

Epidemiological aspects of COVID-19 disease in India during nationwide lockdown phase-
An empirical data-based analysis and its implications on interrupting the transmission.

Vanamail Perumal

Additional Professor

Dept. of Obstetrics & Gynaecology

All India Institute of Medical Sciences

New Delhi, India

Correspondence to: pvanamail@gmail.com

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Covid-19 disease is pandemic in more than 85% of the countries in the world, with
3 about 10 million cases and 0.5 million deaths as on July 2, 2020. In India reporting of the first case
4 was on January 30, 2020, and to prevent rapid community spread of the disease nationwide
5 lockdown phase was imposed from March 25- June 1, 2020. Our objective was to assess various
6 epidemiological measures during the lockdown phase.

7 **Methods:** We used daily reporting of confirmed cases by the Ministry of Health and Family
8 Welfare, Government of India during the period March 19-June 1, 2020. Using statistical packages
9 STATA and R-packages, we fitted three statistical distributions (Gamma, Weibull and Log-normal)
10 to the daily recorded new cases. We estimated daily incidence rate and death rate per million
11 population, generation time and Basic Reproduction numbers.

12 **Results:** During the lockdown phase, the daily per cent increase in the cumulative number of cases
13 showed negative exponential growth with 0.022 as an instantaneous rate of decrease. The average
14 incidence rate with a 95% confidence interval (CI) was 1.84 (1.43-2.25). Day specific incidence rate per
15 million (revealed the exponential pattern with 0.069 as the instantaneous rate of increase per day,
16 which accounted for the doubling time of the disease (10 days; 95% CI: 9.25-10.93). Case fatality
17 rate (2.92%; 95% CI: 2.82% -3.02%) and overall death rate was 1.14 (95% CI: 0.87-1.41) per million. were
18 abysmally low. Statistical distribution fitting of new cases found to be satisfactory with Gamma distribution.
19 Basic reproduction numbers 1.83 (95% CI: 1.82-1.83) was less.

20 **Conclusion:** In India, with a population density of about 450 per Km², the virulent of COVID-19
21 transmission was interrupted significantly with 70 days lockdown during the early transmission stage. We
22 observed a considerable decline in all the epidemiological indices compared to the corresponding indices
23 recorded during the same period in the severely affected countries.

24 Keywords: Covid-19, India, Lockdown phase, Incidence, Case fatality rate, Death rate, Generation Time,
25 Distribution, Reproduction numbers.

26

27 Running Title: Epidemiological indices of COVID-19 in India during the lockdown phase.

28 **Introduction**

29 Currently, about 215 out of 251 countries recognized by the United Nations are experiencing with
30 an infectious disease called coronavirus or COVID-19 [1]. Initially, the virus (thought to have
31 transmitted from animals to humans) was detected in the Wuhan city, China, during the last week of
32 December 2019 [2,3]. Since this virulent disease has broken out simultaneously all over the world,
33 Considering the severity and rapid spread of this disease, the World Health Organization (WHO)
34 declared a pandemic. According to COVID-19 Situation Report (No.164) released by the WHO [1]
35 dated July 2, 2020, there were about 10.5 million infected persons and 0.5 million deaths (4.8%).
36 Reporting of the first COVID-19 case in India was on January 30, 2020, originating from China.
37 Steadily increasing and as of July 2, 2020, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW),
38 Government of India (GOI) have confirmed a total of 6,04,641 cases, 19,148 new cases and 17,834
39 deaths resulting from the case fatality rate 2.95% in the country [1]. India being the second most
40 populated country, the GOI had expected many COVID-19 cases and started taking various
41 integrated approaches such as screening, treating and quarantining the suspected individual to
42 reduce the disease within a manageable level [4]. While the disease load crossed 500 in the third
43 week of March 2020, considering the value of human life and by compromising the Indian
44 economy, the GOI took an innovative approach called “Nationwide lockdown” for 70 days in four
45 phases (March 25-April 14, April 15-May 3, May 4 – May 17 and May 18-June 1, 2020). During
46 that period all kinds of transports, social gatherings in public places were banned with strict
47 enforcement of law and order. It was ensured that only the essential services were available during
48 that period.

49 The present study aimed to assess the necessary epidemiological measures of the
50 COVID-19 disease in India during the lockdown phase. It is a well-known fact that India is
51 contributing about 18% of the total world population and ranks number two in the list of

52 countries by population. Therefore, population-based epidemiological measures are vital to
53 compare the severity of the disease with the other affected countries. Empirical based data
54 analysis will have a further implication on preventing the social spread of this disease.

55 **Materials and Methods**

56 **Data source:** National level daily reporting (between 8 AM and 10 AM) of confirmed cases
57 of COVID-19, recovered and deaths are available either in the website of MoHFW, GOI or in
58 COVID-19 situation Reports published by WHO daily. Though reporting the first case was
59 on January 30, 2020, rapid daily increase was noted from March 18, 2020, onwards. In
60 expecting a more significant number of cases by social spread, the GOI had imposed
61 nationwide lockdown period from March 25 to June 1, 2020. For the present analysis, we
62 considered the cumulative number of cases recorded on March 18 as index cases for COVID-
63 19 transmission in India. Therefore, to assess various epidemiological indices, daily recorded
64 new cases between 8 AM and 10 AM for a period 75 days (March 19, 2020 – June 1, 2020)
65 formed the database for the present analysis. The entire database is available both in
66 MoHFW, GOI website [4] as well as COVID-19 situation reports of WHO [1]. Based on the
67 daily news, we created the essential data in the Excel spreadsheet for the present analysis. We
68 considered midyear projected population of India (~ 1366 million) in the year 2019 [5] to be
69 susceptible to COVID-19 and assumed to be stationary during the study period.

70 **Statistical analysis:**

71 We performed statistical analysis using Statistical Softwares STATA version 16.0 (College
72 Station, TX: StataCorp LLC. StataCorp) and R0-package in R-version 4.0. We derived the
73 following epidemiological indices;

74 Daily increase rate (%) in cumulative no. of cases;

75
$$\left\{ \frac{[\text{Cumulative no.of cases on day } i - \text{Cumulative no.of cases on the day } (i-1)]}{\text{Cumulative no.of cases on the day } (i-1)} \right\} * 100$$

76

77 Daily incidence rate per 10 lakh population;

78
$$\left\{ \frac{\text{No.of new cases on the day } i}{\text{No.of the susceptible population on the day } (i-1)} \right\} * \text{Ten lakhs}$$

79

80 Daily case fatality rate (%)’;

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{No. of cumulative deaths on the day } i}{\text{Cumulative no. of cases on the day } i} \right\} * 100$$

81

82 The daily death rate per 10 lakh population;

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{No. of cumulative deaths on the day } i}{\text{No. of the susceptible population on the day } i} \right\} * \text{Ten lakhs}$$

83 To find out the underlying distribution of day-specific new cases, we fitted popular discrete
 84 distributions such as Gamma, Weibull and Log-normal using maximum likelihood estimation
 85 method by applying an R-package (“fitdistrplus”). We tested the adequacy of the fitted
 86 distribution by comparing goodness of fit statistics (Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics, Cramer-
 87 von Mises statistics and Anderson-Darling statistics) and goodness of fit criteria (Akaike
 88 Information Criteria (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)). Among the three
 89 distributions fitted, we selected the distribution that yielded the lowest goodness of fit
 90 statistics and goodness of fit criteria as the best one. Further, for the selected best distribution
 91 we confirmed the consistency of parameters (shape and scale) estimation using different
 92 methods such as matching moment estimation (MME), maximum spacing estimation (MSE)
 93 and maximum goodness of fit estimation (MGE).

94 Generation Time (GT), which describes “the time that elapses between onset of
95 symptoms in the primary case and onset of symptoms of the secondary case” is a crucial
96 epidemiological parameter that describes the of the disease transmission. Therefore, to get the
97 best estimate of GT, we assumed different underlying distributions such as Empirical,
98 Gamma, Weibull and Log-normal. We obtained mean and standard deviation of GT for each
99 distribution by applying R-packages “MASS” and “R0”.

100 Basic reproduction rate (R0) suggests the transmission potential of a disease. It is the
101 average number of secondary infections produced by an infected case in a susceptible
102 population. Therefore, to know the transmission potential of the COVID-19 disease in India
103 and particularly during different phases of the lockdown period, we estimated R0 with 95%
104 confidence limits using the maximum likelihood estimation and exponential growth method.

105 Doubling time, the period needed for the number of cases in the endemic to double is
106 another critical sign to assess the severity of the disease. Therefore, using the exponential
107 growth (r), we calculated the doubling time as follows;

108 Doubling time = $\ln(2) / r$

109 **Results**

110 During the 75 days study period (March 19, 2020-June 1, 2020) day-specific number of new
111 cases increased from 14 on March 19 to 8392 on June 1. The cumulative number of cases
112 were 151 and 1, 90, 535. As on June 1, the total cases comprised of 49% (93322) active
113 cases, 2.8% (5394) deaths and 48.2% (91819) cured cases.

114 **Daily increasing (%) pattern:**

115 The percent increase in the cumulative no. of cases is shown in Fig. 1. We showed a negative
116 exponential pattern between the time (t) and the percent increase (y). The fitted equation
117 $y = 19.9 * \exp(-0.022t)$ was satisfactory with R²-adjusted value 0.73 (P<0.001), AIC

118 (30.1) and RMSE (0.29). At the end of the lockdown phase (June 1, 2020) the predicted
119 percent increase was about 3.8.

120 Fig. 1. Exponential relationship between percent increase and time with 95% CI.

121

122 **Incidence rate per million population:**

123 During the study period, the incidence rate increased from 0.01 on March 19, 2020, to 6.14
124 on June 1, 2020. The average incidence rate with a 95% confidence interval (CI) was 1.84
125 (1.43-2.25). Day specific incidence rate revealed the exponential pattern, and the fitted
126 equation is $y = 0.062 * \exp(0.069 * t)$, Where y-is daily incidence rate at time t-day, 0.062
127 is the early incidence rate per million population, and 0.069 is the instantaneous rate of
128 increase per day. The fitted equation in terms of R²-adjusted value (0.886; P<0.001), AIC
129 (121.9) and RMSE (0.54) were satisfactory.

130

131 **Doubling time of cases:**

132 Based on the instantaneous rate (0.069) of exponential growth curve we could estimate the
133 doubling time of cases during the study period using the formula, $\text{days} = \ln(2)/r$, where 'r' is
134 the instantaneous rate of increase. (0.069). Therefore, the doubling time with 95% CI was
135 10.05 (9.25-10.93) days. We also fitted the pattern of the cumulative number of cases
136 recorded daily. We noted the pattern was similar to the incidence rate, and the fitted equation
137 is $y = 502.7 * \exp(0.089 * t)$, Where y-is the cumulative number of cases on day 't' and
138 0.089 is the instantaneous rate of increase. The R²-adjusted, AIC and RMSE values were
139 0.935, 114.4 and 0.512, respectively. The estimated doubling time with 95% CI was 7.79
140 (7.34-8.30).

141

142 **Case fatality rate (%):**

143 Case fatality rate (CFR) varied between 1.41 and 3.43%. The overall CFR during the study
 144 period was 2.92% with 95% CI 2.82% -3.02%. As observed in the incidence rate, there was
 145 no clear trend in the CFR.

146

147 **The death rate per million population:**

148 The death rate during the study ranged from 0.002 to 3.948, and contributing the overall
 149 death rate was 1.14 (95% CI: 0.87-1.41) per million. There was a significant linear
 150 relationship between death rate (y) and incidence rate (x) with the estimated equation,
 151 $y=0.050+0.029*x$, (R^2 -adjusted value= 0.99; $P<0.001$; RMSE=0.080). The fitted equation
 152 suggested that for every 1000 new cases, the expected number of COVID-19 deaths would be
 153 29 (95% CI: 28-30).

154 **Distribution pattern of new cases:**

155 Using day-specific new COVID-19 cases, we fitted three familiar distributions viz—Gamma,
 156 Weibull and Log-normal distributions using maximum likelihood estimation procedure. We
 157 presented parameters estimation and goodness fit statistics/criteria in Table 1. Of the three
 158 distributions fitted (Fig. 2), Gamma distribution revealed a good fit, as evidenced by the
 159 lowest goodness of fit statistics and goodness of fit criteria. Further, we evaluated the good fit
 160 of Gamma distribution by comparing the empirical density function, CDF, Q-Q plot
 161 (quantiles of data distribution), and P-P plot (empirical cumulative distribution function), and
 162 depicted in Fig. 3. We inferred that the Gamma distribution fairly represented with all
 163 empirical properties of the distribution and Fig.4 shows the empirical and theoretical
 164 cumulative distribution function (CDF) with 95% CI.

165 Table 1: Parameters estimation and goodness of fit indices for three discrete distributions using
 166 maximum likelihood estimation.

Parameters/Goodness of fit indices	Types of distributions		
	Gamma	Weibull	Log-Normal
Parameters			

Mean	2548.0	2560.9	4121.8
Standard deviation	2914.3	2982.2	13995.8
Goodness of fit Statistics			
Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics	0.0897	0.0929	0.1211
Cramer-von Mises statistics	0.0874	0.1009	0.3435
Anderson-Darling statistics	0.6960	0.8592	2.1808
Goodness of fit criteria			
Akaike's Information Criterion	1325.95	1327.30	1345.11
Bayesian Information Criterion	1330.59	1331.94	1349.74

167

168 Fig 2. Statistical distributions fitting with predicted values and empirical data.

169 Fig 3. Good of fit assessment plots for Gamma distribution fitting.

170 Fig 4. Gamma distribution fitting predicted values with 95% CI .

171 Since the Gamma distribution fitted well to the empirical data, to assess the consistency of

172 estimating the parameters, we applied various estimation procedures such as MME, MSE and

173 MGE. We presented parameters evaluation based on each process and goodness of fit criteria

174 in Table 2. The parameters estimation by maximum likelihood method proved to be the best

175 as shown by small values of the goodness of fit tests compared to the other procedures.

176 Table 2: Parameters (shape and rate) estimation of Gamma distribution by different methods.

Parameters/Goodness of fit indices	Methods of estimation			
	Maximum Likelihood estimation (MLE)	Matching Moment Estimation (MME)	Maximum Spacing Estimation (MSE)	Maximum Goodness of fit Estimation (MGE)
Parameters				
Shape	0.7644	1.0966	0.7353	0.6920
Scale	0.0003	0.0004	0.0003	0.0002
Goodness of fit criteria				
Akaike's Information Criterion	1325.95	1333.28	1326.10	1327.15
Bayesian Information Criterion	1330.59	1337.92	1330.74	1331.78

177

178 **Generation Time (GT) estimation:**

179 We adopted four underlying distributions viz. empirical, Gamma, Weibull and Log-Normal

180 for GT estimation. Among these four distributions, we could get a consistent estimate of GT

181 (Table 3) for Gamma, Weibull and Log-normal. Since the Gamma distribution was the best

182 fit for empirical data, we chose the GT based on the Gamma distribution as the reliable one
 183 and accordingly, the mean \pm sd of GT was 14.2 \pm 11.9 days.

184 Table 3: Generation time estimation by different underlying distributions.

Distribution	Mean generation Time (days)	Standard deviation
Empirical	56.4	14.81
Gamma	14.17	11.93
Weibull	14.26	11.93
Log-normal	13.95	11.68

185 **Estimation of Reproduction numbers (R0):**

186 We presented R0 estimates based on the maximum likelihood estimate and exponential
 187 growth method for each phase of lockdown in Table 4. Since the incidence rate followed the
 188 exponential growth pattern, we considered the R0 estimate using the exponential growth
 189 pattern as a reliable estimate. While the R0 estimate during the pre-lockdown phase was 6.58
 190 (95% CI: 5.02-8.39), it varied from 1.43 in the third phase to 3.19, in the first phase. During
 191 the four periods of the lockdown, the R0 estimate was 1.79 (95% CI: 1.78-1.80) suggesting a
 192 significant decline from the estimate of pre-lockdown phase. Further, because of the 70 days
 193 lockdown phase, the R0 estimate in the entire study period also was shown to be 1.83 (95%
 194 CI: 1.82-1.83).

195 Table 4. Reproduction number estimation based on different methods during the different
 196 phases of study period.

Lockdown phases	Maximum likelihood estimation method		Exponential Growth method	
	Reproduction Mean values	95% confidence limits (LCL-UCL)	Reproduction Mean values	95% confidence limits (LCL-UCL)
Lockdown phase 1 (25 th March – 14 th April)	3.55	3.45-3.65	3.19	3.11-3.28
Lockdown phase 2 (15 th April- 3 rd May)	2.74	2.69-2.78	1.75	1.71-1.79
Lockdown phase 3 (4 th May - 17 rd May)	3.25	3.21-3.29	1.43	1.39-1.46
Lockdown phase 4 (18 th May – 1 st June)	3.10	3.07-3.13	1.53	1.51-1.56
During all the phases	1.76	1.75-1.77	1.79	1.78-1.80
Entire study period	1.76	1.75-1.77	1.83	1.82-1.83

197

198 **Discussion**

199 The merit of the present study is to understand the epidemiological situation of COVID-19 in
200 India during the early transmission period, which covered the complete lockdown phase.
201 Further, we presented various epidemiological indices based on empirical data, which will be
202 more relevant for studying the transmission dynamics of the COVID-19 in a situation like a
203 lockdown phase. This study findings also reflect the impact of the lockdown phase in India,
204 which is ranked number two in the population size.

205 The aim of the lockdown during the early transmission phase was to delay the spike and to
206 put health services and systems in place. The objective, to a large extent, has been met, as
207 evidenced by our demonstration that the growth pattern of the cumulative number of cases
208 was negative exponential. The observed percent increase in cases as on July 2, 2020 was also
209 within the 95% CI prediction. Further, the data on COVID-19 maintained by our world in
210 data (OWID) [6] showed that at the end of the lockdown phase, about 5% of total tested
211 samples turned out to be positive. The similar figures on the same date in the United States,
212 Mexico and the United Kingdom were 10%, 31% and 9% respectively. These facts highlight
213 the impact of lockdown in India, which has a population density of about 450 persons per
214 Km². The effect is sustainable even during the post-lockdown phase as shown by only 6.3%
215 of total tested found to be positive as on June 26, 2020 [6].

216 In many affected countries, the number of detected cases were considered as incidence in
217 their respective countries. Since population size varies across countries, comparison of the
218 cases between the countries is worthless unless it is standardized with the corresponding
219 population size of the country. Therefore, in this study, we have considered the projected
220 population (~1366 million) in the year 2019 as a susceptible population, and it is very much
221 pertinent for the second most populated country. While the average incidence rate per million
222 people during the lockdown phase was about 2.0 in India, it was 75, 57 and 29 in the

223 countries the USA, UK and France respectively in the same period as shown by OWID [6].
224 Further, the incidence rate (12.5) in India as on June 26, 2020, was significantly less than in
225 the USA (123.7) on the same date.

226 We could estimate the doubling time, which explains the time taken in the community to get
227 the doubling of cases. Based on the observed exponential growth curve on confirmed new
228 cases as well as cumulative no. of cases, the estimated doubling time was 10 and 8 days.
229 These estimates were higher than the estimates (1.4- 3.1 days) obtained in China [2,3,7]. Few
230 more studies also reported that the doubling time was in the range of 6-7 days [8–12]. Higher
231 doubling time is an indicator of a slowdown in the transmission during the lockdown phase.
232 Case fatality rate [13,14] typically is used to measure the disease severity, and even though it
233 is not an indicator for lockdown impact, it is essential information for policymakers to take
234 appropriate action to prevent many deaths. Estimated CFR was 2.92% (95% CI: 2.82% -
235 3.02%) and the corresponding figures in USA and UK were 5.0% and 13.7% respectively as
236 evidenced by OWID inferring that even disease severity is less in India compared to
237 developed countries [13,15]. Average death rate 1.14 per million population in India was
238 abysmally low compared to 161, and 323 observed in the USA and UK respectively. Further,
239 the OWID data reveals that in India the percentage of people above 65 years age is 6% and
240 the overall smoking prevalence is about 11.0%. In severely affected countries such as USA,
241 UK, Spain, Italy, Germany, France and Belgium, the aged people (≥ 65 years) population
242 varies between 18% (Belgium) and 23% (Italy). Similarly, the prevalence of smoking varies
243 between 22% (USA) and 33% (France). These observations indicate that the aged people,
244 coupled with high smoking status, may be a significant triggering factor for more COVID-19
245 deaths.

246 Understanding the distribution pattern of cases will be useful for estimating the vital
247 epidemiological measures such as generation time and basic reproduction rate. Therefore, we

248 fitted different statistical distributions to decide an adequate distribution of the observed data,
249 and also we validated the estimations of the parameters by various methods. We obtained
250 Gamma distribution as an adequate fit and established that the estimation of the parameters
251 by maximum likelihood method as a reliable one. Confirmed cases provided the generation
252 time (incubation period) estimation using different underlying distributions (Table 3).
253 Though the estimates were consistent for the three statistical distributions, the generation
254 time (14.2 ± 11.9 days) using the Gamm distribution considered to be reliable. Estimations
255 based on serial events [7,15–17], the generation time was higher in India, which implies that
256 the majority of infected individuals might be typical asymptomatic during the early
257 transmission stage. Another study ([18] estimated the median incubation period as 5.1 days
258 (95% CI, 4.5 to 5.8 days). The authors further stated that 101 out of every 10 000 cases (99th
259 percentile, 482) would develop symptoms after 14 days of active monitoring or quarantine.
260 These observations qualify our conservative estimate based on reported confirmed cases.
261 Basic reproduction rate (R_0) is a measure of transmission potential of any type of disease,
262 and it is likely to vary because of the severity of the disease between the endemic countries.
263 Since the outbreak of COVID-19, estimates using different approaches are available in
264 various countries [7,10–12,17,19–22].
265 We could also estimate R_0 using maximum likelihood and exponential growth methods
266 during the different phases of lockdown. Our R_0 estimates varied from 2.7 in the second
267 phase to 3.6 in the first phase. On account of 70 days lockdown, the R_0 estimate was 1.76
268 (95% CI: 1.75-1.77). During the lockdown phases 2-4, we observed that the R_0 estimates
269 obtained by exponential growth method were markedly less compared to the corresponding
270 estimates obtained by MLE method indicating that the pattern of growth is restricted due to
271 lockdown phase. The R_0 estimate in different countries [21] varied from 1.6 in Republic
272 Korea to 8.2 in the USA. Further, in a meta-analysis study [20] conducted based on various

273 studies carried out in China had shown that the R0 estimate by exponential growth method
274 varied between 1.9 and 6.3. Compared to these observations, our overall estimate (1.79; 95%
275 CI: 1.78-1.8) was much less than the pooled estimate of R0 (3.32; 95% CI: 2.81-3.82)
276 obtained in the meta-analysis.

277 Several studies [23–27] on COVID-19 had estimated various transmission/epidemiological
278 indices in different epidemiological situations using mathematical modellings approach.
279 Indeed, the models will unravel the estimates of many parameters, which may not be
280 measured directly. Further, the models will be used to forecast the disease outbreak to take
281 appropriate preventive measures. However, the accuracy of the model prediction depends on
282 the input parameters that reflect the real epidemiological situation. Therefore, in this context
283 as a principal analysis, we carried out a real data-based analysis to assess various
284 epidemiological measures. Further, these measures area assumptions free estimates in an
285 early stage of disease transmission, which was under lockdown pressure.

286

287 **Acknowledgement**

288 Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India (GOI), WHO and OWID are
289 gratefully acknowledged for accessing the public domain data.

290



291 Author's contribution: PV-formulated the study design, generated database, analysed and wrote the
292 manuscript.

References


- 294 1. COVID-19 situation reports. 22 Apr 2020 [cited 22 Apr 2020]. Available:
295 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports>
- 296 2. Muniz-Rodriguez K, Chowell G, Cheung C-H, Jia D, Lai P-Y, Lee Y, et al. Early
297 Release - Doubling Time of the COVID-19 Epidemic by Province, China - Volume 26,
298 Number 8—August 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. 2020 [cited 8
299 May 2020]. doi:10.3201/eid2608.200219
- 300 3. Fan J, Liu X, Pan W, Douglas MW, Bao S. Early Release - Epidemiology of 2019
301 Novel Coronavirus Disease-19 in Gansu Province, China, 2020 - Volume 26, Number
302 6—June 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. 2020 [cited 4 May 2020].
303 doi:10.3201/eid2606.200251
- 304 4. #IndiaFightsCorona COVID-19 in India, Corona Virus Tracker | mygov.in. 9 May 2020
305 [cited 9 May 2020]. Available: <https://www.mygov.in/covid-19>
- 306 5. United Nations. World Population Prospects 2019: Data Booklet. UN; 2019.
307 doi:10.18356/3e9d869f-en
- 308 6. Roser M, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Hasell J. Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). Our
309 World in Data. 2020 [cited 27 Jun 2020]. Available:
310 <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus>
- 311 7. Ma J. Estimating epidemic exponential growth rate and basic reproduction number.
312 Infectious Disease Modelling. 2020;5: 129–141. doi:10.1016/j.idm.2019.12.009
- 313 8. Predicting the epidemic trend of COVID-19 in China and across the world using the
314 machine learning approach. In: ResearchGate [Internet]. 9 May 2020 [cited 9 May
315 2020]. Available:
316 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340074223_Predicting_the_epidemic_trend_o
317 f_COVID-19_in_China_and_across_the_world_using_the_machine_learning_approach](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340074223_Predicting_the_epidemic_trend_of_COVID-19_in_China_and_across_the_world_using_the_machine_learning_approach)
- 318 9. Arino J, Portet S. A simple model for COVID-19. Infectious Disease Modelling.
319 2020;5: 309–315. doi:10.1016/j.idm.2020.04.002
- 320 10. Nikbakht R, Baneshi MR, Bahrapour A, Hosseinnataj A. Comparison of methods to
321 Estimate Basic Reproduction Number (R0) of influenza, Using Canada 2009 and 2017-
322 18 A (H1N1) Data. Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. 2019;24: 67.
323 doi:10.4103/jrms.JRMS_888_18
- 324 11. Anastassopoulou C, Russo L, Tsakris A, Siettos C. Data-based analysis, modelling and
325 forecasting of the COVID-19 outbreak. Othumpangat S, editor. PLoS ONE. 2020;15:
326 e0230405. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0230405
- 327 12. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus
328 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study | Elsevier Enhanced Reader. 16 Apr
329 2020 [cited 16 Apr 2020]. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7

- 330 13. GlobalData: India has relatively low COVID-19 average case fatality rate despite surge
331 in cases. In: News-Medical.net [Internet]. 4 Jun 2020 [cited 6 Jul 2020]. Available:
332 [https://www.news-medical.net/news/20200604/GlobalData-India-has-relatively-low-](https://www.news-medical.net/news/20200604/GlobalData-India-has-relatively-low-COVID-19-average-case-fatality-rate-despite-surge-in-cases.aspx)
333 [COVID-19-average-case-fatality-rate-despite-surge-in-cases.aspx](https://www.news-medical.net/news/20200604/GlobalData-India-has-relatively-low-COVID-19-average-case-fatality-rate-despite-surge-in-cases.aspx)
- 334 14. Gerli AG, Centanni S, Miozzo M, Sotgiu G. Predictive models for COVID-19-related
335 deaths and infections. : 5.
- 336 15. Jung S, Akhmetzhanov AR, Hayashi K, Linton NM, Yang Y, Yuan B, et al. Real-Time
337 Estimation of the Risk of Death from Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection:
338 Inference Using Exported Cases. *J Clin Med.* 2020;9. doi:10.3390/jcm9020523
- 339 16. Nishiura H, Linton NM, Akhmetzhanov AR. Serial interval of novel coronavirus
340 (COVID-19) infections. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases.* 2020;93: 284–286.
341 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.060
- 342 17. Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D, Torneri A, Faes C, Wallinga J, et al. Estimating the
343 generation interval for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data,
344 March 2020. *Eurosurveillance.* 2020;25. doi:10.2807/1560-
345 7917.ES.2020.25.17.2000257
- 346 18. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus
347 (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20–28 January 2020.
348 *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062
- 349 19. Adhikari SP, Meng S, Wu Y-J, Mao Y-P, Ye R-X, Wang Q-Z, et al. Epidemiology,
350 causes, clinical manifestation and diagnosis, prevention and control of coronavirus
351 disease (COVID-19) during the early outbreak period: a scoping review. *Infect Dis*
352 *Poverty.* 2020;9: 29. doi:10.1186/s40249-020-00646-x
- 353 20. Alimohamadi Y, Taghdir M, Sepandi M. Estimate of the Basic Reproduction Number
354 for COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Prev Med Public Health.*
355 2020;53: 151–157. doi:10.3961/jpmph.20.076
- 356 21. Estimation of reproduction numbers of COVID-19 in typical countries and epidemic
357 trends under different prevention and control scenarios | SpringerLink. 30 Jun 2020
358 [cited 30 Jun 2020]. Available: [https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11684-020-](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11684-020-0787-4)
359 [0787-4](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11684-020-0787-4)
- 360 22. Furushima D, Kawano S, Ohno Y, Kakehashi M. Estimation of the Basic Reproduction
361 Number of Novel Influenza A (H1N1) pdm09 in Elementary Schools Using the SIR
362 Model. *Open Nurs J.* 2017;11: 64–72. doi:10.2174/1874434601711010064
- 363 23. Hollingsworth TD. Controlling infectious disease outbreaks: Lessons from
364 mathematical modelling. *J Public Health Pol.* 2009;30: 328–341.
365 doi:10.1057/jphp.2009.13
- 366 24. A Model for COVID-19 Prediction in Iran Based on China Parameters | Publons. 9 May
367 2020 [cited 9 May 2020]. Available: <https://publons.com/publon/31232027/>


- 368 25. Jenness SM, Goodreau SM, Morris M. EpiModel: An R Package for Mathematical
369 Modeling of Infectious Disease over Networks. *J Stat Softw.* 2018;84.
370 doi:10.18637/jss.v084.i08
- 371 26. Li Y, Wang B, Peng R, Zhou C, Zhan Y, Liu Z, et al. Mathematical Modeling and
372 Epidemic Prediction of COVID-19 and Its Significance to Epidemic Prevention and
373 Control Measures. 2020;5: 9.
- 374 27. Modified SEIR and AI prediction of the epidemics trend of COVID-19 in China under
375 public health interventions - Yang - *Journal of Thoracic Disease.* 9 May 2020 [cited 9
376 May 2020]. Available: <http://jtd.amegroups.com/article/view/36385/htm>.
- 377




Empirical and theoretical CDFs




Empirical and theoretical dens.




Q-Q plot



Empirical and theoretical CDFs



P-P plot



Empirical and theoretical CDF with CI

