Modeling the Epidemic Dynamics of COVID-19 Outbreak in Iran*

Majid Einian† Hamid Reza Tabarraei

March 28, 2020

Abstract

The COVID-19 impact on global health and economic system has been profound and unseen since the Spanish flu of 1918-19. Iran is one of the countries that has been severely affected partly because of slow responses to the crisis, ill-preparedness of the health system, and fragile health infrastructure and shortage of protective equipment due to economic sanctions. Due to shortcomings in the reported data, this note tries to estimate a model-based number of infected cases and examines the effectiveness of different policy responses to contain this crisis. Our results show that in an optimistic estimation, the number of unidentified cases can be 3 to 6 times more than the reported numbers. Social distancing alone cannot be an effective policy at this stage of pandemic unless at least 80 percent of the population confine themselves for an extended period of time. An alternative policy is to increase testing extensively and isolate identified cases actively combined with effective social distancing. Otherwise, many lives will be lost and the health system will collapse, adding to the ongoing economic crisis as a result of sanctions for many years to come.

JEL classification: I10, I18, I19.

Keywords: COVID-19, Coronavirus, Epidemic SEIR, Iran.

*The views expressed in this working paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of their employer institutions.

†Email: einian85@gmail.com

1 Introduction

As the impacts of the coronavirus—COVID-19—rattles the world on this path to more than 199 countries and territories (as of March 27), countries show astonishingly similar behavior, at least in the first phase, of this pandemic. Similar to some deadly diseases that affect individuals, it seems that the society and/or the governing authorities of many countries, go through the similar stages as individuals, namely denial, anger, blame, depression, and acceptance. We understand form scientists, that the sooner a patient accepts her sickness, the sooner she can receive treatment and care. A prolonged process to reach acceptance, makes it more difficult to effectively tackle the disease, and in many instances, if left untreated with unfortunate deadly outcomes.

Iran is a prime example of a country that has prolonged the denial phase, and in doing so, has created a situation that might lead to a catastrophic outcome and could result in a human tragedy. The authorities in Iran broke the news by announcing the death of two COVID-19 victims on February 19, 2020, just a day before the parliamentary elections nationwide. Although it is almost impossible to know the exact date and the number of infected people prior to the official announcement by the authorities, the number of new cases suddenly jumped from zero on February 18 to more than 32,000.[1]

Iran initially refused to quarantine the holy city of Qom, the source city of COVID-19, and let the virus spread all over the country and in a matter of a few weeks, all cities reported new cases of infected patients. The pattern of pandemic in Iran indicates that, even after one month, the country is *still* grappling with the early stages of this terrible diseases and is unable to move on to the stage where it accepts the reality and takes extra-ordinary but necessary measures to confront the spread of the virus.

The data pattern in Iran shows a very high death rate at the beginning of the pandemic and then declined and reached the global average after a couple of weeks. [2] Another anomaly in the Iranian data is that while the crisis started sooner in Iran than many other countries, infected cases rose quickly in Europe and the US, and surpassed those of Iran. This is in despite of complete shutdown in many European countries and many states in the US. Similar to many other countries, this might have been due to the lack of resources for testing and identifying infected individuals. Therefore, this note tries to account for unidentified cases and estimate a model-based number of infected population.

We use a modified Susceptible, Exposed, Infected, and Recovered (SEIR) model to simulate the spread of COVID-19 in Iran. The model is fairly sophisticated but easily understood and it is estimated with available public data. The results show that active cases might be significantly higher than officially reported by 3 to 6 times in an optimistic scenario of shelter-in-place policy of 75 percent of the population. In a scenario where half of the individuals confine themselves,

[1] March 27, 2020

[2] This is maybe because the infected cases were not initially identified.

still around three million individuals get infected of which 50 thousand will die. Therefore, the under-reporting of infected cases, although unintentional, not only undermines the integrity of responses, but ultimately puts more people at risk as they go unrecognized and untreated and continue to spread the virus with no end in sight.

The note examines multiple policy scenarios and their effectiveness. The results show that at this stage of the pandemic, extreme measures need to be adopted to save lives and stop further spread of the virus. Social distancing alone cannot stop this disease except if more than 80 percent of the population confine themselves for quite an extended period of time. However, if the number of testings increases massively, and the authorities successfully isolate infected individuals, the pandemic can be controlled before the summertime, even with a less degree of confinement. In fact, this is how the authorities in South Korea and China could control the outbreak in their countries.

While the paper simulates various scenarios of containment, it does not address the economic cost of each scenario, as the data on the Iranian economy and the measures that the government has taken remains scattered. In line with other papers' findings, the note argues that a fast and aggressive multi-layer intervention is needed to have a substantial dent of the transmission. What the paper calls for is a clear and transparent strategy by the government, and not just the heath authorities and to follow it through. The lack of leadership and a comprehensive strategy will prove deadly for may Iranian who will suffer during a prolonged and painful period in dealing with this virus.

2 Model

2.1 The baseline model

Deterministic compartmental models are simple yet powerful models in describing this kind of epidemic outbreaks. We developed a variant of susceptible (S), exposed (E), infected (I), and recovered/resistant (R) or the SEIR model for the epidemic dynamic and control of COVID-19 in Iran. The model uses [seven] state variables and a minimal number of parameters to avoid over-fitting. The model is different from a standard SEIR model by distinguishing hidden and identified infected cases. Indeed, in estimating standard SEIR models with real data, it is assumed that all infected people are reported. Such an assumption for the novel Coronavirus epidemic is largely unreasonable, as many infected people show no or mild symptoms and as the testing procedure is not available in mass, many remain undetected. Thus, we divide infected compartment into Infected but not reported (I) and infected, detected and reported (Q) groups. We assume that identified cases are less infectious by taking self-precautionary measures and/or due to hospitalization. While unidentified cases can largely continue to infect the rest of the population. The model, therefore, distinguishes between the confirmed infected individuals, which are observable in data, and the total infected individuals. In reality, the number of



Figure 1: The schematic diagram of the phases of COVID-19.

confirmed cases is a function of medical tests and the preparedness of the healthcare system. COVID-19 has an infection capability during the incubation (pre-symptomatic) period. In addition, based on the detection method, there exists a delay between the time that an individual is infected and the time this person is detected. The seven state variables and parameters of the model in equations (2.1)-(2.7) capture these characteristics. Figure 1 shows the schematic diagrams illustrating these states (compartments).

We denote the share of susceptible individuals with no resistance to the disease in the population by S_t. E_t is the share of people who are exposed to the virus but are not yet infected nor infectious. I_t is the infected population share who are undetected and hence un-quarantined. These individuals can be either symptomatic or pre-symptomatic. A share of these individuals, q, are detected and move to somewhat quarantined population Q_t. Among both infected populations, $R_t = R_t^I + R_t^Q$ recover and for some time become resistant to new infections. Finally, we assume those who are detected are the individuals who need medical assistance and those that their general health condition might have deteriorated quickly. A share of these individuals, δ, pass away (D_t).

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta^I S_t I_t - \beta^Q S_t Q \tag{2.1}$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \beta^I S_t + \beta^Q S_t Q_t - \sigma E_t \tag{2.2}$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \sigma E_t - \gamma^I I_t - q I_t \tag{2.3}$$

$$\frac{dQ}{dt} = q I_t - \gamma^Q Q_t - \delta Q_t \tag{2.4}$$

$$\frac{dR^I}{dt} = \gamma^I I_t \tag{2.5}$$

$$\frac{dR^Q}{dt} = \gamma^Q Q_t \tag{2.6}$$

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = \delta Q_t \tag{2.7}$$

Finally, due to the high pace of the current outbreak, the model is a closed model in the sense that there are no new birth and death, except for the disease itself. In a simple SIER model,

people are removed (hence the letter R in SEIR) from the analysis population due to either immunity/ resistance to the disease or death. Dividing the Recovered into "Recovered from I" and "Recovered from Q" groups, and keeping in mind that we only have data on recovered from Q and number of deaths (D), we can fit the model compartments to these series.

The values of β^I and β^Q depend on the contact rate between individuals and the probability of transmission in an encounter. $1/\sigma$ is the mean latent period and $1/\gamma^I$ and $1/\gamma^Q$ are the mean infectious periods for each group of patients. Finally, γ^I and γ^Q are the recovery rates and δ is the death rate among the Q group.

2.2 Estimation

Model is simulated by solving a deterministic Ordinary Differential Equations (ODE), given the parameters (β_1, β_2, σ, γ^I, q, γ^Q, δ) and the initial conditions (S_0, E_0, I_0, Q_0, R_0^I, R_0^Q, D_0). To obtain a realistic simulation of the baseline model and possible scenarios, we needed to estimate or calibrate these parameters and initial conditions. Since we are at the beginning of the epidemic cycle and the full distribution is not yet revealed, the model cannot be properly fit to a probability distribution function. As a result, the model is estimated by minimizing the differences between actual and predicted share of cases for observable data series which are Q, R^Q, and D based on an extension of Drake (2011). The model is estimated using Iran's official data for the number of confirmed, recovered and death cases[3]. As there are limited observable state variables, we fix or restrict a few parameters based on the reports in the literature to avoid over-fitting. First, based on the genomic studies on the phylogeny of SARS-CoV-2, two genetic mutations of the virus has happened in Iran (The Nextstrain team, 2020)[4], first between Jan 10th and Jan 27th, and the second between Jan 24th and Jan 30th. Thus, the virus was present in Iran before Jan 27th, long before the first official record of the disease in Iran (Feb 19th), but not before Jan 1st as the parent mutation has occurred in Hubei, China between Jan 1st and Jan 14th. So, the starting time of the simulations should be between Jan 1st and Jan 27th. Initial values for observable states are obviously zero. Second, we pin down the relationship between β^I and γ^I, and between β^Q and γ^Q, such that $\frac{\beta_Q}{\gamma^Q} = 1.4$, i.e., the minimum basic reproduction value and $\frac{\beta_I}{\gamma^I}$ to be equal to maximum basic reproduction number of 6.6, based on various reported values[5].

Third, the relationship between γ^Q and δ is fixed at 5.7 percent to match the case fatality rate with the one estimated by Baud et al. (2020). Without these restrictions, the parameters and initial states can be estimated, but the issue of over-fitting resides and leads to misspecification. Based on the optimization, the epidemic started on Jan 15th with 1 infected and 290 exposed

[3]Data source: 2019 Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 (2019-nCoV) Data Repository by Johns Hopkins CSSE https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19

[4]https://nextstrain.org/ncov?branchLabel=aa{&}label=clade:A3

[5]Different reported values for the basic reproduction number for COVID-19 fall between 1.4 to 6.6. See Eisenberg (2020); Wu et al. (2020); Read et al. (2020); Liu et al. (2020); Riou and Althaus (2020); Li et al. (2020); Sanche et al. (2020)



Figure 2: The baseline model forecasts.

people.

3 Results

3.1 Baseline forecasts

In the absence of any control measures, changes in individual behaviors, we would expect a peak of infection (some of identified and unidentified patients) to occur around May 23, 2020 (figure 2). As discussed in the previous section, we fix $R_0^I = 6.6$ and $R_0^Q = 1.4$ in this scenario for the whole epidemic period. Under this assumption, 70 percent of the population will be infected by around May 11th. As the epidemic progresses, at the peak, around 9 million identified individuals will be sick and will need medical assistance. In total, in an uncontrolled epidemic, around 900 thousand Iranians will die from this disease, not accounting for all other patients who will not get proper medical assistance during this period due to an overwhelmed medical system being.

In a cabinet meeting, Iran's minister of Health mentioned that the maximum capacity of intensive care of all hospitals in Iran stands around 14,000 beds. Under the baseline scenario and without any control measures, at a 10 percent hospitalization rate of identified cases, all ICU beds in Iran will be filled by April 26 and even all hospital beds will be filled on May 26 (figure 3). Some 13,000 individuals will die per day around Mid-June (figure 4).

3.2 Scenarios

Although Iran initially refused to fully quarantine the holy city of Qom and later the other cities, the government started to react to the epidemic early on by cancelling all cultural, religious and sportive events, and closing of universities and schools in several cities. Iran officials refused to



Figure 3: The baseline model forecasts: Identified cases needing hospitalization.



Figure 4: The baseline model forecasts: Deaths per day.

quarantine areas affected by the outbreak and instead asked people to remain inside their houses on a voluntary basis, without any enforcing measures. Some religious sites remained open until mid-March. Unlike every year in late March (Persian New Year) the authorities urged the public to avoid travelling for the two-weeks holidays. However, according the official statistics, roads were still busy, and millions of people travelled, making the self-quarantine policy ineffective. In the absence of firm suppression policies[6], we simulate the model based on the changes in the behaviors of the public by comparing *i*) the baseline or uncontrolled scenario, *ii*) with complete isolation of identified infected cases, *iii*) case isolation and self-quarantine, *iv*) intensive testing, identification of cases and quarantine, *v*) a combination of previous scenarios, *vi*) abandoning shelter-in-place policy one month after the peak of the epidemic under scenario v, assuming that intensive testing policy will continue. Scenario (*ii*) is implemented by assuming $\beta^Q = 0$, meaning that as soon as an individual is reported as infected, all necessary measures are taken to stop contagion from this person to other people. China forced hospitalization of all confirmed cases and not just those who required hospital care, to reduce onward transmission in the household and potentially other social settings. Results show that this scenario is not effective and the epidemic progress almost at the same rate with and without complete isolation of identified cases.

Scenario (*iii*) is implemented by choosing smaller values for β^I of the base scenario, as it depends on the contact rate between individuals, in addition to $\beta^Q = 0$. Adding social distancing saves many lives (figure 6), but at this stage of the epidemic at least 80 to 90 percent of the population should practice shelter-in-place, so that the death toll remains limited. Even if one quarter of the population continue regular contacts with each other, the number of death cases can easily surpass a quarter of a million. Even this policy will not be enough to overrun hospitals' maximum capacity (figure 5).

We implement scenario (*iv*) by assuming that the health authorities will increase testing 10 folds. It is often discussed that Germany has one of the lowest death rates, partly because the authorities implemented major testing and identification process. This helps isolate infected cases, provides patients with necessary medical assistance and decelerates spread of the disease to the rest of population. This policy would shift individuals from I group to Q group, enforcing better implementation of precautionary measures and control of contagion. The results are shown in figure 7. Even in this case, more than 75 percent of the population will contract the disease and the death toll will remain very heavy. Only by combining this scenario with previous scenarios, one can be hopeful to control the epidemic and save lives.

[6] Ferguson et al. (2020) defines suppression as a set of policies that aim to reduce the reproduction number to below 1



Figure 5: Baseline scenario (black) versus 75 percent shelter-in-place (purple).



Figure 6: Total death count in case isolation and partial self-quarantine in different levels.



Figure 7: Increase testing by 10 times compared to the uncontrolled scenario, no case isolation and shelter-in-place

Scenario (v) shows the result for the combined policies, assuming that only 50 percent of the population respect the shelter-in-place policy, while testing and identification process intensifies by 10 folds. Figure 8 shows the results for the combined policy. If implemented immediately, the total number of deaths by end-June will remain below 5 thousand individuals. The maximum number of infected cases ($I+Q$) will reach its maximum at 175,000 on May 9th and the majority of the population will not contract the virus.



Figure 8: Combined scenarios: Intensive testing and shelter-in-place of 50 percent of the population



Figure 9: Combined scenarios: identified cases. The brown line shows the number of patients with intensive care needs (at 10 percent of total identified cases). Under this scenario, the peak number of patients remains below the hospitals' ICU beds capacity.

Finally, in the last scenario, we assume that last set of policies were effective enough to reach the peak of the epidemic on May 9 and the shelter-in-place policy continues by an additional 30-days period. As a result, businesses and government will open on June 9, while the intensive testing continues. We assume that as the shelter-in-place policy ends, all individuals remain vigilant and take hygiene measures. Under this scenario, social interaction reduces by 25 percent compared to normal times. As a result, the number of patients in need of intensive cares surpasses the total ICU beds capacity before the end of June, while it remains below the total number of hospital beds in the country until the end of year.



Figure 10: Ending the shelter-in-place policy 30-days after the peak of scenario (v), assuming that intensive testing continues and social interaction diminishes by 25 percent.

4 Discussion and Policy Recommendations

Table 1 reports the number of deaths and recovered at end-2020. Obviously, the combined set of policies, described in scenario v yields the best outcome with the lowest fatality and infected cases. Comparing scenario *iii* and *iv*, we conclude that intensive testing, identifying infected individuals and quarantining them is a more effective policy than shelter-in-place.

Many governments are impatient to pass the peak of the pandemic and open businesses. As discussed, scenario *vi* is the same as scenario v, assuming that the authorities end the shelter-in-place policy 30-days after the peak of the pandemic. Unfortunately, under such scenario the death toll can be multiplied by 4 times compared to the scenario where social interactions are just reduced and kept low by 50 percent. If the social interaction is increased to normal times, the death toll can be 15 times the scenario v.

Scenario	D	R
i	891000	81772000
ii	890000	81670000
iii	805000	74137000
iv	246000	60772000
v	12000	2816000
vi	53000	13680000

Table 1: End of 2020 results

Despite initial denial and sluggish response to the COVID-19 crisis, the authorities in Iran are increasingly implementing a broad range of logical responses. As the quality of reported

data remains low, our results show that more firm policies should be put in place to save lives of thousands of people and to alleviate pressures on the health system. A comprehensive set of measures are necessary to stop further spread of the virus, including isolation, shelter-in-place, and intensive and extensive testing. The authorities need to put all resources into a comprehensive package which includes aggressive testing and quarantine. Good examples are Germany, Korea and not surprisingly China, where it not only hospitalized all cases, but also enforced a population-wide social distancing to curb the contagion.

Bottom line is that the authorities should be able to provide intensive and extensive testings and try to identify almost-all infected cases. The authorities should isolate not only infected cases, but they should also investigate and find individuals who might have had interactions with infected cases. The government should also provide the necessary infrastructure, such as high-speed internet for businesses to telecommute and reduce human interaction for essential workers. Only with a comprehensive set of policies, we can hope to overcome this pandemic with minimal human and economic costs.

References

Baud, D., Qi, X., Nielsen-Saines, K., Musso, D., Pomar, L. Ã., and Favre, G. (2020). Correspondence Real estimates of mortality following Covid-19 infection. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.

Drake, J. M. (2011). Fitting epidemics in R. In *9th Annual Ecology and Evolution of Infectious Diseases (EEID) meeting workshops*.

Eisenberg, J. (2020). How Scientists Quantify the Intensity of an Outbreak Like COVID-19.

Ferguson, N. M., Laydon, D., Nedjati-gilani, G., Imai, N., Ainslie, K., Baguelin, M., Bhatia, S., Boonyasiri, A., Cucunubá, Z., Cuomo-dannenburg, G., Dighe, A., Fu, H., Gaythorpe, K., Green, W., Hamlet, A., Hinsley, W., Okell, L. C., Van, S., Thompson, H., Verity, R., Volz, E., Wang, H., Wang, Y., Walker, P. G. T., Walters, C., Winskill, P., Whittaker, C., Donnelly, C. A., Riley, S., and Ghani, A. C. (2020). Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. Technical Report 16 March, Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team.

Hethcote, H. W. (1989). Three Basic Epidemiological Models. In Levin, S. A., Hallam, T. G., and Gross, L. J., editors, *Applied Mathematical Ecology*, pages 119–144. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Li, R., Pei, S., Chen, B., Song, Y., Zhang, T., Yang, W., and Shaman, J. (2020). Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2). *Science*, 3221(January):eabb3221.

Liu, T., Hu, J., Kang, M., Lin, L., Zhong, H., Xiao, J., He, G., Song, T., Huang, Q., Rong, Z., Deng, A., Zeng, W., Tan, X., Zeng, S., Zhu, Z., Li, J., Wan, D., Lu, J., Deng, H., He, J., and Ma, W. (2020). Time-varying transmission dynamics of Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia in China. *bioRxiv*, page 2020.01.25.919787.

Read, J. M., Bridgen, J. R. E., Cummings, D. A. T., Ho, A., and Jewell, C. P. (2020). Novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic predictions. *medRxiv*, page 2020.01.23.20018549.

Riou, J. and Althaus, C. L. (2020). Pattern of early human-to-human transmission of Wuhan 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV), December 2019 to January 2020. *Eurosurveillance*, 25(4).

Sanche, S., Lin, Y. T., Xu, C., Romero-Severson, E., Hengartner, N. W., and Ke, R. (2020). The Novel Coronavirus, 2019-nCoV, is Highly Contagious and More Infectious Than Initially Estimated. *medRxiv*.

The Nextstrain team (2020). Genomic epidemiology of novel coronavirus.

Wu, J. T., Leung, K., Bushman, M., Kishore, N., Niehus, R., de Salazar, P. M., Cowling, B. J., Lipsitch, M., and Leung, G. M. (2020). Estimating clinical severity of COVID-19 from the transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China. *Nature Medicine*.