

Modeling the Post-Containment Elimination of Transmission of COVID-19

Flávio Codeço Coelho^{a,b,*}, Luiz Max Carvalho^{a,b}, Raquel M Lana^{c,b},
Oswaldo G Cruz^{c,b}, Leonardo S Bastos^{c,b,d}, Claudia T Codeço^{c,b}, Marcelo F
C Gomes^{c,b}, Daniel Villela^{c,b}

^a*Escola de Matemática Aplicada (EMAp), Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

^b*Núcleo de Métodos Analíticos para Vigilância em Saúde Pública (MAVE), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

^c*Programa de Computação Científica (PROCC), Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

^d*Department of Infectious Diseases Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK*

Abstract

Roughly six months into the COVID-19 pandemic, many countries have managed to contain the spread of the virus by means of strict containment measures including quarantine, tracing and isolation of patients as well strong restrictions on population mobility. Here we propose an extended SEIR model to explore the dynamics of containment and then explore scenarios for the local extinction of the disease. We present both the deterministic and stochastic version of the model and derive the \mathcal{R}_0 and the probability of local extinction after relaxation (elimination of transmission) of containment, \mathbb{P}_0 . We show that local extinctions are possible without further interventions, with reasonable probability, as long as the number of active cases is driven to single digits and strict control of case importation is maintained. The maintenance of defensive behaviors, such as using masks and avoiding agglomerations are also important factors. We also explore the importance of population immunity even when above the herd immunity threshold.

Keywords: COVID-19, Epidemiology, Mathematical modelling, pandemic, SARS-COV-2, probability of extinction

*Corresponding author

Email address: fccoelho@fgv.br (Flávio Codeço Coelho)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

29/04/2020

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic is among the top three biggest in the last on hundred years, reaching levels only previously seen in Influenza pandemics[1]. At the time of writing, more than 8 million confirmed cases have been reported globally, with more than 500 thousand deaths [2]. Most affected countries still observe transmission, even if number of new cases show signs of reduction. Even with few cases, if cities (or countries) decide to lift quarantine measures, transmission may increase again due to the presence of sizeable portion of susceptible individuals suddenly at greater risk of infection.

The initial containment response varied considerably across countries, with some countries displaying more success than others in avoiding infections and subsequent deaths[3, 4, 5]. The economic impact of the containment efforts in the form of quarantines, lock-downs, suspension of international travelling and other drastic measures, has been remarkable [6]. This economic strain has forced many countries towards an early suspension of many of the most severe containment measures such as quarantines and mobility restrictions [7]. Naturally, the re-normalization of social interaction brings with it may concerns about the potential for a second wave of transmissions, which could potentially grow out of control [8].

Thus, an important question that emerges after a period of isolation is: *What's the probability that local infections will be eliminated once the isolation is lifted?* Evaluating scenarios for incidence evolution after these initial containment efforts requires models which accommodate both biological and population-level dynamics. In particular, models that can represent properly the immunological aspects of COVID-19 progression as well as the impact of containment mechanisms, such as quarantine and social distancing.

Many models have been proposed recently to deal with the temporal evolution of the epidemic[9, 10, 11], but one key aspect that must be considered is the contribution of stochastic fluctuations to the interruption of local transmission after the number of active cases is brought close to zero. Kucharsky et al. (2020, [12]), used an stochastic transmission model to estimate the daily reproduction number, \mathcal{R}_t , which is often used to predict disease extinction ($\mathcal{R}_t < 1$), but empirical estimates of basic reproduction numbers are very sensitive to noise in the testing rates as well as to changes in case definition. Moreover, in real populations, \mathcal{R}_t can move back above one quite

36 easily in response to changes in the population protective behavior.

37 In this paper, we approach the issue of local disease extinction by cal-
38 culating the probability of extinction of the disease as a stochastic epidemic
39 process. In the context of epidemics, the correct epidemiological terminology
40 for the stochastic extinction is the local “elimination of infections”. In this
41 paper, however, we shall continue to use the term extinction throughout,
42 as it is shorter and more in line with the literature on stochastic processes.
43 The probability of extinction is greater when the number of infected is low,
44 so we calculate this probability assuming post-containment scenarios where
45 cases have been dropped to very low numbers. We start by presenting the
46 deterministic version of the model and derive its basic reproduction number.
47 Then we derive an stochastic version of the same model and use it to calcu-
48 late an analytical expression for the extinction probability. We conclude by
49 looking at scenarios of local extinction and discussing how it applies to real
50 scenarios, including also the impact of the fraction of the population already
51 immunized upon the lifting of containment.

52 **2. Methods**

53 *2.1. The SEIAHR model*

54 First, we describe the (deterministic) model used to represent COVID-
55 19 dynamics. The Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Removed (SEIR) model is
56 a classic model for diseases for which it is important to take into account
57 an incubation period, and variants of it have been employed in numerous
58 COVID-19 modelling studies [13, 14]. Here, we propose a variation of this
59 model with added asymptomatic, hospitalized compartments and a quaran-
60 tine mechanism (fig. 1). There is no explicit compartments for Quarantined and
61 dead individuals as they are pure sink states that do not influence the main
62 dynamics.




Figure 1: Block diagram of the SEIAHR model. compartments Q and *death* are included for illustrative purposes only.

The model is represented as system of ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\lambda[(1 - \chi)S], \quad (1a)$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \lambda[(1 - \chi)S] - \alpha E, \quad (1b)$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = (1 - p)\alpha E - \delta I - \phi I, \quad (1c)$$

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = p\alpha E - \gamma A, \quad (1d)$$

$$\frac{dH}{dt} = \phi I - (\rho + \mu)H, \quad (1e)$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \delta I + \rho H + \gamma A, \quad (1f)$$

63 with $\lambda = \beta(I + A)$ as the force of infection. State variables S, E, I, A, R, H
 64 represent the fraction of the population in each of the compartments, thus
 65 $S(t) + E(t) + I(t) + A(t) + H(t) + R(t) = 1$ at any time t . Quarantine enters
 66 the model through the parameter χ which can be taken as a constant or as a
 67 function of time, $\chi(t)$, that represents the modulation of the isolation policies.
 68 Quarantine works by blocking a fraction χ of the susceptibles from being

69 exposed, i.e., taking part on disease transmission. Time-varying quarantine
 70 is achieved through multiplying χ by activation (eq. 2) and deactivation (eq.
 71 3) functions:

$$A_s(t) = \frac{1 + \tanh(t - s)}{2}, \quad (2)$$


72 and

$$D_e(t) = \frac{1 - \tanh(t - e)}{2}, \quad (3)$$

73 where s and e are the start and end of the isolation period ($e > s$), respec-
 74 tively. A finite period $\tau = e - s$ of quarantine can be defined by the combined
 75 effect of both functions:

$$\chi(t) = \chi A_s(t) D_e(t). \quad (4)$$

76 Figure 2 illustrates the activation and deactivation of quarantine.



77

Figure 2: $\chi(t)$ upon activation and deactivation of quarantine for $\chi = 0.3$. Panel on the
 left shows each function separately ($\chi A_1(t)$ and $\chi D_1(t)$) set to $t = 1$. The right panel shows
 78 a combination with activation on $t = 1$ and deactivation on $t = 6$ ($\chi(t) = \chi A_1(t) D_6(t)$).

79 2.2. Basic Reproduction Number

80 The basic reproduction number for the SEIAHR model can be derived using
 81 the next generation matrix method [15], which we show in Appendix A. The
 82 expression for \mathcal{R}_0 is

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{\beta(1 - \chi)(p(\phi + \delta) + (1 - p)\gamma)}{\gamma(\delta + \phi)}. \quad (5)$$

Table 1: State transitions and rates for the stochastic SEIAHR model. In the state transition column, only the changing state variables are indicated.

Description	State transition	rate
Infection	$(S, E) \rightarrow (S - 1, E + 1)$	$\lambda(1 - \chi)S$
Exposed to I	$(E, I) \rightarrow (E - 1, I + 1)$	$(1 - p)\alpha E$
Exposed to A	$(E, A) \rightarrow (E - 1, A + 1)$	$p\alpha E$
Hospitalization	$(I, H) \rightarrow (I - 1, H + 1)$	ϕI
Recovery of I	$(I, R) \rightarrow (I - 1, R + 1)$	δI
Recovery of A	$(A, R) \rightarrow (A - 1, R + 1)$	γA
Recovery of H	$(H, R) \rightarrow (H - 1, R + 1)$	ρH
Death of H	$H \rightarrow H - 1$	μH

83 From equation (5) we can obtain $\mathcal{R}_t = \mathcal{R}_0 S(t)$ and another reproduction
 84 number, denoted by \mathcal{R}_c , which we shall call *control reproduction number*, as
 85 it represents the average number of secondary cases infected by primary cases
 86 under some control scenario – i.e. whenever $\chi > 0$.

87 2.3. Probability of extinction

88 The question of the local extinction the disease can be more realistically
 89 addressed with a stochastic version of the SEIAHR model, where the com-
 90 bination of a discrete state and stochastic state transitions allow for actual
 91 extinctions to occur.

92 The transition rates from the ODE model (Eqs 1) listed on table 1, can be
 93 used to build a continuous–time markov chain model where time is continuous
 94 but the state is discrete, allowing for a more realistic description of population
 95 changes over time.

This model is a multivariate stochastic process $\{S(t), E(t), I(t), A(t), H(t)\}$
 where $R(t) = N - (S(t) + E(t) + I(t) + A(t) + H(t))$. We will leave the
 equation of R out, because it is decoupled from the rest of the system. A
 joint probability function is associated with the set of random state variables,
 $\{S(t), E(t), I(t), A(t), H(t)\}$,

$$P_{s,e,i,a,h}(t) = \Pr(S(t) = s, E(t) = e, I(t) = i, A(t) = a, H(t) = h),$$

which leads to the Kolmogorov forward equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_{s,e,i,a,h}}{dt} = & P_{s+1,e-1,i,a,h}\lambda(1-\chi)(s+1) + P_{s,e+1,i-1,a,h}(1-p)\alpha(e+1) \\ & + P_{s,e+1,i,a-1,h}p\alpha(e+1) + P_{s,e,i+1,a,h-1}\phi(i+1) + P_{s,e,i+1,a,h}\delta(i+1) \\ & + P_{s,e,i,a+1,h}\gamma(a+1) + P_{s,e,i,a,h+1}\rho(h+1) + P_{s,e,i,a,h+1}\mu(h+1). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

96 As a continuous-time branching process, the extinction threshold for the
 97 stochastic model is closely related to the corresponding one in the determin-
 98 istic model but depends on the initial number of infectious individuals[16].
 99 Based of the properties of this kind of stochastic processes, Whittle (1955)
 100 calculated the probability of extinction for the stochastic SIR model to be
 101 $\mathbb{P}_0 = \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_0}\right)^i$, where i is the initial number of infectious individuals[17].
 102 We can apply the same technique described for the stochastic SEIR model
 103 by Allen and Lahodny [16] to derive the probability of extinction for the
 104 SEIAHR model.

105 The analysis presented in Allen and Lahodny [16] assume proximity to the
 106 DFE with a large enough number of susceptibles and a small number of
 107 infectious individuals. Assuming a value for \mathcal{R}_0 from other epidemics or
 108 estimated from initial exponential growth.

109 For a realistic application to the COVID-19 epidemic at the moment t of the
 110 relaxation of population lockdown, we need to acknowledge that $S(t) < N$,
 111 whilst not knowing what the exact value of S at time t and thus the effective
 112 reproduction number at the time. Nevertheless, we know from equation (5)
 113 that \mathcal{R}_t is a function of $S(t)$. Therefore, we calculate \mathbb{P}_0 for various values
 114 of \mathcal{R}_t .

115 *Analytical expression for \mathbb{P}_0 .* The probability of extinction, \mathbb{P}_0 , can be com-
 116 puted analytically following the derivation of probability-generating func-
 117 tions for the system of equations in (6), the details of which are given in Ap-
 118 pendix B. The probability of extinction is computed from the fixed points of
 119 the PGFs, q_1 , q_2 and q_3 , which lie in $(0, 1)^3$. With the fixed points in hand,
 120 we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}_0 = \prod_{i=1}^3 q_i^{k_i}, \quad (7)$$

121 where k_i are the initial states $k_1 = E(0)$, $k_2 = I(0)$ and $k_3 = A(0)$. Here we
 122 denote the moment of relaxation of containment as $t = 0$.

123 *Numerical approximation to \mathbb{P}_0 .* The expression in (7), while very useful, is
124 derived from the assumption that the initial state is small compared to the
125 size of the population and that $S(0) \approx N$. Due to the possible deviations
126 from the theoretical value of \mathbb{P}_0 when $S(0) < N$, In the results, we always
127 present estimates of \mathbb{P}_0 , obtained by simulation as well.

128 We can approximate \mathbb{P}_0 for a given \mathcal{R}_0 and an initial number of infected in-
129 dividuals ($E + I + A$). This can be accomplished by running a large number
130 of simulations of the stochastic model and computing the fraction of simu-
131 lations in which the virus is driven out of the population ($E + I + A = 0$)
132 without first causing an outbreak. To facilitate setting up the simulation to
133 specific \mathcal{R}_0 , we can rewrite the force of infection by replacing β as a function
134 of \mathcal{R}_0 (eq. A.8):

$$\beta = \frac{\gamma(\delta + \phi)\mathcal{R}_0}{(1 - \chi)[p\phi + p(\delta - \gamma) + \gamma]}. \quad (8)$$

135 *2.4. Effect of Increasing Seroprevalence*

136 After a first wave of infections a fraction of the population will become im-
137 munitized against SARS-COV-2. This will have a protective effect on the
138 population even if $S(t)$ is still above the so-called “herd immunity” threshold
139 of $1/\mathcal{R}_0$. The resulting adjusted \mathbb{P}_0 for different levels of population immu-
140 nization can be determined through simulation of the stochastic SEIAHR
141 model (eq. 6).

142 **3. Results**

143 Figure 3 shows how imposing strong containment measures can reverse the
144 growth of the number of cases. But a second wave starts immediately after
145 the restrictions are relaxed. Figure 4 shows that in three out of ten post-
146 containment simulations, the containment resulted in the extinction of the
147 disease, with the other resulting on a second wave.

148 Depending on the value of \mathcal{R}_t at the moment the quarantine is lifted and the
149 number of remaining active cases, the probability of extinction can favor the
150 stochastic extinction of the disease (Fig 5).

151 Tables 2 and 3 contain the values of \mathbb{P}_0 for different scenarios of number of
152 infectious, with high and low \mathcal{R}_0 respectively.

153 We also estimated the \mathbb{P}_0 adjusted for different fractions of immune individ-
154 uals (R) in population from 10000 simulations of the stochastic model. The
155 results are presented in table 5.




Figure 3: Effect of containment, $\chi = .99$ for 55 days starting on the 50th day of the epidemic. Simulation parameters were $\phi = 0.01$, $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1.7$, $\rho = 0.21$, $\delta = 0.04$, $\alpha = 0.34$, $\mu = 0.02$, $p = 0.76$, $s = 50$, $e = 105$.

Table 2: Probabilities of extinction for $\mathcal{R}_t = 2.5$. Approximate \mathbb{P}_0 was calculated from a set of 10000 runs of the stochastic SEIAHR model with different number of initial infectious individuals(I_0).

I_0	E_0	A_0	Approx. \mathbb{P}_0	SEIAHR \mathbb{P}_0	SIR \mathbb{P}_0
1	0	0	0.47	0.45	0.4
2	0	0	0.22	0.20	0.16
3	0	0	0.10	0.09	0.06
4	0	0	0.024	0.04	0.025
5	0	0	0.005	0.01	0.01






Figure 4: Ten runs of the stochastic SEIAHR model with the same parameters used on fig. 3. In 3 out of 10 runs the containment could eliminate the disease but the remaining 7 gave origin to a second wave. All simulations had $I(0) = 2$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1.7$, on a population of 5000.

Table 3: Probabilities of extinction for $\mathcal{R}_t = 1.7$. Approximate \mathbb{P}_0 was calculated from a set of 10000 runs of the stochastic SEIAHR model with different number of initial infectious individuals(I_0).

I_0	E_0	A_0	Approx. \mathbb{P}_0	SEIAHR \mathbb{P}_0	SIR \mathbb{P}_0
1	0	0	0.63	0.64	0.58
2	0	0	0.43	0.41	0.33
3	0	0	0.25	0.26	0.19
4	0	0	0.18	0.17	0.11
5	0	0	0.10	0.10	0.06



(a) SIR model



(b) SEIAHR model.

Figure 5: Probability of local extinction, P_0 as a function of \mathcal{R}_t and I_0 .(a)for the SIR model and (b) for the SEIAHR model.

Table 4: Probabilities of extinction for $\mathcal{R}_t = 1.1$. Approximate \mathbb{P}_0 was calculated from a set of 10000 runs of the stochastic SEIAHR model with different number of initial infectious individuals(I_0).

I_0	E_0	A_0	Approx. \mathbb{P}_0	SEIAHR \mathbb{P}_0	SIR \mathbb{P}_0
1	0	0	0.91	0.92	0.90
2	0	0	0.82	0.86	0.82
3	0	0	0.75	0.79	0.75
1	1	1	0.71	0.76	–
4	0	0	0.69	0.73	0.68
1	3	0	0.66	0.69	–
5	0	0	0.63	0.68	0.62

Table 5: Adjusted \mathbb{P}_0 for different levels seroconversion($R(0)$) of the population. Results are the fraction of stochastic extinctions in 10000 simulations, with $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1.1$.

I_0	$R(0)$	\mathbb{P}_0
10	0	0.35
10	0.1	0.60
10	0.2	0.82
10	0.3	0.93
15	0.3	0.91
20	0.3	0.88
45	0.3	0.78

Table 6: Expected time to elimination of infections, in days, counting from the end of containment. Time is expressed as mean and 95% interval. Values were estimated from a 10000 runs of the stochastic SEIAHR model and rounded to the nearest integer number of days.

Immune fraction	I_0	Time to extinction in days
0	10	149 [38, 325]
0	5	105 [17, 313]
0	1	36 [1, 185]
0.2	10	145 [32, 333]
0.2	5	99 [15, 313]
0.2	1	36 [1, 201]
0.4	10	147 [34, 301]
0.4	5	103 [15, 308]
0.4	1	37 [1, 216]

156 Table 6 shows the expected time in days until extinction under different levels
157 of population immunity and post-containment number of infected.

158 4. Discussion

159 Most countries who managed to control the first wave of COVID-19 did it by
160 means of imposed restrictions on human-to-human contact. Be it through
161 quarantine, tracing and isolation, use of masks or a combination of social dis-
162 tancing tactics, they managed to minimize contacts and thus transmission.
163 Here we have introduced a transmission model (SEIAHR) in both determin-
164 istic and stochastic formulation, which includes the isolation of susceptibles
165 as a means of reducing transmission as well as different levels of infectious
166 individuals. From these models (deterministic and stochastic versions) it is
167 possible to explore the consequences of social distancing as well as to cal-
168 culate the probability of a second wave upon the suspension of distancing
169 behavior. Figure 3 shows how imposing strong social distancing can inter-
170 rupt the transmission, bringing the prevalence to near zero. However, if steps
171 are not taken to permanently change the way people interact in their daily
172 routine, at work, school, public transport, etc. The reproduction number
173 upon lifting of the restrictive regulations, will still be substantially higher
174 than one and will drive a powerful second wave if the population is still far
175 from herd immunity conditions.

176 In the deterministic version of SEIAHR, a second wave will always happen
177 due to the asymptotic way that the number of infectious approach zero.
178 Treating the epidemic process as the stochastic process that it actually is,
179 we can see that the probability of local extinction post-reactivation is quite
180 substantial (fig 5). In the stochastic SEIAHR, extinction events will happen
181 with slightly lower probabilities than those of a SIR model justifying using
182 more detailed model to study this problem. Figure 4 shows stochastic ex-
183 tinction taking place in three out of ten runs, with $\mathcal{R}_t = 1.7$ and $I_0 = 2$. The
184 Stochastic model allows us to compute the probabilities of eliminating local
185 transmission under various scenarios, and can be a useful tool for planning
186 when to lift restrictions to human mobility and interaction.
187 Though the probabilities of elimination of local infections seem rather low
188 on the basic scenarios described on tables 2, 3 and 4, these do not tell us the
189 whole story. If one takes into account the immunity acquired by the popula-
190 tion during the containment period, one can see from the results in table 5,
191 that even if a location is still far from achieving herd immunity, any acquired
192 immunity will greatly improve the chances local extinction substantially.
193 Communities that managed to contain the disease and bring it to the brink
194 of extinction with severe economic impact, need to know how likely they are
195 in succeeding in their fight against the disease as they return to “normal”
196 social and economic activities. Our results also reinforce the need to run
197 seroprevalence surveys previous to the reopening so that the probability to
198 eliminate local infections e properly adjusted for the context of each locality.
199 Here we explored how to improve the chances for local transmission elimina-
200 tion but it must be kept in mind that the \mathcal{R}_t must be kept low (through the
201 use of masks and social distancing) in the post-containment period to guar-
202 antee elimination and even when properly executed the time to elimination
203 can vary from weeks to months, as shown in table 6.

204 References

- 205 [1] List of epidemics, 2020. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_epidemics)
206 [List_of_epidemics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_epidemics), page Version ID: 962716222.
- 207 [2] E. Dong, H. Du, L. Gardner, An interactive web-based dashboard to
208 track covid-19 in real time, *The Lancet infectious diseases* 20 (2020)
209 533–534.

- 210 [3] B. F. Maier, D. Brockmann, Effective containment explains subexpo-
211 nential growth in recent confirmed covid-19 cases in china, *Science* 368
212 (2020) 742–746.
- 213 [4] S. Zhang, Z. Wang, R. Chang, H. Wang, C. Xu, X. Yu, L. Tsamslag,
214 Y. Dong, H. Wang, Y. Cai, Covid-19 containment: China provides
215 important lessons for global response, *Frontiers of Medicine* (2020) 1–5.
- 216 [5] C. J. Wang, C. Y. Ng, R. H. Brook, Response to covid-19 in taiwan: big
217 data analytics, new technology, and proactive testing, *Jama* 323 (2020)
218 1341–1342.
- 219 [6] N. Fernandes, Economic effects of coronavirus outbreak (covid-19) on
220 the world economy, Available at SSRN 3557504 (2020).
- 221 [7] S. Reed, J. M. Gonzalez, R. Johnson, Willingness to accept tradeoffs
222 among covid-19 cases, social-distancing restrictions, and economic im-
223 pact: A nationwide us study, *medRxiv* (2020).
- 224 [8] S. Xu, Y. Li, Beware of the second wave of covid-19, *The Lancet* 395
225 (2020) 1321–1322.
- 226 [9] K. Leung, J. T. Wu, D. Liu, G. M. Leung, First-wave covid-19 transmis-
227 sibility and severity in china outside hubei after control measures, and
228 second-wave scenario planning: a modelling impact assessment, *The*
229 *Lancet* (2020).
- 230 [10] M. Gatto, E. Bertuzzo, L. Mari, S. Miccoli, L. Carraro, R. Casagrandi,
231 A. Rinaldo, Spread and dynamics of the covid-19 epidemic in italy:
232 Effects of emergency containment measures, *Proceedings of the National*
233 *Academy of Sciences* 117 (2020) 10484–10491.
- 234 [11] Z. Yang, Z. Zeng, K. Wang, S.-S. Wong, W. Liang, M. Zanin, P. Liu,
235 X. Cao, Z. Gao, Z. Mai, et al., Modified seir and ai prediction of the
236 epidemics trend of covid-19 in china under public health interventions,
237 *Journal of Thoracic Disease* 12 (2020) 165.
- 238 [12] A. J. Kucharski, T. W. Russell, C. Diamond, Y. Liu, J. Edmunds,
239 S. Funk, R. M. Eggo, F. Sun, M. Jit, J. D. Munday, et al., Early dynam-
240 ics of transmission and control of covid-19: a mathematical modelling
241 study, *The lancet infectious diseases* (2020).

- 242 [13] S. M. Kissler, C. Tedijanto, E. Goldstein, Y. H. Grad, M. Lipsitch,
243 Projecting the transmission dynamics of sars-cov-2 through the post-
244 pandemic period, *Science* 368 (2020) 860–868.
- 245 [14] K. Prem, Y. Liu, T. W. Russell, A. J. Kucharski, R. M. Eggo, N. Davies,
246 S. Flasche, S. Clifford, C. A. Pearson, J. D. Munday, et al., The effect
247 of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the covid-19
248 epidemic in wuhan, china: a modelling study, *The Lancet Public Health*
249 (2020).
- 250 [15] P. van den Driessche, J. Watmough, Reproduction numbers and sub-
251 threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease trans-
252 mission, *Mathematical Biosciences* 180 (2002) 29–48.
- 253 [16] L. J. Allen, G. E. Lahodny Jr, Extinction thresholds in deterministic
254 and stochastic epidemic models, *Journal of Biological Dynamics* 6 (2012)
255 590–611.
- 256 [17] P. Whittle, The outcome of a stochastic epidemic—a note on Bailey’s
257 paper, *Biometrika* 42 (1955) 116–122.

258 **Appendix A. Derivation of the basic reproduction number**

259 In order to use the next-generation method, we start by identifying all m
 260 compartments containing infected individuals. In this case they are E , I
 261 and A and $m = 3$. Let \mathcal{F} be the vector of the rates of appearance of new
 262 infections in the three infectious compartments:

$$\mathcal{F} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda(1 - \chi)S \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

263 Next, we let $\mathcal{V}_i(x)^-$ be rate infectious individuals leave compartment i , and
 264 $\mathcal{V}_i(x)^+$ be the rate with which they enter compartment i :

$$\mathcal{V}^- = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha E \\ (\delta + \phi)I \\ \gamma A \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

265 and

$$\mathcal{V}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ (1 - p)\alpha E \\ p\alpha E \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

266 After defining these we can calculate $\mathcal{V}(x) = \mathcal{V}_i(x)^- - \mathcal{V}_i(x)^+$:

$$\mathcal{V} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha E \\ (p - 1)\alpha E + (\delta + \phi)I \\ -p\alpha E + \gamma A \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

267 Now, if we let $x = \{E, I, A\}$ and x_0 be the Disease-free equilibrium (DFE),
 268 we can define

$$F = \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_i}{\partial x_j}(x_0) \right] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -S\beta(\chi - 1) & -S\beta(\chi - 1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

269 and

$$V = \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_i}{\partial x_j}(x_0) \right] = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha(p - 1) & (\delta + \phi) & 0 \\ -\alpha p & 0 & \gamma \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

270 The next generation matrix is given by FV^{-1} :

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{(S\beta\chi - S\beta)p\phi + (S\beta\chi - S\beta)\gamma + ((S\beta\chi - S\beta)\delta - (S\beta\chi - S\beta)\gamma)p}{\delta\gamma + \gamma\phi} & -\frac{S\beta\chi - S\beta}{\delta + \phi} & -\frac{S\beta\chi - S\beta}{\gamma} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

271 The spectral radius of \mathbb{K} at the DFE (when $S(0) \approx 1$), is the basic reproduc-
272 tion number of the model, $\mathcal{R}_0 = \rho(FV^{-1})$,

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = -\frac{(\beta\chi - \beta)p\phi + (\beta\chi - \beta)\gamma + ((\beta\chi - \beta)\delta - (\beta\chi - \beta)\gamma)p}{\delta\gamma + \gamma\phi}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

273 which, after simplification, gives equation (5).

274 Appendix B. Probability generating functions

Following [16], we derive the probability-generating functions (PGF) for each infectious compartment. Starting with $I_i(0)$, the probability of an infected individual in state i producing offspring of type j given that $I_j(0)$ can be obtained from

$$f_i(z_1, \dots, z_k) = \sum_{j_k=0}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} P_i(z_1, \dots, z_k) z_1^{j_1} \cdots z_k^{j_k}.$$

275 The desired probabilities can be obtained by differentiating the PGF with
276 respect to z_i and setting all z to 1. Notice f_i has a fixed point at $z_1 = \dots =$
277 $z_k = 1$.

278 Computing the relevant probabilities is straightforward by keeping track of
279 the possible transitions (given in Table 1) and considering that only one
280 transition may occur in a given time interval Δt . First, when $E(0) = 1$,
281 $I(0) = 0$ and $A(0) = 0$, we have

$$f_1(z_1, z_2, z_3) = (1 - p)z_2 + pz_3, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

282 and when $E(0) = 0$, $I(0) = 1$ and $A(0) = 0$ the PGF is

$$f_2(z_1, z_2, z_3) = \frac{\beta(1 - \chi)z_1z_2 + \delta + \phi}{\beta(1 - \chi) + \delta + \phi}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

283 Finally, for the case $E(0) = 0$, $I(0) = 0$ and $A(0) = 1$:

$$f_2(z_1, z_2, z_3) = \frac{\beta(1-\chi)z_1z_3 + \gamma}{\beta(1-\chi) + \gamma}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

284 From the PGFs, we can obtain a matrix \mathbb{M} whose entries $m_{ji} = \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i}|_{u=1}$ are
 285 the expected number of offspring in state j from an individual in state i .

286 Given the PGFs above, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{M} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1-p & p \\ \frac{\beta(1-\chi)}{\beta(1-\chi)+\delta+\phi} & \frac{\beta(1-\chi)}{\beta(1-\chi)+\delta+\phi} & 0 \\ \frac{\beta(1-\chi)}{\beta(1-\chi)+\gamma} & 0 & \frac{\beta(1-\chi)}{\beta(1-\chi)+\gamma} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

To obtain the probability of extinction, \mathbb{P}_0 , we need to find the fixed points of the PGFs, i.e. solutions to equations of the form $f_i(q_1, q_2, q_3) = q_i$, $q_i \in (0, 1)$. After some tedious algebra, we arrive at

$$q_1 = \frac{-\sigma + (1-\chi)\beta + (\phi + \delta) + \gamma}{2(1-\chi)\beta}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$q_2 = \frac{(\phi + \delta)(\sigma - (1-\chi)\beta - (\phi + \delta) + \gamma)}{2(1-\chi)\beta(p-1)((\phi + \delta) - \gamma)}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$q_3 = \frac{\gamma(\sigma - (1-\chi)\beta + (\phi + \delta) - \gamma)}{2(1-\chi)\beta p((\phi + \delta) - \gamma)}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

287 with $\sigma = \sqrt{((1-\chi)\beta)^2 + 2(1-\chi)\beta(2p-1)((\phi + \delta) - \gamma) + ((\phi + \delta) - \gamma)^2}$.