medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Development of a Multivariate Prediction Network Model for epidemic progression in order to study the effects of lockdown time and coverage on a closed community of non-immune individuals.

Dimitri Marques Abramov[1]

Saint-Clair Gomes Junior[2]

1. Laboratory of Neurobiology and Clinical Neurophysiology, National Institute of Women, Children and Adolescents, Health Fernandes Figueira, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (FIOCRUZ), Ministry of Health, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

2. Unit of Clinical Research, National Institute of Women, Children and Adolescents, Health Fernandes Figueira, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (FIOCRUZ), Ministry of Health, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Corresponding Author:

Dimitri. M. Abramov

dimitri.abramov@iff.fiocruz.br

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to develop a realistic network model to predict qualitatively the relationship between lockdown duration and coverage in controlling the progression of the incidence curve of an epidemic with the characteristics of COVID-19 in a closed and non-immune population.

Effects of lockdown time and rate on the progression of an epidemic incidence curve in a virtual closed population of 10 thousand subjects. Predictor variables were R0 values established in the most recent literature (2.7 and 5.7), without lockdown and with coverages of 25%, 50%, and 90% for 21, 35, 70, and 140 days in 13 different scenarios for each R0, where individuals remained infected and transmitters for 14 days. We estimated model validity by applying an exponential model on the incidence curve with no lockdown, with growth rate coefficient observed in realistic scenarios. Pairwise comparisons were performed using Wilcoxon test with Bonferroni correction between peak amplitude, peak latency, and total number of cases for each R0 used.

For R0=5.7, the flattening of the curve occurs only with long lockdown periods (70 and 140 days) with a 90% coverage. For R0=2.7, coverages of 25 and 50% also result in curve flattening and reduction of total cases, provided they occur for a long period (70 days or more). Short and soft lockdowns had no relevant effect on incidence or casuistry.

These data corroborate the importance of lockdown duration regardless of virus transmission.

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/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

SARS-CoV2 epidemic has had a significant impact on global public healthcare, due to its high transmissibility and to the significant mortality of COVID-19 (Rothan and Byrareddy, 2020). The pandemic was declared on March 2020 by the WHO (Cucinotta and Vanelli, 2020), mobilizing all nations to take lockdown measures, since there is still no effective treatment for this pandemic.

Economic and social costs of this lockdown must be considered in the projection of which type of lockdown must be adopted. Observing the progression of the pandemic in its epicenter, in March, Shen & Bar-Yam, from the New England Complex Systems Institute (2020), estimated that an extreme lockdown of 5 weeks was sufficient to contain the COVID-19 epidemic in China, warning that a soft lockdown would be ineffective. The ideal lockdown coverage curbs new infections while it buys time for the virus to die out in individuals who are already infected, (1) significantly reducing the infected population, and (2) producing immunity barriers, thus interrupting infection spread (Kissler et al, 2020). These predictions have been based on mathematical modeling using epidemic characteristics, such as initial reproductive number (R0) and effective reproductive number (Re) (Kissler et al., 2020; Zhao and Chen), or epidemic growth rate (Wibens et al, 2020)

As opposed to models based on linear equations, Network Models are adequate for realistic simulations of complex systems with dynamic behavior patterns, where the individual states of its units and the connections among them are intrinsically non-linear, and emulated by pseudo-random series (Haykin, 1994).

Even though it is nearly impossible to determine objectively the ideal, or even realistic, parameters for a model (regarding R0 and quantification of effective lockdown coverage), we might still estimate the relationship between lockdown time and coverage in truthful scenarios. Moreover, these predictions would be important at least as motivation for the planning of public lockdown policies. Coverage is an objectifiable measure in terms of proportions (in %) for comparisons between scenarios with shared parameters, which has qualitative value. In the present evaluation, the most important parameter in this simulation is virus reproduction rate in a non-immune population (R0). R0 for COVID-19 had been estimated as 2.7 (Wu et al, 2020). However, new estimates on pandemic progression have obtained a R0 of 5.7 and a growth rate of 0.21-0.3/day (Sanche et al, 2020). Other recent sources have indicated reproductive numbers of this magnitude (Bulut and Kato, 2020; Zhao and Chen, 2020).

Therefore, we developed a network model to estimate the effect of lockdown coverage intensity and coverage time on incidence curves of COVID-19 epidemic in a closed population (with no significant exchange of individuals from/to other populations). Our intention is to check how these two dimensions might comparatively affect amplitude and latency of peak incidence, as well as total number of cases.

In this preliminary theoretical assay, we adopted a small population of 10 thousand non-immune individuals in the simulations, observing incidence progression over 1000 days, considering the conservative and pessimistic R0 estimates of 2.7 and 5.7 transmissions, respectively, per infected individual, on average, as central parameters.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

METHODOLOGY

We conducted a theoretical study on the progression of the incidence curve comparing possible lockdown coverage and time scenarios, concerning peak amplitude, peak latency, and total number of cases. Considering the two R0 values estimated in literature for COVID-19 (Sanche et al, 2020), the study scenarios are as follows: no lockdown (natural progression of the epidemic); and lockdowns with proportional coverages of 25, 50, and 90% in periods of 21, 35, 70, and 140 days, with a total of 13 scenarios for each R0 value.

Our period of analysis was arbitrarily defined as 1000 days, with temporal accuracy of 1 day. We applied lockdown scenarios starting from the first day of simulation, with the specified coverages and periods.

We used a Network model to simulate the dynamics (progression) of changes in the state (non-immune, infected, and immune/deceased) of the units (population subjects) through their mutual connections, by which the infection spreads.

The universe of this model is a virtual, random-sized population with 10 thousand subjects socially interconnected. We interpreted these connections as the likelihood of each subject infecting each one of their peers. The number of infected subjects per each subject might vary from 0 to infinite. These connections are stochastically based. Thus, due to the non-linear nature of the network model, we used a sample with thirty simulations of each of the 26 scenarios studied, starting from different "patients zero". As criterion for patient-zero eligibility, we adopted patients who had a likelihood of transmitting the disease different from zero.

The script developed in Octave/MatLab language is found in the supplementary information for free use.

Model structure:

We adopted a vector **u** with 10 thousand values (N = 10000), representing a population with 10 thousand subjects *i* who were non-immune (u(i) = 0), many of whom shall be infected (u(i)=1), progressing to the outcome (u(i) = NaN, *not-a-number*), once they become immune or die. Epidemic progression is determined by the total amount of individuals *i* who are infected and progress to the outcome in each time unit *t* (in hypothetical days), with *t* = 1,...,1000.

The N individuals *i* established connections *Cij* with individuals *j* in a non-bidirectional manner ($Cij \neq Cji$ *and* $Cii = NaN$). Connection matrix **C** determines the likelihood of a subject *i* infecting other subjects *j* ($j = 1,..., N-1$), according to a probability density function (pdf) *T* with *N-2* degrees of freedom (figure 1). The number of subjects *j* who might be infected by the individual *i* is determined by a pseudo-random series **r** with size *N-1*, and lambda Poisson distribution equal to *R0*, according to pdf *T*. In other words, the infection between *i* and *j* shall occur according to the conditional function:

$u(j) = 1$, for $Cij \geq T(r(i))$ [1]

The weight of connections *Cij* had a random uniform distribution, leading to a topographic connectivity spread.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

Model parameters - predictors:

The parameters and values adopted in this model were:

Virus reproduction number in a non-immune population: **R0** = [2.7, 5.7], according to Wu et al. (2020) and Sanche et al (2020), respectively. This parameter is dynamic in practice, as the non-immune population decreases over time, becoming *Re* (effective reproductive number) (Aronson et al, 2020).

Days of individual infection progression: p = 14, which is the mean period of infection and transmission by COVID-19 and we presumed that 50% of infections occur between the fourth and eighth days, when the elimination of viral particles is higher (Cevik et al, 2020).

Finally, the parameters analyzed are *lockdown period*, δ = [21, 35, 70, 140], in days, and *relative lockdown coverage*, α = [Inf, 4, 2, 1.12], corresponding to no coverage, 25%, 50%, and 90% of coverage, respectively.

In the model dynamics, lockdown is the reduction in values of matrix **C** proportional to α(k) during a period δ(k), where *k* = 1,..,4 and *t* = 1,..., δ, i.e., lockdown always on the first day of epidemic progression in population **u**, which is characterized by the confirmed first case of community transmission, as described in the next section. Values **C** are determined according to the conditional function below:

$$Cij' = Cij - [|\max(Ci^*) - T(r(i))| / \alpha(k)], \text{ when } t \leq \delta(k') \qquad [2]$$

Where *k* and *k'* progress independently.

Model dynamics

First, one individual i is randomly selected to be the first patient with community transmission, *u(i)* = 1 at *t*=1. From this point on, each infected subject remains infected and transmitting over the period *p*. A vector, $\pi(1 : p) = 0$, is initially determined, representing π days of infection. Infections are distributed semi-randomly in π, according to the following conditional function:

$$\pi(4{:}8) = 1; \text{ if } r(i) \leq 4, \qquad [3]$$

$$\pi(4{:}8) = 1 \text{ and } \pi(rnd^p(r(i)-4)) = \pi(rnd^p(r(i)-4)) + 1; \text{ otherwise}$$

Where *rnd* is the generation function of r(i)-4 random values between 1 and *p*. In other words, it is possible to have *1:r(i)-3* infections on one single day. In the course of time, *t*, subjects *j* are infected by *i* while $1 < \Delta t < p$, in a decreasing likelihood order (first, the most likely), given pdf *T*. Each u(j) = 1 starts a cycle of *p* days of transmission, until *u(j)* = NaN, if $\Delta t - p \geq 1$.

In each cycle (Δt = 1), subject *i* infected new subjects *j* at *(t-1, ..., t-13)*. Each infected subject *i* becomes immune/deceased with Δt = 14, turning into *u(i)* = NaN. At the end of the iteration by all *N* subjects, the current status **u** is stored.

Outputs and Analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

As outputs for analysis, we evaluated the total number of infections per day, *n(t)*, where *t = 1,...,1000*, from which the curves of new infections (*n(t) – n(t-1)*), called incidence curves, and the curve of epidemic growth rate (*n(t)/n(t-1)*) are derived.

In order to validate the model, we calculated coefficients of Growth Rate, $r_{Ro(1)}$ and $r_{Ro(2)}$, through the best-fit curve of an exponential model (Ma et al., 2013), applied to the incidence curve:

$$n(t) = n_0.e^{r.t} \qquad [4]$$

Where $n_0 = 1$ (initial number of infected subjects), t is the time in days, and *r* is the exponential growth coefficient of the curve. In order to apply the best-fit model, we varied the *r*-value from 0.05 to 0.35 with 0.005 increases.

Given the pseudo-random nature of the network model, we performed 30 simulations by raffling the corresponding 30 initial patients, for each parameter, **R0**, δ and α, which determined 26 groups for comparison, since parameter δ is irrelevant for $\alpha(1) = Inf$ (in lockdown).

The values calculated were peak amplitude of the curve of new cases, peak latency, and total number of infected and outcomes in **u**, when *t* = 1000. Peak latency of each output "k" was weighed to correct distortion effect in the sample, and it was multiplied by the corresponding peak amplitude and divided by the mean amplitudes calculated in the output sample.

In order to describe the magnitude of the inherent non-linearity of the model, we showed sample statistics in terms of median and confidence interval (90%) for each scenario, discriminated according to the R0 adopted (table 1). The figures show pairwise comparison tables, where we indicate the intersection of confidence intervals for the measurements described in table 1. Graphs are the mean values of each scenario. Due to the accuracy and predictability inherent to prediction models, inferences are irrelevant since likelihood of equality shall always be inversely proportional to the size of the simulated sample.

COMMENTED RESULTS

Population descriptions

Using pseudo-random Poisson distributions (see methodology) to adjust the likelihood of transmission in the connections between subjects, we found that the maximum number of subjects infected by the same subject was 11 and 17 for R0 = 2.7 and 5.7, respectively. Additionally, the proportion of non-transmitters was 6.9% and 0.23% for these R0, respectively. The large number of non-transmitters explains the higher dispersion of data obtained from the population with R0 = 2.7 (see table 1).

When selecting the participants for simulations, only one patient zero showed 0 likelihood of infecting other individuals; this is in accordance with Poisson distribution for the R0 = 2.7 used to adjust probabilities, which estimates approximately 6 to 7% of zero subjects infected. Another patient was raffled to participate in the simulation.

We used the same 10 thousand individuals in all simulations, and we collectively consolidated individual outcomes (having been infected or not) by the end of the 1000 simulated days for a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

descriptive analysis of each lockdown scenario, and the comparison between them, as shown in table 1.

Validating the model using growth rate coefficient

The reliability of the model is indicated by the comparison between the growth Rate (*r*) estimated by Sanche et al (2020) for *R0* = 5.7 and the growth rate observed. The simulation shows dynamic rates, which is perfectly predictable considering that the effective variation of R0 into Re was progressively lower than *R0*, until epidemic progression was stabilized, when *n(t)-n(t-1)* = 0. When *R0* = 2.7, the epidemic progresses more slowly, maintaining an *r* lower than that for *R0* = 5.7. Figure 1 shows the rate dynamics of new infections (growth rate), which is determining for the adjustment of the incidence curve to one of the exponential models.

Using the exponential model (eq. 4), we found *r(R0=2.7)* = 0.16 and *r(R0=5.7)* = 0.28, according to the incidence curves, i.e. the progression of new infections and individual outcomes. The most recent *r* estimates occurred in the interval 0.21–0.3/day, related to *R0*= 5.7, as opposed to the previously estimated *r*, of 0.1–0.14, related to *R0* = 2.7 (Sanche et al, 2020).



Figure 01. Growth rate profile of the epidemic. Dotted lines represent the medians between t=1 and t = *max(n(t)-n(t-1)))* for R0 = 2.7 (blue) and 5.7 (red), which are the peak of the incidence curve, from whence the growth rate declines.

Behavior of epidemics without lockdown

As the incidence curves in figure 02 show, the epidemic progresses more rapidly with R0 = 5.7, establishing a higher and earlier peak of infection than with R0 = 2.7. Both infections result in more than 90% of subjects contaminated until immunological barriers are established.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 02. Transmission curves in a sample with thirty simulations for R0 of 2.7 and 5.7. Mean values are plotted above the corresponding samples, in black and blue, respectively. Peaks are indicated with red crosses. On the upper right-hand corner, there is a table with descriptive statistics (median, M, and 90% CI) and inference of differences between samples using a non-parametric test.

Behavior of incidence curves during Lockdown

Descriptive data of peak amplitude, peak latency, and total number of infected subjects (mean values and standard deviations) for outputs related to R0 equal to 2.7 and 5.7 might be seen in table 01, where there are also inferences in comparisons between the output samples obtained. The first observation is related to the wide data dispersion when the epidemic with R0=2.7 has a 90% coverage, because the likelihood of an epidemic not progressing increases as patient zero might have very thin connections with other subjects. In other words, viruses with reproductive rate of 2.7 could be immediately contained with a lockdown with intense coverage.

Effect of lockdown duration with ideal coverage.

We evaluated the effect of lockdown period (21, 35, 70, or 140 days) on the incidence curve, considering the ideal lockdown (90%). We observed that all curves are statistically different from each other in latency and amplitude for R0=5.7, except for curve amplitude related to the period of 21 days compared with the curve with no lockdown. The curves related to 70 and 140 days of lockdown overlap, as they are the only ones that showed a relevant flattening effect on the incidence curve (figure 3, upper). Considering R0=5.7, a lockdown of 21 and 35 days with 90% of coverage only delays incidence curve peak by a few days, and longer periods of time are required to flatten the curve. For R0 = 2.7 (figure 3, down), lockdown with 90% of coverage was only effective in delaying the incidence curve peak more significantly with 70 and 140 days of lockdown, although there was no flattening of the curve. Periods of 21 and 35 days, once again, seem to have been effective to delay the incidence curve peak. Lockdowns of 70 and 140 days reduced the number of infected subjects only for R0 = 5.7, (see table 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Effect of Lockdown Duration (days), with 90% coverage (mean values). Top, R0 = 5.7. Down, R0 = 2.7. color crosses: respective medians. See values in table 1.

Effect of lockdown coverage.

Considering R0 = 5.7, intensity of coverage (25%, 50%, or 90%) had a visible effect on curve peak amplitude and latency during lockdown of 70 days (figure 4, top, tables included), although it was relevant only for coverages of 90%, when the curve was effectively flattened. Coverage intensity also affected the total number of infected subjects, although a relevant reduction, of approximately 12% of the infection cases (see descriptive values in table 01), only occurred with 90% coverage.

When we consider results for R0=2.7, we observe that any coverage intensity affected curve behavior compared to no lockdown (figure 4, down, tables included). For 25 and 50% of coverage, there was flattening of the curve with observed effect of approximately 20% on the total number of cases compared to no lockdown.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Effect of Lockdown coverage during 70 days (means). Top, R0 = 5.7. Down, R0 = 2.7. color crosses: respective medians. See values table 1.

Effect of soft lockdown with short duration.

Coverages of 25 and 50% during 21 and 35 days did not have any relevant effect on the dynamics of epidemic progression, whether in terms of incidence curve peak amplitude and latency, for either R0=2.7 or 5.7 (figure 5), or in terms of final number of cases (table 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Effect of Lockdown with short duration and soft coverage (mean values). Right, R0 = 5.7. Left, R0 = 2.7. See values table 1.

DISCUSSION

Network models are frequently used in simulation of neural and cognitive processes, and are a quite realistic modelling strategy for the dynamics of a complex collectivity, as they simulate dynamic information and energy flows through the connection matrix between Network units (Haykin, 1994). With adequate parameters, a network model virtually behaves as a real life population.

In order to simulate realistic scenarios, which have an intrinsic non-linear nature, we used here generators of stochastic numbers: raffles shall always be required to define who is connected to whom and with what intensity. In this application, elucidating behavior patterns of the simulated collectivity occurs by empirical observation of the progression of this interconnected collectivity. In this case, the non-linearity is in the connection matrices (which are here interpreted as the likelihood of subjects being contaminated). Therefore, we worked with output samples, derived from simulations with different "patients zero".

Model validity was checked by a comparative analysis of behavior characteristics previously determined for the population and for the scenario that are intended for simulation. In other words, one way to prove the representativity of the model is comparing the coefficient of exponential growth of the incidence curve obtained with the incidence curve estimated for the actual epidemic. Adopting *R0* values found in literature (Sanche et al., 2020) in this model (Ma et al, 2013), we obtained incidence curves that fit (best-fit) an exponential with growth rate parameters that are nearly the same as those of the actual incidence curve. Using the exponential model (equation 4), we found r of 0.16 and 0.28, respectively, for R0 equal to 2.7 and 5.7, inside or near the respective intervals previously estimated for these R0 (Sanche et al, 2020). Therefore, this model might be considered representative of the progression of an epidemic such as that of COVID-19.

Even considering this model realistic and representative of the COVID-19 epidemic behavior, these simulations did not determine ideal parameters of lockdown coverage and time. Due to its validity, this model might possibly be useful for quantitative estimates in further studies

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

with simulations of large populations. However, the model must be fed with updated parameters (such as Re rather than R0), which are specific to a given population at the current epidemic stage, and a representative number of individuals must also be considered (since the smaller the population, the lower the incidence curve peak latency, for instance).

However, the qualitative evaluation performed with our model indicates determining factors for lockdown effectiveness. Based on the results shown here, we might conclude that: (1) even in ideal lockdown coverage conditions (90%), only periods longer than 5 weeks would be effective to control the epidemic; (2) softer coverages would only be effective if the epidemic has a lower R0, and even so, for relatively longer periods; and (3) in epidemics with R0 relatively low, lockdowns with strong coverage did not flatten the curve, although they significantly delay the peak. In other words, R0 is a determining factor of lockdown characteristics, although lockdown duration is the less dependent factor on virus reproductive number; that is why the priority factor to be included in epidemic containment policies is: lockdown must be relatively long.

On the other hand, paradoxically, softer lockdowns might be preferable in the case of a low reproductive number, which is intuitive: strong lockdowns in epidemics of viruses with low reproductive number might curb infection progression and only delay its incidence peak, and there will be an outbreak with the end of lockdown. Nevertheless, this might be interesting in certain scenarios; for instance, for the health system to prepare to fight outbreaks and at the same time flatten the curve by adopting a hybrid lockdown, initially for 70 days, and then, extended for an equal period in lower intensity.

In Brazil, despite the low lockdown coverage (generally below 50% and never above 60%), the epidemic does not seem to have reached the growth rates of countries of Europe, Europe, and China, with an estimated reproductive number 1.8 lower for over 80% of national territory (Perone, 2020). We know that SARS-CoV2 is especially sensitive to heat (Le Page, 2020), and we are still in the hotter seasons in Brazil, which is unfavorable for the propagation of respiratory infections such as COVID (Kissler et al, 2020; Sun et al, 2020). Therefore, due to climatic and seasonal characteristics of Brazil, it is possible that R0 is lower than that estimated for China, in wintertime. Hence, lockdown duration might be the determining factor for the epidemic, even with low coverage. On the other hand, early release of lockdown might trigger uncontrollable growth of the incidence curve.

At first glance, our results seem to conflict with the Chinese experience of 5 weeks of lockdown to control the pandemic. The determining factor is undoubtedly physical lockdown with maximum restriction of urban mobility. However, there are other important factors in the control of epidemic spread: the correct and general use of homemade masks, per se, reduces the transmission of respiratory viruses by approximately 95 to 99% (Sunjaya e Jenkins, 2020). The Chinese people have experienced respiratory virus outbreaks for decades and it is part of their daily lives to have this self-care behavior, which certainly maximizes the effect of lockdown.

Additionally, mobility is not a parameter in this model. Therefore, we interpreted the decrease in likelihood of infection as "lockdown coverage". In fact, for human beings to be successful in this war against the virus, staying at home is the most important factor, yet it is not enough: creating habits to mitigate transmission must be a priority in people's daily lives during this tragedy. The paradigms predicted by this model might provide guidance in terms of state policies and individual behavior related to these habits.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

Aronson JK, Brassey J, Mahtani KR. "When will it be over?": An introduction to viral reproduction numbers, R0 and Re. Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine WebSite, Oxford University. April, 14, 2020. https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/when-will-it-be-over-an-introduction-to-viral-reproduction-numbers-r0-and-re/, acessed at April, 24, 2020.

Chen Shen and Yaneer Bar-Yam, Why a 5-week lockdown can stop COVID-19, New England Complex Systems Institute (March 24, 2020). In: https://necsi.edu/why-a-5-week-lockdown-can-stop-covid-19, accessed at April, 26, 2020.

Bulut C, Kato Y. Epidemiology of COVID-19. Turk J Med Sci. 2020 Apr 21;50(SI-1):563-570. doi: 10.3906/sag-2004-172.

Cevik, M., Bamford, C., & Ho, A. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic – A focused review for clinicians. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.04.023

Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. Acta Biomed. 2020 Mar 19;91(1):157-160.

Haykin S. Neural Networks: a comprehensive foundation. Saddle River : Prentice Hall, 1994. 768p.

Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Lipsitch M, Grad Y. Social distancing strategies for curbing the COVID-19 epidemic. MedRXiv, 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.22.20041079.

Le Page M. Will heat kill the coronavirus? New Sci. 2020 Feb 22;245(3270):6-7

Ma, J., Dushoff, J., Bolker, B. M., & Earn, D. J. D. (2013). Estimating Initial Epidemic Growth Rates. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology, 76(1), 245–260.

Perone CS. 01/May – COVID-19 Time varying reproduction numbers estimation for Brazil. Covid Analysis Repository At: https://perone.github.io/covid19analysis/brazil_r0.html. Accessed at May, 1st 2020.

Rothan HA, Byrareddy SN. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. J Autoimmun. 2020; 109:102433

Sanche S, Lin YT, Xu C, Romero-Severson E, Hengartner N, Ke R. High Contagiousness and Rapid Spread of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Apr 7;26(7). doi: 10.3201/eid2607.200282.

Sun Z, Thilakavathy K, Kumar SS, He G, Liu SV. Potential Factors Influencing Repeated SARS Outbreaks in China. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020 Mar 3;17(5). pii: E1633. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17051633.

Sunjaya, A. P., & Jenkins, C. (2020). Rationale for universal face masks in public against COVID - 19. Respirology. doi:10.1111/resp.13834

Wibbens, Phebo D. and Koo, Wesley and McGahan, Anita M., How Many More Days of Social Distancing Before Community Transmission is Controlled? A Hierarchical Bayesian Model of COVID-19 by Jurisdiction (April 17, 2020). INSEAD Working Paper No. 2020/21/STR. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3578529 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3578529

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. Lancet. 2020 Feb 29;395(10225):689-697. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30260-9. Epub 2020 Jan 31.

Zhao, S., & Chen, H. (2020). Modeling the epidemic dynamics and control of COVID-19 outbreak in China. Quantitative Biology. doi:10.1007/s40484-020-0199-0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

Table 01 – descriptive statistics regarding R0 values groups (n=30).

	R0 = 2.7			**R0 = 5.7**		
Scenario	**median**	**p5**	**p95**	**median**	**p5**	**p95**
No Ld,kt=21-amp'	558	535	582	887	869	916
No Ld,kt=21-lat'	42	38	48	27	25	29
No Ld,kt=21-ene'	9076	9056	9087	9902	9893	9913
kr=90%,kt=21-amp'	556	1	568	884	860	915
kr=90%,kt=35-amp'	554	1	580	853	808	881
kr=90%,kt=70-amp'	535	1	573	356	337	368
kr=90%,kt=140-amp'	478	1	547	356	341	368
kr=90%,kt=21-lat'	60	10	69	40	37	43
kr=90%,kt=35-lat'	73	10	83	48	46	50
kr=90%,kt=70-lat'	100	10	109	53	50	59
kr=90%,kt=140-lat'	167	10	180	53	50	59
kr=90%,kt=21-ene'	9076	4	9089	9901	9892	9911
kr=90%,kt=35-ene'	9071	4	9087	9894	9870	9907
kr=90%,kt=70-ene'	9042	4	9084	8803	8645	9125
kr=90%,kt=140-ene'	8937	4	9052	7744	7738	7748
kr=50%,kt=21-amp'	558	1	577	872	839	917
kr=50%,kt=35-amp'	540	1	573	783	747	793
kr=50%,kt=70-amp'	291	1	308	780	760	799
kr=50%,kt=140-amp'	292	1	310	776	754	817
kr=50%,kt=21-lat'	50	13	57	32	30	33
kr=50%,kt=35-lat'	55	13	62	33	31	34
kr=50%,kt=70-lat'	57	13	76	33	31	35
kr=50%,kt=140-lat'	59	13	70	33	31	35
kr=50%,kt=21-ene'	9077	4	9088	9899	9885	9905
kr=50%,kt=35-ene'	9062	4	9083	9662	9557	9715
kr=50%,kt=70-ene'	7785	4	8498	9701	9687	9708
kr=50%,kt=140-ene'	7234	4	7241	9699	9688	9708
kr=25%,kt=21-amp'	553	1	584	870	842	892
kr=25%,kt=35-amp'	533	1	567	840	819	870
kr=25%,kt=70-amp'	335	1	357	841	807	875
kr=25%,kt=140-amp'	337	1	347	836	814	873
kr=25%,kt=21-lat'	48	13	57	30	28	32
kr=25%,kt=35-lat'	53	13	60	31	28	32
kr=25%,kt=70-lat'	56	13	66	30	28	32
kr=25%,kt=140-lat'	56	13	65	30	28	33
kr=25%,kt=21-ene'	9078	4	9090	9895	9887	9904
kr=25%,kt=35-ene'	9052	4	9086	9675	9645	9694
kr=25%,kt=70-ene'	7860	4	8312	9852	9841	9858
kr=25%,kt=140-ene'	7695	4	7715	9852	9838	9859

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090712; 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 4.0 International license .

Abbreviations: p5 = percentil 5%, p95 = percentil 95%, kr = lockdown coverage (%), kt = lockdown period (in days), amp = peak amplitude, lat = peak latency, ene = total of infected subjects. Flatten curves are in yellow.