Evaluate the timing of resumption of business for the states of New York, New Jersey and California via a pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission model of COVID-19

Authors: Ting Tian[1]†, Jianbin Tan[1]†, Yukang Jiang[1]†, Xueqin Wang[2,1]*, Heping Zhang[3]*

Affiliations:

[1]School of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

[2]School of Management, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China

[3]School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA

*Corresponding authors. Emails: wangxq20@ustc.edu.cn; heping.zhang@yale.edu;

†Dr. T. Tian, J. Tan and Y. Jiang contributed equally to this article

*Dr. X. Wang and Dr. H. Zhang are corresponding authors

Abstract

The United States has the highest numbers of confirmed cases and death of COVID-19, where confirmed cases took up nearly half in the hot spot states of New York, New Jersey and California[1,2]. The workforce in these states was required to work from home except for essential services to minimize the risk of the spread of COVID-19. Premature reopening of economy will lead to broader spread of COVID-19, while the opposite situation would cause greater loss of economy. We proposed an epidemic compartmental model in considering the pre-symptomatic transmission and asymptomatic transmission[3] of COVID-19, to estimate the numbers of unidentified infected cases and simulate the possible outcomes of resumption of economy at different forthcoming Mondays. The states of New York and New Jersey were not recommended to reopen the economy before May 18 since it may increase 22.44% and 60.18% for the numbers of cumulative confirmed cases if the second wave of the infection would happen, respectively. While that may be feasible for California to reopen business on May 11 if appropriate control measures for prevention of the second wave of the infection are implemented, because of the less benefit for delaying reopening the economy and the relatively smaller magnitude of Outbreak of COVID-19.

Main

The outbreak of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has spread over 200 countries since December 2019[1]. It is unprecedented to have over 2 million cumulative

confirmed cases of COVID-19 worldwide[4]. The first "battle" against COVID-19 in China has provided experience and likely outcomes of interventions to the ongoing hard-hit areas. As a novel and acute infectious disease, the transmissibility of COVID-19 was unclear at the early stage of epidemic, the Chinese government implemented relatively strict nonpharmaceutical interventions in the hot spot areas, where the public transportations were suspended within and outside of the city in Hubei province since January 23, 2020[5]. All nationwide residents were recommended to stay at home except for essential needs. The holiday season of the Chinese Spring Festival had been prolonged to late February when essential services were recommenced operating gradually outside Hubei province[6]. By now, a comprehensive resumption of business is approaching in China[7].

Epidemic situations in the United States

Meanwhile, the confirmed case of COVID-19 was first reported during late January 2020 in the United States[8]. There were over 1000 cumulative confirmed cases on March 13, 2020[9], when the White House declared a national emergency concerning COVID-19 outbreak[10] and issued a "call to action" coronavirus guidelines on March 16, 2020[11]. The United States has become the most severe country of COVID-19 with 295,122, 113,856, and 46,209 cumulative confirmed cases in the states of New York, New Jersey, and California until April 28, 2020[2], respectively. Making things worse, New York and California are the two states that contribute the most to the real gross domestic product (GDP) over years in the United States[12].

The state of New York had the first confirmed case of COVID-19 reported on March 1, 2020, and it proclaimed an executive order on March 16, 2020, including reducing half of the local government workforce, allowing the statewide nonessential workforce to work from home starting on March 17, 2020, and closing all schools starting on March 18, 2020[13]. However, as the rapidly increasing number of additional cases of COVID-19 in the state, the governor announced an aggressive policy of "New York State on PAUSE" on March 20, 2020[14], and required all people in the state to wear masks or face covering in public since April 15, 2020[15].

The state of New Jersey had the first positive case of COVID-19 reported on March 4, 2020[16]. The governor of New Jersey recommended the cancellation of statewide public gatherings over 250 individuals since March 12, 2020, suspended visiting state prisons and statewide halfway houses since March 14, 2020, and closed restaurants, bars, movie theaters, gyms, casinos since March 16, 2020[17]. The governor announced an order including the statewide stay at home and closure of statewide non-essential retail industries on March 21, 2020[18].

The state of California had two positive cases of COVID-19 reported on January 26, 2020[19]. One month later, there was the first possible case of local transmission of COIVD-19 in California[20]. The "stay home except for essential needs" order was issued on March 19, 2020, where all individuals were required to stay at home except for the workforce in 16 critical infrastructure sectors[21]. The timelines of three states of intervention details are shown in Fig. 1. According to the capacity of medical facilities in the website of COVID-19.direct[2], there could be 52200 beds and 219,000 hospitals,

25,300 beds and 5,300 hospitals, 87,800 beds and 463,000 hospitals in the state of New York, New Jersey and California, respectively.

On April 13, 2020, there were 7 states joined together to form a multi-state council to combat COVID-19 and to help reopen the economy including the top 3 states whose cumulative confirmed cases were the largest[22]. As the epidemic of COVID-19 was getting worse in the United States, the state governors issued a series of interventions to slow the spread of virus, including requiring all individuals to stay at home and reducing the workforce in the industries. The whole social system was slowed down, and thus, the time to restore the economy in the United States, especially for three states of New York, New Jersey, and California has been the most significant and consequential decision for the president of the United States and the governors of the states. To recover the economy for people to return to work, the key concern is the risk and severity of the second wave of the infection.

Simulation of epidemical outcomes after the resumption of business

To assess the risk and severity of the second wave of the infection after the resumption of business, it is important to consider the unobserved numbers of unidentified infected cases in the community. Our approach is based on publicly available data to simulate the possible outcomes of an outbreak of COVID-19 at different business reopening dates and to provide recommendations as to when it is reasonable safe for people back to work.

The estimated cumulative numbers of infected individuals (including

Self-healing without being confirmed (H)) on July 11 are 461699 with 95% CI (449908, 473052), 254212 with 95% CI (239335, 269471) and 232216 with 95% CI (182634, 285916) for states of New York, New Jersey, and California, respectively, which the percentages of unidentified infected individuals are 18.49% with 95% CI (17.29%, 19.07%), 29.87% with 95% CI (28.61%, 31.47%), 33.20% with 95% CI (32.17%, 35.47%), respectively. Normally, higher testing rate would lead to smaller percentages of unidentified infected case. The estimated unidentified percentages were consistent with the reported testing rate of three states (4.68%, 2.94%, 1.63% for states of New York, New Jersey, and California, on May 1, respectively)[23].

Moreover, the predicted numbers of daily new infected and new confirmed patients for states of New York, New Jersey, and California are given in Fig. 2 and the details of infectious diseases maps for states of New York, New Jersey, and California are given in Extended Data Figs. 1-3 in the Supplementary Information. According to Fig. 2, the magnitude of the outbreak of COIVD-19 for New York state is greater than that for New Jersey, followed by California. Note that there are gaps between the numbers of daily new confirmed cases and new infected individuals per day, which is caused by the pre-symptomatic transmission and asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19. We called this phenomenon as lagging effect of daily new confirmed cases.

For considering the potential risk of infectious disease, we present the estimated numbers of unidentified infected cases per 100000 for states of New York, New Jersey, and California, which are given in Fig. 3. Based on Fig. 3, the estimated timing of the

peak of unidentified infected cases in the states of New York, New Jersey, and California had passed. Compared with California state, the numbers of unidentified infected cases in the states of New York and New Jersey dropped faster after the peak, which was consistent with the estimated minima of R_t (see Methods) for states of New York, New Jersey, and California: 0.93 with 95% CI (0.92, 0.94), 0.92 with 95% CI (0.920 0.93), 0.99 with 95% CI (0.97, 1.01), respectively. The minimum value of R_t for California was the largest among the three states. On the contrary, the estimated $\hat{\alpha}_0(1-\hat{\eta})$ of California was not the largest among the three states (0.52 with 95% CI (0.51, 0.56) for New York, 0.32 with 95% CI (0.30, 0.33) for New Jersey, 0.30 with 95% CI (0.28, 0.32) for California). The reason for this was that the estimated $\widehat{D}_C$ of California was longer than the other two states (2.17 with 95% CI (2.00, 2.24) for New York, 4.10 with 95% CI (3.89, 4.34) for New Jersey, 5.06 with 95% CI (4.68, 5.39) for California). The details of estimated results for three states are given in Extended Data Figs 4-6 in the Supplementary Information.

We considered the possible timing for resuming business in the forthcoming Mondays, i.e., May 11, May 18, May 25, June, June 8 and June 15. The predicted numbers of unidentified infected cases per 100000 for states of New York, New Jersey and California on May 11, May 18, May 25, June, June 8 and June 15 are given in Extended Data Table 1 in the Supplementary Information. Note that the estimated numbers of unidentified infected cases per 100,000 for states of New York, New Jersey decreased faster than California state. There would be higher benefit for delaying the resumption of businesses for states of New York and New Jersey, while

that in California state would not change significantly since the estimated minimal R_t was closed to 1.

To realize the potential risk of resuming business on these days, we simulated the possible outcomes that the second wave of the infection would happen after people return to work. There could be a maximum infection rate once all individuals back to work, and then the stringent interventions were implemented to curb the wave of infectious disease. In doing so, for the starting days of May 11, May 18, May 25, June, June 8 and June 15, we modified the estimated $\hat{\alpha}(t)$ by initializing $\hat{\alpha}_0$ to last 7 days and specifying to its minimum value afterward, i.e., $\hat{\alpha}(t) = \hat{\alpha}_0(1 - \hat{\eta})$ representing the most intensity of control policies for states of New York, New Jersey, and California accordingly. The simulated results are given in Extended Data Fig. 4 and Fig. 7 in the Supplementary Information.

For New York, the predicted numbers of cumulative confirmed cases per 100000 on July 11 for the simulated outbreak of epidemic when people would return to work on May 11, May 18, May 25, June, June 8 and June 15 are 426, 290, 195, 129, 83 and 52 higher than the estimated number of cumulative confirmed cases per 100000 on July 11 if no resumption of business.

For New Jersey, the predicted numbers of cumulative confirmed cases per 100,000 on July 11 for the simulated outbreak of epidemic when people would return to work on May 11, May 18, May 25, June, June 8 and June 15 are 1224, 928, 691, 504, 358 and 244 higher than the estimated number of cumulative confirmed cases per 100000 on July 11 if no resumption of business.

For California, the predicted numbers of cumulative confirmed cases per 100000 on July 11 for the simulated outbreak of epidemic when people would return to work on May 11, May 18, May 25, June, June 8 and June 15 are 293, 258, 223, 189, 156 and 123 higher than the estimated number of cumulative confirmed cases per 100000 on July 11 if no resumption of business.

Discussion

To understand the spread of COVID-19 for the states of New York, New Jersey, and California, we applied an epidemic model considering pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19 to estimate the numbers of daily new infected individuals and new confirmed case for three states. Normally, the numbers of new infected cases mirrored the actual degree of transmission, while the numbers of new confirmed cases, often lagged the real situation by the existence of the duration between catching virus and being confirmed by testing. According to Fig. 2, such a lagging effect could not be neglected at an early stage of epidemic, would tend to disappear over time.

For the control of epidemic, it was reasonable to alleviate the lagging effect, which could be achieved by shortening the D_c in SIHC model. Notice that D_c was also affected by the testing rate and testing speed, except the length of incubation period. And the estimated $\widehat{D}_C$ of all three states were smaller than 5.1, it implied the policy enhancing the testing rate may be implemented in all three states, which was effective to reduce the unidentified number of infected during incubation period and

asymptomatic carriers. Meanwhile, according to pending data[10] reported for three states, there was a considerable number of testing results remaining pending in California, which implied the remarkably lower testing speed in California. However, the pending data of the states of New York and New Jersey were negligible, which were consistent with estimated $\widehat{D}_C$ for these states.

The higher numbers of unidentified infected cases were obtained, the higher risks for the resumption of business would have been. According to Fig. 4, we concluded that there could be risks for the resumption of businesses on May 11 for three states. If governors of states delayed one week, or more, for the resumption of businesses, that would significantly scale down the simulated magnitude of the second wave of the infection. But the benefit of delaying decision would be smaller and smaller when the current control policies continue to be effective.

According to the report[22], we consider the date of resumption of business for states of New York and New Jersey together. For the states of New York and New Jersey, since the average values of the estimated decreasing numbers of unidentified infected cases per 100,000 of adjacent Mondays in Extended Data Table 1 in the Supplementary Information were large (6.18 per week and 14.15 per week, respectively), there would be higher benefit for delaying the resumption of businesses. Meanwhile, the simulated numbers of cumulative confirmed cases per 100,000 in Fig. 4 were significantly higher than the projected case (22.44% and 60.18%, respectively) on May 11, implied considerable risks for the resumption of businesses before May 18. While the estimated decreasing numbers of unidentified infected cases per

100,000 of adjacent Mondays in Extended Data Table 1 for California state is relatively small (0.43 per week) and the simulated result in Fig. 4 is smaller than other two states, it may be feasible for California state to reopen business on May 11 if appropriate control measures for prevention of the second wave of the infection are implemented. Notice that on May 18 and June 15, which estimated numbers of unidentified infected individuals per 100000 would close to that in California state, for states of New York and New Jersey, respectively, which implied the feasibility for reopening business at those timings for states of New York and New Jersey.

The decision for the resumption of business is not only a public health issue, but also economic issue. What we are focusing on is the epidemiological feasibility of returning to work at an early date, there are still many other factors needed to be paid attention[24]. Meanwhile, for the period after resumption of work, if the number of unidentified infected cases is still non-zero, the risks for the second wave of the infection would never vanish, which underscore the necessity of maintaining epidemic prevention measures, such as, wearing a mask and keeping a social distance.



Fig. 1. The timeline of interventions against COVID-19 in the states of New York, New Jersey, and California.



Fig. 2. The magnitude of outbreak of COVID-19 in the three states of New York (Fig. 2-a), New Jersey (Fig. 2-b), and California (Fig. 2-c) from March 13 to July

11, 2020. The daily confirmed new cases form March 13 to May 4, 2020, were observed data, combing with the projected cases until July 11, 2020.



Fig. 3. The trend of the numbers of unidentified infected individuals per 100000 for states of New York, New Jersey, and California from March 13 to July 11, 2020.

The corresponding 95% credible intervals were represented in each state.



Fig. 4. The possible outbreak of epidemic when people returned to work in the forthcoming Mondays for states of New York, New Jersey, and California (per 100000). The points represent the observed cumulative confirmed cases in the three states of New York, New Jersey and California.

Methods

Data collection

We collected the epidemic data from March 13, 2020 when the national emergency concerning COVID-19 was proclaimed to May 10, 2020 in three states of New York, New Jersey and California. The data are available on COVID-19.direct[2].

Model

Based on the report of WHO, the transmission of COVID-19 could be caused by the individuals infected with the virus before significant symptoms developed[3], or even the carriers who did not develop symptoms. Pre-symptomatic transmission and asymptomatic transmission would interfere with our judgment on the current magnitude of outbreak of infectious diseases because of the existence of the duration between catching virus and being confirmed by testing. To consider this nature of COIVD-19, it is crucial to evaluate the unobserved number of unidentified infected cases.

To understand the mechanism of COVID-19, we divided a concerned population into four compartments: susceptible (S), unidentified infected (I), self-healing without being confirmed (H), and confirmed cases (C).

(a) The susceptible (S) individuals, who have no immunity to the disease, are the majority of the population at an early stage of the epidemic.

(b) Unidentified infected (I) are infected and infectious individuals without isolation, which consist of two kinds of individuals: infectors who would have symptoms eventually and asymptomatic carriers who would not develop symptoms. We assumed that I would transfer to H or C eventually.

(c) Self-healing without being confirmed (H) is assumed to be no longer infectious and resistant to COVID-19.

(d) Confirmed cases (C) contain two kinds of individuals: patients in hospital and asymptomatic carriers who are assumed to stay at home, and unable to transmit the disease.

We introduced Susceptible (S) - Unidentified infected (I) - Self-healing without being confirmed (H) - Confirmed cases (C) (SIHC) model with four compartments: Susceptible (S), unidentified infected (I), self-healing without being confirmed (H), confirmed cases (C). We divided I into two part: asymptomatic carriers without being confirmed (I_1), infectors who would have symptoms eventually (I_2). Similarly, we divided C into two part: confirmed cases who self-quarantine or self-isolate (C_1), confirmed patients at hospitals (C_2).

The transfer diagram of S, I_1, I_2, H, C_1, C_2 are given in Extended Data Fig. 8 in the Supplementary Information.

The dynamic system of numbers of compartments S, I, H, and C at the time t: $S(t)$, $I(t)$, $H(t)$, and $C(t)$ are assumed as:

$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = -\rho\theta(t)\frac{I(t)}{N}S(t),$$

$$\frac{dI(t)}{dt} = \rho\theta(t)\frac{I(t)}{N}S(t) - (\frac{1}{D_P} + \frac{1}{D_H})I(t),$$
$$\frac{dH(t)}{dt} = \frac{I(t)}{D_H},$$
$$\frac{dC(t)}{dt} = \frac{I(t)}{D_C}, \qquad (1)$$

where ρ is transmissibility; $\theta(t)$ is the average contact numbers per person at the time t, which is assumed to be time-varying; D_H is the average length of duration between catching the virus and self-healing without being confirmed. D_c is the average length of duration between catching virus and being confirmed by testing; N is the total number of population.

Let $\alpha(t) = \rho\theta(t)$. Generally, $\theta(t)$ is controlled by policy interventions, which is a constant at an early stage of the epidemic and decreases along with the implementation of interventions until the control policies are completely carried out, i.e., reaching the lowest level. Based on this point of view, we furthermore assumed $\alpha(t)$ is monotonically decreasing curve[25] with four parameters α_0, d, m, and η:

$$\alpha(t) = \alpha_0(\frac{\eta}{1+\exp\left(\lambda_m\left(t-d-\frac{m}{2}\right)\right)} + 1 - \eta), \qquad (2)$$

where α_0 denotes the maximum of $\alpha(t)$ at an early stage of outbreak of infectious disease, d is the time when the control measures start to be effective and the $\alpha(t)$ starts to decline, m represents the duration of decreasing process of $\alpha(t)$, η is the maximum decreasing proportion of $\alpha(t)$ comparing with α_0, i.e., the minimum of $\alpha(t)$ is $\alpha_0(1-\eta)$. λ_m is chosen as $\frac{2\log((1-\varepsilon)/\varepsilon)}{m}$ and ε is fixed to be 0.01. The graph of $\alpha(t)$ is given in Extended Data Fig. 9 in the Supplementary Information.

By the setting above, we can derive the time-varying reproductive rate R_t[26,27] by SIHC (susceptible, unidentified infected, self-healing without being confirmed, and

confirmed cases) model:

$$R_t = \frac{S(t)}{N} \cdot \frac{\alpha_0 D_C D_H}{D_H + D_C} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{1+\exp\left(\lambda_m\left(t-d-\frac{m}{2}\right)\right)} + 1 - \eta \right). \qquad (3)$$

Let $\Omega = (\alpha_0, \eta, D_C)$ and $\Theta = (\Omega, d, D_H, m)$, we introduced randomness to SIHC model: Let S_t, I_t, H_t, C_t be the observed values of S, I, H, C at the time t with constraint

$$N = S_t + I_t + H_t + C_t, \qquad (4)$$

and $A_t = (I_t, H_t, C_t)$ is assumed to be a multi-dimensional Markov process, i.e., for $g < t$ and given H_g:

$$p\left(A_t \middle| A_{s \le g}\right) = p\left(A_t \middle| A_g\right) = Poiss\left(A_t \middle| A_t\left(A_g, \Theta\right)\right), \qquad (5)$$

where $A_t\left(A_g, \Omega\right)$ is the evolve values of I and C at the time t determined by the deterministic dynamic system above with the initial value (S_g, I_g, H_g, C_g) and parameters Θ. $Poiss(\cdot\,|v)$ is the density of multi-dimensional independent Poisson distribution with mean vector v.

For simplicity, let $\alpha(t) = \alpha(k), k \le t < k+1$, k is an integer. Since D_H and H_0 are assumed to be known, we suppose that H_t is not random given the initial value (S_g, I_g, H_g, C_g) and parameters Θ i.e.,

$$H_t =: H_t(A_g, \Theta) \text{ a.s.},$$

which determined by the deterministic dynamic system above with the initial value (S_g, I_g, H_g, C_g) and parameters Θ. Similarly, we define $I_t(A_g, \Theta)$, $C_t(A_g, \Theta)$.

Notice that the observable data is $C_{1:T}, N$, where T is the length of time. We assume that $H_1 = 0$ and treat $I_{1:T}$ and $H_{2:T}$ as the missing data, we applied techniques of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)[28-31] for approximations of

posterior distributions of parameters Ω and unknown numbers of I, H at each time by given priors with values of d, m and D_H. Once the prior distribution of Ω: $\pi(\Omega)$, was given, we apply the Bayesian method combined with MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo) to simulate the posterior distribution:

$$\pi(\Omega, I_{1:T}, H_{2:T} \mid C_{1:T}, N, d, m, D_H) \propto$$
$$\pi(\Omega) \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} Poiss\left(I_{t+1} \middle| I_{t+1}(A_t, \Theta)\right) Poiss\left(C_{t+1} \middle| C_{t+1}(A_t, \Theta)\right) I(H_{t+1} =$$
$$H_{t+1}(A_t, \Theta)). \qquad (6)$$

For the choice of prior distributions, since D_C is governed by the mean of incubation period. In terms of studies about the incubation period of COVID-19[32], we choose log-normal distribution with log-mean 5.1 as the prior distribution of D_C, while the priors of other parameters are chosen non-informative or flat priors. For the fixed parameters d, m, and D_H, d is taken the beginning of implementation of important policy interventions, i.e., $d = 7$ for New York state ("New York State on PAUSE" in Fig. 1), $d = 8$ for New Jersey state ("statewide stay at home" in Fig. 1) and $d = 6$ for California state ("stay home except for essential needs" in Fig. 1). We choose $m = 28$, which means that roughly one month later, the control policies are completely carried out. D_H is assumed to be 9.5 according to the clinical study of asymptomatic cases[33]. The point estimates of Ω, $I_{1:T}$ and $H_{2:T}$ were presented as the median of the posterior distribution while 95% credible intervals were constructed with 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles.

Moreover, since $\pi(\Omega, I_{1:T}, H_{2:T} \mid C_{1:T}, N, d, m, D_H)$ has no close form, we apply Gibbs sampler imbedded Metropolis-Hastings steps for updating parameters. Let

$\Omega^{(k)}, I_{I:T}^{(k)}, H_{I:T}^{(k)}$ be the k-th sample, given initial $\Omega^{(0)}, I_{I:T}^{(0)}, H_{I:T}^{(0)}$, the details of are given in **Algorithm** S1 and **Algorithm** S2 in the Supplementary Information.

Notice that I is high-dimensional, we use mixture MCMC[29] to accelerate the convergence of Markov chain. For sampling I_1, note that at the early stage of $S_1 \approx N$, which implies that

$$I_2(A_1, \Theta) = I_1 \exp\left(\alpha_0 - (1/D_C + 1/D_H)\right),$$

Then the full conditional distribution of I_1 approximately achieves:

$$\begin{aligned} p(I_1 | \cdot) &\propto Poiss\left(I_2 \middle| I_2(A_1, \Theta)\right) Poiss\left(C_2 \middle| C_2(A_1, \Theta)\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-I_1 \exp\left(\alpha_0 - (1/D_C + 1/D_H)\right)\right) {I_1}^{I_2} \; Poiss\left(C_2 \middle| C_2(A_1, \Theta)\right), \end{aligned}$$

we can use $Gamma(I_2 + 1, \exp\left(\alpha_0 - (1/D_C + 1/D_H)\right)$ as the proposal distribution of I_1.

Data availability: Daily reported confirmed cases of COVID-19 from March 13, 2020 to May 4, 2020 for three states of New York, New Jersey and California from the website “https://covid-19.direct/state”. All data are publicly available.

References

1 National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. *Distribution of COVID-19 cases in the world*, <http://2019ncov.chinacdc.cn/2019-nCoV/global.html> (2020).

2 Johns Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering (JHU CSSE). (2020).

3 World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report-73. (2020).

4 World Health Organization. *Rolling updates on coronavirus disease (COVID-19)*, <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen> (2020).

5 Chinese Center for disease control and prevention. Epidemic update and risk assessment of 2019 Novel Coronavirus. (Chinese Center for disease control and prevention, 2020).

6 The State Council The People's Republic of China. *State Council stresses orderly resumption of production and operation*, <http://english.www.gov.cn/policies/latestreleases/202002/22/content_WS5e50f888c6d0595e03c213c0.html> (2020).

7 The State Council The People's Republic of China. *China's progress on*

business resumption on April 16, <http://english.www.gov.cn/news/topnews/202004/16/content_WS5e9869f5c6d0b3f0e949598e.html> (2020).

8 Holshue, M. L. *et al*. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *New England Journal of Medicine*, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001191 (2020).

9 World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report-53. (2020).

10 The White House. *Proclamation on Declaring a National Emergency Concerning the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Outbreak*, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/proclamation-declaring-national-emergency-concerning-novel-coronavirus-disease-covid-19-outbreak/> (2020).

11 The White House. 30 Days to slow the spread. (2020).

12 The United States Census Bureau. Table of United States counties. (2020).

13 Governor New York State. *Video, Audio, Photos & Rush Transcript: During Coronavirus Briefing, Governor Cuomo Issues Executive Order*, 2020).

14 Governor New York State. *Governor Cuomo Signs the 'New York State on PAUSE' Executive Order*, <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-signs-new-york-state-pause-executive-order> (2020).

15 Governor New York State. *Video, Audio, Photos & Rush Transcript: Amid*

Ongoing COVID-19 Pandemic, Governor Cuomo Issues Executive Order Requiring All People in New York to Wear Masks or Face Covering in Public, <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/video-audio-photos-rush-transcript-amid-ongoing-covid-19-pandemic-governor-cuomo-issues-1> (2020).

16 State of New Jersey. *Governor Murphy, Acting Governor Oliver, and Commissioner Persichilli Announce First Presumptive Positive Case of Novel Coronavirus in New Jersey*, <https://www.state.nj.us/governor/news/news/562020/approved/20200304e.shtml> (2020).

17 State of New Jersey. *Governor Murphy Signs Executive Order*, <https://www.state.nj.us/governor/news/news/562020/approved/news_archive.shtml> (2020).

18 State of New Jersey. *Governor Murphy Announces Statewide Stay at Home Order, Closure of All Non-Essential Retail Businesses*, <https://www.state.nj.us/governor/news/news/562020/approved/20200320j.shtml> (2020).

19 California Department of PulbicHealth. *Two Confirmed Cases of Novel Coronavirus in California*, <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OPA/Pages/NR20-001.aspx> (2020).

20 California Department of PulbicHealth. *CDC Confirms Possible First Instance of COVID-19 Community Transmission in California*, <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OPA/Pages/NR20-006.aspx> (2020).

21 California Department of PulbicHealth. *Order of the state public health officer*, <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/CDPH%20Document%20Library/COVID-19/Health%20Order%203.19.2020.pdf> (2020).

22 Governor New York State. *Massachusetts Joins New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Rhode Island's Multi-State Council to Get People Back to Work and Restore the Economy*, <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/massachusetts-joins-new-york-new-jersey-connecticut-pennsylvania-delaware-and-rhode-islands> (2020).

23 Jin, B. *Live tracker: How many coronavirus cases have been reported in each U.S. state?*, <https://www.politico.com/interactives/2020/coronavirus-testing-by-state-chart-of-new-cases/> (2020).

24 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Return to Work for Healthcare Personnel with Confirmed or Suspected COVID-19*, <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/return-to-work.html> (2020).

25 Tan, J., Jinag, Y., Tian, T. & Wang, X. P-SIHR probabilistic graphical model: An applicable model of COVID-19 in estimating the number of infectious individuals without isolation and time-varying reproduction number. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica* **42** (2020).

26 Anderson, R. M., Anderson, B. & May, R. M. *Infectious diseases of humans:*

dynamics and control. (Oxford university press, 1992).

27 Jones, J. H. Notes on R0. *Califonia: Department of Anthropological Sciences* (2007).

28 Ghosh, J. K., Delampady, M., Samanta, T. J. A. I. t. B. A. T. & Methods. Bayesian Inference and Decision Theory. 29-63 (2006).

29 Andrieu, C., De Freitas, N., Doucet, A. & Jordan, M. I. J. M. l. An introduction to MCMC for machine learning. **50**, 5-43 (2003).

30 Chib, S. & Greenberg, E. J. T. a. s. Understanding the metropolis-hastings algorithm. **49**, 327-335 (1995).

31 Soubeyrand, S. Construction of semi-Markov genetic-space-time SEIR models and inference. (2016).

32 Lauer, S. A. *et al*. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Annals of Internal Medicine* (2020).

33 Hu, Z. *et al*. Clinical characteristics of 24 asymptomatic infections with COVID-19 screened among close contacts in Nanjing, China. *Sci China Life Sci*, doi:10.1007/s11427-020-1661-4 (2020).

Acknowledgments

This study was partly supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2018YFC1315400), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11771462; Grant No. 71991474), the Key Research

and Development Program of Guangdong, China (Grant No. 2019B020228001) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (19lgpy236).

Contributors

T. T., X. W. and H. Z. developed the idea and research. T. T., J. T. and Y. J. wrote the first draft of the manuscript and all other authors discussed results and edited the manuscript. T. T., J. T. and Y. J collected and validated epidemiological data.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.