

# COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) Ventilator Resource Management Using a Network Optimization Model and Predictive System Demand

Samuel Billingham<sup>a,\*</sup>, Rebecca Widrick<sup>a</sup>, Nathan J. Edwards<sup>a</sup>, Sybil A. Klaus, MD, MPH<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The MITRE Corporation, Colorado Springs, CO 80910, USA

<sup>b</sup>The MITRE Corporation, McLean, VA 22102, USA

---

## Abstract

The COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic is overwhelming global healthcare delivery systems due to the exponential spike in cases requiring specialty tests, facilities and equipment, including complex, precision devices like ventilators. In particular, the surge in critically ill patients has revealed a significant deficiency in regional availability of respiratory care ventilators. The authors offer a mathematical framework for ventilator distribution under scarcity conditions using an optimized network model and solver. The framework is interoperable with existing COVID-19 healthcare demand models and scales for different user-defined system sizes, including hospital networks, city, state, regional and national-scale prioritization. The authors' approach improves current capabilities for medical device resource management within the existing incident command system while accounting for availability of devices, ventilation treatment time periods, disinfection and cleaning between patients, as well as shipping logistics time. The authors present a proof of concept using a high fidelity COVID-19 data set from Colorado, discusses how to scale nationally, and emphasizes the importance of applying ethical human-in-the-loop decision making when using this or similar approaches to managing medical device resources during epidemic emergencies.

*Keywords:* COVID-19, SARS, ventilators, medical device resources, pandemic management

---

## 1. Introduction

1 The global health challenges of combating the COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic have exposed  
2 constraints on healthcare systems including insufficient healthcare staffing, test kit availability,  
3 hospital ICU facilities, personal protective equipment, and availability of respiratory care devices  
4

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email address:* [sbillingham@mitre.org](mailto:sbillingham@mitre.org) (Samuel Billingham)

<sup>1</sup>The authors' affiliations with The MITRE Corporation is provided for identification purposes only, and is not intended to convey or imply MITRE's concurrence with, or support for, the positions, opinions, or viewpoints expressed by the author. © 2020 The MITRE Corporation. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. Public Release Case Number 20-1307

*Preprint submitted to Frontiers in Digital Health*

*May 18, 2020*

5 such as ventilators. While traditional disaster incident command systems can account for broad  
6 resource management, the extreme ventilator resource demand and scarce supply during the  
7 pandemic have revealed shortcomings in current approaches to medical device resource management  
8 as described by Adelman [1] where intra-regional resource sharing must be considered as a risk  
9 mitigation. However the majority of mitigation efforts have been placed primarily on the emergency  
10 care of infected patients or on the strategy and tactics to reduce infection rates and not on the  
11 optimization of resource management for the complex demands within the U.S.

12 The complexity of medical device resource management during the COVID-19 pandemic provides  
13 a key opportunity for using computer based modeling and expert advisory systems to aid in the  
14 decision-making process of allocating resources as described by Beemer and Gregg [2]. In response to  
15 the pandemic in the United States, at least thirty predictive models on infection rates, ICU resource  
16 demand, and future ventilator demand have been developed. When these computational models are  
17 combined with real COVID-19 data, they allow for decisions to be made based on expected growth  
18 or demand. Additional models such as that presented by Polanco, et al. [3] aid in early detection of  
19 extreme demand on healthcare systems from severe respiratory disease epidemic outbreaks, however  
20 none of the models fully explore effective medical device resource management at regional or national  
21 levels.

22 This body of work presents a framework using a mathematical optimization for ventilator  
23 utilization and significantly aids in the management of scarce medical resources. And while the peak  
24 infection rates are gradually declining at the time of writing this manuscript, the approach will be  
25 highly applicable to any resurgence of COVID-19 or other future pandemics. The framework plans  
26 ventilator sharing within a region of interest by focusing on minimizing the number of patients not  
27 receiving a ventilator. The approach takes into account current ventilator inventories, addresses the  
28 arrival of new ventilators, typical ventilator treatment time periods, disinfection and cleaning time  
29 between patients, as well as shipping logistics time. The framework leverages existing COVID-19  
30 infection prediction and healthcare demand models but can accommodate improved demand models  
31 or regional tailoring. The flexibility offered in the framework allows it to scale from local communities  
32 to counties, state, and nation. This work also presents a proof of concept using recent COVID-19  
33 data from Colorado to demonstrate the algorithm along with a discussion on scaling to a national  
34 level. And finally the authors describe the importance of applying ethical decision making when  
35 using this or similar approaches to managing medical device resources during epidemic or pandemic  
36 emergencies.

## 37 **2. COVID-19 Data Sets**

38 Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, a wide variety of data sets have been made  
39 available to the public. For example, the COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science

40 and Engineering at Johns Hopkins University (JHU) provides case, recovery, and deaths counts  
41 globally by nation [4]. For the United States, this tool also breaks case counts down by county.  
42 Several states, counties, and municipalities within the United States are also providing COVID-19  
43 data to the public, often with additional metrics.

44 Our research focuses on a proof-of-concept for ventilator sharing similar in nature to that  
45 described by Adelman and Gregg [1], but rather providing a scalable solution during peak and non-  
46 peak events. As such, we use the Colorado COVID-19 data provided by the Colorado Department  
47 of Public Health and Environment for this effort. Colorado has a population of nearly 6 million  
48 people and is made up of 64 counties. By using each county as a region for distributing ventilators,  
49 we are able to use a smaller set of data than would be required to distribute ventilators across  
50 the entire United States. Colorado's data also provides many of the metrics needed to seed the  
51 model and demonstrate its capability. By using this smaller set of higher fidelity data, we are able  
52 to illustrate and provide proof of concept of our modeling construct, showing an optimal schedule  
53 of distributing ventilators across all Colorado counties in need. The modeling construct can then  
54 be scaled at regional, state or national levels. Sections 3 and 4 discuss all precise data needed to  
55 execute the model.

### 56 **3. Modeling Ventilator Sharing**

57 Mathematical optimization models are a representation of a set of choices to be made by a  
58 decision maker with the goal of maximizing or minimizing some objective. These decisions are  
59 subject to a set of constraints that express the limits on possible decision choices. For this work,  
60 time-phased decision variables are used in conjunction with time-phased balanced constraints over a  
61 fixed time horizon to allocate ventilators among facilities in order to meet demands in the entire  
62 region of interest. The following sections establish the notation and the structure of our model. The  
63 first three sections describe the sets, data parameters, and variables needed for the model with the  
64 final two sections establishing the objective and constraints for the model.

#### 65 *3.1. Sets*

66 For our model we consider three sets. The first,  $\mathcal{T}$  denotes time periods of interest when utilizing  
67 ventilators. The length of these time periods is inconsequential and could be set to whatever duration  
68 makes sense for the region. For our work we consider a time period to be one 24 hour period as most  
69 of the predictive models for ventilator demand predict daily values. The second,  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes the set  
70 of facilities in the region of interest utilizing ventilators. The last set,  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the set of shipping  
71 routes, or arcs, between the facilities and is defined as the set of  $(i, j)$  pairs where  $i, j \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $i \neq j$ .

### 72 3.2. Parameters

73 Parameters are the data items needed to execute the model. For our research we identified  
74 five parameters of interest. The parameter  $P$  denotes the intubation period for a patient and any  
75 ventilator reset time post extubation. While in practice these values will vary (i.e. intubation  
76 periods vary with patient age, gender, etc.), for a large scale planning model, it is helpful to assume  
77 away some of these sources of variability. Further research could explore the effects of variability in  
78 these parameters. The next two parameters  $\kappa_i$  and  $k_{it}$  are similar and denote the initial number of  
79 ventilators at facility  $i$  and any new ventilators arriving at facility  $i$  during time period  $t$  respectively.  
80 The first parameter  $\kappa_i$  represents the ventilators that are native to the region while the second  
81 parameter  $k_{it}$  represents ventilators not native to the region and are those supplied by increases in  
82 manufacturing, new purchases, arrivals from other regions, donations, etc. These new ventilators do  
83 not represent those shipped from another facility. We also assume that these new ventilators arriving  
84 in time period  $t$  will not be available for use until at least time period  $t + 1$  as there will likely be  
85 some overhead time associated with in-processing the ventilator. The next parameter  $d_{it}$  denotes  
86 the number of new patients at facility  $i$  needing ventilators in time period  $t$ . For our research, this  
87 parameter is based on predictive models and will be discussed later. The last parameter  $s_{(i,j)}$  is  
88 simply the shipping time, in time periods, on arc  $(i, j)$ .

### 89 3.3. Variables

90 Variables represent the decisions that can be made when allocating ventilators. The first variable  
91  $y_{it}$  denotes the number of ventilators that are assigned to new patients at facility  $i$  during the time  
92 period  $t$ . The second variable  $I_{it}$  represents the number of ventilators held in inventory at facility  
93  $i$  at the end of time period  $t$ . The last variable  $x_{(i,j),t}$  denotes the number of ventilators that are  
94 shipped along arc  $(i, j)$  during time period  $t$ . This model assumes that the shipping logistics along  
95 the arc can be handled either by the facility or through a contracted shipper. Further research  
96 could explore the optimal shipping method although the pure logistics problem set is already well  
97 understood by large scale shipping companies such as FedEx or United Parcel Service (UPS).

### 98 3.4. Objective

The overall objective of our research is to minimize death of COVID-19 patients due to the lack of ventilators. To do this we make the assumption that if a patient does not receive a ventilator in the time period they need it, they will die of acute hypoxia or respiratory failure. To minimize death due to lack of ventilators we establish the following equation.

$$\text{Minimize: } \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (d_{it} - y_{it}) \quad (1)$$

99 This objective function does not take into account any socio-political assumptions on the value of  
 100 one life over another nor does it attempt to address disparity between facilities in the region. Future  
 101 research could consider the effect of these assumptions on ventilator sharing.

102 For the modeling effort, a slightly different objective function is used to prevent excessive  
 103 movement of ventilators in the schedule. That is, this objective as seen in Equation 2 simply  
 104 penalizes the objective for moving the ventilator but not so much that the movement of ventilators  
 105 will result in the loss of a life. This has the added benefit of creating a movement or transportation  
 106 schedule that is relatively simple. For example, a 180-day planning period involving 28,775 cases  
 107 spread across 64 counties in the state of Colorado produces a sharing schedule that involves only  
 108 117 shipments.

$$\text{Minimize: } \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (d_{it} - y_{it}) + 0.1 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} x_{(i,j),t} \quad (2)$$

### 109 3.5. Constraints

All decisions are constrained including ventilator assignment and distribution. For this effort the following six constraints were identified.

$$y_{it} \leq d_{it} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (3)$$

$$\kappa_i = I_{i,1} + \sum_j x_{(i,j),1} + y_{i,1} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{F} \quad (4)$$

$$k_{i,t} + I_{i,t-1} + \sum_{j | s_{(j,i)} < t} x_{(j,i),t-s_{(j,i)}} = I_{it} + \sum_j x_{(i,j),t} + y_{it} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, 1 < t \leq P \quad (5)$$

$$k_{i,t} + I_{i,t-1} + y_{i,t-P} + \sum_{j | s_{(j,i)} < t} x_{(j,i),t-s_{(j,i)}} = I_{it} + \sum_j x_{(i,j),t} + y_{it} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, P < t \leq |\mathcal{T}| \quad (6)$$

$$x_{(i,j),t}, y_{it}, I_{it} \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{F}, i \neq j, t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (7)$$

110 Constraint 3 ensures that ventilators assigned at a facility in a time period do not exceed the  
 111 number of new patients arriving at the facility who need ventilator support during the time period.

112 Constraints 4, 5, and 6 are the balance constraints and ensure that something is done with each  
113 available ventilator during the time period (assigned to patients, moved to a different facility, or  
114 held in inventory at the facility). These three constraints are needed as constraint 4 sets the initial  
115 conditions, constraint 5 holds during the time periods where extubations have yet to occur, and  
116 constraint 6 includes those time periods where extubations begin to occur. The last constraint 7  
117 confines the decisions to non-negative integers.

#### 118 4. Predicting Demand for Ventilators

119 The network optimization model is agnostic to the demand prediction model. Any model that  
120 can project new demand for ventilators can be used to populate the demand signal in the network  
121 optimization. The best available forecasting model for a specific region should be used to project  
122 demand.

123 To demonstrate our modeling construct, we model the demand projections,  $d_{it}$ , using a standard  
124 Susceptible, Infected, Recovered (SIR) model to project new hospital admissions due to COVID-19  
125 with a fixed proportion of these admissions requiring ventilators. The standard SIR model derived  
126 from Kermack-McKendrick [5] is defined by the following set of equations and constants where  $t$   
127 represents the time period of interest.

$$S_{t+1} = S_t - \beta S_t I_t \quad (8)$$

$$I_{t+1} = I_t - \beta S_t I_t - \gamma I_t \quad (9)$$

$$R_{t+1} = R_t + \gamma I_t \quad (10)$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{T_r} \quad (11)$$

$$\beta = (2^{1/T_d} - 1) + \gamma \quad (12)$$

128 The constants,  $T_d$  and  $T_r$  represent doubling time and recovery time respectively and also aid in  
129 calculating the basic reproduction number ( $R_0$ ) of a disease.  $R_0$  represents the expected number of  
130 cases generated by a single case of a disease and indicates how contagious an infectious disease is.  
131 Higher values of  $R_0$  indicate more rapid growth with  $R_0 \geq 1$  indicating that the disease will spread.  
132 For a notional disease, a doubling time of 4 days ( $T_d = 4$ ) and recovery time of 14 days ( $T_r = 14$ )  
133 implies

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma} = \frac{(2^{1/T_d} - 1) + 1/T_r}{1/T_r} = \frac{0.2606}{0.0714} = 3.65. \quad (13)$$

134 This means each infected person, on average, will infect 3.65 other people. Applications of the  
135 SIR model can also be adjusted to account for social distancing measures by making adjustments to  
136 the reproduction number over time, i.e.  $R_t$ . For our notional disease, if we assume social distancing  
137 measures reduce population interaction by 30% beginning on day  $t$ , this will increase the disease's  
138 doubling time to 6.6 days, resulting in  $R_t = 2.55$ .

139 For our research we use the COVID-19 Hospital Impact Model for Epidemics (CHIME) developed  
140 by the Penn Medicine Predictive Healthcare team [6]. CHIME implements a SIR model that allows  
141 hospitals to enter information about the population in their entrapment area and modify assumptions  
142 around the spread and behavior of COVID-19. CHIME applies to a population, specifically a  
143 hospital's entrapment area, it is expandable to any population. For example, Figure 1 shows how  
144 CHIME can be applied at the county level and displays new ventilator demand in the 10 most  
145 infected counties in the State of Colorado. This figure assumes a 30% reduction in social contact,  
146 one ventilator needed per hospitalization, and  $R_0 = 2.55$ . Figure 1 also demonstrates how demand  
147 for ventilators will peak at different times during the COVID-19 pandemic. This further supports  
148 the thesis that if ventilators are shared between populations within a region of interest more patients  
149 will receive needed ventilators.




Figure 1: Predicted daily ventilator demand for Colorado counties with highest COVID-19 infection counts on March 31, 2020. Assumes 30% population interaction reduction due to social distancing measures.

150 CHIME also allows for sensitivity analysis by changing the underlying assumptions required to  
151 predict new ventilator demand. Figure 2 shows the expected ventilator demand in Denver County,  
152 Colorado throughout the COVID-19 pandemic adjusted for differing reductions in social contact. For

153 example, if planners assume that social distancing measures result in a 30% reduction in population  
154 interaction and social contact in Denver County, then the model will surge ventilators to the county  
155 in the early days of the pandemic. However, if the measures had instead resulted in a 50% reduction  
156 in population interaction the ventilator surge will arrive early and be unavailable in other counties.  
157 Since the social distancing parameters can be adjusted and modeled quickly, the impact of varying  
158 assumptions can be compared and better sharing strategies developed. One potential limitation of  
159 the CHIME model is that it is not calibrated at the local level.

160 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) COVID-19 Projections model [7] is another  
161 high fidelity model that takes into account when social distancing policies go into effect at the state  
162 and global levels, which has a strong impact on the infections over time. IHME’s model could also  
163 be considered for predicting ventilator demand over time.




Figure 2: Effect of social distancing assumptions on predicted daily ventilator demand for Denver County on March 31, 2020.

## 164 5. Demonstration

165 This section demonstrates how the prediction and ventilator sharing models work together to  
166 minimize patient death due to lack of ventilators. To demonstrate, we utilize population data,  
167 case counts, and ventilator inventory estimates from each county in the State of Colorado with a  
168 confirmed COVID-19 infection as of March 31, 2020. The population estimates, case counts, and  
169 hospitalization estimates are used to predict future demand for ventilators. The population estimate  
170 is also used to estimate the number of ventilators in each county with a ratio of 19.7 ventilators per  
171 100,000 people [8]. These ventilator counts serve as the  $\kappa_i$  values in the ventilator sharing model.

172 The counties serve as proxies for facilities as the data can be readily accessed and can aid in  
 173 planning at a regional level. Future research could isolate the planning to individual hospitals.  
 174 Table 1 shows the estimated populations, case counts, estimated hospitalizations, and estimated  
 175 ventilator inventory from each of the Colorado counties with at least one estimated COVID-19  
 176 hospitalization.

County	Pop.	Cases	Hospitalized	Vent. Inv.
Denver	717797	539	97	142
El Paso	714395	286	51	141
Arapahoe	651342	333	60	129
Jefferson	579491	304	55	115
Adams	511473	181	32	101
Larimer	350362	99	18	70
Douglas	342842	141	25	68
Boulder	325476	107	19	65
Weld	314251	255	46	62
Pueblo	167116	21	4	33
Mesa	153630	14	3	31
Broomfield	69453	20	4	14
Garfield	59807	33	6	12
La Plata	56403	23	4	12
Eagle	54863	227	41	11
Montrose	42260	13	2	9
Summit	30973	20	4	7
Morgan	28503	4	1	6
Elbert	26218	5	1	6
Routt	25683	17	3	6
Teller	25060	7	1	5
Logan	21854	6	1	5
Chaffee	20028	17	3	4
Park	18557	3	1	4
Otero	18364	3	1	4
Pitkin	17879	30	5	4
Gunnison	17173	82	15	4
Grand	15474	4	1	4
Moffat	13181	4	1	3
Rio Grande	11226	5	1	3
Clear Creek	9663	4	1	2
San Miguel	8177	4	1	2
Costilla	3809	3	1	1
Baca	3547	3	1	1

Table 1: Population, case counts, estimated hospitalizations, and ventilator inventory estimates from Colorado counties with at least one estimated COVID-19 hospitalization on March 31, 2020.

177 Populations, positive COVID-19 case counts, and total Colorado COVID-19 hospitalizations  
 178 are provided by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. Hospitalizations by  
 179 county are estimated using the total hospitalizations and the proportion of positive cases in each  
 180 county.

181 To begin the demonstration we adapt CHIME in MATLAB to batch process demand predictions  
 182 for all 34 counties in Colorado with at least one estimated hospitalization due to COVID-19. The

183 data of interest are new daily ventilator admissions. Table 2 shows the model inputs and assumptions  
 184 used to predict ventilator demand. Settings were kept the same as the default settings in CHIME  
 185 with the exception of regional population and currently hospitalized, which were varied based on the  
 186 regions of interest. The settings can be easily modified as new data emerges regarding COVID-19.

187 Figure 3 demonstrates the new demand predictions generated for Denver County. Day 0 in the  
 188 figure represents March 31, 2020. For our model we assume social distancing measures went into  
 189 effect on this date and accounts for the slight dip in new hospital admissions early on. In order to  
 190 adequately account for partial values in the prediction we round all partial values up to the nearest  
 191 integer (e.g., 2.02 new admissions  $\rightarrow$  3 new admissions). And while this is a slight over-prediction,  
 192 the authors believe that this provides the best means to conservatively handle these types of values  
 193 especially since fractional patients cannot be a real value.

Table 2: CHIME inputs & settings

Variable	Setting
Regional Population	see Table 1
Hospital Market Share	100%
Currently Hospitalized COVID-19 Cases	see Table 1
Doubling Time (Days)	4
% Reduction in Population Interaction (Social Distancing)	30%
Hospitalizations (% Infected)	2.5%
ICU (% Infected)	0.75%
Ventilated (% Infected)	0.5%
Infectious Days	14
Average Days Hospitalized	7
Average Days in ICU	9
Average Days on Ventilator	10
Number of Days to Project	180

194 Once generated, the predicted ventilator demands provide the  $d_{it}$  values needed for the ventilator  
 195 distribution model. Note that two parameters needed for the CHIME model are also needed for the  
 196 ventilator sharing model. First the average number of days on a ventilator equates to the ventilator  
 197 intubation and reset period. We use  $P = 10$  in this ventilator distribution model demonstration,  
 198 although  $P$  can be adjusted to a value that is consistent with current clinical data on ventilator  
 199 treatment periods. Second, the number of days to project equates to the number of time periods to  
 200 plan, in our case  $|\mathcal{T}| = 180$ . This leaves two remaining parameters to discuss, shipping times and  
 201 new ventilators.

202 For shipping times in our demonstration we simply use the geographic coordinates for the center  
 203 of each county and measure the straight-line distance between all counties, divide by a estimated  
 204 travel distance per day and round up. Rounding up occurs to force at least one day for shipping.  
 205 This assumption is based on our belief that the ventilator, if shipped, will take at least a day to pull  
 206 out of service at the facility, go through processing to clean and inventory, be packaged for shipping,  
 207 shipped, and then processed on the receiving end before being put back into service. Further work is




Figure 3: Denver 30% Social Distancing New Admissions - March 31, 2020

208 needed to precisely calculate shipping times and facilities may have to work with their local shipping  
209 vendors to establish these times.

210 Lastly, new ventilators being introduced into the system are accounted for. Since this team does  
211 not have accurate counts nor expected arrival dates for any new ventilators in Colorado (either  
212 purchases or national stockpile), we provide new ventilator counts for demonstration purposes only.  
213 For the demonstration the team will use the following values; 100, 250, and 500 new ventilators  
214 arriving in Denver (Denver is the main transportation hub for Colorado) on the 6<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup>  
215 of April respectively.

216 Now that the parameters have been defined we demonstrate the sharing model utilizing two  
217 different scenarios. The first scenario shows the predicted death rate due to lack of ventilators under  
218 three conditions: (1) no sharing, (2) sharing, and (3) sharing with new ventilators. The second  
219 demonstrates how sensitivity analysis can be conducted as the social distancing parameters are  
220 adjusted to show how ventilator sharing is robust to changes in assumptions.

221 For the first scenario the sharing model is run under three conditions. The first condition,  
222 no sharing, indicates that there will be 17,678 deaths due to the lack of ventilators. The second  
223 condition, sharing, indicates that there will be no deaths due to lack of ventilators. To accomplish  
224 this 117 ventilator shipping actions will occur throughout the 180 day planning cycle. The last  
225 scenario also results in no deaths due to lack of ventilators as simply injecting more ventilators into  
226 a system that already contains enough to meet demand throughout the planning horizon produces  
227 the same result. However, the additional ventilators do produce a sharing plan that only involves 62  
228 shipping actions. Table 3 provides a snapshot of the shipping schedule for condition 2.

Table 3: First ten entries of the ventilator sharing schedule from scenario 1 condition 2.

Shipping	Receiving	Shipping Day	Amount
Adams	Arapahoe	1	10
Adams	Boulder	1	2
Alamosa	Larimer	1	3
Archuleta	Douglas	1	1
Archuleta	Elbert	1	1
Archuleta	Morgan	2	1
Bent	Grand	1	1
Chaffee	Baca	1	1
Chaffee	El Paso	1	1
Chaffee	Teller	1	1

229 For the second scenario we demonstrate a sensitivity analysis using the model setup parameters  
230 as presented except we will vary the social distancing (or reduction in social contact) parameter  
231 when predicting new ventilator demands. This demonstration shows how planning assumptions can  
232 be varied allowing planners to understand the associated risks and to adjust their plans as these  
233 assumptions change. The first condition for this demonstration will serve as the baseline and use the  
234 30% reduction in social contact parameter, as well as sharing with no new ventilators. The second  
235 condition will increase the social distancing to 50%, highlighting the movement of peak demand  
236 further into the planning horizon. Lastly, the social distancing parameter will begin with 30%,  
237 increase to 50% on day 15 of the planning horizon, then decrease back to 30% on day 61 of the  
238 planning horizon. This attempts to emulate an initial social distancing period, followed by a period  
239 of tightening restrictions, and a return to looser restrictions. This demonstrates the robustness of  
240 the method under changing and dynamic assumptions. Each run condition will assume the arrival  
241 of new ventilators into the region.

242 The first condition of the second scenario assumes a 30% reduction in social contact and yields  
243 zero deaths due to not having a ventilator and produces 62 shipping actions. The second scenario  
244 assumes a 50% reduction in social contact and also yields zero deaths due to not having a ventilator.  
245 The difference is in the sharing of ventilators and yields a sharing schedule that involves 64 shipping  
246 actions. The final scenario varies the social distancing parameter over time and again yields zero  
247 deaths due to lack of ventilators. These scenarios show that the initial planning assumptions can  
248 be modified throughout the course of the pandemic and schedules adjusted. Also while the social  
249 distancing assumptions were modified in the scenarios, sensitivity analysis is not limited with this  
250 parameter. In fact, any of the parameters used in the sharing model or the prediction model can be  
251 varied and their impacts explored.

## 252 6. Scaling Considerations

253 While our mathematical framework and approach can accommodate improved ventilator demand  
254 models and other constraints, it is important to recognize the various regional aspects for scaling

255 (up or down) to specific problem sets. The presented proof of concept is based on publicly available  
256 COVID-19 data for the state of Colorado that serves as a general proxy for both ventilator demand  
257 and shipping in other regions, but in order to make healthcare resource allocation decisions for  
258 local communities, counties, state and national levels there are a number of tailored inputs that  
259 should be considered. For example, each region is likely to have different assumptions of ventilator  
260 prioritization and maintenance cycles within single hospital, city, county, state, etc. Additionally  
261 the presented model generally optimizes for nearest neighbor (non-mathematical competitors), but  
262 might require human-in-loop decisions based on existing healthcare partnerships or other sources of  
263 medical devices or disposable ventilator service items.

264 One of the key elements of this framework that lends itself to scalability is the flexibility of  
265 parameter  $s_{(i,j)}$ , the shipping time along transportation route or arc  $(i, j)$ . The shipping time  
266 needs to account for intra-regional and inter-regional transportation, roadways, airways, railways,  
267 waterways, and also logistics midway nodes or transportation hubs. While our proof of concept  
268 uses GPS lat/long of mid-points for each county, the details of shipping time and logistics are best  
269 provided by the available commercial companies such as FedEx, UPS, DHL, or other express logistic  
270 services who offer an application programming interface (API). In some cases the transportation  
271 estimation may be provided by a local staff or public health employee who will be individually  
272 transporting the medical devices following an optimized route provided by a GPS traffic mapping  
273 application.

274 Additional considerations for scaling this approach to a national level are the computational  
275 needs, both hardware and software, for computing the distribution solution of a complex national  
276 system. If computer calculations are too slow, then solutions will not account for current event data  
277 or may be obsolete by the time the output is available. For the ventilator sharing model, scenarios  
278 were run on a Sun Fire x4150 with 2 Intel Zeon E5440 2.83GHz 8 core processors with 16 GB RAM.  
279 CPLEX 12.10.0.0 served as the solver and AMPL was used to setup and implement the sharing  
280 model into CPLEX. All scenarios presented solve to optimality within 5 minutes.

281 For the demand prediction model, projections were done on a Dell Latitude 7480 Intel Core  
282 i7-7600U CPU @ 2.8GHz, 2901Mhz, 2 Cores, 4 Logical Processors and 16GB RAM. For Colorado, 34  
283 out of the 64 counties have at least one estimated hospitalization as of March 31, 2020. Predicting  
284 demand curves for all 34 counties over 180 days using MATLAB R2019a takes 1.12 seconds. To  
285 predict all 64 counties over 180 days takes 1.15 seconds. However these time frames are very  
286 dependent on the hardware used and the scale of the sharing model (64 counties and 180 days to  
287 plan).

288 There is no guarantee that the optimal solution for larger regions or the national-level will solve  
289 within this documented time frame on the described hardware. It is suggested to consider the use of  
290 high performance computing systems that might be available through government or local university  
291 resources for larger problem sets desiring a higher fidelity solution within hospital networks, counties,

292 or regions with more cities.

## 293 **7. Ethical Considerations of Using a Scarce Resource Allocation Framework**

294 During a catastrophic public health crisis, a scarce resource allocation framework can aid health  
295 officials more effectively use medical resources to do the greatest good for the greatest number of  
296 patients [9, 10, 11]. However, healthcare decisions based solely on computational predictive models  
297 will be limited by their assumptions, and may not be grounded in standard healthcare practices  
298 nor would they account for ethical decisions that take into account situational considerations.  
299 Fortunately there are many different guidelines regarding the ethical criteria to inform the creation of  
300 an allocation framework for ventilators or critical care resources [12, 13]. The goals of an allocation  
301 framework often include providing meaningful access and individualized assessments based on the  
302 best available medical evidence for all patients. In addition, most decision makers agree a successful  
303 allocation effort requires public trust and cooperation through transparent and inclusive participation  
304 in the process.

305 The use of an allocation framework generated with community engagement prior to a crisis  
306 can help ensure no patient is denied care based on stereotypes, assessments of quality of life or  
307 judgments about their ‘worth’ based on the presence or absence of disabilities or other factors.  
308 There is significant caution to consider not using categorical exclusion criteria because they are often  
309 too rigid during a dynamic crisis and can be associated with discrimination. Other considerations  
310 include: periodic reassessments of patients to maximize population health outcomes; prioritization  
311 of individuals with vital functions during a pandemic (e.g. essential workers and healthcare workers).  
312 Potential methods to generate an allocation of resources are outlined by White et. al [12, 11]; we  
313 adapt those to the use of our mathematical framework for ventilator distribution:

- 314 1. Create triage teams to ensure consistent decision making on the availability and needs of  
315 scarce critical care resources at the local healthcare facility;
- 316 2. Establish criteria for initial allocation of incoming ventilators; and
- 317 3. Establish reassessment criteria to determine whether ongoing provision of ventilators are  
318 justified for individual patients, and to ensure the extensive regional demand for ventilator  
319 resources are not biasing individual patient healthcare decisions.

320 Another key consideration is that any implemented solution based on the method described  
321 in the mathematical framework should use demand values based on actual healthcare data or in  
322 combination with predictive models that fully describe their assumptions. Some states like Colorado  
323 and other regions offer this data, while others may not. It is important to consider the fusion of  
324 real and predictive data to guide ethical decision making but not to provide definitive healthcare  
325 resource management.

## 326 **8. Conclusions**

327 Our work demonstrates a mathematical framework for ventilator distribution under scarcity  
328 conditions using an optimized network model and solver and shows when to transport ventilators and  
329 to which locations while accounting for availability of devices, ventilation treatment time periods,  
330 disinfection and cleaning between patients, as well as shipping logistics time. While the proof of  
331 concept used Colorado data with GPS center point locations and a generalized ventilator predicative  
332 demand model, it represents elements of all healthcare systems. Our work also discusses some of  
333 the scaling considerations that require regional or situational adjustments for actual geographic  
334 locations, shipping logistics and a daily or 12-hour updates to the ventilator demand signal with  
335 real data. We also emphasize the importance of applying ethical human-in-the-loop decision making  
336 when using this or similar computational predictive model approaches to managing medical device  
337 resources during epidemic emergencies. The foundations of this work can also apply to other scarce  
338 medical resource challenges. Future work should investigate the nuances of applying this approach  
339 to special hospital health networks in addition to leveraging synthetic patient healthcare data [14]  
340 as a more accurate predictor of emerging resource needs.

## 341 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

342 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial  
343 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## 344 **Author Contributions**

345 Mr. Billingham developed the network optimization model and proof of concept. Ms. Widrick  
346 developed the Ventilator demand model dataset for Colorado, Mr. Edwards contributed to the  
347 use-case and background research. Dr. Klaus provided key discussion on the ethics and use of  
348 computer-based models in a healthcare setting.

## 349 **Funding**

350 This work was an independent research effort to contribute to the national COVID-19 response.  
351 The authors' affiliations with The MITRE Corporation is provided for identification purposes only,  
352 and is not intended to convey or imply MITRE's concurrence with, or support for, the positions,  
353 opinions, or viewpoints expressed by the author. © 2020 The MITRE Corporation. ALL RIGHTS  
354 RESERVED. Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. Public Release Case Number  
355 20-1307.

## 356 Acknowledgments

357 We would like to acknowledge CHIME at Penn Medicine for making their model available for  
358 public use. We could not have reproduced their logic and generated the demand curves seen in this  
359 paper in such a rapid turnaround without their methodology and downloadable source code.

## 360 Data Availability Statement

361 The datasets generated for this study are available to U.S. national, state and regional agencies  
362 as well as healthcare systems on request to the corresponding author.

## 363 References

- 364 1. Adelman D. Thousands Of Lives Could Be Saved In The US During The COVID-19 Pan-  
365 demic If States Exchanged Ventilators. *Health Affairs* 2020;:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00505 URL:  
366 <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/full/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00505>. doi:10.1377/  
367 hlthaff.2020.00505; publisher: Health Affairs.
- 368 2. Beemer BA, Gregg DG. Advisory Systems to Support Decision Making. In: Burstein F, W. Hol-  
369 sapple C, eds. *Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1: Basic Themes*. International Handbooks  
370 Information System; Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. ISBN 978-3-540-48713-5; 2008:511–27. URL:  
371 [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5_24). doi:10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5\_24.
- 372 3. Polanco C, Castañón-González JA, Macías AE, Samaniego JL, Buhse T, Villanueva-Martínez  
373 S. Detection of Severe Respiratory Disease Epidemic Outbreaks by CUSUM-Based Overcrowd-  
374 Severe-Respiratory-Disease-Index Model. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in*  
375 *Medicine* 2013;2013. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3771461/>.  
376 doi:10.1155/2013/213206.
- 377 4. Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU)  
378 . COVID-19 Dashboard. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>; 2020. URL: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>.
- 380 5. Anderson RM, May RM. Population biology of infectious diseases: Part I. *Nature*  
381 1979;280(5721):361–7. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/280361a0>. doi:10.1038/  
382 280361a0; number: 5721 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- 383 6. Predictive Healthcare at Penn Medicine . COVID-19 Hospital Impact Model for Epidemics  
384 (CHIME). <https://penn-chime.phl.io/>; 2020. URL: <https://penn-chime.phl.io/>.

- 385 7. IHME COVID-19 Projections. <https://covid19.healthdata.org/>; 2020. URL: <https://covid19.healthdata.org/>; library Catalog: [covid19.healthdata.org](https://covid19.healthdata.org/).
- 386
- 387 8. Rubinson L, Vaughn F, Nelson S, Giordano S, Kallstrom T, Buckley T, Burney T, Hupert N,  
388 Mutter R, Handrigan M, et al. . Mechanical ventilators in us acute care hospitals. *Disaster*  
389 *Medicine and Public Health Preparedness* 2010;4(3):199–206. doi:10.1001/dmp.2010.18.
- 390 9. Childress JF, Faden RR, Gaare RD, Gostin LO, Kahn J, Bonnie RJ, Kass NE, Mastroianni AC,  
391 Moreno JD, Nieburg P. Public health ethics: mapping the terrain. *The Journal of Law, Medicine*  
392 *& Ethics: A Journal of the American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 2002;30(2):170–8.  
393 doi:10.1111/j.1748-720x.2002.tb00384.x.
- 394 10. Gostin L. Public Health Strategies for Pandemic Influenza: Ethics and the Law.  
395 *JAMA* 2006;295(14):1700–4. URL: [https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/202648)  
396 [202648](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/202648). doi:10.1001/jama.295.14.1700; publisher: American Medical Association.
- 397 11. White DB. A Model Hospital Policy for Allocating Scarce Crit-  
398 ical Care Resources 2020;URL: [https://ccm.pitt.edu/?q=content/](https://ccm.pitt.edu/?q=content/model-hospital-policy-allocating-scarce-critical-care-resources-available-online-now)  
399 [model-hospital-policy-allocating-scarce-critical-care-resources-available-online-now](https://ccm.pitt.edu/?q=content/model-hospital-policy-allocating-scarce-critical-care-resources-available-online-now).
- 400 12. White DB, Lo B. A Framework for Rationing Ventilators and Critical Care Beds During  
401 the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA* 2020;URL: [https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2763953)  
402 [fullarticle/2763953](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2763953). doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5046.
- 403 13. Biddison ELD, Gwon HS, Schoch-Spana M, Regenberg AC, Juliano C, Faden RR, Toner  
404 ES. Scarce Resource Allocation During Disasters: A Mixed-Method Community Engage-  
405 ment Study. *CHEST* 2018;153(1):187–95. URL: [https://journal.chestnet.org/article/](https://journal.chestnet.org/article/S0012-3692(17)31393-4/abstract)  
406 [S0012-3692\(17\)31393-4/abstract](https://journal.chestnet.org/article/S0012-3692(17)31393-4/abstract). doi:10.1016/j.chest.2017.08.001; publisher: Elsevier.
- 407 14. The MITRE Corporation . Synthea™ Synthetic Patient Generator.  
408 <https://synthetichealth.github.io/synthea/>; 2020. URL: [https://synthetichealth.](https://synthetichealth.github.io/synthea/)  
409 [github.io/synthea/](https://synthetichealth.github.io/synthea/).