

1 Simulation of Non-Pharmaceutical 2 Interventions on COVID-19 with an 3 Agent-based Model of Zonal Restraint

4 Lindsay Álvarez^{1*} and Sergio Rojas-Galeano^{1*}

*For correspondence:

srojas@udistrital.edu.co (SRG);
lalvarez@udistrital.edu.co (LA)

5 ¹School of Engineering, Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, Bogotá,
6 Colombia.

8 **Abstract** Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPI) are currently the only mechanism
9 governments can use to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 epidemic. Similarly to the actual
10 spread of the disease, the dynamics of the contention patterns emerging from the application of
11 NPIs are complex and depend on interactions between people within a specific region as well as
12 other stochastic factors associated to demographic, geographic, political and economical
13 conditions. Agent-based models simulate microscopic rules of simultaneous spatial interactions
14 between multiple agents within a population, in an attempt to reproduce the complex dynamics
15 of the effect of the contention measures. In this way, it is possible to design individual behaviours
16 along with NPI scenarios, measuring how the simulation dynamics is affected and therefore,
17 yielding rapid insights to perform a broad assessment of the potential of composite interventions
18 at different stages of the epidemic. In this paper we describe a model and a tool to experiment
19 with such kind of analysis applied to a conceptual city, considering a number of widely-applied
20 NPIs such as social distancing, case isolation, home quarantine, total lockdown, sentinel testing,
21 mask wearing and a distinctive “zonal” enforcement measure, requiring these interventions to be
22 applied gradually to separated enclosed districts (zones). We find that the model is able to
23 capture emerging dynamics associated to these NPIs; besides, the zonal contention strategy
24 yields an improvement on the mitigation impact across all scenarios of combination with
25 individual NPIs. The model and tool are open to extensions to account for omitted or newer
26 factors affecting the planning and design of NPIs intended to counter the late stages or
27 forthcoming waves of the COVID-19 crisis.

29 Introduction

30 In view of the absence of approved drugs or vaccines for COVID-19 (up to this day), Non-Pharmaceutical
31 Interventions (NPI) are the mechanisms that public health offices around the world are using in an
32 attempt to mitigate the impact of its epidemic (*Lai et al., 2020; Ferguson et al., 2020*). Similarly
33 to the actual spread of the disease, the dynamics of the contention patterns obtained as a result
34 of application of NPIs are complex and may depend not only on interactions (contacts) between
35 people according to their individual behaviour, but many other stochastic factors associated to
36 demographic, geographic, political and economical conditions.

37 One way of getting insights about the progression of the epidemics so as to allow researchers
38 and policy-makers to take actions to control its spread, are simulation models. In this respect, there
39 are two main approaches. The best-known approach uses macroscopic models that represent
40 population level dynamics with causality analysis or through transition between discrete events

41 that affect the state of the system (System Dynamics, Discrete Event Simulation). These sort of
42 models are intended to describe the average infection dynamics and have been used in the past
43 to study the spread of influenza pandemics (*Ferguson et al., 2006*), and more recently to COVID-
44 19 (*Ferguson et al., 2020*). They are build on the basis of the classical epidemic SIR compartment
45 model (Susceptible, Infectious, Recovered) or variations of the same, where the entire population is
46 split in such compartments and the dynamic of the epidemics is explained by how disease evolves
47 in each compartment rather than at the individual level. Model parameters such as compartment
48 transition rates are calibrated with available data, whilst others such as reproduction number or
49 NPI settings are assumed in order to simulate hypothetical scenarios, see e.g. *Fanelli and Piazza*
50 *(2020)*; *Wilson et al. (2020)*; *Kantner (2020)*; *Giordano et al. (2020)*; *Ansumali and Prakash (2020)*;
51 *Ferguson et al. (2020)*; *Lai et al. (2020)*.

52 The other approach resorts to microscopic modelling of interactions simulated at the individual
53 level, also known as microsimulation; here the global phenomena are observed as an emergent
54 property of collective dynamics. Commonly referred as Individual-Based Models or IBM, this ap-
55 proach assumes an inherent network structure within the population, yielding contagions depen-
56 dent on the interaction (or links) between individuals, whereas onset of symptoms and disease
57 progress are modelled with probability distributions conditioned on age structures. A number
58 of models of this kind have been also proposed recently to study the spread and contention of
59 COVID-19 (*Bock et al., 2020*; *Tuomisto et al., 2020*; *Gomez et al., 2020*).

60 The latter microsimulation approach is also known as Agent-based Modelling or ABM (*Railsback*
61 *and Grimm, 2019*). Some advantages of the ABM approach to study the epidemic include their abil-
62 ity to model deterministic and non-deterministic decisions made by the individuals affected by
63 interactions with other agents within a spatial vicinity, enabling a more intuitive and closely resem-
64 bling the real system being simulated. In this way, uncertainty or variance arises inherently in a
65 ABM, enabling the model to obtain non-deterministic emergencies without input parameter varia-
66 tion (*Ahmed et al., 2012*). The randomness of the spatial patterns followed by the free movement
67 of agents, allows a broader representation of epidemiological relevant heterogeneity in the popu-
68 lation. In addition, the ability to define particular individual traits, as well as behaviour and disease
69 progression per individual, are useful features to study how non-deterministic effects emerge from
70 the application of a diverse combination of NPIs.

71 In this paper we propose an ABM model of the COVID-19 epidemic, incorporating a number of
72 NPIs such as social distancing, case isolation, home quarantine, total lockdown, sentinel testing,
73 mask protection and a distinctive “zonal” restriction where these interventions can be applied to
74 separated districts or zones of a hypothetical city. The effect of these strategies are measured in
75 terms of morbidity, mortality, lethality -infection fatality rate (IFR) and case fatality rate (CFR)-, dou-
76 bling time, reproduction number and plots of infection, recovery and deaths occurring during the
77 simulation timeline. The main purpose of the tool is to let modellers see which NPIs or combina-
78 tion of NPIs can help flattening the curve of spread (mitigate) of the disease, in addition to assess
79 the emergencies in the corresponding epidemics indicators. The details of the contemplated NPIs,
80 model features and the developed tool are given in the following sections, along with the results
81 of several simulation scenarios.

82 **Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions**

83 NPIs are health policies intended to mitigate the effects of the spread of a new virus when vac-
84 cines or medicines are not yet available. They consist of actions recommended to the public or in
85 some cases, enforced by the government, that affect their daily life habits. During the COVID-19
86 pandemic, many of these action plans have been designed and deployed at a global scale. Here
87 we describe those that are currently incorporated into our model.

88 **Social Distancing**

89 This intervention consists of maintaining a minimum physical distance between people so as to
90 reduce the number of close interactions between infected and healthy individuals, slowing down
91 the speed of transmission and eventual deaths. In the model, this intervention can be set on or
92 off, and the actual amount of people willing to comply with the intervention can be defined with a
93 parameter between 0 and 100%.

94 **Case Isolation**

95 This intervention consists of confining in an enclosed facility (home) either positive tested people
96 or sufficiently symptomatic patients that self-isolate, until they recover from the disease. In the
97 model, this intervention can be set on or off.

98 **Home Quarantine**

99 This intervention consists of confinement of relatives or housemates living in the same household
100 of isolated cases, during their recovery. It is assumed that quarantined healthy people in the house-
101 hold must observe strict safety protocols to avoid contagion from the isolated case. In the model,
102 this intervention can be set on or off.

103 **Total Lockdown**

104 This intervention enforces a stay-at-home policy due to partial shutdown of economy. Only some
105 people are authorised to move around to fulfil basic needs or to support essential services. In the
106 model, this intervention can be set on or off with a parameter of percentage of mobility permits
107 between 5 and 95%.

108 **Sentinel Testing**

109 This intervention consists of running health campaigns performing mass testing at random loca-
110 tions in order to detect not isolated or unconfirmed cases of either symptomatic or asymptomatic
111 carriers. Persons whose test result positive are isolated immediately. In the model, this interven-
112 tion can be set on or off, with an option to deploy the campaigns widely or restricted to zones. The
113 stock of tests available is a parameter of the model defined as a fraction of the population between
114 10 and 100%. Once the campaigns run out of tests, it is possible to replenished them with a new
115 equal supply.

116 **Zonal Enforcement**

117 This intervention assumes that the hypothetical city can be divided in different districts (or zones),
118 and then recommends to restrict movement of residents to their respective zones only. In other
119 words, it enforces border closures between districts. The other NPIs can be applied localised to
120 each zone. In addition, the model enables applying a novel NPI consisting of a total lockdown to
121 the entire city with the option of gradually lifting of the curfew by individual zones. In the model,
122 this intervention can be set on or off; besides, it features a command to unlock one zone at a time.

123 **Mask Protection**

124 This intervention consists of the use of face masks as personal protective equipment to avoid
125 spreading, or breathing in, airborne virus particles. In the model, this intervention is currently
126 simulated as a population habit controlled by a combination of two parameters: carriers (infected
127 people) wearing masks or not, and susceptibles (healthy people) wearing masks or not. A partic-
128 ular combination will have incidence in the chance of contagion when two people encounter: 3%
129 if both are wearing masks, 8% if carrier wears masks but susceptible do not, 50% if susceptible
130 wears masks but carrier do not, and 90% if none wear masks.




Figure 1. Schematic of the *SIRE+CARDS* state model.

131 The Agent-based Model

132 Epidemics model

133 We build upon the compartmental *SIRE* epidemic model (*Susceptible-Infected-Recovered-Extinct*),
134 but we regarded the *Infectious* compartment as an extended-state (*Lano, 2009*) consisting of a num-
135 ber of conditions that we believe explain better the dynamics of the infection. These conditions
136 are the following: *Confirmed* or not (indicating the patient will remain isolated), *Risky* or not (mean-
137 ing predisposition to develop severe or critical disease), *Asymptomatic* or not (meaning patient is
138 unaware of being a virus carrier), *Severe* or not (meaning it requires to be hospitalised to prevent
139 death), and *Deadly* or not (indicating the patient requires Intensive Care Unit -ICU- assistance to
140 prevent death). The schematics of the resulting extended model, that we termed *SIRE+CARDS*, is
141 shown in Figure 1. Notice that not all of these conditions are mutually-exclusive, as they represent
142 incremental stages of the *I* state, evolving in a manner that is explained below.

143 Accordingly, we designed three types of agents: a healthy agent associated to the *S* and *R*
144 states (the latter marked with an immunity condition), a sick agent associated to the *I* extended
145 state tagged with the *CARDS* conditions, and a dead agent associated to the *E* state. In contrast to
146 population-dynamic simulation, instead of using transition rates between states, our model uses
147 transition events. A transition event is a set of decision rules evaluated on the conditions of each
148 state. It is in this sense our proposal differs from other related ABM approaches where these condi-
149 tions are regarded as additional compartments of modified SIR models, e.g. *SIDHARTE (Giordano*
150 *et al., 2020)*, *REINA (Tuomisto et al., 2020)* or *INFEKTA (Gomez et al., 2020)*.

151 Therefore, we consider the following transition events:

- 152 • $S \rightarrow I$ (infection). A healthy individual may become infected (with a probability p -contagion) if
153 contact with another infectious individual occurs. When transmission happens, the new case
154 is initially characterised as not confirmed, not tested, not severe, not deadly, not hospitalised
155 and not ICU-admitted. Besides, a recovery (or illness) period in days is assigned as a random
156 variate with a Gaussian distribution centered at the *avg-duration* model parameter.
- 157 • $I + Confirmed$. This condition characterises an agent as a positive case. This may happen in any
158 of the following moments: when the patient is tested for the virus and the test results positive;
159 when the agent has not been previously diagnosed as positive at the moment of admission to
160 hospital, or admission to ICU bed or death; or when the patient feels sufficiently symptomatic
161 so as to self-isolate. On the other hand, if the Case Isolation NPI (see above) is lifted after
162 having been enforced during the course of the simulation, then the confirmed condition of
163 agents who have not been tested positive, is reversed (i.e those who self-isolated).
164 The distinction between confirmed and non-confirmed cases is used to identify individuals
165 that need to stay isolated so as to prevent his capability to spread the virus. Besides, this
166 distinction is also useful to examine the discrepancy between “official” confirmed fatality rates
167 and the actual case fatality rate (which is computed with the totality of cases, not only the
168 confirmed ones).
- 169 • $I + Asymptomatic$. This condition characterises an agent as not showing symptoms for the
170 disease. The condition is activated upon acquiring the infection, with a probability defined as

171 a model parameter (*%-asymptomatic*). In the simulation tool, this condition is indicated with
 172 the colour of the agent (yellow for asymptomatic, red for symptomatic).

173 • *I + Risky*. This condition characterises an agent as being in a high-risk population group. Cur-
 174 rently the model does not consider neither risk stratification of co-morbidities nor age struc-
 175 ture of the population. Therefore all these risk factors (obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular dis-
 176 ease or medium to old age) are encompassed in this single condition which is activated upon
 177 acquiring the infection, with a probability defined as a model parameter (*%-high risk*).

178 • *I + Severity*. This condition indicates progression of the disease to a severe state, which in turn
 179 represents a higher threat of death, as it is defined in the $I \rightarrow E$ transition. This event occurs
 180 according to the following parameters (see *Tuomisto et al. (2020)*):

181

Conditions	Value
P(Severe Symptomatic, Risky)	0.25
P(Severe Symptomatic, no Risky)	0.05
P(Severe Asymptomatic)	0.0

182 We model the day in which the severity event is triggered with a uniform distribution during
 183 the illness period:

$$P(\text{day}) = \text{CDF-Uniform}(x < \text{day}),$$

184

and the occurrence of severity in a given day as follows:

$$P(\text{Severe} | \text{day}) = P(\text{day}) P(\text{Severe} | \text{Conditions}).$$

185

• *I + Deadliness*. This condition indicates progression of the disease to a critical state, which in
 186 turn represents an even higher threat of death, as it is defined in the $I \rightarrow E$ transition. The
 187 event occurs according to the following parameters (see *Tuomisto et al. (2020)*):

188

Conditions	Value
P(Deadly Severe)	0.25
P(Deadly no Severe)	0.05

189

Similarly, we model the day in which the deadliness event is triggered uniformly distributed
 190 within the illness period:

$$P(\text{day}) = \text{CDF-Uniform}(x < \text{day}).$$

191

So the occurrence of deadliness in a given day is:

$$P(\text{Deadly} | \text{day}) = P(\text{day}) P(\text{Deadly} | \text{Conditions}).$$

192

• *I + Hospitalised*. This event indicates proper care for the severity condition is taking place;
 193 hence it lowers the chance of death, as it is defined in the $I \rightarrow E$ transition. The occurrence of
 194 this event depends on the availability of *hospital-beds* (defined as a model parameter). Basi-
 195 cally, as soon as a bed is emptied, it is assigned to an agent with severe condition in waiting (if
 196 any), until the maximum capacity is reached. When a patient is admitted, its state is switched
 197 to hospitalised, tested and confirmed (the latter two in case it was not previously diagnosed).
 198 Occupation and demand of these beds are updated on a daily basis; notice that beds are
 199 released when infectious agents recover or are translated to ICU treatment or die.

200

• *I + ICU-admitted*. Similar to the previous event, this one refers to proper treatment for the
 201 critical condition is being given, hence lowering the chance of death, as it is defined in the $I \rightarrow$
 202 E transition. The assignment, discharge and availability of ICU beds is performed analogous
 203 to hospital beds, on a daily basis but considering patients with a deadly condition instead.
 204 Here, ICU beds are released when agents recover or die.

- $I \rightarrow E$ (extinction). An infected individual may become extinct with a probability that depends on his conditions according to the following parameters (see *Tuomisto et al. (2020)*):

Conditions	Value
P(Extinct Deadly, no ICU-admitted)	1.0
P(Extinct Deadly, ICU-admitted)	0.5
P(Extinct Severe, no Hospitalised)	0.2
P(Extinct Severe, Hospitalised)	0.05
P(Extinct Symptomatic)	0.005

Since dead may occur in any day during the illness period, we modelled the chance of the day of fatality as a triangular distribution with peak in the middle of such individual's particular recovery period (*half-recover-period*). In other words, we assume:

$$P(\text{day}) = \text{CDF-Triangular}(x < \text{day} \mid \text{half-recovery-period}),$$

where CDF stands for cumulative distributed function. As a result, we compute the actual probability of death in a given day as follows:

$$P(\text{Extinct} \mid \text{day}) = P(\text{day}) P(\text{Extinct} \mid \text{Conditions}).$$

- $I \rightarrow R$ (recovery). An infected individual gets cured when he reaches the end of his recovery period. If this happens, our model assumes the individual acquires immunity to the virus and cannot be re-infected. In the simulation view, agents with this condition are coloured white.

Agent design and behaviour

We designed agents to represent individual people residing in a hypothetical city, whose attributes include: spatial location, household location and zone or district of residence. The simulation traces an individual disease path for every agent, from susceptible to recovery or death, according to the *SIRE+CARDS* epidemic model described above. Each agent is assigned a daily routine consisting of going outdoors and returning home with a commuting distance range randomly chosen from 25, 50, 100, 200 unit steps; the actual route the agent follows varies slightly due to random fluctuations in his orientation. In addition the length of each step can be set as a global parameter between 0.1 and 1 units. Similarly, the day length can be defined with a given number of ticks in the range between 600 and 2400.

Individuals interact by random contacts they make within his/her household or during their daily routines outdoors. Virus transmission occurs when proximity within a spatial radius of 0.5 units of an infectious individual with other susceptible individuals; the chance of contagion depends on what mask protection intervention is applied, as it was explained before. Besides, our model does not consider incubation periods; infectiousness is assumed to start as soon as contagion occurs, with no difference in infectivity between symptomatic and asymptomatic carriers, or variable infectiousness between individuals. On recovery from the disease, individuals are assumed to acquire immunity to the virus so they cannot be re-infected. In this model all deaths are considered to be caused by COVID-19. No births are taken into consideration during the timeline of the simulation. A high-level depiction of the flow of events that is applied in each iteration of the simulation is shown in Figure 2. Next, we provide a brief description of each of these events.




Figure 2. Simulation flow chart.

- 245 • **lifestyle**: simulates the daily routine of agents, which currently encompasses moving the
246 agent ahead towards its current destination, or head it backwards home if he has reached
247 his range limit. In any case, confirmed patients are not allowed to move around.
248 If zonal enforcement is on, the movement is restricted only within the periphery of the zone
249 where the agent is resident. In the simulation view, residents of different zones are identified
250 with different shapes and colours (the latter coincides with the colour of their zone's ground).
- 251 • **epidemic**: here the spread of the epidemic is simulated, with transmissions occurring in
252 proportion to proximity between infectious and susceptibles and probability of contagion. If
253 a transmission happens, the new case is initially characterised as not confirmed, not tested,
254 not severe and not deadly. The condition of asymptomatic and/or risky of a new case is
255 defined according to the corresponding probabilities set as model parameters. Lastly, the
256 agent's recovery period in days is assigned as a random variate with a Gaussian distribution
257 centred at the *avg-duration* model parameter.
- 258 • **isolation**: when the Case Isolation NPI (CI) is enforced, those symptomatic cases that have
259 not been tested yet are sent to their households and are tagged as confirmed cases so they
260 have to stay isolated (their movement is restricted). If CI is lifted during the simulation, the
261 confined cases are tagged back as not confirmed and therefore, are set free to leave its iso-
262 lation.
- 263 • **quarantine**: when the Home Quarantine NPI (HQ) is enforced, housemates of confirmed
264 cases are sent home and their movement is restricted; they will stay quarantined unless HQ
265 is lifted during the simulation.
- 266 • **distancing**: when the Social Distancing NPI (SD) is enabled, every agent stays away of any
267 other agent within a radius of the minimal distance model parameter. For this purpose the
268 agent chooses the closest agent in its vicinity and heads into the opposite direction.
- 269 • **sentinel**: when the Sentinel Testing NPI (ST) is enforced, ambulances move around the en-
270 tire region performing mass-testing of any agent found on their ways. Therefore each ambu-
271 lance looks around its vicinity for agents that has not been tested before, perform the test on
272 them, mark these persons as tested, and for those with positive result, sent them to isolation
273 marked as confirmed cases. Each ambulance is supplied with a stock of tests defined as a
274 model parameter (*%-tests*); however if they run out of tests during the simulation it is possible
275 to replenish them with a new supply of stock. We remark that this NPI can be applied locally
276 within each zone if the *zonal?* parameter is enabled. Lastly, notice that once a healthy agent
277 is tested it will not be tested again in the future, unless it gets infected in which case his tested
278 condition is reset, as it was previously explained in the epidemic event.
- 279 • **lockdown**: when the Total Lockdown NPI (TL) is enforced, all the agents are confined at home,
280 except for a few with movement permits. The latter is intended to represent people going
281 out for food or medicines or workers of essential jobs; they are chosen randomly every day
282 according to a proportion of the population defined with the model parameter *%-permits*. Be-
283 cause our model considers zonal divisions, hence it is possible to lift the restriction in one or
284 many zones while keeping the remainder locked down (this can be done tapping the *unlock*
285 *zone* button in the simulation panel). If TL is disabled during the simulation, all the agents are
286 unlocked so they can move freely, unless of course, they are confirmed cases. TL enforce-
287 ment or lifting have effect from midnight on the next day of simulation, after having been
288 applied.
- 289 • **illness**: in this step, progress of illness for the entire population of infectious agents is sim-
290 ulated according to the transition events of the *SIRE+CARDS* model described earlier. The
291 sequence of application of these events is the following: $I \rightarrow R$, $I \rightarrow E$, $I + Severity$, $I + Deadliness$,
292 $I + Hospitalised$, and lastly, $I + ICU-admitted$.
- 293 • **clock**: this event updates the day and hour counters which depends on the number of ticks
294 (or iterations) that are needed to complete a simulated day, as defined by the corresponding
295 model parameter.

296 • **indicators:** here the simulations statistics and epidemic indicators are computed, including
297 the following:

- 298
1. History of the number of infected people per day during the timeline of the simulation.
 2. Two estimates of the reproduction number. The first one uses a population-level approach that takes cumulative incidence data at a given day, namely the attack rate (*Obadia et al., 2012*); here R_0 is computed as the inverse of the proportion of susceptibles after the last day of simulation of the epidemic (*Dietz, 1993*):

$$R_0 = \frac{\ln S_0 - \ln S_t}{S_0 - S_t}$$

299 where S_0 is the initial amount of susceptibles at the time of introduction of the first
300 infected, and S_t the susceptibles at time t .

The second estimate is computed with a individual-based approach, computed directly by tracing agents, contacts and contagions individually throughout the epidemic timeline, and then taking the average:

$$\bar{R}_0 = \frac{1}{|C^t|} \sum_k C_k^t$$

301 here C_k^t is the number of contagions made by agent k up to time t , and $|C_t|$ is the count
302 of agents that have actually made a contagion up to that point. In this sense, instead
303 of making assumptions about the value of reproduction number, we measure it as an
304 emergent property of the epidemic dynamics. Both indicators, R_0 and \bar{R}_0 usually follow
305 similar trends, although in some scenarios they may differ amply, as it has been previ-
306 ously reported (*Breban et al., 2007*), as it can be also verified in the corresponding plot
307 output section of the simulation tool.

- 308 3. The doubling time computed as (*Bakir, 2016*):

$$DT = \frac{\ln 2}{\ln N_t^i - \ln N_{t-1}^i}$$

309 where N_t^i is the number of infected agents at time t .

- 310 4. Additionally, the following statistics are recorded or obtained: total amount of healthy
311 agents (susceptible or recovered), total amount of deaths, total amount of infected agents,
312 amount of infected and confirmed agents today, new cases today, number of positive
313 tested, and herd immunity percentage. Lethality is reported as infection fatality rate (IFR)
314 and case fatality rate (CFR) which are computed each day as the cumulative number of
315 deaths per cumulative number of total infections or confirmed cases, respectively.
- 316 5. Lastly, since these indicators vary with respect to time along the duration of the simula-
317 tion, we keep record of a number of plots showing the dynamics of the epidemics: SIRE
318 plot (Susceptibles, Infectious, Recovered, Extinct), I+CARDS plot (Infectious, Confirmed,
319 Asymptomatic, Risky, Severe, Deadly), Hospital and ICU demand plot, and R_0 and Dou-
320 bling Time plots.

321 Simulation Tool

322 The simulator was developed in the NetLogo language v.6.1 (May 13, 2019). It is available as free
323 software and can be accessed via the ModelingCommons web server in the following URL: [http://](http://modelingcommons.org/browse/one_model/6374)
324 modelingcommons.org/browse/one_model/6374. To experiment with the tool, choose the "Run in
325 NetLogo Web" tab. NetLogo is a widely popular software platform for ABMs, which further to the
326 simulation language, also integrates a graphical view area and a test-bed for experimental design
327 (*Wilensky and Rand, 2015*).

328 The developed tool implements the NPIs, epidemic *SIRE+CARDS* model and agent behaviour
329 rules described previously. A snapshot of the simulation view area is shown in Figure 3. In there,




Figure 3. View area of the simulation tool. Agents are identified by a different shape and colour per zone; additionally, the epidemic state of agents is indicated by red (symptomatic), yellow (asymptomatic) or white (recovered, immune); deaths are shown by black cross marks (x). Besides, households and sentinels (ambulances) can also be seen.

330 agents are represented with different shapes according to the zone where they reside. The colour
331 of the agent also represents its extended state (healthy: same colour as zone ground; immune:
332 white; sick: red, or yellow if asymptomatic; dead: black x). Special-purpose agents designed to im-
333 plement some of the NPIs such as households for home-quarantine and ambulances for sentinel-
334 testing can also be seen.

335 The control panel is organised in sections related to general, city and COVID-19 settings, mon-
336 itors of epidemic indicators, parameters, action commands to execute the simulation, and a ded-
337 icated section for NPI activation with their corresponding parameters. A snapshot of the panel is
338 shown in Figure 4. Besides, the tool also includes another panel with plot outputs showing the
339 dynamics of the simulation, as it was mentioned in the previous section. An example of the plots
340 obtained in a particular execution of the model is shown in Figure 5.

341 **Hypothetical Scenarios and Results**

342 In this section we describe a number of scenarios conceived to illustrate how to perform a rapid
343 assessment of the effect of NPIs, or combination of NPIs, to contain the spread of the epidemics
344 in the population of agents. We start with a baseline scenario where no measure is taken (Do
345 Nothing). Then we simulate scenarios where the individual NPIs are applied. Finally, we simulate
346 scenarios where these NPIs are combined with the zonal enforcement strategy in order to verify
347 its potential impact. The description of these scenarios is given in Table 1. General, city and COVID-
348 19 parameters used in all simulations are defined in Figure 2. For each scenario, the epidemic is
349 assumed to begin with a “patient zero” seeded randomly in any zone of the city at 0d:12h after the
350 start of the simulation. The application of the configured NPI policies begins at 04d:00h.

351 For each scenario we performed an experiment consisting of 30 repetitions of execution of
352 the simulation model for a timeline of 60 days. We collected the results of the count of healthy
353 agents, deaths and immunity rate, as well as some epidemic indicators obtained at the end of the
354 simulation time. Average results are reported in Table 3 and Table 4.




Figure 4. Control panel of the simulation tool.




Figure 5. Plot area of the simulation tool.

Scenario	Description
DN	Baseline scenario. Patient zero is seeded at 00d:12h, epidemics unfolds with no interventions.
SD	Baseline plus social distancing activated with 50% of population willing to comply (<i>%-willingness</i>).
CI	Baseline plus case isolation activated with no home quarantine (HQ) of relatives was applied.
TL	Baseline plus total lockdown with 10% of people allowed to leave households (<i>%-permits</i>).
ST	Baseline plus sentinel testing with no zonal limitation. A sufficient stock of tests is guaranteed.
ZE	Baseline plus zone enforcement or mobility restriction within each of nine zones.
MP	Baseline plus mask protection (either everybody wearing masks, sick only or healthy only)
SD+ZE	Same as SD with zone enforcing activated.
CI+ZE	Same as CI with zone enforcing activated.
TL+ZE	Same as TL with zone enforcing activated.
ST+ZE	Same as ST with zone enforcing activated.
MP+ZE	Same as MP everybody with zone enforcing activated.

Table 1. Description of the simulated scenarios.

Parameter	Description	Value
pop-size	Total number of simulated people (agents)	400
zones	Number of residential zones	9
days	Period of observation days (simulation length)	60 days
% high-risk	% of population with co-morbidities	30%
hospital-beds	Total number of hospital beds available	12
ICU-beds	Total number of ICU beds available	2
ambulances-zone	Number of ambulances (sentinels) per zone	1
avg-duration	Average day period to recover from illness	18 days
% asymptomatic	% of patients showing no or mild symptoms	50%

Table 2. Settings used in all simulated scenarios.

Scenario	Survivor	Death	Immune	Immune (%)
DN	334.9 ± 8.7	65.1 ± 8.7	334.8 ± 8.8	1.00 ± 0.00
SD	338.8 ± 7.6	58.2 ± 7.3	329.9 ± 8.2	0.97 ± 0.01
CI	344.0 ± 20.0	55.9 ± 20.0	302.7 ± 102.5	0.90 ± 0.30
TL	344.6 ± 25.0	26.8 ± 14.4	162.1 ± 82.4	0.47 ± 0.24
ST	380.8 ± 13.0	18.8 ± 12.6	125.4 ± 77.7	0.34 ± 0.21
MP sick	329.0 ± 38.1	49.9 ± 20.9	265.2 ± 109.2	0.83 ± 0.33
MP healthy	334.0 ± 6.6	66.0 ± 6.6	334.0 ± 6.6	1.00 ± 0.00
MP everyone	361.2 ± 43.7	6.3 ± 9.1	35.0 ± 45.2	0.11 ± 0.15
DN+ZE	339.1 ± 49.2	36.5 ± 18.2 **	211.0 ± 104.8	0.65 ± 0.33
SD+ZE	356.1 ± 29.3 *	17.9 ± 8.8 **	105.9 ± 48.8	0.31 ± 0.16
CI+ZE	375.0 ± 39.5 **	10.4 ± 8.2 **	64.0 ± 55.6	0.18 ± 0.16
TL+ZE	394.0 ± 3.4 **	6.0 ± 3.4 **	35.3 ± 19.7	0.09 ± 0.05
ST+ZE	394.8 ± 4.6 **	5.2 ± 4.6 **	34.6 ± 26.4	0.09 ± 0.07
MP everyone +ZE	388.8 ± 12.6 *	5.3 ± 3.9	28.4 ± 20.4	0.07 ± 0.05

Table 3. Survivor, death and immune count in each scenario starting with a single infection. Statistical significant differences in counts of survivors and deaths between the single NPI scenarios compared to their corresponding combined NPI+ZE scenarios, are marked as * ($p < 0.01$) and ** ($p < 0.001$).

Scenario	CFR (%)	IFR (%)	R_0 (attack)	\bar{R}_0 (tracing)
DN	0.69 ± 0.05	0.16 ± 0.02	21.94 ± 4.33	1.97 ± 0.05
SD	0.61 ± 0.05	0.15 ± 0.02	3.97 ± 0.36	1.87 ± 0.05
CI	0.28 ± 0.10	0.14 ± 0.05	10.15 ± 8.77	2.57 ± 0.88
TL	0.49 ± 0.15	0.11 ± 0.04	1.54 ± 0.34	2.85 ± 0.40
ST	0.10 ± 0.05	0.10 ± 0.05	1.19 ± 0.44	1.72 ± 0.65
MP sick	0.65 ± 0.13	0.21 ± 0.22	3.22 ± 1.25	1.65 ± 0.58
MP healthy	0.70 ± 0.04	0.17 ± 0.02	22.51 ± 3.12	1.97 ± 0.05
MP everyone	0.33 ± 0.25	0.07 ± 0.08	0.84 ± 0.58	1.22 ± 0.89
DN+ZE	0.56 ± 0.08	0.13 ± 0.03	3.55 ± 5.41	1.94 ± 0.14
SD+ZE	0.50 ± 0.10	0.12 ± 0.04	1.29 ± 0.19	1.93 ± 0.24
CI+ZE	0.27 ± 0.23	0.17 ± 0.23	1.03 ± 0.44	2.05 ± 0.94
TL+ZE	0.54 ± 0.19	0.17 ± 0.11	1.06 ± 0.03	2.59 ± 0.57
ST+ZE	0.12 ± 0.07	0.12 ± 0.07	1.06 ± 0.05	1.82 ± 0.30
MP everyone +ZE	0.59 ± 0.24	0.15 ± 0.15	0.96 ± 0.33	1.48 ± 0.57

Table 4. Epidemic indicators obtained in each scenario starting with a single infection.

355 These results hint at the effectiveness of the different NPI strategies. Across all the scenarios,
 356 the deaths count varies from 65.1 to 5.3, whereas immunity rate ranges from 100% to 7%. Re-
 357 garding individual NPI scenarios, that Sentinel Testing reaches the highest count of healthy people
 358 (381 ± 13 in average), of which about 34% acquired immunity to the disease, while also achieving
 359 the lowest rates of mortality of approximately 4% (19 ± 13 deaths); hence, ST seems to be the sin-
 360 gle NPI yielding the major impact in the epidemics outcome. Should authorities need to prioritise
 361 application of interventions, these assessment suggests ST should be given top priority.

362 Now regarding the count of healthy survivors, Mask Protection for everyone achieves the sec-
 363 ond best result (361 ± 43) followed by Total Lockdown (345 ± 25). This is an interesting result, taking
 364 into account that financial cost of providing population with masks can be negligible compared
 365 to the economic and social costs of maintaining lengthy lockdowns. On the other hand it is also
 366 interesting to notice that Social Distancing when 50% of population willing to comply, yields a very
 367 low impact (survivors: 339 ± 8 , deaths: 58 ± 7 , immunity: 97%), only comparable with the Do Nothing
 368 scenario (survivors: 335 ± 9 , deaths: 65.1 ± 8.7 , immunity: 100%). The latter suggests that more than
 369 half of the population should embrace distancing habits if one expect this NPI to produce any miti-
 370 gation impact, maybe by reinforcing awareness through extensive coverage education campaigns.
 371 We observe that Mask Protection of healthy people only, also obtains similar figures to DN, yielding
 372 a low impact NPI. MP of sick, in contrast, is more effective in reducing the mortality rate.

373 Another interesting finding related to R_0 , shows that Mask Protection-everyone obtained the
374 best result (0.84), followed by Sentinel Testing (1.19), and then by Total Lockdown (1.54). On the
375 other hand, the \bar{R}_0 number that is computed directly by tracing the contacts of agents, yielded a
376 best result with Mask Protection-everyone again (1.22), then Sentinel Testing (1.72), followed by
377 Social Distancing (1.87). The latter corroborates the observation regarding the prioritisation that
378 should be given to ST or MP interventions, plus education campaigns. Moreover, the two estimates
379 of reproduction number can differ amply, particularly in the DN scenario ($R_0 = 21,94$, $\bar{R}_0 = 1.97$), as
380 it has been noted elsewhere (*Breban et al., 2007*). In view of these results, we believe the tracing
381 approach \bar{R}_0 is a more realistic estimate for epidemics ABM simulations.

382 On the other hand, we found that the Zone Enforcement NPI exhibits interesting indicators
383 suggesting its potential benefit for mitigation impact. Compared to the Do Nothing scenario, ZE
384 improves death rate (from 65 ± 9 to 37 ± 18), CFR (from $69 \pm 5\%$ to $56 \pm 8\%$) and IFR (from $16 \pm 2\%$ to
385 $13 \pm 3\%$). Since this is one of the distinctive features of our model, we thus decided to assess the
386 effect of combining every individual NPI with the ZE restriction.

387 Interestingly enough, across all scenarios of NPIs combined with ZE, more effective mitigation
388 indicators were obtained. For example, survivor and death count is better than any other sce-
389 nario: TL+ZE (survivors: 394 ± 3 , death: 6 ± 3), ST+ZE (survivors: 395 ± 5 , deaths: 5 ± 5) and MP every-
390 one+ZE (survivors: 389 ± 13 , deaths: 5 ± 4). SD+ZE achieves herd immunity rate of 31%, which may be
391 favourable for protection against a subsequent second wave of virus spread, taking into account
392 that this scenario assumes that only 50% of population respects distancing. Regarding case fatality
393 rate (CFR) these zone-restricted NPIs obtained ranges between 12% and 59%, whilst the infected
394 fatality rate (IFR) obtained more optimistic values between 12% and 17%, a result that confirms
395 the overestimation phenomenon when only official confirmed cases are accounted rather than
396 actual contagions (*Verity et al., 2020*). Another observation concerning herd immunity is that fol-
397 lowing Social Distancing then comes Case Isolation (deaths: 56 ± 20 , immunity: $90 \pm 30\%$) and Mask
398 Protection for sick only (deaths: 50 ± 21 , immunity: $83 \pm 33\%$); then Total Lockdown (deaths: 27 ± 14 ,
399 immunity: $47 \pm 24\%$) and Sentinel Testing (deaths: 19 ± 17 , immunity: $34 \pm 21\%$).

400 On a different note, a noticeable pattern in these experiments is the high variability of the av-
401 erage results, which can be explained by two reasons. Firstly, a common theme in all these NPIs
402 is that they perform isolation of cases as soon as they are discovered: CI by self-isolation of symp-
403 tomatic cases, ST by immediate isolation of asymptomatic tested positive, and TL by mandatory
404 confining of both symptomatic or asymptomatic (or healthy for that matter) people. Secondly,
405 since the experiments were designed in a way that only one infected agent (patient zero) is ran-
406 domly seeded at the beginning of the simulation, it is likely that in some repetitions, as soon as
407 these NPIs take effect, patient zero can be sent by pure chance to isolation just before he or she
408 can transmit virus to other agents; therefore, in those executions indicators may remain unaltered
409 whilst in other repetitions the epidemics effectively unfolds fully. This kind of variability is actually
410 an inherent property of ABM models (*Ahmed et al., 2012*), one that may resemble more closely the
411 natural phenomena they simulate (take for example, the way the COVID-19 epidemics has evolved
412 in Latin America differs amply between countries, despite sharing similar socio-economical condi-
413 tions and that likewise NPIs measures have been taken by their local governments).

414 In order to perform an analysis ensuring the epidemics fully develops across all repetitions, we
415 embarked in another set of experiments where rather than beginning with a single infection of
416 a patient zero, the simulation starts with a small outbreak of 5% of the population representing
417 "imported cases", distributed randomly in different zones of the city. Again we run 30 repetitions
418 per scenario for a timeline of 60 days. The average results are reported in Table 5 and Table 6.

419 The first observation in this set of outbreak experiments is that the results exhibit a smaller
420 variability, confirming the fully unfolding intuition explained before. Moreover, compared to the
421 patient zero experiments, the overall trend can also be identified here, except that with higher
422 numbers. Let us examine for example, the death count here varies from 65.7 in the DN scenario
423 to 33.2, compared to 65.1 and 5.3 in the same scenario for the patient zero experiments.

Scenario	Survivor	Death	Immune	Immune (%)
DN	334.27 ± 8.04	65.73 ± 8.04	334.20 ± 8.07	1.00 ± 0.00
SD	336.63 ± 7.99	63.30 ± 7.99	330.70 ± 8.00	0.98 ± 0.01
CI	333.57 ± 6.84	66.43 ± 6.84	332.00 ± 7.03	1.00 ± 0.00
TL	335.57 ± 10.23	64.40 ± 10.27	316.77 ± 11.80	0.94 ± 0.02
ST	353.23 ± 6.26	46.77 ± 6.26	260.27 ± 18.37	0.74 ± 0.05
MP Sicks	340.30 ± 8.88	58.60 ± 9.23	330.27 ± 10.06	0.97 ± 0.01
MP Healthy	334.63 ± 8.79	65.37 ± 8.79	334.53 ± 8.87	1.00 ± 0.00
MP Everyone	332.70 ± 9.45	33.23 ± 5.03	195.17 ± 29.32	0.59 ± 0.08
DN+ZE	336.47 ± 8.30	63.43 ± 8.20	330.97 ± 12.52	0.98 ± 0.04
SD+ZE	339.53 ± 11.29	56.83 ± 7.93 *	322.67 ± 20.84	0.95 ± 0.05
CI+ZE	338.93 ± 7.55 *	60.13 ± 8.09 *	316.10 ± 17.31	0.93 ± 0.05
TL+ZE	350.80 ± 8.66 **	49.03 ± 8.61 **	276.77 ± 29.89	0.79 ± 0.09
ST+ZE	355.97 ± 8.99	44.03 ± 8.99	246.23 ± 21.26	0.69 ± 0.07
MP Everyone+ZE	345.57 ± 13.10 **	33.17 ± 6.35	194.13 ± 22.11	0.56 ± 0.07

Table 5. Survivor, death and immune count in each scenario starting with an outbreak of 5% population. Statistical significant differences in counts of survivors and deaths between the single NPI scenarios compared to their corresponding combined NPI+ZE scenarios, are marked as * ($p < 0.01$) and ** ($p < 0.001$).

Scenario	CFR (%)	IFR (%)	R_0 (attack)	\bar{R}_0 (tracing)
DN	0.70 ± 0.04	0.16 ± 0.02	22.99 ± 4.55	1.88 ± 0.07
SD	0.67 ± 0.05	0.16 ± 0.02	4.54 ± 0.44	1.87 ± 0.07
CI	0.34 ± 0.03	0.17 ± 0.02	9.41 ± 7.53	2.19 ± 0.08
TL	0.70 ± 0.05	0.17 ± 0.03	3.44 ± 0.48	2.54 ± 0.16
ST	0.15 ± 0.02	0.15 ± 0.02	1.98 ± 0.16	1.86 ± 0.08
MP Sicks	0.62 ± 0.05	0.15 ± 0.02	4.00 ± 0.36	1.81 ± 0.06
MP Healthy	0.70 ± 0.05	0.16 ± 0.02	22.39 ± 5.47	1.87 ± 0.06
MP Everyone	0.53 ± 0.05	0.13 ± 0.02	1.69 ± 0.14	1.66 ± 0.06
DN+ZE	0.68 ± 0.04	0.16 ± 0.02	17.03 ± 9.62	1.84 ± 0.06
SD+ZE	0.63 ± 0.05	0.15 ± 0.02	3.90 ± 0.90	1.83 ± 0.06
CI+ZE	0.32 ± 0.04	0.16 ± 0.02	5.56 ± 6.41	2.13 ± 0.10
TL+ZE	0.64 ± 0.07	0.15 ± 0.02	2.23 ± 0.37	2.29 ± 0.15
ST+ZE	0.15 ± 0.02	0.15 ± 0.02	1.86 ± 0.18	1.85 ± 0.06
MP Everyone+ZE	0.53 ± 0.05	0.13 ± 0.02	1.62 ± 0.13	1.69 ± 0.05

Table 6. Epidemic indicators obtained in each scenario starting with an outbreak of 5% population.

424 The latter increase is caused of course, by the larger amount of carriers at the beginning of the
 425 simulation (20 individuals or 5%) yielding a higher burden on the hospital facilities at the peak of
 426 the epidemics. On the contrary, immunisation also rises in the MP everyone+ZE scenario to a 56%,
 427 from a 7% in the earlier experiment. The higher levels of immunity achieved in all the scenarios are
 428 beneficial to effectively suppress the contagion or prevent it in a forthcoming second wave of the
 429 epidemics. Similar trends can be identified when comparing the other indicators with the earlier
 430 patient zero experiments.

431 The main finding however, in our opinion, is that simultaneous application of the Zone Enforc-
 432 ing intervention with the other NPIs, again yields an improvement on the mitigation impact com-
 433 pared to the single NPI scenarios (more survivors, fewer deaths). Significant differences between
 434 the single and their corresponding +ZE scenarios (p -value < 0.01) are highlighted in the tables. To
 435 further illustrate the effect of the application of Zone Enforcing, in the Appendix we included a
 436 comparison of the epidemic dynamics between arbitrary executions of the simulation for each
 437 pair of scenarios (single vs its corresponding combination with ZE). Particularly, the “flattening” of
 438 the infectious curve can be seen in the +ZE plots, both as a lower height of the infectious peak and
 439 in some cases as a longer tail shifted towards a later time in hours, with respect to the start of the
 440 simulation.

441 **Conclusion**

442 Given the complex nature of human behavior and virus infection, attempting to model every mech-
443 anism of the COVID-19 epidemic may prove difficult; necessary assumptions have to be made to
444 simplify the representation of the agents and their interactions. Our aim was to focus on find-
445 ing emergencies in the dynamic of this disease, considering a broad set of traits for the agents;
446 in real life of course, there are many properties of interest that may impact the growing of the
447 epidemics. Here we omitted detailed structures such as age, gender, profession, health status,
448 or family, school and work clusters, transportation, job shifts or economic impacts. Clearly, those
449 properties can be examined as extensions of the model, in the hope of capturing additional hidden
450 patterns that may yield a better assessment of the effects NPIs can have taking additional mecha-
451 nisms into consideration. Nonetheless, the results obtained indicate that the proposed model can
452 be a useful tool in relation to a rapid assessment of the potential impact of combinations of NPIs
453 at different stages of the contagion.

454 Overall, our findings suggest three relevant recommendations. In general, mass-testing (ST as
455 we denote it in our model) is the one intervention that authorities should give priority to mitigate
456 the impact of COVID-19, providing for this purpose with sufficient stock of tests to medical units
457 performing random testing campaigns. Besides, Mask Protection for everyone, is even a cheaper
458 strategy authorities should strengthen as an alternative to declaring costly lengthy total lockdowns.

459 In addition, the proposed zonal enforcing NPI proved to be useful to boost the mitigation im-
460 pact of combination of other individual NPIs. Although this seems an appealing finding, practical
461 application of said zonal enforcing may require logistic, residential and economical adjustments,
462 since people usually reside and work in different districts of a city. Therefore the feasibility of
463 limiting mobility of people within districts will depend on the urban planning and development
464 of sufficient decentralised infrastructure, such as industrial, residential, technological, commercial
465 and financial hubs distributed in a way that motivate people to reside and work within the same
466 district. This may not be feasible to achieve for the current COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in
467 cities in Latin America where proper urban zonal planning is unsatisfactory, but it is an alluring
468 idea to start exploring as a preventive measure to counter new epidemics that may come in the
469 forthcoming future.

470 Finally, interesting gaps remain to be addressed in future work. Some of the ideas we are con-
471 sidering are: expanding the model to include more realistic attributes regarding patients and epi-
472 demic dynamics, such as differentiated infectiousness taking into account symptomatic structures
473 associated with age and gender; also considering incubation periods, co-morbidity risk stratifica-
474 tion with age windows, inclusion of conglomeration centres (that is, mass transportation, schools,
475 cinemas, hospitals), as well as the estimation of indicators of economic impacts and the study of
476 the importance of educational aspects in the habits of collective social intelligence that may be
477 beneficial for the mitigation power of NPIs.

478 **Conflict of interest**

479 The authors declare they do not have any conflict of interest.

480 **References**

- 481 **Ahmed A**, Greensmith J, Aickelin U. Variance in system dynamics and agent based modelling using the SIR
482 model of infectious disease. Available at SSRN 2829229. 2012; .
- 483 **Ansumali S**, Prakash MK. A Very Flat Peak: Why Standard SEIR Models Miss the Plateau of COVID-19 Infections
484 and How it can be Corrected. medRxiv. 2020; .
- 485 **Bakir ST**. Compound Interest Doubling Time Rule: Extensions and Examples from Antiquities. Communications
486 in Mathematical Finance. 2016; 5(2).
- 487 **Bock W**, Adamik B, Bawiec M, Bezborodov V, Bodych M, Burgard JP, Goetz T, Krueger T, Migalska A, Pabjan B,
488 et al. Mitigation and herd immunity strategy for COVID-19 is likely to fail. medRxiv. 2020; .

- 489 **Breban R**, Vardavas R, Blower S. Theory versus data: how to calculate R_0 ? PLoS One. 2007; 2(3).
- 490 **Dietz K**. The estimation of the basic reproduction number for infectious diseases. Statistical methods in medical
491 research. 1993; 2(1):23–41.
- 492 **Fanelli D**, Piazza F. Analysis and forecast of COVID-19 spreading in China, Italy and France. Chaos, Solitons &
493 Fractals. 2020; 134:109761.
- 494 **Ferguson N**, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, Bhatia S, Boonyasiri A, Cucunuba Perez Z,
495 Cuomo-Dannenburg G, et al. Report 9: impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19
496 mortality and healthcare demand. Imperial College: UK. 2020; .
- 497 **Ferguson NM**, Cummings DA, Fraser C, Cajka JC, Cooley PC, Burke DS. Strategies for mitigating an influenza
498 pandemic. Nature. 2006; 442(7101):448–452.
- 499 **Giordano G**, Blanchini F, Bruno R, Colaneri P, Di Filippo A, Di Matteo A, Colaneri M. Modelling the COVID-19
500 epidemic and implementation of population-wide interventions in Italy. Nature Medicine. 2020; p. 1–6.
- 501 **Gomez J**, Prieto J, Leon E, Rodriguez A. INFEKTA: A General Agent-based Model for Transmission of Infectious
502 Diseases: Studying the COVID-19 Propagation in Bogotá-Colombia. medRxiv. 2020; .
- 503 **Kantner M**. Beyond just" flattening the curve": Optimal control of epidemics with purely non-pharmaceutical
504 interventions. arXiv preprint arXiv:200409471. 2020; .
- 505 **Lai S**, Ruktanonchai NW, Zhou L, Prosper O, Luo W, Floyd JR, Wesolowski A, Santillana M, Zhang C, Du X, et al.
506 Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain COVID-19 in China. . 2020; .
- 507 **Lano K**. UML 2 semantics and applications. Wiley Online Library; 2009.
- 508 **Obadia T**, Haneef R, Boëlle PY. The R_0 package: a toolbox to estimate reproduction numbers for epidemic
509 outbreaks. BMC medical informatics and decision making. 2012; 12(1):147.
- 510 **Railsback SF**, Grimm V. Agent-based and individual-based modeling: a practical introduction. Princeton uni-
511 versity press; 2019.
- 512 **Tuomisto JT**, Yrjölä J, Kolehmainen M, Bonsdorff J, Pekkanen J, Tikkanen T. An agent-based epidemic model
513 REINA for COVID-19 to identify destructive policies. medRxiv. 2020; .
- 514 **Verity R**, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Thompson H, Walker
515 PG, Fu H, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. The Lancet
516 infectious diseases. 2020; .
- 517 **Wilensky U**, Rand W. An introduction to agent-based modeling: modeling natural, social, and engineered
518 complex systems with NetLogo. Mit Press; 2015.
- 519 **Wilson N**, Barnard LT, Kvalsig A, Verrall A, Baker MG, Schwehm M. Modelling the potential health impact of the
520 covid-19 pandemic on a hypothetical european country. medRxiv. 2020; .

521 **Appendix**

522 Here we report plots of example executions of simulated scenarios with an outbreak infecting 5%
523 of the population. For each scenario in Table 1, we include the individual NPIs outcome (left-hand
524 side) and the corresponding NPIs plus zonal enforcement outcome (right-hand side).




Figure 6. Plots of a single run of DN simulation.




Figure 7. Plots of a single run of ZE simulation.




Figure 8. Plots of a single run of SD simulation.




Figure 9. Plots of a single run of SD+ZE simulation.




Figure 10. Plots of a single run of CI simulation.




Figure 11. Plots of a single run of CI+ZE simulation.




Figure 12. Plots of a single run of ST simulation.




Figure 13. Plots of a single run of ST+ZE simulation.




Figure 14. Plots of a single run of TL simulation.




Figure 15. Plots of a single run of TL+ZE simulation.




Figure 16. Plots of a single run of MP simulation.




Figure 17. Plots of a single run of MP+ZE simulation.