

# Lessons from a pandemic

**Authors:** Yves Egli<sup>1\*</sup>, Valentin Rousson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisante), University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

\*Corresponding author: [yves.eggli@unisante.ch](mailto:yves.eggli@unisante.ch)

Both authors contributed to the study conception and design. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Yves Egli, completed and revised by Valentin Rousson. Both authors calculated and refined the results of the scenarios, read and approved the final manuscript.

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 12 **Abstract**

13 **Objectives:** Several interventions have been used around the world trying to contain  
14 the SARS-Cov-2 pandemic, such as quarantine, prohibition of mass demonstrations,  
15 isolation of sick people, tracing of virus carriers, semi-containment, promotion of barrier  
16 gestures, development of rapid auto-tests and vaccines among others. We propose a  
17 simple model to evaluate the potential impact of such interventions.

18 **Methods:** A model for the reproduction number of an infectious disease including three  
19 main contexts of infection (indoor mass events, public indoor activities and household)  
20 and seven parameters is considered. We illustrate how these parameters could be  
21 obtained from the literature or from expert assumptions, and we apply the model to  
22 describe 20 scenarios that can typically occur during the different phases of a pandemic.

23 **Results:** This model provides a useful framework for better understanding and  
24 communicating the effects of different (combinations of) possible interventions, while  
25 encouraging constant updating of expert assumptions to better match reality.

26 **Conclusion:** This simple approach will bring more transparency and public support to  
27 help governments to think, decide, evaluate and adjust what to do during a pandemic.

## 29 **Introduction**

30 The SARS-Cov-2 pandemic has been a challenge for the whole world. Countries  
31 implemented diverse measures to contain it such as quarantine, prohibition of mass  
32 demonstrations, isolation of sick people, tracing of virus carriers, semi-containment,  
33 promotion of barrier gestures (masks, hand washing with alcohol), development of  
34 rapid auto-tests and vaccines among others. The effectiveness of such specific  
35 interventions is difficult to measure, since they were often implemented simultaneously  
36 and in non-comparable contexts [1].

37 Politicians often turned to scientists with the creation of "task forces" to advise them.  
38 They took tough political decisions, depriving residents of their freedom of movement,  
39 shutting down schools and entire sectors of the economy for several months [2]. Fear set  
40 in and conflicting information circulated [3]. They invested significant amounts in  
41 scientific research [4]. Controversies arose, for example on the effectiveness of certain  
42 treatments, on the importance of the climatic factor [5, 6] or on the impact of partial  
43 containment measures [7, 8]. This planetary experience showed that it was difficult to  
44 predict the development of a pandemic [9, 10]. How should we react if a new pandemic  
45 would occur? What lessons can we learn from the current pandemic?

46 From our point of view, the main lesson is that we missed a general theory to manage  
47 this pandemic, in a context of great uncertainty. We missed a conceptual framework to  
48 assess the potential impact of each intervention, taking into account the characteristics  
49 of the virus and the affected population.

50 The aim of this paper is to lay the foundations for such a theory for the different phases  
51 of a pandemic. Most of the elements of this theory are known and have already been

52 intuitively applied. The purpose here is only to clarify certain points and to set the  
53 minimum parameters necessary to monitor and manage a pandemic. Everyone can then  
54 refine the proposed model and make their own assumptions and adjustments.

## 55 **Methods**

56 A formula has long been available for measuring the development of an epidemic  
57 through its reproduction number R, defined as the average number of people infected by  
58 a carrier of a specific infection [11,12]. If the value of R exceeds 1.0 the epidemic will  
59 grow up exponentially, if it is less than 1.0 it will die out. This formula involves the  
60 product of three factors as follows:

$$61 \quad R = D * C * N \quad (\text{Formula 1})$$

62 where D is the average duration of contagion (measured in days), C is the  
63 contagiousness (probability that a person will be contaminated during a contact with a  
64 carrier), and N is the average number of contacts per day that a carrier may have. Of  
65 course, the contagiousness will not be the same for each contact, obviously depending  
66 on the “intensity” of the contact. In this formula, C must therefore be considered as an  
67 “average” probability calculated over all types of daily contacts.

68 Formula 1 applies at the start of an epidemic, where it is usually noted  $R_0$ , and when  
69 anyone in contact is likely to be infected. To take into account the appearance of  
70 immunized people (following the disease or by vaccination [13]), a fourth factor is  
71 introduced into the formula [14], yielding:

$$72 \quad R = D * C * N * (1-P) \quad (\text{Formula 2})$$

73 where P is the prevalence of immunized people. Formula 2 explains herd immunity, the  
74 value of R falling below 1.0 if P is large enough, in fact as soon as  $P > 1 - 1/R_0$ .

75 From there, one can immediately understand how the various measures taken by a  
76 government may affect the course of an epidemic. Testing and isolating the patients  
77 makes it possible to reduce the duration of the contagion (D), the barrier gestures will  
78 influence the contagiousness (C), the containment reduces the number of contacts (N)  
79 and the vaccination will act on the prevalence of immunized people (P). These  
80 mechanisms were clearly in the minds of the governments that imposed these measures.  
81 However, as far as we can ascertain, there has been little or no discussion of the  
82 expected consequences of the actions taken with respect to these simple formulae.

83 Some of the concrete questions that decision makers ask during an epidemic include the  
84 following. Should demonstrations be banned? If so, from what size? Should school  
85 classes, restaurants, and certain businesses be closed? In high schools or universities,  
86 what percentage of student participation should be allowed? To answer this type of  
87 questions, it would be necessary to stratify the contexts of contamination, and to  
88 consider a finer formula for the reproduction number:

89 
$$R = \sum_i D_i * C_i * N_i * (1-P_i) \quad (\text{Formula 3})$$

90 This formula expresses the obvious fact that the total number of contaminations due to a  
91 carrier is obtained by the sum of those occurring in all possible (and mutually exclusive)  
92 contexts where that carrier has a chance to infect someone. In Formula 3, a possibly  
93 different duration  $D_i$ , contagiousness  $C_i$ , number of contacts  $N_i$  and prevalence of  
94 immunized people  $P_i$  is allowed in each population stratum  $i$ . Strata could include for  
95 example mass manifestations, public transports, schools, work, shops, leisure activities,  
96 homes for the elderly and households. Importantly, each individual could contaminate  
97 people in more than one stratum, depending on his/her activities. Again, we are

98 considering a stratification of contaminations, not of individuals, so our terminology  
99 may differ somewhat from its traditional meaning in epidemiology.

100 To use Formula 3 in practice, it is necessary to simplify it. We could for example assume  
101 that the duration of the contagion and the prevalence of immunized people is the same  
102 in all strata. This is not always possible though. For instance, the prevalence of  
103 immunized people will increase more quickly in contaminated strata, such as homes for  
104 the elderly, than in the general population. In fact, we shall not consider below the  
105 (important but peculiar) stratum of the homes for the elderly, which actually  
106 necessitates separate actions and discussions. On the other hand, it is probably fair to  
107 assume that contagiousness will be lower for outdoor than for indoor activities, being  
108 close to zero and almost negligible for the former. Finally, the number of contacts will  
109 strongly depend on the strata, a carrier obviously meeting more people in a crowd or in  
110 a public transport than within his/her household.

111 In this paper, we consider the following simplified formula (or model) to express the  
112 reproduction number:

113 
$$R = D (1-P) (C*N_1+C*N_2+C_3*N_3) \quad (\text{Formula 4})$$

114 It is a model with three strata and seven parameters. These three strata represent  
115 respectively *indoor mass events* (in a closed space with at least 100 persons, e.g.  
116 concerts, cinemas, bars, dancing, choirs), *public indoor activities* (including public  
117 transport, schools, work, shopping or leisure) and *households* (i.e. families), thought to  
118 be three main contexts where contaminations occur. We consider that the number of  
119 contacts might be different in each stratum, and assume that contagiousness is identical  
120 in the first two strata, but might be higher within households, where the contacts are

121 closer. On the basis of such a simplification of reality, it becomes possible to partly  
122 answer some of the questions above, to quantify approximately what the consequences  
123 of a government's measures will be, and to suggest appropriate decisions, as we shall  
124 see in the next section.

## 125 **Results**

126 In what follows, we examine 20 scenarios involving different parameter values in  
127 Formula 4. Results are summarized in Table 1.

129 Table 1: Values of the seven parameters of our model defined by Formula 4 according to  
 130 20 scenarios to manage the SARS-Cov-2 epidemic, together with the resulting  
 131 reproduction number R characterizing the spread of the disease. In bold the parameter  
 132 values that are different from the baseline scenario (Scenario A). Underlined, the R-  
 133 values that are less than one.

Scenario	P	D	C	C <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	R
A Baseline (Switzerland)	0	7	0.027	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	2.21
B China	0	7	0.027	0.081	<b>1.19</b>	<b>8.40</b>	<b>2.65</b>	3.32
C India	0	7	0.027	0.081	<b>1.19</b>	<b>8.40</b>	<b>4.79</b>	4.53
D Senegal	0	7	0.027	0.081	<b>1.19</b>	<b>8.40</b>	<b>12.30</b>	8.79
E Quarantine (30 persons)	0	7	0.027	0.081	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>29.00</b>	16.44
F Quarantine (10 persons)	0	7	0.027	0.081	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	5.10
G Seasonal variations	0	7	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.027</b>	1.00	7.06	1.21	<u>0.74</u>
H Barrier gestures	0	7	<b>0.014</b>	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	1.48
I Isolation of patient	0	<b>5</b>	0.027	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	1.58
J Isolation & contact tracing	0	<b>3</b>	0.027	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	<u>0.95</u>
K Ban of mass events	0	7	0.027	0.081	<b>0.00</b>	7.06	1.21	2.02
L Semi-containment	0	7	0.027	<b>0.122</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.53</b>	1.21	1.70
M Full-containment	0	7	0.027	<b>0.162</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	1.21	1.37
N Mixture of measures (H+I+K)	0	<b>5</b>	<b>0.014</b>	0.081	<b>0.00</b>	7.06	1.21	<u>0.98</u>
O Auto-testing (100% sensitivity)	0	<b>1</b>	0.027	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	<u>0.32</u>
P Auto-testing (60% sensitivity)	0	<b>3.4</b>	0.027	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	1.07
Q Vaccination start	<b>0.33</b>	7	<b>0.014</b>	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	<u>0.99</u>
R Herd immunity	<b>0.55</b>	7	0.027	0.081	1.00	7.06	1.21	<u>0.99</u>
S New variant	<b>0.78</b>	7	<b>0.054</b>	<b>0.162</b>	1.00	7.06	1.21	<u>0.97</u>
T New resistant variant	<b>0.55</b>	7	<b>0.054</b>	<b>0.162</b>	1.00	7.06	1.21	1.99
Parameters: P = prevalence of immunized people D = duration of the contagion (days)								

<p>C = contagiousness (probability of contamination during a contact with a carrier) C<sub>3</sub> = contagiousness in households N<sub>1</sub> = average number of contacts per day during indoor mass events N<sub>2</sub> = average number of contacts per day during public indoor activities N<sub>3</sub> = average number of contacts per day in households</p>
--

134

135 **Baseline scenario (onset of the SARS-Cov-2 epidemic in Switzerland)**

136 Since we have 7 parameters in our model, we need 7 information to estimate them. We  
137 attempt here to estimate these quantities in a country like Switzerland, where the  
138 present authors are living, but this may also be valid in other European countries. For  
139 the SARS-Cov-2 epidemic emerging in Wuhan (China), it was reported that the contagion  
140 lasted on average  $D=7$  days (two days before the onset of symptoms [15] plus five days  
141 after [16]). A similar value of  $D$  should probably apply in other parts of the world. At the  
142 start of the epidemic, the proportion of immunized people is obviously  $P=0$ , while an  
143 estimated  $R=R_0=2.21$  has been reported for Western Europe [17]. On the other hand, a  
144 study in Switzerland [18] estimated that  $D \cdot C_3=57\%$  of the people sharing the household  
145 of a carrier were in turn contaminated, this percentage decreasing to  $D \cdot C=19\%$  for the  
146 contacts of a carrier outside the household. This suggests daily contagiousness values of  
147  $C_3=0.57/7=0.081$  and  $C=0.19/7=0.027$ . The number of people per household in  
148 Switzerland is 2.21 [19], meaning that a carrier shared his/her household with an  
149 average of  $N_3=1.21$  persons. To get a seventh information, we assume that 1% of the  
150 Swiss population participates to a mass manifestation averaging 100 persons each day,  
151 yielding an average number of daily contacts in a mass manifestation of  $N_1=0.01 \cdot 100=1$ .  
152 Clearly, a more precise estimation of this quantity could/should be obtained via a  
153 dedicated survey, although this would not fundamentally change the nature of our  
154 results. From there, one can estimate an average number of daily contacts outside

155 household of  $N_2=(R_0-D*C*N_1-D*C_3*N_3)/(D*C)=7.06$ . These are contacts likely to produce  
156 contamination, often estimated by fifteen minutes at least of direct or close physical  
157 contact [20]. Of note, the  $R_0=2.21$  contaminations due to a carrier can be decomposed  
158 into  $D*C*N_1=0.19$  (9%) contaminations in the first stratum,  $D*C*N_2=1.33$  (60%) in the  
159 second stratum and  $D*C_3*N_3=0.69$  (31%) in the third stratum. Surveys could be used to  
160 check whether this decomposition reasonably matches the reality or not, and in the  
161 latter case, suggest some appropriate update of the values of parameters in our model.

162 These data represent Scenario A in Table 1, referred to as the baseline scenario. Without  
163 explicit mention of a change, these parameter values of our model will be taken identical  
164 in the other scenarios presented below.

### 165 **Other places in the world**

166 In China, a meta-analysis provided an estimated value of  $R_0=3.32$  [21]. Keeping the same  
167 contagiousness values as in the baseline scenario, and knowing that the number of  
168 people per household is 3.65 in the Hubei region (where it all began) [22], yielding  
169  $N_3=2.65$ , this value of  $R_0$  would be compatible with an increase of 19% of the contacts in  
170 the first two strata compared to the baseline scenario (Scenario B).

171 This reminds and illustrates that a disease with a given contagiousness and duration of  
172 contagion may reach different values of  $R_0$  depending on the number of contacts and  
173 size of the households. As further examples, keeping the data of Scenario B, but  
174 considering households of size 5.79 (as in India, Scenario C) or 13.3 (as in Senegal,  
175 Scenario D), one would obtain values of respectively  $R_0=4.53$  and  $R_0=8.79$ , considerably  
176 higher than what has been reported in China. Other factors would probably affect the  
177 different parameters of our model, for instance climatic factors or the social

178 organization, but these simple calculations show that the reproduction number can vary  
179 considerably from one country to another, only depending on the size of the households.

## 180 **Quarantines**

181 A strict quarantine strategy is effective in protecting the global population from the  
182 arrival of contagious people. However, there are significant risks to those quarantined,  
183 as illustrated by the example of the Diamond Princess, where 697 out of 3711  
184 passengers were infected (and 7 died) because of a single carrier at the start of the  
185 quarantine [23]. In places less spacious than a ship, quarantined persons could be seen  
186 as forming a large household, without any contact outside the household (i.e. with  
187  $N_1=N_2=0$ ). Considering that 30 people are quarantined (i.e.  $N_3=29$ ), which could be a  
188 school classroom, we end up with a very high reproduction number ( $R=16.44$ , Scenario  
189 E), such that many of those people will be quickly infected. The calculation also shows  
190 that if we would quarantine these people by forming three sub-groups of 10 persons (i.e.  
191  $N_3=9$ ), the risks would be lower ( $R=5.10$ , Scenario F). Note that these values are just  
192 indicative of the intensity of the contagiousness of the disease at the beginning of the  
193 quarantine. This does not imply that each carrier will really infect an average of 16.44,  
194 respectively of 5.10 other persons, since the prevalence of immunized persons  $P$  would  
195 quickly increase in such a context.

## 196 **Seasonal variations**

197 The onset of the summer 2020 in Europe correlated with a marked decline in the  
198 reproduction rate. Assuming a reduction of two thirds of contagiousness ( $C$  and  $C_3$ )  
199 during the summer would drop the reproduction number below the critical value of 1  
200 without taking any protective measure ( $R=0.74$ , Scenario G). Note that the decrease of

201 contagiousness in summer could also be due to the decrease of the intensity of indoor  
202 contacts, as people would spend more time outside.

### 203 **Protective measures**

204 Apart from a few countries that have implemented a strict containment policy, most  
205 nations have had to deal with the pandemic by taking partial protective measures.  
206 Formula 4 makes it possible to estimate the potential effectiveness of the different  
207 measures. For instance, a realistic application of barrier gestures in public (including  
208 wearing a mask), aiming at reducing contagiousness  $C$  by half (for example), would not  
209 be sufficiently effective on its own, allowing a reduction from  $R= 2.21$  (baseline  
210 scenario) to  $R=1.48$  (Scenario H).

211 A systematic isolation of patients as soon as they show symptoms would typically  
212 reduce the average duration of contagion, e.g. from  $D=7$  to  $D=5$  days, to reach  $R=1.58$   
213 (Scenario I). On the other hand, isolating not only the patients but also his/her contacts  
214 via efficient (although administratively demanding) contact tracing should make it  
215 possible to further reduce this average duration, e.g. to  $D=3$  days, yielding  $R=0.95$   
216 (Scenario J), thus falling below the critical value of 1. The values of  $D=5$  and  $D=3$  days  
217 used here are just rough estimations to provide an idea of what could be achieved.  
218 Updated and more accurate values of  $D$  achievable in these cases could be easily  
219 incorporated into Formula 4 if available.

220 One of the first obvious measure taken by the governments was a total ban on mass  
221 events, which in our model is characterized by  $N_1=0$ , allowing for a modest reduction of  
222 the reproduction number, to reach  $R=2.02$  (Scenario K). A semi-containment will further  
223 reduce the number of public contacts in our model ( $N_2$ ), but probably also increase the  
224 intensity of contacts among people living in the same household (via more time spent

225 together), and thus intra-household contagiousness ( $C_3$ ). Assuming a reduction of 50%  
226 of  $N_2$  (while further assuming  $N_1=0$ ) and an increase of 50% of  $C_3$ , we obtain  $R=1.70$   
227 (scenario L), which is not sufficient to fall below the value of 1. Full-containment consist  
228 in completely banning any public contact ( $N_1=N_2=0$ ). If, as a result, intra-household  
229 contagiousness is doubled compared to the baseline scenario ( $C_3=0.162$ ), this yields  
230  $R=1.37$  (Scenario M), which would still be high. Of note, as with quarantines, this would  
231 only be an indication of the intensity of contagiousness of the disease at the onset of a  
232 full-containment. In theory, a strict full-containment would stop the epidemics, as the  
233 proportion of immunized persons living in an infected household would quickly  
234 increase, this being not captured by our simple model.

235 On the other hand, a mixture of measures relatively easy to implement, combining  
236 barriers gestures (Scenario H), isolation of patients (Scenario I) and ban of mass events  
237 (Scenario K), would allow to formally stabilize the epidemics ( $R=0.98$ , Scenario N).

238 Another promising measure has been the use of auto-tests, which are inexpensive,  
239 carried out at home and could significantly reduce the time to contamination if the  
240 detected cases are isolated [24]. With tests detecting all cases (100% of sensitivity)  
241 already during the asymptomatic stage (e.g. reaching an average duration of contagion  
242 of  $D=1$  day, half of the time before the onset of symptoms), we would obtain a low  
243  $R=0.32$  (Scenario O). Unfortunately, such tests may have a modest sensitivity depending  
244 on the gold standard (e.g. the number of cycle thresholds used with a PCR test as gold  
245 standard) [25]. For example, with 60% of sensitivity, the average duration of contagion  
246 would increase to  $D=0.6*1+0.4*7=3.4$  days (since only 60% of cases could be isolated  
247 one day after infection, the 40% missed cases remaining contagious during an average

248 of 7 days in this scenario), yielding  $R=1.07$  (scenario P), thus narrowly missing  
249 stabilizing the epidemic without additional measures.

## 250 **Herd immunity**

251 Formula 4 is also of interest during the last phase of an epidemic, when it comes to  
252 estimating how to mitigate the measures, as the prevalence of immunized persons  $P$  in  
253 the population is increasing (via vaccination or previous infection with the virus).

254 Shortly after the start of vaccination, when herd immunity reaches, say,  $P=0.33$ , it would  
255 be sufficient to apply barrier gestures (scenario H) to contain the epidemics, reaching  
256  $R=0.99$  (Scenario Q). In order to avoid any protective measure, herd immunity should  
257 reach in our case  $P=1-1/2.21=0.55$  to stabilize the epidemics ( $R=0.99$ , Scenario R).

258 Unfortunately, many viruses tend to develop new variants, with a possible significant  
259 change in the contagiousness  $C$  and  $C_3$  of the virus. Recently, searchers estimated a (pre-  
260 vaccination)  $R_0$  value around 5 with the delta variant of SARS-Cov-2 [26, 27] such that  
261 contagiousness is roughly doubled compared to our baseline scenario. In such condition,  
262 vaccinating 78% of the whole population would be necessary to stop the epidemics  
263 ( $R=0.97$ , Scenario S). If such a variant were to be partially resistant to vaccination, the  
264 reproduction number would increase again. Assuming that only 70% of those immune  
265 to the original variant would still be immune to the new one, which would give  
266  $P=0.78*0.7=0.55$ , and without any protective measures, we would (almost) be back to  
267 the beginning of the epidemics ( $R=1.99$ , Scenario T).

## 268 **Discussion**

269 In this paper, we proposed a simple model with three strata and seven parameters to  
270 evaluate the reproduction number characterizing the spread of an infectious disease.

271 The three strata included in our model are indoor mass events, public indoor activities  
272 and households, representing three main contexts where one can be infected. We  
273 suggest using such a model to help manage a pandemic during its different phases. It  
274 should allow for an expert estimation of the expected effects of the various protective  
275 measures taken, an open communication with the public on the assumptions made by  
276 the experts in this regard, a continuous assessment of the results through  
277 epidemiological surveillance, and finally for suggesting and supporting the gradual  
278 release of measures towards the end of the pandemic. In case of discrepancies between  
279 what has been assumed and what has been observed in reality, some assumptions could  
280 be updated and the model re-evaluated using different parameter values.

281 To estimate the seven parameters in our model, seven assumptions or pieces of  
282 information are needed. Some is not be too difficult to obtain, such as the average  
283 household size in a given country. Some could be borrowed from other countries, such  
284 as the average duration of contagion of the disease. Others could be obtained through  
285 specific surveys, such as the frequency of population participation in a mass event, the  
286 proportion of infections occurring within a household, or by investigating the sources of  
287 contamination [28]. Finally, some information should simply be guessed or assumed on  
288 the basis of the scientific literature, with the possibility (and duty) of being updated to  
289 become more and more accurate along the course of the pandemic.

290 In the Results section, we have illustrated how such information could be gathered and  
291 the model used to manage the SARS-Cov2-epidemic, considering as baseline scenario the  
292 onset of the epidemic in Switzerland (or in a European context), although it could easily  
293 be recalculated to fit other configurations. Although our model is simple, we could

294 attempt to evaluate the influence of most of the potential protective measures that could  
295 be applied by governments, either alone or simultaneously.

296 Using debatable but transparent assumptions, we were able to identify some scenarios  
297 that would allow us to reach a reproduction number of less than one, a necessary  
298 condition for the stabilization of an epidemic. One of the most effective scenario would  
299 be just to rely on seasonal variations, as a virus is generally less contagious in summer  
300 than in winter. Of the measures we could act on, simple isolation of patients might not  
301 be effective enough, while isolation and contact tracing might be sufficient, but  
302 cumbersome to implement. Semi-containment, accompanied by a ban on mass events  
303 and the application of gesture barriers might be a more pragmatic alternative. The best  
304 approach would probably be a systematic application of rapid auto-tests with isolation  
305 of the detected cases. Both interventions are inexpensive and do not cause too many  
306 social restrictions. The possibly low sensitivity of these tests will, however, mitigates the  
307 effects of this attractive measure, although it will remain useful, if not to stop the  
308 pandemics, at least to identify clusters, for example. When available, vaccination of a  
309 significant proportion of the population is another effective measure, unless a resistant  
310 variant of the virus emerges. Of course, all these examples are theoretical and, as already  
311 mentioned, each parameter value we have used can be criticized and modified to obtain  
312 possibly more accurate evaluations.

313 An important aspect of our model is to consider a specific stratum for households. The  
314 focus on stratifying for household contagion is not new [29, 30]. Surprisingly, almost no  
315 action has been recommended to reduce this factor during the pandemic. De facto, many  
316 professionals separated their spouses during the acute phases of the pandemic,  
317 especially when masks and other protective measures were lacking. This is likely to

318 have had an impact. The effect of such an action at the level of the population could be  
319 investigated using our model.

320 Many authors have compared the dangerousness of the coronavirus with other viruses,  
321 such as influenza for example, based on  $R_0$  values. Our model helps to better understand  
322 and illustrate that an  $R_0$  can vary considerably depending on the context and that it  
323 would be better to analyze contagiousness directly [31]. Even with a much more stable  
324 virus like measles, there are large variations in  $R_0$  estimates that are poorly understood  
325 [32]. The SARS-Cov-2 pandemic surprised by its virulence, with an initial  
326 underestimation of its dangerousness. The epicenter of the onset of the pandemic was in  
327 China, which has a relatively small household size. Our calculations show, that the  
328 epidemic would probably have appeared more dangerous if it had originated in India,  
329 for example.

330 Our model has of course limitations. An important one is that we are not able to  
331 recognize that a strict full-containment would be effective (even if it is difficult to  
332 implement and to get a population to accept), as shown during the first wave of SARS-  
333 Cov-2 epidemic in China. This is because the proportion of immunized persons in our  
334 model is assumed to be stable and identical in all three strata. In particular, we do not  
335 capture in our model that the proportion of immunized persons in an infected  
336 household will increase rapidly in the event of a full-containment, so that there will be  
337 no one left to infect, thus stopping the epidemics. This will also apply to a lesser extend  
338 in a semi-containment [33,34]. We are currently investigating ways to extend our model  
339 in this respect, to take into account the fact that herd immunity is reached more quickly  
340 in households than in the general population.

341 Other limitations of our model include the following. We are not able to assess the role  
342 of border controls to limit the circulation of virus variants. As mentioned in the Methods  
343 section, we ignored the important stratum of the homes for the elderly, while we did not  
344 consider the specific situation of children. A model with more than three strata might be  
345 preferable, although this would imply a larger number of parameters to estimate.

346 In the end, our model is probably too simple. Note that the use of more sophisticated  
347 models (SEIR compartmental models or others) provided similar results (advantage or  
348 early detection and mixture of containments measures) but are much more difficult to  
349 implement [35,36]. Scientific studies have also struggled to demonstrate the  
350 effectiveness of e.g. semi-containment measures and the effects of climatic factors. This  
351 is why we still believe that despite its obvious limitations, our simple and pedagogical  
352 model can be extremely useful in helping a government to think, decide and evaluate  
353 what to do during a pandemic. Its use will bring more transparency and public support  
354 than the use of more sophisticated models, also to manage future pandemics with  
355 different characteristics than SARS-Cov-2.

## 357 **References**

- 358 1. Haug N, Geyrhofer L, Londei A, Dervic E, Desvars-Larrive A, Loreto V, et al. Ranking  
359 the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government interventions. *Nat Hum*  
360 *Behav.* 2020;4(12):1303-1312. doi: 10.1038/s41562-020-01009-0.
- 361 2. Ritchie H, Mathieu E, Rod s-Guirao L, Appel C, Giattino C, Ortiz-Ospina E, et al.  
362 Policy responses to the coronavirus pandemic. OurWorldInData organization.  
363 2020. Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/policy-responses-covid>.
- 364 3. Blumenthal-Barby J. COVID-19 current controversies. *J Med Ethics.*  
365 2020;46(7):419-420. doi: 10.1136/medethics-2020-106554.
- 366 4. Global research on coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Global research database.  
367 World Health Organization. 2021. Available from :  
368 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov)  
369 [research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov).
- 370 5. Sajadi MM, Habibzadeh P, Vintzileos A, Shokouhi S, Miralles-Wilhelm F, Amoroso A.  
371 Temperature, humidity, and latitude analysis to estimate potential spread and  
372 seasonality of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Netw Open.*  
373 2020;3(6):e2011834. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.11834.
- 374 6. Carlson CJ, Gomez ACR, Bansal S, Ryan SJ. Misconceptions about weather and  
375 seasonality must not misguide COVID-19 response. *Nat Commun.* 2020 ;11:4312.  
376 doi : 10.1038/s41467-020-18150-z.
- 377 7. Bendavid E, Oh C, Bhattacharya J, Ioannidis JPA. Assessing mandatory stay-at-  
378 home and business closure effects on the spread of COVID-19. *Eur J Clin Invest.*  
379 2021;51(4) :e13484. doi: 10.1111/eci.13484.

- 380 8. Boretti A. After less than 2 months, the simulations that drove the world to strict  
381 lockdown appear to be wrong, the same of the policies they generated. *Health Serv*  
382 *Res Manag Epidemiol.* 2020;7:2333392820932324.  
383 doi: 10.1177/2333392820932324.
- 384 9. Wille M, Geoghegan JL, Edward C Holmes EC. How accurately can we assess  
385 zoonotic risk? *PLoS Biol.* 2021;19(4):e3001135.  
386 doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3001135.
- 387 10. Mangiarotti S, Peyre M, Zhang Y, Huc M, Roger F, Kerr Y. Chaos theory applied to  
388 the outbreak of COVID-19: an ancillary approach to decision making in pandemic  
389 context. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2020;148: e95. doi: 10.1017/S0950268820000990.
- 390 11. Shaw CL, Kennedy DA. What the reproductive number  $R_0$  can and cannot tell us  
391 about COVID-19 dynamics. *Theoretical Population Biology.* 2021;137 :2-9.  
392 doi: 10.1016/j.tpb.2020.12.003.
- 393 12. Delamater PL, Street EJ, Leslie TF, Yang YT, Jacobsen KH. Complexity of the basic  
394 reproduction number ( $R_0$ ). *Emerging Infectious Diseases.* 2019;25(1): 1-4.  
395 doi: 10.3201/eid2501.171901
- 396 13. Anderson RM, May RM. Vaccination and herd immunity to infectious diseases.  
397 *Nature.* 1985;318:323-9. doi: 10.1038/318323a0.
- 398 14. Fine PEM. Herd Immunity: History, Theory, Practice. *Epidemiologic Reviews.*  
399 1993;15(2):265-302. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.epirev.a036121.
- 400 15. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral  
401 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine.* 2020; 26:672–675.  
402 doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5.
- 403 16. Xu XK, Liu XF, Wu Y, Ali ST, Du Z, Bosetti P, et al. Reconstruction of transmission  
404 pairs for novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in mainland China:

- 405 estimation of super-spreading events, serial interval, and hazard of infection. Clin  
406 Infect Dis. 2020;71/12:3163–3167. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa790.
- 407 17. Locatelli I, Trächsel B, Rousson V. Estimating the basic reproduction number for  
408 COVID-19 in Western Europe. PLoS One. 2021;16(3):e0248731.  
409 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0248731.
- 410 18. Dupraz J, Butty A, Duperrex O, Estoppey S, Faivre V, Thabard J et al. Prevalence of  
411 SARS-CoV-2 in household members and other close contacts of COVID-19 Cases: A  
412 serologic study in Canton of Vaud, Switzerland. Open Forum Infect Dis.  
413 2021;8(7):ofab149. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0248731.
- 414 19. Federal statistical office. Population and Households Statistics. 2019. Available  
415 from: [https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/fr/home/statistiques/population/effectif-  
416 evolution/menages.assetdetail.14567008.html](https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/fr/home/statistiques/population/effectif-evolution/menages.assetdetail.14567008.html).
- 417 20. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts  
418 and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. PLoS Med.  
419 2008;5(3):e74. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074.
- 420 21. Alimohamadi Y, Taghdir M, Sepandi M. Estimate of the basic reproduction number  
421 for COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Prev Med Public Health.  
422 2020;53(3):151-157. doi: 10.3961/jpmp.20.076.
- 423 22. Global Data Lab. Area Database (4.0). 2021. Available from:  
424 [https://globaldatalab.org/areadata/hhsize/CHN+IND+SEN/?levels=1%2B2%2B3  
425 %2B5%2B4&interpolation=1&extrapolation=1&extrapolation\\_years=3&nearest\\_r  
426 eal=0](https://globaldatalab.org/areadata/hhsize/CHN+IND+SEN/?levels=1%2B2%2B3%2B5%2B4&interpolation=1&extrapolation=1&extrapolation_years=3&nearest_real=0).
- 427 23. Sekizukaa T, Itokawaa K, Kageyamab T, Saitob S, Takayamab I, Asanuma H, et al.  
428 Haplotype networks of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the Diamond Princess cruise ship

- 429 outbreak. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2020;117(33):20198-20201.  
430 doi: 10.1073/pnas.2006824117.
- 431 24. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Options for the use of rapid  
432 antigen tests for COVID-19 in the EU/EEA and the UK. 19 November 2020. ECDC:  
433 Stockholm. 2020. Available from : [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/options-use-rapid-antigen-tests-covid-19-eueea-first-update)  
434 [data/options-use-rapid-antigen-tests-covid-19-eueea-first-update](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/options-use-rapid-antigen-tests-covid-19-eueea-first-update).
- 435 25. Jegerlehner S, Suter-Riniker F, Jent P, Bittel P, Nagle M. Diagnostic accuracy of a  
436 SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test in real-life clinical settings. International Journal of  
437 Infectious Diseases. 2021;109:118-122. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.07.010.
- 438 26. McBryde E, Meehan M, Caldwell, JM, Adekunle AI, Ogunlade ST, Kuddus MA, et al.  
439 Modelling direct and herd protection effects of vaccination against the SARS-CoV-2  
440 Delta variant in Australia. Med J Aust. 2021;215(9):427-32.  
441 doi: 10.5694/mja2.51263.
- 442 27. Liu Y, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 is far  
443 higher compared to the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 virus. J Travel Med.  
444 2021;28(7):taab124. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taab124.
- 445 28. Denis F, Septans AL, Le Goff F, Jeanneau S, Lescure, FX. Analysis of COVID-19  
446 Transmission sources in France by self-assessment before and after the partial  
447 lockdown: observational study. J Med Internet Res. 2021;23(5): e26932. doi:  
448 10.2196/26932.
- 449 29. Andreasen V, Christiansen FB. Persistence of an infectious disease in a subdivided  
450 population. Mathematical Biosciences. 1989;96(2): 239-253. doi: 10.1016/0025-  
451 5564(89)90061-8.

- 452 30. Huber G, Kamb M, Kawagoe K, Li LM, Veytsman B, Yllanes D, et al. A minimal model  
453 for household effects in epidemics. *Physical Biology*. 2019;17:065010.  
454 doi: 10.1088/1478-3975/abb209.
- 455 31. Delamater PL, Street EJ, Leslie TF, Yang YT, Jacobsen KH. Complexity of the basic  
456 reproduction number (R0). *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2019;25(1): 1–4.  
457 doi: 10.3201/eid2501.171901.
- 458 32. Guerra FM, Bolotin S, Lim G, Heffernan J, Deeks SL, Li Y, et al. The basic  
459 reproduction number (R0) of measles: a systematic review. *Lancet Infect Dis*.  
460 2017;17(12):e420-e428. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30307-9.
- 461 33. Curmei M, Ilyas A, Evans O, Steinhardt J. Constructing and adjusting estimates for  
462 household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from prior studies, widespread-testing and  
463 contact-tracing data. *International Journal of Epidemiology, International Journal*  
464 *of Epidemiology*. 2021; 50(5): 1444-1457. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyab108.
- 465 34. Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, Wang Y, Luo K, Ren L, et al. Transmission heterogeneities,  
466 kinetics, and controllability of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. 2021;371(6526):eabe2424.  
467 doi: 10.1126/science.abe2424.
- 468 35. Kucharski AJ, Klepac P, Conlan AJK, Kissler SM, Tang ML, Fry H, et al. Effectiveness  
469 of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing  
470 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study.  
471 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(10): 1151–1160. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30457-  
472 6.
- 473 36. Cui Y, Ni S, Shen S. A network-based model to explore the role of testing in the  
474 epidemiological control of the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2021;21(1):58.  
475 doi: 10.1186/s12879-020-05750-9.