medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

The relatively young and rural population may limit the spread and severity of Covid-19 in Africa: a modelling study

Binta Zahra Diop*, Marième Ngom†, Clémence Pougué Biyong‡,
and John N. Pougué Biyong§¶1

May 2020

Abstract

Introduction A novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has spread to all regions of the world. There is great uncertainty regarding how countries characteristics will affect the spread of the epidemic; to date, there are few studies that attempt to predict the spread of the epidemic in African countries. In this paper, we investigate the role of demographic patterns, urbanization and co-morbidities on the possible trajectories of COVID-19 in Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal.

Methods We use an augmented deterministic SIR model to predict the true spread of the disease, under the containment measures taken so far. We dis-aggregate the infected compartment into asymptomatic, mildly symptomatic, and severely symptomatic to match observed clinical development of COVID-19. We also account for age structures, urbanization, and co-morbidities (HIV, tuberculosis, anemia).

Results In our baseline model, we project that the peak of active cases will occur in July, subject to the effectiveness of policy measures. When accounting for the urbanization, and factoring-in co-morbidities, the peak may occur between June 2nd and June 17th (Ghana), July 22nd and August 29th (Kenya), and finally May 28th and June 15th (Senegal). Successful containment policies could lead to lower rates of severe infections. While most cases will be mild, we project in the absence of policies further containing the spread, that between 0.78 and 1.03%, 0.61 and 1.22%, and 0.60 and 0.84% of individuals in Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal respectively may develop severe symptoms at the time of the peak of the epidemic.

Conclusion Compared to Europe, Africa's younger and rural population may modify the severity of the epidemic. The large youth population may lead to more infections but most of these infections will be asymptomatic or mild, and will probably go undetected. The higher prevalence of underlying conditions must be considered.

---

*PhD Candidate, Department of Economics, University of Oxford
†Postdoctoral Researcher in Mathematics, Argonne National Laboratory
‡PhD Candidate, Department of Economics, Université Paris 1 Sorbonne
§PhD Candidate, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford
¶Authors contributed equally to this study and are listed alphabetically, corresponding author: bintazahra.diop@economics.ox.ac.uk

1We thank Martin J. Williams, Kevin Marsh, Mike English, Renaud Lambiotte, Philip Bejon, Douglas Gollin and Isabel Ruiz for reviewing the manuscript. Binta Zahra Diop's PhD is funded by the Center for the Study of African Economies and the Global Challenges Research Fund. Marième Ngom's work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, under Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357. Clémence Pougué Biyong's PhD is funded by the French Ministry of Higher Education and Ecole Normale Supérieure of Rennes. John N. Pougué Biyong's PhD is funded by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC).

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/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

Summary

What is known?

- While most COVID-19 studies focus on western and Asian countries, very few are concerned with the spread of the virus in African countries.
- Most African countries have relatively low urbanization rates, a young population and context-specific co-morbidities that are still to be explored in the spread of COVID-19.

What are the new findings?

- In our baseline predictions 33 to 50% of the public will be actively infected at the peak of the epidemic and 1 in 36 (Ghana), 1 in 40 (Kenya) and 1 in 42 (Senegal) of these active cases may be severe.
- With rural areas, infection may be lowered to 65-73% (Ghana), 48-71% (Kenya) and 61-69% (Senegal) of the baseline infections.
- Comorbidities may however increase the ratio of severe infections among the active cases at the peak of the epidemic.

What do the new findings imply?

- Rural areas and large youth population may limit the spread and severity of the epidemic and outweigh the negative impact of HIV, tuberculosis and anemia.

INTRODUCTION

Since the first reported severe acute syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection in December 2019, the virus has spread to all continents.[1] There is still little evidence on the pattern of the spread in Africa. Although the African continent is made up of countries with different infrastructures, health policies, and characteristics in the face of this novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19); some characteristics such as a young population,[2] co-morbidities (tuberculosis, HIV, anemia[3,4]) and low urbanization rates transcend these differences and have been seldom considered in the large number of studies published to date. For example, the median age below 20,[5] and the low rates of urbanization, could potentially lead to a lower death toll of the epidemic in African countries than elsewhere.

However, having a young population implies that many infected individuals may not display symptoms and will risk infecting more people than would symptomatic individuals.[6] Additionally, the large number of informal settlements could accentuate this phenomenon. It is therefore urgent to develop a framework that could accurately predict the spread of the virus, accounting for the idiosyncrasies of the African context. A country-specific model will provide policy makers with a wide range of prediction scenarios,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

based on different actions they can take to address the pandemic. With the scarce resources at their disposal,[7,8] models like these will help target prevention strategies to individuals with co-morbidities who might suffer the most from the epidemic. Moreover, with containment policies that can grind economies to a halt,[9] understanding the trade-off between rural and urban spreads could lead to better informed decisions between the short term impacts of the epidemic, and the long-term looming shortage in the food-supply that could stem enforcing strict social distancing measures in rural areas.

This study contributes to the meager literature on the burden of the virus on African countries; it also adds to the use of differential equation models to predict the spread of epidemics. This paper focuses on three African countries that have received little attention: Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal. We chose Kenya to have a comparison point with another in-depth study by Brand et al.[10] Ghana and Senegal on the other hand have had transparent data sharing policies from the start of the epidemic; they made available publicly the number of positive cases, the number tests conducted and a clear outline of the containment measures. Ghana has an extensive testing policy, while Senegal has tested very few individuals comparatively[1], we are thus able to see the difference in predictions for two countries that have adopted widely different testing strategies.

To project the trends of the epidemic, we augment the canonical *Susceptible - Infected - Recovered* by splitting the *infected* compartment into three groups: an infected without symptoms, an infected with mild symptoms, and finally, the infected with severe symptoms. With our projections accounting for policies implemented to date, we present different scenarios accounting for local policies, urbanization, and co-morbidities. Our strategy is relevant beyond the application of this paper; it could be used in Asian or European contexts as well, and is similar to work by Ferguson et al.[12] who discuss suppression and mitigation measures in the UK and the USA.

METHODS

Compartmental epidemiological model

Several models have been used to predict the spread of the virus. Read et al.[13] use a standard *Susceptible – Exposed – Infected – Recovered* (SEIR) model with an *exposed* compartment that comprises infected individuals who do not yet have symptoms and who are not infectious. Danon et al.[14] also use a SEIR model but split the *infected* compartment into two sub-compartments: mild symptoms and symptomatic. Finally, Arenas et al.[15] study use a model composed of *susceptible*, *exposed*, *asymptomatic infectious*, *infected*, *hospitalized to ICU*, *dead*, and *recovered* compartments; however, they assume that all asymptomatic infectious individuals cannot recover before they ever develop symptoms.

There is early evidence that a large number of individuals infected with COVID-19 will recover without ever developing symptoms and that asymptomatic individuals are contagious to varying degrees.[16–19]

[1] As of May 1st, 2020, Ghana has conducted 3.37 tests per thousand individuals while Kenya and Senegal are respectively at 0.4 and 0.76.[11]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

Based on these findings, our model assumes that individuals are contagious from the moment they get infected. We define a *Susceptible - Infected – Recovered* (SIR) model with vital dynamics (see figure 1 of the appendix). The known natural progression of the disease is (1) asymptomatic, (2) mild symptomatic, (3) moderate symptomatic, (4) severe, and (5) critical. There are benefits in understanding the heterogeneity among infected individuals namely, those carriers without symptoms (asymptomatic), carriers without symptoms (mild and moderately symptomatic), and severe cases who might seek medical attention (severe and critical). We therefore propose to divide the *infected* compartment into three sub-compartments: asymptomatic infectious, mildly (and moderate) symptomatic infectious, and severely (and critically) infected requiring medical attention.

We introduce some notations. S is the share of susceptible, i.e. individuals who are exposed to the virus but not immune. I_{as}, I_{ms}, and I_{ss} are respectively the shares of asymptomatic, mildly symptomatic, and severely symptomatic individuals. R is the share of immune individuals. D is the share of deceased individuals (due to COVID-19 and other non-related causes). All numbers are expressed in terms of percentages of the total population. We note $I = I_{as} + I_{ms} + I_{ss}$ the total share of *infected* and $N = S + I + R$ the share of individuals alive. We suppose that borders are closed. Moreover, all compartments experience natural vital dynamics via the birth rate μ_{birth} and the death rate μ_{death} from causes unrelated to the virus (e.g. long-term diseases, accidents). Daily epidemic transmission is described by equations (1)-(5):

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta SI + \mu_{birth}(S + R) - \mu_{death}S \qquad (1)$$

where $\beta SI = \beta_{as}SI_{as} + \beta_{ms}SI_{ms} + \beta_{ss}SI_{ss}$.

β_{as} is the contact rate between asymptomatic *infected* individuals and *susceptible* ones. Because asymptomatic individuals are not aware of their infection, their rate of contact with susceptible individuals is the same as the rate of contact within the group of *susceptible* individuals. This contact rate will vary with containment measures that are enforced within each country. We define the asymptomatic effective reproduction number $R_t = \beta_{as} * T_{rec,as}$ as the average number of secondary cases per asymptomatic case at time t.

β_{ms} is the contact rate between mildly symptomatic individuals and susceptible ones. It is assumed to be lower than β_{as} because symptomatic individuals tend to self-isolate, either because they are bedridden due to their symptoms or simply because they want to limit contacts with *susceptible* individuals.

β_{ss} is the contact rate between severely symptomatic and *susceptible* individuals. Individuals who experience severe symptoms may seek medical care and get admitted as inpatients at a hospital. They might not get hospital care for various reasons (e.g. health facilities are overwhelmed). This rate accounts for contacts between hospitalized patients and healthcare workers, but can also be interpreted as contacts between severely symptomatic individuals and any care-giver (at home for instance, if the health services

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

are overloaded). It also accounts for the contacts between hospitalized severely symptomatic individuals and *susceptible* individuals outside of their care-takers. It remains unclear how contacts other than healthcare workers affect the value of β_{ss}.

$$\frac{dI_{as}}{dt} = \beta SI - \frac{r_{as}}{T_{rec,as}} I_{as} - \frac{(1 - r_{as})}{T_{inc}} I_{as} - \mu_{death} I_{as} \qquad (2)$$

where r_{as} is the probability of recovery without ever developing symptoms, $T_{rec,as}$ is the recovery time of an asymptomatic individual, and T_{inc} is the incubation period during which an individual is infected and infectious, but does not have symptoms.

$$\frac{dI_{ms}}{dt} = \frac{(1 - r_{as})}{T_{inc}} I_{as} - \frac{d_{ms}}{T_d} I_{ms} - (1 - d_{ms}) \left(\frac{r_{ms}}{T_{rec,ms}} + \frac{1 - r_{ms}}{T_{sev}} \right) I_{ms} - \mu_{death} I_{ms} \qquad (3)$$

where d_{ms} is the probability of dying from a fast deterioration, T_d is the time elapsed between the appearance of first symptoms and the death of the individual, r_{ms} is the probability to recover from mild symptoms, $T_{rec,ms}$ is the recovery time associated with r_{ms} and T_{sev} is the time for severe symptoms to develop. We deviate for the recovery rates of the mildly symptomatic compartment r_{ms} by taking the weighted average of age-grouped fatality rates of COVID-19 found in Hubei, Hong Kong, and Macau [40]:

$$r_{ms} = \sum_{ag} w_{ag}(1 - f_{ag})$$

Where the sum is over the age groups $ag \in \{[0, 9], [10, 19], \ldots, [70, 79], 80+\}$, w_{ag} is the share of the population in age group ag and f_{ag} is the fatality rate found in earlier studies for the population in age group [18].

$$\frac{dI_{ss}}{dt} = \frac{(1 - r_{ms})(1 - d_{ms})}{T_{sev}} I_{ms} - \frac{d_{ss}}{\alpha T_d} I_{ss} - \frac{(1 - d_{ss})}{T_{rec,ss}} I_{ss} - \mu_{death} I_{ss} \qquad (4)$$

Where d_{ss} is the probability of dying after progressively developing severe symptoms that require hospitalization, $T_{rec,ss}$ is the recovery time of the severely symptomatic. αT_d is the time to death from the start of severe symptoms, for individuals who pass away from severe, progressively developing symptoms. Intuitively, if most severe cases are hospitalized, α should be higher than 1 as health professionals will slow down the evolution of the disease.

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{r_{as}}{T_{rec,as}} I_{as} + (1 - d_{ms}) \frac{r_{ms}}{T_{rec,ms}} I_{ms} + \frac{(1 - d_{ss})}{T_{rec,ss}} I_{ss} - \mu_{death} R \qquad (5)$$

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = \mu_{death} N + \frac{d_{ms}}{T_d} I_{ms} + \frac{d_{ss}}{\alpha T_d} I_{ss} \qquad (6)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

In our simulations, we include fatalities, but we do not include the outcomes in the results. We make this choice because of the high uncertainty around the capacity of the healthcare systems of each individual country to absorb the increased demand from severely ill patients. For instance, with the same predictions, a country that has a stock of ventilators of 1,000 will likely have less fatalities than a country with no ventilators. Because we do not have data on healthcare capacities, therefore we chose not to present these results. Our predicted number of fatalities are however subtracted from the number of susceptibles.

Patient and Public Involvement

Our study does not involve the participation of patients or any members of the public. All data used for the purpose of this study are aggregated and publicly available.

RESULTS

Baseline Simulations

We use publicly available data from the European Center for Disease Control and Prevention, and from daily press releases made by the Senegalese ministry of health and social protection. [20,21] We also do checks using the Ghana Health Service and the Kenya ministry of health websites.

Whenever possible, we use values of parameters drawn from the literature to fit the model (see table 1).

Although there are reports that as many as 80% of active cases are asymptomatic,[22] these reports are based on cases that are still active and include pre-symptomatic individuals. We thus use 40% as the share of individuals infected with COVID-19 who recover without ever developing symptoms.[16–19]

Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal have extensive communication strategies including in local languages to ensure that communities are able to detect the symptoms of COVID-19 such as a cough and fever and would report any person with those symptoms. We there use the share of individuals who do not have a cough as a proxy for the rate of symptomatic infected individuals who can leave their home without being reported. Wang et al.[23] find that 59% of individuals who test positive for COVID-19 have a cough which implies β_{ms} = $0.41\beta_{as}$. We set $\beta_{ss} = \frac{\beta_{as}}{T_{rec,ss}}$ *as* we presume that individuals are most at risk of infecting other susceptibles during their transport to the hospital. This ratio therefore mean that a severely ill patient would infect as many individuals over the course of their severely symptomatic phase as an asymptomatic individual would over the course of one day.

We chose South-Korea as a benchmark to validate β_{ms}, β_{ss}, and other parameters of our model because it is cited as an example for its extensive testing, tracking, and tracing of infections. We calibrate R_t by allowing it to change at each new containment measure taken by South-Korean authorities until the number

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

of identified cases reach a plateau. We solve an optimization problem constrained by (1)-(5) using the MATLAB optimization codes of D'Errico.[24] The values of R_t obtained and other parameters are summarized in table 1. The number of infections computed with our model accurately approximates the positive cases in South-Korea (see figure 1).

For the fatality rates d_{ss} and d_{ms} in Ghana, Kenya and Senegal, we split the reported regional fatality rate[2] 2.37% between d_{ss} = 2% and d_{ms}=0.37% as most deaths occurred for the severely symptomatic[3].[25] However, in South Korea, we use the South Korean COVID-19 fatality rate — 1.07 % as of April 2, 2020 — and split it across d_{ms}=0.03% and d_{ss}=1.04%.

I_{ms} was initialized with the number of cases tested positive on the first day of the epidemic in the country. I_{as} was initialized with the number of cases T_{inc} = 5 days after this same date. I_{ss} was initialized at 0.

Insert figure 1

For Ghana and Senegal, R_t is tuned to match the number of official cases until the first reported case of community transmission (see table 1), that is the transmission that cannot be traced back to one of the initial cases. Then, R_t is increased once and then lowered as soon as the first containment policy is enacted in the country and further lowered at each additional containment measure. Because Kenya first reported community transmission case coincided with the enforcement of a curfew to limit the spread of the virus, we only change R_t once for both the community transmission and the curfew.

Since they alter R_t, our baseline projections account for mitigation policies that were put in place in each of these countries (see figure 2). For instance, on the eighth day of the epidemic, Ghanaian officials restricted internal travels between infectious hot-spots and the rest of the country. Because these restrictions were announced 48 hours before they were effective, there is anecdotal evidence that a lot of individuals who lived in these hotspots travelled to other areas of the countries; we thus increase R_t for two days, before decreasing it again when the internal limitations of travel were effective. Similarly, R_t is tailored to each of the three countries according to the different policies they enforced. For example, in Kenya, we decrease it less for school closings than for regional lockdowns.

At the date of each containment measure, we adjust the value of R_t and provide low policy and high policy effectiveness scenarios. Our baseline projections assume a moderate impact of the policy, while the high effectiveness projections correspond to the case in which containment measures reduce the reproduction

[2] As of April 25, 2020, the Western African fatality rate is 2.49% while the Eastern African fatality rate is 2.25%, we take the average of both these numbers. Note that we use the regional figures because the number of cases at the national level is still low in the three countries. Western Africa has 8,034 cases and Eastern Africa has 3,319 cases as of April 27, 2020 (Africa CDC). Although these numbers are much lower than the Africa-wide (32,182 cases) and the worldwide ones, we find them more appropriate as they are more faithful to the standards of living and the age pyramid of the countries we study. Particularly, Algeria (12.57% fatality rate) and Egypt (6.99%), among others, raise the Africa-wide fatality rate to 4.44% but are structurally different from Ghana, Kenya and Senegal. That being said, we acknowledge that our choice relies on the testing capacity in both Western and Eastern African regions and might underestimate the true fatality rate as a consequence.

[3] Note that there are two ways to compute the fatality rate, either (1) as the ratio deaths / total cases, or (2) deaths / closed cases. While the former is likely to be an underestimate because lots of open cases can still end up in death, the latter is an overestimate because it's likely that deaths are closed quicker than recoveries. As critical cases are more likely to be detected than mild infections, it is also likely that the number of true cases is underestimated by official numbers but the number of COVID-19 related deaths is relatively well captured by official reports. Therefore, the ratio (1) is likely to be a better estimate of the true fatality rate than (2), and we use this definition of fatality rate.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

number significantly — that is the situation in which the policy has had large positive impacts to reduce the effective rate of reproduction (see table 1). Our low policy effectiveness scenario translates the instance in which, on the contrary, the impact of each policy on the reproduction number is minimal.

Insert figure 2

Insert table 1

Results reported in figure 3 show how the predictions fit the detected cases in the early days of the pandemic.

Insert figure 3

We report predictions for a year (see figure 3). Under the assumptions of the baseline model and their limitations, we predict that the peak of the epidemic will occur in July for all three countries as detailed in table 2. For Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal respectively, this peak should lead to approximately 11.1, 18.9, and 5.8 million active infections (including asymptomatic, and symptomatic cases) at the peak of the epidemic, with 308, 465, and 138 thousand individuals severely ill needing medical attention (see figure 3).

These long-term scenarios should be interpreted with great caution as they do not consider future policies or actions that could drastically reduce the contact rates and subsequently, flatten the curve further[4].

Insert figure 3

Insert table 2

Testing the Sensitivity of the Simulations to R_t

We perform a sensitivity analysis for R_t on our baseline model. We perturb it 100 times by ε drawn uniformly in $[-5\%R_t, +5\%R_t]$. The number of infections at the peak fluctuates between 27% to 40% of the total population in the active infection compartment for Ghana, between 28% and 40% for Kenya and between 25% to 37% for Senegal (see figure 2 of the appendix). In countries that enforced strict social distancing measures, predictions were significantly updated down — from about 2.2 million deaths on March 16,[12] to about 60 thousand on March 30.[26] A similar update can be expected from the outputs of our model as authorities take effective measures to reduce R_t and/or people in these countries gradually adopt behavior that would minimize contacts.

Population Density and Rate of Reproduction

As the population density increases, the rate of transmission of infectious diseases increases.[27] With respectively 43.3%, 72.2%, and 50.6% as a share of their population living in rural areas, Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal have sparsely populated areas outside of their main metropolitan areas, compared to countries like South Korea (18.5% of rural population).

[4] For instance, wearing a mask in public space is now mandatory in Kenya (since April, 15), Senegal (since April, 20) and Ghana (since April, 25). Additionally, the government of Ghana lifted its partial lockdown on April, 20.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

There is little information on the relative rate of transmission of COVID-19 between rural and urban areas but we draw on other diseases, for which there is available data. During the 2014 Ebola outbreak in Sierra-Leone,[28] we find that the basic reproduction number in Kambia (the least densely populated district of Sierra-Leone) is .56 times the one of the Western Area Urban district (the most densely populated district, that comprises the capital Freetown)[5]. We take that to mean that the R_t in rural areas was .56 times that of urban areas. Other mostly rural districts had a higher R_t. To mirror the range of ratios of reproduction rates observed in mostly rural and mostly urban districts for the Ebola epidemic in Sierra Leone, we run two simulations, one in which the rural to urban ratio is .50, and one where it is .75. These two ratios bound the difference between mostly rural districts and mostly urban areas for Ebola in Sierra Leone.[28] Using these ratios, we calibrate the rural and urban reproduction rates so their population-weighted average is equal to the national R_t which we keep constant across our baseline scenario and this scenario:

$$\begin{cases} R_{t,rur} = \gamma R_{t,urb} \\ R_t = r_{urb}\, R_{t,urb} + (1 - r_{urb}) R_{t,rur} \end{cases}$$

Where $R_{t,rur}$ and $R_{t,urb}$ are the rural and urban reproduction rates respectively; γ= .50, or γ=.75; r_{urb} is the national urbanization rate; R_t is the national reproduction rate listed in table 1. We use the first day of the first community transmission as the day of the first case in the rural area. Results are compiled in table 3. Effectively, we see in figure 4 that when accounting for rural areas, we observe two peaks. The first peak is driven by the spread in urban areas while the second peak, delayed in time is driven by the spread in rural areas. Kenya, with a rural share of the population of over 70% has the most noticeable split across its rural and urban areas.

Co-Morbidity and Rise in the Occurrence of Severe Symptoms

Co-morbidity can impact the share of mild cases that develop severe symptoms.[29] In Asia and Europe, hypertension, obesity, diabetes, and coronary heart diseases have been drivers of adverse health outcomes.[29,30] Because the combined prevalence of diabetes, hypertension and obesity are not higher in Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal than they are in regions we use to derive the recovery rates, the baseline simulations already account for them. However, Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal have a persistent and high rates of anemia and tuberculosis[3] (see table 6). To our knowledge, there is no study on the magnitude of the impacts of anemia, tuberculosis, or HIV on the recovery of patients who have contracted the virus. We simulate two scenarios, with 25% and 75% of the recovery rate of otherwise healthy individuals for individuals with one of these underlying conditions1 (see table 5). In comparison, Zhou et al.[29] find that in Wuhan, China, patients with comorbidities (hypertension, diabetes, coronary heart disease, chronic obstructive lung disease, carcinoma, chronic kidney diseases and others) have a recovery rate equal to 73.2% of their otherwise healthy counterparts. Though uncertain for HIV, anemia and TB, the impact of these underlying conditions on the recovery of individuals will likely lie between these two bounds. This

[5] We chose the most and the lease populated districts, because all these districts include urban areas.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

translates into adjusting r_{ms} for individuals with TB, HIV, and anemia. Comorbidities have age-specific incidence rates; anemia affects women of child bearing age primarily, while HIV affects young adults at higher rates. The prevalence of HIV, TB and anemia are extracted from the open database Global Burden Disease.[31] We account for these age-based differences to compute the recovery rate of the population accounting for comorbidities:

$$r_{ms,morb} = \sum_{ag} w_{ag} r_{ag} (1 - i_{morb} x_{ag,morb})$$

Where $r_{ms,morb}$ is the rate of recovery for infected individuals who develop mild symptoms and have one of the three comorbidities. r_{ag} is the recovery rate of the otherwise healthy individuals in the age-group, i_{morb} is either 1-.25 or 1-.75 depending on the scenario, and $x_{ag,morb}$ is the share of individuals in each age-group with the comorbidity.

We report the results in figure 4 and table 3. As expected, the predictions are higher in the case where we assume that individuals with comorbidities have a rate of recovery that is 25% that of otherwise healthy individuals. In the scenario with $R_{t,rur} = .75R_{t,urb}$, the number of active severe cases at the peak is 0.242M with a 75% recovery scenario for Ghana (0.308M for the 25% scenario), 0.313M for Kenya (0.631M) against and 0.104M (0.145M) for Senegal. Kenya's large impact is driven by its larger HIV positive population.

Insert table 3

Insert figure 4

Mirroring South Korea's effectiveness

Unlike countries in Europe, Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal have taken containment measures very early in the progression of the disease. The policies could have had impacts similar to the ones in South Korea. We present results of simulations mirroring the R_t for South Korea. Specifically, we decrease R_t for each country three weeks after the last recorded policy to 0.88, and then again at 6 weeks to 0.3. We find that the peak is much lower, with a number of active severe infections at the peak between 166 and 214 individuals for Ghana, 208 and 286 individuals for Kenya, and 140 and 189 individuals for Senegal; with the two bounds being a for recovery rates of respectively 75% and 25% of the recovery rate otherwise healthy patients. These peaks will occur two to three months after the first case (see figure 5). This scenario is attainable only if these countries are able to maintain effective policies for an extended period.

Insert table 4

Insert figure 5

DISCUSSION

In this study, we account for the age structure of the population in each country, the burden of potential comorbidities and the differential spreads of the virus in rural and urban areas. We find that the relatively

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

young population may limit the severity of the epidemic, by lowering the number of infections that lead to severe symptoms. We also find that sparsely populated areas may limit the spread of the epidemic. Rural areas effectively may lead to staggered peaks; this has important implications for policy makers who may be faced with two waves, and so may need to adapt their responses to adaptively deploy personnel on their territory as these peaks occur.

High rates of comorbidities however may lead to more individuals developing severe symptoms relative to a scenario with no comorbidities. We find that at the peak Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal are predicted to have respectively between 0.78 and 1.03%, 0.89 and 1.22%, and finally, 0.60 and .84% active clinical severe cases of COVID-19 with a peak of total infections predicted to occur between June 2 and June 17 (Ghana), July 22 and August 29 (Kenya), and May 28 and June 15 (Senegal) respectively against a July timeline for our baseline specification. Successful containment policies could lead to even lower rates of severe infections.

Though recent models look at a few countries in Africa,[32] or at the continent as a whole,[33,34], there are little to no studies predicting the spread of COVID-19 in Ghana and Senegal while incorporating specificities of these two countries. In Kenya, however Brand et al.[10] account for age-based population mixing and assume that asymptomatic individuals are as infectious as symptomatic individuals to predict that by the end of the year, 46.1 million (i.e. 89% of the public) of infections will have occurred. This prediction is comparable with the baseline results of our study in the absence of further containment policies. In that scenario, we find that about 47.7 million (93% of the public) individuals may be infected cumulatively.

Containment measures will be successful only if the public complies; however, measuring compliance is complex and has not been rigorously studied in the context of COVD-19 in these countries. In Ghana, Kenya and Senegal poverty is the main challenge to compliance, with official unemployment rates reaching 68.7%, 51.3% and 64.6% respectively.[35] As a response, authorities have implemented emergency transfer programs in cash and in-kind to the most vulnerable households partly to address compliance but also to avoid a humanitarian crisis (Senegal, Ghana). In urban areas, officials have required buses and taxis to reduce their number of passengers (Kenya, Senegal) and have mandated the use of masks (Ghana, Senegal).

Looking at how spike in cases was met by various healthcare systems in Europe and Asia, it is likely that most asymptomatic and mild cases may remain undetected.

Limitations

Our model does not incorporate changes in the survival rate of the virus due to weather or humidity, and in that regard, our simulations are a worst-case scenario.[36,37] Additionally, the model assumes homogeneous mixing of individuals within rural areas and urban areas which is an unlikely assumption. In a future iteration of our model, we plan to use a spatially-structured model in order to relax the homogeneous mixing assumption by leveraging phone data.[38–40]

The model also excludes international population flows. All countries in our sample have closed their international borders — airports and roads — before or a few days after their first confirmed imported case

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

(see figure 2). However, it is possible that COVID-19 was spreading undetected for days in the respective countries. If that is true, the peak of active cases might be delayed in comparison to the true peak. Furthermore, the spread of this disease is highly dependent on the reproduction number R_t. Since this number is contingent upon many factors (policies, individuals' behavior etc.); its value in the long-run is subject to large uncertainties. The projected number of infections in the medium to long term could thus be considerable overestimates (or underestimates) of the true number of infections (depending on the scenarios).

These predictions aggregate infections in rural and urban areas, however, in practice, the peaks in urban areas, due to higher reproduction rates, will occur earlier. In rural areas however, the peaks will be delayed due to their lower R_t. This distinction is important for policy makers who can target their resources accordingly.

The use of the data also comes with limitations such as the inaccuracy of the data collection. For example, one person was tested positive for COVID-19 on March 4 but entered Senegal on February 24. We expect that all the countries in our sample are dealing with similar delays, however, we did not find a consistent way to address this issue. Additionally, given the low number of tests performed to detect the virus, we cannot ex-ante measure the accuracy of our model in Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal.

Because outcomes of individuals with critical needs are highly dependent on the capacity of health care systems, having data on health care capacity is important in predicting the number of fatalities. In our simulations, information such as the number of intensive care unit beds would inform the fatality rate of individuals with severe symptoms (d_{ss}). Unfortunately, we do not have access to such data and we thus choose not to show the results for fatalities rates in these three countries. Finally, we use a SIR, which assumes perpetual immunity – however, there are still uncertainties regarding the possibility of reinfection.[41]

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, containment measures, age structures, low urbanization and co-morbidity may lead Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal to having different trajectories from the USA, and from Asian and European countries. This study is a first attempt at accounting for rural densities and co-morbidity, and it suggests that rural areas will slow down the spread of the epidemic, and that relatively young population will keep the number of severe cases low compared to the nearly 3.5% hospitalization rate in Europe and central Asia.[42] Our findings also show how sensitive these results are to different assumptions on the effectiveness of policies, assumptions on co-morbidities and differential effective rates of reproduction in rural and urban areas.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

References

[1] Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) 2020. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html (accessed April 27, 2020).

[2] United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. The Demographic Profile of African Countries 2015. https://www.uneca.org/publications/demographic-profi%1Fle-african-countries (accessed April 25, 2020).

[3] Lancet Global Burden of Disease. https://www.thelancet.com/gbd?source=post_page (accessed April 27, 2020).

[4] Bcheraoui CE, Mimche H, Miangotar Y et al. Burden of disease in francophone Africa, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. Lancet Glob Health 2020;8:e341–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30024-3.

[5] World Demographics 2020 (Population, Age, Sex, Trends) - Worldometer 2020. https://www.worldometers.info/demographics/world-demographics/ (accessed April 27, 2020).

[6] Lee P-I, Hu Y-L, Chen P-Y et al. Are children less susceptible to COVID-19? J Microbiol Immunol Infect 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmii.2020.02.011.

[7] Africa's debt crisis hampers its fight against covid-19. The Economist 2020.

[8] Barasa E, Ouma PO, Okiro EA. Assessing the Hospital Surge Capacity of the Kenyan Health System in the Face of the COVID-19 Pandemic. MedRxiv 2020.

[9] Tackling the coronavirus (COVID-19) crisis together: OECD policy contributions for co-ordinated action 2020. http://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/en/ (accessed April 27, 2020).

[10] Brand SPC, Aziza R, Kombe IK et al. Forecasting the scale of the COVID-19 epidemic in Kenya. MedRxiv 2020:2020.04.09.20059865. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20059865.

[11] Worldometer. Coronavirus Update (Live): 2,489,956 Cases and 170,552 Deaths from COVID-19 Virus Pandemic - 2020. https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/ (accessed April 21, 2020).

[12] Ferguson NM, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID- 19 mortality and healthcare demand 2020:20. https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf (Accessed March 23, 2020).

[13] Read J, Bridgen J, Cummings D et al. Novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic predictions. medRxiv 2020.01.23.20018549. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.23.20018549.

[14] Danon L, Brooks-Pollock E, Bailey M et al. A spatial model of CoVID-19 transmission in England and Wales: early spread and peak timing. MedRxiv 2020:2020.02.12.20022566. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.12.20022566.

[15] Arenas A, Cota W, Gomez-Gardenes J et al. A mathematical model for the spatiotemporal epidemic spreading of COVID19. MedRxiv 2020:2020.03.21.20040022. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.21.20040022.

[16] Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A et al. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. Eurosurveillance 2020;25:2000180. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180.

[17] Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Miyama T et al. Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). MedRxiv 2020:2020.02.03.20020248. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.03.20020248.

[18] Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D et al. Estimating the generation interval for COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

based on symptom onset data. MedRxiv 2020:2020.03.05.20031815. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.05.20031815.

[19] Al-Tawfiq JA. Asymptomatic coronavirus infection: MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19). Travel Med Infect Dis 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101608.

[20] European Center for Disease Prevention and Control. Geographic distribution of COVID-19 cases worldwide. Eur Cent Dis Prev Control 2020. https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/download-todays-data-geographic-distribution-covid-19-cases-worldwide (accessed April 2, 2020).

[21] Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) – Statistics and Research - Our World in Data 2020. https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus (accessed April 21, 2020).

[22] Day M. Covid-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. BMJ 2020;369. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1375.

[23] Wang H, Wang Z, Dong Y, Chang R, Xu C, Yu X, et al. Phase-adjusted estimation of the number of Coronavirus Disease 2019 cases in Wuhan, China. Cell Discov 2020;6:1–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41421-020-0148-0.

[24] D'Errico J. fminsearchbnd, fminsearchcon - File Exchange - MATLAB Central 2020. https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/8277-fminsearchbnd-fminsearchcon (accessed April 21, 2020).

[25] Africa CDC - COVID-19 Daily Updates. Afr CDC 2020. https://africacdc.org/covid-19/ (accessed April 27, 2020).

[26] Team IC-19 health service utilization forecasting, Murray CJ. Forecasting COVID-19 impact on hospital bed-days, ICU-days, ventilator-days and deaths by US state in the next 4 months. MedRxiv 2020:2020.03.27.20043752. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20043752.

[27] Heesterbeek J a. P, Dietz K. The concept of Ro in epidemic theory. Stat Neerlandica 1996;50:89–110. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9574.1996.tb01482.x.

[28] Yang W, Zhang W, Kargbo D et al. Transmission network of the 2014–2015 Ebola epidemic in Sierra Leone. J R Soc Interface 2015;12:20150536. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2015.0536.

[29] Zhou F, Yu T, Du R 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;395:1054–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3.

[30] Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. JAMA 2020.

[31] GBD Results Tool | GHDx 2020. http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool (accessed April 28, 2020).

[32] van Zandvoort K, Jarvis CI, Pearson CAB et al. Response strategies for COVID-19 epidemics in African settings: a mathematical modelling study. MedRxiv 2020.04.27.20081711. 10.1101/2020.04.27.20081711

[33] Pearson CA, Schalkwyk CV, Foss AM et al. Projected early spread of COVID-19 in Africa. MedRxiv 2020:2020.04.05.20054403. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.05.20054403.

[34] United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. COVID-19 in Africa: Protecting Lives and Economies 2020. https://www.uneca.org/publications/covid-19-africa-protecting-lives-and-economies (accessed April 27, 2020).

[35] The World Bank. World Development Indicators | DataBank 2020. https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators (accessed April 28, 2020).

[36] Wang J, Tang K, Feng K et al. High Temperature and High Humidity Reduce the Transmission of COVID-19. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3551767.

[37] Sajadi MM, Habibzadeh P, Vintzileos et al. Temperature, Humidity and Latitude Analysis to Predict Potential Spread and Seasonality for COVID-19. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2020. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3550308.

[38] Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. PLOS Comput Biol 2017;13:e1005697. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697.

[39] Dong W, Guan T, Lepri B et al. PocketCare. Proc ACM Interact Mob Wearable Ubiquitous Technol 2019. https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3328912 (Accessed March 28, 2020).

[40] Oliver N, Letouzé E, Sterly H et al. Mobile phone data and COVID-19: Missing an opportunity? 2020. arXiv: 2003.12347.

[41] Mahase E. Covid-19: WHO and South Korea investigate reconfirmed cases. BMJ 2020;369. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1498.

[42] Walker P, Whittaker C, Watson O et al. Report 12: The global impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation and suppression. 2020. https://doi.org/10.25561/77735.

[43] Current world population by country. Population data for every country as of 2020, 2020. https://countrymeters.info/en (accessed April 2, 2020).

[44] McIntosh K. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). UpToDate Hirsch MS Bloom Eds 2020;5.

[45] Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. Lancet Infect Dis 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .



Figure 1: Benchmark, South Korea



Figure 2: Timing of Policies Across Countries

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .



Figure 3: Projection of Active Infections

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .



Note: y-axis is percent of total population.

Figure 4: Projected Active Infections Accounting for Underlying Conditions and Rural Areas

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .



Figure 5: Projected Severe Active Infections Mirroring South Korean's R_t

Table 1: Parameters of the Model

	Ghana	Kenya	Senegal	South Korea	Source
1st Case	13-mars-20	14-mars-20	02-mars-20	20-janv-20	European CDC (2020), Sen. Ministry of Health (2020)
Pop.	30.497 M	51.808 M	17.354 M	51.410 M	CountryMeters[43]
μbirth	9.01E-05	9.71E-05	1.00E-04	2.51E-05	CountryMeters[43]
μdeath	9.01E-05	9.71E-05	1.00E-04	1.60E-05	The World Bank [35]
ras	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	Nishiura et al. [17]
Trec,as	14d	14d	14d	14d	Hubei: Mcintosh et al.[44]
Tinc	5d	5d	5d	5d	Mcintosh et al.[44]
Td	6d	6d	6d	6d	Mcintosh et al.[44]
Trec,ms	16d	16d	16d	16d	Mcintosh et al.[44]
Tsev	5d	5d	5d	5d	Mcintosh et al.[44]
Trec,ss	18d	18d	18d	18d	Mcintosh et al.[44]
α	2	2	2	2	Mcintosh et al.[44]
dms	0.37%	0.37%	0.37%	0.03%	Country Meters[43]
dss	2%	2%	2%	1.04%	Country Meters[43]
rms	98.34%	98.53%	98.62%	94.33%	Verity et al. [45]
Rt	1.25, (1.0−1.4) if 0≤d<7 2.35, (2.2−2.7) if 7≤d<9 2.3, (1.7−2.5) if 9≤d<16 1.6, (1.0−2.2) if 16 ≤ d	2.4, (2.2−2.6) if 0≤d<7 2.15, (1.8−2.5) if 7≤d<9 2, (1.6−2.4) if 9≤d<14 1.6, (1.0−2.2) if 14 ≤ d	1.29, (1.1−1.48) if 0≤d<20 2.4, (2.1−2.7) if 20≤d<26 1.5, (1.0−2.00) if 26 ≤ d	1.13 if 0 ≤d< 30 3.02 if 30 ≤d< 41 1.85 if 41 ≤d< 44 0.88 if 44 ≤d< 49 0.3 if 49 ≤d< 59	Author's estimates, adjusting Rt with timeline of govt. policies outlined in figure 2
βms *βss*	0.41*βas* *βas/Trec,ss*	0.41*βas* *βas/Trec,ss*	0.41*βas* *βas/Trec,ss*	0.41*βas* *βas/Trec,ss*	Author's estimate using Wang et al.[23]

Notes: *Rt* in parenthesis are *Rt* values for optimistic and pessimistic scenarios respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

Table 2: Projections of Active Cases at the Peak of the Epidemic for each Infected Compartment

			Active Cases at Peak		
		Days since first case	Severe symptoms	Mild symptoms	No symptoms
Ghana	Low Policy Effectiveness	79	0.4M	9.1M	7.7M
	Baseline	114	0.3M	6.7M	4.9M
	High Policy Effectiveness	250	0.1M	2.7M	1.6M
Kenya	Low Policy Effectiveness	79	0.6M	15.4M	13.1M
	Baseline	116	0.5M	11.7M	8.3M
	High Policy Effectiveness	252	0.2M	4.6M	2.7M
Senegal	Low Policy Effectiveness	90	0.2M	4.8M	3.9M
	Baseline	128	0.1M	3.5M	2.5M
	High Policy Effectiveness	254	0.1M	1.5M	1.0M

Note : The peaks of each infection sub-compartment might not align.

Table 3: Projection of Infections Accounting for Africa Specific Factors

		Co-morbidity % of the survival rate of healthy patients							
		75%				25%			
	$\frac{R_t(rural)}{R_t(urban)}$	Severe	Mild	Asympt.	Days*	Severe	Mild	Asympt.	Days*
Ghana	50%	0.2M	4.4M	3.3M	81	0.3M	4.8M	3.9M	81
	75%	0.2M	4.8M	3.9M	96	0.3M	4.4M	3.3M	96
Kenya	50%	0.4M	8.2M	5.3M	167	0.4M	5.5M	4.2M	168
	75%	0.3M	5,6M	4.2M	130	0.6M	8M	5.3M	131
Senegal	50%	0.1M	2.2M	1.6M	87	0.1M	2.3M	1.9M	87
	75%	0.1M	2.4M	1.9M	105	0.1M	2.1M	1.6M	105

*Days of total infection peak, since the first case tested positive.
Note : The peaks of each infection sub-compartment might not align.

Table 4: Projection of Active Cases at Peak Accounting of Co-morbidities, With South-Korea's *Rt*

		Co-morbidity % of the survival rate of healthy patients							
		75%				25%			
	$\frac{R_t(rural)}{R_t(urban)}$	Severe	Mild	Asympt.	Days*	Severe	Mild	Asympt.	Days*
Ghana	100%	166	3,164	2,428	57	214	3,110	3,110	57
Kenya	100%	208	4,221	3,206	60	286	4,134	4,134	60
Senegal	100%	140	3,253	2,661	69	189	3,183	3,183	69

Note: The peak of each active cases for each sub -compartment might not align.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

Appendix



Figure 1: Visual representation of the model



Figure 2: Sensitivity of Active Cases to Perturbations of R_t

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089532; this version posted May 12, 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 .

Table 1: Projection of Active Cases Accounting for Co-morbidity or Rural/Urban factors

			Active cases at peak			
			Severe	Mild	Asympt.	Days*
Ghana	Rural/Urban**	50%	0.2M	4.8M	3.9M	81
		75%	0.2M	4.4M	3.4M	96
	Co-morbidity***	25%	0.5M	6.6M	4.9M	114
		75%	0.4M	6.7M	4.9M	114
Kenya	Rural/Urban	50%	0.2M	5.7M	4.2M	167
		75%	0.4M	8.2M	5.3M	130
	Co-morbidity	25%	0.8M	11.3M	8.3M	116
		75%	0.6M	11.4M	8.3M	116
Senegal	Rural/Urban	50%	0.08M	2.4M	1.9M	87
		75%	0.09M	2.2M	1.6M	105
	Co-morbidity	25%	0.2M	3.5M	2.5M	129
		75%	0.2M	3.5M	2.5M	128

* Days of total infection peak, since the first case tested positive.

** $\frac{R_t\ (rural)}{R_t\ (urbain)}$

***Recovery rate for patients with preexisting conditions as percentage of healthy patients' recovery rates.

Note: The peak of each active cases for each sub -compartment might not align.