respectively. Model best fit to data and predictions with those parameters are given by the lines and shaded region. The data from March 9 up to March 18 are given by the points in blue (in red, the data from March 19, not used in model fitting).

interval gives an upper bound and lower bound for the growing number of cases expected.



Figure 7: **Scenarios of control and associated uncertainty, higher efficacy** ($k = 0.2$) The uncertainty stems from the confidence interval for initial exposed E_0 and uncertainty around β. A. $\phi = 0.6, \tau = 6$ B. $\phi = 0.5, \tau = 14$. The predictions with the uncertainty interval for number of symptomatic cases (blue shaded region) and fatalities (pink shaded region) extrapolate from initial number of confirmed cases up to 60 days. The confidence region gives bounds for worst-case and best-case scenario respectively. Model best fit to data and predictions with those parameters are given by the lines (blue for I_S and red for F) and shaded region. The data from March 9 up to March 18 are given by the circles in blue (in red, the data from March 19, not used in model fitting).

In Fig.6, medium efficacy scenario, which represents the less positive prediction on average (higher peak), we could expect numbers of 150 or 200 cases in Albania around beginning of April, with a difference between short incubation time (6A) and long incubation time (6B) being lower and shorter epidemic vs. higher and longer epidemic.

Notice however, there is uncertainty, and within the same scenario, there is a possibility that the epidemic is significantly smaller or significantly higher (up to 450/1000 cases at the peak). It is clear that there is a lot of sensitivity of the dynamics to the value of estimated transmission rate and initial number E_0, both sensitive to the assumed value of percentage symptomatic infection, and to the value of incubation time. In Fig.7, reflecting a much more positive scenario, with higher efficacy $k = 0.2$ from transmission reduction, we can see that the maximum range for peak number cases should be around 100 and 160 under the assumption of incubation time of 6 days or 14 days. The peak is also expected in these predictions to be around the end of March, or first week of April (20-30 days following first case). This provided that control measures continue as strong, throughout this time.

Notice these are preliminary analyses and estimates based on a very small amount of data, but in a context where drastic control measures were in place almost immediately after the first detected case. Thus there is a strong potential for the epidemic outbreak to be limited. As more data becomes available in the coming days, these model predictions can be verified. This will lead to a better understanding of the epidemic course in Albania, better calibration of parameters and increasingly more accurate predictions.

6 Discussion

This is a simple model developed using the little available data of early COVID-19 dynamics in Albania. The model assumes homogeneous mixing of all individuals, which is of course an approximation. There are clear social networks and heterogeneities between regions, age classes, socio-demographic groups, especially households, that the model is not considering. There is a lot of stochasticity unaccounted for by the model, especially in person-person variation for number of new infections generated. Other studies have opted for stochastic modeling to describe these phenomena and their role in dynamics (Kucharski et al., 2020), which could be applied and be important also in this context.

The analysis computing 50 imported cases from travel from Italy, as independent estimate for number of imported cases, assumes that there is uniform spatial spread of travel from Italy, which is not exactly accurate given that most travel connections are with Milan and Rome, thus instead of using the total population of Italy in the denominator for computing prevalence in the travelers, one should perhaps use the total population of cities with most travel communication in Albania, and their associated epidemic numbers. So I caution that this is a first-order approximation. Surely the indirect E_0 values estimated with a model should be closer the truth, although they are dependent on the assumed proportion symptomatic and assumed detection capability of cases. It is easy to foresee, in the context of this model, that the smaller the proportion of symptomatic assumed (ϕ) to fit the model to the confirmed cases (matching them with $I_S(t)$), the higher will be the estimate of exposed cases at time 0 E_0, starting off the outbreak in Albania. There is some uncertainty here related also to the detection probability of cases, which so far we have assumed perfect. Thus, the model is fitted to the confirmed cases as if they are all true symptomatic cases in the population. If confirmed cases only reflect a proportion of the true symptomatic cases, then the effective symptomatic proportion the model would 'see' would be lower, and a higher initial number model would result. It becomes important thus to account also for detection probability in future modeling.

A very important part of control efforts that this model does not capture is the specific isolation of contacts of confirmed cases. We have modeled control as a global transmission-reducing intervention, but this affects all the population homogeneously. Targeted control efforts directed at contacts of confirmed cases should be modeled in the future to quantify the added value of this specific control for the control of the epidemic.

The case-fatality-ratio here is assumed the same for the entire population, while variation between age-classes exist (Riou et al., 2020). Extending the model to reflect age distribution should make more specific and accurate predictions for cases and fatalities in different age groups. Similarly, extending the model to include other routes of transmission, e.g. environmental (van Doremalen et al., 2020) and the role of weather and seasonality in transmission, might affect outcomes and alter predictions.

In general, this model assumes mean values of parameters which can be refined as more data becomes available. In particular, even with fixed values of incubation time, and clearance rate, there is a lot of uncertainty in predictions for dynamics. If the entire distributions (Kucharski et al., 2020; Backer et al., 2020), instead of the mean are taken into account, uncertainty in the epidemic variables over time should increase.

While model predictions across scenarios vary quantitatively, qualitatively, it remains very critical to maintain in place the very strong control measures to minimize transmission. The model must be verified with incoming data that should be compared to theoretical expectations. Over the next weeks widespread testing and accurate detection of cases will be important to reevaluate the model structure, parameters and associated predictions for the growth, peak and duration of Covid-19 epidemic in this setting.

References

Backer, J., D. Klinkenberg, and J. Wallinga (2020). The incubation period of 2019-ncov infections among travellers from wuhan.

Bi, Q., Y. Wu, S. Mei, C. Ye, X. Zou, Z. Zhang, X. Liu, L. Wei, S. A. Truelove, T. Zhang, et al. (2020). Epidemiology and transmission of covid-19 in shenzhen china: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. *medRxiv*.

ECDC (2020). Novel coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19) pandemic: increased transmission in the eu/eea and the uk – sixth update 12 march 2020. Stockholm.

Kucharski, A. J., T. W. Russell, C. Diamond, Y. Liu, J. Edmunds, S. Funk, R. M. Eggo, C. nCoV working group, et al. (2020). Early dynamics of transmission and control of covid-19: a mathematical modelling study. *medRxiv*.

Max Roser, H. R. and E. Ortiz-Ospina (2020). Coronavirus disease (covid-19) – statistics and research. *Our World in Data*. https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus.

Niehus, R., P. M. De Salazar, A. Taylor, and M. Lipsitch (2020). Quantifying bias of covid-19 prevalence and severity estimates in wuhan, china that depend on reported cases in international travelers. *medRxiv*.

Panorama (2020 (accessed March 15, 2020)). *Koronavirusi tek fqinjet lidhjet e forta tregtare sa persona fluturojne nga dhe drejt italise qytetet qe kryesojne*.

Remuzzi, A. and G. Remuzzi (2020). Covid-19 and italy: what next? *The Lancet*.

Riou, J., A. Hauser, M. J. Counotte, and C. L. Althaus (2020). Adjusted age-specific case fatality ratio during the covid-19 epidemic in hubei, china, january and february 2020. *medRxiv*.

van Doremalen, N., T. Bushmaker, D. Morris, M. Holbrook, A. Gamble, B. Williamson, A. Tamin, J. Harcourt, N. Thornburg, S. Gerber, et al. (2020). Aerosol and surface stability of hcov-19 (sars-cov-2) compared to sars-cov-1. *medRxiv*.