

1 Cumulative Active and Recovery Rates Based Criterion for Gradual Lockdown Exit: A 2 Global Observation of SARS Cov-2 Management

3 Dhananjay V Raje¹, Abhay Bajaj², Moumita Chakraborty¹, and Hemant J Purohit^{2*}

4 ¹MDS Bio-Analytics, Shankar Nagar, Nagpur; ²Environmental Biotechnology and Genomics
5 Division, CSIR- National Environmental Engineering Research Institute (CSIR-NEERI),
6 Nagpur

7 *Corresponding author: hj_purohit@neeri.res.in

8 **Keywords**

9 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, Lockdown, WHO, Cumulative Recovery Rate, Cumulative Fatality
10 Rate, Data Analytics

11 **Abstract**

12 On March 11, 2020 the World Health Organization (WHO) had declared SARS-CoV-2
13 pandemic; and at present there are over 6 million cases across the globe. Based on the interim
14 guidelines of WHO, most of the countries opted for social distancing with lockdown as the
15 only way to control the pandemic. This led to ‘Manufacturing’ shut down, which acted as a
16 spanner in the wheel for international supply chain leading to pressure on governments to
17 review the protocols of the lockdown. We studied epidemiological parameters for 18
18 countries and obtained crossover time point referring to cumulative case active and case
19 recovery rates and the time point for the peak positive confirmation rate in a time window of
20 92 days; and linked with the respective governmental decisions. For countries awaiting
21 crossover, time series non-linear models could be used for predicting the crossover point. A
22 sample study was carried out for India. The median time for reaching crossover for 12
23 countries was 37 days, while peak positive confirmation rate was 30 days after their first
24 intervention. These countries enforced strict lockdown regulations and have shown constant
25 improvement in their recovery rate even after crossover time point. A phase wise relaxation
26 of lockdown is evident after crossover point in most of these countries. The crossover time
27 point with the subsequent increasing recovery rate can be a strategy for lockdown relaxation
28 as evident from the experiences of few countries. Also, we propose a criterion based on
29 cumulative recovery and fatality rate for micro-management of lockdown.

30

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

31 **Introduction**

32 World economy is a network of the global value chain, where every single country is a
33 partner. By March 2020, the whole civilization realized the pandemic impact of SARS CoV2;
34 and world over, the restrictions in movement and lockdown have severely impacted the
35 industrial supply chain.^{1,2} The cumulative effect of this interrupted productivity led to loss of
36 millions of jobs and this has now created uneasiness at the different levels of society; and
37 hence, governments are looking for solutions to come out of this lockdown situation.³⁻⁵
38 Different modelling approaches have been reported to predict the course of the viral spread,
39 of which susceptible-exposed-infected-recovered (SEIR) model, is the most explored
40 approach applied by various groups with data collected from different countries.^{6,7} However,
41 due to the unpredictable propensity of this virus and the sporadic identifications of surge
42 clusters in the society, there were interim directives made by different governments. Inclusion
43 of such inputs limits the prediction accuracy of model for the course of a pandemic.⁸⁻¹⁰
44 Another issue is the diversity as reflected by genome sequence data that suggests, virus is
45 either mutating or adapting according to host in different part of the world.¹¹

46 In this paper, we have opted an observational approach using the data for monitoring test with
47 active, recovered and fatal cases and whenever the model showed some perturbations, we
48 have tried to link with the government interventions, which could have influenced the spread
49 of the virus through usual or community transmission mode.

50 **Method**

51 In this study, an observational approach was adopted in which epidemiological parameters
52 were observed with time and retrospectively analysed with reference to interventions or
53 public announcements by the governments.

54 Eighteen countries mostly from Europe and Asia were considered with at least 1000
55 diagnosed cases as on March 31st 2020. All these countries were tracked from March 1st for
56 the number of new cases, active cases, recoveries and number of fatalities. The data source
57 was *John Hopkins CSSEDISandData*, available as an open source. This data was used to
58 derive the case active rate (CAR), recovery rate (CRR) and the fatality rate (CFR) at each
59 discrete time point till May 31, 2020. These rates were obtained as the cumulative number of
60 active/recovered/fatalities on a specific day to the total number of cases diagnosed till that
61 day, considering a lag of zero days. Thus, on any day, the total infected individuals were
62 categorized into these three states, summing to unity. Moreover, the ratio of number of newly

63 detected cases to the total number of tests performed was also obtained giving the positive
64 confirmation rate (PCR) of the disease with time. The data source for the number of tests was
65 ourworldindata.org.¹² All these rates were plotted in the same frame with a time window
66 spanning 92 days i.e. from March 01, 2020 to May 31, 2020. The interventions in the form of
67 national recommendation, lockdowns in each of these countries during this period were
68 linked with the progression of CAR, CRR, CFR and PCR. The foremost interest was to
69 observe the crossover time point of active and recovery rates for each country. This is the
70 time point at which the CRR is either greater than or equal to CAR. Also, the time point for
71 peak PCR i.e. the time at which the PCR attains maximum, was observed for each country.

72 For countries in which the crossover point has not reached, time-series non-linear models
73 could be used for prediction. A sample study was performed for India in which piece-wise
74 linear regression and quadratic regression models were fitted to predict the crossover point at
75 the end of 60th and 75th day in the lockdown period. The residuals were obtained to decide
76 how well the models capture the trend.

77 Further, a *hierarchical* strategy of disease management has been proposed for multistate
78 countries, with each state comprises of cities/districts. Two outcome criteria i.e. CRR and
79 CFR can be referred to indicate the COVID19 status of each city/district within the state. The
80 CRR at the crossover time point and the corresponding CFR at the same time point can be
81 used to determine the hot-spot cities/districts within the state. A sample study was performed
82 for India, in which the most affected states were mapped based on the above rates. Further, a
83 sample exercise was performed for Maharashtra state, wherein the cities/districts were
84 mapped using the above rates. Thus, the city/district level information is available for state
85 government, while state level information is available to central government for necessary
86 interventions.

87 **Results**

88 Among the selected countries, seven were from Asia, while eleven were from European
89 continent including Russia, which is transcontinental. The CAR, CRR and CFR for each day
90 along with the PCR were obtained for each country. Simultaneously, the major events and
91 interventions relevant to the disease dynamics were studied for each country. The trends for
92 twelve countries attaining the crossover are shown in Figure 1 along with the government
93 interventions.

94 In *Austria*, the PCR increased exponentially till the end of March. By this time, the CAR and
95 CRR were almost constant and the CFR was negligible ($< 1\%$). The effect of intervention
96 surfaced by the end of March, where the PCR reached a saturation level and subsequently
97 started declining. The CAR and CRR deflected by March end and showed a crossover on
98 April 12th with CRR (0.5010) exceeding CAR (0.4739). The CFR was 2.4% at the crossover.
99 Post-crossover, the situation in the country started improving with 93.2% recovery and 3.99%
100 active cases as on May 31th. The time of peak PCR occurred nearly 12 days before the
101 crossover point in Austria.

102 In *Germany*, the PCR increased across country till March end, while the CAR, CRR and CFR
103 were constant. After 22nd, the CRR gradually headed upwards, and by April 13th, the country
104 attained the crossover with CRR (0.4943) marginally exceeding CAR (0.4811). Moreover,
105 the PCR attained the peak by the same time, which subsequently showed a decline. Post-
106 crossover, the government adopted strategies for stepwise modifying the measures against
107 pandemic. The country has 90.1% recovery and 5.19% active cases as on May 31st.

108 In *Italy*, the PCR was steep from March 1st to March 25rd, and later showed a consistent
109 decline. The crossover was achieved on May 6th with CRR (0.4348) marginally above CAR
110 (0.4268). The peak PCR reached by 21st March and occurred nearly 45 days before the
111 crossover. Post-crossover, the CRR is continually increasing with government restrictions
112 with 67.6% recovery and 18% active cases as on May 31st.

113 In *Spain*, the CAR and CRR showed a gradual change with high fluctuations till March 21st.
114 Although the PCR was increasing, the CRR showed upward trend with time. The crossover
115 was achieved on April 24th with CAR (0.455) exceeding the CAR (0.4341). The time of peak
116 PCR almost coincided with the crossover. By 31st May, the country had 62.8% recovery and
117 25.8% active cases.

118 In *Switzerland*, the PCR increased up to April 5th, while CAR, CRR and CFR were almost
119 constant till March 25th. A crossover was reached on April 12th with CRR (0.4997) exceeding
120 the CAR (0.4568). The PCR started declining after April 12th. The crossover and the time
121 point of peak PCR coincided for Switzerland. Post-cross over, the CRR increased
122 consistently and reached to 92.3%, while active cases were only 1.4% by May 31st.

123 In *Turkey*, the spreading peak of virus was noted on April 12th, and subsequently, a gradual
124 slowdown was observed till May 15th. The CAR started declining after April 23rd and the
125 crossover reached on May 3rd with CRR (0.5010) exceeding CAR (0.4720), and CFR around

126 2.7% continuing till the end of observation period. The time of peak PCR occurred 21 days
127 before the crossover point in Turkey. By 31st May, the recovery was 78.1%, while active
128 cases were 19.2%.

129 Among Asian countries, in *Iran*, the CAR and CRR showed fluctuations with gradual decline
130 from March 1st to 25th. On April 9th, a crossover was observed with CRR (0.4879) exceeding
131 the CAR (0.45). The CRR increased logarithmically till May 1st and remained constant even
132 after relaxation. The positive confirmation data available from March 5th showed an
133 exponential decline till May 15th. As on 31st May, the country has 78.5% recovery and
134 16.4% active cases.

135 In *Japan*, till March 25th, there was almost a constant PCR of around 5%, with the decrease in
136 CAR and corresponding increase in the CRR with CFR near to 3.4%. The PCR and CAR
137 were at peak on April 19th, which later showed gradual declines. The crossover reached on
138 May 10th with CRR (0.5151) exceeding CAR (0.4453). After May 10th, the CRR continued to
139 increase, while the CFR gradually increased to 4.4% by the end of the observation period. At
140 the end of observation period, the country had 85.6% recovery, while 9.02% active case.

141 In *Malaysia*, the spread of virus increased sharply from March 1st till 23rd. The CAR also
142 showed increase till this time point with a corresponding decrease in the CRR. The crossover
143 reached on April 14th with the CRR (0.4969) exceeding CAR (0.4867). Post-crossover, the
144 CRR continued increasing till the end of observation period. The time of peak PCR reached
145 21 days before the crossover. The recovery was 81.2% and active cases were 17.3% by May
146 31st.

147 In *South Korea*, the spread of virus reached a peak on March 3rd and thereafter showed a
148 gradual decline by the end of May. The CAR and CRR were almost constant till March 10th;
149 however, subsequently, there was a sharp change in these rates resulting into a crossover by
150 March 28th with the CRR (0.5076) exceeding CAR (0.4772). Post-crossover, the trends
151 continued along with reducing spread as on May 31st. The time of peak PCR reached 25 days
152 before the crossover point.

153 In *Singapore*, the CAR increased till April 22nd, and then was constant till May 9th. Later it
154 started declining and by May 27th provided the crossover. Subsequent to this, the CAR
155 continued declining with increasing CRR. The peak PCR was observed by May 4th and was
156 constant till the end of May. The recovery was 62.2%, which active cases were 37.8% by the
157 end of observation period.

158 In Saudi Arabia, the CAR and CRR were almost constant till March end. There was a
159 deflection in the trend, which continued till April 10th. Again, there was almost a constant
160 phase for both the rates till May 3rd. Later, there was consistent decline in CAR and increase
161 in CRR with a crossover on May 20th. Post-cross over the trends continued with a recovery of
162 73.2% and active rate of 26.2% as on May 31st.

163 For other countries like *France, India, Russia, Sweden* and *United Kingdom*, the crossover
164 could not be observed till the end of May, despite different measures by the local
165 governments (Figure 2). The crossover point could be predicted for such countries using
166 appropriate linear/non-linear models. The analysis for India have been presented.

167 **Cross-over forecasting – A study for India**

168 In India, since March, the incidence of COVID19 is on its rise. Figure 3 provides the CAR,
169 CRR and CFR, which shows that the crossover point is very close but not reached in the
170 observation window. The PCR increased till April 6th and later continued in the range of 4 –
171 4.71% till May 15th. However, subsequently, the rate is increasing exponentially and has
172 touched 5.1% by May 31st. Since April 10th, the CRR started increasing; nevertheless, the
173 crossover is still awaited. The fatality rate is around 3% since April 1st.

174 A predictive modelling to estimate the crossover time point was carried out using Piecewise
175 linear and quadratic models (Figure 4A-B), which shows graphical visualization of model fits
176 along with predictions for piecewise model with 80% and 95% confidence bands. The
177 predictions were done after 60 days and 75 days with March 1st as zeroth day. For piecewise
178 model, a single knot at $c=40$ days was considered for fitting purpose. Based on 60 days
179 (Figure 4A), the quadratic model predicted the crossover on 72nd day, while the piecewise
180 model predicted on 84th day. The analysis based on 75 days provided crossover on 90th day
181 by quadratic model, while 91st day using piecewise model. Thus, it is evident that the
182 piecewise regression model was relatively more consistent in predicting the crossover
183 irrespective of the training set. From April 10th, the two rates are following almost a linear
184 trend. The predictions by quadratic model deviated drastically with 60 days data sets, while
185 overlapped considerably with piecewise model for 75 days data set. The heteroscedasticity in
186 the rates was less after 40 days as evident from the figure, resulting in minimal residual error
187 for piecewise regression model. So, with continuing restrictions, the crossover was expected
188 by 91 days i.e. end of May for India; however, could not be achieved when observed with
189 actual data. Tentatively, now expected in first week of June.

190 Since, it was observed that once a country crosses 50% cumulative recovery cases, the trend
191 is always followed. Hence, we first predicted the possible time point for 50% cumulative
192 recovery of cases for India; as described earlier. The next step was how to derive a criterion,
193 which can propose the strategy to gradually exit the lockdown with national data supporting
194 0.5 CRR. We have applied following disease management strategy, we propose two
195 parameters viz., CFR and CRR that can be jointly assessed for each state and eventually each
196 city/district. The thresholds for these parameters can be referred based on overall national
197 data for CRR and CFR; and accordingly, the classification can be obtained at each
198 hierarchical level. Figure 5A provides the country level representation in which different
199 states (majorly affected) have been positioned as per the CFR and CRR status on May 31st.
200 The states in each quadrant can be further assessed at next hierarchical level i.e.
201 cities/districts. Figure 5B gives the state level representation for Maharashtra. The hot-spots
202 within the states and their movements with time can be observed and accordingly the action
203 plan at city level can be determined. Figure 5C provides the plans for the four zones, which
204 are subject to alterations.

205 Since, the disease progression is dynamic, it is essential to track the movement of each city
206 and thereby the state on a daily basis. A dashboard has been prepared, which at present
207 provides the updates for the most vulnerable state i.e. Maharashtra, which has ~34% of the
208 active cases of the country. We are expanding this platform for the critical states of the
209 country, so that the day wise state level information is available for all critical states. The
210 dashboard can be viewed at: <https://covid19stat.shinyapps.io/covid19status/>.

211 **Discussion**

212 The issue with coming out of lockdown or relaxing scenario in between different periods of
213 lockdown is an unexpected surge of transmission waves.¹³⁻¹⁵ It challenges the medical
214 infrastructure with overburdened staff and stressed supplies; and this seems to be true for
215 almost every country.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ The volatility analysis of world economy suggests there will be a
216 deep depression around the world in the year 2020;^{3,19,20} and WHO recently stated the virus
217 will be around for a while. In such scenario, every country has to delineate the strategic time
218 lines to exit lockdown, since it is crucial to balance the health and economic burdens.²¹⁻²³

219 In this study, we adopted a strategy of learning from the experiences of select countries based
220 on epidemiological parameters. The primary focus was on crossover time and the time of
221 peak PCR. The government interventions were linked with these two parameters. The

222 analysis of twelve countries revealed that the two time parameters have association with the
223 governmental decisions, as evident from Figure 1; and that the spread of SARS-CoV-2 can be
224 effectively modulated. In countries where initial lockdown measures were strictly
225 implemented, like home quarantine, ban on public gatherings, conditional movement only for
226 essential services, and closing of education system, the PCR could be controlled and the
227 crossover could be achieved. The median time for reaching crossover for 12 countries was 37
228 days, while median peak PCR time was 30 days after their first intervention. In six out of the
229 twelve countries, the crossover time occurred after time of peak PCR with a median of 21
230 days; while in three countries i.e. *Germany*, *Spain* and *Switzerland*, the times for two
231 parameters coincided. Further, post-crossover, it was observed that in these countries, with
232 step-wise relaxation of lockdown, the CFR and CRR continued in the acquired directions
233 indicating better pandemic control. The countries like *Belgium*, *France*, *India*, *Russia* and
234 *United Kingdom* (UK) are awaiting the crossover point or the peak PCR. In *Belgium*, *France*
235 and UK, the crossover is much awaited considering the CAR, CRR and CFR trends. The
236 patients are under prolonged treatment and thus confining the recovery rate. Perhaps age
237 could be one of the factors, as the population median age of these countries is above 40 years.
238 In *India* and *Russia*, the crossovers are nearby. It would be interesting to observe the
239 progression of two rates in these countries; and especially for India, which is stepping in the
240 unlock phase I. During the lockdown period, the country has seen improvement in the CRR
241 with controlled CFR; however, could not reach the crossover. Based on the experiences of
242 other countries regarding lockdown and relaxations, it is anticipated that the two rates should
243 continue with the acquired trends, and that the current CFR remains steady and PCR shows
244 deceleration. To achieve this, the unlocking phase needs a careful monitoring of cities and in
245 turn the states. The hot-spots will depend on the current national CFR and CRR rates, which
246 are dynamic with time. The proposed real time dashboard could be of immense utility at these
247 moments.

248 Another interesting observation comes from the genome sequence data of virus, with over
249 32000 genome sequence available globally (<https://www.gisaid.org/epiflu-applications/next-hcov-19-app/>). The data suggests that there are seven major clades which can group most of
250 the sequences with every clade having significant variation at the individual sequence level.
251 There is significant variation in sequences after mid-February. The viral sequences can be
252 grouped in two different clades which are associated with European sequence data. Whereas,
253

254 Asian sequences are close to two major European clades, with an additional clade having
255 different sequences representing different countries.

256 There is a need to understand the whether the strains/sequence data observed in the twelve
257 countries have any association with the peak PCR and the crossover times observed in these
258 countries. This may reveal the relevance of different strains and its interaction with host
259 machinery, which is supporting the viral multiplication and its dispersion factor.²⁴ The viral
260 genome sequence data analysis from India shows two major clades.^{25,26} However, the
261 sequence data is not having enough representative sequences from the country, and hence
262 cannot be correlated with number of active cases observed in different states for the moment.

263 For some countries, the crossover point is before 50 days, while for others it is beyond. It will
264 be interesting to map the sequence data from different countries before and after the cross
265 over time, where 50% recovery rate has been achieved. This can further be analysed with
266 countries showing delayed or no crossover point. This pattern of dispersion of infection needs
267 further analysis with its correlation with demographic or even with data from the virus-host
268 interaction studies.²⁷ Irrespective of genetic property of virus and its multiplication in host,
269 it's evident from the analysis of different countries that the regulation imposed as lockdown
270 and restriction in activities has real role in controlling of this pandemic. The other important
271 observation emerged that once a country crosses 50% cumulative case recovery, then it
272 always follows the improvement trend, even though in cases of few countries, there were
273 surges of positive cases around the cross over point was observed.

274 **Conclusion**

275 The exit from lockdown is the only imperative option for any economy to come back to its
276 normalcy, and that means the restoration of supply chain so that every component of society
277 gradually recovers from scarcity of resources. The parameters used in this study, like crude
278 active rate, recovery rate and positive confirmation rate are the 'real indicators', which are
279 inclusive of many factors like population location, susceptibility, incidences, and surveillance
280 for respiratory infections, which may independently and severely impact the forecasting. By
281 referring to the criteria of crossover and peak time point of positive confirmation rate, policy
282 makers can assess the impact of the decisions being taken up. This proposal advocates
283 relaxing norms for state or district where these criteria are fulfilled but puts the condition of
284 isolating the areas, which are still struggling with unfilled threshold parameters.

285

286

287 **Acknowledgement**

288 Authors are thankful to the Director, CSIR-National Environmental Engineering Research
289 Institute (CSIR-NEERI) for his kind support. The manuscript has been duly checked and
290 assigned KRC No. CSIR-NEERI/KRC/2020/MAY/EBGD/2.

291 **Author Contributions**

292 HJP, DVR, AB planned the study. DVR, AB, MC, HJP performed analysis. MC developed
293 the site using R-Shiny App platform, DVR, HJP, AB wrote the manuscript. All authors proof
294 read the manuscript.

295 **Competing Interests Statement**

296 Authors declare no conflict of interest.

297 **References**

- 298 1. Hale, T., Petherick, A., Phillips, T. & Webster, S. Variation in government responses to
299 COVID-19. *Work. Pap.* (2020).
- 300 2. Anderson, R. M., Heesterbeek, H., Klinkenberg, D. & Hollingsworth, T. D. How will country-
301 based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *The Lancet* vol.
302 395 931–934 (2020).
- 303 3. McKee, M. & Stuckler, D. If the world fails to protect the economy, COVID-19 will damage
304 health not just now but also in the future. *Nature Medicine* vol. 26 640–642 (2020).
- 305 4. Ichino, A., Calzolari, G., Mattozzi, A. & Rustichini, A. Transition steps to stop COVID-19
306 without killing the world economy. *VOX CEPR Policy Portal* 8–10 (2020).
- 307 5. Guerrieri, V., Lorenzoni, G., Straub, L. & Werning, I. Macroeconomic Implications of
308 COVID-19: Can Negative Supply Shocks Cause Demand Shortages? *SSRN Electron. J.* (2020)
309 doi:10.2139/ssrn.3570096.
- 310 6. Moran, R. J. *et al.* Estimating required ‘lockdown’ cycles before immunity to SARS-CoV-2:
311 Model-based analyses of susceptible population sizes, ‘S0’, in seven European countries
312 including the UK and Ireland. 1–10 (2020) doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15886.1.
- 313 7. Silverman, J. D. & Washburne, A. D. Using ILI surveillance to estimate state-specific case
314 detection rates and forecast SARS-CoV-2 spread in the United States. *medRxiv*
315 2020.04.01.20050542 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.04.01.20050542.
- 316 8. Roda, W. C., Varughese, M. B., Han, D. & Li, M. Y. Why is it difficult to accurately predict
317 the COVID-19 epidemic? *Infect. Dis. Model.* **5**, 271–281 (2020).
- 318 9. Jewell, N. P., Lewnard, J. A. & Jewell, B. L. Predictive Mathematical Models of the COVID-
319 19 Pandemic: Underlying Principles and Value of Projections. *JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 19–
320 20 (2020) doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6585.
- 321 10. Giordano, G. *et al.* *Modelling the COVID-19 epidemic and implementation of population-wide*
322 *interventions in Italy. Nature Medicine* (2020). doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0883-7.

- 323 11. van Dorp, L. *et al.* Emergence of genomic diversity and recurrent mutations in SARS-CoV-2.
324 *Infect. Genet. Evol.* **83**, 104351 (2020).
- 325 12. Roser, M. Our World In Data. *Life Expect.* 1–9 (2016).
- 326 13. Rawson, T., Brewer, T., Veltcheva, D., Huntingford, C. & Bonsall, M. B. How and when to
327 end the COVID-19 lockdown : an optimisation approach. (2020).
- 328 14. Brethouwer, J., van de Rijdt, A., Lindelauf, R. & Fokkink, R. ‘Stay Nearby or Get Checked’: A
329 Covid-19 Lockdown Exit Strategy. *arxiv* 1–11 (2020).
- 330 15. Dehning, J. *et al.* Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness
331 of interventions. *Science* (80-.). eabb9789 (2020) doi:10.1126/science.abb9789.
- 332 16. World Health Organization. Critical preparedness , readiness and response actions for COVID-
333 19 . Interim guidance 22 March 2020. *WHO Interim Guid. 22 March 2020* 1–3 (2020).
- 334 17. Chen, Q. *et al.* Mental health care for medical staff in China during the COVID-19 outbreak.
335 *The Lancet Psychiatry* vol. 7 e15–e16 (2020).
- 336 18. Adams, J. G. & Walls, R. M. Supporting the Health Care Workforce during the COVID-19
337 Global Epidemic. *Journal of the American Medical Association* vol. 323 1439–1440 (2020).
- 338 19. Inoue, H. & Todo, Y. The Propagation of the Economic Impact through Supply Chains: The
339 Case of a Mega-City Lockdown against the Spread of COVID-19. *SSRN Electron. J.* 1–11
340 (2020) doi:10.2139/ssrn.3564898.
- 341 20. Fernandes, N. Economic Effects of Coronavirus Outbreak (COVID-19) on the World
342 Economy. *SSRN Electron. J.* (2020) doi:10.2139/ssrn.3557504.
- 343 21. Gates, B. Responding to Covid-19 - A Once-in-a-Century Pandemic? *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**,
344 1677–1679 (2020).
- 345 22. Gilbert, M. *et al.* Preparedness and vulnerability of African countries against importations of
346 COVID-19: a modelling study. *Lancet* **395**, 871–877 (2020).
- 347 23. Hopman, J., Allegranzi, B. & Mehtar, S. Managing COVID-19 in Low- and Middle-Income
348 Countries. *Journal of the American Medical Association* vol. 323 1549–1550 (2020).
- 349 24. Kumar, R. *et al.* Comparative Genomic Analysis of Rapidly Evolving SARS CoV-2 Viruses
350 Reveal Mosaic Pattern of Phylogeographical Distribution. *bioRxiv* 2020.03.25.006213 (2020)
351 doi:10.1101/2020.03.25.006213.
- 352 25. Banu, S. *et al.* A distinct phylogenetic cluster of Indian SARS-CoV-2 isolates. *bioRxiv*
353 2020.05.31.126136 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.05.31.126136.
- 354 26. Somasundaram, K., Mondal, M. & Lawarde, A. Genomics of Indian SARS-CoV-2:
355 Implications in genetic diversity, possible origin and spread of virus. *medRxiv*
356 2020.04.25.20079475 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.04.25.20079475.
- 357 27. Bajaj, A. & Purohit, H. J. Understanding SARS-CoV-2: Genetic Diversity, Transmission and
358 Cure in Human. *Indian J. Microbiol.* 1 (2020) doi:10.1007/s12088-020-00869-4.

359

360

361 **Figure 1:**

362 The epidemiological measures for Asian (A) and European (B) countries achieving crossover time
363 point within the observation window of 92 days starting from March 01 – May 31, 2020. Alongside is
364 the description of various events and interventions by the respective governments before and after
365 crossover time. It seems that in eight of these twelve countries, the decision for relaxation of
366 lockdown has been taken after reaching the crossover time and deceleration of PCR. A prior peak for
367 PCR followed by a crossover could be a controlled scenario for any country to manage COVID19
368 pandemic. Subsequent to crossover, the CAR and CRR were found progressing in the same acquired
369 directions in logarithmic manner. Based on these trends, the strategies by these governments appears
370 to be rational, and can be adopted by countries in which the crossover is still awaited.

371 **Figure 2:**

372 The countries from Asia and Europe with crossover awaited. The adjacent panel provides the
373 description of events and government interventions till May 31st. These nations have either attained
374 the peak PCR or still awaiting.



375

376 **Figure 3:**

377 The trends of epidemiological parameters for India in the observation window of 92 days. The
378 adjacent panel provides the description of events and government intervention from March 20
379 onward. The crossover for the country is yet awaited. India is the only country in the study list
380 showing a prolonged stationary PCR till May 15th and thereafter an exponential increase. The CAR
381 and CRR are indicating a crossover by May end, provided the CFR remains stable around 3%.

382

383 **Figure 4A-B**

384 The active, recovery and case fatality rates at different days of COVID19 progression starting from
385 March 01, 2020 in India along with predictions. A) Model predictions for active and recovery rates
386 based on 60 days B) Predictions based on 75 days. The 80%  and 95%  confidence intervals
387 are shown for Piece wise linear fit. The cross over point is the time (in days) of intersection of active
388 and recovery rates.

389







390 **Figure 5A-C**

391 The 2D representation based on CFR and CRR in different quadrants. A) Country level representation
392 for India showing states with more than 500 cases B) State level representation for Maharashtra state
393 showing cities with more than 100 cases as on May 31st C) A tentative state level management
394 guideline to improve upon the two parameters. The dashed lines indicate the national level CFR and
395 CRR as reference to identify the hot-spots.







396

397 **Figure 1. A**


398



399 **Figure 1. B**




401 **Figure 2.**



403 **Figure 3.**

404


405




406 **Figure 4.**

407

408



409 **Figure 5.**



| STATE LEVEL MANAGEMENT BASED ON STATUS OF CITIES | Medical Facilities | | | | Mass Gathering | | | Business | | | Transportation | | Population behaviour | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | Testing / Tracing | Medical facility | Health worker Safety | Emergency Back up | Shopping Malls | Market areas | Religious places | Educational Institutes | Kiosks / Small shops | Restaurants | Essential services | Corporate Offices | City Transport | Goods / Cargo | Mask at public places | Social distancing | Containment | Home Quarantine |
| | oo | ooo | ooo | ooo | xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx | x | xxx | xxx | x | xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx |
| | o | oo | ooo | oo | xxx | xx | xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx | x | xx | xxx | x | xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx |
| | o | oo | ooo | o | xxx | xx | xxx | xxx | xx | xx | x | x | xx | x | xxx | xxx | xx | xx |
| | o | o | ooo | o | xxx | x | xx | xxx | x | x | x | x | xx | x | xxx | xxx | xx | x |

O: Intensity of health care by administration; X: Intensity of regulatory and civic control by administration