Evaluation of national responses to COVID-19 pandemic based on Pareto optimality

Marek Kochańczyk & Tomasz Lipniacki

Department of Biosystems and Soft Matter,
Institute of Fundamental Technological Research,
Polish Academy of Sciences, 02-106 Warsaw, Poland

Corresponding authors' e-mails: {mkochan,tlipnia}@ippt.pan.pl

Abstract

Countries worldwide have adopted various strategies to minimize the socio-economic impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Stringency and efficacy of imposed measures vary due to diversity of organizational cultures and ingrained societal practices, but also universally reflect the standpoint from which protecting public health and saving economy are seen as contradictory objectives. We analyzed cumulative deaths *per capita* and cumulative mobility reduction related to the decrease of economic activity in terms of Pareto optimality to show that as long as epidemic suppression is the aim, the trade-off between the death toll and economic loss is illusory: high death toll correlates with deep lockdown and thus, very likely, with severe economic downturn. We explained this effect by analyzing national epidemic trajectories in the mobility reduction *vs*. reproduction number (R) plane. When the number of daily new infections is high, mobility reduction is the only way to bring R below 1, but when new infections become sporadic, the epidemic can be suppressed by efficient testing complemented by relatively mild restrictions. South American trajectories suggest that lifting mobility restrictions at $R > 1$ may ultimately lead to the "herd immunity scenario", in which transient lockdown only adds economic costs to an inevitably high death toll.

Introduction

The COVID-19 epidemic is a major threat to both public health and global economy. To minimize death toll and economic loss, countries worldwide have assumed various strategies (not always officially declared). Two main strategies to counteract the epidemic spread are eradication and suppression. Countries such as China, South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, New Zealand, Australia, and others, decided to fully eradicate the disease on their territories and then limit and control incoming travelers. Geographic isolation helps to implement such strategy. Most European countries have chosen the suppression strategy that aims to limit the exponential growth of the outbreak and then reduce daily new cases to a small number. Both the eradication and the suppression strategy are founded on the expectation that a vaccine will be developed in near future, and that massive vaccination will ultimately enable governments to lift imposed restrictions. A third strategy, in which it is anticipated that, on the contrary, no effective vaccine will be available soon and thus long-term containment is not realistic, is to rely on mitigation and ultimately acquisition of herd immunity. This strategy had been initially declared in the UK but was promptly abandoned due to a rapid increase in the death toll and the threat of overwhelming the health system.

In the conceptual framework of mathematical models of infectious diseases, any policy that aims at reducing transmission of the virus seeks to decrease the effective reproduction number $R(t)$ (sometimes denoted R_t), which within S(E)IR-type epidemic models [1] is equal to the ratio of the contact rate β of the infectious and susceptible individuals and removal rate γ of the infectious individuals, $R = \beta/\gamma$. In terms of policy-making, the contact rate β can be reduced by prohibition of mass gatherings that increase the risk of super-spreading events, social distancing, and hygienic precautions, which decrease the risk that a given contact is infectious, and by quarantine in which the individuals are forced to stay home or at least significantly limit their out-of-home activity. The removal rate γ can be increased by enhanced testing and contact tracing, which both enable prompt isolation of (potentially) infectious individuals. While a nation-wide quarantine (lockdown) is an effective mean of reducing β (and R) and saving lives, it hampers economic activity and may thus incur a significant loss of country GDP, in addition to psychological and social costs. In individual countries the policy-making is thus intuitively understood as a balancing act between health and fiscal risks of the pandemic.

We show that when the strategies of multiple countries are juxtaposed, there is effectively no trade-off between the death toll and the economic toll. As the cumulative deaths per capita and cumulative lockdown are the two quantities that have to be jointly minimized, we constructed Pareto fronts that help to evaluate the European suppression and Australasian eradication policies and, as such, provide a reference for the assessment of policies applied in the United States and other countries of the Americas. We show that there is a strong correlation between cumulative deaths *per capita* and cumulative lockdown, and interpret this result by dissecting the impact of testing and nation-wide quarantine on the effective reproduction number.

Results

Severity of national lockdowns can be inferred from data on the reduction of mobility gathered in Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports [2]. We expect that the relative reduction of mobility in locations belonging to two categories—workplaces and places related to retail and recreation—is strongly associated with economic slowdown. We thus assume that the cumulative average mobility reduction in these two categories serves as a good indicator of the impact the epidemic has on economy. In Fig. 1 we plotted national trajectories of cumulative mobility reduction *vs*. deaths per million inhabitants (the latter on the logarithmic scale) for Western, Central, and South European countries that have populations of at least four million. These countries nearly unanimously adopted the suppression strategy. We also marked present-day data points for several Australasian countries that adopted the eradication strategy.

The current Pareto-*optimal* front (darkest gray dotted line) is spanned by Slovakia, Bulgaria, and three Scandinavian countries: Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. The countries that have the smallest number of reported deaths *per capita* are two non-Western European countries, Slovakia (5/million) and Bulgaria (26/million). The Scandinavian countries have higher death tolls (ranging from 45/million for Norway to 483/million for Sweden) but lower cumulative lockdown. Since we consider cumulative values, over time the Pareto-optimal front moves away from the origin of the coordinate system (in Fig. 1, adjacent dotted gray lines indicate front positions in two-week intervals) and countries forming the front may change. The five Australasian countries that adopted the eradication strategy have small death tolls not exceed-



Figure 1: Epidemic trajectories of 24 Western, Central, and South European countries and present-day coordinates of 5 Australasian countries in the cumulative mobility reduction *vs*. cumulative deaths plane. The trajectories begin in February and end on June 17, 2020. Data points for Australasian countries (black octagons) are given for June 17, 2020. Small dots on trajectories indicate positions in one-week intervals. Pareto-optimal fronts (dotted gray lines) and Pareto-pessimal fronts (dashed gray lines) are drawn in two-week intervals. In the available data, the cumulative death count in Spain is not a non-decreasing function of time.

ing 7 deaths/million (Japan) and relatively small cumulative lockdowns, and thus are situated below the European Pareto-optimal front. When all 29 countries are considered jointly, the Pearson correlation coefficient between cumulative lockdown and logarithm of deaths *per capita* is 0.71.

The current Pareto-*pessimal* front (darkest gray dashed line) is shorter, spanned by three countries: Belgium (with the highest per capita death toll in Europe of 843 deaths/million), UK, and Spain, imposing the highest cumulative lockdown. Italy, France, and Ireland lie close to the Pareto-pessimal front. These six countries are clustered in the top-right corner of Fig. 1, which means that they have simultaneously a high death toll and a high cumulative lockdown.



Figure 2: Epidemic trajectories of 24 Western, Central, and South European countries and 5 Australasian countries in the mobility reduction *vs*. effective reproduction number (R) plane. R has been estimated based on the number of daily new cases. The trajectories begin in February and end on June 17, 2020 (except for Spain, for reasons explained in Methods), and have a single-day resolution.

High correlation between cumulative lockdown and deaths *per capita* can be explained by analysis of trajectories of individual countries in the mobility reduction *vs*. effective reproduction number plane, see Fig. 2. The effective reproduction number R (equal β/γ in the SEIR

model we used to estimate R [3]) is calculated from the number of daily new registered cases as explained in Methods. In the countries that are close to the current Pareto-pessimal front, the epidemic had three distinguishable phases, depicted schematically in Fig. 3. In the initial phase, characterized by a high R value and no mobility reduction, R decreases due to suppression of super-spreading events and social distancing. In the next phase, R drops below 1 due to the reduction of mobility, which leads to a decrease of the contact rate β. When analyzing individual trajectories plotted in Fig. 2 we may notice that in the second phase the number of tests per case (indicated by line width and color intensity) remains constant or decreases (possibly due to saturation of the capacity of facilities that perform tests), suggesting that in this phase the removal rate γ remains constant or decreases. This confirms that the reduction of mobility, and thus β, was instrumental in bringing R below 1.



Figure 3: Scheme of a three-phase epidemic trajectory typical for the most affected European countries that implemented effective lockdowns.

We digress here to note that the daily number of performed tests can be referred either to the population size or to the number of positive cases (positive tests). We think that this latter scaling is more adequate as it reflects the idea of contact tracing, when the individuals that had contact with an infected individual undergo testing. The bigger is the tested cluster of individuals, the higher is the probability that majority of the secondary infectious will be identified and "removed". Therefore we assume that γ grows monotonically with the number of 'tests per case'. Another measure related to 'tests per case' and γ is the ratio of the delayed daily new cases to daily new deaths. A large number of 'cases per death' indicates that a large fraction of infected individuals have been identified (and isolated), and thus implies large γ.

In the third phase, while the mobility is increasing, R is smaller than 1 and remains nearly constant, suggesting that the inevitable growth of β is compensated by a proportionate growth of γ. Indeed, when R is kept below 1, there is epidemic regression, during which the number of daily new cases is steadily decreasing, which leads to an increase of the average number of tests per case as can be seen for nearly all countries in Fig. 2. As a consequence, a given value of mobility reduction (and, thus, of β) corresponds to two values of R: higher than 1 in the second phase (when γ is low) and lower than 1 in the third phase (when γ is high).

An essentially similar three-phase dynamics can be seen also when R is calculated from the number of daily registered deaths (not cases; see Methods). In Supplementary Figure S1 we show that the number of the delayed cases per death is higher in the third than in the second phase, indicating that a larger fraction of cases is detected in the epidemic regression phase.

Considered countries that introduced restrictions when the number of daily cases was relatively small were able to perform a higher number of tests per case and thus achieved higher γ. This allowed them to reduce R below 1 at larger β values, that is, at smaller mobility reduction (see Fig. 2 and Supplementary Figure S1). This explains a positive correlation between the death toll and cumulative lockdown (visible in Fig. 1), implying that, when the epidemic eradication or suppression is the objective, there is no trade-off between public health and economic loss.

Up-to-date analysis shows that in most European countries the lockdown, even when introduced with some delay, allowed to bring R below 1 and proved to be an effective strategy to suppress the spread of the epidemic. However, when larger Latin American countries and the most populated states of USA are considered, the current picture is different. As shown in Fig. 4, nearly all considered Latin American countries failed to reduce R below 1 despite their lockdowns being of similar magnitude as the lockdowns imposed in most European countries. This may be attributed to a considerable difference in the number of tests per case with respect to European countries. Much less extensive (and sometimes even dwindling) testing coverage leads to smaller γ, which at comparable mobility reduction yields larger R. Due to economic and societal pressures, many Latin American countries are currently perilously decreasing mobility restrictions while having $R > 1$.

Among the considered American countries, Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia achieved the highest cumulative lockdowns (see Fig. 5). Only Peru managed to reduce R below 1; however, since



Figure 4: Epidemic trajectories of 10 most populated states of the USA and larger countries of the Americas in the mobility reduction *vs*. effective reproduction number (R) plane. R has been estimated based on the number of daily new cases. The trajectories begin in February and end on June 17, 2020, and have a single-day resolution.

the number of tests per case in this country is currently very low, it is possible that a potential increase in the number of new cases is unreported and thus the current R estimate should be considered with caution. Trajectories presented in Fig. 4 suggest that the administrative suppression strategy may fail at least in some Latin American countries.

In the United States, only in the New York State and in Illinois—that are among top 10 most populated states and were most severely affected by the epidemic—current R remains below 1. In the remaining eight states, $R \geq 1$, while mobility restrictions are gradually lifted (Fig. 4). As the number of daily new cases is increasing, improved testing efficient and reduction of R by increasing γ becomes difficult. Trajectories of American countries and states of the USA plotted in the cumulative deaths *vs*. cumulative lockdown plane (see Fig. 5) indicate that the most devastating may be the changing of the strategy. All considered American countries



Figure 5: Epidemic trajectories of 10 most populated states of the USA and larger countries of the Americas in the cumulative mobility reduction *vs*. cumulative deaths plane. The trajectories begin in February and end on June 17, 2020. Small dots on trajectories indicate positions in one-week intervals. The *European* Pareto-optimal fronts (dotted gray lines) and Pareto-pessimal fronts (dashed gray lines) are shown for reference.

and states are above the European Pareto optimal-front, and, additionally having $R \geq 1$, are moving fast along the cumulative deaths axis. However, since the outbreak of the epidemic in the Americas has been delayed with respect to Europe, it is too early to evaluate strategies or scenarios in these countries.

Discussion

Construction of Pareto fronts allowed us to select countries that up to a given time point minimized the number of fatalities and economic cost more effectively than others. Clearly, considered Australasian countries outperformed European countries, being on the "good" side of the European Pareto-optimal front. As of June 17, 2020, this front is formed by Slovakia

and Bulgaria (with coordinates of Poland and Czechia lying nearby), and three Scandinavian countries: Norway, Denmark and Sweden. Without some additional criteria weighting the number of deaths and the severity of lockdown one may not compare countries on a Pareto front. The Pareto-pessimal front in Europe is much shorter than the Pareto-optimal front. Countries forming this front or lying close to it encountered first a lot of deaths due to the delayed lockdown decision and then had a long and strict lockdown that was introduced to stop the spread of the epidemic.

We showed that when the number of daily new cases exceeds some threshold, the further epidemic growth can be suppressed only by strict quarantine. In the growth phase, the number of tests per case decreases, implying reduction of the removal rate γ. This in turn implies that the reproduction number $R = \beta/\gamma$ is decreased only due to quarantine that reduced the contact rate β. Only after the imposed quarantine reduced R below 1 can the epidemic be further suppressed by the increased efficiency of testing (number of test per case), increasing the removal rate γ. The increase of γ allows for curbing the number of daily new cases (and resulting deaths) at gradual relaxation of lockdown measures.

Our analysis shows that in Latin American countries that perform a relatively small number of tests and thus have small removal rate γ, reduction of the contact rate β through national quarantine turned out to be insufficient to reduce R below 1. In the United States significant suppression of the epidemic seems to be within technological reach, as in all ten most populated states the lockdown had reduced R below 1, however subsequent increase of mobility caused that R returned above 1 in eight of these states. As the number of daily new cases is growing, it becomes increasing difficult to boost the removal rate γ by enhanced testing, thus the only option to reduce R below 1 is to restore lockdown (which seems politically unrealistic in the USA). One may thus anticipate that these countries will inevitably realize the herd immunity-based scenario of epidemic dynamics, in which the administratively imposed restrictions are replaced by voluntary risk-avoiding and risk-adapting strategies of the individuals [3]. Such scenario appears to be currently taking place in Sweden. In such a case the preceding transient lockdown may be not beneficial as it adds economic cost to the unavoidable death toll.

Over time, countries may leave and (re)appear on the Pareto front. The "velocity" of a country on the cumulative mobility reduction *vs*. effective reproduction number (R) plane is given

by the number of daily deaths and current mobility reduction. In a bit longer perspective, the countries currently having $R > 1$ are in the worst situation as their number of daily new cases is still increasing. In a longer time scale, both the cumulated death toll and the country-specific history of lockdown accumulation (lockdown fatigue) should be taken into consideration when predicting plausible further country trajectory as these two factors influence risk avoidance and risk acceptance, respectively. Countries that managed to prevent a high death toll by early and effective lockdown may find themselves in a psychologically more challenging situation as they will face lockdown fatigue that will not be counterbalanced be the "cumulated fear".

Methods

Data sources

The COVID-19 dataset maintained by Our World in Data [4] is used as the source of data on the number of confirmed cases and deaths (original data source being European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control) and the number of tests (collected from national government reports). For the states of the USA, analogous data were extracted from The COVID Tracking Project [5]. Mobility reduction has been taken from the Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports [2].

Missing counts of daily new cases and deaths are filled with zeros and missing cumulative counts of cases and deaths are taken from the previous available counts. When the number of tests is not available daily, their number is linearly interpolated between available data points. To avoid artifacts in analyzed trends that would result from temporally non-uniform reporting, negative daily new counts were replaced by zeros while positive daily new counts known to result from aggregation of counts from multiple days were replaced by an average of counts in adjacent days (pertains to Spain: April 19, May 22; France: May 7, May 29, June 3; UK: May 21; Ireland: May 15, Portugal: May 3). New cases and deaths are reported for Spain until May 11 due to apparently inaccurate later reporting.

We should notice that the official data on the deaths associated with the COVID-19 epidemic depend on the way of counting (especially, on the inclusion of out-of-hospital deaths) and may be underestimated, especially in the most affected countries. The extent of under-reporting may be estimated for a given period based on the "excess deaths" [6] that appear

above the expected number of deaths when the officially recorded COVID-19 fatalities are subtracted from the total number of deaths (for example, in Italy, between 24 February and 26 April, there were nearly 43,000 more deaths than would be expected for this period with only about 60% of these deaths attributed to COVID-19 [7]).

Testing density is analyzed according to: the number of people tested – in Canada, Croatia, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Serbia, South Korea, Sweden; the number of samples tested – in Colombia, Finland, Poland and Portugal; and the number of tests performed – for all remaining countries; for Belgium, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Ireland units are labeled as unclear.

Estimation of the reproduction number, *R*

To compute R based on the daily new confirmed cases (Fig. 2) or deaths (Supplementary Figure S1), we first estimated the doubling time T_d at each i-th day as:

$$T_\mathrm{d}(i) = \frac{\log 2}{\frac{1}{w-1}\log\frac{x_{i+w/2}}{x_{i-w/2}}},$$

where x_i is rolling mean of the respective daily new counts (calculated within a 14-day window with equal weights) and the time span is set to $w = 14$ days. Let us notice that T_d is positive when the number of daily cases (or deaths) is increasing, and T_d is negative when the number of daily cases is decreasing; when the number of daily cases remains constant in time, then $T_\mathrm{d} = \infty$. The reproduction number R on i-th day was then computed in accordance with Wallinga and Lipsitch [8] and Wearing, Rohani, and Keeling [9] as:

$$R(i) = \frac{\frac{\log 2}{T_\mathrm{d}(i)}\left(\frac{\log 2}{T_\mathrm{d}(i)\,m\,\sigma}+1\right)^{m}}{\gamma\left(1-\left(\frac{\log 2}{T_\mathrm{d}(i)\,n\,\gamma}+1\right)^{-n}\right)},$$

assuming $m = 6$, $n = 1$, $\sigma = 1/(5.28\text{ days})$, $\gamma = 1/(3\text{ days})$. These parameter values reflect the assumption that the incubation period is Erlang-distributed with the shape parameter 6 and mean of 5.28 days [10], while the period of infectiousness is distributed exponentially with the mean of 3 days [11]. As a simplification, to estimate R the identical and constant in time γ

has been assumed in all countries, however, as discussed in the Results section, the period of infectiousness is affected by testing capacity. For given m, n, and σ the reproduction number R is a decreasing function of γ for $T_d > 0$ and an increasing function of γ for $T_d < 0$. For $T_d = \infty$, we obtain $R = 1$, regardless of remaining parameters; thus the critical point in which R passes 1 in Fig. 2, Fig. 4, and Supplementary Figure S1 is independent of the specific values of model parameters.

Quantification of mobility reduction

To account for mobility reduction related to the decrease of economic activity, we averaged daily mobility reduction in categories of 'workplaces' and 'retail and recreation' (includes shopping centers and restaurants) on weekdays, excluding days of country-wide holidays in each country. National epidemic trajectories shown in Fig. 2 are drawn by taking current $R(i)$ (computed based on the daily new cases as described above) and mobility reduction in previous days weighted according to the (time-reversed) distribution of infection-to-removal times, which is the hypoexponential distribution with rates $\{\lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \gamma\}$ where $\lambda = 6\sigma$. National epidemic trajectories shown in Supplementary Figure S1 are drawn by taking current $R(i)$ computed based on the daily deaths as described above) and mobility reduction in previous days weighted according to the (time-reversed) distribution of infection-to-death times, which results from the convolution of the incubation time distribution (Erlang with $k = 6$ and $\lambda = 6\sigma$, as previously) and the distribution of the onset-to-death time (log-normal with median of 13.2 days and standard deviation of 0.44, as determined by [12]; the resulting infection-to-death distribution has the mean of 19.8 days).

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the National Science Centre (Poland) grant 2018/29/B/NZ2/00668.

References

[1] Roy M. Anderson and Robert M. May. *Infectious diseases of humans: Dynamics and control*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

[2] Google LLC. *Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports*. https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/. Accessed: 2020-06-26.

[3] Marek Kochańczyk, Frederic Grabowski, and Tomasz Lipniacki. "Dynamics of COVID-19 pandemic at constant and time-dependent contact rates". In: *Mathematical Modeling of Natural Phenomena* 15 (2020), p. 28. DOI: 10.1051/mmnp/2020011.

[4] Max Roser et al. *Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19)*. https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus. Accessed: 2020-06-26. 2020.

[5] *The COVID Tracking Porject*. https://covidtracking.com. Accessed: 2020-06-26. 2020.

[6] James Tozer and Martín González. *Tracking covid-19 excess deaths across countries*. https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2020/04/16/tracking-covid-19-excess-deaths-across-countries. Accessed: 2020-06-26. 2020.

[7] Becky Dale and Nassos Stylianou. *Coronavirus: What is the true death toll of the pandemic?* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-53073046. Accessed: 2020-06-26. 2020.

[8] Jacco Wallinga and Marc Lipsitch. "How generation intervals shape the relationship between growth rates and reproductive numbers". In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 274 (2007), pp. 599–604. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2006.3754.

[9] Helen J Wearing, Pejman Rohani, and Matt J Keeling. "Appropriate Models for the Management of Infectious Diseases". In: *PLOS Medicine* 2 (2005), p. 0020174. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020174.

[10] Stephen A. Lauer et al. "The incubation period of 2019-nCoV from publicly reported confirmed cases: Estimation and application". In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: 10.1101/2020.02.02.20020016.

[11] Marek Kochańczyk, Frederic Grabowski, and Tomasz Lipniacki. "Accounting for superspreading gives the basic reproduction number R_0 of COVID-19 that is higher than initially estimated". In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.26.20080788.

[12] Natalie M Linton et al. "Incubation period and other epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus infections with right truncation: A statistical analysis of publicly available case data". In: *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 9 (2 Feb. 2020). DOI: 10.3390/jcm9020538.

Supplementary materials



Supplementary Figure S1: **Epidemic trajectories of Western, Central, and South European and Australasian countries in the mobility reduction *vs*. effective reproduction number (R) plane.** In contrast to Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 in the main text, R has been estimated based on the daily number of deaths. The trajectories begin in February and end on June 17, 2020 (except for Spain, for reasons explained in Methods in the main text), and have a single-day resolution.