

Optimal shutdown strategies for COVID-19 with economic and mortality costs: BC as a case study

M.T. Barlow, N.D. Marshall, R.C. Tyson

Abstract

Decision makers with the responsibility of managing policy for the COVID-19 epidemic have faced difficult choices in balancing the competing claims of saving lives and the high economic cost of shutdowns. In this paper we formulate a model with both epidemiological and economic content to assist this decision making process. We consider two ways to handle the balance between economic costs and deaths. First, we use the statistical value of life, which in Canada is about C\$7 million, to optimise over a single variable, which is the sum of the economic cost and the value of lives lost. Our second method is to calculate the Pareto optimal front when we look at the two variables – deaths and economic costs.

In both cases we find that, for most parameter values, the optimal policy is to adopt an initial shutdown level which reduces the reproduction number of the epidemic to close to 1. This level is then reduced once a vaccination program is underway. Our model also indicates that an oscillating policy of strict and mild shutdowns is less effective than a policy which maintains a moderate shutdown level.

Keywords: epidemic, COVID-19, SEIR model, concave function, mathematical model, differential equations, pareto optimization, shutdown strategy

1 Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic led many countries to introduce an extensive economic and social lockdown to limit the spread of the disease (Wikipedia, 2020). While these measures are very expensive (Mandel and Veetil, 2020), in most regions where the measures were applied relatively early and with sufficient stringency, they were successful in stopping the growth of the epidemic (Moosa, 2020). After an initial period of shutdown, many jurisdictions have partially reopened their economies, and in some cases this has led to a second surge of infections (World Health Organisation, 2018) including in Canada (Grasley et al., 2020), reopening the question of whether or not to impose another lockdown.

Some kind of balance has to be struck between saving lives and the economic (and social) cost of the lockdown (Lee et al., n.d.; Miles, Stedman, and Heald, 2020). This paper presents a simple model, with both economic and epidemiological content, to help assess the options. In particular, we aim to determine what type of shutdown strategy

35 (X_t) minimizes costs over the period of the epidemic. The data and numbers are for
36 the Canadian province of British Columbia. We remark that any decision on the extent
37 of the lockdown has to take many factors into account. We have chosen to express
38 those factors which we do consider in monetary terms; inevitably this means that some
39 important aspects will have been left out. The optimization we perform should be viewed
40 as information that can assist in making a complex decision, rather than as a simple
41 prescription.

42 We start our model at an early stage of the epidemic, corresponding roughly to the
43 situation in B.C. in March 2020; thus we consider ‘what should have been done’ as well as
44 ‘what should now be done’. Moving forward, we find that the minimum cost scenario does
45 include a significant level of economic shutdown in order to ensure reduced transmission.
46 In particular, we obtain a high level of shutdown at the beginning of the epidemic, which
47 is monotonically decreased until the population has been vaccinated.

48 2 Model

49 Our model contains two parts: One part describing the disease dynamics, the second
50 describing the economic costs and optimal control. We separately present each part of
51 the model below.

52 2.1 Disease Dynamics

Our model for the epidemic is of standard compartmental type. For clarity, we split it
into two parts. The first part is a standard SEIQ model, where S is Susceptible, E is
Exposed, I is infectious and Q is Quarantined (i.e. no longer mixing with the susceptible
population while infectious):

$$S_{t+1} - S_t = -\beta_t I_t \frac{S_t}{N}, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$E_{t+1} - E_t = \beta_t I_t \frac{S_t}{N} - \gamma E_t \quad (2.1b)$$

$$I_{t+1} - I_t = \gamma E_t - \alpha I_t \quad (2.1c)$$

$$Q_{t+1} - Q_t = \alpha I_t. \quad (2.1d)$$

The time-dependent infectivity parameter β_t depends on the amount of economic lock-
down, as explained below. We initialise the model by taking

$$E_0 = I_0 = e_0,$$

53 that is, the initial number of COVID-19 carriers is split evenly between the exposed and
54 infectious compartments.

55 To model the progress of patients through the medical system we separate the Q bin
56 into smaller bins depending on quarantine state. These bins are named M, H, W, U, R, D .
57 Here M_t is the number of patients who are mildly ill (or asymptomatic) and therefore




Figure 1: The compartments of the disease model. The two dashed line boxes surround all of those compartments that are still infectious, but are no longer transmitting disease as they are quarantined at home or in hospital (the Q compartment in the model). The green arrows indicate transitions from sick states to the recovered state, while blue arrows indicate transitions from sick states to the deceased state. The variables are fractions of the total population: S = susceptible, E = exposed, I = infectious and not quarantined, M = infected but only mildly ill, H = infected and in hospital, W = infected and waiting for space to open up in hospital, U = infected and in the ICU, W_U = infected and waiting for ICU space to open up, R = recovered, and D = deceased. The W individuals are assumed to be quarantined at home, while the W_U individuals transition directly into the D compartment.

58 quarantining at home, H_t and U_t are the numbers of patients in hospital (but not ICU)
 59 and ICU beds respectively, R_t is the number of recovered patients, and D_t is the number of
 60 deceased patients. These population compartments, and the connections between them,
 61 are illustrated in Figure 1.

We wish to handle possible overload of the medical system, so we set the maximum capacity of hospital and ICU beds to be H_{max} and U_{max} respectively. For patients needing a hospital (non-ICU) bed, we introduce the W_t compartment: The number of patients waiting for hospital beds. At time $t + 1$ the demand for hospital beds is

$$\tilde{H}_{t+1} = H_t(1 - \kappa_H) + W_t(1 - \kappa_W) + \alpha I_t p_H.$$

If demand is greater than supply, we move as many patients as possible into hospital, and

the remainder go into the W container. Thus we set

$$H_{t+1} = \min(H_{max}, \tilde{H}_{t+1}), \quad W_{t+1} = \max(\tilde{H}_{t+1} - H_{max}, 0).$$

We follow a similar procedure for the ICU patients, except that (as these patients are presumably very ill) any excess is immediately moved into the D container; we write

$$D_{t+1}^{EU} = \max(0, U_t(1 - \kappa_U) + \alpha I_t p_U)$$

for the number of these deaths. Thus, the model for the quarantined group is written

$$M_{t+1} = M_t(1 - \kappa_M) + \alpha p_M I_t, \tag{2.2a}$$

$$H_{t+1} = \min(H_{max}, H_t(1 - \kappa_H) + W_t(1 - \kappa_W) + \alpha I_t p_H) \tag{2.2b}$$

$$W_{t+1} = \max(0, H_t(1 - \kappa_H) + W_t(1 - \kappa_W) + \alpha I_t p_H - H_{max}) \tag{2.2c}$$

$$U_{t+1} = \min(U_{max}, U_t(1 - \kappa_U) + \alpha I_t p_U) \tag{2.2d}$$

$$R_{t+1} = R_t + \kappa_B B_t + \kappa_H(1 - p_{HD})H_t + \kappa_W(1 - p_{WD})W_t + \kappa_U(1 - p_{UD})U_t \tag{2.2e}$$

$$D_{t+1} = D_t + \kappa_H p_{HD} H_t + \kappa_W p_{WD} W_t + \kappa_U p_{UD} U_t + D_{t+1}^{EU} \tag{2.2f}$$

62 We count as *excess deaths* those deaths arising from overload of the health system. This
 63 consists of two terms: the number of patients who move into the D container due to ICU
 64 overload, together with the patients who move from W to D . We write D^{Excess} for the
 65 total number of these deaths.

66 Note that we have assumed that everyone who becomes infectious is eventually quar-
 67 antined. While this assumption is likely unrealistically optimistic, it nevertheless means
 68 that our optimal shutdown strategy will provide a lower bound. We make similarly con-
 69 servative choices with regard to the parameters contributing to the infection fatality ratio.

70 The disease part of the model involves a substantial number of parameters. Some of
 71 these are fairly well established but many remain quite uncertain. Table 1 summarizes
 72 the values and sources.

With these parameter values the total infection fatality rate (IFR) without overload is

$$p_{IFR} = p_H \cdot p_{HD} + p_U \cdot p_{UD} = 0.48\%$$

73 which is at the low end of the range of values reported in the literature (PHAC Emerging
 74 Sciences, 2020).

75 2.2 Economic Costs

76 We now describe the economic/control part of the model. The proportion of the economy
 77 which is shut down (SD) on day t is given by $X_t \in [0, x_m]$. Here $x_m < 1$, as parts of the
 78 economy, e.g. food distribution, cannot be shut down. We assume that the shutdown is
 79 arranged so that the parts of the economy with the biggest effect on β are chosen first;
 80 thus we obtain a concave effectiveness from the shutdown.

Let $f(x)$ be the proportional reduction in social contacts due to the shutdown; we call
 f the *shutdown effectiveness* function. A shutdown of X_t will lead to an infection rate on
 day t of

$$\beta_t = \beta(1 - f(X_t)).$$

Table 1: Parameter values and sources for the disease dynamics portion of the model, equations (2.1) and (2.2). † These estimated values are in line with the rates reported in Salje et al. (2020). ‡ We were unable to find data for p_{WD} , and so we assumed that survival is very low for individuals needing the ICU but unable to access those resources.

Parameter	Value	Remarks
α	.17	Anderson et al. (2020)
γ	0.2	Anderson et al. (2020)
\mathcal{R}_0	3.3	Salje et al. (2020)
β	$\alpha\mathcal{R}_0$	Derived
κ_M^{-1}	14	estimated†
κ_H^{-1}	10	Salje et al. (2020)
κ_U^{-1}	15	Salje et al. (2020)
κ_W^{-1}	2	estimated†
p_H	0.021	Salje et al. (2020)
p_U	0.0047	Salje et al. (2020)
p_M	$1 - p_H - p_U$	Derived
p_{HD}	0.17	PHAC Emerging Sciences (2020)
p_{UD}	0.27	PHAC Emerging Sciences (2020)
p_{WD}	0.8	estimated‡
e_0	200	Initial values of I_0 and E_0

81 We do not have the data to calculate f in detail. A simple model is to take

$$f(x) = x^\theta, \tag{2.3}$$

82 (see Figure 2) where $\theta < 1$. The reproduction number due to a SD of x is then given by

$$\mathcal{R}(x) = \mathcal{R}_0(1 - x^\theta). \tag{2.4}$$

83 We note that $d\mathcal{R}_0(0+)/dx = -\infty$, which implies that some level of shutdown is always
84 advantageous – see Appendix B.

85 With an effectiveness function of this form we need to estimate θ . A first guess would
86 be to use the ‘Pareto principle’, which states roughly that “80% of the output is due to
87 20% of the input”. We thus write $f(1/5) = 4/5$ which gives $\theta \approx 0.14$. This guess has some
88 support from data: The fall in GDP in Canada in the first quarter of 2020 is estimated
89 to lie between 7% and 14% (Infoline, 2020a,b; Statistics Canada, n.d.). Anderson et al.
90 (2020, page10) estimates that the March-April 2020 shutdown in B.C. reduced contacts
91 by about 78%, with a 90% credible interval of 66% to 89%, which reduced $\mathcal{R}(x)$ to below
92 1. Using these values for GDP and contact reduction in (2.3), we obtain $\theta \in [0.04, 0.21]$.
93 The highest values of θ are obtained for the highest fall in GDP, and the lowest reduction
94 in contacts. We note that the GDP estimates do not include capital destruction costs,
95 which tend to take longer to become evident (Erken et al., 2020), and so we assume that
96 the ultimate cost is actually higher than estimated. It therefore seems prudent to set θ




Figure 2: The shutdown effectiveness function, $f(x) = x^\theta$. The higher the value of θ , the greater is the reduction in effective reproduction number for a given level x of economic shutdown.

97 at a value closer to the upper end of the plausible range. We thus select $\theta = 0.2$ as the
 98 default value.

99 We write x_c for the amount of SD needed to make \mathcal{R} equal to 1; thus

$$x_c = \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_0 - 1}{\mathcal{R}_0} \right)^{1/\theta}. \quad (2.5)$$

100 If $\mathcal{R}_0 = 3.3$ and $\theta = 0.2$, then $x_c = 0.164$.

101 The equations above describe the evolution of the epidemic for the period $t =$
 102 $0, 1, \dots, T_V$ once we have fixed the initial conditions and the control X_t . We take T_V
 103 to be 360 days; this is the approximate time from the start of the epidemic (March 2020)
 104 until we might hope that a vaccine is available. Once a vaccine is available, supply con-
 105 straints mean that it will still not be possible to vaccinate the whole population of B.C.
 106 all at once, and so some level of shutdown may still be necessary for $t > T_V$. We assume
 107 that the vaccine is 100% effective and that N_V people are vaccinated daily for each day
 108 $t \geq T_V$. For each day $t \geq T_V$ we move N_V people from S to R , and otherwise continue
 109 to run the model as above. We take a terminal time $T = T_V + N/N_V$ for the model;
 110 at this point the whole population is vaccinated and the epidemic is at an end. In fact,
 111 herd immunity will be reached before the terminal time T (Garibaldi, E.R.Moen, and
 112 Pissarides, 2020), but some costs are likely to extend past this point, and so we take the
 113 larger terminal time as our end time. With our base parameter values we have $T_V = 360$
 114 and $T = 610$.

115 We now introduce costs; throughout the paper these are in Canadian dollars. The
 116 costs we consider are the economic costs of the shutdown $C^{(SD)}$, costs arising from the
 117 medical care of infected individuals $C^{(M)}$, and costs due to lives lost $C^{(D)}$.

The economic cost of shutdown is taken to be the daily shutdown costs summed over
 the time period of the the epidemic, so that writing G_D to for the daily GDP of B.C. we

have

$$C^{(SD)} = \sum_{t=1}^T G_D X_t.$$

Medical costs can be inferred from Jones (2020); we take the cost of a day in a regular hospital bed as \$1,000, and ICU costs as \$10,000 on the first day and \$2,000 per day thereafter. The medical cost during the period $t = 0, \dots, T$ is therefore

$$C^{(M)} = \sum_{t=1}^T (v_M M_t + v_H H_t + v_U U_t + v_{NU} U_t^{New});$$

118 here v_M, v_H, v_U are the daily costs for patients in states M, H or U , v_{NU} is the excess
119 cost for the first day in ICU, and U_t^{New} is the number of new patients in ICU on day t .

To determine costs due to the lives lost, we need to determine the ‘statistical (dollar) value of a life’ (SVL) or V_L . There is a substantial literature on this topic – see Dionne and Lanoie (2004), Greenstone and Nigam (2020), and Thunström et al. (2020); authors use a variety of methods to get some handle on this number. As one would expect, estimates vary widely – the review in Dionne and Lanoie (2004) gives a range for Canada of C\$2.0m – C\$11.1m, with a median of C\$5.5m. In 2020 dollars that is $V_L = C\$7.0m$, which we take as our base figure. We then set

$$C^{(D)} = V_L D_T.$$

120 The total cost of the epidemic is the sum of the shutdown, medical, and death costs:

$$C^{(Tot)} = C^{(SD)} + C^{(M)} + C^{(D)}. \quad (2.6)$$

121 Note that the first two of the costs in (2.6) are pure dollar costs, while the third is based
122 on a more subjective evaluation of the dollar cost of a lost life. We use the SVL in order
123 to estimate the total cost of the epidemic, but since the quantitative assessment of the
124 pure dollar and SVL costs are so different, in our analysis below we also treat these two
125 types of costs separately. We write

$$C^{(Dol)} = C^{(SD)} + C^{(M)}. \quad (2.7)$$

126 We list the economic parameters in Table 2.

127 2.3 Optimization procedure

128 We considered two types of optimization. In section 3.1 we minimized the total cost of
129 the epidemic using value of life V_L to translate lost lives into costs. Since it does not
130 always make sense to translate a lost life into a dollar value, we take a different approach
131 in Section 3.2. There we looked at Pareto optimization (Mock, 2011) of pure dollar
132 costs and deaths, i.e. for the two numbers $(C^{(Dol)}, D_T)$. We studied the structure of the
133 epidemic associated with some sample points on the Pareto curve.

Table 2: Economic parameters. Dollar values are in Canadian dollars. For the lost wages per day of illness, v_M , we take the drop in GDP and divided by the number of days over which the drop occurred. For the number of daily vaccinations after T_V , we take the population of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2020) divided by the estimated length of time it will take to vaccinate everyone (Miller and Zafar, 2020).

Parameter	Value	Remarks
N	5,100,000	Population of BC (Statistics Canada, 2020)
G_D	\$800,000,000	daily GDP in B.C. (Statistics Canada, n.d.)
v_M	\$100	Lost wages per day of illness
v_H	\$1000	Day in hospital (Jones, 2020)
v_U	\$2000	Day in ICU (Jones, 2020)
v_{NU}	\$8000	ICU setup (Jones, 2020)
V_L	\$7,000,000	Value of life (Dionne and Lanoie, 2002)
T_V	360	Number of days until vaccination starts
N_V	20400	Number of daily vaccinations after T_V
T	$T_V + N/N_V$	Terminal time for model
θ	0.2	Effectiveness of shutdown: range 0.1 – 0.2.

134 In both cases we only considered strategies in which X_t was held constant for a sig-
 135 nificant time period. For the total cost optimization we divided the time period into
 136 10 equal segments of 61 days (about 2 months), and held X_t constant in each of these
 137 periods. Writing x_i for the value of X_t in period i , the strategy (X_t) is described by the
 138 vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{10})$. We used Matlabs’s multivariate optimization routine “fmincon”
 139 to optimize over vectors x . For the Pareto optimization we used 5 equal time periods,
 140 each of 122 days (the Pareto optimisation performed poorly with 10 periods).

141 We had several reasons for this restriction on shutdown strategies. First, from a com-
 142 putational point of view, it is not feasible to optimize over several hundred control values
 143 X_i . Next, since the effectiveness function f is concave, rapidly varying control strategies
 144 will perform less well than more slowly varying control strategies (see Appendix A). Fi-
 145 nally, as it is not realistic to consider that a government could implement a shutdown
 146 function X_t that changes too frequently.

147 We remark that it would be as computationally feasible to consider piecewise linear
 148 strategies as piecewise constant ones – in both cases the optimization reduces to optimizing
 149 over a 10-dimensional space (if we use our baseline setup). However, we did not consider
 150 such strategies because we did not consider them to be applicable in practice.

151 The two types of optimization are connected, since the total cost optimization corre-
 152 sponds to tangents on the Pareto curve. More precisely, write (C, D) for the two axes
 153 (dollar costs and deaths) for the Pareto curve. Let $vD + C = b$ be a tangent to the Pareto
 154 curve at the point (C_1, D_1) . Then $b = C_1 + vD_1$ is also the minimum total cost when we
 155 take $V_L = v$.

156 3 Results

Before we consider the optimization problem in detail, it is helpful to look at the basic structure of the model described above. If the epidemic is such that there is no overload of hospital capacity, and so no excess deaths, then the total number of infected individuals is $R_T + D_T$, and the total number of deaths is

$$D_T = p_{IFR}(R_T + D_T).$$

We can compute the expected ‘value of life’ costs as the probability of dying times the value of a lost life, i.e. $V_L p_{IFR} = \$33,600$, for our baseline parameter values. On the other hand, the expected medical costs are

$$p_M \kappa_M^{-1} v_M + p_H \kappa_H^{-1} v_H + p_U (v_{NU} + \kappa_U^{-1} v_U) = \$1574,$$

157 for the baseline parameter values. So, on average, the medical costs of the epidemic are
158 small in comparison with the value of life costs.

159 3.1 Optimization of total costs

160 3.1.1 Baseline (constant shut down) scenarios

161 The simplest strategy is to take $X_t = x$ constant for the whole period. Figure 3 shows
162 the total cost as a function of x for various values of the SVL V_L . This graph has
163 several informative features. We consider first the curves with $V_L \geq \$3.0\text{m}$. In these
164 cases, the minimum value x_{min} is a little smaller than $x_c = 0.164$ (if $V_L = \$7.0\text{m}$ then
165 $x_{min} = 0.13$). These values of x correspond to allowing the epidemic to grow slowly
166 over the pre-vaccination period; it then declines once vaccination reduces the effective
167 reproduction rate. One sees further that the minimizing value x_{min} is not very sensitive
168 to V_L . These values of x_{min} give rise to a relatively small epidemic, so any further increase
169 in x would save relatively few lives. For $x > x_c$ the total cost curves for differing values
170 of V_L are very close together; this is because in this regime the total number of deaths is
171 small (a few hundred), so the term $V_L D_T$ is much smaller than the pure dollar cost C^{Dol} .

172 For $V_L = 1.0\text{m}$ one sees a rather different pattern. The minimum cost is obtained at
173 a much lower shutdown level, around 5%. In this case, deaths are counted as relatively
174 unimportant, so the optimal strategy is to adopt a relatively mild shutdown.

175 3.1.2 Variable shutdown scenarios

176 We next consider strategies that are piecewise constant, being allowed to vary only every
177 61 days. We see the same general pattern as with a constant shutdown. For the baseline
178 parameter values we find that the optimum policy (Figure 4, left plots) starts with a
179 fairly strict shutdown, with $X_t \approx x_c = 0.164$, for the first six time periods. Subsequently,
180 X_t is gradually relaxed, and is zero in the final period. Taking $X_t < x_c$ means that the
181 epidemic grows over the first year, but at a slow and controlled rate. As vaccinations
182 proceed, the optimum policy is to relax the shutdown enough to allow a late peak in the




Figure 3: Total costs as a function of shutdown level for a constant shutdown strategy. Several values of V_L (in thousands of dollars CAD) are shown.

183 epidemic. This peak occurs during the period when the vaccine has become available. If
184 the initial infection level is ten times higher than the baseline (Figure 4, right plots), we
185 see a similar pattern, but with higher shutdown levels at the beginning, and shutdown
186 levels dropping more in the first third of the year. Notice that in this second scenario,
187 the optimal strategy designates $X_t > x_c$ initially, so that the epidemic decreases, bringing
188 the case load under control before resuming the late wave pattern of the baseline case.

189 The overall pattern can be characterised as a high level of shutdown at the beginning
190 of the epidemic, with X_t decreasing in small steps at first, and then in larger steps as a
191 vaccine becomes available. The change in X_t is monotonic: Under optimal conditions,
192 there is no second wave. This pattern held for most of the runs we performed with
193 modified parameters: see Table 3 for a summary of the outcomes. Increasing the number
194 of time periods to 20 makes little difference to the total cost or number of deaths.

195 As in the constant policy case, for $V_L \leq \$1.0\text{m}$ the optimal strategy changes to one
196 which permits a large epidemic, with many deaths. The shutdown values for the first
197 three periods are 0.0001, 0.0684, 0.0718. One might expect that a strategy which is the
198 same for the final 7 periods, but is the average of the first three at the beginning (i.e.
199 0.0467), would perform better, but this is not the case. This modification to the optimum
200 strategy delays the epidemic peak, but gives less social distancing when it is needed most,
201 and allows a bigger epidemic, with 31,010 deaths as opposed to 20,477. See Figure 5.

202 Thus, apart from the need to control a large initial epidemic, one finds one wants
203 X_t close to x_c in the pre-vaccination phase. Taking X_t significantly smaller than x_c
204 causes a large epidemic, with many deaths, while taking X_t significantly larger than x_c is
205 economically costly, and saves few lives.




Figure 4: Number of infections and shutdown for optimal policy for base parameters (left) and a larger initial epidemic with $I_0 = E_0 = 2000$ (right) **Need bigger axis labels!**, minimizing total costs, $C^{(Tot)}$ (see (2.6)). For these parameter values, the critical shutdown level is $X_c = 0.164$. Vaccination begins at $T_V = 360$.

206 3.2 Pareto optimization: Costs and Deaths

207 In the results presented above, we find the optimum shutdown pattern by expressing all
 208 of the constraints, including lives lost, in terms of their monetary value, $C^{(Tot)}$. Here, we
 209 separate out pure dollar costs $C^{(Dol)}$ from deaths, applying the two as separate constraints,
 210 and present the Pareto optimum (Mock, 2011). The results are shown in Figure 3.2.
 211 The curve shows the competing effects of minimizing costs versus minimizing deaths:
 212 Minimizing the pure dollar costs of shutdown leads to higher mortality, and minimizing
 213 mortality leads to higher pure dollar costs.

214 Each point (x, y) on the Pareto curve corresponds to the shutdown strategy which
 215 gives the minimum possible number of deaths y at pure dollar cost x . Three of these
 216 Pareto-optimum shutdown strategies are shown in the lower half of Figure 3.2, and the
 217 Pareto points they correspond to are circled on the Pareto curve. The extreme strategies
 218 are: (Strategy 1) prioritise minimizing pure dollar costs over deaths, and (Strategy 3)
 219 prioritize minimizing deaths over costs. We also show an intermediate strategy (Strategy
 220 2), where costs are half that of Strategy 3, but mortality is still close to the minimum.

221 If minimizing pure dollar costs is the highest priority (Strategy 1), then the optimal
 222 strategy is to have no economic shutdown at all, and we obtain a death toll of over 80,000
 223 individuals. The total cost is less than \$10 billion. If minimizing deaths is the highest
 224 priority (Strategy 3), we obtain a shutdown strategy with an initially high shutdown level,
 225 which then decreases at each time period until finally becoming zero at the last interval.
 226 The cost skyrockets to over \$70 billion, and the number of deaths is less than 100. If,




Figure 5: Effect of a lower $V_L = \$1.0\text{m}$. Number of infections and shutdown for the optimal policy (left), and a modified control held constant at the average value of the optimal control for the first three time periods (right). The number of deaths for the optimal control is 20,477, and for the modified control is 31,010.

227 instead, we choose the intermediate strategy (Strategy 2), pure dollar costs can be reduced
228 to near half that of the most expensive strategy, and the total deaths are a few thousand.

229 Table 3 lists economic and epidemiology outcomes for a few additional scenarios. These
230 results provide context to the Pareto curve in Figure 3.2. We do not see excess deaths
231 (and a large decrease in cost) until V_L drops to \$1.0m or less. Increasing the frequency
232 with which the control strategy is adjusted (i.e., increasing the number of time periods)
233 has very little effect on any of the outcomes. In contrast, decreasing the adjustment
234 frequency down to the point where only one constant shutdown level is used throughout
235 the epidemic results in almost twice as many deaths and actually increases the total cost.
236 Decreasing the shutdown efficiency θ and basic reproduction number \mathcal{R}_0 both lead to
237 reduced cost and deaths, while increasing \mathcal{R}_0 and the initial disease prevalence e_0 both
238 lead to increased costs and deaths.

239 3.3 Sensitivity Analysis

240 Since some of the parameters are not well known, we test our results using a Partial Rank
241 Correlation Coefficient (PRCC) sensitivity analysis as described by Marino et al. (2008).
242 PRCC is a reliable measure of the contribution that parameters have to the model when
243 the relationship between the parameter and the output is monotonic. Each parameter is
244 varied over a range from half to twice the baseline value given in Tables 1 and 2. The
245 PRCC values can be interpreted as the correlation between parameter and model output,

Table 3: Economic and epidemiological outcomes corresponding to the optimal solution of the model under variation of a few key parameters (left column). The Total Cost outcome includes the value of lives lost (all dollar values are in CAD). For each row in the table, all parameters except the one being varied are held at the default values listed in Tables 1 and 2. For comparison, the outcomes under default values for all of the parameters are listed in the first row.

Parameter varied	Total Cost (\$billion)	Deaths	Max infected	Excess deaths
None	51.4	494	3,345	0
$V_L = \$5.0\text{m}$	50.3	697	4,783	0
$V_L = \$3.0\text{m}$	48.4	1,228	8,435	0
$V_L = \$2.0\text{m}$	46.9	2,214	13,835	0
$V_L = \$1.0\text{m}$	34.1	20,477	161,167	8,751
$V_L = \$0.0\text{m}$	6.8	64,339	584,296	55,932
$\theta = 0.15$	27.8	347	2,124	0
$\mathcal{R}_0 = 3.6$	62.5	532	3,657	0
$\mathcal{R}_0 = 3.0$	40.5	445	2,936	0
$e_0 = 2,000$	59.0	665	3,408	0
$e_0 = 20,000$	68.6	1,250	20,782	0
20 time periods	51.3	494	3,105	0
1 time period	69.6	811	5341	0

246 linearly discounting the effects of the other parameters.

247 We ran the sensitivity analysis on the model with the optimal strategy given for the
 248 baseline parameters, and considered the sensitivity (a) with respect to both total costs
 249 (i.e. the sum of pure dollar and value of life costs), and (b) with respect to deaths. Both
 250 sensitivity analyses show high (greater than 0.6) sensitivity values for the parameters \mathcal{R}_0
 251 and θ . In addition, for costs T_V and N_V had moderate sensitivity, in the range (0.2 to
 252 0.6). For deaths, the parameters p_H , p_{HD} , p_{UD} and e_0 had moderate sensitivity. See the
 253 supplementary material for full details. In both cases the parameters α , γ , κ_M^{-1} , κ_H^{-1} , κ_U^{-1} ,
 254 κ_W^{-1} , p_{UD} , p_{WD} had low sensitivity – less than 0.11.

255 It may seem somewhat surprising that V_L has a relatively low sensitivity of 0.19. One
 256 reason for this is that our sensitivity analysis only studies sensitivity of a parameter x over
 257 the range $[x_0/2, 2x_0]$, where x_0 is our base value. Thus for V_L , the sensitivity analysis only
 258 considered the range between \$3.5m and \$14m, and, as we already saw when we looked at
 259 constant shutdowns, in this range the value of life makes little difference to the strategy
 260 or to the total cost.




Figure 6: Top: Pareto plot. Each asterisk corresponds to the shutdown strategy which gives the minimum possible number of deaths D_t at dollar cost $C^{(Dol)}$ (recall that dollar cost does not include the value of a lost life). The Pareto front assumes default parameter values and five shutdown intervals with possibly varying levels of social distancing. Points on the Pareto front with excess deaths are red and those without are blue. The three highlighted strategies are: Do nothing (minimize costs, excluding value of life), do a some of both (try to minimize deaths and costs simultaneously), and implement severe distancing (minimize deaths). Bottom grid of plots: The cumulative cost (top row), daily infections (middle row), and daily shutdown strategy (bottom row), are shown for the epidemics associated with the three points circled in the Pareto plot (Strategies 1-3). Note that the shutdown strategy for Strategy 1 is zero (the vertical axis includes negative values - for this subplot only - so that the zero strategy line is visible).

261 4 Discussion

262 Our study is motivated by the hesitation shown by some leaders to implementing strict
 263 control measures to slow the spread of COVID-19 (Haberman and Senger, 2020; Mandl
 264 and Benassatto, 2020; Maynes, 2020), in part due to the huge toll to the economy. For
 265 informed decision making, it is clear that we need some objective quantification of the
 266 total cost of both the health crisis and the economic shutdown measures. In this work, we

267 present a coupled disease and economic cost model which is a useful tool for evaluating
268 shutdown options. While our model is in no way a comprehensive representation of all
269 of the costs and benefits of shutdown measures, we submit that it contains the salient
270 features of the system, and so the patterns in our results should reflect real dynamics.

271 For a simple minimization it is necessary to combine our two key variables, that is the
272 dollar cost (medical costs plus economic shutdown costs), and deaths, which we did by
273 using the ‘value of a statistical life’ V_L . For values of V_L close to the consensus value
274 of about \$7.0m given in Dionne and Lanoie (2004) our results indicate that total costs
275 (deaths, hospital costs, and deaths costs) are minimized by a significant shutdown – of
276 about 10%-15% in the early stages of the epidemic. For these values of V_L the optimal
277 shutdown strategy decreases slowly in the initial phases of the epidemic, and then falls
278 rapidly to nearly zero once vaccination is well underway and the system is close to herd
279 immunity. In the middle of the vaccination phase the shutdown is relaxed sufficiently to
280 allow a moderate late peak in infections. At this point the effective reproduction number
281 has been reduced sufficiently so that the epidemic has no possibility to explode before the
282 completion of the vaccination program.

283 If V_L is taken to be \$1m or less, a different pattern occurs. As death costs are smaller,
284 economic costs play a relatively larger role, and the question is how best to deploy the
285 relatively small amount of shutdown that will be introduced. It turns out that the optimal
286 control is to wait until the infections are rising rapidly, and then use the shutdown to
287 reduce the height of the epidemic peak.

288 In this paper we have studied the optimization problem for the situation when the
289 disease and economic parameters are known. In practice of course this is not the case, and
290 in particular neither of the two most significant parameters (\mathcal{R}_0 and θ) would have been
291 known to a government considering lockdowns. One therefore needs to consider strategies
292 using feedback to control the epidemic. In the context of our model, a reasonable goal
293 would be to aim at having the effective reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0(X_t) = \mathcal{R}_0(1 - X_t^\theta)$
294 close to 1. The results of Stewart, Van Heusden, and Dumont (2020) suggest this goal is
295 reasonably attainable.

296 4.1 Gradual versus periodic shutdowns

297 Our observations provide an interesting perspective on the shutdown approaches taken
298 by governments in BC and elsewhere. In almost all cases, after a severe initial shutdown,
299 economies were reopened and it was hoped the transmission rate could be controlled
300 through contact tracing as well as individual prophylactic behaviours (mask-wearing,
301 washing hands, avoiding crowds, keeping business patrons 2 m (6’) apart, etc.). Un-
302 fortunately, these methods do not seem to be as effective as was hoped, and as we write
303 (November 2020) cases are rising dramatically in many jurisdictions, and governments
304 are reimplementing significant shutdown measures (Wikipedia, 2020). From our work, it
305 appears that a slower and more gradual decrease in shutdown level would have led to a
306 smaller overall cost of the epidemic.

307 4.2 Cost of lives lost

308 Since the equating of a life lost to a dollar value is debatable, we found it useful to separate
309 pure dollar costs and deaths. The Pareto curve shows us that deaths can be maintained at
310 a very low level, even if the shutdown level falls short of "stop the epidemic". Again, unless
311 it is acceptable to let the number of deaths skyrocket, the optimal shutdown strategy
312 always includes a positive and significant (i.e. over $\approx 15\%$) level of shutdown.

313 In this work we use a single value for the value of life V_L : that is, we do not make any
314 adjustments for the age of the deceased. If we neglect excess deaths, then this gives a
315 SVL cost of $C_0 = p_{IFR}V_L$ per infection; with our base parameters this is \$36,400. It is
316 natural to ask what happens if we look at an age stratified population. Mortality rates
317 are substantially higher for older patients Salje et al. (2020), and as they have a smaller
318 life expectancy it can be argued that their SVL should be smaller.

To assess this point, we can look at the following simple age stratified model. We divide
the population into n age groups. Group i consists of a proportion a_i of the population,
has death rate (IFR) p_i and has SVL v_i . Then if we neglect excess deaths, the overall
cost per infection is

$$C_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i p_i v_i.$$

319 Let v_i for each age group be the life expectancy of the mid point of the age range times
320 \$170,000, which following we take to be the value of a year of life. Using the age-
321 related death rates from Salje et al. (ibid.) and BC census data from 2011, we obtain
322 $C_1 = \$12,377$, i.e. about 38% of $C_0 = p_{IFR}V_L = \$33,600$. Thus the age stratified model
323 outlined above corresponds to taking V_L to be 37% of the value listed in Table 2, i.e.
324 about \$2,600,000. (See the supplementary information for more details.) The outcomes
325 listed in Table 3 show that for V_L as low as \$2.0 m, the optimal shutdown strategy is
326 sufficiently large to prevent any excess deaths, and so, broadly speaking, our results are
327 not changed. Note that this calculation neglects excess deaths, and assumes that all the
328 disease parameters except death rates are independent of age.

329 4.3 Other costs

330 Since our focus is the epidemic in BC, we make a few remarks about the specific situation
331 there, namely, the overdose crisis. While our work strongly suggests that the adoption
332 of economic shutdown measures in BC is, in the long term, a responsible strategy, the
333 shutdown in BC has caused a significant increase in deaths due to drug overdoses there
334 (BC Coroners Service, 2020); the excess (total overdose deaths over and above the usual
335 average) for March through June 2020, exceeds the total number of COVID-19 deaths for
336 that time period by over 40% (BC Centre for Disease Control, 2020; BC Coroners Service,
337 2020). A number of factors are likely involved in this mortality, including the disruption of
338 regular drug supply chains, through border closures, leading to an increasingly toxic drug
339 supply (Zussman, 2020), the reduction in access to harm reduction services as a result of
340 physical distancing protocols (ibid.), and increased stress resulting from increased isolation
341 and economic uncertainty (Ebrahimi, Hoffart, and Johnson, 2020; Hyland et al., 2020;

342 Lechner et al., 2020) (similar patterns have been observed in the US (Katz, Goodnough,
343 and Sanger-Katz, 2020)). The value of these lost lives could have a significant effect on
344 our cost calculations, but assessing the relation between the level of economic shutdown
345 and the number of overdose deaths is not straightforward. The social issues around the
346 legality of drugs, addictions treatment, and overdose deaths is well beyond the scope of
347 this paper, but is nevertheless an extremely important issue.

348 There are many additional costs to social distancing that have not been included in our
349 model due to lack of data. We discuss some of the most important of these here. First,
350 while our economic cost calculations take account of loss of wages and business income
351 due to the shutdown, it does not include costs due to capital destruction. The Canadian
352 Federation of Independent Business recently estimated that 12% of small and medium-
353 sized BC businesses are at risk of closure (Gaudreault, 2020; McCusker and Tindale,
354 2020), but estimates of the effect of these possible closures on provincial GDP is not yet
355 known. Second, with hospitals stretched to accommodate COVID-19 patients, and with
356 fear of contracting COVID-19 limiting movement, treatment of non-COVID illnesses can
357 be severely delayed (Dayal et al., 2020; Lazzarini et al., 2020). Thus there will be excess
358 deaths from other causes, and costs associated with suffering due to untreated conditions
359 (Dayal et al., 2020; Solis et al., 2020). Finally, mental health, in general, is known to suffer
360 during community disasters (Lowe et al., 2019; North and Pfefferbaum, 2013), including
361 pandemics. Research is emerging regarding the effects of COVID-19 non-pharmaceutical
362 measures on mental health (Ebrahimi, Hoffart, and Johnson, 2020; Hyland et al., 2020;
363 Lechner et al., 2020; Van Rheen et al., 2020; Vinkers et al., 2020), but costs are difficult
364 to determine at this stage.

365 **4.4 Future considerations**

366 Our understanding of the SARS-Cov-2 virus and COVID-19 disease are continually evol-
367 ving, and so necessarily our model is relevant to the current epidemic up to a certain time
368 point. In particular, we do not consider the possibility of a successful treatment that
369 reduces mortality among those who become infected. There is evidence that treatment
370 outcomes are improving for COVID-19 patients (National Institute of Health (USA),
371 2020), but the data are still preliminary and therefore difficult to include. We also do
372 not include contact tracing as a measure for reducing transmission. Considerable work
373 evaluating the effectiveness of contact tracing has been done by other researchers (Firth
374 et al., 2020; Kucharski et al., 2020), and the general consensus is that contact tracing
375 alone is insufficient, and can quickly become overwhelmed by a few large-scale outbreaks.

376 Finally, we remark that the eventual cost of the epidemic depends a great deal on the
377 time horizon considered, and the value a society places on its elderly population (the group
378 most at risk) (Keogh-Brown et al., 2009). Indeed, the metric used to evaluate a country's
379 economy is another factor that could change the calculation significantly (Marikina, 2018).
380 These considerations are beyond the scope of the current paper, but provide interesting
381 avenues of future work in this area, and would help countries prepare for future pandemics.

382 5 Conclusions

383 Our analysis suggests that the BC and federal governments were wise to impose severe
384 shutdown levels at the beginning of the epidemic. The later reduction in shutdown levels
385 was likely too large as compared to an optimal strategy. The difficulty is that people
386 are unlikely to cooperate with rules that appear to be unnecessarily restrictive, especially
387 when livelihoods are at stake (Bodas and Peleg, 2020; DiGiovanni et al., 2004). Future
388 modelling studies that include behavioural components will be very helpful. Much work
389 needs to be done by government and society to make sure that not only are countries
390 economically prepared to handle future pandemics, but that populations also have the
391 necessary understanding and mental resiliency to maintain a high level of prophylaxis for
392 a long period of time.

393 Acknowledgements

394 This work was supported by (RCT) NSERC DG RGPIN-2016-05277 and (MTB) NSERC
395 DG RGPIN-2016-03703. MTB initiated the project, and NDM wrote all of the code,
396 ran the simulations, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. RCT was part of the
397 discussions throughout. MTB and RCT together wrote the final draft.

398 Appendix A Slowly-varying SD is better when f is 399 concave

In Section 2.3 above, we stated that slowly-varying SD strategies would outperform rapidly-varying strategies because the shutdown effectiveness function f is concave. To see this relationship, consider a strategy with period $2S$, where for the first half of each period $X_t \equiv x_1$, and $X_t \equiv x_2$ for the second half of each period. If the x_i are close enough to x_c so that the epidemic does not explode over a period of S days, then an analysis of the SEIQ equation shows that the effect of the shutdown is roughly linear, so that the periodic strategy above has approximately the same effect as a constant strategy x' with $f(x') = \frac{1}{2}(f(x_1) + f(x_2))$. As f is concave,

$$f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}(f(x_1) + f(x_2)) = f(x'),$$

400 and so the periodic strategy is more expensive than a constant strategy with the same
401 effectiveness. For example, if we take $X_t \equiv x_c$ for the whole period of T days, the
402 shutdown cost is \$80.3b. If we alternate between values $x_1 = 0.28$ and $x_2 = 0.09$ (which
403 satisfy $\frac{1}{2}(f(x_1) + f(x_2)) = f(x_c)$) then the shutdown cost increases to \$90.3b.

404 Appendix B SD is non-zero

405 In Section 2.2 we chose the shutdown effectiveness function $f(x) = x^\theta$, with $\theta < 1$. We
406 now show that this implies that the optimal strategy (with respect to total costs) is

407 non-zero. For simplicity we just treat the case when we ignore excess deaths.

In a SEIR model the final population of susceptibles S_∞ satisfies (Martcheva, 2015)

$$\ln(S_0/S_\infty) = \mathcal{R}_0(1 - N^{-1}S_\infty).$$

It follows that S_∞ is a differentiable function of \mathcal{R}_0 : write $S_\infty = H(\mathcal{R}_0)$. Let us write S_∞ for the final number of susceptibles if we adopt a modified strategy $X_t \equiv 0$, and \tilde{S}_∞ for the final number if $X_t \equiv x$, where x is small. Then

$$\tilde{S}_\infty - S_\infty = H(\mathcal{R}_0(x)) - H(\mathcal{R}_0) = H(\mathcal{R}_0 - x^\theta \mathcal{R}_0) - H(\mathcal{R}_0) \simeq -x^\theta \mathcal{R}_0 H'(\mathcal{R}_0).$$

Hence the modified strategy leads to a cost saving (in terms of medical and deaths costs) of

$$x^\theta \mathcal{R}_0 H'(\mathcal{R}_0) p_{IFR} V_L.$$

On the other hand, the economic cost of the modified strategy is $x g_D T$, so writing $C^{(Tot)}$ and $\tilde{C}^{(Tot)}$ for the total costs of the original and modified strategies, we have

$$C^{(Tot)} - \tilde{C}^{(Tot)} = x^\theta \mathcal{R}_0 H'(\mathcal{R}_0) p_{IFR} V_L - x g_D T,$$

408 which is positive for small enough x .

409 A similar analysis shows that if we consider piecewise constant strategies, the optimal
410 strategy X_t satisfies $X_t > 0$ in any time period in which the initial number of infected is
411 greater than zero.

412 References

- 413 Anderson, S.C. et al. (2020). “Estimating the impact of COVID-19 control measures using
414 a Bayesian model of physical distancing”. In: *medRxiv*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20070086>.
415
- 416 BC Centre for Disease Control (2020). *Surveillance Report July 30, 2020*. URL: https://www.bccdc.ca/Health-Info-Site/Documents/BC_Surveillance_Summary_July_30_2020.pdf (visited on 07/30/2020).
417
- 418 BC Coroners Service (2020). *Illicit Drug Toxicity January 1, 2010 - June 30, 2020*. URL: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/birth-adoption-death-marriage-and-divorce/> (visited on 07/16/2020).
419
- 420 Bodas, M. and K. Peleg (2020). “Self-isolation compliance in the COVID-19 era influenced
421 by compensation: Findings from a recent survey in Israel”. In: *Health Affairs* 39.6,
422 pp. 936–941.
423
- 424 Dayal, D. et al. (2020). “Missing during COVID-19 lockdown: Children with onset of
425 type 1 diabetes”. In: *Acta Paediatrica*. DOI: 10.1111/apa.15443. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/apa.15443>.
426
- 427 DiGiovanni, C. et al. (2004). “Factors influencing compliance with quarantine in Toronto
428 during the 2003 SARS outbreak”. In: *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism - Biodefense Strat-
429 egy Practice and Science* 2.4, pp. 265–272.
430

- 431 Dionne, G. and P. Lanoie (2002). *How to make a public choice about the value of a*
432 *statistical life: The case of road safety*. Tech. rep. Risk Management Chair Working
433 Paper Series No. 02-02. HEC Montreal. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.](http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.351700)
434 [351700](http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.351700). URL: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=351700>.
- 435 — (2004). “How to make a public choice about the value of a statistical life: The case of
436 road safety”. In: *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 38.4, pp. 247–274.
- 437 Ebrahimi, O.V., A. Hoffart, and S.U. Johnson (2020). “The mental health impact of
438 non-pharmacological interventions aimed at impending viral transmission during the
439 COVID-19 pandemic in a general adult population and the factors associated with
440 adherence to these mitigation strategies”. In: preprint. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/kjzsp)
441 [31234/osf.io/kjzsp](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/kjzsp).
- 442 Erken, H. et al. (2020). *Looking beyond the COVID-19 crisis*. Tech. rep. Special, April 30.
443 Rabobank. URL: [https://economics.rabobank.com/publications/2020/april/](https://economics.rabobank.com/publications/2020/april/looking-beyond-the-covid-19-crisis/)
444 [looking-beyond-the-covid-19-crisis/](https://economics.rabobank.com/publications/2020/april/looking-beyond-the-covid-19-crisis/).
- 445 Firth, J.A. et al. (2020). “Using a real-world network to model localized COVID-19 control
446 strategies”. In: *Nature Medicine* 26.10, pp. 1151–1160.
- 447 Garibaldi, P., E.R.Moen, and C.A. Pissarides (2020). “Modelling contacts and transitions
448 in the SIR epidemics model”. In: *CEPR press Covid Economics*.5. URL: [https://](https://www.carloalberto.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/garibaldi.pdf)
449 www.carloalberto.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/garibaldi.pdf.
- 450 Gaudreault, S. (July 1, 2020). *How many Canadian businesses are at risk of permanently*
451 *closing due to COVID-19?* Tech. rep. Research Snapshot. URL: [https://www.cfib-](https://www.cfib-fcei.ca/sites/default/files/2020-07/research-snapshot-businesses-at-risk-of-closing.pdf)
452 [fcei.ca/sites/default/files/2020-07/research-snapshot-businesses-at-](https://www.cfib-fcei.ca/sites/default/files/2020-07/research-snapshot-businesses-at-risk-of-closing.pdf)
453 [risk-of-closing.pdf](https://www.cfib-fcei.ca/sites/default/files/2020-07/research-snapshot-businesses-at-risk-of-closing.pdf).
- 454 Grasley, R. et al. (2020). *Tracking the coronavirus*. Date accessed: 2020-11-01. URL: [https:](https://newsinteractives.cbc.ca/coronavirustracker/)
455 [//newsinteractives.cbc.ca/coronavirustracker/](https://newsinteractives.cbc.ca/coronavirustracker/).
- 456 Greenstone, M. and V. Nigam (Mar. 2020). *Does social distancing matter?* Tech. rep.
457 Working paper 2020-26. University of Chicago: Becker Friedman Institute. URL:
458 https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3561244.
- 459 Haberman, M. and D.E. Senger (Mar. 2020). “Trump says coronavirus cure cannot ’be
460 worse than the problem itself’”. In: *New York Times*. URL: [https://www.nytimes.](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/23/us/politics/trump-coronavirus-restrictions.html)
461 [com/2020/03/23/us/politics/trump-coronavirus-restrictions.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/23/us/politics/trump-coronavirus-restrictions.html).
- 462 Hyland, P. et al. (2020). “Anxiety and depression in the Republic of Ireland during the
463 COVID-19 pandemic”. In: *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. DOI: 10.1111/acps.13219.
- 464 Infoline (2020a). *Gross Domestic Product*. Tech. rep. 20-99. Province of British Columbia.
465 URL: [https://ww2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/infoline/](https://ww2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/infoline/infoline-2020/20-99-gdp)
466 [infoline-2020/20-99-gdp](https://ww2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/infoline/infoline-2020/20-99-gdp).
- 467 — (2020b). *Gross Domestic Product*. Tech. rep. 20-145. Province of British Columbia.
468 URL: [https://ww2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/infoline/](https://ww2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/infoline/infoline-2020/20-145-gdp)
469 [infoline-2020/20-145-gdp](https://ww2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/infoline/infoline-2020/20-145-gdp).
- 470 Jones, N. (2020). “INFOGRAPHICS: How BC’s Medical Resources Stack Up”. In: *The*
471 *Tyee (with Hakai Magazine)*. URL: [https://thetyee.ca/News/2020/04/02/COVID-](https://thetyee.ca/News/2020/04/02/COVID-BC-Hospitals-Mapped/)
472 [BC-Hospitals-Mapped/](https://thetyee.ca/News/2020/04/02/COVID-BC-Hospitals-Mapped/). (visited on 05/13/2020).
- 473 Katz, J., A. Goodnough, and M. Sanger-Katz (2020). “In shadow of pandemic, U.S. drug
474 overdose deaths resurge to record”. In: *The New York Times*. URL: <https://www>.

- 475 [nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/15/upshot/drug-overdose-deaths.html](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/15/upshot/drug-overdose-deaths.html)
476 (visited on 07/15/2020).
- 477 Keogh-Brown, M. et al. (2009). *The possible macroeconomic impact on the UK of an*
478 *influenza pandemic*. Tech. rep. ISSN 1471-0498. Department of Economics, University
479 of Oxford.
- 480 Kucharski, A.J. et al. (2020). “Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and
481 physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a
482 mathematical modeling study”. In: *Lancet Infectious Diseases* 20.10, pp. 1151–1160.
- 483 Lazzarini, M. et al. (2020). “Delayed access or provision of care in Italy resulting from
484 fear of COVID-19”. In: *Lancet* 4.5, e10–e11. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30108-5)
485 [4642\(20\)30108-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30108-5).
- 486 Lechner, W.V. et al. (2020). “Changes in alcohol use as a function of psychological dis-
487 tress and social support following COVID-19 related university closings”. In: *Addictive*
488 *Behaviours* 110.106527. DOI: [10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106527](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106527).
- 489 Lee, A. et al. (n.d.). “Should countries aim for elimination in the covid-19 pandemic?” In:
490 *British Medical Journal* 370.m3410 (). DOI: [10.1136/bmj.m3401](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3401).
- 491 Lowe, S.R. et al. (2019). “Posttraumatic stress and depression in the aftermath of envi-
492 ronmental disasters: A review of quantitative studies published in 2018”. In: *Current*
493 *Environmental Health Reports* 6.4, pp. 344–360.
- 494 Mandel, A. and V.P. Veetil (2020). “The economic cost of COVID lockdowns: An out-of-
495 equilibrium analysis”. In: *SSRN: Economics of Disasters and Climate Change*. DOI:
496 [10.1007/s41885-020-00066-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s41885-020-00066-z).
- 497 Mandl, C. and L. Benassatto (July 2020). “Brazil’s Bolsonaro says coronavirus restrictions
498 kill economy”. In: *Reuters*. URL: [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-brazil-idUSKCN24J0V8)
499 [coronavirus-brazil-idUSKCN24J0V8](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-brazil-idUSKCN24J0V8) (visited on 07/18/2020).
- 500 Marikina, M. (2018). “Gross domestic product or gross national happiness - which is
501 the better alternative for economic development?” In: *XVIII International Social*
502 *Congress*. International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development.
503 Varazdin Development and Entrepreneurship Agency, pp. 188–193.
- 504 Marino, Simeone et al. (2008). “A methodology for performing global uncertainty and sen-
505 sitivity analysis in systems biology”. In: *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 254.1, pp. 178–
506 196. ISSN: 0022-5193. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.04.011>.
- 507 Martcheva, M. (2015). *An Introduction to Mathematical Epidemiology*. Vol. 61. Texts in
508 Applied Mathematics. Boston MA: Springer.
- 509 Maynes, C. (Oct. 2020). “Russia’s Putin says no to lockdown despite spiking COVID
510 cases”. In: *VOA*. URL: [https://www.voanews.com/europe/russias-putin-says-](https://www.voanews.com/europe/russias-putin-says-no-lockdown-despite-spiking-covid-cases)
511 [no-lockdown-despite-spiking-covid-cases](https://www.voanews.com/europe/russias-putin-says-no-lockdown-despite-spiking-covid-cases) (visited on 10/29/2020).
- 512 McCusker, K. and K. Tindale (July 29, 2020). “One in seven small Canadian busi-
513 nesses risk closure during COVID-19 pandemic: survey”. In: URL: [https://www.](https://www.citynews1130.com/2020/07/29/cfib-small-business-closure/)
514 [citynews1130.com/2020/07/29/cfib-small-business-closure/](https://www.citynews1130.com/2020/07/29/cfib-small-business-closure/) (visited on
515 08/24/2020).
- 516 Miles, D., M. Stedman, and A. Heald (2020). “Living with COVID-19: Balancing costs
517 against benefits in the face of the virus”. In: *National Institute Economic Review* 253,
518 R60–R76. DOI: [10.1017/nie.2020.30](https://doi.org/10.1017/nie.2020.30).

- 519 Miller, A. and A. Zafar (Nov. 2020). “Why rollout of COVID-19 vaccine could be ”the
520 most difficult part” in Canada”. In: *CBC news*. URL: [https://www.cbc.ca/news/
521 health/coronavirus-canada-covid-19-vaccine-rollout-1.5797082](https://www.cbc.ca/news/health/coronavirus-canada-covid-19-vaccine-rollout-1.5797082) (visited on
522 11/11/2020).
- 523 Mock, W.B.T. (2011). “Pareto optimality”. In: *Encyclopedia of Global Justice*. Ed. by
524 D.K. Chatterjee. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-9160-5_341.
- 525 Moosa, I.A. (2020). “The effectiveness of social distancing in containing Covid-19”. In:
526 *Applied Economics*. DOI: 10.1080/00036846.2020.1789061.
- 527 National Institute of Health (USA) (Oct. 2020). *COVID-19 treatment guidelines: Thera-
528 peutic management of patients with COVID-19*. URL: [https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.
529 hin.gov/therapeutic-management](https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.hin.gov/therapeutic-management) (visited on 10/09/2020).
- 530 North, C.S. and B. Pfefferbaum (2013). “Mental health response to community disasters:
531 A systematic review”. In: *Journal of the American Medical Association* 310.5, pp. 507–
532 518.
- 533 PHAC Emerging Sciences (July 13, 2020). *COVID-19 Epidemiological and Modelling Pa-
534 rameters Report*. Tech. rep. Report available upon request: [phac.emergingsciencessecretariat-
535 secretariatdessciencesemergentes.aspc@canada.ca](mailto:phac.emergingsciencessecretariat-secretariatdessciencesemergentes.aspc@canada.ca). Public Health Agency of Canada.
- 536 Salje, H. et al. (2020). “Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France”. In: *Science*
537 369, pp. 208–211.
- 538 Solis, E. et al. (May 21, 2020). “Delayed emergency surgical presentation: impact of corona
539 virus disease (COVID-19) on non-COVID patients”. In: *ANZ Journal of Surgery*. DOI:
540 10.1111/ans.16048.
- 541 Statistics Canada (2020). *Table 17-10-0009-01 Population estimates, quarterly*. DOI: 10.
542 25318/1710000901-eng.
- 543 — (n.d.). *Table 36-10-0434-02 Gross domestic product (GDP) at basic prices, by industry,
544 monthly, growth rates (x 1,000,000)*. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25318/3610043401-
545 eng](https://doi.org/10.25318/3610043401-eng).
- 546 Stewart, G., K. Van Heusden, and G.A. Dumont (2020). “How control theory can help us
547 control COVID-19”. In: *IEEE Spectrum* 57.6, pp. 22–26. URL: [https://spectrum.
548 ieee.org/biomedical/diagnostics/how-control-theory-can-help-control-
549 covid19](https://spectrum.ieee.org/biomedical/diagnostics/how-control-theory-can-help-control-covid19).
- 550 Thunström, L. et al. (2020). “The benefits and costs of using social distancing to flatten
551 the curve for COVID-19”. In: *Journal of Benefit Cost Analysis* 11.2, pp. 179–195. DOI:
552 <https://doi.org/10.1017/bca.2020.12>.
- 553 Van Rheenen, T.E. et al. (2020). “Mental health status of individuals with a mood-
554 disorder during the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia: Initial results from the COL-
555 LATE project”. In: *Journal of Affective Disorders* 275, pp. 69–77. DOI: 10.1016/j.
556 jad.2020.06.037.
- 557 Vinkers, C.H. et al. (2020). “Stress reliance during the coronavirus pandemic”. In: *Euro-
558 pean Neuropsychopharmacology* 35, pp. 12–16.
- 559 Wikipedia (2020). *COVID-19 pandemic lockdowns*. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/
560 wiki/COVID-19_pandemic_lockdowns](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19_pandemic_lockdowns) (visited on 10/27/2020).
- 561 World Health Organisation (2018). *Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard*. Date
562 accessed: 2020-11-01. URL: <https://covid19.who.int/>.

563 Zussman, R. (2020). “B.C. overdoes deaths hit record high for second consecutive month”.
564 In: *Global News* (). URL: [https://globalnews.ca/news/7184850/bc-overdose-](https://globalnews.ca/news/7184850/bc-overdose-numbers-record-june-2020/)
565 [numbers-record-june-2020/](https://globalnews.ca/news/7184850/bc-overdose-numbers-record-june-2020/) (visited on 07/16/2020).

566 MB: Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia,
567 Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2, Canada (barlow@math.ubc.ca)

568 NM: Dept of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, 805 Sherbrooke St. West,
569 Montreal, Quebec H3A 0B9, Canada (noah.marshall2@mail.mcgill.ca)

570 RT: CMPS Department, University of British Columbia Okanagan,
571 1177 Research Rd, Kelowna, BC V1V 1V7, Canada