Two alternative scenarios for easing COVID-19 lockdown measures: one reasonable and one catastrophic

A.S. Fokas,[1,2] J. Cuevas-Maraver,[3,*] and P. G. Kevrekidis[4,5]

[1]*Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, U.K.*
[2]*Department of Civil and Environment Engineering, University of Southern California, 90089, Los Angeles, Ca, USA*
[3]*Grupo de Física No Lineal, Departamento de Física Aplicada I, Universidad de Sevilla. Escuela Politécnica Superior, C/ Virgen de África, 7, 41011-Sevilla, Spain*
Instituto de Matemáticas de la Universidad de Sevilla (IMUS). Edificio Celestino Mutis. Avda. Reina Mercedes s/n, 41012-Sevilla, Spain
[4]*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003-4515, USA*
[5]*Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK*

(Dated: May 28, 2020)

Guided by a rigorous mathematical result, we have recently introduced a numerical algorithm, which using as input the cumulative number of deaths caused by COVID-19, computes the number of deaths following the easing of lockdown conditions. Here, after applying this algorithm to data from Greece, we concentrated on two subpopulations, namely, those consisting of individuals below and above 40 years of age. By supplementing the Greek data for deaths with the data for the number of individuals reported to be infected by SARS-CoV-2, we estimated the effect on deaths and infections in the case that the easing of the lockdown measures is different for these two subpopulations. We found that if the lockdown measures are eased only for the young subpopulation, then the effect on deaths and infections is small; however, if the easing is substantial for the older population, this effect may be catastrophic.

* Email: jcuevas@us.es

I. INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

SARS-CoV-2, the causative virus of the current pandemic, has 75-80% identical viral genome sequence with the coronaviruses (MERS)-CoV and SARS-CoV [1]. Fortunately, it has lower mortality rates than these two viruses which caused outbreaks in 2012 and 2002 [2]. However, SARS-CoV-2 is highly contagious. Perhaps the increased transmissivity of SARS-CoV-2 is due to its dual receptor attachment in the host cells: it has been shown that the attachment of SARS-CoV-2 to the surface of respiratory cells is mediated by certain viral proteins which bind not only to the angiotensin converting enzyme-2 (ACE-2) receptor [3], but also bind to sialic acid containing glycoproteins and gangliosides that reside on cell surfaces [4] (this is to be contrasted with SARS-CoV that binds only to ACE-2 receptors [3–5]). As a result of this high transmissivity, as well as of the delay of the international community to take appropriate preventive measures, SARS-CoV-2 has caused a pandemic, which represents the most serious global public health threat since the devastating 1918 H1N1 influenza pandemic that killed approximately 50 million people (in proportion to today's population, this would correspond to about 200 million people).

In order to combat this threat, several countries used justifiably draconian measures which culminated to a complete lockdown. As a result of these measures, the number of the total persons infected by SARS-CoV-2, in China, South Korea, many European countries, USA, and several other countries, has now passed the inflection point, namely the point where the rate of infected individuals reaches its maximum. For the above countries, the curve depicting the number of deaths as a function of time is also past the inflection point. Predictions for the time that a plateau will be attained (defined as the time when the rate of deaths is 5% of the maximum rate) as well as the corresponding number of total deaths at that time, have been presented, e.g., in [6] (similar results regarding reported infections are presented in [7]). In addition to these works, it should be noted that there is a wide effort under way to use epidemiological models stemming from different (deterministic, as well as probabilistic) variations of the broad SIR class of models to capture different countries [8–11], and states or provinces [12–16]. These are only a few examples of an ever expanding volume of literature of well above 5000 papers within the past 5 months alone, in arXiv, medRxiv and bioRxiv.

Following the expected decline of the 'first wave' of infections, it is now contemplated that the lockdown measures will be eased. The importance of easing the lockdown measures differently, depending on the age of individuals, is argued in [17]. This appears vital, not only for economical but also for health considerations. Indeed, the psychological impact on the population at large of the current situations is substantial [18]; furthermore, it is expected to worsen, especially due to the effect of the post-traumatic disorder.

It is obvious that the scientific community should play a crucial role for assisting the policy makers to design an optimal exit strategy. Naturally, the best possible scenario would be the discovery of a safe and effective vaccine; however, it appears that this will not be achieved for at least several months. The second optimal solution would be the discovery of effective pharmacological interventions. In this direction unprecedented efforts are underway, including the use of old or new medications as well as the employment of specific monoclonal antibodies. For example, there are ongoing clinical trials testing the synthetic protein tocilizumab that binds interleukin-6 (often used in rheumatoid arthritis), as well as the infusion of COVID-19 convalescent plasma [19]. Unfortunately, the combination of the anti-viral medications lopinavir and ritonavir that are effective against the human immunodeficiency virus has not shown to be beneficial [20]; similarly, the combination of the anti-malarial medication hydroxychloroquine and the antibiotic azithromycin, is not only ineffective but can be harmful [21]. Also, taking into consideration that the complement pathway is an integral component of the innate immune response to viruses, and that complement deposits are abundant in the lung biopsies from COVID-19 patients indicating that this system is overacting [22], it has been suggested that anti-complement therapies may be beneficial to COVID-19 patients. It has been shown [22] that the activation of various components of the complement system exacerbate the acute respiratory distress syndrome disease associated to COVID-19. The Federal Drug Administration of USA has granted a conditional approval to the anti-viral medication Remdesivir [23]. Yet, definitive results (including ones on side-effects) will not be available on time to be especially relevant for this first wave of the pandemic. From the above discussion it becomes clear that the lockdown measures must be eased without the benefit of substantial pharmacological cover against the multitude of the possible ways that COVID-19 can attack the human body [24]. Thus, designing an optimal exit strategy is indeed a matter of life or death.

In a separate work [25], we have introduced a mathematically rigorous and computationally tractable approach that can provide the basis for a qualitative analysis of the effect of easing the lockdown measures. The starting point of this methodology is a SIR type model [26] consisting of 6 ordinary differential equations (ODEs) uniquely specified in terms of the population T of a given country (or region) and 9 constant parameters. One of these parameters, denoted by c, is particularly important for the analysis of the effect of easing the lockdown conditions, because it is proportional to the number of contacts between asymptomatic individuals that are infected by COVID-19 and susceptible ones. Easing the lockdown corresponds to multiplying c by a number ζ, such as $\zeta = 2$, or 3, i.e., increasing the number of contacts. The rigorous foundation of the methodology is provided by the proof of a mathematical result stating that the knowledge of 5 specific combinations of the 9 model-parameters, is a necessary and sufficient condition for the determination of a 4th order ODE determining the time evolution of the number of deaths arising within the model. This mathematical result, in turn, motivates the following algorithm: starting with the death data during the lockdown period, we compute uniquely the 5 combinations of the 9 model-parameters that most closely (in numerical terms) satisfy the 4th order ODE determining the evolution of the number of deaths. The parameter c enters in one of

these combinations, and appears in a homogeneous manner; thus, replacing c by ζc results in replacing the relevant combination by ζ times its original value. Then, using this combination and the remaining 4 combinations determined from the death data, we solve the resulting 4th order ODE. This leads to the prediction of the number of deaths in the post-lockdown period within the realm of the model.

Here, we applied the above algorithm to the case of the COVID-19 epidemic in Greece. However, the novelty and the main interest of the present work consists of the analysis of two subpopulations. This situation is described by 12 ODEs involving 18 parameters (details are discussed in the Methods section). In particular, we consider two possible scenarios for data stemming from the case of Greece: in the first, we envision that the interactions between older persons, namely persons above 40 years of age, as well as between older and young persons, namely those below 40, continue to be dictated by the current strict lockdown conditions; however, for the interaction among the young, the lockdown measures are substantially eased. In the second case, the lockdown measures are substantially eased for all interactions without distinguishing the older from the young.

In principle, the effect on deaths in the above scenarios could be analyzed by the extension of the rigorous results of [25]. However, due to the sparsity of the deaths data (especially for the younger population), this approach is practically not possible at present. Thus, in this case we supplemented the data for deaths for the two subpopulations with data for the cumulative numbers of reported infected. Using these 4 sets of data we find that these two alternatives have very different outcomes: in the first case, the total number of deaths of the two sub-populations and the number of total infections is relatively small; in the second case, these numbers are prohibitively high. Specifically, in the case of Greece, in the unrealistic scenario that the lockdown continues indefinitely, our analysis suggests that the total numbers of deaths and infections will finally be around 165 and 2550, respectively (the comparison of this prediction with different aspects of both the model and the official data will be discussed in the Methods Section). These numbers remain essentially the same even if the lockdown measures for the interaction between the young people are eased substantially, provided that the interactions of older-older and older-young observe the current lockdown conditions. For example, even if the parameter measuring the effect of the lockdown restrictions on the young-young interactions is increased fourfold, the number of deaths and infections are (according to the model extrapolation) 184 and 3585, respectively. On the other hand, even if the parameters characterizing all three interactions are increased only threefold, the relevant numbers are 48144 and 1283462. It is clear that the latter numbers are prohibitive, suggesting that a generic release of the lockdown may be catastrophic.

As a complement to the above results, we have also used the methodology of [25], which requires only data for deaths but for a single population (without partition to young and older). In that case, we find that the number of total deaths would be 158 for $\zeta = 1$, and when $\zeta = 2$ (implying that the contacts of the entire, single population double) the number of deaths would only slightly increase to 167; these values can be compared with the two-subpopulation results in Table II of the present paper, with both approaches yielding a limited growth in the number of deaths for $\zeta = 2$. However, changing ζ to 3 has a dramatic impact for the whole population, as in that case, the number of deaths is drastically increased to 18474. Each of these models has its own assumptions (e.g., the model of [25] enjoys the mathematically rigorous uniqueness properties of its parametric set but does not bear the more refined modeling layer of the present two-populations model and of their distinct properties and interactions). Yet, the key message is uniform across the models, namely that a generic doubling of c for the full population is safe, while a tripling thereof can be catastrophic.

In our view, the explanations provided in the Methods Section for the assumptions of our model, which show that these assumptions are typical in the standard epidemiological models, substantiate the qualitative conclusions (and notes of caution) regarding the impact of different types of exit policies. This may provide a sense of how a partial restoration of regular life activities can be achieved without catastrophic consequences, while the race for pharmacological or vaccine-based interventions that will lead to an end of the current pandemic is still ongoing. Importantly, we also offer some caveats emphasizing the qualitative nature of our conclusions and possible factors that may (additionally) affect the actual outcome of the release measures.

II. RESULTS

A. Model Setup: Single Population vs. Two Age Groups

We divide the population in two subpopulations, the young (y) and the older (o). In order to explain the basic assumptions of our model we first consider a single population, and then discuss the needed modifications in our case which involves two subpopulations.

Let $I(t)$ denote the infected (but not infectious) population. An individual in this population, after a median 4-day period (required for incubation [27]) will either become sick or will be asymptomatic; an interval of 3-10 days captures 98% of the cases. The sick and asymptomatic populations will be denoted, respectively, by $S(t)$ and $A(t)$. The rate at which an infected person becomes asymptomatic is denoted by a; this means that each day $aA(t)$ persons leave the infected population and enter the asymptomatic population. Similarly, each day $sS(t)$ leave the infected population and enter the sick population. These processes, as well as the subsequent movements are depicted in the flowchart of Fig. 1.

The asymptomatic individuals recover with a rate r_1, i.e., each day $r_1 A(t)$ leave the asymptomatic population and enter the



FIG. 1: Flowchart of the populations considered in the model and the rates of transformation between them. The corresponding dynamical equations are Eqs. (1)–(6).

recovered population, which is denoted by $R(t)$. The sick individuals either recover with a rate r_2 or they become hospitalized, $H(t)$, with a rate h. In turn, the hospitalized patients also have two possible destinations; either they recover with a rate r_3, or they become deceased, $D(t)$, with a rate d.

It is straightforward to write the above statements in the language of mathematics; this gives rise to the equations (1)–(5) presented in the Materials & Methods section. It is noted that our model is inspired by various expanded versions of the classic SIR model adapted to the particularities of COVID-19 (such as the key role of the asymptomatically infected). It is, in particular, inspired by, yet not identical with that of [14]. In order to complete the system of equations (1)–(6), it is necessary to describe the mechanism via which a person can become infected. For this purpose we adopt the standard assumptions made in the typical epidemiological models, such as the SIR (susceptible, infected, recovered) model: let T denote the total population and let c characterize the number of contacts per day made by an individual with the capacity to infect (c is thought of as being normalized by T). Such a person belongs to S, A or H. However, for simplicity we assume that the hospitalized population *cannot* infect; this assumption is based on two considerations: first, the strict protective measures taken at the hospital, and second, the fact that hospitalized patients are infectious only for part of their stay in the hospital. The latter fact is a consequence of the relevant time scales of virus shedding in comparison to the time to hospitalization and the duration of hospital stay. The asymptomatic individuals are (more) free to interact with others, whereas the (self-isolating) sick persons are not. Thus, we use c to characterize the contacts of the asymptomatic persons and b to indicate the different infectiousness (due to reduced contacts/self-isolation) of the sick in comparison to the asymptomatic individuals.

The number of people available to be infected is $T-(I+S+A+H+R+D)$. Indeed, the susceptible individuals consist of the total population minus all the individuals that are going or have gone through the course of some phase of infection, namely they either bear the infection at present ($I+A+S+H$) or have died from COVID-19 (D) or are assumed to have developed immunity to COVID-19 due to recovery (R). Hence, if we call the total initial individuals T, this susceptible population is given by the expression written earlier. The rate by which each day individuals enter I is given by the product of the above expression with $c(A+bS)$. At the same time, as discussed earlier, every day $(a+s)I$ persons leave the infected population. The mathematical description of this statement gives rise to the equation (6) of the Materials & Methods Section.

It is straightforward to modify the above model so that it can describe the dynamics of the older and young subpopulations. Each subpopulation satisfies the same set of equations as those described above, except for the last equation which is modified as follows: the people available to be infected in each subpopulation are described by the expression given above where T, I, S, A, H, R, D have the superscripts ^{o} or ^{y}, denoting older and young, respectively; $A+bS$ is replaced in both cases by $A^o+A^y+b(S^o+S^y)$ where for simplicity we have assumed that the infectiousness of the older and the young is the same. We have already considered the implications of the generalisation of the above model by allowing different parameters to describe the interaction of the older and young populations; this will be discussed in the Materials & Methods. In what follows, we will discuss the results of this simpler "isotropic" interaction model.

B. Two-age model in the case of Greece

The parameters of the model are given in the flowchart of Fig. 1. Naturally, for the two-age model considered below, there is one set of such parameters associated with the young population and one associated with the older one. The optimization routine used for the identification of these parameters is explained in detail in the Materials & Methods Section. The parameters resulting from this optimization for each of the two populations are given in Table I. Clearly, many of these parameters are larger

Parameter	Optimal value
b	0.2936
c	7.4941×10^{-9}
a^y	0.2715
s^y	0.0751
a^o	0.2437
s^o	0.0846
r_1^y	0.1360
r_2^y	0.1526
r_3^y	0.1094
r_1^o	0.1343
r_2^o	0.2668
r_3^o	0.0801
h^y	0.0173
d^y	0.0017
h^o	0.3120
d^o	0.0103

TABLE I: Optimized (Isotropic) Model Parameters (see Materials & Methods Section).

for the older population in comparison to the young, leading to a larger number of both infections and deaths in the older than in the young population.

Support for the validity of our model is presented in Fig. 2, which depicts its comparison (using the above optimized parameters) with the available data. The situation corresponding to the unrealistic assumption that the lockdown conditions presently in place continue indefinitely, is the one illustrated in Fig. 2. In this case, the number of deaths and cumulative infections rapidly reaches a plateau, indicating the elimination of the infection. Here, we have optimized the model on the basis of data used from Greece [34] between April 3rd and May 4th. A small but not irrelevant point here is that daily updates occur at 3pm for the country of Greece, hence it is not clear up to what time the data are collected that are included in the daily report. We have assumed that the data reflect the infections and deaths present on that particular day. This possibly shifts the starting point of our count by a few hours, but should not change the overall result trends.

We next explain the implications of the model when different scenarios of 'exit' from the lockdown state are institutionalized. The relevant results are illustrated in Figs. 3-4 and the essential conclusions are summarized in Table II for the numbers of deaths and cumulative infections, respectively. First, we need to explain the meaning of the parameter ζ appearing in the above tables: this parameter reflects the magnitude of the easing of the lock down restrictions. Indeed, since the main effect of the lessening of these restrictions is that the number of contacts increases, we model the effect of easing the lockdown restrictions by multiplying the parameter c with a factor that we refer to as ζ. The complete lockdown situation corresponds to ζ=1; the larger the value of ζ, the lesser the restrictions imposed on the population. By employing the above quantitative measure of easing the lockdown restrictions, we consider in detail two distinct scenarios. In the first, which corresponds to the top rows of the Figures 3 and 4, and the third row of Fig. 4 we only allow the number of contacts of "young individuals with young individuals" (corresponding to the parameter c^{yy} mentioned in the Methods Section) to be multiplied by the factor ζ. This means that the lockdown measures are eased only with respect to the interaction of young individuals with other young individuals, while the interactions of the young individuals with the older ones, as well as the interactions among older individuals remain in the lockdown state. In the second scenario, corresponding to the bottom rows of the Figures 3 and 4, and the second row of Fig. 4, the restrictions of the lockdown are simultaneously eased in both the young and the older population; in this case all contacts are increased by the factor ζ. It is noted that while we change c by this factor, we maintain the product cb at its previous value (i.e., we concurrently transform $c \to \zeta c$ and $b \to b/\zeta$) considering that the sick still operate under self-isolation conditions and thus do not accordingly increase their number of contacts.

Fig. 3 corresponds to the case where the parameter ζ associated with the number of contacts between susceptible and asymptomatic individuals *doubles*. In this case, as also shown in Table II, the situation does not worsen in a dramatic way. In particular, the number of deaths increases by 1, whereas the cumulative infections only increase by the small number of 58. In the second scenario where the number of contacts is doubled for both the young and the older populations, we find slightly larger (but not totally catastrophic) effects: the number of deceased individuals increases by 58 and the total number of infections grows by 1550.

The situation becomes far more dire when the number of contacts is multiplied by a factor of 3 for both the young and older populations, meaning that the lockdown restrictions are eased significantly for the entire population. As shown in Table II and

	Deaths		Cumulative infections	
ζ	Y Only Release	Y+O Release	Y Only Release	Y+O Release
1	164	164	2564	2564
2	165	222	2622	4114
3	167	48144	2762	1283462
4	184	72180	3585	1925122
5	6044	83274	306219	2221296

TABLE II: Deaths $D(t)$ and Cumulative infections $C(t)$ in the case of enhancement of the number of contacts by ζ. The second and fourth columns refer to the case for which the lockdown measures are eased for the young population, whereas the third and fifth column refer to the one where this occurs for both the young and older populations.



FIG. 2: Evolution of the current situation of deaths $D(t)$ (left) and cumulative infections $C(t)$ (right) in Greece, under the unrealistic assumption of the indefinite continuation of lockdown conditions. In this and all the figures that follow, the blue curve corresponds to the young population, while the red curve to the older population. The data for Greece from the 3rd of April to the 4th of May 2020 are depicted by dots. For the latter, alternate colors have been used (i.e., blue dots for the older population and red for the younger for clearer visualization).

in Fig. 4, if the c's of the young population only are multiplied by a factor of 3, then the deaths are increased by 3 and the infections by 198 (top row of the Figure and 3rd row of the Tables). This pales by comparison to the dramatic scenario when the c's associated with both the young and older sub-populations are multiplied by 3; in this case, the number of deaths jumps dramatically to 48144, while the number of infections is a staggering 1283462, growing by about 500 times.

A final example corroborating the above qualitative trend can be found in Fig. 4 (the third row shows the effect of easing the restrictions only for the young population and the bottom row shows the effect when restrictions are eased for both the young and older populations) and in the 5th row of Table II. Here, even the effect of releasing the young population leads to very substantial increases, namely to 6044 deaths and 306219 infections although of course it is nowhere near to the scenarios of releasing both young and older populations. In the second scenario, the numbers are absolutely daunting: using the parameters of Table I we find that the number of deaths jumps to 83274 and the number of cumulative infections to 2221296.

In light of the above results, the significance of preserving the lockdown of the sensitive groups of the older population is naturally emerging. It can be seen that in the case where the number of contacts is roughly doubled, the behavior of release of young or young and older individuals is not dramatic (although even in that case release of the young only is, of course, preferable). Nevertheless, a more substantial release of the young population is still not catastrophic. On the contrary, the higher rates of infection, hospitalization and proneness to death of senior individuals may bring about highly undesirable consequences, should both the young and older members of the population be allowed to significantly increase (by 3 times or more) their number of contacts.



FIG. 3: Again the Deaths $D(t)$ and the cumulative infections $C(t)$ are given for the case where the c factor (characterizing the number of contacts) amongst young individuals is doubled, but those of the older individuals (and of the young-older interaction) are kept fixed. This is shown in the top panels. In the bottom panels, the c's of both young and old individuals are doubled.

III. DISCUSSION

The above results are both encouraging and at the same time raise the possibility of a potential disaster. The encouraging results are twofold: (i) If the number of contacts in the population at large is roughly doubled in comparison to the fully lockdown situation, the number of deaths and infections increases only slightly. (ii) If the older population continues to observe the conditions of the lockdown, but the young people are allowed to interact among themselves relatively freely, the number of deaths and of infected persons remains relatively small.

The first result above suggests that a mild modification of the lockdown restrictions (where the number of contacts doubles) is relatively safe, irrespectively of whether this process is applied to the young members of the population (top rows of Fig. 3) or both to the young and the older persons (bottom rows of Fig. 3). The fact that $\zeta = 2$ gives rise to a stable situation is consistent with the following considerations: mathematically, the notion of stability is usually formulated in terms of the concept of the so-called "dominant eigenvalue". For our case, by computing this eigenvalue for the *healthy state* (where no individuals are at any stage of sickness, symptomatic or asymptomatic), we find that the transition between stability and instability occurs if the dominant eigenvalue vanishes and this corresponds to a scenario where c equals 2.0923 times the value of c corresponding to the lockdown conditions. In epidemiological language, this corresponds to the scenario of $R_0 = 1$. Thus, the transition from stability to instability occurs between doubling and tripling of all contacts. Indeed, in this case, the analysis of the model provides a warning of a possible disaster: if the number of contacts of the older population increases threefold, either among themselves or with the young population, the increase of deaths and of the number of infected persons is dramatic. On the other hand, if we only release the young population, the critical value of the corresponding c^{yy} is 3.3848 larger than the one corresponding to lockdown conditions, so it is safe to allow the young population to even triple its contacts. Moreover, we have seen that even



FIG. 4: Same as reported in Fig. 3 but now where the contacts are tripled or multiplied by 5.

increasing that number of contacts by a factor of 4 does not have catastrophic consequences. More dire is the situation when the relevant factor is 5 but even then it leads to a far less significant effect than, e.g., allowing both the young and the older population to triple their contacts. A relevant, suggestive comparison to perhaps add here (yet not in any way a "definitive" one) is that in a recent, ongoing study by some of the authors in a single-age population model including both data prior to quarantine

("normal conditions") and ones post-quarantine, the relevant ratio of ζ between the two was found to be between 3 and 4 [28]. This suggests that in that single-age model an increase of the contacts by such a factor is proximal to a return to pre-quarantine conditions for the cases of Greece and Andalusia considered therein.

An important potential weakness of our results lies in the possible discrepancy between the function C(t) of the total number of (truly) 'infected' individuals calculated in our model, and the number of 'reported infected' provided in the Greek data. Since the latter number is likely to be smaller than the actual number of infected individuals we have repeated the above considerations using a "virtual time series" formed by magnifying the actual data by a factor, e.g., of 2; it is encouraging for the validity of our conclusions that in this case there was qualitative agreement with the trends discussed above obtained using the available data.

What are the implications of the above results for policy makers? In this connection, it is important to remark that a definitive connection of the parameter of interest (ζ) with non-pharmacological practices such as proper hygiene, wearing gloves and a face-covering mask, social distancing, etc. is presently lacking. As a relevant note of caution, we highlight that c does not solely depend on contacts but also on the probability of infection given a contact which is proportional to the viral load (i.e., the viral concentration in the respiratory-tract fluid) of expelled respiratory droplets [29]. Clearly, the above additional protective measures reduce the viral load and therefore c. A more systematic experimental determination of the role of such protective measures in the presently modified reality of inter-personal contacts would thus be important towards further assessing safe thresholds of contact increase. Moreover, as we are moving past the early phase of this first wave of the pandemic, there are significant mitigating factors that may affect how things play out. A key such factor can be the heat and humidity especially in the northern hemisphere which holds dramatically the lion's share in terms of COVID-19 infections and deaths. A remarkable associated report is that of [30] suggesting that over 96% of cases and 98% of deaths were from northern hemisphere. Indeed, this was also before the dramatic increase of the numbers in the USA, which is at the moment the worst hit country world-wide.

Nevertheless, the standing connection of c within SIR models [26] with the number of contacts per unit time (and in our case, per population unit) suggests that policy makers should *strongly recommend that people above 40 years of age continue to observe all above measures as strictly as it was done during the full lockdown period*. At the same time, it appears that the young require less protection. By implementing the above recommendations, it may be possible to allow the society and of course the economy to begin functioning, and at the same time to avoid a humanitarian disaster. Consider for example the case of primary schools; members of the teaching stuff younger that 40 years of age could perhaps function normally. On the other hand, members older than 40 years of age would be best served by adhering to lockdown restrictions. Similarly, if the parents of the children are younger than 40, they can perhaps function normally; however, if they are older that 40, they should continue to observe lockdown restrictions. Moreover, as is self-evident, individuals with medical conditions that place them in high risk, should also follow the stricter measure recommendations applicable to the older population.

Further studies are needed to delineate better the risks associated with different age groups. The results presented here should be considered only as indicative, broad guidelines. Indeed, when reaching the above conclusions, we used the partition of data available in the country of Greece. It is conceivable that the results would not dramatically change if a partition of COVID-19 patients was available for infections and deaths under vs. over the age of 50. Nevertheless, the above analysis should serve as a note of caution that for people over the age of 40 a *substantial* additional degree of caution is needed. We believe that further studies with natural generalizations of the model to a larger number of age groups would be particularly valuable in that regard.

Although in this work we have concentrated on Greece, we expect that similar conclusions are also valid for other countries. Actually, taking into consideration that the numbers of deaths and of infected individuals are quite low in Greece in comparison with other countries, it follows that the need for considering the above recommendations is even more crucial in these countries. At the same time, the availability of data that would allow the broader applicability of this type of modeling would be of paramount importance in evaluating the course of the pandemic (the corresponding critical value of c etc.) in different locations and under different population distributions, climate/weather conditions etc.

In this work the primary composite end point was the number of deaths and the number of infected individuals. A more detailed analysis should examine the number of patients admitted in the intensive care unit, as well as several other consequences of a COVID-19 infection (including, ideally, age-resolved time series for the evolution of hospitalizations and recovered individuals). For example, it is well known that many viral infections can cause a variety of post-viral illnesses, including many neurological conditions, such as the Guillain–Barré syndromes (which comprise a spectrum of polyneuropathies; surprisingly, in the case of COVID-19 such neurological syndromes were not reported until very recently. However, [31, 32] summarizes the documentation of 11 cases of Guillain–Barré syndromes, and warns that other devastating post-viral neurological conditions are also expected to be associated with COVID-19). The possibility of these devastating conditions implies that the recommendations suggested in this work may also bear a broader impact, in connection to such effects.

IV. MATERIALS & METHODS

A. The Model Equations

The relevant equations of the model read (using the notation developed in Section 2):

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = aI - r_1 A \tag{1}$$
$$\frac{dS}{dt} = sI - (h + r_2)S \tag{2}$$
$$\frac{dH}{dt} = hS - (r_3 + d)H \tag{3}$$
$$\frac{dR}{dt} = r_1 A + r_2 S + r_3 H \tag{4}$$
$$\frac{dD}{dt} = dH \tag{5}$$
$$\frac{dI}{dt} = c\left[T - (I + S + A + H + R + D)\right](A + bS) - (a + s)I \tag{6}$$

For our model we assume that *each* of the two sub- populations has its own individual characteristics, $(a^y, s^y, r^y_{1,2,3}, h^y, d^y)$ and correspondingly $(a^o, s^o, r^o_{1,2,3}, h^o, d^o)$. We assume that this is the only way in which the two populations differ. Of course, we identify the dependent variables as pertaining to each of the two populations, i.e., we split the population into $(T^y, I^y, A^y, S^y, H^y, R^y, D^y)$ and correspondingly $(T^o, I^o, A^o, S^o, H^o, R^o, D^o)$. Then, each of the equations (1)-(5) remains identical as before with the exception that each term in them carries a superscript ^{y} or ^{o} depending on whether they refer to the young or older population. To avoid cluttering the work with equations, we do not rewrite these equations here.

Instead, we focus on writing the one distinguishing equation, namely the equation for the infected, because there an additional key assumption needs to be discussed. We now have two equations for the infected pertaining to the two populations:

$$\frac{dI^y}{dt} = c\left[T^y - (I^y + S^y + A^y + H^y + R^y + D^y)\right](A^o + A^y + b(S^o + S^y)) - (a^y + s^y)I^y \tag{7}$$
$$\frac{dI^o}{dt} = c\left[T^o - (I^o + S^o + A^o + H^o + R^o + D^o)\right](A^o + A^y + b(S^o + S^y)) - (a^o + s^o)I^o \tag{8}$$

With these equations we have a full dynamical system for the young and older populations. Implicit, however, within this dynamical system is the following modeling assumption: in Eqs. (7)-(8), we have assumed a *single* prefactor c and a single coefficient b. This assumes that young infectious agents $(A^y + bS^y)$ interact with a young susceptible person (first bracket in Eq. (7)) in *exactly the same way* that older infectious agents $(A^o + bS^o)$ interact with a young susceptible person. Since it is not clear that this is indeed the case, in a generalized form of the model, one could assume a factor $c^{yy}(A^y + b^{yy}S^y)$ for the contact interaction of a young with a young and similarly a different factor $c^{yo}(A^o + b^{yo}S^o)$ for the interaction of an older infectious individual (given by this expression) with a young susceptible one. Similarly in this setting, Eq. (8) would include a different mode of interaction between young infectious agents and older susceptibles (proportional to $c^{oy}(A^y + b^{oy}S^y)$), and between older infectious agents and older susceptibles (proportional to $c^{oo}(A^o + b^{oo}S^o)$). We have analyzed this generalized model, which we have called anisotropic. Actually, we obtained slightly better fits for the numbers of infections and deaths using this model. Nevertheless, we opted against showing the results of the latter computations regarding the effect of varying ζ. The reason for this decision is that several more parameters are needed for the specification of the anisotropic model; these parameters characterize the ^{yy}, ^{yo}, ^{oy} and ^{oo} interactions (i.e., 4 pairs of (b, c) parameters instead of 1). This enlarges significantly the space of possible fitting parameters; actually, in this case we have observed the existence of multiple possible local minima (although distinct, these minima yield similarly adequate fitting results). A mathematical formulation of this issue is associated with the notion of identifiability of parameters in such SIR type models [33]. Hence, despite the potential slight improvement of the anisotropic model towards capturing the available data, we feel that the simpler model still provides a quite accurate picture of the impact of the different easing of lockdown strategies.

In the subsection below, we explain how to fit the different parameters of the model of Eqs. (1)-(5) (for both the young and the older sub-populations), as well as (7)-(8), in line with the discussion above regarding the simpler versus the anisotropic model.

B. The Optimization Routine

In what follows, we explain the method for obtaining the optimized parameters of the model and also discuss simulation results for the case of Greece. In order to seek the optimized parameters, we look for the constrained minimization (by means of the Matlab function `fmincon`) of the norm

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_i \Big(|\log(C^y(t_i)) - \log(C^y_{\rm data}(t_i))| + |\log(C^o(t_i)) - \log(C^o_{\rm data}(t_i))| + \\ |\log(D^y(t_i)) - \log(D^y_{\rm data}(t_i))| + |\log(D^o(t_i)) - \log(D^o_{\rm data}(t_i))| \Big) \tag{9}$$

with $C(t)$ being the cumulative infections. This cumulative number of reported infections consists of all the people that have passed some symptomatic form of the infection. In this connection we distinguish between the individuals who recovered from the asymptomatic state R_A, and those that eventually recovered stemming from the sick population, R_S; the total number of recovered individuals is $R = R_A + R_S$. The cumulative number of *reported* infected persons is given by $C(t) = S(t) + H(t) + R_S(t) + D(t)$. It is this number of cumulative infections computed from the model that we compare to the corresponding number in the official data.

The variable without subscript corresponds to the result obtained from integrating the model equations whereas the subscript *data* refers to the observed data; both variables are tracked at times t_i (that is, every day). The relevant data were obtained from [34]. It is worth highlighting that unfortunately we were not able to obtain relevant data in a ready-to-use format for research purposes (despite our formal request), such as in the form of a spreadsheet. Thus, we had to assemble the relevant data point-by-point from the corresponding daily reports. Hopefully, this will be amended in the near future and will accordingly facilitate relevant future research. Moreover, as indicated above, a potential further partition of ages may be beneficial in its own right. Indeed, in the data such a partition does exist between individuals of $0-17$ years, $18-39$ years, $40-64$ years and over 65 years. This renders the relevant data ripe for a consideration towards a 4-age model in the near future. As an additional note worth adding, we have observed that in the above reports the total number of infections does not match the sum of the above 4 age groups. We are not immediately aware for the reason of this discrepancy (possibly the unavailability of age declaration in some of the infection cases). As an example on the May 4th report, the total number of reported infections is indicated as 2632, yet the sum of 104 infections of up to 17 years, 748 between 18 and 39, 1045 between 40 and 64 and 527 above 64 is 2423, leaving 209 infections of unaccounted age. Hopefully, this too will be clarified in future installments of the relevant data. The numbers that we have used pertain to the age partitions in the relevant table of [34] and thus our numbers add up to less than the total known number of infections.

It is also worth noting as an aside that using the methodology of [25], it is possible to obtain some groups of parameters for a single-age population model, which are in a similar ballpark as the parameters obtained via minimization and shown in Table I. These groups of parameters are $R_2 = r_2 + h = 0.2467$, $R_3 = r_3 + d = 0.1175$, $C_1 = ac/(hsd) = 1.5486 \times 10^{-5}$, $C_2 = bc/(hd) = 6.4947 \times 10^{-6}$, $r_1 = 0.1464$ and $F = a + s = 0.61$.

Acknolwegdments. ASF acknowledges support from EPSRC in the form of a a Senior Fellowship. PGK and JCM greatly appreciate numerous helpful discussions with Y. Drossinos, Z. Rapti, and G.A. Kevrekidis. This material is based upon work supported by the US National Science Foundation under Grants No. PHY-1602994 and DMS-1809074 (PGK). PGK also acknowledges support from the Leverhulme Trust via a Visiting Fellowship and thanks the Mathematical Institute of the University of Oxford for its hospitality during part of this work.

[1] N. Zhu, D. Zhang, W. Wang *et al.* A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, N. Engl. J. Med. **382**, 727 (2020)
[2] V.J. Munster, M. Koopmans, N. van Doremalen, D. van Riel, E. de Wit. A Novel Coronavirus Emerging in China – Key Questions for Impact Assessment, N. Eng. J. Med. **382**, 692 (2020)
[3] M. Vaduganathan, O. Vardeny, T. Michel T, *et al.* Renin–Angiotensin–Aldosterone System Inhibitors in Patients with COVID-19. N. Engl. J. Med. **382**, 1653 (2020)
[4] J. Fantini, C. Di Scala, H. Chahinian H, N. Yahi. Structural and molecular modeling studies reveal a new mechanism of action of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine against SARS-CoV-2 infection, Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105960
[5] T. Armangue, M. Spatola, A. Vlagea, *et al.* Frequency, symptoms, risk factors, and outcomes of autoimmune encephalitis after herpes simplex encephalitis: a prospective observational study and retrospective analysis. Lancet Neurol. **17**, 760 (2018)
[6] A.S. Fokas, N. Dikaios, G.A. Kastis. COVID-19: Predictive Mathematical Models for the Number of Deaths (preprint).
[7] A.S. Fokas, N. Dikaios, G.A. Kastis, COVID-19: Predictive Mathematical Models for the Number of Reported Infected Individuals, medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.02.20088591
[8] S.B. Bastos, D.O. Caljueiro. Modeling and forecasting the early evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil. arXiv:2003.14288.
[9] C. Qi, D. Karlsson, K. Sallmen, R. Wyss, Model studies on the COVID-19 pandemic in Sweden. arXiv:2004.01575
[10] E. Gjini, Modeling COVID-19 dynamics for real-time estimates and projections: an application to Albanian data. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.20.20038141
[11] E. Kaxiras, G. Neofotistos, E. Angelaki, The first 100 days: modeling the evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic, arXiv:2004.14664.
[12] C. Yang, J. Wang, A mathematical model for the novel coronavirus epidemic in Wuhan, China, Math. Biosci. Eng. **17**, 2708 (2020).
[13] K.-M. Tam, N. Walker, J. Moreno, Projected Development of COVID-19 in Louisiana, arXiv:2004.02859.

[14] A. Arenas et al., A mathematical model for the spatiotemporal epidemic spreading of COVID19. medRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.21.20040022

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

[16] L. Russo, C. Anastassopoulou, A. Tsakris, G.N. Bifulco, E.F. Campana, G. Toraldo, C. Siettos, Tracing DAY-ZERO and Forecasting the Fade out of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Lombardy, Italy: A Compartmental Modelling and Numerical Optimization Approach, medRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037689; C. Anastassopoulou, L. Russo, A. Tsakris, C. Siettos, Data-Based Analysis, Modelling and Forecasting of the COVID-19 outbreak. medRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.11.20022186

[17] A.J. Oswald, N. Powdthavee, Age, Death Risk, and the Design of an Exit Strategy: A Guide for Policymakers and for Citizens Who Want to Stay Alive. https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/13221/age-death-risk-and-the-design-of-an-exit-strategy-a-guide-for-policymakers-and-for-citizens-who-want-to-stay-alive

[18] S. K Brooks, *et al.*, The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence, Rapid Review **395**, 912 (2020).

[19] Adarsh Bhimraj *et al.*, Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19 Infection, https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/

[20] B. Cao *et al.*, A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with Severe COVID-19, N. Engl. J. Med. **382**, 1787 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001282

[21] M.R. Mehra, S.S. Desai, F. Ruschitzka, A.M. Patel, Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis. The Lancet https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31180-6

[22] A.M. Risitano, D.C. Mastellos, M. Huber-Lang et al., Complement as a target in COVID-19? Nat. Rev. Immunol https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-020-0320-7

[23] https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-issues-emergency-use-authorization-potential-covid-19-treatment

[24] https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/04/how-does-coronavirus-kill-clinicians-trace-ferocious-rampage-through-body-brain-toes

[25] A.S. Fokas, J. Cuevas-Maraver, P.G. Kevrekidis. A quantitative framework for exploring exit strategies from the COVID-19 lockdown, (preprint).

[26] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compartmental_models_in_epidemiology

[27] See, e.g., https://elifesciences.org/articles/57309

[28] P.G. Kevrekidis, J. Cuevas-Maraver, Y. Drossinos, Z. Rapti, G.A. Kevrekidis, *Spatial modeling of COVID-19: Greece and Andalusia as Case Examples*, Arxiv:2005.04527.

[29] Y. Drossinos and N.I. Stilianakis, Aerosol Sci. Technol. **54**, 639 (2020), https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2020.1751055.

[30] https://www.news18.com/news/india/why-the-northern-and-southern-hemispheres-are-worlds-apart-when-it-comes-to-covid-19-spread-2572083.html

[31] M.C.Dalakas, COVID19 and Guillain–Barré Syndromes: the first documented COVID19-triggered autoimmune Neurological disease. To appear in Neurology.

[32] Z. Sedaghat, N. Karimi, Guillain Barre syndrome associated with COVID-19 infection: A case report. J. Clin. Neurosci. 10.1016/j.jocn.2020.04.062 (2020).

[33] M.C. Eisenberh, S.L. Robertson, J.H. Tien, Identifiability and estimation of multiple transmission pathways in cholera and waterborne disease, J. Theor Biol. **324**, 84 (2013).

[34] https://eody.gov.gr/epidimiologika-statistika-dedomena/imerisies-ektheseis-covid-19/