medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20041897; this version posted March 31, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Targeted adaptive isolation strategy for Covid-19 pandemic

Zoltan Neufeld and Hamid Khataee

March 23, 2020

School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

Abstract

We investigate the effects of social distancing in controlling the impact of the Covid-19 epidemic using a simple SIR epidemic model. We show that an alternative or complementary approach based on targeted isolation of the vulnerable subpopulation may provide a more efficient and robust strategy at a lower economic and social cost within a shorter timeframe.

1 SIR model

We consider the standard susceptible-infected-removed/recovered (SIR) epidemic model [1, 2] to represent the current covid-19 pandemic:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -kSI, \quad \frac{dI}{dt} = kSI - \gamma I, \quad \frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma I, \tag{1}$$

where the parameter k characterises the probability of transmission of infection from the infected (I) to the susceptible (S) fraction of the population, and γ is the rate of recovery, which is assumed to lead to immunity or death; see Fig. 1(a). The behavior of the model depends on a single non-dimensional parameter $R_0 = k/\gamma$ which is the number of new infections caused by a single infected in a fully susceptible population. The condition for an epidemic outbreak is $R_0 > 1$ otherwise the infection dies out monotonously. Typical estimates of R_0 for the covid epidemic are roughly in the range $1.5 - 3.5$ [3-5]. We will use $\gamma = 0.1$ consistent with a typical recovery time of around $1 - 2$ weeks [3-5]. A few example solutions of the model (1) for different values of R_0 are shown in Fig. 1(b).

2 Social distancing

The so called "social distancing" strategy aims to reduce social interactions within the population decreasing the probability of transmission of the infection, represented by the parameter k in the model. A strong reduction of social interactions may thus lead to $R_0 < 1$ when the infection dies out monotonously, or otherwise, when the reduced R_0 is still larger than unity, it leads to a reduction of the total infected fraction of the population $I_{total} = 1 - S(\infty)$, and a lower peak infected fraction. A side effect of this reduction, however, is that the duration of the epidemic outbreak increases significantly. The dependence of the peak infected fraction and the time to maximum infected are shown in Fig. 1(c). The total infected fraction at the end of the epidemic as a function of R_0 is shown in Fig. 1(d). For example, starting with a reference value $R_0 = 2.4$ with time to peak infection around 65 days, reducing R_0 by factor 2 to $R_0 = 1.2$, extends the time to peak infection to ~ 320 days, while reducing the maximum infected fraction from $\sim 22\%$ to $\sim 1.5\%$ and the total infected by the end of the epidemic decreases from $\sim 90\%$ to $\sim 30\%$.

Why reducing R_0 by social distancing reduces total infections and the peak infected fraction, which is critical due to the limited hospital infrastructure, (or termination of the epidemic if $R_0 < 1$) it has the following possible problems:

- since the Covid-19 infection results in mild or no symptoms in a large majority of the population and often remains undetected it is difficult to prevent further transmission (this may be one of the reasons why drastic social distancing introduced in Western Europe had limited success so far)

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20041897; this version posted March 31, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- if R_0 remains > 1 the social distancing can significantly extend the duration of the epidemic making it difficult to maintain the reduced transmissions over a long time period in a large population
- perhaps the most important problem is that there is no clear exit strategy until large scale vaccination becomes available. Since at the end of the epidemic a large proportion of the population remains susceptible to infection, after relaxation of social distancing, the population is highly susceptible to recurrent epidemic outbreaks due to remaining undetected or imported infections from other regions/countries where the infection has not been eliminated yet
- social distancing measures over extended period of time applied uniformly to a large population leads to widespread disruption of the functioning of the society and economy therefore it has a huge long term cost

3 SIR model with vulnerable subpopulation

To address these issues we consider an alternative or complementary strategy. An essential feature of the Covid-19 epidemic is that it produces mild transient symptoms in the large majority of the population (around $\sim 95\%$) comparable to the usual flu, while it leads to very serious respiratory problems mainly in the older population (> 70), or in younger individuals with serious pre-existing chronic diseases [6]

To take into account the markedly different age-dependent outcome of the Covid-19 infection we extend the standard SIR model by separating the population into two compartments: the majority population with mild symptoms, and a vulnerable older population where infection is likely to lead to hospitalization and death. Both sub-populations follow the SIR dynamics with the important difference that while in the majority population the infections are primarily caused by transmission within this subpopulation from infected to susceptible individuals; in the vulnerable minority the dominant route is via transmission from infected in the majority population to susceptible vulnerable. (We neglect transmission within the vulnerable population and the infection of majority susceptible due to infected vulnerable) See diagram in Fig. 1(a).

Thus the majority population follows the same SIR dynamics (1) as described above independently of the vulnerable population. The infection rate of the vulnerable population is described by

$$\frac{dS_V}{dt} = -\mu S_V I(t) \tag{2}$$

where the parameter μ represents the rate of transmission from infected individuals of the majority population (I) to vulnerable susceptible population (S_V).

Thus the relative proportion of newly infected vulnerable individuals (requiring hospitalization and possibility of death) per unit time is determined by the product $\mu I(t)$.

We can calculate the proportion of the vulnerable population infected over the whole course of the epidemic as

$$\frac{S_V(0) - S_V(\infty)}{S_V(0)} = 1 - \exp\left(-\int_0^\infty \mu I(t) dt\right). \tag{3}$$

4 Targeted adaptive isolation

According to (3) reducing the loss in S_V requires reducing the product μI_{total}. While social distancing aims to reduce the total infected by decreasing R_0 (see continuous curve showing I_{total} vs R_0 in Fig. 1D), this model highlights the possibility of an alternative or complementary measure based on reducing the parameter μ by isolating/shielding the vulnerable population from infections in the majority population. This could be achieved by targeted measures providing free home-delivery of food, medication etc. combined with targeted support addressing communication and healthcare needs, support with creating separated living space where needed.

Since the isolation strategy targets a small portion of the population which is less socially active and has a low participation in the economy, a radical isolation is likely to be much more efficient than uniform social distancing, with smaller cost for the economy and the functioning of the society.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20041897; this version posted March 31, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

It is also apparent that the integral in (3) can be reduced by decreasing μ in a time-dependent manner. This can be linked to monitoring the progression of the infection $I(t)$ by statistically representative testing of different regions and cities, and intensifying/relaxing the isolation of the vulnerable population accordingly.

According to our model the social distancing (represented by the horizontal arrow in Fig. 1(d)) and targeted isolation (vertical arrow in Fig. 1(d)) could be used together in combination to reduce the overall death and hospitalisation rate. However, social distancing extends the duration of the epidemic (which may affect the sustainability of efficient isolation) and results in insufficient overall immunity of the majority population against a recurrence of the epidemic outbreak triggered by hidden or newly imported infection. On the other hand when the strategy is primarily based on drastic targeted isolation over a shorter time, the end result is a collectively immune population resistant to further infections. Therefore, when targeted isolation is implemented with high efficiency, it is preferable to avoid or apply moderate social distancing only to allow a large proportion of the majority population to become infected and develop immunity, at the cost of mostly minor symptoms similarly to a conventional flu season.

Our model and conclusions relies on the separation of the population based on age and health into two compartments with very different outcomes. Of course there could be a certain grey area where the separation between the two subpopulations is not always clear. In this case the separation should be determined as a usual trade-off between resources available and risk. The immunity may not be complete but from the limited information currently available on Covid-19, it appears to be fairly robust. In the absence of alternative options available the development of population level immunity could be the optimal resolution of the global pandemic at least in regions where the infection is already widespread, e.g. in Western Europe.

Some countries, for example Italy and Spain, implemented severe social distancing, but so far seems to be unable to stop the progress of the epidemic and may in fact be on track towards achieving large scale immunity in the population. However, with too much focus on the implementation of uniform social distancing and no clear targeted measures for identifying and efficiently protecting the vulnerable sub-population can lead to a very dangerous scenario with high mortality in spite of the high social and economic costs of an extended and potentially recurrent epidemic.



Figure 1: Model and predictions. (a) Extended susceptible-infected-removed/recovered (SIR) model. S, I, and R are proportions of susceptible, infected, and recovered individuals, respectively. Subscript v represents vulnerable individuals. (b) Solutions of the SIR model with R_0 =1.4, 1.8, and 2.4. Solutions S and I represent the fractions of the susceptible and infected populations over time. Initial conditions: $S = 0.9999, I = 0.0001$, and $R = 0$. (c) Maximum fraction of infected individuals (left axis) and time at which the fraction of infected individuals has its peak (right axis). (d) Continuous curve: total infected fraction $I_{\text{total}} = 1 - S(\infty)$ versus R_0. Dashed curve shows an example of reducing the exponent in (3) by decreasing μ by a factor 2 through targeted isolation. Arrows show that the infected vulnerable population can be reduced by distancing and isolation.

References

[1] Anderson, R. M. and May, R. M. "Population Biology of Infectious Diseases: Part I." Nature 280, 361-367, 1979.

[2] Kermack, W. O. and McKendrick, A. G. "A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics." Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A 115, 700-721, 1927.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20041897; this version posted March 31, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[3] Kucharski, Adam J., Timothy W. Russell, Charlie Diamond, Yang Liu, John Edmunds, Sebastian Funk, Rosalind M. Eggo et al. "Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study." The Lancet Infectious Diseases (2020).

[4] Wang, Yixuan, Yuyi Wang, Yan Chen, and Qingsong Qin. "Unique epidemiological and clinical features of the emerging 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia (COVID-19) implicate special control measures." Journal of Medical Virology (2020).

[5] Jiang, Fang, Liehua Deng, Liangqing Zhang, Yin Cai, Chi Wai Cheung, and Zhengyuan Xia. "Review of the clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)." Journal of General Internal Medicine (2020): 1-5.

[6] Zhou, Fei, Ting Yu, Ronghui Du, Guohui Fan, Ying Liu, Zhibo Liu, Jie Xiang et al. "Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study." The Lancet (2020).