

When might Host Heterogeneity Drive the Evolution of Asymptomatic, Pandemic Coronaviruses?

Kenichi W. Okamoto†★, Virakbott Ong†, Robert Wallace ★,

Rodrick Wallace ♣, Luis Fernando Chaves‡

†*Department of Biology*

University of St. Thomas, St. Paul MN 55105 USA

★ *Agroecology and Rural Economics Research Corps, St. Paul MN USA*

♣ *New York State Psychiatric Institute, NYC, NY USA*

‡*Institute of Tropical Medicine, Nagasaki University, Nagasaki, 852-8521 Japan and
Instituto Costarricense de Investigación y Enseñanza en Nutrición y Salud, San José, Costa Rica*

December 16, 2020

Abstract

For most emerging infectious diseases, including SARS-Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), pharmaceutical interventions such as drugs and vaccines are not widely available, and disease surveillance followed by isolating, contact-tracing and quarantining infectious individuals is critical for controlling outbreaks. These interventions often begin by identifying symptomatic individuals. However, by actively removing pathogen strains likely to be symptomatic, such interventions may inadvertently select for strains less likely to result in symptomatic infections. Additionally, the pathogen's fitness landscape is structured around a heterogeneous host pool. In particular, uneven surveillance efforts and distinct transmission risks across host classes can drastically alter selection pressures. Here we explore this interplay between evolution caused by disease control efforts, on the one hand, and host heterogeneity in the efficacy of public health interventions on the other, on the potential for a less symptomatic, but widespread, pathogen to evolve. We use an evolutionary epidemiology model parameterized for SARS-CoV-2, as the widespread potential for silent transmission by asymptomatic hosts has been hypothesized to account, in part, for its rapid global spread. We show that relying on symptoms-driven reporting for disease control ultimately shifts the pathogen's fitness landscape and can cause pandemics. We find such outcomes result when isolation and quarantine efforts are intense, but insufficient for suppression. We further show that when host removal depends on the prevalence of symptomatic infections, intense isolation efforts can select for the emergence and extensive spread of more asymptomatic strains. The severity of selection pressure on pathogens caused by these interventions likely lies somewhere between the extremes of no intervention and thoroughly successful eradication. Identifying the levels of public health responses that facilitate selection for asymptomatic pathogen strains is therefore critical for calibrating disease suppression and surveillance efforts and for sustainably managing emerging infectious diseases.

1 Introduction

2 Epidemiologically, the 2020 SARS-Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic differs markedly
3 from the 2003 SARS-Coronavirus-1 (SARS-CoV-1) outbreak. In particular, the global scale
4 and incidence of the 2020 pandemic stands in sharp contrast with the largely regional scale
5 of the 2003 SARS epidemic (e.g., Chen et al. 2020b; Mahase 2020; Petersen et al. 2020; Prem
6 et al. 2020; Xu et al. 2020). While the underlying pathogens and human host populations in
7 which the outbreak occurred differ along several biological and social axes, one of the major
8 differences has been the degree to which individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 are unlikely to
9 present symptoms (Nishiura et al. 2020; Mizumoto et al. 2020; Oran and Topol 2020; but see Lee
10 et al. 2003). This results in fewer cases being detected, and a higher proportion of unwittingly
11 infectious carriers circulating in the population. The large fraction of asymptomatic hosts there-
12 fore presents a major epidemiological challenge when facing pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2
13 (Rahimi and Talebi Bezmin Abadi 2020; Lai et al. 2020; Wilder-Smith et al. 2020).

14 Simultaneously, the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic of 2020 has reinforced the centrality of non-
15 pharmaceutical interventions to suppress and mitigate outbreaks of emerging zoonotic pathogens
16 (Cheng et al. 2020; Davies et al. 2020). Most emerging zoonotic pathogens such as coronaviruses
17 lack well-tested, widely and immediately available pharmaceutical interventions, especially as
18 many veterinary pharmaceuticals remain untested for human use (Qualls et al. 2017; Bird and
19 Mazet 2018). Thus, the selection pressures these pathogens experience from public health in-
20 terventions have the potential to be very different from the selection pressures operating on
21 endemic pathogens. For instance, with the important exception of vector-borne diseases, an
22 endemic pathogen’s evolutionary responses to control strategies typically result from interven-
23 tions on the primary (often human) host. By contrast, emerging zoonotic pathogens must
24 evolve within a fitness landscape characterized mainly by host heterogeneity.

25 From the perspective of pathogen evolution, a major consequence of host heterogeneity is
26 that the intensity of non-pharmaceutical intervention efforts likely differs across host classes. For
27 instance, disease surveillance efforts among human populations far outpaces efforts in animal,
28 an especially sylvatic, populations (e.g., Keusch et al. 2010; Halliday et al. 2017). As a result,
29 the fitness consequences of public health interventions on pathogens are likely to be experienced

30 differently by pathogens infecting different host types.

31 Even after zoonotic transmission, host heterogeneity among humans can continue to define
32 the fitness landscape of pathogens (Lo Iacono et al. 2016). For instance, social differences can
33 be a major driver of host heterogeneity in zoonotic disease risk (Dzingirai et al. 2017a,b; Leach
34 et al. 2017). Economic disparities in particular are likely to result not only in distinct transmis-
35 sion and infection risks among hosts, but also in variable public health responses (Levins 1995;
36 Kawachi and Kennedy 1999; Navarro and Shi 2001; Szreter and Woolcock 2004; Wallace et al.
37 2015). The lack of pharmaceutical interventions, and the heavy reliance on public institutions
38 for disease control may exacerbate existing disparities (Marmot 2005; Waitzkin 2018; Stojkoski
39 et al. 2020). This is because non-pharmaceutical interventions, ranging from highly targeted
40 case-detection and expansive contact-tracing to population-wide guidelines on physical distanc-
41 ing to broad-scale shutdowns, require both a robust public health infrastructure and high social
42 and economic development to implement successfully (Farmer 1996; Jamison DT, Breman JG,
43 Measham AR, et al. 2006; Garrett 2007; Jones et al. 2008; Dye 2014; Whitmee et al. 2015;
44 National Research Council 2016; Birn, Anne-Emanuelle and Holtz 2017; Halliday et al. 2017;
45 Wood et al. 2017; Lim and Sziarto 2020). At its best, disease control relying on isolating and
46 tracking severe cases can ensure that limited public health resources are optimally allocated
47 to reducing transmission (Eames and Keeling 2003; Klinkenberg et al. 2006; Armbruster and
48 Brandeau 2010; Rodrigues et al. 2014; Peak et al. 2017). By July 2020, these policies proved
49 tentatively effective in suppressing SARS-CoV-2 in some cases when carried out with precision,
50 multi-sector societal collaboration and adequate financial and operational support (Lu et al.
51 2020; Cheng et al. 2020; Watson et al. 2020; Chaves et al. 2020; World Health Organization
52 2020). By contrast, several jurisdictions have also struggled to contain the outbreak (Campbell
53 and Doshi 2020; Solis et al. 2020; World Health Organization 2020).

54 Yet we argue that even under generally favorable conditions, intervention measures that fall
55 short of disease eradication could allow strains that are able to circulate with minimal host re-
56 moval to readily outcompete strains that cause their hosts to be detected. When asymptomatic
57 carriers are not detected by the epidemiological monitoring system, the pathogens they har-
58 bor are able to spread with less friction through the host population. By contrast, potentially
59 symptomatic lineages are subject to detection and even asymptomatic, exposed contacts are

60 quarantined, thereby pruning that particular viral lineage. We wish to be clear. Our goal here
61 is not to argue against the value of case detection at the point of care and subsequent, vigorous
62 contact tracing. Rather, our point is that symptoms-based surveillance is a necessary, but,
63 from an evolutionary perspective, potentially insufficient component of a robust public health
64 strategy aimed at preventing disease emergence. Furthermore, the adequacy of any broad-scale
65 non-pharmaceutical intervention is likely to be compromised by differential attention and re-
66 sources aimed at different host groups - be they sylvatic or human, economically prosperous
67 or neglected, or otherwise. If reducing disease burden is a long-term objective, localized con-
68 tainment, particularly if it is haphazardly implemented across host classes, may prove to be
69 evolutionarily unsustainable.

70 We interrogate this possibility using a mathematical model of a population of hosts in which
71 multiple coronavirus strains, some more symptomatic than others, circulate. Superficially,
72 selection for a largely asymptomatic strain may seem like a tolerable epidemiological outcome.
73 However, we argue that high prevalence of undetected infections is a major reason for why host
74 heterogeneity is important. As the 2020 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic cruelly illustrates, widespread
75 circulation of a generally asymptomatic pathogen raises risks for vulnerable host subpopulations
76 in which the infection is unlikely to be mild (Borjas 2020; Lippi et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2020a; Wu
77 et al. 2020; Li et al. 2020), and there is growing evidence of differences among host populations
78 driving the efficacy of public health interventions and transmission risks (Abedi et al. 2020;
79 Stojkoski et al. 2020; Vahidy et al. 2020). Hence, we model the evolutionary dynamics of
80 multiple strains of a pathogen circulating among heterogeneous hosts consisting of two host
81 types: hosts vulnerable to infections and experiencing limited public health attention, and
82 hosts less likely to be infected and experiencing greater public health attention. Because host
83 heterogeneity plays a critical role in structuring the fitness landscapes of emerging zoonotic
84 pathogens, we seek to elucidate how such heterogeneity interacts with the selective effects of
85 non-pharmaceutical intervention strategies on pathogen evolution, particularly as it concerns
86 selection for disease severity. Below, we present the structure of our model and our analyses.

87 **Materials and Methods**

88 **Model development**

89 We consider a pathogen circulating within a heterogeneous host population. The host popu-
90 lation consists of two main host classes: vulnerable hosts, which experience potentially higher
91 disease transmission but are also potentially less likely to be subject to disease surveillance,
92 and resilient hosts, who have reduced infection risk and are potentially likelier to be the target
93 of disease surveillance. We focus our analyses on the case where the individual transition of
94 hosts between the two host classes over the course of their lifetime is negligible (as may occur,
95 for instance, with limited socioeconomic mobility) or nonexistent (as in the case of sylvatic and
96 human hosts).

97 **A Baseline Model without Interventions**

98 We assume that transmission is frequency-dependent. Thus, if a susceptible host of type h en-
99 counters infectious hosts of type h' , pathogen transmission occurs at a per-capita rate $\beta r_{h,h'}/N$,
100 where N is the density of all susceptible and infectious hosts, β is the baseline per-capita infec-
101 tion rate, and $r_{h,h'}$ describes the extent of mixing between hosts h and h' . Following infection,
102 we assume individuals of host type h infected with strain j become asymptomatic with strain-
103 specific probability $\pi_{j,h,A}$. During infection, strain i may emerge via mutation, and subsequently
104 out-compete strain j within a host at a per-infected individual rate $\mu_{j \rightarrow i}$ (e.g., Saloniemi 1993;
105 Bohannan and Lenski 2000; Rice 2004). For brevity, we refer to this process by which an in-
106 fected individual of strain j undergoes a within-host replacement by strain i as “mutation”.
107 Furthermore, because of the relatively low case fatality rate of SARS-CoV-2 (e.g., Russell et al.
108 2020; Mizumoto and Chowell 2020), we consider infection-induced mortality to have minimal
109 epidemiological effects over the time scales of interest. Similarly, the incubation period is treated
110 as being sufficiently short to not affect evolutionary trajectories.

111 Finally, infectious individuals recover from the infection at rate γ . In the absence of evidence
112 of antagonistic pleiotropy, we treat this rate as consistent across strains. Furthermore, for
113 SARS-coronaviruses, there is as yet no robust, widely available vaccine and limited evidence of
114 lifelong immunity (Galanti and Shaman 2020; Kellam and Barclay 2020; Edridge et al. 2020).

115 Should these conditions change, we think our model will remain relevant as coronaviruses are
 116 subject to repeated and regular zoonotic emergences and re-emergences (e.g., Lee and Hsueh
 117 2020) for which there is unlikely to be pre-existing immunity. Thus, we consider the period of
 118 complete immunity over evolutionary-epidemiological timescales to be relatively short, at least
 119 as it concerns the evolutionary dynamics of symptomatic and less-symptomatic strains.

120 Taking all of the above into consideration, in the absence of any public-health interventions
 121 (pharmaceutical or otherwise), the resulting evolutionary epidemiology can be summarized as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS_h}{dt} &= -\frac{\sum_{j=1}^J \beta \sum_{h'=1}^H r_{h,h'}(I_{h',\sigma,j} + aI_{h',a,j})}{N} S_h + \gamma \sum_j^J (I_{h,j,\sigma} + I_{h,j,A}) \\
 \frac{dI_{h,j,A}}{dt} &= \pi_{h,j,A} \frac{\beta \sum_{h'=1}^H r_{h,h'}(I_{h',\sigma,j} + aI_{h',a,j})}{N} S_h - \sum_{i \neq j}^J \mu_{j \rightarrow i} I_{h,j,A} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j}^J \pi_{h,j,A} \mu_{i \rightarrow j} (I_{h,i,A} + I_{h,i,\sigma}) - \gamma I_{h,j,A} \\
 \frac{dI_{h,j,\sigma}}{dt} &= (1 - \pi_{h,j,A}) \frac{\beta \sum_{h'=1}^H r_{h,h'}(I_{h',\sigma,j} + aI_{h',a,j})}{N} S_h - \sum_{i \neq j}^J \mu_{j \rightarrow i} I_{h,j,\sigma} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j}^J (1 - \pi_{h,j,A}) \mu_{i \rightarrow j} (I_{h,i,A} + I_{h,i,\sigma}) - \gamma I_{h,j,\sigma}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

122 Table 1 summarizes the parameter values of model (1).

Table 1

Variable	Interpretation	Range	Notes
S_h	Density of hosts of type h	-	-
$I_{h,j,A}$	Density of hosts of type h infectious, asymptomatic with viral strain j	-	-
$I_{h,j,\sigma}$	Density of hosts of type h infectious, symptomatic with viral strain j	-	-
N	Total density of susceptible and infectious hosts	-	-
β	Baseline per-capita infection risk	0.085 $\cdot \text{host}^{-1} \text{time}^{-1}$	Chaves et al. 2020
$r_{h,h'}$	Constant of proportionality describing interactions leading to pathogen transmission to hosts of type h from hosts of type h'	0.01-100	Systematically varied
a	Relative infectiousness of asymptomatic, infectious hosts	0.1	Ferretti et al. 2020; Moghadas et al. 2020
$\pi_{h,j,A}$	Probability that an infection of host type h by viral strain j becomes asymptomatic	0.075 - 0.975	For lower bound, Wilder-Smith et al. 2005; otherwise, systematically varied
$\mu_{j \rightarrow i}$	Within-host replacement rate of strain j to strain i	$10^{-6} \cdot \text{time}^{-1}$	Okamoto et al. 2019
γ	Per-capita recovery rate	$0.033 \cdot \text{time}^{-1}$	Chaves et al. 2020

123

124 Table 1. Variables for the baseline model without any interventions.

125 The effect of public health interventions

126 To model the effect of public health interventions as well as their potential unequal application
 127 across host classes on the evolution of viral phenotypes, we focus on two types of interventions
 128 currently used. First, we assume that symptomatic individuals can be successfully identified
 129 and isolated at a potentially time-varying, per-capita rate $\theta_{h,j}(t)$ that depends on the host
 130 type h and the strain type j with which they are infected. Symptomatic individuals that are

131 isolated are removed from the population of infectious hosts. Because isolated hosts eventually
132 recirculate in the population after recovery, the density of isolated hosts is denoted by $K_{h,j}$ for
133 isolated hosts of type h infectious with strain j .

134 Second, we model the effect of subsequent contact tracing and testing aimed at identifying
135 asymptomatic carriers. We assume that this contact tracing and testing can identify infected,
136 asymptomatic hosts of type h infected with strain j at a potentially time-varying, per-capita
137 rate $q_{h,j}(t)$. Once asymptomatic carriers are identified through contact tracing and testing, they
138 are also removed from the population of infectious hosts. As with isolated, symptomatic hosts,
139 these asymptomatic cases are ultimately returned to the population after the infection clears,
140 so we track the density $Q_{h,j}$ of successfully removed, asymptomatic hosts of type h carrying
141 strain j . To distinguish the removal of asymptomatic and symptomatic hosts, we refer to the
142 removal of asymptomatic hosts following contact tracing and testing as “quarantining”, and the
143 removal of symptomatic hosts as “isolation”. We use v_q, v_θ to describe the relative difference in
144 quarantining and isolation efficacy between the two strains ($q_{h,j}(t)/q_{h,j'}(t)$ and $\theta_{h,j}(t)/\theta_{h,j'}(t)$,
145 respectively). Successfully quarantined or isolated hosts do not come into contact with suscep-
146 tible and infectious individuals; thus, their densities do not contribute to N , which, as noted
147 above, we define as the sum of infectious and susceptible hosts. We further treat the testing
148 regime during the decision to isolate or quarantine as sufficiently effective (e.g., Yates et al.
149 2020; Watson et al. 2020) that the accidental removal of uninfected hosts (i.e., false positives)
150 is negligible.

151 Successfully isolated or quarantined hosts recover at an accelerated rate δ that represents,
152 for instance, the effects of administering antiviral drugs (Wang et al. 2020) or the successful
153 management of symptoms (Horby et al. 2020). Because asymptomatic individuals may, po-
154 tentially, be subject to ongoing monitoring, we treat the enhanced per-capita recovery rate
155 of quarantined individuals as comparable to the enhanced per-capita recovery rate of isolated
156 individuals.

157 The combined eco-evolutionary dynamics of the interacting hosts and pathogens in the
158 presence of a public health response are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS_h}{dt} &= -\frac{\beta \sum_{h'=1}^H r_{h,h'} \sum_{j=1}^J I_{h',j}}{N} S_h + \gamma \sum_j (I_{h,j,\sigma} + I_{h,j,A} + \delta \sum_j (Q_{h,j} + K_{h,j})) \\
 \frac{dI_{h,j,A}}{dt} &= \pi_{h,j,A} \frac{\beta \sum_{h'=1}^H r_{h,h'} I_{h',j}}{N} S_h - \sum_{j \neq i} \mu_{j \rightarrow i} I_{h,j,A} - \mathbf{q}_{h,j}(\mathbf{t}) I_{h,j,A} - \gamma I_{h,j,A} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j \neq i} \pi_{h,j,A} \mu_{i \rightarrow j} (I_{h,i,A} + I_{h,i,\sigma}) \\
 \frac{dI_{h,j,\sigma}}{dt} &= (1 - \pi_{h,j,A}) \frac{\beta \sum_{h'=1}^H r_{h,h'} I_{h',j}}{N} S_h - \sum_{i \neq j} \mu_{j \rightarrow i} I_{h,j,\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h,j}(\mathbf{t}) I_{h,j,\sigma} - \gamma I_{h,j,\sigma} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} (1 - \pi_{h,j,A}) \mu_{i \rightarrow j} (I_{h,i,A} + I_{h,i,\sigma}) \\
 \frac{dQ_{h,j}}{dt} &= q_{h,j}(\mathbf{t}) I_{h,j,A} - \delta \gamma Q_{h,j} \\
 \frac{dK_{h,j}}{dt} &= \theta_{h,j}(\mathbf{t}) I_{h,j,\sigma} - \delta \gamma K_{h,j}
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

159 for pathogen strains $j = 1, \dots, J$ and host types $h = 1, \dots, H$. We highlight two further points re-
 160 garding model (2). First, because successfully quarantined and isolated hosts do not contribute
 161 to onward pathogen transmission, we ignore mutation dynamics within successfully isolated or
 162 quarantined hosts as those viral mutants cannot spread further. Second, we do not model the
 163 effects of public health policies that aim to reduce the supply of susceptible hosts (e.g., mass
 164 lock-downs, culling, etc...). This is because we seek to model how interventions based on surveil-
 165 lance in the pre-pandemic stage select for different pathogen strains. Thus, here we concern
 166 ourselves with evolution that occurs before large-scale public health interventions reducing the
 167 density of susceptibles become necessary. Nevertheless, we hasten to add that our model does
 168 allow for public health measures aimed at transmission reduction (e.g., by providing access to
 169 personal protective equipment): the composite term $\beta_{j,h} r_{h,h'}$ governing transmission is able to
 170 account for such effects. Table 2 summarizes the key parameters added to model (1) in model
 171 (2).

Table 2

Variable	Interpretation	Range
$Q_{h,j}$	Density of quarantined hosts of type h infected with viral strain j	-
$K_{h,j}$	Density of isolated hosts of type h infected with viral strain j	-
$q_{h,j}(t)$	The efficacy of quarantining asymptomatic infections of hosts of type h by viruses of type j	0.0001-1
$\theta_{h,j}(t)$	The efficacy of isolating asymptomatic infections of hosts of type h by viruses of type j	0.0001-1
v	The relative ability to successfully identify and remove symptomatic and asymptomatic infections involving the novel virus	0.0001-1
δ	The accelerated recovery of quarantined or isolated hosts	0.05-0.85

172

173 Table 2. Additional variables used to model public health interventions.

174 Model Analyses

175 We explore how public health interventions and differences between host classes drive the evolu-
 176 tionary emergence of asymptomatic strains of SARS-coronaviruses. We focus on two scenarios.
 177 We begin by examining the scenario where an ongoing, background surveillance effort leads to
 178 generally constant, host-class and virus-strain specific quarantining and isolation efforts over
 179 time (i.e., $q_{h,j}(t) \approx q_{h,j}$ and $\theta_h(t) \approx \theta_{h,j}$). We then assess the effects of reactive surveillance
 180 efforts, in which the quarantining and isolation efforts depend on the prevalence of symptomatic
 181 infections $P_\sigma(t) = \frac{1}{N(t)} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{h=1}^H I_{h,j,\sigma}(t)$. Because infection prevalence is time-varying, under
 182 this scenario, $q_{h,j}(t) = q_{h,j}P(t)$ and $\theta_{h,j}(t) = \theta_{h,j}P(t)$. We assume that, over the evolution-
 183 ary timescales we consider, the ability of public health responses to respond to prevalence is
 184 effectively instantaneous.

185 Because of the high-dimensionality of model (2), we focus our analyses on numerical ex-

186 plorations; even the relatively simpler baseline model (1) did not lend itself to ready algebraic
187 or analytic characterization. Tables 1-2 summarize the numerical range of parameter values
188 used. Additionally, to facilitate biological interpretation, we present results for two pathogen
189 strains - an ancestral strain and a novel, less-symptomatic strain, systematically varying the
190 extent to which infection by the novel strain is likely to be asymptomatic. All numerical anal-
191 yses are conducted using the function `lsoda` from the package `deSolve` in R (Soetaert et al.
192 2010), with absolute error tolerance set at 10^{-50} . We initialized our analyses with a total
193 host population density of 10^6 individuals per unit area, with a ten-to-one ratio of vulnera-
194 ble to resilient hosts. Epidemics in all analyses are seeded with a single infectious individual
195 with the ancestral, symptomatic strain. All code used in the analysis is accessible on github
196 (<https://github.com/kewok/AsymptomaticEvolution>) and is released under the GNU Pub-
197 lic License v3 (Stallman 2007).

198 Results

199 We highlight results showing how the efficacy of public health interventions and their hetero-
200 geneous application to distinct host classes drives the evolution and spread of asymptomatic
201 coronaviruses. In the context of public health, the prevalence of infection by the novel strain is
202 of greater concern than the frequency of the asymptomatic virus in the viral population *per se*.
203 Thus, we illustrate our results using the long-term prevalence of hosts infected with the evolved,
204 asymptomatic strain to characterize the joint evolutionary and epidemiological predictions. In
205 the comparisons that follow, we distinguish between a baseline isolation efficacy and a baseline
206 efficacy of contact-tracing followed by quarantining for the ancestral strain, and the effectiveness
207 of isolation and contact tracing followed by quarantining for the derived, more asymptomatic
208 strain. We also compare the effects of increased infection risk and reduced efficacy for the
209 vulnerable host class.

210 Scenario 1: Constant effort for public health interventions

211 When isolation and contact-tracing followed by quarantine (hereafter “quarantining”) are car-
212 ried out at a constant rate ($q_{h,j}(t) = q_{h,j}$ and $\theta_{h,j}(t) = \theta_{h,j}$), a wide range of qualitatively

213 distinct evolutionary outcomes result (Fig. 1). Generally, increasing isolation effort selects for
214 a novel strain to spread in the host population, until the isolation efficacy is sufficiently high
215 that disease control occurs before an asymptomatic mutant can evolve. Exceptions are Fig.
216 1J and scenarios resulting in complete suppression or prevalences of 100% across the entire
217 parameter space (not shown in Fig 1).

218 Across the parameter space we explore, a critical distinguishing feature among the range of
219 dynamical behaviors is whether the interaction between isolation and quarantine effort promotes
220 the evolution and spread of the novel, more asymptomatic virus. The evolutionary consequences
221 of isolation can, in some cases, occur largely irrespective of the quarantine effort (e.g., Figs. 1A,
222 1D, 1G, 1H, 1O). When quarantining also affects viral evolution and spread, we find increasing
223 quarantine efforts can have divergent effects. At times, increased removal of symptomatic hosts
224 selects for an asymptomatic strain, but this can be mitigated by more effective quarantining.
225 For instance, Figs. 1B-C, 1J-L and 1P show how even at levels of isolation effort selecting
226 for an asymptomatic strain, effective quarantining can mitigate the spread of the evolved virus
227 (cooler colors in upper regions of those panels). By contrast, Figs. 1E-F, 1I and 1M-N illustrate
228 the opposite effect: higher quarantining efforts interact with levels of isolation that select for
229 asymptomatic viruses to drive high prevalence. Even within the latter scenarios, the joint effects
230 of isolation and quarantining are not always consistent. For instance, Figs. 1E-1F and 1N show
231 how the interaction between high quarantine levels and isolation diminishes as isolation efficacy
232 increases.

233 Supplementary Tables S3 and S4 systematically group all the scenarios we analyzed into
234 each of these qualitative long-term patterns based on direct visual inspection of all parameter
235 combinations. Supplementary Table S3 categorizes the effects for the case where the two host
236 classes receive disparate public health intervention efforts; Supplementary Table S4 evaluates
237 the conditions when the two host classes receive comparable public health intervention efforts.

238 A comparison of scenarios in Supplementary Table S3 reveals how the ability to detect
239 asymptomatic cases can be a major driver of the distinctions highlighted above. Indeed, the
240 differing effects of increasing quarantine effort arise because, like isolation effort, it is ultimately
241 intermediate levels of quarantining that select for the emergence and spread of an asymptomatic
242 variant. In our model, the net quarantine effort for the novel virus is a composite of the ability

243 to detect asymptomatic hosts infected with either strain, and a baseline quarantine effort. Thus,
244 whether increasing quarantining selects for an asymptomatic virus critically depends upon the
245 ability to detect asymptomatic infections. Comparing Fig. 1C to Fig. 1F illustrates how an
246 ability to detect asymptomatic infections shifts the evolutionary effects of quarantining. When
247 the ability to detect asymptomatic infections is limited (Fig. 1F), higher quarantining efforts
248 promote the evolution and spread of an asymptomatic strain. Yet as the ability to detect
249 asymptomatic infections improves (Fig. 1C), increasing quarantining efforts can successfully
250 suppress the asymptomatic strain.

251 A further driver of the qualitative differences is the transmission risk for the resilient host
252 (Table S3). Because these hosts are likelier to be the target of strong public health interventions,
253 increased transmission in this host class can result in greater selection on the asymptomatic
254 strain, until sufficiently high isolation efforts in this host class facilitate successful disease sup-
255 pression. Supplementary Table S3 again illustrates how this outcome depends on whether there
256 is a reasonable prospect of identifying asymptomatic mutant infections.

257 Finally, in addition to public health interventions and host heterogeneities, the probability
258 ($\pi_{h,j,A}$) that infections from the evolved strain are asymptomatic also mediates the nature of how
259 quarantine and isolation effort interact to drive the evolution and spread of the asymptomatic
260 virus. For instance, when the ability to detect asymptomatic cases is low, as the evolved
261 virus becomes increasingly asymptomatic (particularly towards the resilient host), the effect of
262 increasing quarantine efforts changes from successful suppression to facilitating the evolution of
263 the asymptomatic strain at intermediate isolation efforts (Supplementary Table S3). This shift
264 occurs because strains that cause more asymptomatic infections are harder to suppress even
265 when quarantine efforts are high, whereas viruses less likely to cause asymptomatic infections
266 are more readily controlled by increasing quarantine efforts. Once more, we see how these effects
267 are magnified when the probability of being asymptomatic is high for resilient hosts, because
268 the resilient host is also likelier to be subject to increased isolation and quarantine efforts.

269 These results thusfar characterize the evolutionary and epidemiological consequences of
270 host heterogeneities in public health responses. When there is a more even application of
271 isolation and quarantining across host classes (so that $q_{h,j} = q_{h',j}$, $h \neq h'$), a somewhat different
272 pattern emerges. In general, we find that more uniformity in transmission risk and isolation and

273 quarantining efforts between vulnerable and resilient hosts usually reduces the prevalence of the
274 more asymptomatic virus (Fig. 2A-C and 2D-F). An exception is when isolation efforts are very
275 low but disease suppression otherwise results (Fig 2G-I). In this scenario, very modest isolation
276 efforts prevent the evolutionary emergence of the asymptomatic strain when the public health
277 response is unequal (Fig. 2G), but can result in selective pressure for the more asymptomatic
278 strain when public health responses and transmission risk are more even across host classes
279 (Fig. 2I-H).

280 Supplementary Table S4 summarizes the conditions under which the distinct evolutionary
281 outcomes identified in Fig. 1 result when both host types are subject to the same extent of
282 isolation and quarantining. A key result is that as a generality, even modest levels of isolation
283 can prevent the evolution and spread of the novel virus. Improved detection of symptomatic
284 infections by the evolved virus readily causes suppression (Supplementary Table S4). Even when
285 the ability to detect such symptomatic infections is more limited, modest isolation efforts can
286 help limit the spread of the more asymptomatic, novel strain, with high isolation facilitating
287 disease suppression. Still, if the ability to detect asymptomatic infections is low, there is
288 potentially more potential for quarantining and isolation to drive infections by the novel virus.
289 This is especially the case when there is a high transmission risk to the resilient host class, as well
290 as a lower probability that infections by the evolved strain are asymptomatic (Supplementary
291 Table S4 and Figs. 2A-C).

292 **Scenario 2: Intervention efforts reflect prevalence of symptomatic infections**

293 As was the case for when isolation and quarantine efforts are constant through time, model
294 (2) predicts several qualitatively distinct evolutionary outcomes when these efforts respond to
295 the prevalence of symptomatic hosts (Fig. 3). First, above a certain isolation efficacy, most
296 infections are with the novel strain, with the prevalence of such infections potentially depending
297 on the quarantine efficacy (Fig 3A-3D). In contrast to a common case with constant control,
298 when control effort tracks symptomatic infections, we find increasing public health responses
299 can prove counter productive; higher removal efforts ultimately select for the asymptomatic
300 strain, which subsequently spreads to high prevalence.

301 A second class of possible dynamic behavior results when higher isolation efforts either

302 facilitate suppressing the evolution and spread of the asymptomatic strain, particularly as
303 quarantine effort decreases (Fig 3E-3F). Finally, although very subtle, in some cases modest to
304 intermediate levels of isolation coupled with low quarantining modestly reduced the prevalence
305 of the novel strain (Fig. 3G), while in others increasing isolation efforts are what reduced the
306 strain's prevalence (Fig. 3H).

307 Supplementary Tables S5-S6 characterize the key processes driving these qualitatively dis-
308 tinct eco-evolutionary predictions. A key result is that in comparison to the case where inter-
309 vention efforts are constant through time, the qualitative differences in dynamical behaviors are
310 driven much more by the detection ability of the novel strain rather than by different likelihoods
311 of the novel virus causing asymptomatic infections.

312 One important result is that unlike in the case where intervention efforts are constant,
313 high isolation efforts coupled with low quarantine efficacy most readily promote the emergence
314 of the novel strain when the detection of asymptomatic and symptomatic infections are both
315 high. When intervention intensity tracks the prevalence of symptomatic infections, the more
316 symptomatic strain is quite readily removed as isolation efforts increase, and as quarantine
317 efforts are relaxed following a reduction in the prevalence of symptomatic infections, the novel
318 virus can then escape suppression. This outcome stands in contrast to what we found when
319 intervention efforts were constant, in which pathogen suppression often occurred when the
320 ability to detect asymptomatic and symptomatic infections by the evolved virus were high
321 (Supplementary Tables S3-S4).

322 A somewhat different pattern emerges when most asymptomatic infections by the novel
323 viral strain go undetected. Under this scenario, even if the detection of symptomatic infections
324 is high, greater quarantine effort can still promote the evolution and spread of the more asymp-
325 tomatic strain (Supplementary Table S5). Thus, the qualitative trend is somewhat akin to the
326 case when intervention efforts were constant. Because quarantining efficacy is a composite of
327 quarantining effort and the ability to detect asymptomatic cases, these results highlight how it
328 is at intermediate levels of removing asymptomatic hosts via quarantining that results in the
329 novel virus spreading to high prevalence. When the ability to detect and remove asymptomatic
330 infections is high, then coupled with high isolation efforts this can facilitate disease eradication.
331 When the ability to similarly quarantine asymptomatic infections is very low, this reduces the

332 relative selective advantage for more asymptomatic viruses.

333 We further find conditions under which greater equality between host classes in public
334 health responses diffuse selection pressure for the asymptomatic strain (Figure 4A-B, 4E and
335 Supplementary Table S6). This contrasts to the case when the intensity of public health in-
336 terventions is constant through time. The discrepancy arises because when intervention efforts
337 track symptomatic cases, selection for being asymptomatic is low when infection rates are low.
338 When infection rates are low, even symptomatic infections are not removed efficiently from the
339 system. This relaxes selection pressure against the symptomatic strain. This relaxed selection
340 pressure, in turn, prevents the asymptomatic strain from increasing to high frequency.

341 At the same time, in some cases even quite low isolation efforts can induce the evolution and
342 spread of the more asymptomatic virus, with quarantine effort having little effect (Fig. 4C-D).
343 This outcome mirrors the results for the constant control effort case characterized in, e.g., Fig.
344 (2I). We find this to especially be the case if most infections are of the more common, vulnerable
345 host class that experiences lower isolation and quarantine efficacy. When the intensity of public
346 health intervention is even, a higher infection risk for the vulnerable host class can amplify
347 selection pressure for the more asymptomatic strain. Indeed, increasing the ability to detect
348 infections of the vulnerable host class selects for the novel virus when there is enhanced infection
349 risk among the vulnerable host class (Supplementary Table S6). When infection risks are more
350 even across host classes, improving isolation and quarantine efforts for the vulnerable host class
351 reduces selection for the more asymptomatic strain (Supplementary Table S6).

352 Discussion

353 Because many emerging zoonotic pathogens lack effective prophylactics or treatment, the iden-
354 tification and removal of infectious individuals remains the primary control strategy (Eames
355 and Keeling 2003; Bird and Mazet 2018). When epidemiological monitoring fails to detect
356 asymptomatic carriers, the pathogens they harbor are able to spread with less friction through
357 the host population. By contrast, potentially symptomatic lineages are subject to detection
358 and, through contact-tracing even asymptomatic infections are identified quarantined, thereby
359 pruning that particular viral lineage.

360 Our model analyses using SARS-Coronaviruses as a case study illustrates how reliance
361 on symptoms-driven reporting and control, however well-meaning, can ultimately shift the
362 pathogen’s fitness landscape to select for pandemic strains. We show that such selection for an
363 asymptomatic pathogen is often most acute when isolation and quarantine efforts are intense,
364 but fall short of complete disease suppression. Our comparative analyses further indicate that
365 when host removal depends on the prevalence of symptomatic infections, even very high levels of
366 isolation effort can facilitate the emergence and extensive spread of more asymptomatic strains.

367 One implication is that although most public health responses to emerging zoonotic pathogens
368 are necessarily reactive, an anticipatory approach to case identification may be necessary for
369 highly infectious pathogens such as coronaviruses known to cause asymptomatic infections. For
370 instance, routine, widespread randomized metagenomic surveys of known and suspected reser-
371 voirs would more closely approximate the “constant intervention efforts” scenario we model.
372 Our results indicate, however, that such efforts need to be quite effective to prevent the emer-
373 gence of asymptomatic viruses. Whether anticipatory control measures such as these are real-
374 istic given constraints on public health budgets remains an open question (Waitzkin 2018).

375 We further highlighted the critical role host heterogeneity plays in driving the evolutionary
376 consequences of isolation and quarantining symptomatic individuals. By definition, emerging
377 zoonotic pathogens navigate a heterogenous landscape of hosts, and even after evolving to cir-
378 culate in humans, social differences result in distinct intervention efficacies and transmission
379 chains (Levins 1995; Szreter and Woolcock 2004; Wallace et al. 2015; Dzingirai et al. 2017a).
380 These differences imply that selection pressures experienced by pathogens is variable, and our
381 results show how such variable selection can promote the evolution and spread of more asymp-
382 tomatic viruses.

383 We find in general that implementing isolation and quarantine evenly across host classes
384 can facilitate disease suppression and thereby reduce selection for more asymptomatic viruses.
385 However, reducing disparities among host classes can also increase overall selection pressure
386 against more symptomatic strains in some cases. For instance, when isolation and quarantine
387 efficacy just low enough to permit the suppression of a more asymptomatic virus by a less
388 asymptomatic virus, evenly carrying out isolation or quarantining efforts across host classes
389 can occasionally shift the balance to promote the spread of the more asymptomatic virus.

390 One dimension of host heterogeneity that had a slightly counter-intuitive effect was when
391 transmission risk was more even across host classes, this in fact promoted suppression. We
392 found that at least in some cases, increasing transmission for the resilient host operates, to
393 some degree, in a manner analogous to the dilution effect, in which viral infections of hosts
394 that cannot transmit the pathogen slow the epidemic (e.g., Roberts and Heesterbeek 2018).
395 When resilient hosts are likelier to be successfully identified and removed from the population
396 of infectious hosts, the ability of isolation and quarantine to suppress the disease becomes more
397 apparent when these hosts are more likely to get infected. One consequence of this is that when
398 resilient hosts, who are likelier to be successfully identified and removed if infected, are less
399 likely to be exposed to the pathogen, then this can create conditions conducive the evolution
400 and spread of a more asymptomatic strain. Thus, evening transmission risk across host classes
401 may be one strategy for disease control when infections in some hosts are likelier to be removed
402 from the population.

403 By design, but also due to limitations in the data, our numerical analyses surveyed a wide
404 segment of parameter space. Given the frequency with which a more asymptomatic coronavirus
405 emerged and spread in our simulations, as well as the distinct qualitative outcomes of the role
406 of isolation and quarantine efforts, we highlight the need for better measurements of key quan-
407 tities. A case in point is the degree to which mutations enable viruses to cause asymptomatic
408 infections. Because selection against symptomatic strains involves a reciprocal interplay be-
409 tween epidemiological and evolutionary processes, the evolution and spread of the novel strain
410 at times depended on the probability that infection with the novel virus is asymptomatic. Thus,
411 any intervention measure aimed at preventing the emergence of an asymptomatic strain must
412 take into account the viral genotype-phenotype map. To be sure, whether a virus causes symp-
413 toms also depends heavily on the host's biology. Nevertheless, in light of our results, given the
414 growing capacity to characterize large amounts of viral sequence variation, explaining how this
415 variability drives the propensity of viral infections to be symptomatic (such as Korber et al.
416 2020) seems particularly warranted.

417 In conclusion, our analyses show how the evolution and spread of asymptomatic viruses
418 is driven by a reciprocal interplay between public health intervention measures and prevailing
419 host population structure, on the one hand, and the nature of the host-pathogen interaction

420 at the level of individual hosts on the other. We think our results also have implications
421 for endemic pathogens. Several other major human pathogens (dengue, Methicillin-resistant
422 Staphylococcus aureus) similarly lack effective and widespread prophylactics or treatment. In
423 light of our conclusions, we urge epidemiological monitoring efforts to seriously consider un-
424 dertaking randomized testing to avoid inadvertently creating a surveillance regime that selects
425 for more asymptomatic strains, and to do so in a way that is consistent across host classes.
426 Our investigation provides a critical first step towards providing quantitative guidance for de-
427 termining evolutionarily appropriate levels of interventions for coronaviruses and other highly
428 transmissible pathogens.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank P. Turner for valuable comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Material S1 Showing little effect of varying δ from 0.05 to 0.85 with constant intervention effort

Supplementary Material S2 Showing little effect of varying δ from 0.05 to 0.85 with variable intervention effort

Supplementary Tables S3-S4. A description of the effects of varying the parameter values pertaining to host heterogeneity and viral phenotype on the qualitative outcomes under varying intervention efforts. The qualitative behavior for parameter combinations are categorized according to the panels depicted in Fig. 1, when the isolation and quarantine efforts differ across host types (Supplementary Table S3) and when they are concomitant across host types (Supplementary Table S4). (*) denotes instances where the novel strain did not spread or where the pathogen was eradicated regardless of infectious host removal efforts, (**) denotes instances where the novel strain did not spread, but the pathogen persisted (often at very low prevalence) regardless of infectious host removal efforts, and (X) denotes instances where the novel pathogen spread through the entire host population regardless of infectious host removal efforts.

Supplementary Tables S5-S6. A description of the effects of varying the parameter values pertaining to host heterogeneity and viral phenotype on the qualitative outcomes under varying intervention efforts. The qualitative behavior for parameter combinations are categorized according to the panels depicted in Fig. 3, when the isolation and quarantine efforts differ across host types (Supplementary Table S5) and when they are concomitant across host types (Supplementary Table S6). As in Supplementary Tables S3-S4, (*) denotes instances where the novel strain did not spread or where the pathogen was eradicated regardless of infectious host removal efforts, (**) denotes instances where the novel strain did not spread, but the pathogen persisted (often at very low prevalence) regardless of infectious host removal efforts, and (X) denotes instances where the novel pathogen spread through the entire host population regardless of infectious host removal efforts.

References

- ABEDI, V., OLULANA, O., AVULA, V., CHAUDHARY, D., KHAN, A., SHAHJOU EI, S., LI, J., AND ZAND, R. 2020. Racial, Economic and Health Inequality and COVID-19 Infection in the United States. *medRxiv* .
- ARMBRUSTER, B. AND BRANDEAU, M. L. 2010. Cost-effective control of chronic viral diseases: Finding the optimal level of screening and contact tracing. *Mathematical Biosciences* 224:35–42.
- BIRD, B. H. AND MAZET, J. A. 2018. Detection of Emerging Zoonotic Pathogens: An Integrated One Health Approach. *Annual Review of Animal Biosciences* 6:121–139.
- BIRN, ANNE-EMANUELLE, Y. P. AND HOLTZ, T. H. 2017. Textbook of global health. Oxford Univ Press, New York.

- BOHANNAN, B. J. M. AND LENSKI, R. E. 2000. Linking genetic change to community evolution: Insights from studies of bacteria and bacteriophage. *Ecology Letters* 3:362–377.
- BORJAS, G. J. 2020. Demographic Determinants of Testing Incidence and COVID-19 Infections in New York City Neighborhoods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
- CAMPBELL, K. M. AND DOSHI, R. 2020. The coronavirus could reshape global order. *Foreign Affairs* 18.
- CHAVES, L. F., HURTADO, L. A., ROJAS, M. R., FRIBERG, M. D., RODRÍGUEZ, R. M., AND AVILA-AGUERO, M. L. 2020. COVID-19 basic reproduction number and assessment of initial suppression policies in Costa Rica. *Mathematical Modelling of Natural Phenomena* In press.
- CHEN, N., ZHOU, M., DONG, X., QU, J., GONG, F., HAN, Y., QIU, Y., WANG, J., LIU, Y., WEI, Y., XIA, J., YU, T., ZHANG, X., AND ZHANG, L. 2020a. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *The Lancet* 395:507–513.
- CHEN, Z., ZHANG, W., LU, Y., GUO, C., GUO, Z., LIAO, C., ZHANG, X., ZHANG, Y., HAN, X., LI, Q., AND LU, J. 2020b. From SARS-CoV to Wuhan 2019-nCoV Outbreak: Similarity of Early Epidemic and Prediction of Future Trends. *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
- CHENG, C., BARCELÓ, J., HARTNETT, A. S., KUBINEC, R., AND MESSERSCHMIDT, L. 2020. COVID-19 Government Response Event Dataset (CoronaNet v.1.0). *Nature human behaviour* 1:1–13.
- DAVIES, N. G., KUCHARSKI, A. J., EGGO, R. M., GIMMA, A., EDMUNDS, W. J., JOMBART, T., O'REILLY, K., ENDO, A., HELLEWELL, J., NIGHTINGALE, E. S., QUILTY, B. J., JARVIS, C. I., RUSSELL, T. W., KLEPAC, P., BOSSE, N. I., FUNK, S., ABBOTT, S., MEDLEY, G. F., GIBBS, H., PEARSON, C. A., FLASCHE, S., JIT, M., CLIFFORD, S., PREM, K., DIAMOND, C., EMERY, J., DEOL, A. K., PROCTER, S. R., VAN ZANDVOORT, K., SUN, Y. F., MUNDAY, J. D., ROSELLO, A., AUZENBERGS, M., KNIGHT, G., HOUBEN, R. M., AND LIU, Y. 2020. Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health* 5:E375–E385.
- DYE, C. 2014. After 2015: Infectious diseases in a new era of health and development. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 369:20130426.
- DZINGIRAI, V., BETT, B., BUKACHI, S., LAWSON, E., MANGWANYA, L., SCOONES, I., WALDMAN, L., WILKINSON, A., LEACH, M., AND WINNEBAH, T. 2017a. Zoonotic diseases: who gets sick, and why? Explorations from Africa. *Critical Public Health* pp. 1–14.
- DZINGIRAI, V., BUKACHI, S., LEACH, M., MANGWANYA, L., SCOONES, I., AND WILKINSON, A. 2017b. Structural drivers of vulnerability to zoonotic disease in Africa. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 372:20160169.
- EAMES, K. T. AND KEELING, M. J. 2003. Contact tracing and disease control. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 270:2565–2571.

- EDRIDGE, A. W. D., KACZOROWSKA, J. M., HOSTE, A. C. R., BAKKER, M., KLEIN, M., JEBBINK, M. F., MATSER, A., KINSELLA, C., RUEDA, P., PRINS, M., SASTRE, P., DEIJS, M., AND VAN DER HOEK, L. 2020. Coronavirus protective immunity is short-lasting. *medRxiv* .
- FARMER, P. 1996. Social Inequalities and Emerging Infectious Diseases. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2:259.
- FERRETTI, L., WYMANT, C., KENDALL, M., ZHAO, L., NURTAY, A., ABELER-DÖRNER, L., PARKER, M., BONSALE, D., AND FRASER, C. 2020. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science* 368:eabb6936.
- GALANTI, M. AND SHAMAN, J. 2020. Direct observation of repeated infections with endemic coronaviruses. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* In press.
- GARRETT, L. 2007. The challenge of global health. *Foreign Affairs* pp. 14–38.
- HALLIDAY, J. E., HAMPSON, K., HANLEY, N., LEMBO, T., SHARP, J. P., HAYDON, D. T., AND CLEVELAND, S. 2017. Driving improvements in emerging disease surveillance through locally relevant capacity strengthening. *Science* 357:146–148.
- HORBY, P., LIM, W. S., EMBERSON, J., MAFHAM, M., BELL, J., LINSELL, L., STAPLIN, N., BRIGHTLING, C., USTIANOWSKI, A., ELMAHI, E., PRUDON, B., GREEN, C., FELTON, T., CHADWICK, D., REGE, K., FEGAN, C., CHAPPELL, L. C., FAUST, S. N., JAKI, T., JEFFERY, K., MONTGOMERY, A., ROWAN, K., JUSZCZAK, E., BAILLIE, J. K., HAYNES, R., LANDRAY, M. J., AND GROUP, R. C. 2020. Effect of Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: Preliminary Report. *medRxiv* .
- JAMISON DT, BREMAN JG, MEASHAM AR, ET AL., E. 2006. Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries (2nd Edition). Oxford University Press, New York.
- JONES, K. E., PATEL, N. G., LEVY, M. A., STOREYGARD, A., BALK, D., GITTLEMAN, J. L., AND DASZAK, P. 2008. Global trends in emerging infectious diseases. *Nature* 451:990–993.
- KAWACHI, I. AND KENNEDY, B. P. 1999. Income inequality and health: pathways and mechanisms. *Health Services Research* 34:215.
- KELLAM, P. AND BARCLAY, W. 2020. The dynamics of humoral immune responses following SARS-CoV-2 infection and the potential for reinfection. *Journal of General Virology* In press.
- KEUSCH, G. T., PAPPAIOANOU, M., GONZALEZ, M. C., SCOTT, K. A., AND TSAI, P. 2010. Sustaining global surveillance and response to emerging zoonotic diseases. National Academies Press, Washington DC.
- KLINKENBERG, D., FRASER, C., AND HEESTERBEEK, H. 2006. The effectiveness of contact tracing in emerging epidemics. *PLoS ONE* 1:e12.
- KORBER, B., FISCHER, W. M., GNANAKARAN, S., YOON, H., THEILER, J., ABFALTERER, W., HENGARTNER, N., GIORGI, E. E., BHATTACHARYA, T., FOLEY, B., HASTIE, K. M., AND PARKER, D. G. 2020. Tracking changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike: evidence that D614G increases infectivity of the COVID-19 virus. *Cell* .

- LAI, C. C., LIU, Y. H., WANG, C. Y., WANG, Y. H., HSUEH, S. C., YEN, M. Y., KO, W. C., AND HSUEH, P. R. 2020. Asymptomatic carrier state, acute respiratory disease, and pneumonia due to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2): Facts and myths. *Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection* In press.
- LEACH, M., BETT, B., SAID, M., BUKACHI, S., SANG, R., ANDERSON, N., MACHILA, N., KULESZO, J., SCHATEN, K., DZINGIRAI, V., MANGWANYA, L., NTIAMOA-BAIDU, Y., LAWSON, E., AMPONSAH-MENSAH, K., MOSES, L. M., WILKINSON, A., GRANT, D. S., AND KONINGA, J. 2017. Local disease ecosystem livelihood dynamics: Reflections from comparative case studies in Africa. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 372:20160163.
- LEE, H. K. K., TSO, E. Y. K., CHAU, T. N., TSANG, O. T. Y., AND OTHERS 2003. Asymptomatic severe acute respiratory syndrome-associated coronavirus infection. *Emerging infectious diseases* 9:1491.
- LEE, P. I. AND HSUEH, P. R. 2020. Emerging threats from zoonotic coronaviruses—from SARS and MERS to 2019-nCoV. *Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection* In press.
- LEVINS, R. 1995. Toward an integrated epidemiology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 10:304.
- LI, R., PEI, S., CHEN, B., SONG, Y., ZHANG, T., YANG, W., AND SHAMAN, J. 2020. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* .
- LIM, S. H. AND SZIARTO, K. 2020. When the illiberal and the neoliberal meet around infectious diseases: an examination of the MERS response in South Korea. *Territory, Politics, Governance* 8:60–76.
- LIPPI, G., MATTIUZZI, C., SANCHIS-GOMAR, F., AND HENRY, B. M. 2020. Clinical and demographic characteristics of patients dying from COVID-19 in Italy versus China. *Journal of Medical Virology* .
- LO IACONO, G., CUNNINGHAM, A. A., FICHET-CALVET, E., GARRY, R. F., GRANT, D. S., LEACH, M., MOSES, L. M., NICHOLS, G., SCHIEFFELIN, J. S., SHAFFER, J. G., WEBB, C. T., AND WOOD, J. L. 2016. A Unified Framework for the Infection Dynamics of Zoonotic Spillover and Spread. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 10:e0004957.
- LU, N., CHENG, K.-W., QAMAR, N., HUANG, K.-C., AND JOHNSON, J. A. 2020. Weathering COVID-19 storm: Successful control measures of five Asian countries. *American Journal of Infection Control* 48:851–852.
- MAHASE, E. 2020. Coronavirus covid-19 has killed more people than SARS and MERS combined, despite lower case fatality rate. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)* 368:m641.
- MARMOT, M. 2005. Social determinants of health inequalities. *Lancet* 364:1099–1104.
- MIZUMOTO, K. AND CHOWELL, G. 2020. Estimating risk for death from coronavirus disease, China, January-February 2020. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 26:1251.
- MIZUMOTO, K., KAGAYA, K., ZAREBSKI, A., AND CHOWELL, G. 2020. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* .

- MOGHADAS, S. M., FITZPATRICK, M., SAH, P., PANDEY, A., A, S., SINGER, B., AND GALVANI, A. P. 2020. The implications of silent transmission for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* In press.
- NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL 2016. Neglected Dimensions of Global Security: A Framework to Counter Infectious Diseases Crises. Technical report, National Academy of Medicine.
- NAVARRO, V. AND SHI, L. 2001. The political context of social inequalities and health. *Social Science and Medicine* 31:1–21.
- NISHIURA, H., KOBAYASHI, T., MIYAMA, T., SUZUKI, A., MOK JUNG, S., HAYASHI, K., KINOSHITA, R., YANG, Y., YUAN, B., AKHMETZHANOV, A. R., AND LINTON, N. M. 2020. Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* .
- OKAMOTO, K. W., AMARASEKARE, P., POST, D. M., VASSEUR, D. A., AND TURNER, P. E. 2019. The interplay between host community structure and pathogen life-history constraints in driving the evolution of host-range shifts. *Functional Ecology* 33:2338–2353.
- ORAN, D. P. AND TOPOL, E. J. 2020. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A narrative review. *Annals of Internal Medicine* In press.
- PEAK, C. M., CHILDS, L. M., GRAD, Y. H., AND BUCKEE, C. O. 2017. Comparing non-pharmaceutical interventions for containing emerging epidemics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 114:4023–4028.
- PETERSEN, E., KOOPMANS, M., GO, U., HAMER, D. H., PETROSILLO, N., CASTELLI, F., STORGAARD, M., AL KHALILI, S., AND SIMONSEN, L. 2020. Comparing SARS-CoV-2 with SARS-CoV and influenza pandemics. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* In press.
- PREM, K., LIU, Y., RUSSELL, T. W., KUCHARSKI, A. J., EGGO, R. M., DAVIES, N., FLASCHE, S., CLIFFORD, S., PEARSON, C. A., MUNDAY, J. D., ABBOTT, S., GIBBS, H., ROSELLO, A., QUILTY, B. J., JOMBART, T., SUN, F., DIAMOND, C., GIMMA, A., VAN ZANDVOORT, K., FUNK, S., JARVIS, C. I., EDMUNDS, W. J., BOSSE, N. I., HELLEWELL, J., JIT, M., AND KLEPAC, P. 2020. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health* 5:e261–e270.
- QUALLS, N., LEVITT, A., KANADE, N., WRIGHT-JEGEDE, N., DOPSON, S., BIGGERSTAFF, M., REED, C., AND UZICANIN, A. 2017. Community mitigation guidelines to prevent pandemic influenza - United States, 2017. *MMWR Recommendations and Reports* 66:1–34.
- RAHIMI, F. AND TALEBI BEZMIN ABADI, A. 2020. Challenges of managing the asymptomatic carriers of SARS-CoV-2. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease* p. 101677.
- RICE, S. H. 2004. Evolutionary Theory: Mathematical and Conceptual Foundation. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland MA.
- ROBERTS, M. G. AND HEESTERBEEK, J. A. 2018. Quantifying the dilution effect for models in ecological epidemiology. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 15:20170791.
- RODRIGUES, P., SILVA, C. J., AND TORRES, D. F. 2014. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Optimal Control Measures for Tuberculosis. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 76:2627–2645.

- RUSSELL, T. W., HELLEWELL, J., JARVIS, C. I., ZANDVOORT, K. V., ABBOTT, S., RATNAYAKE, R., FLASCHE, S., EGGO, R. M., EDMUNDS, W. J., AND KUCHARSKI, A. J. 2020. Estimating the infection and case fatality ratio for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) using age-adjusted data from the outbreak on the Diamond Princess cruise ship, February 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 25:2000256.
- SALONIEMI, I. 1993. A coevolutionary predator-prey model with quantitative characters. *The American Naturalist* 141:880–896.
- SOETAERT, K., PETZOLDT, T., AND SETZER, R. W. 2010. Solving Differential Equations in R: Package deSolve. *Journal of Statistical Software* 33:1–25.
- SOLIS, J., FRANCO-PAREDES, C., HENAO-MARTÍNEZ, A. F., KRSAK, M., AND ZIMMER, S. M. 2020. Structural Vulnerability in the United States Revealed in Three Waves of Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* In press.
- STALLMAN, R. 2007. GNU General Public License v3.
- STOJKOSKI, V., UTKOVSKI, Z., JOLAKOSKI, P., TEVDOVSKI, D., AND KOCAREV, L. 2020. The Socio-Economic Determinants of the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pandemic. *SSRN Electronic Journal* DOI: 10.21.
- SZRETER, S. AND WOOLCOCK, M. 2004. Health by association? Social capital, social theory, and the political economy of public health. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 33:650–667.
- VAHIDY, F. S., NICOLAS, J. C., MEEKS, J. R., KHAN, O., JONES, S. L., MASUD, F., SOSTMAN, H. D., PHILLIPS, R. A., ANDRIENI, J. D., KASH, B. A., AND NASIR, K. 2020. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic: Analysis of a COVID-19 Observational Registry for a Diverse U.S. Metropolitan Population. *medRxiv* .
- WAITZKIN, H. 2018. Healthcare Under the Knife. Monthly Review Press.
- WALLACE, R. G., BERGMANN, L., KOCK, R., GILBERT, M., HOGERWERF, L., WALLACE, R., AND HOLMBERG, M. 2015. The dawn of Structural One Health: A new science tracking disease emergence along circuits of capital. *Social Science and Medicine* 129:68–77.
- WANG, Y., ZHANG, D., DU, G., DU, R., ZHAO, J., JIN, Y., FU, S., GAO, L., CHENG, Z., LU, Q., HU, Y., LUO, G., WANG, K., LU, Y., LI, H., WANG, S., RUAN, S., YANG, C., MEI, C., WANG, Y., DING, D., WU, F., TANG, X., YE, X., YE, Y., LIU, B., YANG, J., YIN, W., WANG, A., FAN, G., ZHOU, F., LIU, Z., GU, X., XU, J., SHANG, L., ZHANG, Y., CAO, L., GUO, T., WAN, Y., QIN, H., JIANG, Y., JAKI, T., HAYDEN, F. G., HORBY, P. W., CAO, B., AND WANG, C. 2020. Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *The Lancet* In press.
- WATSON, J., WHITING, P. F., AND BRUSH, J. E. 2020. Interpreting a covid-19 test result. *BMJ* May 12:369.
- WHITMEE, S., HAINES, A., BEYRER, C., BOLTZ, F., CAPON, A. G., DE SOUZA DIAS, B. F., EZEH, A., FRUMKIN, H., GONG, P., HEAD, P., HORTON, R., MACE, G. M., MARTEN, R., MYERS, S. S., NISHTAR, S., OSOFSKY, S. A., PATTANAYAK, S. K., PONGSIRI, M. J.,

- ROMANELLI, C., SOUCAT, A., VEGA, J., AND YACH, D. 2015. Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: Report of the Rockefeller Foundation-Lancet Commission on planetary health. *The Lancet* 386:1973–2028.
- WILDER-SMITH, A., CHIEW, C. J., AND LEE, V. J. 2020. Can we contain the COVID-19 outbreak with the same measures as for SARS? *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 20:E102–E107.
- WILDER-SMITH, A., TELEMAN, M. D., HENG, B. H., EARNEST, A., LING, A. E., AND LEO, Y. S. 2005. Asymptomatic SARS coronavirus infection among healthcare workers, Singapore. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 11:1142.
- WOOD, C. L., MCINTURFF, A., YOUNG, H. S., KIM, D., AND LAFFERTY, K. D. 2017. Human infectious disease burdens decrease with urbanization but not with biodiversity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 372:20160122.
- WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION 2020. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Situation Report 173. Technical report, World Health Organization.
- WU, C., CHEN, X., CAI, Y., XIA, J., ZHOU, X., XU, S., HUANG, H., ZHANG, L., ZHOU, X., DU, C., ZHANG, Y., SONG, J., WANG, S., CHAO, Y., YANG, Z., XU, J., ZHOU, X., CHEN, D., XIONG, W., XU, L., ZHOU, F., JIANG, J., BAI, C., ZHENG, J., AND SONG, Y. 2020. Risk Factors Associated with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Internal Medicine* In press.
- XU, J., ZHAO, S., TENG, T., ABDALLA, A. E., ZHU, W., XIE, L., WANG, Y., AND GUO, X. 2020. Systematic comparison of two animal-to-human transmitted human coronaviruses: SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV. *Viruses* 12:244.
- YATES, T., COOKE, G., AND MACPHERSON, P. 2020. Rational use of SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain reaction tests within institutions caring for the vulnerable. *F1000Research* 9:671.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




Figure 1: The range of possible qualitative behavior of long-term prevalence of all hosts infected with the novel, more asymptomatic virus in model (2) as a function of quarantine and isolation effort. In addition to the results above, the model also produced outcomes where the novel virus could not successfully spread or would infect all hosts irrespective of the isolation and quarantine efforts (results not shown).

(A) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (B) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (C) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (D) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (E) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (F) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (G) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (H) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (I) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (J) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (K) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (L) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (M) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (N) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (O) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (P) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. Here, and for subsequent figures, we note that varying the rate δ at which isolated or quarantined hosts recovered had very little effect on long-term prevalence (Supplementary Material S1 and S2).




Figure 2: The effect of increasing isolation and quarantine efforts or reducing transmission risk for the neglected host, in terms of long-term prevalence of among hosts infected with the novel, more asymptomatic virus in model (2) as a function of quarantine and isolation effort. In this, and in subsequent figures, the color scheme follows Figure 1. (A) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 0.1$. (B) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 0.1$. (C) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 1$. (D) $r_{h,h'} = 100, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 0.11$. (E) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 1$. (F) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 13, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 1$. (G) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 0.1$. (H) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 1$. (I) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',cdot} = 1$.




Figure 3: The range of possible qualitative behavior of long-term prevalence of all hosts infected with the novel, more asymptomatic virus in model (2) as a function of quarantine and isolation effort. In addition to the results above, the model also produced outcomes where the novel virus could not successfully spread or would infect all hosts irrespective of the isolation and quarantine efforts (results not shown). (A) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (B) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (C) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (D) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (E) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 13, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (F) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (G) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 1.1, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.1$. (H) $r_{h,h'} = 0.1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 1, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$.




Figure 4: The effect of increasing isolation and quarantine efforts for the neglected host or equalizing transmission risk, in terms of long-term prevalence of among hosts infected with the novel, more asymptomatic virus in model (2) as a function of quarantine and isolation effort. (A) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (B) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (C) $r_{h,h'} = 1, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 1$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (D) $r_{h,h'} = 10, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 5, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 1$. (E) $r_{h,h'} = 100, \pi_{1,2}/\pi_{1,1} = 1.1, \pi_{2,2}/\pi_{2,1} = 5, v_q = 0.001, v_\theta = 0.001$ and $q_{h,\cdot}/q_{h',\cdot} = \theta_{h,\cdot}/\theta_{h',\cdot} = 0.11$.