Postlockdown Dynamics of COVID-19 in New York, Florida, Arizona, and Wisconsin

Sherry Scott[3], Keisha J. Cook[2], Kamal Barley[1]

Department of Mathematics, formerly MSOE, Department of Mathematics, Tulane University. Applied Mathematics Statistics, Stony Brook University.

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic is widely studied as it continues to threaten many populations of people especially in the USA, the leading country in terms of both deaths and cases. More and more reports show that the spread of COVID-19 involves infected individuals first passing through a pre-symptomatic infectious stage in addition to the incubation period and that many of the infectious individuals are asymptomatic. In this study, we design and use a mathematical model to primarily address the question of who are the main drivers of COVID-19 - the symptomatic infectious or the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic infectious in the states of Florida, Arizona, New York, Wisconsin and the entire United States. We emphasize the benefit of lockdown by showing that for all four states, earlier and later lockdown dates decrease the number of cumulative deaths. This benefit of lockdown is also evidenced by the decrease in the infectious cases for Arizona and the entire US when lockdown is implemented earlier. When comparing the influence of the symptomatic infectious versus the presympomatic/asymptomatic infectious, it is shown that, in general, the larger contribution comes from the latter group. This is seen from several perspectives (1) in terms of daily cases, (2) in terms of daily cases when the influence of one group is targeted over the other by setting the effective contact rate(s) for the non-targeted group to zero, and (3) in terms of cumulative cases and deaths for the US and Arizona when the influence of one group is targeted over the other by setting the effective contact rate(s) for the non-targeted group to zero. The consequences of the difference in the contributions of the two infectious groups is simulated in terms of testing and these simulations show that an increase in testing and isolating for the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic infectious group has more impact than an increase in testing for the symptomatic infectious. For example, for the entire US, a 50% increase in testing for the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic infectious group results in a 25% decrease in deaths as opposed to a lower 6% decrease in deaths when a 50% increase in testing rate for the symptomatic infectious is implemented. We also see that if the testing for infectious symptomatic is kept at the baseline value and the testing for the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic is increased from 0.2 to 0.25, then the control reproduction number falls below 1. On the other hand, to get even close to such a result when keeping the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic at baseline fitted values, the symptomatic infectious testing rate must be increased considerably more - from 0.4 to 1.7. Lastly, we use our model to simulate an implementation of a natural herd immunity strategy for the entire U.S. and for the state of Wisconsin (the most recent epicenter) and we find that such a strategy requires a significant number of deaths and as such is questionable in terms of success. We conclude with a brief summary of our results and some implications regarding COVID-19 control and mitigation strategies.

Keywords: COVID-19, symptomatic infectious, asymptomatic infectious, pre-symptomatic infectious, natural herd immunity

1. Introduction

The coronavirus, known as COVID-19, emerged in Wuhan, China in December 2019, and has since then spread to all countries on earth. As of 12/10/2020, the United States has reported 15,535,565 cases and 291,403 deaths and although the leading country in both deaths and cases, the U.S. did not implement a national pandemic control initiative. Instead, many states and cities implemented their own initiatives at various times, and the transmission of COVID-19 has varied from state to state. States also implemented

[1]Email: Kamal.Barley@stonybrook.edu
[2]Email: kcook7@tulane.edu
[3]Email: sscott@msri.org, corresponding author
[4]This collaboration was sponsored by the ADJOINT 2020 workshop at MSRI through the University of California Berkeley.

their own testing initiatives. Around 12-10-2020, the reported testing rates are as follows: Arizona testing at a rate of 347.7 tests per 100,000 people, Florida testing at a rate of 497.2 tests per 100,000 people, New York testing at a rate of 985.7 tests per 100,000 people, and Wisconsin testing at a rate of 562.4 tests per 100,000 people [2]. With regard to mask usage, the observed mask usage percentage in the US has increased since the beginning of the pandemic. From March 1, 2020 to May 1, 2020, the mask use percentage increased from 5% to 40%. From May 1, 2020 to November 22, 2020, the mask use percentage increased from 71%. Social distancing has also played a role in the transmission of COVID-19. From March 8, 2020 to April 4, 2020, the US experienced a 53% decrease in mobility. From April 4, 2020 to June 24, 2020, the decrease in mobility changed to only -22%. From June 24, 2020 to November 22, 2020, the mobility oscillated between -18% and -25% [3]. The social distancing statistics are due to the fact that different states implemented stay-at-home periods for various intervals of time. All of these factors play a part in the transmission of COVID-19 in the US as a whole, and effectively in each state. Although we do not consider all of these measures directly, we do discuss the effect that lockdown has on the number of cases and deaths. We do include mask usage, and we use a different mask compliance value for each period per state [14]. To study social distancing, we fit the values for the effective contact rate for each time period per state and per time period.

Mathematical modelling can help us better understand how COVID-19 cases and mortality is affected based on when and how long lockdown periods are enforced. Modelling can also help us identify the main drivers of the disease and give insight on how best to use the standard control and mitigation strategies. We expand on the standard SIR model, which uses a system of ordinary differential equations to model disease spread through multiple compartments over time. In this study, we do not consider a time-varying system.

Prior studies consider susceptible individuals transitioning to exposed and then to infectious. We include a pre-symptomatic compartment for individuals who are infectious before the onset of symptoms. We also consider individuals who were tested, resulting in an asymptomatic or symptomatic classification, as well as the population of people who may have self-isolated after being exposed by an infected individual. It is known that over the course of the pandemic, hospitals have been highly stressed and over-crowded due to the influx of COVID-19 patients. In order to study mortality due to the pandemic, we also include compartments that keep track of the number of patients admitted to the hospital and the ICU.

We explore scenarios where lockdown is started earlier or extended past the reported date. We show that both scenarios decrease the number of deaths. We can use these type of simulations to predict future mortality populations and use the information to help with determining when lockdown periods should start and how long the lockdown period should be enforced.

Finally, in response to the increase in public discussions of a natural herd immunity approach, we use our model to run some basic scenarios for implementing such a strategy in the state of Wisconsin and the US as a whole. We simulate the number of deaths that would occur before herd immunity is achieved.

2. Main Questions

The overall purpose of this study is to explore the postlockdown dynamics of COVID-19 and in the process, explore the notion that the main drivers of COVID19 are the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious individuals. Because both the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious spread COVID-19 without showing symptoms we group these two compartments together and compare that group to the symptomatic infectious. More specifically, we use a mathematical model to address the following questions for New York, Arizona, Florida, Wisconsin, and in some cases, the entire US. The section of the paper in which each question is addressed is given after the question.

- How do changes in lockdown dates (i.e., earlier or later lockdown dates) affect the number of deaths and cases? (Section 4.3.1)
- How does the contribution of the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic infectious individuals compare to that of the symptomatic infectious in terms of cases and deaths? (Section 4.3.2)

- If we isolate all symptomatic infectious individuals or all asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious individuals, how will this impact deaths and cases? (Section 4.3.3)
- How might a minimum testing rate for pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic compare to that for the symptomatic infectious individuals in order to obtain a reproduction number below 1? (section 4.3.4)
- How many deaths will occur in a natural herd immunity simulation for Wisconsin and the entire US? (Section 4.4)

2.1. COVID-19

In order to assess and deliver guidelines for individuals to avoid coronavirus infection, the CDC has implemented models equipped with the many stages of the virus [1]. A person who has been infected is considered pre-symptomatic (an individual who is infectious but did not show symptoms at the time of testing) or asymptomatic (a person who is infectious and does not show symptoms throughout the course of the infection). The CDC built pandemic planning scenarios varying the infectiousness of asymptomatic individuals compared to symptomatic, varying the percent of asymptomatic individuals, and varying the percentage of transmission of pre-symptomatic individuals. In this paper, we use similar methods to build our model and determine parameter values for the locations and time periods of interest. Figure 1 shows the stages of COVID-19, especially the incubation period, infectious period, pre-symptomatic period, and symptomatic period. It should be noted that a pre-symptomatic infectious individual can become either asymptomatic or symptomatic infectious.



Figure 1: The Stages of COVID-19

We are interested in modeling COVID-19 in the United States as a whole, as well as focusing on four states. We consider New York (Northeast), which started as an epicenter in the US. We consider Florida (Southeast) and Arizona (Southwest) due to the fact that they became hot spots with significant numbers of daily cases and overwhelming numbers in their healthcare facilities. Lastly, we consider Wisconsin (Midwest), which became a hot spot later in the year. Table 1 shows the differences between the states with regards to the number of cumulative deaths.

Cumulative Deaths

	Beginning of lockdown	End of lockdown	on August 11, 2020	on November 23, 2020
United States	16767	104803	164519	257779
Arizona	25	651	4199	6464
Florida	170	1399	8553	18085
New York	249	30482	32770	34339
Wisconsin	10	594	1006	3158

Table 1: This table gives the cumulative deaths for each state and the United States. The lockdown dates depend on the state.

3. Methods

3.1. Model with pre-symptomatic compartment and face masks

We use a modified Kermack-McKendrik-type epidemic (no human demography) model to better understand the dynamics of COVID-19. Since a main objective of this study is to analyze the role of infectious individuals who show no symptoms, the model (2) includes a pre-symptomatic compartment as the foundation for parameter estimation. We use a deterministic susceptible, exposed, pre-symptomatic, symptomatically-infectious, asymptomatically-infectious, self-isolated, hospitalized, recovered, and ICU patients modeling framework, with the classes denoted as $S(t)$, $E(t)$, $E_P(t)$, $I(t)$, $A(t)$, $J(t)$, $H(t)$, $R(t)$, $C(t)$ respectively; we also include $D(t)$ to track deaths. The model also includes the mitigation/control interventions of face mask usage (with a compliance parameter as well as a face mask efficacy parameter) and testing/detection implementation for each of the infectious classes.



Figure 2: Schematic flow diagram of the model

3.2. Data Collection

We obtain the observed cumulative deaths and cases data for the states of Arizona, Florida, New York and Wisconsin from the COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (2020). The repository contains data beginning at January 22, 2020 (the marked beginning of the pandemic in the US), however, we focus primarily on the data from March 1, 2020 through October 13, 2020. Using these data sets we determine the initial conditions for the number of cases and deaths for a given time period.

The model has 24 parameters and we use values from the literature for 18 of these and estimate the remaining 6 by fitting the model to the observed cumulative mortality data for each state. The parameters that are estimated are as follows: the effective contact rate for the symptomatically-infectious individuals β_I, the effective contact rate for the asymptomatically-infectious individuals β_A, the effective contact rate for pre-symptomatically-infectious individuals β_P, the rate at which presympotomatically-infectious individuals self-isolate τ_P, the rate at which asympotomatically-infectious individuals self-isolate τ_A, and the hospitalization rate for self-isolating individuals α_J. Parameter fitting was performed using a non-linear sum-of-squares estimate - i.e. determining the best parameters set that minimizes the sum of the square of the difference between the model outputs for death and the observed values for deaths.

Our model for the transmission dynamics of COVID-19 is given by the following deterministic system of non-linear differential equations.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta_I(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\frac{SI}{N} - \beta_A(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\frac{SA}{N} - \beta_P(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\frac{SE_P}{N} = -\lambda S \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta_I(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\frac{SI}{N} + \beta_A(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\frac{SA}{N} + \beta_P(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\frac{SE_P}{N} - \sigma_e E = \lambda S - \sigma_e E \\
\frac{dE_P}{dt} &= \sigma_e E - \sigma_p E_P - \tau_p E_P \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= r\sigma_p E_P - \alpha_I I - \tau_I I - \gamma_I I - \delta_I I \\
\frac{dA}{dt} &= (1-r)\,\sigma_p E_P - \alpha_A A - \tau_A A - \gamma_A A - \delta_A A \\
\frac{dH}{dt} &= \alpha_I I + \alpha_A A + \alpha_J J - \psi_H H - \gamma_H H - \delta_H H \\
\frac{dC}{dt} &= \psi_H H - \gamma_C C - \delta_C C \\
\frac{dJ}{dt} &= \tau_p E_P + \tau_A A + \tau_I I - \alpha_J J - \gamma_J J \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma_I I + \gamma_A A + \gamma_C C + \gamma_J J + \gamma_H H \\
\frac{dD}{dt} &= \delta_A A + \delta_I I + \delta_H H + \delta_C C
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

where $N(t) = S+E+EP+I+A+H+J+C+R$ is the total population at time t. Let ϵ_m be the efficacy of face masks to prevent transmission and acquisition of infection, c_m the compliance in face mask usage in the community ($0 < c_m \leq 1$), σ the progression rate from exposed (E) to infectious classes (I or A), r the fraction of exposed individuals who show clinical symptoms at the end of the incubation period, τ_I the rate self-quarantined symptomatically-infectious humans self-isolate, γ_I, γ_A, γ_J, γ_H, γ_C the recovery rates for the subscripted population, ψ_H the rate of ICU admission for hospitalized individuals, α_I the hospitalization rate for symptomatically-infectious individuals, α_A the hospitalization rate for asymptomatically-infectious individuals, δ_I the disease-induced mortality rate for symptomatically-infectious individuals, δ_A the disease-induced mortality rate for asymptomatically-infectious individuals, δ_H the disease-induced mortality rate for hospitalized individuals, δ_C the disease-induced mortality rate individuals in ICU. We assume that hospitalized individuals do not come in contact with the general population.

4. Results

4.1. Computation of Reproduction Numbers

The basic reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0$ is the average number of secondary infections produced when one infected individual is introduced into a host population of susceptible individuals. For our model's $\mathcal{R}_0$, we have $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_{0A} + \mathcal{R}_{0I} + \mathcal{R}_{0P}$ where

$$\mathcal{R}_{0A} = \frac{\beta_A(1-r)}{\alpha_A + \gamma_A + \delta_A}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{0I} = \frac{\beta_I r}{\alpha_I + \gamma_I + \delta_I}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{0P} = \frac{\beta_P}{\sigma_P}.$$

The control reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_C$ is the average number of new cases generated by a typical infectious individual introduced into a host population of susceptible individuals with some control measures/interventions in place. Using the next generation operator method and notation found in [17] we have the following computation for the control reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_C$. If we take the column vector $(E \quad E_P \quad I \quad A)$ representing the compartments of infected, we have the associated next generation matrices, F and V, for the new infection terms and the transition terms are given respectively as

$$\mathcal{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (1-\epsilon_m c_m)\,\beta_P & (1-\epsilon_m c_m)\,\beta_I & (1-\epsilon_m c_m)\,\beta_A \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sigma_e & G_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -r\sigma_P & G_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -(1-r)\,\sigma_P & 0 & G_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

where, $G_1 = \sigma_P + \tau_P$, $G_2 = \alpha_I + \gamma_I + \delta_I + \tau_I$, $G_3 = \alpha_A + \gamma_A + \delta_A + \tau_A$. $\mathcal{R}_C$ is the spectral radius of the next generation matrix given by,

$$\mathcal{R}_C = \rho\left(FV^{-1}\right) = \mathcal{R}_I + \mathcal{R}_A + \mathcal{R}_P$$

where $\mathcal{R}_I = \frac{(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\beta_I r \sigma_P}{G_1 G_2}$, $\mathcal{R}_A = \frac{(1-\epsilon_m c_m)(1-r)\beta_A \sigma_P}{G_1 G_3}$, and $\mathcal{R}_P = \frac{(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\beta_P}{G_1}$. In absence of interventions, i.e. with $\tau_I = \tau_A = \tau_P = \tau_A = \epsilon_m = c_m = 0$, we get the basic reproduction number for model (1), $\mathcal{R}_0$, as given earlier.

Theorem 1. *The disease-free equilibrium (DFE) of the model 1 is locally-asymptotically stable if $\mathcal{R}_C < 1$, and unstable if $\mathcal{R}_C > 1$.*

A basic implication of Theorem 1 is that in order to control the COVID-19 outbreak (to not generate more), it suffices to keep $\mathcal{R}_C < 1$.

4.2. Goodness of Fit

We analyze how well our model fits the data from John Hopkins using the T-Test in *R*. The T-Test measures the difference between two sets of continuous data. We want to compare two sample means to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the model and the data. We use a paired T-test where each vector has the same amount of entries and the values are taken from the same independent variable. The T-Test assumes that the data in each vector is normally distributed and that they have approximately equal variances. To test for normality, we use the Shapiro-Wilk Test in *R*. The null hypothesis for this test is that the values in the vector are normally distributed. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, then the distribution of the values in the vector are not significantly different from the normal distribution. I.e. we fail to reject the null hypothesis. We can visualize this using a Q-Q plot. We assume normality if all the points fall along the reference line. We then check the variances of the values in the two vectors using the standard variance equation from probability. Let the null hypothesis for the T-Test be that the difference between the two groups is 0. The T-statistic is defined as

$$T = \frac{\bar{x_1} - \bar{x_2}}{\sqrt{(s_1^2/n_1) + (s_2^2/n_2)}},$$

where, $\bar{x_1}$ is the mean of the data, $\bar{x_s}$ is the mean of the model values, s_1^2 is the variance of the data, s_2^2 is the variance of the model values, n_1 is the sample size of the data, and n_2 is the sample size of the model values. We conclude that the model for each state, cumulative death population, during the lockdown period does indeed fit the data. Table 2 shows the resulting p-values of the T-Test for each state and the United States as a whole during the lockdown period. The goodness of fit plots can be found in the appendix (section 6.3) in Figures 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21.

	Daily p-value	Daily T-statistic	Cumulative p-value	Cumulative T-statistic
United States	0.9722	0.035037	0.7839	0.27581
Florida	0.9083	0.11621	0.4947	0.69165
Arizona	0.6002	-0.52796	0.0004622	3.7845
New York	0.8781	-0.15396	0.007702	2.749
Wisconsin	0.02353	-2.323	2.2e-16	-17.953

Table 2: Goodness of Fit for the T-Test. This table gives the p-values and T-statistic for each test for each state and the United States during the lockdown period. The daily column denotes the model vs the data of the daily deaths. The cumulative column denotes the model vs the data of the cumulative deaths.

4.3. Simulated Epidemics

We fit our model using the cumulative and daily mortality data for Florida, Arizona, Wisconsin, and New York over the pre-lockdown, lockdown, and post-lockdown periods based on the state's respective decisions. Florida, Arizona, New York, and Wisconsin pre-lockdown period is defined from March 10, 2020 to April 3, 2020, March 21, 2020 to March 31, 2020, March 2, 2020 to March 22, 2020, and March 19, 2020 to March 25, 2020 respectively. The lockdown period is defined from April 3, 2020 to May 4, 2020, March 31, 2020 to May 15, 2020, March 22, 2020 to May 28, 2020, March 25, 2020 to May 26, 2020 respectively. For the entire US the pre-lockdown and postlockdown dates are January 22, 2020 to April 7, 2020 and April 7, 2020 to May 28, 2020, as given in [14]. The post-lockdown periods begin at the end of the prescribed lockdown period for each state and for most of our results ends on August 11, 2020. Figure 3 shows the fit for our model with the cumulative deaths data during the lockdown period.



Figure 3: Data fitting of the model using COVID-19 mortality data for the states of Florida, Arizona, New York and Wisconsin during their respective lockdown periods. The plots show the model (blue) against the data (red).

The state variables and the parameters for our model are given in the Appendix in Tables 3 and 4 respectively.

4.3.1. Lockdown starting earlier or later

For all of the states, the first lockdown (and for most states, the only lockdown so far) was implemented in the month of March. Since an earlier lockdown would have most likely prevented the disease from gaining a foothold in these areas, when we simulate an earlier lockdown, we find that the number of cumulative deaths decreases significantly for each state. This decrease occurs each time we add one week to the beginning of the lockdown period - see Figure 4.



Figure 4: **Row 1**: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown began 1 week earlier. **Row 2**: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown began 2 weeks earlier.

In general, an earlier lockdown also results in a decrease in daily cases for both the symptomatic and asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic compartments, as shown in the daily cases plots for Arizona and the entire US in Figure 5.



Figure 5: Daily cases for the asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic individuals (cyan curve) versus the symptomatic individuals (red curve) for the entire US and Arizona. **Row 1**: If lockdown began 1 week earlier. **Row 2**: If lockdown began 2 weeks earlier.

On the other hand, if we use the original lockdown start dates but extend the lockdown periods by 2 and 4 weeks for each state, we again see a decrease in cumulative deaths as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6: **Row 1**: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown was lifted 2 weeks later. **Row 2**: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown was lifted 4 weeks later.

These varying lockdown dates scenarios can be used to assess the efficacy of lockdown periods and to guide the manner in which the lockdown periods are implemented. For example, one interesting lockdown scenario is to consider what would happen if the entire U.S. implemented a lockdown during the month of December 2020 for two weeks. In order to simulate such a strategy we reduce the contact rate parameters - i.e., the betas - by 40% [11] and run the simulation forward. As shown in Figure 7 below, the simulations give that such a lockdown would result in a marked decrease in the number of deaths.



Figure 7: Cumulative deaths in US with lockdown in December (green) versus without lockdown (blue)

4.3.2. Simulations for Asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic, and Symptomatic

In this section, we focus more on comparing the contributions of the symptomatic infectious group versus the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious group. To this end, we first consider plotting the daily cases for the two groups against each other. In all states and time periods, we find that the number of daily cases for the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic is more than the daily cases for the symptomatic as shown in the following figure.



Figure 8: The plots show the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic versus symptomatic individuals for each state during their respective time period. **Row 1**: Pre-lockdown period. **Row 2**: Lockdown period. **Row 3**: Post-lockdown period.

The parameter β_I represents the contacts by the symptomatically infectious individuals that could transmit the disease. By setting $\beta_I = 0$, we eliminate that transmission and focus on the effect of the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. Similarly, fixing $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$, targets the effect of the symptomatically infectious. In order to further discern the role of the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious versus that of the symptomatic infectious, we consider these zero contact rate scenarios in terms of the number of daily cases for all of the states and the entire US. In Figure 9, we show the results for the pre-lockdown and post-lockdown periods and for those periods, we again get that the larger contribution comes from the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals. For the lockdown period we obtain mixed results and these are considered in the appendix (Figure 16).



Figure 9: The plots show the daily cases for each state with $\beta_I = 0$ (cyan curve) and with $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (red curve) during their respective **Row 1**: Pre-lockdown period and **Row 2**: Post-lockdown period.

In Figure 10, we again take the $\beta_I = 0$ (green curve) versus the $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (magenta curve) scenario, but here we consider the effect in terms of cumulative cases and cumulative deaths for the entire US and the state of Arizona. Both types of plots indicate that the main drivers are the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals.



Figure 10: The cumulative cases and deaths for the US and Arizona over the respective lockdown period where **Case 1** corresponds to $\beta_I = 0$ (green curve; so focuses on the impact of asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic individuals) and **Case 2** corresponds to $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (magenta curve; so focuses on the impact of symptomatic individuals)

4.3.3. Isolating Symptomatic and Asymptomatic/Pre-symptomatic

Recall that the τ values give the rate for testing/detection of infected individuals and subsequent self-isolation. In this section we compare and contrast the effect of isolating the symptomatic against the effect of isolating the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic by changing the appropriate τ values. For example, to address the effect of isolating symptomatic infectious individuals, we can increase the value of τ_I (the rate that symptomatically infectious individuals self-isolate) while keeping all other rates the same. We consider this scenario for the entire US and find that when τ_I increases (so that the number of symptomatically infectious individuals that are self-isolated and taken out of the general population increases), the number of cumulative deaths decreases by as much as 12.5%. Alternatively, if the rate of self-isolation for the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious individuals - τ_A and τ_P respectively - are increased and the τ_I is kept at the baseline value for the US, the number of cumulative deaths decreases by about 35% at the end of the period - see Figure 11. Thus, the decrease is more pronounced when the τ_A and τ_P are increased than when the τ_I is increased which indicates that the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic have more impact. Figure 12 focuses on the difference in impact with 50% increase in testing and shows that the asmptomatic

and pre-symptomatic testing gives up to about four times as much percent decrease as the symptomatic.

We can also compare the effect of these type of testing scenarios for different states. For example, although Wisconsin and Florida had similar testing rates around 12/10/2020, we find that a 50% increase in τ_A and τ_P, results in roughly a 20% decrease in cumulative deaths for Wisconsin compared to a 50% decrease in cumulative deaths for Florida - Figure 13. Note that the results for both states show the greater influence of the aysmptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious.



Figure 11: The effect of an increase in testing of symptomatic individuals versus asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals on the cumulative deaths in the US during post-lockdown period 5/15 to 8/11.



Figure 12: The effect of a 50% increase in testing of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic versus symptomatic on the cumulative deaths in the US during post-lockdown period 5/28 to 8/11.



Figure 13: The effect of a 50 percent increase in testing of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic (green curve) versus symptomatic (magenta curve) individuals on the cumulative deaths for Wisconsin and Florida.

4.3.4. Minimum testing needed

In this section we consider the question concerning the minimum rate of testing/detection required to lower the control reproduction number, $\mathcal{R}_C$ below one. This question is more difficult to answer directly, but we can begin to get at an answer by again considering the effect of increasing testing. For example, for the entire US from May 28 to Aug 11 (after lifting of lockdown) if the testing rate for asymptomatic and

pre-symptomatic is 0.2 - that is, if τ_A and τ_P are both set to 0.2, while $\tau_I = 0.4$, then the reproduction control number $\mathcal{R}_C$ is 1.0346 (so just above 1). If τ_A and τ_P are bumped above 0.2, for example to 0.25, while τ_I remains at 0.4, then $\mathcal{R}_C$ falls below 1 - to 0.9628 - and the resulting decrease in cumulative deaths and daily cases is shown in Figure 14. To get a better appreciation of the impact of testing for asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases, note that if τ_A and τ_P are kept at their baseline fitted values, then τ_I must be increased to 1.7 to get $\mathcal{R}_C = 0.9945$. Of course, the challenge with all of these testing scenarios is that the testing of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals is more difficult since those individuals do not have symptoms, so in order to achieve these testing rates, widespread and frequent testing should be implemented.



Figure 14: The effect of an increase in τ_A and τ_P

4.4. Forward Simulation of the Pandemic

Natural herd immunity refers to the process by which enough of the population achieves immunity via natural recovery from the disease, so that the remaining population that is not immune also receives protection against the acquisition of the disease. The process involves a natural herd immunity threshold, that is, the minimum number of people required to achieve disease-acquired immunity. For a disease with a basic reproduction number of $\mathcal{R}_0$, the necessary minimum fraction of people who must achieve immunity can be given as $1 - 1/\mathcal{R}_0$. We simulate for both Wisconsin (a state which was considered an epicenter later in 2020) and the entire US, a scenario in which COVID-19 is allowed to run its natural course (with no implementation of any new control or mitigation strategies) until natural herd immunity is achieved . For both Wisconsin and the entire US, the number of deaths that occur before reaching the herd immunity threshold, is considerably high; thus, making the success of a natural herd immunity strategy for COVID-19 questionable (at the very least). For the state of Wisconsin, the number of deaths that occurs is approximately 290,000 and for the entire U.S., the number of deaths is more than 5 million - see Figure 15.



Figure 15: The number of deaths that will occur before natural herd immunity threshold is achieved for the state of Wisconsin and the entire US. The simulations are run starting on October 13.

5. Discussion

From various perspectives, our analysis indicates that overall, the drivers of COVID-19 are the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious individuals. We see that if testing is increased, these asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infectious have a greater impact than the symptomatic infectious; hence, widespread and frequent testing is key to controlling the spread of the disease. This is especially true after holiday periods and large gathering events which are often notorious for reduced and lax implementation of control and mitigation strategies such as social distancing. Thus, in the schools and workplaces, testing should be intentionally and systematically increased after such occurrences in order to control the silent transmission by the newly infectious individuals who do not (yet) have symptoms. Our simulations also show that although lockdown might be difficult in terms of economic impact, the benefit of even a short lockdown (2 weeks) in reducing deaths is considerable.

6. Acknowledgements

The authors extend special thanks to the 2020 African Diaspora Joint Mathematics Workshop (ADJOINT), Dr. Abba Gumel (our ADJOINT group leader) and & the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute (MSRI), especially the MSRI IT members Aaron Hale & Nate Orange. We also acknowledge the following funding sources for ADJOINT: Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (G-2020-12602), National Science Foundation (DMS-1915954 and DMS-2016406), and National Security Agency (H98230-20-1-0015).

7. Appendix A

7.1. Tables of State Variables and Parameter Values

State Variable	Description
S	Population of susceptible individuals
E	Population of non-quarantined exposed individuals (infected but not showing symptoms and cannot transmit infection; newly-infected but not infectious)
E_P	Population of pre-symptomatic (infectious) individuals
I	Population of symptomatically-infectious individuals
A	Population of asymptomatically-infectious individuals
J	Population of self-isolated individuals
H	Population of hospitalized individuals
R	Population of recovered individuals
C	Population of individuals in intensive care unit (ICU)
D	Population of COVID-19 deceased individuals

Table 3: State variables for the Model 1

Parameter	Description	Range	Baseline value	References
β_I	Effective contact rate for symptomatically-infectious individuals	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
β_A	Effective contact rate for asymptomatically-infectious individuals	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
β_P	Effective contact rate for pre-symptomatically-infections individuals	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
ϵ_m	Efficacy of face masks to prevent transmission and acquisition of infection ($0 < \epsilon_m \leq 1$)	0.4 –0.6	0.5	[14]
c_m	Compliance in face mask usage in the community ($0 < c_m \leq 1$)	0.0190-0.1835	per state	[14]
σ_e	Progression rate from exposed (E) to pre-symptomatic infectious class (E_p) infectious class	1/2.5 day^{-1}	1/2.5 day^{-1}	[14]
σ_P	Progression rate from pre-symptomatic infectious class (E_p) to asymptomatically infectious or symptomatically infectious	1/2.5 day^{-1}	1/2.5 day^{-1}	[14]
r	Fraction of exposed individuals who show clinical symptoms at the end of the incubation period	0.4 – 0.6	0.6	[13, 10, 6]
τ_P	Rate at which pre-symptomatic infectious individuals self-isolate	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
τ_I	Rate self-quarantined symptomatically-infectious humans self-isolate	0.07 - 0.4681 day^{-1}	1/2.5 day^{-1}	[18, 5, 15, 12, 16, 11]
τ_A	Rate at which asymptomatically-infectious humans self-isolate	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
γ_I	Recovery rate for individuals in the I class	1/30 – 1/3 day^{-1}	1/7 day^{-1}	[13, 10, 6]
γ_A	Recovery rate for individuals in the A class	1/14 – 1/3 day^{-1}	1/7 day^{-1}	[13, 10, 6]
γ_J	Recovery rate for self-isolated individuals	0.0714 – 0.1667 day^{-1}	1/8 day^{-1}	[13]
γ_H	Recovery rate for hospitalized patients	1/30 – 1/3 day^{-1}	1/14 day^{-1}	[13, 10, 6]
γ_C	Recovery rate for ICU patients	0.018 – 0.14 day^{-1}	0.0225 day^{-1}	[13, 9]
ψ_H	Rate of ICU admission for hospitalized individuals	0.02 – 0.1667 day^{-1}	0.083 day^{-1}	[13, 6, 11]
α_I	Hospitalization rate for symptomatically-infectious individuals	0.1111 - 0.3333 day^{-1}	0.2199 day^{-1}	[6, 8, 10]
α_A	Hospitalization rate for asymptomatically-infectious individuals	0.1667 – 0.3333 day^{-1}	1/4 day^{-1}	[4, 13**?**]
α_J	Hospitalization rate for self-isolated individuals	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
δ_I	Disease-induced mortality rate for symptomatically-infectious individuals	0.001 – 0.1 day^{-1}	0.0225 day^{-1}	[6, 11, 13, 7]
δ_A	Disease-induced mortality rate for asymptomatically-infectious individuals	0.001 – 0.1 day^{-1}	0.0075 day^{-1}	[6, 7]
δ_H	Disease-induced mortality rate for hospitalized individuals	0.001 – 0.1 day^{-1}	0.015 day^{-1}	[10, 6, 11]
δ_C	Disease-induced mortality rate individuals in ICU	0.001 – 0.1 day^{-1}	0.0225 day^{-1}	[10, 6, 7]

Table 4: **Parameter notation, description, values and sources for the Model 1.** Some values change depending on the state and time period and for simulations that are post post-lockdown or involve testing implications, the testing parameter values are chosen to moreso align with reported testing trends.

7.2. Lockdown period with separated symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals

In Figure 9, the results for the pre-lockdown and post-lockdown periods confirm the hypothesis that the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic are the primary contributors to the spread of COVID-19. However, when we consider this scenario of targeting the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic (by setting $\beta_I = 0$) versus the symptomatic (with $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$) for lockdown, we get mixed results. In particular for New York and Wisconsin we get more symptomatic infectious cases than asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic - see Figure 16.



Figure 16: The plots show the daily cases for each state with $\beta_I = 0$ (cyan curve) and $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (red curve) for the lockdown period.

7.3. Goodness of Fit

In this section, we show the plots for the goodness of fit of the lockdown period for each state and the US as a whole.



Figure 17: US **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 18: Florida **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 19: Arizona **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 20: New York **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 21: Wisconsin **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank MSRI and the AJOINT program for their continued support.

References

[1] Coronavirus. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-84ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html. Accessed: 2020-12-10.

[2] Covid-19 dashboard by the center for systems science and engineering. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html. Accessed: 2020-12-10.

[3] Covid-19 statistics. https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-america?view=mask-use&tab=trendl. Accessed: 2020-12-10.

[4] Management of patients with confirmed 2019-ncov. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html. Accessed: 2020-12-10.

[5] Gerardo Chowell, Diego Chowell, Kimberlyn Roosa, Ranu Dhillon, and Devabhaktuni Srikrishna. Sustainable social distancing through facemask use and testing during the covid-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*, pages 2020.04.01.20049981–2020.04.01.20049981, 2020.

[6] Steffen E. Eikenberry, Marina Mancuso, Enahoro Iboi, Tin Phan, Keenan Eikenberry, Yang Kuang, Eric Kostelich, and Abba B. Gumel. To mask or not to mask: Modeling the potential for face mask use by the general public to curtail the covid-19 pandemic. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 5:293–308, 2020.

[7] N. Ferguson and et. al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (npis) to reduce covid19 mortality and healthcare demand. 2020.

[8] Shikha Garg and et al. Hospitalization Rates and Characteristics of Patients Hospitalized with Laboratory-Confirmed Coronavirus Disease 2019 - COVID-NET, 14 States, March 1 - 30, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 2020.

[9] Jeremy Gold and et al. Characteristics and Clinical Outcomes of Adult Patients Hospitalized with COVDI-19 -Georgia, March 2020. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69.

[10] Abba B. Gumel, Enahoro Iboi, and Calistus N. Ngonghala. Using mathematics to understand covid-19 dynamics. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, (Under review), 2020.

[11] Enahoro Amos Iboi, Calistus N. Ngonghala, and Abba B Gumel. Will an imperfect vaccine curtail the covid-19 pandemic in the u.s.? *medRxiv*, page 2020.05.10.20097428, 01 2020.

[12] Adam J Kucharski and et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of sars-cov-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 06 2020.

[13] Calistus N. Ngonghala, Enahoro Iboi, Steffen Eikenberry, Matthew Scotch, Chandini Raina MacIntyre, Matthew H. Bonds, and Abba B. Gumel. Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel coronavirus. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 325:108364, 2020.

[14] N. Iboi Enahoro A. Gumel Abba B. Ngonghala, Calistus. Could masks curtail the post-lockdown resurgence of COVID-19 in the US? *Mathematical Biosciences*, 329:1–18, 2020.

[15] Timothy P Sheahan and et al. An orally bioavailable broad-spectrum antiviral inhibits sars-cov-2 in human airway epithelial cell cultures and multiple coronaviruses in mice. *Science Translational Medicine*, 12(541):eabb5883–eabb5883, 04 2020.

[16] Suochen Tian and et al. Clinical Characteristics and Reasons for Differences in Duration From Symptom Onset to Release From Quarantine Among Patients With COVID-19 in Liaocheng, China. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 2020.

[17] P. van den Driessche and J. Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 180:29–48, 2002.

[18] Lee Worden, Rae Wannier, Seth Blumberg, Alex Y. Ge, George W. Rutherford, and Travis C. Porco. Estimation of effects of contact tracing and mask adoption on covid-19 transmission in san francisco: a modeling study. *medRxiv*, pages 2020.06.09.20125831–2020.06.09.20125831, 2020.



Ian M Mackay for virologydownunder.com
Created: 10MAR2020



$$\lambda = (1 - \epsilon_m c_m)\left(\beta_I I + \beta_A A + \beta_P E_P\right)\frac{1}{N}$$


Wisconsin Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
3/25 - 5/26


Arizona Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
75
80
3/31 - 5/15


Florida Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
1500
1000
500
0
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
4/3 - 5/4


New York Lockdown
Data
Model
3.5
3
2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
0
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


Florida Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
3/28 - 5/4
0
200
400
600
800
1000
1200
1400
25
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65


Florida Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
200
400
600
800
1000
1200
1400
20
25
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
3/21 - 5/4


Arizona Lockdown
Data
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
20
30
40
50
60
70
80


Arizona Lockdown
Data
Model
700
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
3/13 - 5/15


New York Lockdown
Data
Model
3
2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


New York Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
0.5
1
1.5
2
2.5
3
3.5
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
1/7 - 5/28


Wisconsin Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
3/18 - 5/26


Wisconsin Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
3/11 - 5/26


US Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Population
1/31 - 5/28


US Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Population
0
1000
2000
3000
4000
5000
6000
7000
8000
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


Arizona Lockdown
Asymptomatic
Symptomatic


Arizona Lockdown
Symptomatic
1.8
1.6
1.4
1.2
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
3/13 - 5/15


Arizona Lockdown
Data
Model
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
800
900
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
3/31 - 5/29


Arizona Lockdown
Data
Model
1200
1000
800
600
400
200
0
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
110
3/31 - 6/12


Florida Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
200
400
600
800
1000
1200
1400
1600
1800
2000
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
75
80
4/3 - 5/18


Florida Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
4/3 - 6/1
0
500
1000
1500
2000
2500
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100


New York Lockdown
Data
Model
3.5
3
2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
0
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
110


New York Lockdown
Cumulative Deaths
1/22 - 6/25


Wisconsin Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
110


Wisconsin Lockdown
Data
Model
Cumulative Deaths
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
800
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
110
120


US Postlockdown
Cumulative Deaths
Dec 02, 2020 - Jan 20, 2021


New York Post-Lockdown
1400
1200
1000
800
600
400
200
0
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Wisconsin Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Proportion
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


Wisconsin Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
Population
1/19 - 5/26


Wisconsin Post-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Population
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
80
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Arizona Lockdown


Arizona Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Proportion
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
20
22
24
26
28
30
32


Arizona Post-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
1200
400
0
70
80
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Florida Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
Population
900
800
700
600
500
400
300
200
100
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
4/3 - 5/4


Florida Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
Population
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
10
15
20
25
30
35
3/10 - 4/3


Florida Post-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
Population
5/4 - 8/11
0
1000
2000
3000
4000
5000
6000
7000
8000
60
80
100
120
140
160
180


New York Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
3000
2000
1000
0
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


New York Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Population
0
500
1000
1500
2000
2500
3000
3500
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
20
22


Florida Post-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
Population
3000
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
5/4 - 8/11


New York Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
0
20
40
60
80
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
20
22


New York Post-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
1200
400
0
80
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Wisconsin Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Proportion
3/19 - 3/25


Wisconsin Post-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Population
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
80
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Arizona Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Proportion
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
20
22
24
26
28
30
32


Arizona Post-Lockdown
Symptomatic
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
-100
70
80
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Florida Pre-Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
Population
3/10 - 4/3
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
15
20
25
30
35


US Lockdown
Case 1
Case 2
Case 3


US Lockdown
Model
Cumulative Deaths


Arizona Lockdown
Model
Case 1
Case 2
0
500
1000
1500
2000
2500
3000
3500
4000
4500
5000
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
75
80


Arizona Lockdown
Node
Case 1
Cumulative Deaths
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
75
80


Effect of Percent Increase in Tau0 & TauP in US
1.7
1.6
1.5
1.4
1.3
1.2
1.1
1
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Effect of Percent Increase In Tau I In US
Data
1.6
1.5
1.4
1.3
1.2
1.1
1
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Effect of 50 Percent Increase in testing and Isolating in US
1.7
1.6
1.5
1.4
1.3
1.2
1.1
1
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Effect of 50 Percent Increase in Testing and Isolating in WI
Data
1000
900
800
700
600
500
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


Effect of 50 Percent Increase in testing and isolating in FL
Data
Cumulative Deaths
1000
2000
3000
4000
5000
6000
7000
8000
9000
60
80
100
120
140
160
180



US, tauI = 0.4, tauA = 0.25, tauP = 0.25, Rc = 0.95178
mode
1.6
1.4
1.2
1
80
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


US Postlockdown
2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170


US. R_0= 5.2149 & R_t = 1.7236, unddate 155
betaU = 0.1 betaA = 0.47 betaF = 1
unddate 155 = Dec 28, 2021
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140


Wisconsin, R_0 = 3.8565 & R_t = 2.537, enddate 53
enddate 53 = Dec 05
0
10
20
30
40
50
60


Florida Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Symptomatic
Population
900
800
700
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
4/3 - 5/4


New York Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
3000
2000
1000
0
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


Wisconsin Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Proportion
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


Arizona Lockdown
Asymptomatic & Presymptomatic
Proportion
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
75
80


US Cumulative Deaths
Model
Data


3000
2000
1000
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


4000
3000
2000
1000
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


150000
100000
50000
0
-50000
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


150000
100000
50000
0
-50000
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


US Daily Deaths
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
Model
Data


Florida Cumulative Deaths
Model
Data


50
40
30
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


80
40
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


2000
1000
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


2000
1000
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


Florida Daily Deaths
20
40
60
80
Model
Data


Arizona Cumulative Deaths
Model
Data


20
10
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


50
25
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


1000
500
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


500
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


Arizona Daily Deaths
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
Model
Data


New York State Cumulative Deaths
0
5000
15000
25000
Model
Data


1500
1000
500
0
-500
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


1000
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


50000
25000
0
-25000
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


50000
25000
0
-25000
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


New York Daily Deaths
1200
800
600
400
200
Model
Data


Wisconsin Daily Deaths
15
10
5
Model
Data


Wisconsin Cumulative Deaths
500
300
100
Model
Data


15
10
5
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


20
15
10
5
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


1000
500
0
-500
Sencle
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical


1000
500
0
Sample
2
1
0
1
2
Theoretical