Modelling fatality curves of COVID-19 and the effectiveness of intervention strategies

Giovani L. Vasconcelos[1], Antônio M. S. Macêdo[2], Raydonal Ospina[3], Francisco A. G. Almeida[4], Gerson C. Duarte-Filho[4], and Inês C. L. Souza[5]

[1]Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Paraná, 81531-990 Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil
[2]Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, 50670-901 Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil
[3]Departamento de Estatística, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, 50740–540, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil
[4]Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, 49100-000, São Cristóvão, Sergipe, Brazil
[5]3Hippos Data Consulting, Rua Fernando Simas 685, 80430-190, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

Corresponding author:
Giovani L. Vasconcelos[1], e-mail: giovani.vasconcelos@ufpr.br

ABSTRACT

The main objective of the present paper is twofold: first, to model the fatality curves of the COVID-19 disease, as represented by the cumulative number of deaths as a function of time; and second, to use the corresponding mathematical model to study the effectiveness of possible intervention strategies. We applied the Richards growth model (RGM) to the COVID-19 fatality curves from several countries, where we used the data from the Johns Hopkins University database up to April 1, 2020. Countries selected for analysis were China, Italy, Spain, Iran, and Brazil. The RGM was shown to describe very well the fatality curves of China, which is in a late stage of the COVID-19 outbreak, as well as of Italy, Spain, and Iran, which supposedly are in the middle of the outbreak at the time of this writing. As for Brazil, which is still in the so-called exponential growth regime, we used the generalized growth model which is more appropriate for such cases. An analytic formula for the efficiency of intervention strategies within the context of the RGM is derived. Our findings show that there is only a narrow window of opportunity, after the onset of the epidemic, during which effective countermeasures can be taken. We applied our intervention model to the COVID-19 fatality curve of Italy to illustrate the effect of several possible interventions.

BACKGROUND

The response interventions to the pandemic of the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) have varied from country to country. Several countries, specially those first hit by the disease, have adopted a standard progressive protocol, from containment to mitigation to supression (WHO, 2020). As these strategies failed to deter the spread of the virus, government authorities introduced ever more stringent measures on their citizens' movements in an attempt to suppress or sharply reduce the propagation of the virus. More recently, countries have adopted drastic countermeasures at the very outset of the outbreak. For example, on March 24, 2020, India announced a three-week total ban on people "venturing out" of their homes (BBC-News, 2020), even though there were fewer than 500 confirmed cases and only nine people had died from COVID-19 in a country with a population of 1.3 billion people. One difficulty in deciding the best approach to counter the spread of the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) is that the virus propagation dynamics is not yet well understood.

In this stark context, it becomes relevant to have simple models for the evolution of the COVID-19

epidemic, so as to be able to obtain estimates —however tentative—for the rise in the number of infected people as well as in the number of fatal cases, both in the near and in the more distant future. Such estimates are, of course, prone to high uncertainty: the less data available and the further in the future, the greater the uncertainty. Notwithstanding their inherent shortcomings, simple mathematical models provide valuable tools for quickly assessing the severity of an epidemic and help to guide the health and political authorities in defining or adjusting their national strategies to fight the disease (Crokidakis, 2020; Sameni, 2020; Castorina et al., 2020; Dehkordi et al., 2020; Mair et al., 2016; Siegenfeld and Bar-Yam, 2020; Bastos and Cajueiro, 2020; Schulz et al., 2020; Manchein et al., 2020).

In the same vein, it would be desirable to have simple methods to assess the effectiveness of intervention measures as a function of the time at which they are adopted. As a general rule, the sooner an intervention is put in place the more effective it is expected to be. It is however difficult to model *a priori* how effective any given set of interventions will be. The effectiveness of interventions are often investigated through complex agent-based simulation models (Ferguson et al., 2020; Koo et al., 2020), which require a synthetic population and a host of parameters related to the human-to-human transmission, and as such they are very costly computationally and heavily dependent on the choice of values for the various model parameters.

In this paper we use the Richards growth model (RGM) (Richards, 1959) to study the fatality curves, represented by the cumulative number of deaths as a function of time, of COVID-19 for the following countries: China, Italy, Spain, Iran, and Brazil, which are at different stages of the epidemic. We show that the RGM describes reasonably well the fatality curves of all countries analysed in this study, except Brazil which is in a very early stage of the epidemic. In the Brazilian case, we use the so-called generalized growth model to describe the available preliminary data. We also introduce a theoretical framework, within the context of the RGM model, to calculate the efficiency of interventions. Here an intervention strategy is modelled by assuming that its net result is captured by a change in the values of the parameters of the RGM after a given time t_0. In this picture, the full epidemic dynamics is described in terms of two Richards models: one before and the other after the intervention 'adoption time' t_0, where certain matching conditions are imposed at t_0. In this way, we are able to derive an analytical formula for the efficiency of the corresponding intervention as a function of the adoption time t_0. We show, in particular, that the intervention efficiency quickly decays past a critical adoption time, thus showing that time is really of essence in containing an outbreak.

DATA

Data Source

Data used in this study were downloaded from the database made publicly available by the Johns Hopkins University (JHU, 2020), which lists in an automated fashion the number of confirmed cases and deaths per country, and compared with the corresponding data from Worldometer (2020) for eventual data inconsistency and data redundancy. We have used data up to April 1, 2020 (JHU, 2020; Worldometer, 2020). In the present study we considered the mortality data of COVID-19 from the following countries: China, Italy, Spain, Iran, and Brazil.

Confirmed Cases vs. Mortality Data

Because a large proportion of COVID-19 infections go undetected (Li et al., 2020), it is difficult to estimate the actual number of infected people within a given population. As many carriers of the virus are either asymptomatic or develop only mild symptoms, they will not be detected unless they are tested. In other words, the number of confirmed cases for COVID-19 is a poor proxy for the total number

of infections. Furthermore, the fraction of confirmed cases relative to the total number of infections depends heavily on the testing policy of each country, which makes it problematic to compare the evolution of confirmed cases among different countries. In contrast, the number of deaths attributed to COVID-19 is a much more reliable measure of the advance of the epidemic and its severity. Of course, many other factors, such as age structure of a population and quality of care, may affect the fraction of deaths relative to the number of confirmed cases. Nevertheless, it is expected that overall the evolution of number of deaths bear a relation to the dynamics of the number of infections (Famulare, 2020). Under these circumstances and in the absence of reliable estimates for the number of infected cases for COVID-19, we decided here to seek an alternative approach and model the fatality curves, defined as the cumulative number of deaths as a function of time, rather than the number of confirmed cases, as is more commonly done.

METHODS

Mathematical Models

We model the time evolution of the number of cases in the epidemic by means of the Richards growth model (RGM), defined by the following ordinary differential equation (ODE) (Wang et al., 2012; Hsieh, 2009):

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = rC(t)\left[1 - \left(\frac{C(t)}{K}\right)^{\alpha}\right], \tag{1}$$

where $C(t)$ is the cumulative number of cases at time t, r is the growth rate at the early stage, K is the final epidemic size, and the parameter α measures the asymmetry with respect to the s-shaped dynamics of the standard logistic model, which is recovered for $\alpha = 1$. It is worth to point out that the Richards model has an intrinsic connection to the SIR epidemic model, see, e.g., Wang et al. (2012), with the advantage that it allows for an exact solution (see below), which makes the data analysis much simpler. As already mentioned, in the present paper we shall apply the RGM to the fatality curves of COVID-19, so that $C(t)$ will represent the cumulative numbers of deaths in a given country at time t, where t will be counted in days from the first death. Nevertheless, in the interest of generality, in this and in the following section we shall refer to $C(t)$ simply as the number of cases.

Equation (1) must be supplemented with a boundary condition. Here it is convenient to choose

$$C''(t_c) = 0, \tag{2}$$

for some given t_c, where $C''(t) = d^2C(t)/dt^2$. A direct integration of (1) subjected to condition (2) yields the following explicit formula:

$$C(t; r, \alpha, K, t_c) = \frac{K}{\{1 + \alpha \exp[-\alpha r(t - t_c)]\}^{1/\alpha}}, \tag{3}$$

where in the left-hand side we have explicitly denoted the dependence of the solution of the RGM on the four parameters, namely r, α, K, and t_c.

We note, however, that the RGM is not reliable in situations where the epidemic is in such an early stage that the available data is well below the estimated inflection point t_c, i.e., when the epidemic is still in the so-called exponential growth regime (Wu et al., 2020). In this case, it is preferable to

use the so-called generalized growth model (Wu et al., 2020; Chowell, 2017), which is defined by the following ODE:

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = r\,[C(t)]^q\,, \tag{4}$$

where the parameter q provides an interpolation between the sub-exponential regime ($0 < q < 1$) and the exponential one ($q = 1$). The solution of (4) is

$$C(t;r,q,A) = [A + (1-q)rt]^{1/(1-q)} = A^{1/(1-q)} e_q(rt/A), \tag{5}$$

where the function $e_q(x) = [1 + (1-q)x]^{1/(1-q)}$ is known in the physics literature as the q-exponential function (Tsallis, 1988; Picoli Jr et al., 2009). Here the parameter A is related to the initial condition, i.e., $A = C(0)^{(1-q)}$, but we shall treat A as a free parameter to be determined from the fit of (5) to a given dataset.

Intervention Strategy and Efficiency

We define an intervention strategy in the context of the RGM by considering that the corresponding measures, as applied to the actual population, induce at some time t_0 a change in the parameters of the model. In this way, the solution for the whole epidemic curve acquires the following piecewise form:

$$C(t) = \begin{cases} C(t;r,K,\alpha,t_c), & t \le t_0 \\ C(t;r',K',\alpha',t_c'), & t > t_0, \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

where we obviously require that $K'/K < 1$. Furthermore we impose the following boundary conditions at t_0:

$$C(t_0;r,K,\alpha,t_c) = C(t_0;r',K',\alpha',t_c') \tag{7}$$

and

$$C'(t_0;r,K,\alpha,t_c) = C'(t_0;r',K',\alpha',t_c'), \tag{8}$$

where $C'(t) = dC(t)/dt$. Note that condition (8) takes into account, albeit indirectly, the fact that intervention measures take some time to affect the epidemic dynamics. In other words, the trend (i.e., the derivative) one sees at a given time t reflects in part the measures taken at some earlier time (or lack thereof). Thus, imposing continuity of the derivative of the epidemic curve at time t_0 in our 'intervention strategy' seeks to capture this delay effect.

In our intervention model above, we assume that the net result of the intervention is to alter the parameters r and α of the Richards model after the time t_0; see (6). Of course, the difficult part is to estimate how a particular set of intervention measures (e.g., contact tracing and quarantine of contacts, social distancing, school closures, etc) would influence these parameters. This could perhaps be done, for instance, by implementing a specific intervention in an agent-based model, use the RGM to fit the resulting epidemic curve, and then compare the new model parameters with respect to those for the reference curve (no intervention). Such an analysis is however beyond the scope of the present paper. Note furthermore that, as discussed above, the time t_0 is not the actual time of adoption of the intervention but rather the time after which the corresponding measures start to affect the epidemic dynamics, as reflected in a change in the evolution of the number of cases. Nevertheless we shall for simplicity refer to t_0 as the intervention 'adoption time.'

As defined in (6), an intervention strategy adopted at time t_0 can be viewed as a map $(r, K, \alpha, t_c) \to (r', K', \alpha', t'_c)$ in the parameter space of the RGM, which results in the condition $K'/K < 1$. Let us therefore define the intervention efficiency as the relative reduction in the total number of cases: $\eta(t_0) = (K - K')/K$, where it is assumed that $\eta(t_0) > 0$. Using conditions (7) and (8) in (3), one obtains that

$$\eta(t_0) = 1 - \frac{y}{[1 - x(1 - y^{\alpha})]^{1/\alpha'}}, \tag{9}$$

where $y = C(t_0)/K$ and $x = r/r'$. Later we will exemplify the above measure of intervention efficiency, using as input the parameters r and α obtained from the fatality curve of the COVID-19 from Italy. This will allow us to investigate how the efficiency of different strategies (i.e., for different choices of r' and α') varies as a function of the adoption time t_0.

Statistical Fits

All statistical fits in the paper were performed using the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm (Moré, 1978) to solve the corresponding non-linear least square optimization problem. In the case of the Richards model, there are four parameters, namely (r, K, α, t_c), to be determined; whereas for the q-exponential growth model we need to determine three parameters, (r, q, A). The fitting procedures were implemented in the opensource software `QtiPlot`, which was also used to produce the corresponding plots in Figs. 1-3. Figures 4 and 5 were produced with the data visualisation library `Matplotlib` for `Python`.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fatality Curves

In Fig. 1(a) we show the cumulative number of deaths (red circles) attributed to COVID-19 for China, superimposed with the statistical fit of the RGM curve (black solid line), with the respective parameters shown in the inset of the figure. One sees from the figure that the fatality curve in this case, where the epidemic has apparently leveled off, is well adjusted by the RGM formula. This indicates that the evolution of the number of deaths in the COVID-19 epidemic can be effectively described with a dynamical model such as the Richards model.

The good performance of the RGM for the data from China, exhibited in Fig. 1, encouraged us to apply the model to other countries at earlier stages of the epidemic. Here, however, care must be taken when estimating the model parameters from small time series, since it is well known that the Richards model (Wang et al., 2012; Hsieh, 2009) and its variants (Wu et al., 2020) are susceptible to the problem of *over fitting*, owing to the redundancy of the parameters. This may lead, for example, to estimation of certain parameters that are outside of biologically or otherwise reasonable ranges. For example, when applied to the number of infected cases in an epidemic, the parameter α should be constrained within the interval $(0, 1)$ (Wang et al., 2012). Here we apply the RGM instead to the number of deaths, but we assume that the same constraint should be observed. In other words, fits that return α outside this interval are disregarded as not reliable. Similarly, we restrict the acceptable values of r to the range (0,1), as we observed that values of r outside this interval tends to be an indication that the RGM is not quite suitable to fit the data. In other words, for our purposes here we assume that the restrictions $0 < r < 1$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ are useful empirical criteria for the validity of the RGM. The unsuitability of the RGM is particularly evident when the available data does not encompass the inflection point t_c (Wu et al., 2020), although as more data is accumulated the model is expected to become more accurate.

With these considerations in mind, we applied the RGM to the mortality data of COVID-19 from several other countries, but only show here those for which the fits satisfied the above criteria. In Fig. 2,



(a)

Figure 1. Cumulative number of deaths attributed to COVID-19 for China up to April 1, 2020. The red circles represent the data and the solid black curve is the fit by the Richards growth model.

we show the cumulative deaths for Italy, Spain, and Iran, together with the respective RGM fits. Here again the RGM seems to be able to provide a reasonably good fit to the data. In all these cases, the last data point is sufficiently beyond the inflection point t_c predicted by the model to lend some credibility to the model predictions. However, owing to the unavoidable incompleteness of the data, as the epidemic is still ongoing, there is considerably larger uncertainty in the parameters, particularly in the parameter K which represents an estimate of the total numbers of fatalities at the end of the epidemic.

In the case of countries, such as Brazil, where the epidemic is still in an early stage, the RGM is not justifiable. In such cases, it is more advisable to use a simpler growth model, such as the q-exponential. In Fig. 3 we show the fit of the q-exponential curve (5) to the Brazilian data, where one sees that the agreement is very good. From the fit parameters, see inset of Fig. 3, we predict that the current time for doubling the number of deaths in Brazil is 4.6 days.

It should be emphasized, however, that all countries considered above, except China, are still in the middle or early stages of the outbreak, so that any long-term prediction based on the Richards model—or any other model for that matter—are only tentative at best. Furthermore, our interest in the RGM is not so much aimed at its predictive capacity in the face of incomplete data, but rather more so as a mathematical framework in which one can obtain quantitative measures (in fact, an explicit formula) for the effectiveness of mitigation strategies. We now turn to discuss the results of such a mitigation analysis as applied, for instance, to the Italian fatality curve shown in Fig. 2(a).

Intervention Efficiency

As already mentioned, an intervention strategy in our model is defined by the two parameters r' and α' of the new Richards model after the adoption time t_0; see (6). Recall that the parameter r in the RGM corresponds to the growth rate at the early stage of the epidemic; hence an early intervention should, in our language, seek to change this parameter. We shall therefore refer to this type of intervention as 'mitigation'. Similarly, at later stages of the epidemic one should try to change the parameter α, so as to force the levelling off of the curve of cumulative cases as soon as possible after the intervention; this type of strategy will thus be said to be of the 'suppression' type. We emphasise that here we use the terminology 'mitigation' and 'suppression' merely to indicate which parameter in the Richards model



Figure 2. Cumulative number of deaths (red circles) attributed to COVID-19 up to April 1, 2020, for (a) Italy, (b) Spain, and (c) Iran. The solid black curves are the fits by the Richards growth model, see (3), with the corresponding parameters given in the respective insets.

is being varied by the respective 'intervention strategy,' as explained above. It is premature at this stage to establish a more direct link between actual intervention measures and a corresponding change in the parameters of effective growth models, as already discussed. Nonetheless, we will see later that the intervention efficiency $\eta(t_0)$ defined in (9) is less sensitive to changes in r than to variations in α, which in part justifies our terminology.

Summarising the previous discussion, in our model we can define two general sets of intervention strategies: i) *mitigation*, when we take $\alpha = \alpha'$ and change r'; and ii) *suppression*, for which we set $r' = r$ and change α'. (More generally, a mixed strategy would modify both r and α, but for our purposes here it is preferable to study separately the effects of these two parameters.)

In Fig. 4 we show the efficiency curves as a function of the adoption time t_0 for the two types of intervention strategies described above, as applied to the fatality curve of Italy. This means that we take $r = 0.44$ and $\alpha = 0.21$ for $t < t_0$, as obtained from the fit shown in Fig. 2a; whereas for $t > t_0$ we suppose two possible scenarios: mitigation and suppression. In the first type of scenario, shown in Fig. 4(a), we set $\alpha' = \alpha$ and consider two mitigation strategies: i) action 1 with $r' = 0.5$ (blue) and ii) action 2 with $r' = 0.6$ (red). In the second scenario, shown in Fig. 4(b), we consider instead $r' = r$ and implement two suppression strategies: i) action 1 with $\alpha' = 0.3$ (red) and ii) action 2 with $\alpha' = 0.9$



Figure 3. Cumulative number of deaths attributed to COVID-19 up to April 1, 2020, for Brazil. The solid black curve represents the fit with the q-exponential model shown in (5) for the parameters shown in the inset.



(a) (b)

Figure 4. Efficiency curves as a function of the adoption time t_0 for two different intervention strategies applied to Italy's fatality curve (black dots indicate the current time): (a) mitigation actions with $\alpha = 0.21 = \alpha'$ and $r = 0.44$, where action 1 has $r' = 0.5$ (red) and action 2 has $r' = 0.6$ (blue); (b) suppression actions with $r = 0.44 = r'$ and $\alpha = 0.21$, where action 1 has $\alpha' = 0.3$ (red) and action 2 has $\alpha' = 0.9$ (blue).

(blue). Here we have chosen the adoption time $t_0 = 39$, corresponding to the day before the last point included in the data set; this is indicated as the black dots on the curves in Fig. 4. Comparing Figs. 4(a) and 4(b), one clearly sees that, in general, varying r yields smaller efficiencies than changing α. For example, at the adoption time $t_0 = 39$, the suppression strategies in Fig. 4(b), i.e., by varying α, show a reduction of 45% in the number of fatalities for the largest α' considered (black dot on the blue curve in Fig. 4(b)), whilst no mitigation strategy with an acceptable value of r', i.e., $r' < 1$, produces such a reduction.

It should be pointed out at this stage that only intervention strategies with $t_0 > T$, where T denotes the 'present time' (i.e., the time of the last data point) would be of practical value in an ongoing



(a) (b)

Figure 5. Resulting fatality curves after implementing two different interventions at t_0=39 in Italy's fatality curve, as compared to the no-action reference curve (black): (a) mitigation actions with $\alpha = 0.21 = \alpha'$ and $r = 0.44$, where action 1 has $r' = 0.5$, $\eta = 0.1$ (red), and action 2 has $r' = 0.6$ and $\eta = 0.25$ (blue); and (b) suppression actions with $r = 0.44 = r'$ and $\alpha = 0.21$, where action 1 has $\alpha' = 0.3$, $\eta = 0.2$ (red) and action 2 has $\alpha' = 0.9$, $\eta = 0.45$ (blue).

epidemic. (For the Italian data, $T = 40$.) Nevertheless, for $t_0 < T$ the efficiency curve is still of some theoretical interest, as it indicates the relative reduction in fatalities that would have resulted if the corresponding strategy had been adopted at some earlier time t_0 in the past. Furthermore, in all cases shown in Fig. 4, we see that there is a quick decrease in efficiency as the adoption time increases. This confirms the commonly held view that there is only a narrow window of opportunity, after the outbreak of an epidemic, during which effective countermeasures can be taken that could have a significant impact on the final outcome.

In Fig. 5(a) we show the resulting fatality curves, as compared to the no-action case (black curve), after implementing the two mitigation actions indicted by the black dots on the red and blue curves of Fig. 4(a). Similarly, in Fig. 5(b) we show the fatality curves for the two suppression actions corresponding to the black dots on the red and blue curves of Fig. 4(b). It is interesting to observe that the qualitative behavior of the interventions seen in Fig. 5 is reminiscent of similar curves, albeit for the number of infections, obtained in agent-based simulations of actual intervention measures (Weng and Ni, 2015).

CONCLUSION

To summarize, this paper provides important insights into the time evolution of the accumulated number of deaths attributed to COVID-19, specially for countries, such as Italy and Spain, which are in the middle of the outbreak at the time of this writing. Our modelling of the fatality curves is particularly relevant for the COVID-19 epidemic because the actual number of infections in this case remains largely unknown, and so one is forced to deal with proxy measures, such as mortality data, to gain a better understanding of the actual severity of the epidemic.

The paper also shows how simple and soluble mathematical models can provide a rich theoretical framework in which to investigate some basic and deep aspects of epidemic dynamics. In particular, we have successfully applied the Richards growth model to describe the fatalities curves of four different countries at different stages of the COVID-19 outbreak, namely China, Italy, Spain, and Iran. We also

analysed the case of Brazil, which is in a much earlier stage of the outbreak, and so we had to resort to a modified exponential growth model, known as the generalized growth model. This model also gave a good fit of the rising fatality curve of Brazil, from which we could estimate that at present the time for doubling the number of fatalities from COVID-19 in Brazil is 4.6 days.

Another important contribution of the present study is to provide an analytical formula to quantitatively assess the efficiency of intervention measures in an ongoing epidemic. Interventions strategies were defined in the context of the Richards model as a change in the model parameters at some specified time, referred to as the intervention adoption time. Our formula shows that, in general, the efficiency of an intervention strategy decays quite quickly as the adoption time is delayed, thus showing that time is really of essence in containing an outbreak. As an example, we applied our intervention model to the curve of accumulated deaths attributed to COVID-19 in Italy, according to the available data at the time of this writing. Our main conclusions, however, do not rely on any specific case and should hold in general.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the following Brazilian agencies: Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), under Grants No. 303772/2017-4 (GLV), No. 312612/2019-2 (AMSM), and No. 305305/2019-0 (RO), and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES).

REFERENCES

Bastos, S. B. and Cajueiro, D. O. (2020). Modeling and forecasting the covid-19 pandemic in Brazil. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.14288*.

BBC-News (2020). Coronavirus: India enters 'total lockdown' after spike in cases. `https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-52024239`. Accessed: 2020-03-29.

Castorina, P., Iorio, A., and Lanteri, D. (2020). Data analysis on coronavirus spreading by macroscopic growth laws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.00507*.

Chowell, G. (2017). Fitting dynamic models to epidemic outbreaks with quantified uncertainty: a primer for parameter uncertainty, identifiability, and forecasts. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 2(3):379–398.

Crokidakis, N. (2020). Data analysis and modeling of the evolution of covid-19 in Brazil. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.12150*.

Dehkordi, A. H., Alizadeh, M., Derakhshan, P., Babazadeh, P., and Jahandideh, A. (2020). Understanding epidemic data and statistics: A case study of covid-19. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.06933*.

Famulare, M. (2020). 2019-ncov: Preliminary estimates of the confirmed-case-fatality-ratio and infection-fatality-ratio, and initial pandemic risk assessment. v2. 0.

Ferguson, N. M., Laydon, D., Nedjati-Gilani, G., Imai, N., Ainslie, K., Baguelin, M., Bhatia, S., Boonyasiri, A., Cucunubá, Z., Cuomo-Dannenburg, G., et al. (2020). Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (npis) to reduce covid-19 mortality and healthcare demand. *Imperial College, London. DOI: https://doi. org/10.25561/77482*.

Hsieh, Y.-H. (2009). Richards model: a simple procedure for real-time prediction of outbreak severity. In *Modeling and dynamics of infectious diseases*, pages 216–236. World Scientific.

JHU (2020). Coronavirus covid-19 global cases by the center for systems science and engineering (csse) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU). `https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html`. Accessed: 2020-03-29.

Koo, J. R., Cook, A. R., Park, M., Sun, Y., Sun, H., Lim, J. T., Tam, C., and Dickens, B. L. (2020). Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in singapore: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.

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*.

Mair, C., Nickbakhsh, S., Reeve, R., McMenamin, J., Reynolds, A., Gunson, R., Murcia, P. R., and Matthews, L. (2016). Estimation of temporal covariances in pathogen dynamics using bayesian multivariate autoregressive models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09063*.

Manchein, C., Brugnago, E. L., da Silva, R. M., Mendes, C. F. O., and Beims, M. W. (2020). Strong correlations between power-law growth of covid-19 in four continents and the inefficiency of soft quarantine strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.00044*.

Moré, J. J. (1978). The Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm: implementation and theory. In *Numerical analysis*, pages 105–116. Springer.

Picoli Jr, S., Mendes, R., Malacarne, L., and Santos, R. (2009). q-distributions in complex systems: A brief review. *Brazilian Journal of Physics*, 39(2A):468–474.

Richards, F. (1959). A flexible growth function for empirical use. *Journal of experimental Botany*, 10(2):290–301.

Sameni, R. (2020). Mathematical modeling of epidemic diseases; a case study of the COVID-19 coronavirus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.11371*.

Schulz, R. A., Coimbra-Araújo, C. H., and Costiche, S. W. S. (2020). Covid-19: A model for studying the evolution of contamination in Brazil.

Siegenfeld, A. F. and Bar-Yam, Y. (2020). Eliminating covid-19: A community-based analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10086*.

Tsallis, C. (1988). Possible generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics. *Journal of statistical physics*, 52(1-2):479–487.

Wang, X.-S., Wu, J., and Yang, Y. (2012). Richards model revisited: Validation by and application to infection dynamics. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 313:12–19.

Weng, W. and Ni, S. (2015). Evaluation of containment and mitigation strategies for an influenza a pandemic in china. *Simulation*, 91(5):407–416.

WHO (2020). World Health Organization and others. Managing epidemics: key facts about major deadly diseases. `https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/managing-epidemics-interactive.pdf`. Accessed: 2020-03-29.

Worldometer (2020). Worldometer - covid-19 data. `https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/`. Accessed: 2020-03-29.

Wu, K., Darcet, D., Wang, Q., and Sornette, D. (2020). Generalized logistic growth modeling of the covid-19 outbreak in 29 provinces in china and in the rest of the world. *medRxiv preprint medRxiv:2020.03.11.20034363*.