An Agent-Based Model to assess COVID-19 spread and health systems burden in Telangana state, India

Narassima M S[1], Guru Rajesh Jammy[2], Sankarshana A[3], Rashmi Pant[2], Anbuudayasankar S P[1], Lincoln Choudhury[4], Vijay Yeldandi[2], Shubham Singh[5], Denny John[6]

[1]Department of Mechanical Engineering, Amrita School of Engineering, Coimbatore, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India.

[2]Society for Health, Allied Research and Education (SHARE-INDIA), Telangana, India.

[3]Department of Computer Science Engineering, Amrita School of Engineering, Coimbatore, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India.

[4]Krashapana Consultancy Private limited, New Delhi, India.

[5]Assistant System Engineer, Tata Consultancy Services Limited.

[6]Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Kochi, Kerala, India

Abstract

Objectives: To assess the transmission dynamics and the health systems' burden of COVID-19 using an Agent Based Modeling (ABM) approach using a synthetic population.

Study design: The study used a synthetic population with 31,738,240 agents representing 90.67 percent of the overall population of Telangana state, India as per 2011 Census of India. Lockdown phases as per Indian scenario considering the effects of post-lockdown, use of control measures and immunity on secondary infections were studied. District-level localized parameters were assigned to agents as local models prove to be much helpful for policymakers.

Methods: The counts of people in different health states were measured separately for each district of Telangana. The model was run for 365 days and six scenarios with varying proportions of people using control measures (100%, 75% and 50%) and varying immunity periods of recovered patients (90 and 180 days).

Results: Results indicate that the peak values were attained soon after the lockdown was lifted. The risk estimates indicate that protection factor values are higher when more proportion of people adopt control measures such as use of face mask and social distancing. Population Attributable Risk values measured longitudinally indicated higher values like 60.41% and 47.18% when 75 percent of people followed control measures during lockdowns.

Conclusions: ABM approach helps to analyze grassroot details compared to compartmental models. Risk estimates allows the policymakers to determine the protection offered, its strength and percentage of population shielded by use of control measures.

Key words

Agent Based Model, AnyLogic, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Coronavirus, India

1. Introduction:

On Jan 30, 2020, India reported its first infection of Covid-19 (SARS-CoV-2) during when WHO categorized Covid-19 to be "Public Health Emergency of International Concern" (PHEIC), owing to the serious impacts that could be caused by the infection [1,2]. The world has witnessed an enormous outbreak of the epidemic with 34,503,272 infections and 1,027,138 deaths across 213 nations worldwide, as on September 30, 2020 resulting in a global health crisis [3]. In India, total infections reported are 6,310,267 with 940,643 active cases, 5,270,007 recoveries and 98,708 deaths, till September 30 2020 [4]. Countries like India, with higher population densities have a greater concern owing to the influx of infections [5]. The severity of infection and recovery varies from case to case, majorly governed by some parameters such as comorbidities, age, exposure to virus particles, air pollution, etc. [6,7]. In addition, majority of the infections being asymptomatic raise a serious threat as they remain untraceable and continue to transmit the infection [6–8]. There is a lot of work being done by

researchers, policymakers, healthcare professionals across various disciplines to rapidly eradicate the spread of the infection [9,10].

Several studies on infectious diseases dealing with containment of diseases such as tuberculosis [11], measles [12], etc., operationalizing antiviral prophylaxis to control H5N1 influenza and distancing [13], strategizing evacuations in the case of airborne infections [14], establishing vaccination techniques for smallpox [15], influenza [16], etc. Presently, ABMs have been developed to study COVID-19 related scenarios like the effectiveness of imposing lockdowns [17–20], post-lockdown control strategies [21], insulation of vulnerable population [21,22], direct and indirect transmission (via viral particles in air) [19], effect of control measures like distancing and face mask [21,23], transmission based on viral-load [23], population intelligence [18], contact tracing initiatives [18,23], contacts based on schedule and locations [19,21,24], etc.

Most studies from India on COVID-19 have largely followed compartmental approach adhering to either the basic Susceptible (S), Infective (I) and Recovered (R) model or its variations that include additional states. These include, the Susceptible (S), Exposed (E), Symptomatic (I), Purely Asymptomatic (P), Hospitalized or Quarantined (H), Recovered (R) and Deceased (D) (SIPHERD) [25], Susceptible (S), Exposed (E), Infective (I) and Recovered (R) (SEIR) [26–29], analytical models [30,31].

Simulation models map the real-world behaviour through a set of rules, with the defined level accuracy, subject to constraints [32,33]. These models eliminate the investment of cost, time and associated risks [33,34]. Complex problems involving dynamicity are much effectively handled by simulations [35]. Three widely used simulation approaches are System Dynamics (SD), Discrete Event Simulation (DES) and Agent Based Modeling (ABM). SD and DES provide only collective measures whereas ABM holds granular details of individual agents [36,37]. ABM allows modelers to define parameters uniquely to agents [35,36,38].

ABMs are resultant of advancements in science and technology and the ability of systems to handle complexities [35,39]. In recent times, these models are sought by researchers across various sectors [40–42].

ABM incorporates a bottom-up approach wherein the behavior of agents cumulate to the behaviour of the system [38,43]. This has attracted the public health researchers and practitioners as they can observe the actions of individuals and clearly apprehend the population dynamics better [32,44]. However, the computational capabilities majorly govern the potential of ABMs [39]. In this paper, we have used ABM approach to analyse outbreak and health systems burden on COVID-19 in Telangana state.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research design

The current study employs an Agent Based Modeling (ABM) approach to analyze the outbreak and health systems burden for Covid-19 with the synthetic population of Telangana state (Table 1). The model was coded in python using PyCharm (Version: 2020.1.3). Python being an Object-Oriented Programming (OOP) language was chosen to code the model as OOP are more suitable for ABM [45]. The model was run for 365 days considering the lockdown phases as per Indian scenario (Table 3). The study involves agent creation, establishing a contact network, creating a disease model and initializing the model. This is followed by running the model, extracting and analyzing the results and providing useful interpretations. Public health policies and recommendations are underpinned based on the estimations of the mathematical models devised [46,47]. The code, scenarios, parameters and scope of the model are all made transparent in the present study and adheres to ethical good practices in modelling and International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR-SMDM) Modeling Good Research Practices [46–48].

2.2. Agent creation

Synthetic population developed using the 2011 Census of India data for 31,738,270 people was used to generate agents. Agent attributes such as person ID, age, household ID, geocoordinates, and district code were assigned to each agent. During this process, 30 invalid records were skipped thereby making

the valid number of agents to be 31,738,240 (Table 1). This count represents 90.67 percent (n=35,003,674) of the overall Telangana population as per 2011 Census [49,50].

2.3. Contact network

Transmission of an infection is majorly governed by transmission rates and contact network. As per the WHO report on COVID-19 (16 to 24 Feb 2020), transmission rates were randomly varied from 3 to 10 percent for household and closer contacts and 1 to 5 percent for other contacts [51]. To establish varying contact rates for each district, a Density-Dependent contact rate was assumed [52,53]. Kumar et al. (2018) determined the contact rates for close contact infections by considering the case of Ballabgarh, India [54]. The population density of Ballabgarh and those of the ten districts of Telangana chosen for the study were used to derive the contact rates for the ten districts. The ratio of the population density of Ballabgarh to that of each district would be the corresponding multiplication factor to scale up the number of contacts made by each person in Ballabgarh, as presented by Kumar et al. (2018) [52–54]. The distributions followed by the datasets consisting the contact rates of individuals of each district were determined using Arena's 'Input Analyzer' tool (Arena 16.00.00002) (Table 1). The tool generates different distributions to which the input datasets could fit, with the associated errors [55].

Table 1: Number and contact rate distributions of agents

District Code	**Name**	**Number of agents**		**Number of households**	**Distribution of contact rate (per day)**		
		Valid	**Invalid**		**Less than 5**	**5 to 59**	**60 and above**
28532	Adilabad	1485539	5	348733	Gamma (3.36, 1.1)	Gamma (4.86, 1.1)	Gamma (5.11, 0.78)
28533	Nizamabad	2305194	1	538087	Gamma (3.53, 2.27)	Gamma (4.86, 2.35)	Gamma (5.11, 1.67)

28534	Karimnagar	3670101	3	947624	Gamma (3.13, 3.18)	Gamma (4.86, 3.03)	Gamma (5.11, 2.16)
28535	Medak	2730312	4	612530	Gamma (4.32, 1.51)	Gamma (4.86, 1.76)	Gamma (5.11, 1.26)
28536	Hyderabad	6855177	3	1566574	Gamma (2.54, 144)	Gamma (4.14, 129)	Beta (3.3, 7.62)
28537	Rangareddy	548317	6	125771	Gamma (3.21, 3.21)	Gamma (4.86, 3.12)	Gamma (5.11, 2.22)
28538	Mahabubnagar	3629330	4	786355	Gamma (2.67, 2.14)	Gamma (4.86, 1.8)	Beta (4.77, 10.5)
28539	Nalgonda	4122388	3	1030984	Gamma (3.99, 1.31)	Gamma (4.86, 1.46)	Beta (4.92, 10.8)
28540	Warangal	3685156	1	925262	Gamma (3.27, 2.16)	Gamma (4.86, 2.12)	Beta (5.42, 12.1)
28541	Khammam	2706726	0	879810	Gamma (3.19, 2.14)	Gamma (4.86, 2.06)	Beta (4.75, 10.4)
Total		31738240	30	7761730			

2.4. Disease model

Disease model helps to represent the agent behaviour and trajectory of a disease using various health states [56]. Each agent can exist in any one of the states described by the state chart at a moment (figure 1). The transition between these states and the duration for which an agent remains in a state are defined as presented in table 2. During the simulation, agents interact based on the contact rates during which an infected agent transmits the infection to a healthy agent. Infected agents who are asymptomatic recover without treatment but continue to transmit the infection till they recover.

Symptomatic individuals seek treatment after incubation period. They either recover or decease whilst



Figure 1: State Chart

in any of the treatment levels defined as admitted, ICU and ventilator.

2.5. Model initialization

Parameters that are required to drive the model were acquired from various sources including Models of Infectious Disease Agent Study (MIDAS) [57].

Table 2: Model parameters

Parameters	**<5**	**5-59**	**>59**	**References**
Number of contacts per day	Table 1			58,59
Probability of getting infected through contact	i) household/ closer circle: (3 to 10) percent ii) other contacts: (1 to 5) percent			51
Proportion of people remaining asymptomatic	0.8			60,61
Average incubation period (in days)	5			38,62
Average treatment duration (in days)	14			62
Proportion of hospitalized cases in ICU	0.11			63,64
Treatment duration in ICU (in days)	Triangular(7,8,9)			62,64
Proportion of people moving from ICU to critical illness (Ventilator assistance)	0.88			64
Treatment duration in ventilator state (in days)	Triangular(5,7,12)			62
Time between symptom arrival and admission (in days)	3			65
Proportion of people who die	As per Indian statistics			4
Risk difference for use of control measures (percentage)	i) Mask: 10.2 ii) Distancing: 14.3			66

2.6. Model simulation

The model coded in Python was equipped with the input parameters and run for six different scenarios (table 4) [67]. The lockdown stringency was varied for various phases of lockdowns imposed. The proportion of contacts made by Indians based on locations were determined [68]. To bring in the effect of lockdown, contacts made by people at work and other places were reduced proportionately based on lockdown stringency, the contacts in home were maintained same and the school contacts were nullified.

Table 3: Lockdown phases

Lockdown	**Duration**	**Days**	**Lockdown (%)**	**Contact rate (%)**	**Closest contacts (%)**
Phase 1	25 March 2020 – 14 April 2020	21	75	42.794	90.749
Phase 2	15 April 2020 – 3 May 2020	19			
Phase 3	4 May 2020 – 17 May 2020	14			
Phase 4	18 May 2020 – 31 May 2020	14			
Unlock 1.0	1 June 2020 – 30 June 2020	30	50	56.436	81.498
Unlock 2.0	1 July 2020 – 31 July 2020	31			
Unlock 3.0	1 August 2020 – 31 August 2020	13	25	70.077	72.247
Post Unlock	After 31 August 2020	NA	0	100.000	62.995

3. Results of Simulation

The model was run for six different scenarios considering the various phases of lockdown imposed in India, control measures such as use of face mask and social distancing and the impact of immunity on the transmission of infection. The six scenarios would be referred to as MD100I90, MD75I90, MD50I90, MD100I180, MD75I180 and MD50I180 in subsequent sections. The number following 'MD' indicates the percentage of people following control measures and the number following 'I' indicates the days for which people remain immune after recovery. The graphs plotted represent the number of people in each health state for the entire state of Telangana. District-wise counts are provided in the supplementary excel.



Figure 2 a): Number of Uninfected people (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Uninfected people (180 days immunity scenarios)

It is clear from figures 2 a) and b) that the number of uninfected people decrease significantly once the lockdown has been completely lifted after 142 days. As the stringency of lockdown is reduced, people meet more people increasing the vulnerability of acquiring or transmitting infection. In both these figures, there is a visible increase in the number of uninfected people which indicates the transit of people from immune state to uninfected state i.e., loss of immunity/ prone to infection [69].


NUMBER OF ASYMPTOMATIC PEOPLE
MD100|90
MD75|90
MD50|90
3000000
2500000
2000000
1500000
1000000
500000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350


NUMBER OF ASYMPTOMATIC PEOPLE
MD100|180
MD75|180
MD50|180
3500000
3000000
2500000
2000000
1500000
1000000
500000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350





Figure 3 a): Number of Asymptomatic people (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Asymptomatic people (180 days immunity scenarios); c): Number of Symptomatic people (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Symptomatic people (180 days immunity scenarios)

In figures 3 a), b), c) and d), it is evident that the infection has begun to rise as the lockdown is lifted. The second spike in figures 3 a) and c) indicates the secondary infection which is because of the loss of immunity among recovered people. The same phenomena can be observed to have just begun at the end of one year in figures 3 b) and d). Though control measures do not curtail the spread of infection as effectively as lockdown, it offers a level of protection, reducing risk. This is evident from the above figures where the peak values are lesser for the scenarios in which higher proportion of people follow control measures.


NUMBER OF ADMITTED PEOPLE
MD100|90
MD75|90
MD50|90
600000
500000
400000
300000
200000
100000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350


NUMBER OF ADMITTED PEOPLE
MD100|180
MD75|180
MD50|180
800000
600000
400000
200000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350


NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN ICU
MD100|90
MD75|90
MD50|90
50000
40000
30000
20000
10000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350


NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN ICU
MD100|180
MD75|180
MD50|180
50000
40000
30000
20000
10000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350



Figure 4 a): Number of Admitted people (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Admitted people (180 days immunity scenarios); c): Number of people in ICU (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of people in ICU (180 days immunity scenarios); e) Number of people using Ventilators (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of people using Ventilators (180 days immunity scenarios)

From figures 4 a), b) c), d), e) and f), we can observe that there is always a second influx of admissions possible in absence of vaccination. These graphs provide information that could help policymakers, health care system and government to plan their capacity to accommodate the patients and make arrangements for intensive care and ventilators. Similar observations as in figure 3 are observed in terms of secondary infections post loss of immunity of people.


NUMBER OF PEOPLE DECEASED
MD100|90
MD75|90
MD50|90
30000
25000
20000
15000
10000
5000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350


NUMBER OF PEOPLE DECEASED
MD100|180
MD75|180
MD50|180
15000
10000
5000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350



Figure 5 a): Number of Deceased people (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Deceased people (180 days immunity scenarios); c): Number of Immune people (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Immune people (180 days immunity scenarios)

Figures 5 a) and b) represent the number of deceased people. The spike in this number is observed post-lockdown and an additional spike is observed in 5 a) indicating the second influx of infections. This can be directly related to the loss of immunity that is seen in figures 5 c) and d). Longer immunity offers the health care systems more time to devise vaccination strategies and capacity planning.


NUMBER OF CUMULATIVE INFECTIONS
MD100|90
MD75|90
MD50|90
15000000
12000000
9000000
6000000
3000000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350


NUMBER OF CUMULATIVE INFECTIONS
MD100|180
MD75|180
MD50|180
12000000
10000000
8000000
6000000
4000000
2000000
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350



Figure 6 a): Number of Cumulative infections (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Cumulative infections (180 days immunity scenarios); c): Number of Recoveries (90 days immunity scenarios); b) Number of Recoveries (180 days immunity scenarios)

The trends in which the curves of figures 5 a), b), and 6 a), b), c) and d) move are all similar with a time-offset denoting the time in which people stay in each of the intermediate states. Though most of the patients recover, major proportion of people being asymptomatic remains a great challenge for contact tracing and isolation. To measure the protection offered by the lockdown and use of control measures, Relative Risk (RR), Attributable Risk (AR), Population Attributable Risk (PAR) and PAR % were determined for the various scenarios (table 4). The first time period of 104 days indicates the time period after which

the first recovered person would lose immunity. Successively, these parameters are calculated for further time periods to analyze how they vary for different lockdown scenarios [70,71].

Table 4: Risk estimations

Duration (days)	Scenario	Number of people infected (In a time period)		Relative Risk (95% CI)	Attributable Risk (AR) (95% CI)	PAR	PAR%
		Non-Intervention (unexposed)	Using preventive measures (exposed)				
	MD100I90	2554	69371	NA	NA		
	MD75I90	21310	31228	0.4885(0.4711, 0.5059)	-0.0014(-0.001433, -0.001367)	-0.001	-60.4101
	MD50I90	20348	14235	0.6996(0.6782, 0.721)	-0.0004(-0.000423, -0.000377)	-0.0002	-18.3548
	MD100I180	2100	33437	NA	NA		
	MD75I180	32016	55428	0.5771(0.5634, 0.5908)	-0.0017(-0.001742, -0.001658)	-0.0013	-47.1842
0 to 104	MD50I180	19685	12586	0.6394(0.617, 0.6618)	-0.0004(-0.000422, -0.000378)	-0.0002	-19.6698
	MD100I90	0	6547839	NA	NA		
	MD75I90	1938398	4330703	0.7447(0.7432, 0.7462)	-0.0624(-0.06272, -0.06208)	-0.0468	-23.6932
	MD50I90	3266488	2541571	0.7781(0.7766, 0.7796)	-0.0457(-0.045969, -0.045431)	-0.0228	-12.4591
	MD100I180	0	5668435	NA	NA		
	MD75I180	1693952	3907223	0.7689(0.7673, 0.7705)	-0.0493(-0.049606, -0.048994)	-0.037	-20.9655
105 to 204	MD50I180	3382489	2782060	0.8225(0.8211, 0.8239)	-0.0378(-0.038075, -0.037525)	-0.0189	-9.7307
	MD100I90	0	5999937	NA	NA		
	MD75I90	1841228	4716186	0.8538(0.8523, 0.8553)	-0.0339(-0.034225, -0.033575)	-0.0254	-12.2937
	MD50I90	3332683	2445789	0.7339(0.7324, 0.7354)	-0.0559(-0.056169, -0.055631)	-0.0279	-15.3241
	MD100I180	0	1171268	NA	NA		
	MD75I180	427366	1008006	0.7862(0.7827, 0.7897)	-0.0115(-0.011667, -0.011333)	-0.0086	-19.0159
205 to 304	MD50I180	544102	297366	0.5465(0.5421, 0.5509)	-0.0155(-0.015612, -0.015388)	-0.0078	-29.4198

The RR values in table 4 indicate that they are estimates of a protective factor as they are less than 1 [71]. The values of RR increase with time owing to the relaxation in lockdown that reduces the protection. Also, the RR values of MD75I90 are lower than those of MD50I90 for the first two time periods indicating the higher protection levels offered when more percentage of people follow control measures. The values of AR and

PAR% also indicate that the protection offered is higher when the lockdowns are more stringent. Also, for a specific time instant, the PAR values are higher for MD75I90 scenarios than for MD50I90 for the first two time periods.

Table 5: Peak values

Peak values/ Scenarios	MD100I90		MD75I90		MD50I90		MD100I180		MD75I180		MD50I180	
	Value	Day	Value	Day	Value	Day	Value	Day	Value	Day	Value	Day
Healthy	31738202	1	31738208	1	31738204	1	31738208	1	31738200	1	31738206	1
Asymptomatic	2491332	160	2950047	157	2842052	158	2416859	161	2440704	154	3341037	161
Symptomatic	416618	152	498176	152	513427	152	377067	155	405197	152	532776	154
Infected	2782185	157	3353298	155	3236504	155	2709667	161	2830878	152	3729075	160
Admitted	538683	166	639556	166	634877	166	511264	168	516807	164	715501	167
ICU	37256	176	44739	175	46224	176	34393	179	37176	175	47353	178
Ventilator	29641	184	35580	183	36589	184	27389	187	29574	183	37891	186
Immune	6443023	228	6508198	333	6620998	358	6724187	323	6853529	302	6895030	325

It is clear that the peak infections in all scenarios occur in a few days after lifting of lockdown on 143rd day. It is also observed that the peak values of infected, admitted, ICU, and ventilator are the least for the scenarios where 100 percent of the population follow the control measures.

4. Discussion

The present study simulated 31738240 valid agents representing 90.67% of Telangana population for six different scenarios considering the various phases of lockdown as was imposed in India. The study also measures the effect of use of control measures and role of immunity in the

spread of infection. This places policymakers in a better position to take decisions locally [72]. District level parameters have been considered to run the

simulation along with assignment of agent-level details such as age, geospatial locations, etc. The model description, results, and discussion are inline with ethical good practice in modelling and ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices.

Present study involves modeling of six different scenarios with varying proportions of people using control measures (100%, 75% and 50%) and varying immunity periods of recovered patients (90 and 180 days). Likewise, several other studies have modeled different types of scenarios. Most of the studies revolve around imposing lockdowns whilst varying the durations of lockdown [21], isolating vulnerable population [21], varying lockdown stringency based on age [22], changing proportions of contacts made outside household and close contacts [19], considering contact tracing measures [18,22], etc.

In this study, we have developed the agents from the 2011 Census of India data with 31738240 valid agents representing 90.67 percent of Telangana's population [49,50]. Number of people in each of the states have been determined based on parameters of each district as localized models are much preferred for decision-making. Synthetic population approach that is widely employed use open data sources like the Australian Census data [73], US Census data [19,22], London Imperial College data [21], etc. Various geolocations have been represented previously using different number of agents such as 5000 agents in a University of Italy [24], 500000 agents of NYC [22], 24 million agents of entire Australian population [73], 750805 agents of Urmia, Iran [20], 10 million agents of Delaware, US [19], etc.

Contact network influences the behavior of agents in the network. Present study has considered contacts made in closest circle and external places as mentioned in table 3. As the stringency of lockdown is increased, the overall contact rate decreases whereas the proportion of contacts made in closer circle and households increase. Different studies have considered a range of contact network settings such as contacts in closed environments as offices, colleges, contacts based on schedules [18,19,22],

indirect transmission through viral particles [19], touching of contaminated objects, enhancing protection by washing hands [18,23,74], inclusion of travel medium and routes [43,44], transmission in public places [19], etc.

From the results, it is clear that the rate of transmission of infection increased as the lockdowns were lifted and the peak infections were observed in a lesser number of days post-lockdown. Also, the values of RR, AR, PAR% indicate that the protection factor had higher values during lockdown and when a higher number of people followed control measures. The values of AR, RR and PAR% help in determining the protection offered, strength, and percent of population that could attribute to the protection factor [71]. Effect of immunity also provides information about possible secondary infections post loss of immunity. This assists the capacity planning of health care practitioners and policymakers. Complementing this is the study by The Center For Disease Dynamics, Economics & Policy (CDDEP) and Princeton University where they have provided state-wise estimates across India to assist policymakers to cope up with the influx of infections [75,76].

Limitations to the study include the exclusion of comorbidities among patients, transportation modes, indirect transmission through suspended particles, etc., which could be considered to improve the accuracy of the model. Considering more parameters are however limited to the availability and authenticity of data.

5. Conclusions

We have modeled the COVID-19 transmission dynamics considering the various lockdown phases of India using an ABM approach using Python, an open source coding platform. Localized studies such as this, based on synthetic populations could be helpful in decision-making processes of localized authorities. Important factors such as protective factor could provide insights on the proportion of population that would be shielded by imposing control measures.

Data Availability

The python code, and detailed district-wise estimates files are available in the link: https://osf.io/3nxby/?view_only=96320e1dd7f048318294898ccd657275

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Funding information

No funds were received for conducting this modeling study.

References

1. Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Situation Reports [Internet]. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW). Update Covid-19. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/

2. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) [Internet]. MoHFW. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.mohfw.gov.in/

3. Worldometer. Coronavirus Cases. Worldometer [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26];1–22. Available from: https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/?

4. Coronavirus Outbreak in India - covid19india.org [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.covid19india.org/

5. India population 2020 - StatisticsTimes.com [Internet]. StatisticsTimes. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 27]. Available from: http://statisticstimes.com/demographics/country/india-population.php

6. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, James A, Taylor J, Spicer K, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility

— King County, Washington, March 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020 Apr 3;69(13):377–81.

7. Covid-19 risk factors: Age, underlying conditions, genetics, and unknowns - Vox [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2020/4/8/21207269/covid-19-coronavirus-risk-factors

8. Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany | NEJM [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMc2001468

9. GitHub - thoughtworks/epirust: An agent-based epidemiology simulation framework built in Rust [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 27]. Available from: https://github.com/thoughtworks/epirust

10. Michael Barton C, Alberti M, Ames D, Atkinson JA, Bales J, Burke E, et al. Call for transparency of COVID-19 models. Science. 2020.

11. Murray M. Determinants of cluster distribution in the molecular epidemiology of tuberculosis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2002;99(3):1538–43.

12. Enanoria WTA, Liu F, Zipprich J, Harriman K, Ackley S, Blumberg S, et al. The effect of contact investigations and public health interventions in the control and prevention of measles transmission: A simulation study. PLoS One. 2016;11(12):e0167160.

13. Ferguson NM, Cummings DAT, Cauchemez S, Fraser C, Riley S, Meeyai A, et al. Strategies for containing an emerging influenza pandemic in Southeast Asia. Nature. 2005;437(7056):209–14.

14. Epstein JM, Pankajakshan R, Hammond RA. Combining computational fluid dynamics and agent-based modeling: A new approach to evacuation planning. PLoS One. 2011;6(5):e20139.

15. Halloran ME, Longini IM, Nizam A, Yang Y. Containing bioterrorist smallpox. Science (80-). 2002;298(5597):1428–32.

16. Cooley P, Lee BY, Brown S, Cajka J, Chasteen B, Ganapathi L, et al. Protecting health care workers: A pandemic simulation based on Allegheny County. Influenza Other Respi Viruses. 2010;4(2):61–72.

17. Tracy M, Cerdá M, Keyes KM. Agent-Based Modeling in Public Health: Current Applications and Future Directions. Annu Rev Public Health. 2018;39(April):77–94.

18. Shamil MS, Farheen F, Ibtehaz N, Khan IM, Rahman MS. An Agent Based Modeling of COVID-19: Validation, Analysis, and Recommendations. medRxiv [Internet]. 2020;2020.07.05.20146977. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/08/2020.07.05.20146977.abstract

19. Jalayer M, Orsenigo C, Vercellis C. CoV-ABM: A stochastic discrete-event agent-based framework to simulate spatiotemporal dynamics of COVID-19. arXiv [Internet]. 2020 Jul 26 [cited 2020 Sep 19]; Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.13231

20. Mahdizadeh Gharakhanlou N, Hooshangi N. Spatio-temporal simulation of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak using the agent-based modeling approach (case study: Urmia, Iran). Informatics Med Unlocked [Internet]. 2020;20(August):100403. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imu.2020.100403

21. Hoertel N, Blachier M, Blanco C, Olfson M, Massetti M, Rico MS, et al. A stochastic agent-based model of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in France. Nat Med. 2020;26(9):1417–1421.

22. Hoertel N, Blachier M, Blanco C, Olfson M, Massetti M, Limosin F, et al. Facing the COVID-19 epidemic in NYC: a stochastic agent-based model of various intervention strategies. medRxiv. 2020;

23. Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, Abeysuriya RG, Hart G, Rosenfeld K, et al. Covasim: an agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. medRxiv [Internet]. 2020;2020.05.10.20097469. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097469v1

24. D'Orazio M, Bernardini G, Quagliarini E. How to restart? An agent-based simulation model towards the definition of strategies for COVID-19 "second phase" in public buildings. arXiv [Internet]. 2020;1–21. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.12927

25. Mahajan A, Sivadas NA, Solanki R. An epidemic model SIPHERD and its application for prediction of the spread of COVID-19 infection in India. Chaos, Solitons and Fractals. 2020;140:110156.

26. Samui P, Mondal J, Khajanchi S. A mathematical model for COVID-19 transmission dynamics with a case study of India. Chaos, Solitons and Fractals. 2020;140(November):110173.

27. Verma VR, Saini A, Gandhi S, Dash U, Koya SF. Capacity-need gap in hospital resources for varying mitigation and containment strategies in India in the face of COVID-19 pandemic. Infect Dis Model. 2020;5(1):608–21.

28. Chatterjee K, Chatterjee K, Kumar A, Shankar S. Healthcare impact of COVID-19 epidemic in India: A stochastic mathematical model. Med J Armed Forces India [Internet]. 2020;76(2):147–55. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2020.03.022

29. Zhang Z, Jain S. Mathematical model of Ebola and Covid-19 with fractional differential operators: Non-Markovian process and class for virus pathogen in the environment. Chaos, Solitons and Fractals [Internet]. 2020;140:110175. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2020.110175

30. Sardar T, Nadim SS, Rana S, Chattopadhyay J. Assessment of lockdown effect in some states and overall India: A predictive mathematical study on COVID-19 outbreak. Chaos, Solitons and

Fractals. 2020;139(October):110078.

31. Ambikapathy B, Krishnamurthy K. Mathematical modelling to assess the impact of lockdown on COVID-19 transmission in India: Model development and validation. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(5):1–8.

32. Badham J, Chattoe-Brown E, Gilbert N, Chalabi Z, Kee F, Hunter RF. Developing agent-based models of complex health behaviour. Heal Place. 2018;54(January):170–7.

33. Bai R-H, Dong W-Y, Shi Y, Feng A-Z, Xu A-D, Lyu J. Simulation of epidemic trends for a new coronavirus under effective control measures. New Med. 2020;30(2):8–12.

34. Lateef F. Simulation-based learning: Just like the real thing. J Emergencies, Trauma Shock. 2010;3(4):348–52.

35. Grigoryev I. Anylogic in three days: A quick course in simulation modeling [Internet]. Fifth. The AnyLogic Company; 2018. Available from: https://www.anylogic.com/resources/books/free-simulation-book-and-modeling-tutorials/

36. Tako AA, Robinson S. Comparing model development in discrete event simulation and system dynamics. In: Proceedings of the 2009 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC). 13-16 Dec. 2009; Austin, TX, USA, USA: IEEE; 2010.

37. Chan WKV, Son YJ, Macal CM. Agent-based simulation tutorial - Simulation of emergent behavior and differences between agent-based simulation and discrete-event simulation. In: Proceedings of the 2010 Winter Simulation Conference. 5-8 Dec. 2010; Baltimore, MD, USA: IEEE; 2011.

38. Chang SL, Harding N, Zachreson C, Cliff OM, Prokopenko M. Modelling transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. arXiv Prepr arXiv200310218 2020 Mar 23 [Internet]. 2020;1–31. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.10218

39. Luke DA, Stamatakis KA. Systems science methods in public health: Dynamics, networks, and agents. Annu Rev Public Health. 2012;33(April):357–76.

40. Grimm V, Berger U, Bastiansen F, Eliassen S, Ginot V, Giske J, et al. A standard protocol for describing individual-based and agent-based models. Ecol Modell. 2006;198(1–2):115–26.

41. Grimm V, Berger U, DeAngelis DL, Polhill JG, Giske J, Railsback SF. The ODD protocol: A review and first update. Ecol Modell. 2010;221(23):2760–8.

42. Grimm V, Revilla E, Berger U, Jeltsch F, Mooij WM, Railsback SF, et al. Pattern-oriented modeling of agent-based complex systems: Lessons from ecology. Science (80-). 2005;310(5750):987–91.

43. Gomez J, Prieto J, Leon E, Rodriguez A. INFEKTA: A General Agent-based Model for Transmission of Infectious Diseases: Studying the COVID-19 Propagation in Bogotá - Colombia. medRxiv. 2020;1–15.

44. Perez L, Dragicevic S. An agent-based approach for modeling dynamics of contagious disease spread. Int J Health Geogr. 2009;8(1):1–17.

45. Auchincloss AH, Garcia LMT. Brief introductory guide to agent-based modeling and an illustration from urban health research. Cad Saude Publica. 2015;31(suppl 1):65–78.

46. Roberts M, Russell LB, Paltiel AD, Chambers M, McEwan P, Krahn M. Conceptualizing a model: A report of the ISPOR-SMDM modeling good research practices task force-2. Value Heal. 2012;15(6):804–11.

47. Boden LA, McKendrick IJ. Model-based policymaking: A framework to promote ethical “good practice” in mathematical modeling for public health policymaking. Front Public Heal. 2017;5(APR):1–7.

48. Caro JJ, Briggs AH, Siebert U, Kuntz KM. Modeling Good Research Practices-Overview: A Report of the ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices Task Force-1. 2012;15(6):796–803.

49. Telangana State Portal State-Profile [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct 1]. Available from: https://www.telangana.gov.in/about/state-profile

50. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 13]. Available from: https://censusindia.gov.in/

51. Aylward, Bruce (WHO); Liang W (PRC). Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [Internet]. The WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019. 2020. Available from: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf

52. Parasite Ecology. Density-dependent vs. Frequency-dependent Disease Transmission [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://parasiteecology.wordpress.com/2013/10/17/density-dependent-vs-frequency-dependent-disease-transmission/

53. Institute for Disease Modeling. Population density and transmission scaling — Generic Model documentation [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: https://idmod.org/docs/emod/generic/model-population-density.html

54. Kumar S, Gosain M, Sharma H, Swetts E, Amarchand R, Kumar R, et al. Who interacts with whom? Social mixing insights from a rural population in India. PLoS One. 2018;13(12):1–17.

55. Rockwell Automation. Getting started with Arena [Internet]. Rockwell Automation. Supersedes Publication ARENA-UM001F-EN-P PN-111648; 2017. 142 p. Available from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/778906?origin=crossref

56. Abu-Rayash A, Dincer I. Analysis of mobility trends during the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic: Exploring the impacts on global aviation and travel in selected cities. Energy Res Soc Sci [Internet]. 2020;68(July):101693. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101693

57. Models of Infectious Disease Agent Study (MIDAS): Online Portal for COVID-19 Modelling Research [Internet]. Coordination Center University of Pittsburgh. 2020. Available from: https://midasnetwork.us/covid-19/

58. Kumar S, Gosain M, Sharma H, Swetts E, Amarchand R, Kumar R, et al. Who interacts with whom? Social mixing insights from a rural population in India. Lau EH, editor. PLoS One. 2018 Dec 21;13(12):e0209039.

59. Balk D, Montgomery MR, Engin H, Lin N, Major E, Jones B. Urbanization in India: Population and urban classification grids for 2011. Data. 2019;4(1):1–16.

60. Day M. Covid-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. BMJ [Internet]. 2020;369(April):m1375. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.m1375

61. WHO Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report - 46 [Internet]. 2020. p. 1–9. Available from: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200306-sitrep-46-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=96b04adf_4

62. Zhao W, Yu S, Zha X, Wang N, Pang Q, Li T, et al. Clinical characteristics and durations of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Beijing: a retrospective cohort study. medRxiv. 2020;(April).

63. Arentz M, Yim E, Klaff L, Lokhandwala S, Riedo FX, Chong M, et al. Characteristics and Outcomes of 21 Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19 in Washington State. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc. 2020;323(16):1612–4.

64. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, Antonelli M, Cabrini L, Castelli A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected with SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc. 2020;323(16):1574–81.

65. WHO Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report - 73 [Internet]. 2020. p. 1–13. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331686/nCoVsitrep02Apr2020-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

66. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2020;395(10242):1973–87.

67. COVID-19 pandemic lockdown in India - Wikipedia [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 27]. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19_pandemic_lockdown_in_India

68. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Supporting information: Projected comtact matrices in 152 countries for models of contact-transmissible infectious diesases. PLoS Comput Biol. 2017;110(46):1–15.

69. RACGP - More evidence suggests no long-term COVID-19 immunity [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 27]. Available from: https://www1.racgp.org.au/newsgp/clinical/more-evidence-suggests-no-long-term-covid-19-immun

70. Handler A, Rosenberg D, Kennelly J, Monahan C. Analytic methods in maternal and child health. Handler A, Rosenberg D, Kennelly J, Monahan C, editors. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois at Chicago, School of Public Health; 1998. 279 p.

71. Kahn MJ, O'Fallon WM, Sicks JD. Generalized Population Attributable Estimation. St. Olaf College, Mayo Clinic and National Institutes of Health, U.S.P.H.S.; 2000. p. 72.

72. Brian. and Caiado CC. Coronavirus: why we need local models to successfully exit lockdown [Internet]. The Conversation Media Group Ltd. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 10]. Available from: https://theconversation.com/coronavirus-why-we-need-local-models-to-successfully-exit-lockdown-138358

73. Rockett RJ, Arnott A, Lam C, Sadsad R, Timms V, Gray KA, et al. Revealing COVID-19 transmission in Australia by SARS-CoV-2 genome sequencing and agent-based modeling. Nat Med [Internet]. 2020;26(September). Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1000-7

74. Cuevas E. An agent-based model to evaluate the COVID-19 transmission risks in facilities. Comput Biol Med [Internet]. 2020;121(April):103827. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compbiomed.2020.103827

75. Kapoor G, Hauck S, Sriram A, Joshi J, Schueller E, Frost I, et al. State-wise estimates of current hospital beds, intensive care unit (ICU) beds and ventilators in India: Are we prepared for a surge in COVID-19 hospitalizations? medRxiv [Internet]. 2020;2020.06.16.20132787. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132787

76. Tseng K, Frost I, Kapoor G, Sriram A, Nandi A, Laxminarayan R. Covid-19 India: State-level Estimates of Hospitalization Needs [Internet]. CDDEP and Princeton University. 2020. Available from: https://cddep.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Covid.state_.hosp_3Apr2020.pdf