medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

An Agent Based Model for assessing spread and health systems burden for COVID-19 using a synthetic population in Rangareddy district, Telangana state, India

Narassima M S[1], Guru Rajesh Jammy[2], Rashmi Pant[2], Lincoln Choudhury[3], Aadharsh R[4], Vijay Yeldandi[2], Anbuudayasankar S P[1], Rangasami R[5], Denny John[6]

[1]Department of Mechanical Engineering, Amrita School of Engineering, Coimbatore, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India.

[2]Society for Health, Allied Research and Education (SHARE-INDIA), Telangana, India.

[3]Krashapana Consultancy Private limited, New Delhi, India.

[4]Department of Aerospace Engineering, Amrita School of Engineering, Coimbatore, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India.

[5]Department of Social Work, Coimbatore, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India.

[6]Department of Public Health, Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Kochi, Kerala, India

Abstract

COVID-19 disease, caused by SARS-CoV-2 virus, has infected over four million people globally. It has been declared as a "Public Health Emergency of International Concern" (PHEIC), by the World Health Organization (1). Several mathematical models, mostly based on compartmental modeling, are being used for projections for COVID-19 in India. These projections are being used for policy level decisions and public health prevention activities (2,3). Unlike compartmental models, which consider population averages, Agent Based Models (ABM) consider individual behavior in the models for disease projections. ABMs, provide better insights into projections compared to compartmental models (4).

We present an ABM approach with a synthetic population from Rangareddy district, Telangana state, India, to examine the patterns and trends of the COVID-19 in terms of infected, admitted, critical cases requiring intensive care and/ or ventilator support, mortality and recovery. The model is developed based on data pertaining to a local area, i.e. district, as this

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

prove to be much helpful for policymaking compared to models estimating nation-wide disease projections. The parameters for the ABM model were defined and model run for a period of 365 days for three different non-pharmaceutical intervention (NPI) scenarios, namely; no lockdown, 50% lockdown and 75% lockdown scenarios. AnyLogic platform was used for the ABM simulations. Results revealed that the peak values and slope of the curve declined as NPI became more stringent. The results could provide a platform for researchers and modelers to explore using ABM approach for COVID-19 projections with inclusion of interventions and health system preparedness.

Key words

Agent Based Model, AnyLogic, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Coronavirus, India

1. Introduction

The first reported case of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19 or SARS-CoV-2) in India dates back to January 30, 2020 when it was also announced as pandemic by WHO (5,6). Since then, epidemic has spread across India infecting 44,94,389 people with 9,27,545 active cases, 34,90,908 recovered cases and 75,328 deaths as on Sep 10, 2020 (7). Globally, COVID-19 has spread across 213 nations, infecting 28,035,700 people worldwide and claiming 908,991 lives as on Sep 10, 2020, posing a global health emergency (8–10).

In a country like India having a denser population, the situation poses a serious challenge (11). There are several underlying factors such as age, comorbidities, exposure to air pollution, amount of exposure to virus, etc., that may determine the severity of infection and rate of recovery (12). Higher transmission rate of the disease further increases the vulnerability. Reports estimate that the transmission rates range from 2.24 to 3.58 and WHO estimates transmission rates between 1.4 to 2.5 (10,13). The behaviour of COVID-19 is found to be similar to that of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) epidemic family which reduces

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the chance of reinfection (12,14). Common symptoms of COVID-19 include fever, cough and fatigue (9). Yet, the existence of a significant proportion of asymptomatic carriers makes it a greater cause for concern as they remain unidentified and can unknowingly spread the disease to healthy people (15–17). Travel restrictions have reduced the rate of spread of the infection (18,19). Other non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) such as restrictions on public gatherings, intra-city movements, etc., may flatten the curve. It is important to understand the time required between exposure and complete recovery, using these interventions, to take timely responsive actions against COVID-19 (20).

Simulation is an effective technique to provide solutions to real-time problems because it obviates the burden of making changes to physical systems that require a lot of investment in time, cost and risks (21). Simulation represents a way of mapping several real-world scenarios as a model (22). Simulation outperforms analytical models for handling optimization of complex and dynamic systems (23). There are several mathematical models being utilized at this time for COVID-19 that are based on compartmental models and Discrete Event Simulation (DES). Since compartmental models and DES do not account for the interactions between individual entities within the system, Agent Based Modeling (ABM) may be a better option to gain insights (24).

There are major differences among the widely used simulation models. DES mainly focusses on the flows of entities through various states/ processes of the system. There are no interactions between the entities of the system. System Dynamics concentrates on flows, stocks and delays. It focusses on collective measures rather than on measures pertaining to single/ group of agents. ABM is said to direct agents based on their parameters. This method also considers the interaction between agents whilst distinguishing them based on their individual parameters (25,26). Advancements in information technology and computational capabilities

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

have paved way for system science techniques like ABM (27). ABMs have gained interest among researchers across various verticals, including public health in recent times (28–30).

ABM is thought to be of a greater importance in the public health domain as it incorporates actions of individuals/ agents within the system, helping the model comprehend infection spread dynamics better (31,32). ABM follows a bottom-up approach i.e., the behaviour of the system is a result of behaviour of individuals, defined as agents within the system (33,34). ABM allows definition of factors such as age, underlying health conditions and other susceptibility factors to the agents to make each of them behave distinctly (34). Various factors such as the data quality, disease dynamics, ever-changing social and environmental interactions, uncertainties in effects of these interventions need to be properly dealt with as they impact on the accuracy of models (35). Mixing patterns among the agents within a system play a vital role in dynamic transmission models for close contact infections (36).

In the past, ABMs have been employed to address various infectious diseases such as, a bioterrorist introduction of smallpox (37), design vaccination strategies for influenza (38), curtail transmission of measles through contact tracing and quarantine (39), control of tuberculosis (40), implementation of distancing measures and antiviral prophylaxis to control H5N1 influenza A (bird flu) (41) and devise evacuation strategies in the event of airborne contamination (42).

An evaluation of use of ABM on COVID-19 globally suggests its use to measure; the effects of lockdown on transmission dynamics (43–46), post-lockdown measures (47), use of control measures (face mask, social distancing) (47,48), isolation of vulnerable proportion of population (47,49), contact tracing, intelligence of agents (based on awareness level (44) or protection level), contact tracing measures (44,48), good practices such as sneezing into one's hands (45), both direct (upon contact) and indirect transmission (through suspended particles)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(45), scheduled-based contacts (45,47,50) with close circle and in work, transport and public places (45,49,51), viral-load based transmissibility (48), examination of genomic sequencing to determine the spread (52), etc.

In India, several COVID-19 models have been conducted based on Susceptible (S), Exposed (E), Infective (I) and Recovered (R) (SEIR) (53–56), Susceptible (S), Exposed (E), Symptomatic (I), Purely Asymptomatic (P), Hospitalized or Quarantined (H), Recovered (R) and Deceased (D) (SIPHERD) (57), mathematical models (58,59), etc., to compare the spread during lockdown and no lockdown scenarios. Majority of these models ignore certain important aspects as they encapsulate the entire population as a compartment whilst the ABMs account for granular details. However, the complexity of models is associated with computational intensity. Ability of ABM to account for details of individual agents steered the present study to adopt ABM.

The present study aims to define an ABM approach using AnyLogic 8.5.2 University edition, to examine the patterns and trends for the number of infected people, admitted people, people who might require intensive care and/ or ventilator support, mortality rate, recovery and effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions on the transmission dynamics, for the COVID-19 epidemic in Rangareddy district, Telangana State, India. Nation-wide models restrict the policymakers locally to devise strategies based on the results as they might not fit properly to the locality (60). In countries like India where people are diverse in all respects like population dynamics, contact network, migrating population, nature of work, etc., local models might prove effective and would assist policymakers to take local decisions for disease mitigation.

2. Materials and Methods

The present study models a local population of Rangareddy district, Telangana state, India with an aim to help the policymakers to identify the latent factors of COVID-19 that lead to influx of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

infections and impose measures (61). The modeling follows an ABM approach using AnyLogic 8.5.2 University edition to model the interaction environment (22).

The parameters that were available through review of literature were used to define the proportion of people who get infected and die, number of people to whom an infected individual would transmit the infection, etc. The three key components of ABM namely i) a realistic synthetic population, ii) social contact network among the agents, and iii) a disease model was considered to construct the model (35). The entire simulation and reporting follows the ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices and ethical good practice in modelling (62–64). These guidelines were used so that the assumptions, scope and shortcomings of the model are transparent to the readers and policymakers.

2.1. Synthetic population

A synthetic population is one of the commonly used approaches to represent a group of people, preserving the confidentiality of individuals. Synthetic population has statistical equivalence with the original population being represented and is indistinguishable from the census data (65). For this study, we used a synthetic population developed for Rangareddy, Telangana state consisting of 5,48,323 people (representing 10.35 % of total population (n-52,96,741 as per Census of India 2011), to demonstrate the ABM (66,67). .

Age was a major parameter considered to distinguish the population as it is one of the major parameters governing the number of people who would be met by an individual (12,36). Table 1 represents the age-wise distribution of the synthetic population.

Table 1: Age-wise distribution of synthetic population of Rangareddy

Age group (years)	**Population/ No. of agents**
Less than 5	47039

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

5 to 59	459372
Above 60	41912

2.2. Transmission rates of COVID-19

Based on the WHO report on COVID-19 (16 to 24 Feb 2020), the transmission rates were defined using the upper and lower limits given for the close contact infections (considering both household and other infections). The close contact transmission rate was varied from 1 to 10 percent (68).

2.3. Contact network

The contact network plays a vital role in transmission dynamics. This includes i) contact rate estimation, ii) mapping the estimated contact rate in proportion with the population densities of various townships and iii) estimation of average contact rate based on proportion of various population densities. For contact rate estimation, we used a study from Ballabgarh, India, which determined the number of close contacts made by individuals on a daily basis, which could assist the researchers to define contact rates for close contact infections (69). The dataset representing the number of people met by each individual was input into the 'Input Analyzer' tool of Arena (Version 16.00.00002). Input Analyzer takes the values of a dataset and gives the best-fit distribution. It also provides the option to fit the data to any desired distribution with some errors of fitting into a distribution. The contact rates of each group were found to follow normal distributions using "Input Analyzer" tool of Arena software (Table 2). Density-Dependent contact rate was presumed for the study.

Table 2: Contact rate distribution of Ballabgarh (69)

Years	Number of respondents	Average no. of people met per day	Min	Max	Distribution of contact rate(s)	Square Error
<5	378	15.108	4	48	NORM(15.1, 6.82)	0.00656

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

5 to 59	2185	17.194	1	67	NORM(17.2, 8.01)	0.003202
60+	380	12.863	1	41	NORM(12.9, 5.49)	0.002328

To determine the population densities of various classified townships of India, we used the Indian population proportion classified based on types of towns that are presented in table 3 (70,71). The population density of Ballabgarh is 551 people per square kilometer (69). This was used to proportionately determine the contact rates that would be obtained for various types of towns based on their respective population densities, assuming Density Dependent (DD) contact rate (72,73).

$$\text{Contact rate} = \text{Slope} * \frac{\text{Population}}{\text{Area}} \qquad ...(1)$$

For estimation of average contact rate based on proportion of various population densities, the corresponding proportions of people from the sample size of the study in Ballabgarh were segregated and mapped to be living in Statutory town, Census town, Outgrowth and Village, respectively. The contact rates for people in these various townships were calculated proportionately based on their corresponding population densities using the multiplication factor (slope in equation (1)) (table 3), which represents the ratio of the population density of a particular location type to the population density of Ballabgarh.

Table 3: Classification of Indian towns with population proportions and densities (70)

Census classification	Population density per km^2	Proportion of Indian population (%)	Multiplication factor
Statutory town	3977	26.3	7.22
Census town	2069	4.5	3.75
Outgrowth	1241	0.4	2.25
Village	292	68.9	0.53

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4: Contact rate distributions of various age groups (for India). Indicated are the parameters of Lognormal distributions: μ – mean of the included Normal; σ – standard deviation of the included Normal; Min – minimum sample (contact) value.

	No lockdown			**50% lockdown**			**75% lockdown**		
Years	μ	σ	Min	M	σ	Min	μ	Σ	Min
<5	2.774	0.899	6	2.080	0.899	3	1.387	0.899	1.5
5 to 59	2.883	0.856	6	2.189	0.856	3	1.496	0.856	1.5
60+	2.599	0.844	5	1.906	0.844	3	1.213	0.844	1.25

Table 4 indicates the contact rate distributions for each of the age groups, which were calculated as explained subsequently. Number of people in each age group were divided further based on the proportion of people residing in each of the town type (70). The number of contacts made by people under town category were multiplied by their respective multiplication factors as reported in Table 3. These values were integrated to Input Analyzer and their respective contact rate distributions were then determined. Lognormal distributions as mentioned in table 4 were obtained for contact rates. Natural log of the lognormal variables was then determined, the parameters of which indicate the included normal values.

2.4. State chart

A state chart represents the various states in which an agent would exist, at any given instant (23). Figure 1 represents the state chart for the disease model (22). The initial state of all agents is defined to be healthy, as it is linked with the 'start' of the simulation. Once the simulation is run, an agent would be triggered to move to the 'infected' state randomly based on the probability i.e., he/ she is considered to acquire the infection. Further, based on the parameters assigned as per table 5, the agents would interact with other agents in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

population and transmit the infection which is dependent on the number of contacts an agent interacts every day and the probability of an agent to get infected through contact, i.e., transmission rate. Agents in 'infected' state go through an incubation period from the time of exposure and turn out to be either symptomatic or asymptomatic. Agents continue to contact other agents and transmit till they either get 'admitted' after being 'symptomatic' or till they 'recover' being 'asymptomatic' for a defined time duration. Once admitted, all agents undergo treatment and either recover from the illness or move to serious illness condition and are taken to Intensive Care Unit (ICU) state. Upon further treatment, some patients recover after intensive care whereas a proportion of them turn critical and would require 'ventilator' support. Patients in this state either recover or are deceased after the treatment. Illness levels of patients during treatment tenure are categorized in three levels represented by 'admitted', 'ICU' and 'ventilator' states indicating severity of illness as illness, serious illness and critical illness respectively (33).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: State chart for agent(s) (people)

2.5. Model calibration

Various parameters that are included in the model were determined based on various sources as discussed in this section. Models of Infectious Disease Agent Study (MIDAS) has also been used as a source of acquiring parameters through the pre-prints and manuscripts available (74). Calibration of the model depicts the assignment of run parameters required for simulation that are presented in table 5 and also in points that follow.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 5: Parameters for the model

Parameters	**<5**	**5-59**	**>59**	**References**
Number of contacts per day	Table 4 (Lognormal distribution)			(69,70)
Probability of getting infected through contact	Varies in random from (1 to 10) percent			(68)
Proportion of people remaining asymptomatic after infection	0.8			(75,76)
Average incubation period (for both symptomatic and asymptomatic) (in days)	5			(34)
Average treatment duration (in days)	14			(20)
Proportion of hospitalized cases in ICU	0.11			(77,78)
Treatment duration in ICU (in days)	Triangular(7,8,9)			(20,78)
Proportion of people moving from ICU to critical illness (Ventilator assistance)	0.88			(78)
Treatment duration in ventilator state (in days)	Triangular(5,7,12)			(20)
Time between symptom arrival and admission (with no intervention) (in days)	5			(79)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Time between symptom arrival and admission (with intervention) (in days)	3	(79)
Proportion of people who die	Number of deaths/ Number of infections (as per Indian statistics)	(7)

References for parameters:

- The WHO estimates that in India, about 80% of the cases remain asymptomatic or mild, 15% of the cases are severe and 5% cases require intense care and/ or ventilator assistance (76).
- Recovered patients are not infected again and hence are excluded from further simulation process.
- Number of people who come in contact with an individual in the population follows a lognormal distribution as mentioned in table 4.
- Hospital admission duration was determined to be 13 days with an Inter-quartile range (IQR) of (10-18) days for patients with no severity (20).
- Time duration between exposure to discharge was 23 days with an IQR of (18-24.5) days (20).
- Time duration of illness onset to discharge i.e., after the arrival of symptoms, was 18.5 days with an IQR of (15-22) days (20).
- Incubation period was found to be 4 days with an IQR of (3-6) days. The longest incubation period was determined to be 14 days (20).
- Time between illness onset to admission was 5 days (20).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2.6. Model scenarios

Once the model was developed and the parameters were assigned appropriately, the simulation was run for a duration of 365 days. The model was designed to trigger one infected agent (5-59 years) into the healthy population to understand the transmission dynamics and spread of infection based on the given parameters. In order to study the effect of minimization of number of contacts among the agents, three different scenarios were simulated and the results were compared that are discussed in the subsequent sections.

First scenario, referred to as "no lockdown" scenario can be comprehended as a routine day-to-day life as there were no NPI put in place from the day when the epidemic marked its onset in India (7). The parameters considered for the simulation of "no lockdown" scenario (scenario 1) are all based on the statistics obtained after the origination of the epidemic. Second and third scenarios considered 50% and 75% reductions in day-to-day contact among people, that are referred to as "50% lockdown" or "scenario 2" and "75% lockdown" or "scenario 3" respectively in this manuscript. In order to study the effect of lockdown, the contact rate of people needs to be reduced. To achieve this, the results of a study that presented the proportion of contacts made by individuals of different age groups were utilized (table 6). The number of contacts made at different locations namely home, school, work and others, as designated by the authors of the study was used to enact the lockdown (80). To simulate the NPI scenarios, the number of people met in work and other places were reduced by 75 percent and 50 percent for the two scenarios whereas the contacts in school was completely discarded owing to the closure of schools. These resulted in reduced diffusion of the infection across the population, results of which are discussed subsequently.

Table 6: Age-wise contact rate (average) based on different locations

Age group	Home	Work	School	Other
0-5	4.97	0.03	0.52	3.54

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

5 to 59	41.17	34.06	31.67	60.41
60+	12.86	1.45	0.76	10.94
Total	59	35.54	32.95	74.89

3. Results

Simulations were run for different age groups as per the categorization for all the three scenarios. Detailed day-wise data of the number of people in each health state is provided in the supplementary excel file. The results of the same and their interpretations are discussed below.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: a) Number of uninfected people – all age groups b) Number of infected people – all age groups (Cumulative) c) Number of infected people (for a given instant)

Figure 2 a) represents the number of uninfected people on each day and it is clear that the rate of reduction in number of uninfected people declines as the stringency of the imposed lockdown increases. After a duration of one year, proportion of people who remain uninfected are 28.53, 76.33 and 93.8 percent in No lockdown, 50% lockdown and 75% lockdown scenarios respectively.

Figure 2 b) indicates the total number of people infected till any day cumulatively. These results complement figure 2 a) owing to the fact that lockdown conditions hinder the rate of spread of the infection. The rate of spread of the infection is the minimum for the third scenario and is the maximum for scenario without any lockdown. Maximum number of people

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

infected in scenarios 2 & 3 over a one-year simulation run are 129779 and 33973 which would be reached in a period of just 33 and 25 days in a no lockdown condition.

Figure 2 c) represents the number of infections on a given day for all the three scenarios. These values reach a maximum of 191907, 37790 and 7986 which corresponds to 35%, 6.89% and 1.46% respectively of the initial population. A significant amount of reduction in peak infections is seen due to the lockdowns imposed. Furthermore, it is also noteworthy that there is a delay in the occurrence of these peak values as the stringency of the lockdowns-imposed increases.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: a) Number of asymptomatic people – all age groups b) Number of admitted people– all age groups c) Number of people in ICU – all age groups d) Number of people using ventilators – all age groups

Figure 3 a) represents the number of asymptomatic people on each day indicating the peak values for the three different scenarios. The proportion of asymptomatic people is as high as 80% of the total infected people. Number of asymptomatic carriers reach a peak value corresponding to 31.71%, 6.28% and 1.33% of the initial population respectively for the three scenarios. There is an occurrence of a maximum equal to 173892 on 44th day, 34414 on 84th day and 7281 on 90th day for the no lockdown, 50% and 75% lockdown scenarios respectively.

Figure 3 b) represents the number of people who would be in admitted state on each day. The peak values correspond to 6.42%, 1.33% and 0.28% of the initial healthy population

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

respectively for the three scenarios. There is a considerable reduction in the maximum number of simultaneous admissions as the lockdown stringency is increased.

Figure 3 c) indicates the number of people who move from normal illness to ICU on each day. The peak number of patients in ICU are 2390, 496 and 94 respectively for the three scenarios, which indicate the minimum number of intensive care setups required for the respective scenarios.

The peak values represented in figure 3 d) indicate the number of people who would require ventilator assistance on any given day. The peak values 1929, 405 and 78 indicate the minimum number of ventilator setups required for each of the scenarios, as indicated in table 7 for each state represented by figure 3 d).



Figure 4: Number of people deceased – all age groups

Figure 4 indicates the number of people deceased for various days. Higher mortality rate is seen for a no lockdown condition and it is seen to decline as the stringency of lockdown is increased. Number of people deceased after the model was simulated for 365 days are 2288, 760 and 199 which correspond to 0.42%, 0.14% and 0.04% of the initial population respectively for three of the scenarios.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 7 indicates the peak values for various states possessed by the agents in the infection model. These values throw light on the timely measures to be taken to meet the peak demands for resources for each of the scenario considered. The peak values also decrease for all these states as the stringency of lockdown is increased, indicating the effectiveness of lockdown measures. The values (in %) indicate the percentage with respect to the initial healthy population.

Table 7: Peak values for various health conditions

	No lockdown			**50% lockdown**			**75% lockdown**		
	Value	**%**	**Day**	**Value**	**%**	**Day**	**Value**	**%**	**Day**
Uninfected	548320	100.00	1	548321	100.00	1	548321	100.00	1
Infected	191907	35.00	43	37790	6.89	84	7986	1.46	90
Asymptomatic	173892	31.71	44	34414	6.28	84	7281	1.33	90
Symptomatic	23269	4.24	36	3450	0.63	78	723	0.13	85
Admitted	35186	6.42	49	7271	1.33	91	1510	0.28	97
ICU	2390	0.44	60	496	0.09	104	94	0.02	125
Ventilator	1929	0.35	68	405	0.07	114	78	0.01	132
Deceased	2288	0.42	224	760	0.14	209	199	0.04	231
Recovered	389572	71.05	226	129018	23.53	216	33773	6.16	230

The peak number of infections is seen to decline for 50% and 75% lockdown conditions compared to that of the no lockdown scenario. Likewise, there are drops across all the peak values such as the number of admissions in ICU, peak number of patients requiring ventilators, and number of people deceased. A significant drop in peak number of ICUs required from 2390 for a no lockdown condition to 94 for a 75% lockdown is evident. Concurrently, the peak

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

number of ventilators decline from 1929 for a no lockdown condition to 78 for a 75% lockdown condition.

4. Discussion

This approach based on the synthetic population of 5,43,823 agents in Rangareddy District, Telangana state, India, for three different NPI scenarios (no lockdown, 50% lockdown and 75% lockdown) projects that the transmission rate of COVID-19 could be effectively brought down by stringency of lockdowns imposed. The focus of the study being on a district-level is a major strength of the study as it facilitates decision-making easier to policymakers at specific regions (60). The simulation results are presented using ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices and ethical good practice in modelling.

Synthetic populations are most often generated from open source data such as Open data from French National Statistical Institute (INSEE), Santé Publique France, London Imperial College, etc., (47), US Census Bureau data, (45,49), Australian Census data (52), etc. The geographical scope of the study governs the number of agents considered and the number of agents considered varies depending on the region studied. For example, 10 million stochastic agents for the State of Delaware, US (45), a scaled-down simulation of New York with 10000 agents (44), synthetic population of NYC with 500,000 (49), 5000 agents in the premises of Università Politecnica delle Marche, Italy (50), 24 million agents representing the population of Australia (52), 750,805 agents representing Urmia, Iran (46), etc.

Assumptions/ approaches to establish the contact networks augment variations in behavioral aspects of agents in each model. Classification of a group of people aged greater than 65 and/ or with underlying illness as obesity, chronic cardiac or respiratory illness, and diabetes (47), awareness level (that enhances protection), use of contact tracing mechanisms (48), schedule-based contacts with house members (44,45,49), close contacts (49), closed spaces such as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

work/ office spaces, university (44,50), indirect contact with suspended viral particles, public gatherings at café, gym, hospitals, transport, (45), touching contaminated surfaces, washing hands (44,48,81), etc., have all been modeled.

Given the above variations in models, there are also a spectrum of scenarios analyzed by modelers with an aim to determine the ones that outperform others, such as the no lockdown scenario that is included in almost all studies to be used as a base for comparison, control measures such as face masks, physical distancing , shielding of vulnerable population (47), lockdowns for varying durations (47), by reducing number of contacts in external settings whilst maintaining the close contacts in family constant (45), lifting lockdowns based on age-groups (49), and effect of contact tracing of symptomatic individuals (44,49).

In the present study, a decrease in number of contacts at various locations such as in schools, works, etc., was incorporated to enact lockdown scenarios whilst maintaining the contacts made at house (54). It is evident from the results of present study that as the percentage of lockdown imposed was increased, the magnitudes of peak infections reduced with a delay in their corresponding occurrences, which provides more time for the policymakers to increase their capacities to meet the influx of cases. A team of researchers from The Center For Disease Dynamics, Economics & Policy (CDDEP) and Princeton University using ABM estimated the state-wise capacity requirements to accommodate the influx of hospitalizations to help the policymakers to increase their capacities to match the influx based on estimates in India (82,83).

Considering some other parameters for projections could improve the accuracy of projections, such as high levels of clustering in contact networks, especially in the context of spread of infections would provide more accurate results (84–87). GIS information, migration routes and defined schedules could be included to improve the projections in specific areas (32,33).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Wearable devices could be integrated with mobiles to provide real-time monitoring of COVID-19 patients by their healthcare practitioners (88). Other NPIs such as maintenance of face and hand hygiene, wearing protective face mask, etc. could be incorporated into the model to improve the accuracy and to understand the infection transmission dynamics (89). Exploring the contact network and dynamics of different regions would help us to represent the region-specific disease spread better (60). Also, including spatial data, ethnicity, gender, etc., into the model would allow obtaining region-specific results.

There are certain limitations to the study as parameters such as underlying health conditions, migration routes, adoption of control measures (face mask, social distancing, etc.), longitudinally varying lockdown phases, etc., have not been considered. The results of simulation model clearly indicate that the peak values of the number of infections, number of admissions in hospital, number of symptomatic/ asymptomatic cases, number of ICUs and ventilators required, and number of people deceased could significantly be reduced by increasing the lockdown imposed. Thus, the importance of reducing the number of contacts, i.e., social distancing, is apparent through the results of this study and flattening the disease curve.

5. Conclusions

Majority of the ABM studies focus on specific regions that is a major strength of ABM as it allows defining characteristics at individual level (49). We present an approach towards ABM using AnyLogic on a synthetic population in Rangareddy district, Telangana state, India. Further, data specific to India to parametrize such ABM will be critical. Having a synthetic population of a country can provide several options to create ABMs for several disease conditions apart from COVID-19 and may prove efficient for decision-making.

Data Availability

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Detailed day-wise data of the number of people in each of the state (age-group wise), the AnyLogic model file, synthetic population (text file) and input template (Spreadsheet) are available at: https://cloud.anylogic.com/model/7cd10c0c-f1c1-4b8f-9aac-0bf37a45379a?mode=SETTINGS and https://osf.io/utmhg/files/

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Funding information

No funds were received for conducting this modeling study.

References

1. Menon G. In times of COVID-19: An interview with Professor Gautam Menon [Internet]. Ashoka Bulletin. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.ashoka.edu.in/stories/welcome-488
2. Ian Ginbey, Emma Barkas, Rajpreet Uppal. COVID-19 UK: Top 10 predictions for the planning and development sector in a post-COVID-19 world: Clyde & Co [Internet]. Clyde & Co LLP. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 13]. Available from: https://www.clydeco.com/en/insights/2020/05/COVID-19-uk-top-10-predictions-for-the-planning-an
3. Adam D. Special report: The simulations driving the world's response to COVID-19. Nature. 2020 Apr 1;580(7803):316–8.
4. Maziarz M, Zach M. Agent-based modelling for SARS-CoV-2 epidemic prediction and intervention assessment: A methodological appraisal. J Eval Clin Pract [published online ahead print, 2020 Aug 21]. 2020;1–9.
5. World Health Organization (WHO) [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-statement-on-ihr-emergency-committee-on-novel-coronavirus-
6. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) [Internet]. MoHFW. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.mohfw.gov.in/
7. Coronavirus Outbreak in India - COVID19india.org [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.COVID19india.org/
8. Khademi A, Saure D, Schaefer A, Nucifora K, Braithwaite RS, Roberts MS. HIV Treatment in Resource-Limited Environments: Treatment Coverage and Insights. Value Heal [Internet]. 2015;18(8):1113–9. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2015.10.003

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

9. Wang L, Wang Y, Ye D, Liu Q. Review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) based on current evidence. Int J Antimicrob Agents [Internet]. 2020;55(6):105948. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105948

10. COVID-19 CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC [Internet]. Worldometer. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/?

11. India population 2020 - StatisticsTimes.com [Internet]. StatisticsTimes. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 27]. Available from: http://statisticstimes.com/demographics/country/india-population.php

12. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, James A, Taylor J, Spicer K, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility — King County, Washington, March 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020 Apr 3;69(13):377–81.

13. Zhao S, Lin Q, Ran J, Musa SS, Yang G, Wang W, et al. Preliminary estimation of the basic reproduction number of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China, from 2019 to 2020: A data-driven analysis in the early phase of the outbreak. Int J Infect Dis. 2020 Mar 1;92(March):214–7.

14. Pant R, Choudhry LP, Rajesh JG, Yeldandi V. COVID-19 Epidemic Dynamics and Population Projections from Early Days of Case Reporting in a 40 million population from Southern India. medRxiv. 2020;1–12.

15. Resnick B. Scientist are trying to figure why COVID-19 hits some young, healthy people hard [Internet]. Vox. 2020. p. 1–10. Available from: https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2020/4/8/21207269/COVID-19-coronavirus-risk-factors

16. Layden JE, Ghinai I, Pray I, Kimball A, Layer M, Tenforde MW, et al. Pulmonary illness related to e-cigarette use in Illinois and Wisconsin - Final report. N Engl J Med. 2020 Mar 5;382(10):903–16.

17. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, et al. Transmission of 2019-NCOV infection from an asymptomatic contact in Germany [Internet]. Vol. 382, New England Journal of Medicine. Massachussetts Medical Society; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. p. 970–1. Available from: http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMc2001468

18. Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, Gioannini C, Litvinova M, Merler S, et al. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. Science (80-). 2020;368(6489):395–400.

19. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20(5):553–8.

20. Zhao W, Yu S, Zha X, Wang N, Pang Q, Li T, et al. Clinical characteristics and durations of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Beijing: a retrospective cohort study. medRxiv. 2020;(April).

21. Lateef F. Simulation-based learning: Just like the real thing. J Emergencies, Trauma Shock. 2010;3(4):348–52.

22. Bai R-H, Dong W-Y, Shi Y, Feng A-Z, Xu A-D, Lyu J. Simulation of epidemic trends for a new coronavirus under effective control measures. New Med. 2020;30(2):8–12.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

23. Grigoryev I. Anylogic in three days: A quick course in simulation modeling [Internet]. Fifth. The AnyLogic Company; 2018. Available from: https://www.anylogic.com/resources/books/free-simulation-book-and-modeling-tutorials/

24. Gallagher Advisor S, Eddy WF. Comparing compartment and agent-based models [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Sep 13]. Available from: http://www.stat.cmu.edu/~sgallagh/papers/gallagher_8-17.pdf

25. Tako AA, Robinson S. Comparing model development in discrete event simulation and system dynamics. In: Proceedings of the 2009 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC). 13-16 Dec. 2009; Austin, TX, USA, USA: IEEE; 2010.

26. Chan WKV, Son YJ, Macal CM. Agent-based simulation tutorial - Simulation of emergent behavior and differences between agent-based simulation and discrete-event simulation. In: Proceedings of the 2010 Winter Simulation Conference. 5-8 Dec. 2010; Baltimore, MD, USA: IEEE; 2011.

27. Luke DA, Stamatakis KA. Systems science methods in public health: Dynamics, networks, and agents. Annu Rev Public Health. 2012;33(April):357–76.

28. Grimm V, Berger U, Bastiansen F, Eliassen S, Ginot V, Giske J, et al. A standard protocol for describing individual-based and agent-based models. Ecol Modell. 2006;198(1–2):115–26.

29. Grimm V, Berger U, DeAngelis DL, Polhill JG, Giske J, Railsback SF. The ODD protocol: A review and first update. Ecol Modell. 2010;221(23):2760–8.

30. Grimm V, Revilla E, Berger U, Jeltsch F, Mooij WM, Railsback SF, et al. Pattern-oriented modeling of agent-based complex systems: Lessons from ecology. Science (80-). 2005;310(5750):987–91.

31. Badham J, Chattoe-Brown E, Gilbert N, Chalabi Z, Kee F, Hunter RF. Developing agent-based models of complex health behaviour. Heal Place. 2018;54(January):170–7.

32. Perez L, Dragicevic S. An agent-based approach for modeling dynamics of contagious disease spread. Int J Health Geogr. 2009;8(1):1–17.

33. Gomez J, Prieto J, Leon E, Rodriguez A. INFEKTA: A General Agent-based Model for Transmission of Infectious Diseases: Studying the COVID-19 Propagation in Bogotá - Colombia. medRxiv. 2020;1–15.

34. Chang SL, Harding N, Zachreson C, Cliff OM, Prokopenko M. Modelling transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. arXiv Prepr arXiv200310218 2020 Mar 23 [Internet]. 2020;1–31. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.10218

35. Venkatramanan S, Lewis B, Chen J, Higdon D, Vullikanti A, Marathe M. Using data-driven agent-based models for forecasting emerging infectious diseases. Epidemics. 2018;22(March):43–9.

36. Beutels P, Shkedy Z, Aerts M, Van Damme P. Social mixing patterns for transmission models of close contact infections: Exploring self-evaluation and diary-based data collection through a web-based interface. Epidemiol Infect. 2006;134(6):1158–66.

37. Halloran ME, Longini IM, Nizam A, Yang Y. Containing bioterrorist smallpox. Science (80-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

). 2002;298(5597):1428–32.

38. Cooley P, Lee BY, Brown S, Cajka J, Chasteen B, Ganapathi L, et al. Protecting health care workers: A pandemic simulation based on Allegheny County. Influenza Other Respi Viruses. 2010;4(2):61–72.

39. Enanoria WTA, Liu F, Zipprich J, Harriman K, Ackley S, Blumberg S, et al. The effect of contact investigations and public health interventions in the control and prevention of measles transmission: A simulation study. PLoS One. 2016;11(12):e0167160.

40. Murray M. Determinants of cluster distribution in the molecular epidemiology of tuberculosis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2002;99(3):1538–43.

41. Ferguson NM, Cummings DAT, Cauchemez S, Fraser C, Riley S, Meeyai A, et al. Strategies for containing an emerging influenza pandemic in Southeast Asia. Nature. 2005;437(7056):209–14.

42. Epstein JM, Pankajakshan R, Hammond RA. Combining computational fluid dynamics and agent-based modeling: A new approach to evacuation planning. PLoS One. 2011;6(5):e20139.

43. Tracy M, Cerdá M, Keyes KM. Agent-Based Modeling in Public Health: Current Applications and Future Directions. Annu Rev Public Health. 2018;39(April):77–94.

44. Shamil MS, Farheen F, Ibtehaz N, Khan IM, Rahman MS. An Agent Based Modeling of COVID-19: Validation, Analysis, and Recommendations. medRxiv [Internet]. 2020;2020.07.05.20146977. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/08/2020.07.05.20146977.abstract

45. Jalayer M, Orsenigo C, Vercellis C. CoV-ABM: A stochastic discrete-event agent-based framework to simulate spatiotemporal dynamics of COVID-19. arXiv [Internet]. 2020 Jul 26 [cited 2020 Sep 19]; Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.13231

46. Mahdizadeh Gharakhanlou N, Hooshangi N. Spatio-temporal simulation of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak using the agent-based modeling approach (case study: Urmia, Iran). Informatics Med Unlocked [Internet]. 2020;20(August):100403. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imu.2020.100403

47. Hoertel N, Blachier M, Blanco C, Olfson M, Massetti M, Rico MS, et al. A stochastic agent-based model of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in France. Nat Med. 2020;26(9):1417–1421.

48. Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, Abeysuriya RG, Hart G, Rosenfeld K, et al. Covasim: an agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. medRxiv [Internet]. 2020;2020.05.10.20097469. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097469v1

49. Hoertel N, Blachier M, Blanco C, Olfson M, Massetti M, Limosin F, et al. Facing the COVID-19 epidemic in NYC: a stochastic agent-based model of various intervention strategies. medRxiv. 2020;

50. D'Orazio M, Bernardini G, Quagliarini E. How to restart? An agent-based simulation model towards the definition of strategies for COVID-19 'second phase' in public buildings. arXiv [Internet]. 2020;1–21. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.12927

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

51. Megiddo I, Nandi A, Prabhakaran D, Laxminarayan R. IndiaSim: An Agent-based Model for Estimating the Health and Economic Benefits of Secondary Prevention of Coronary Heart Diseases in India 1. 2014.

52. Rockett RJ, Arnott A, Lam C, Sadsad R, Timms V, Gray KA, et al. Revealing COVID-19 transmission in Australia by SARS-CoV-2 genome sequencing and agent-based modeling. Nat Med [Internet]. 2020;26(September). Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1000-7

53. Samui P, Mondal J, Khajanchi S. A mathematical model for COVID-19 transmission dynamics with a case study of India. Chaos, Solitons and Fractals. 2020;140(November):110173.

54. Verma VR, Saini A, Gandhi S, Dash U, Koya SF. Capacity-need gap in hospital resources for varying mitigation and containment strategies in India in the face of COVID-19 pandemic. Infect Dis Model. 2020;5(1):608–21.

55. Chatterjee K, Chatterjee K, Kumar A, Shankar S. Healthcare impact of COVID-19 epidemic in India: A stochastic mathematical model. Med J Armed Forces India [Internet]. 2020;76(2):147–55. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2020.03.022

56. Zhang Z, Jain S. Mathematical model of Ebola and COVID-19 with fractional differential operators: Non-Markovian process and class for virus pathogen in the environment. Chaos, Solitons and Fractals [Internet]. 2020;140:110175. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2020.110175

57. Mahajan A, Sivadas NA, Solanki R. An epidemic model SIPHERD and its application for prediction of the spread of COVID-19 infection in India. Chaos, Solitons and Fractals. 2020;140:110156.

58. Sardar T, Nadim SS, Rana S, Chattopadhyay J. Assessment of lockdown effect in some states and overall India: A predictive mathematical study on COVID-19 outbreak. Chaos, Solitons and Fractals. 2020;139(October):110078.

59. Ambikapathy B, Krishnamurthy K. Mathematical modelling to assess the impact of lockdown on COVID-19 transmission in India: Model development and validation. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(5):1–8.

60. Brian. and Caiado CC. Coronavirus: why we need local models to successfully exit lockdown [Internet]. The Conversation Media Group Ltd. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 10]. Available from: https://theconversation.com/coronavirus-why-we-need-local-models-to-successfully-exit-lockdown-138358

61. CMCC. Guidance on Use of Modelling for Policy Responses to COVID-19 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 27]. Available from: https://decidehealth.world/en/news/guidance-use-modelling-policy-responses-COVID-19

62. Caro JJ, Briggs AH, Siebert U, Kuntz KM. Modeling Good Research Practices-Overview: A Report of the ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices Task Force-1. 2012;15(6):796–803.

63. Roberts M, Russell LB, Paltiel AD, Chambers M, McEwan P, Krahn M. Conceptualizing a model: A report of the ISPOR-SMDM modeling good research practices task force-2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Value Heal. 2012;15(6):804–11.

64. Boden LA, McKendrick IJ. Model-based policymaking: A framework to promote ethical 'good practice' in mathematical modeling for public health policymaking. Front Public Heal. 2017;5(APR):1–7.

65. Adiga A, Agashe A, Arifuzzaman S, Barrett CL, Tech V. Generating a synthetic population of the United States [Internet]. NDSSL Technical Report 15-009. 2015. Available from: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.712.1618&rep=rep1&type=pdf

66. Raheel Sayeed. Creating a Synthetic Population: Case Study, Telangana, India [Internet]. Public Health Dynamics Workshop (PHD 2018). 2018. Available from: https://www.phdl.pitt.edu/presentations/RSayeed-ICMR-Synthetic-Population-PHD2018.pdf

67. Rangareddy District Population Census 2011-2020, Andhra Pradesh literacy sex ratio and density [Internet]. Copyright Census Population 2020 Data. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 10]. Available from: https://www.census2011.co.in/census/district/123-rangareddy.html

68. Aylward, Bruce (WHO); Liang W (PRC). Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [Internet]. The WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019. 2020. Available from: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-COVID-19-final-report.pdf

69. Kumar S, Gosain M, Sharma H, Swetts E, Amarchand R, Kumar R, et al. Who interacts with whom? Social mixing insights from a rural population in India. Lau EH, editor. PLoS One. 2018 Dec 21;13(12):e0209039.

70. Balk D, Montgomery MR, Engin H, Lin N, Major E, Jones B. Urbanization in India: Population and urban classification grids for 2011. Data. 2019;4(1):1–16.

71. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 13]. Available from: https://censusindia.gov.in/

72. Parasite Ecology. Density-dependent vs. Frequency-dependent Disease Transmission [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://parasiteecology.wordpress.com/2013/10/17/density-dependent-vs-frequency-dependent-disease-transmission/

73. Institute for Disease Modeling. Population density and transmission scaling — Generic Model documentation [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://idmod.org/docs/emod/generic/model-population-density.html

74. Models of Infectious Disease Agent Study (MIDAS): Online Portal for COVID-19 Modelling Research [Internet]. Coordination Center University of Pittsburgh. 2020. Available from: https://midasnetwork.us/COVID-19/

75. Day M. COVID-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. BMJ [Internet]. 2020;369(April):m1375. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.m1375

76. WHO Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report - 46 [Internet]. 2020. p. 1–

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

9. Available from: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200306-sitrep-46-COVID-19.pdf?sfvrsn=96b04adf_4

77. Arentz M, Yim E, Klaff L, Lokhandwala S, Riedo FX, Chong M, et al. Characteristics and Outcomes of 21 Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19 in Washington State. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc. 2020;323(16):1612–4.

78. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, Antonelli M, Cabrini L, Castelli A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected with SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc. 2020;323(16):1574–81.

79. WHO Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report - 73 [Internet]. 2020. p. 1–13. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331686/nCoVsitrep02Apr2020-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

80. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. PLoS Comput Biol. 2017;13(9):1–21.

81. Cuevas E. An agent-based model to evaluate the COVID-19 transmission risks in facilities. Comput Biol Med [Internet]. 2020;121(April):103827. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compbiomed.2020.103827

82. Kapoor G, Hauck S, Sriram A, Joshi J, Schueller E, Frost I, et al. State-wise estimates of current hospital beds, intensive care unit (ICU) beds and ventilators in India: Are we prepared for a surge in COVID-19 hospitalizations? medRxiv [Internet]. 2020;2020.06.16.20132787. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132787

83. Tseng K, Frost I, Kapoor G, Sriram A, Nandi A, Laxminarayan R. COVID-19 India: State-level Estimates of Hospitalization Needs [Internet]. CDDEP and Princeton University. 2020. Available from: https://cddep.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/COVID.state_.hosp_3Apr2020.pdf

84. Kumar S, Grefenstette JJ, Galloway D, Albert SM, Burke DS. Policies to reduce influenza in the workplace: Impact assessments using an agent-based model. Am J Public Health. 2013;103(8):1406–11.

85. Read JM, Eames KTD, Edmunds WJ. Dynamic social networks and the implications for the spread of infectious disease. J R Soc Interface. 2008;5(26):1001–7.

86. Smieszek T, Burri EU, Scherzinger R, Scholz RW. Collecting close-contact social mixing data with contact diaries: Reporting errors and biases. Epidemiol Infect. 2012;140(4):744–52.

87. Danon L, Read JM, House TA, Vernon MC, Keeling MJ. Social encounter networks: Characterizing great Britain. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. 2013;280(1765):20131037.

88. Narassima MS, Anbuudayasankar SP, Vasudevan SK, Abhinavaram J. Physicians' and users' perceptions towards wearable health devices. Indones J Electr Eng Comput Sci. 2017;5(1):234–42.

89. Clipping of The New Indian Express Group - The New Indian Express-Hyderabad [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://epaper.newindianexpress.com/c/51220333

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121848; this version posted September 21, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .