Using a real-world network to model the tradeoff between stay-at-home restriction, vaccination, social distancing and working hours on COVID-19 dynamics.

Ramin Nashebi[1], Murat Sari[1], Seyfullah Kotil[2]

[1] Department of Mathematics, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey,

[2] Department of Biophysics, Bahcesehir University Medical School, Istanbul, Turkey

Corresponding Author:

Seyfullah Kotil[2]

Sahrayı Cedit, Batman Sk. No:66, 34734 Kadıköy/İstanbul/Turkey

Email address: enesseyfullah.kotil@med.bau.edu.tr

Abstract

Background. Human behavior, economic activity, vaccination, and social distancing are inseparably entangled in epidemic management. This study aims to investigate the effects of various parameters such as stay-at-home restrictions, work hours, vaccination and social distance on the containment of pandemics such as COVID-19.

Methods. To achieve this, we developed an agent-based model based on a time-dynamic graph with stochastic transmission events. The graph is constructed from a real-world social network. The graph's edges have been categorized into three categories: home, workplaces, and social environment. The conditions needed to mitigate the spread of wild-type (WT) COVID-19 and the delta variant have been analyzed. Our purposeful agent-based model has carefully executed tens of thousands of individual-based simulations. We propose simple relationships for the trade-offs between effective reproduction number (R_e), transmission rate, work hours, vaccination, and stay at home restrictions.

Results. For the WT, it has been found that a 13% increase in vaccination impacts the reproduction number, like the magnitude of decreasing nine hours of work to four and a single day of stay-at-home order. For the delta, 16% vaccination has the same effect. Also, since we can keep track of household and non-household infections, we observed that the change in household transmission rate does not significantly alter the R_e. Household infections are not limited by transmission rate due to the high frequency of connections. For COVID-19's specifications, the R_e depends on the non-household transmissions rate.

Conclusions. All measures are worth considering. Vaccination and transmission reduction are almost interchangeable. Without vaccination or teaching people how to lower their transmission probability significantly, changing work hours or weekend restrictions will only make people more frustrated

Keywords. Pandemic, COVID-19, Agent-based model, Household transmission, social network, working hours

Introduction

Human behavior in households, workplaces, social environment during weekends and weekdays have a vital role in the dissemination of infectious diseases such as middle east respiratory

syndrome (MERS) [1], H1N1 influenza [2], severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) [3], and the current acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [1]. Household members have frequent and intimate contact, making the disease spread rapidly within the households [4-5]. Developing strategies for preventing infectious diseases is a priority of health organizations. There are three general containment strategies for avoiding and mitigating contagious diseases: antiviral, vaccine, and non-pharmaceutical measures [7]. The non-pharmaceutical measures include a wide range of policies such as changing the number of work hours, limiting transmissibility between individuals by distancing measures, and stay at home (short-term) restrictions [6, 8, 35].

The stay-at-home policy is frequently used [8-11]. The World Health Organization [12,13] and many local authorities [14,15] supported and encouraged stay-at-home measures. Governmental policies upon stay-at-home orders are grouped into four [16] categories: no measures implemented concerning staying at home, recommended to stay at home, moderate restriction concerning staying at home (people can do their daily exercise, grocery shopping, and 'essential' trips), and high restriction regarding staying at home (people allowed to leave only once every few days, or only one person can go at a time). The same countries modified the lengthy lockdown to a short-term stay at home orders, such as France [17,18], Turkey [19,20], and India [21]. These countries recommend stay-at-home orders only during weekends. On the downside, stay-at-home orders, limiting work hours and distancing measures affect mental health negatively, physical health, and the economy [36]. Understanding the interplay of the mentioned non-pharmaceutical policies and vaccination is essential in the containment of the disease and successfully managing the economy. Since the experimental study is not compliant to investigate the social dynamic, control, and management of disease among humans, mathematical models are crucial to quantify and investigate such effects [22].

The role of stay-at-home (short-term) orders, limiting work hours, distancing measures, and vaccination in disseminating COVID-19 requires modelling the interplay between agents and their environment. The social and spatial heterogeneity of agents and the interaction between agents. These factors make it a complex phenomenon [70]. The problem can be represented by agent-based models simulated on a time-resolved contact network with stochastic events. We have aimed for a model where the duration of stay-at-home restrictions, number of working hours, distance measures, and vaccination can be varied independently on an individual level.

Agent-based modelling is a computational approach to modelling complex systems with autonomous agent interactions [38,39]. Consequently, agent-based models are essential tools for understanding the impact of human behavior in transmitting infectious diseases in different environments such as households, workplaces, and social environments. Aleta et al. [40] used an agent-based model with three layers: school, workplace, and household. They used their model to investigate the influence of the closure of schools and stay-at-home restrictions. Another study by Hoertel et al. [41] developed a stochastic agent-based model and ran it over a synthetical social network. Braun et al. [42] developed a network-based, agent-based model. Using this model, they simulate the synthetic Watts–Strogatz small-world network to catch the efficiency of social distancing, personal protective equipment, and quarantining. Some mathematical models and meta-analyses analyzed the dynamic of COVID-19 inside and outside of households [23, 6, 24, 25, 26, 69]. Many studies found that the probability of indoor transmission was remarkably high compared to outdoors [40].

The basic reproduction number (R_o) indicates infectious diseases' contagiousness or transmissibility when the population is only susceptible [44]. At the same time, the effective reproduction number (R_e) estimates an epidemic's growth rate, which is influenced by the containment strategies, herd immunity and any other factor[44]. Thus, estimates of COVID-19 are not exclusively determined by the pathogen, and variability depends on local socio-behavioral and environmental settings [45]. Anderson RM [46] and May RM [46] calculate the effective reproduction number as a function of contacts, transmission rate, and transmission duration. We used it as a measurement parameter to explore the role of stay-at-home restriction, working hours, social distancing, and vaccination in the containment of COVID-19.

There have been many published works in the efforts to study the role of vaccination [71], social distancing [6], and household [6, 72] in understanding the dynamic and control of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Several authors have been designed and used simple models [74,73,75], complex models [71,77,78], and multiscale models [82,83] to simulate the trade-off between pharmaceutical (vaccination) and non-pharmaceutical (social distancing, stay-at-home restriction, decrease in working hours) intervention in the containment of COVID-19 pandemic. This study presents an agent-based model based on a time-dynamic network with stochastic transmission events to analyze the interplay between pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical interventions. We made thousands of carefully executed individual level simulations of multiscale modelling on

the real network. The advancement is by modelling so that the following are tunable: stay-at-home restriction, working hours, vaccination, and social distancing. The simulations that were made depend on four parameters. The multidimensionality of the problem hinders clear understanding. We represent all our results that show the trade-offs between complex phenomena in a simple mathematical expression. This simple function links the modelled forces with (R_e) from the generated data. Additionally, since we can distinguish between household and non-household infections, some exciting observations include that the household infections provide resilience for epidemic eradication but do not contribute significantly to spread.

Materials & Methods

Real-world Social Network Data Description and Classification

We use the BBC documentary Contagion to make our simulation more realistic of human interaction patterns! The BBC Four Pandemic demonstrate social network data of 469 volunteers from Haslemere, England [84]. The data is not categorized as where the interactions occur. Our main goal is to order each interaction, whether it occurs in workplaces, social environments, or households. By classifying the edges of the graph, we can understand which of the settings and behaviors of staying in that environment would affect the COVID-19 dynamics.

The Haslemere dataset consists of the pairwise distances of up to 50m resolution between 469 volunteers from Haslemere, England, at five-minute intervals over three consecutive days (Thursday 12 Oct – Saturday 14 Oct 2017). It gives users' data for sixteen daytime hours only, between 07:00:00am and 22:55:00pm, excluding the hours between 11 pm and 7 am. There are 576-time points for each user. According to the 2011 UK census, volunteers of the Haslemere dataset establish a sample of 4.2% of the total population of Haslemere. Participants downloaded the BBC Pandemic mobile phone app and then went about their daily business with the app running in the background. The study was restricted to volunteers at least 16 or 13 years of age with parental consent. The pairwise distances between volunteers were calculated using the Haversine formula for great-circle geographic distance and are based on the most accurate GPS coordinates that the volunteers' mobile phones could provide. [37,43].

We want to categorize this network into households, workplaces, and social environments. In other words, we classify each edge and contact into three categories. We choose contacts with an average pairwise distance of 20m or less, making 3245 unique contacts. Our primary analysis



Figure 1: Methodology of our work.
(**Aa) Firstly,** we choose and analysis a real-world social network dataset of Haslemere, England. (**Ab)** secondly, we classified social network edges into the household (blue edges), workplace (green ages), and social environment (magenta edges). (**Ac)** After that, we start the simulation with our agent-based model. Here the dark red square shows exposed individuals, red circles illustrate susceptible individuals infected by interacting with exposed individuals, and light red edges represent infection contacts. We make chains of infection ancestors and descendants from discovered infected agents. Here two chains of infection ancestor and descendants with 10 cases shown (**Ad)** Finally, we identify infection occurrence environments. (**B)** Number of encounters that occurred for three days (Tuesday, Friday, Saturday) after classification of data (C) Graphical representation of our discrete-time, stochastic agent-based model, which starts with an exposed agent. After the latency period (d_1) finishes, he/she tends to one of the two branches: pre-symptomatic with a ratio of s or asymptomatic with a ratio of $(1-s)$. If he/she proceeds to the asymptomatic stage. The infectious period of the asymptomatic stage is $d_3 = 5.4$ days, in which he/she infect susceptible hosts in household and non-household (workplace, social environment) with a probability of $\mu_H \times P(t)$ and $\mu_o \times P(t)$, respectively.

After that, he/she proceeds to the recovered stage. If he/she proceeds to the pre-symptomatic stage, he/she will stay in this stage for $d_2 = 2.4$ days. During this period, he/she infect susceptible hosts in household and non-household (workplace, social environment) with the probability of $P(t)$. After the pre-symptomatic period ends, the agent changes the stage to the symptomatic stage. The symptomatic period lasts for $d_4 = 3$ days. Throughout the infectious period of the symptomatic stage, he/she infect susceptible hosts in household and non-household (workplace, social environment) with the probability of $P(t)$. When the delay period from symptomatic finishes agent proceeds to the hospitalization stage, where he/she will recover or die. The default parameter values with their sources were presented in supplementary information Table S2.

identifies contacts whose average pairwise distances are 5m or less because we aimed to capture household encounters and understand their daily routine and behavior. To investigate the behavior of everyone during these three days, we developed a visualization method (see supplementary information Fig. S2). After investigation, we developed procedures (see supplementary information Table S1) to categorize the network edges and contacts in the household, workplace, and social environment. There are 1350 unique contacts, which occurred between 1m and 5m. We use the visualization method to classify 123, 514, and 713 of them as household, workplace, and social environment contacts, respectively.

We established an automated classification algorithm to classify the remaining 1895 unique encounters, which occurred between 6m and 20m distances. We develop the algorithm using procedures from the visualization method, see supplementary information Fig. S1 for algorithm pseudocode. From 1895 unique contacts, 52, 790, 1003 of them occurred in the household, workplaces, and social environments. We create a confusion matrix to evaluate the algorithm's performance by choosing the classified data points (using the visualization method) as actual data and the algorithm classified data points as predicted data. Overall, 91.73% of the predictions of our algorithm are correct, and 8.27% are wrong, according to the confusion matrix of the algorithm concerning data points classified by the visualization method (see supplementary information Fig. S2). The distribution of household, workplace and social environment interactions after classification is illustrated in Fig. 1B.

Agent-Based Model

We have developed a discrete-time stochastic agent-based model, parameterized to simulate distinct types of COVID-19 outbreaks across the Haslemere data set. An agent in our simulation can be in the following states: *E(t)* (exposed), *PS(t)* (pre-symptomatic, documented),

A(t) (asymptomatic, undocumented), *S(t)* (symptomatic, documented), *H(t)* (hospitalized) and *R(t)* (recovered) (Fig. 1C). In our model, symptomatic individuals are symptomatic concerning medical records; those who do not report symptoms are considered undocumented (asymptomatic). The agent-based model starts with an exposed individual. Initially, the jth individual is exposed to the virus, and he/she cannot infect others during his/her latent period for $d_1=2.7$ days (see supplementary information Table S2). After the latency period finishes, the jth individual ends up in one of the two branches: pre-symptomatic with a ratio of s or asymptomatic with $(1 - s)$. When the period of delay from the onset finishes, we generate a random number ε, and there are two probabilities for the jth individual to proceed; the first one, if $\varepsilon<1-s$, he/she proceeds to the asymptomatic stage. The infectious period of the asymptomatic stage is $d_3=5.4$ days (see supplementary information in Table S2). Through the infectious period of the asymptomatic stage, when the jth individual comes in contact with *the* i^{th} individual, then we infect the ith individual with probability $\mu_H\, Ph_{j,i}$ if the edge is classified as household and $\mu_O\, Po_{j,i}$ if non-household. The μH and μo are the reduction factor for asymptomatic transmission in households and non-household. $Ph_{j,i}$ and $Po_{j,i}$ Are the probability that j^{th} individual infects i^{th} individual of his/her contacts in household and non-household. When the infectious period of the asymptomatic stage finishes, the jth individual proceeds to the recovered stage. Alternatively, the jth individual can be in the pre-symptomatic stage. The infectious period of the pre-symptomatic stage is $d_2 = 2.4$ [49]. The infection probabilities are $Ph_{j,i}$ and $Po_{j,i}$ in household and non-household. When the pre-symptomatic stage finishes, the jth individual proceeds to the symptomatic stage and stays for $d_4=3$ days [50]. The infection probabilities are the same as in the pre-symptomatic stage. When the delay period from symptomatic finishes, j^{th} individual proceeds to the hospitalization stage where he/she will recover or die. The hospital stage does not necessarily mean that the agent is hospitalized. All reported cases end up in the hospital stage, regardless of severity (which is not modelled). The default parameter values for the simulations with their sources were presented in supplementary information in Table S2.

Constructing contact matrices and simulation with real-world social network data

We construct classification matrices for households, $H_{i,j}$, workplaces, $W_{i,j}$, and social environment, $S_{i,j}$, which we classified from Haslemere data. $H_{i,j} = 1$ if the contact of jth and i^{th} agent occurs in a household environment, and $Hi,j = 0$ otherwise. The simulations are

made for 5 minutes time step. Each contact is checked at each time step if one of the agents is infectious; also, if the other is susceptible, then it is infected by the precomputed probability. There are three days in the Haslemere data: Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Our simulations take 14 days, so we construct the more prolonged contact network using real data. The Weekday contacts are taken from Thursday to Friday. We repeat each day sequentially and in whole. We do not mix the data in a day. The weekend contacts are replicated from Saturday contacts of the Haslemere data. We start the simulation with two exposed individuals. The first 14 days are designed as a warmup run. After 14 days, we randomly chose two individuals whose states are exposed, presymptomatic, asymptomatic, or symptomatic.

We start with a more realistic initial sample of states by this method. Then, we restart the simulation for another fourteen. We calculate the effective reproduction number (R_e), infection occurrence ratio, and secondary attack rate (SAR) of households from the second set of 14-day simulations. We run five hundred trial simulations for each scenario. The default parameter values for the simulations were present in Table S2. By starting with only two infected individuals, we aimed that the total cases at the end of 14 days do not exceed 10% of the total population. Otherwise, the small population and repetitive use of data would have more effect on the estimates. In line with our decision, even after two years, COVID-19 cases in countries did not reach a substantial percentage [62].

Calculating infection probability (*P*) and basic reproduction number (R_o)

We specify the probability that a susceptible agent i^{th} becomes infected by a jth infectious agent in a 5-minute interval is given as a function of distance in equation (1) for household and in equation (2) for non-household (workplace, social environment).

$$Ph_{j,i}(t) = \begin{cases} \beta_h e^{-(\alpha d_{j,i})} & d_{i,j} \leq \theta \\ 0 & d_{i,j} > \theta \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$$Po_{j,i}(t) = \begin{cases} \beta_o e^{-(\alpha d_{j,i})} & d_{i,j} \leq \theta \\ 0 & d_{i,j} > \theta \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$Ph_{j,i}(t)$ is the probability of infection if the contact occurs in a household. $Poj,i(t)$ is the probability of infection if the contact occurs in the workplace or social environment. Also, dj,i is the distance in meters between individuals i and j at time t; α , βh , βo are distance scaling parameters, transmission probability per 5 minutes in and out of households,

respectively. θ defines the cutoff distance, after which the infection probability is assumed to be zero. Our social network consists of a pairwise distance of up to 50m. Since we choose only those interactions which occurred less than or equal to 20m, so $\theta=20$. Infection probability ranges between 0 and 1. Our network consists of 102831 interactions in 5 minutes time intervals for three consecutive days (Tuesday, Friday, and Saturday). We calculate the infection probability for each interaction separately. Effective reproduction number (*Re*) is estimated directly by counting the descendants of a discovered agent after the simulation is finished, then averaged for 14 days. Percentage reduction of transmission probability is computed as a ratio of the effective-outside transmission probability to WT (default, estimated) transmission rate. Thus

$$D = \frac{\beta_o}{\beta_{WT}} 100 \tag{3}$$

Estimating Infection Occurrence Ratio

Throughout the simulations, we track down ancestors and descendants of infected agents. Each infection pair is an edge of the classification matrices, $H_{i,j}$, $W_{i,j}$, $S_{i,j}$. Then each classified edge is calculated.

Calculating Household Secondary attack rate (SAR)

The household secondary attack rate is defined as the probability of transmission per susceptible household member when a single infected individual is in the house [6, 59]. The SAR of households calculates the number of cases among contacts of primary cases divided by the total number of primary cases. Our model starts the simulations with ten exposed individuals executed with a daily life contact matrix to calculate the SAR of households. After that, we tract the infection occurrence environments (household, workplace, social environment). We identify those who are members of different households. We accept those initially exposed individuals who are members of different households as our primary case in each household. At the end of the simulation, we calculate the SAR of each household by the following formula:

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{Number\ of\ cases\ among\ contacts\ of\ primary\ cases}}{Total\ number\ of\ contacts\ of\ primary\ cases} \times \mathbf{100} \tag{4}$$

Calculating scaling parameters of distance (α) and transmission rate (β) of COVID-19

We estimate scaling parameters of distance and transmission rate by sampling to obtain a baseline Ro =2.87 [27] and 0.46≤ SAR≤ 0.72 [34], which are the basic reproduction number and secondary attack rate of households of COVID-19, respectively. Fig. S4 in supplementary information shows the sampling results for calculating α and β constants for COVID-19. To do this, we calculate the absolute error between the estimated model Ro and the exact COVID-19. We also compute the absolute error between the estimated and the exact household SAR model for COVID-19. Finally, we add these two errors and choose α and β values that give the smallest error. The estimated values are present in supplementary information in Table S2.

Changing number of work hours during weekdays

We alter work hours during weekdays by changing the work edges of the network. According to our classification methodology of the network, individuals work for 9 hours from 09:00 AM up to 06:00 PM during weekdays. To decrease work hours from 9 hours to 9 - i ($1 \leq I \leq 9$) hours during weekdays, we identify a home, work, and social environment edges between 06:00 PM and 9 - i hour before 06:00 PM of each weekday. Secondly, we randomly change only work edges with work, home, and social environment edges from edges between 06:00 PM and 11:00 PM of each weekday. For example, if we want to decrease work hours from 9 hours to 8 hours (i=1) during weekdays. Firstly, we identify every workplace, social environment, and household contact that occurred between 06:00 PM hour and 05:00 AM hour. Then we changed only workplace contact with the workplace, social environment and household contacts between 06:00 PM and 11:00 PM.

Simulating stay-at-home restrictions

We have four stay-at-home restrictions scenarios: restrictions on Sunday, restrictions on Sunday and Saturday, restrictions on Sunday, Saturday and Friday and restrictions on Sunday, Saturday, Friday, and Thursday. After we form the 14 days of the contact network, we replace all non-household (workplace and social environment) contacts that occurred in a 5-minute time step with a household contact that also occurred in that 5-minute interval.

Lowering transmission probability, increasing social distancing

The infection probability is parameterized by two parameters, β and α. The α indicates the probability of decay with the distance of contacts, whereas β is the maximum transmission probability (at a distance of 0). We have obtained these parameters by sampling many simulations that fit the COVID-19's RO and secondary attack rate. We use two β parameters, βh, and βo, to distinguish between the infectiousness in households and outside. In our simulations, we reduce the infectious probability to simulate a population where people reduce the probability of infection by personal social distancing measures. The parameter β could be the total virus present near an infectious agent. In contrast, α is the "loss parameter" (due to diffusion and other effects) for distance. Thus, we have chosen to alter the parameter β on the total number of virus changes when a person engages in protective measures such as wearing masks. The parameter α is left untouched since the events that lead to the distance loss do not change. Alternative explanations can be made; however, this is how our simulation has been conducted. Whenever we mention a reduction in infectiousness, we reduce the parameter β. So, in some simulations, we alter both βh, and βo when agents at home are also engaging in personal protection; in other simulations, we change βo when agents do not engage in personal social distancing in households. We have four stay-at-home restrictions scenarios: restrictions on Sunday, restrictions on Sunday and Saturday, restrictions on Sunday, Saturday and Friday and restrictions on Sunday, Saturday, Friday, and Thursday. After we form the 14 days of the contact network, we replace all non-household (workplace and social environment) contacts that occurred in a 5-minute time step with a household contact that occurred in that 5-minute interval.

Vaccination and the delta variant.

The simulations with delta variants use different values for β and α parameters. Again, we have left α untouched. We have changed β according to the literature [47]. It is assumed that the infectious probability of the delta variant is double of the wild type of virus. We have used β for the delta variant as 0.33, whereas the wild type was 0.167.

The agents that are vaccinated are chosen randomly. The vaccinated agents have reduced β value. We have assumed a 93% and 88% reduction in infectiousness for the wild type and delta variants, respectively [48]. So, β for the vaccinated, wild type and delta variant is 0.012 and 0.067, respectively, whilst α is unchanged.

Parameters

General: $d_1=2.7$ days, $d_2=2.4$ days, $d_3=5.4$ days, $s = 0.83$, $p = 3$ days, $\alpha = 0.9841$, $\mu_H = 0.696$ $\mu_o = 0.42$, $g=192$

Figures 2a-2b: For the first scenario, $\beta_h = 0.1672$, $0.001 \leq \beta_o \leq 0.1672$. For the second scenario, $0.001 \leq \beta_h \leq 0.1672$, $0.001 \leq \beta_o \leq 0.1672$

Figure 3: $\beta_h = \beta_o = 0.1672$ for $R_o = 2.87$, $\beta_h = \beta_o = 0.0214$ for $R_0 = 1$, $\beta_h = 0.1672$, $\beta_o = 0.0165$ for $R_0 = 1$, 88% reduction applied to β_o. Same parameter for random networks.

Figures 4a-4c:

Figures 5a-5b: $\beta_h = 0.1672$, $0.001 \leq \beta_o \leq 0.1672$.

Figures 6a-6e:

Figures 7a-7b: $\beta_h = 0.1672$, $0.001 \leq \beta_o \leq 0.1672$.

Results

This work investigates the impact of stay-at-home restrictions, social distancing, working hours, and vaccination on the effective reproduction number. To do so, we simulate disease dynamics on a real network. The network's edges and contacts between agents (nodes) are further classified for the place infections. The three categories are household (H), workplace (W), and social environment (S). Furthermore, the network changes with time and the time-dependent connections between agents. So, the network can be modified by changing the place of infection. For example, social environment edges on weekends can be replaced with household edges, indicating that the agent stayed at home. Furthermore, the change can be made in a specific time interval. For example, the agent's work edges on Monday 4-6 pm are converted to household edges, indicating he went home after 4 pm.

After constructing the network and the tools for alteration, we first investigated how three environments contribute to disseminating the disease on an unaltered network. In that analysis, we also vary the social distancing parameter. Secondly, we investigate the effect of stay-at-home orders on weekends. Thirdly, we investigate all parameters together: change of work hours, vaccination, stay-at-home orders, and social distancing.

Estimating Infection Occurrence Ratio in The Household, Workplace and Social Environment

It is vital to know where the infections occur depending on the effective reproduction number (*Re*). Here, we count the infection occurring in three environments: households, work, and social.

Our agent-based model simulates *Re* by independently varying household and non-household transmission rates βh, βo, respectively. People do not conduct social distancing in their homes [6]. To simulate this phenomenon, we reduce the total transmission rate by decreasing the non-household transmission (βo) while fixing the household transmission rate βh. Squares with a line in Fig. 2a show Re's dependence on varying βo when βh is constant. Additionally, triangles with a line show the dependence of *Re* on varying βo when βh is also changing, $\beta o = \beta h$. The latter simulations are made to assess the effect of making the distinction between βo and βh. Interestingly, until $Re<1$, *Re* does not depend on the decrease of βh. Only after $Ro<1$ further decreasing in βh decreases *Re* more than when βh is kept at its maximum.

The household, workplace, and social environment infection occurrence ratio has been counted for *Re* (for real networks). Overall, the household infections are dominant when $Re<1$ and most of the infections occur in the social environment when $Re<2.5$.

We capture the only difference between Fig. 2b (βh kept constant) and Fig. 2c (βh decreases) was in the slight increase of household infection occurrence ratio when βh was kept constant, $Re<1$. At $Re<1$, the infections' environments do not change significantly. These results are further supporting the results in Fig. 2a. The decrease in household transmission rate only affects the dynamics at low *Re*.

Additional simulations have been made with random networks. Two separate results are plotted: 1) the range of βo and βh are the same with the real-network, line with circles in Fig. 2a; 2) the maximum *Re* is taken as the 2.87 (same as the maximum of the real-network), line with diamonds in Fig. 2a.

For case 1, the random networks show much higher *Re*. Except, when the transmission rate is reduced by more than 88%, the random network shows lower *Re* than the simulations with the real network (βh fixed), Fig. 2a. Thus, the real network used is limited by the number of unique connections. The interactions are more clustered and local. On the other hand, the frequency of interactions among the selected agents is significantly higher.



Figure 2: Representation of effect of social distancing infection events.
(a) show the R_e correspond for different reduction level in transmission probability. When agents applied social distance measure only in non-household (graph with square marks) and agents applied social distance measure in household and non-household (graph with triangular marks). The x-axis shows, the percentage of reduction of the transmission probability (see method). (b)-(c) shows the infection occurrence ratio for R_e in the household (blue graph), workplaces (green graph), and social environment (red graph), (b) when β_h fix and β_o varies, (c) when β_h and β_o varies. The dashed line demonstrates the COVID-19 R_0, the shaded areas in (a)-(c) give 95th confidence intervals

Re's decreasing is much faster than the real networks (Fig. 2a). Thus, decreasing *Re* in real networks is harder and retains infection chains.

Overall, we speculate that the household transmission reaches its capacity at low βh due to abundant link frequency. The large βh cannot lead to an increase in *Re* value among the infections in the household. Therefore, the household transmission contributes to the resilience of the eradication but does not contribute significantly to the overall spread.

The way we investigate the impact of human behavior on the household, workplace, and social environment can be generalized to other infectious disease epidemics. MERS [1] is an infectious disease that first appeared in Saudi Arabia in September 2012. Basic reproduction number (*Ro*)

for the MERS has ranged from 0.42 to 0.92 [78,79,80,81]. In 2017, a cluster of the MERS was reported from the Al-Jawf Region, Saudi Arabia, including seven cases, six of which were household contacts [81]. According to our results (Fig. 2a), since *Re<1* for the MERS, most infections have occurred in households, which is in line with earlier work. It may also be noted that household infections can increase the resilience of eradication but do not significantly contribute to the spread.

Estimating Contribution of Household and Non-Household in Stabilizing of COVID-19

To better understand the effect of Household and non-household transmission on the spread of disease, we study the transmission chain of infections. In the earlier results, Fig. 2, we counted the place of infections in the transmission chain, namely, the household (H), social environment (S), and workplace (W). This can be regarded as the 0th order knowledge on the transmission chain—we first group S and W to non-household transmission (O) to get further information. We then study the third-order knowledge by counting three consecutive places of infections, e.g., HOH (the first infection is in Household, the infected person infected another person in O, and that person infected another person in H).

There are eight combinations of H and O: HHH, HHO, HOH, HOO, OHH, OHO, OOH, OOO. The combination OOO is dominant for Ro at 2.87, the default case Fig. 3. HHH is the least frequent. Thus, a decrease in βo affects the OOO-chain three times, whereas βh has a minor influence. Therefore, the spread of the disease (Ro at 2.87) on our real network depends much more sensitively on βo than βh.

Similar analysis can be made for the real network when Re =1, βh is fixed or not. The combination OOO is significantly lower. The combinations with Hs are much more frequent. Therefore, the system becomes more sensitive to βh.

Besides the real-world network, a random network was also simulated for Re at 2.87. For the correct comparison, the number of H and O edges is kept the same in random and real networks. The number of H connections is more than O connections. It is natural to assume that infections should occur more frequently on H-edges. Indeed, At Ro=2.87, the frequencies of the combinations are the opposite for the random networks and the real network, Fig. 3. The combination of OOO dominates the real network, while the HHH is the highest random network.



Figure 3: Third order transmission chain analysis.
Five cases were simulated. The simulations with random networks ($R_0 = 2.87$, $R_0 = 1$) are plotted overlappingly. For $R_0 = 2.87$ the infections occurred the most as OOO combination for real network. Followed by combinations with two "O"s. Then tracked by single "O"s and lastly by HHH. There is a significant decrease in OOO combination for $R_0 = 1$, while others are of comparable frequency. The random simulations are quite the opposite; the HHH combination has the most occurred ratio since total "H" edges are more than "O" edges.

The discrepancy is that the unique pairs for H connections are scarce, but their frequency is significantly higher.

Overall, at high βh and βo, both H and O infections are high, but the higher number of unique O pairs contributes more to the spread. In contrast, when the β decrease, the infection at O diminishes faster than H because the high frequency of connections for the H-edges provides a higher infection probability.

Calculating The Influence of Stay-at-home Restriction During Weekends in the Spread of COVID-19

After investigating the effects of contagion probability, we have investigated the effect of stay-at-home restrictions on weekends. To understand the impact of stay-at-home restriction versus transmission probability, we have simulated three cases: free weekend without restrictions, restriction on Sunday, and restriction on Saturday and Sunday. We have simulated each restriction scenario when social distancing is applied in the workplace and social environment (βh fixed). The edge frequencies of the altered networks are given in supplementary information Fig. 4a, Fig. 4b, and Fig. 4c. As detailed in the methods, the household edges replace the social environment edges to implement the weekend restrictions.

We have found that stay-at-home restrictions during the weekends cause a decrease in Re. Figure 5a shows that Ro drops from 2.95 to 2.71 for restrictions on Saturdays and to 2.56 when restrictions are on Saturdays and Sundays. Fig. 5b, Fig. 5c, Fig. 5d show the ratio of infection occurrence ratio for increasing Re when implementing stay-at-home restrictions during weekends. When stay-at-home restrictions increase, the social environment's infection decreases and work infections increase.

Expectedly, decreasing the social environment edges decreases infections in the social environment. However, the increase in household edges does not increase the number of household infections due to saturation. Overall, it leads to a decrease in Ro [59-60].

Estimating Impact of the Daily Working Hours, Stay-at-home Restriction and Transmission Reduction Level During Weekends and Weekdays on COVID-19.

The subsequent alteration to the network is on working hours. We alter working hours by changing working edges. For example, if the working hours decreased from nine to eight hours, the work edges between 5 pm to 6 pm are converted to a sample from the edges between 6 pm to 11 pm, as detailed in the methods. The edge frequencies of the altered networks are given in supplementary information Fig. 6a, Fig. 6b, Fig. 6c, Fig. 6d, and Fig. 6e.

The last alteration is the vaccination. Different vaccination levels have been simulated. At the beginning of the simulations, a certain percentage of randomly selected individuals are vaccinated.



Figure 4: The edge frequencies of the altered networks.

For (a) free weekend without restriction scenario, (b) restriction on Sunday, (c) restriction on Sunday and Saturday

We simulate combinations of different vaccination levels, working hours, social distancing measures (transmission probability), and weekend restrictions: thirty thousand simulations were made. The number of parameters hinders us from understanding the interplay of parameters. One would like to understand the following functions ReWT (DW, SDM, SH, Vac), Redelta (DW, SDM, SH, Vac), where DW is the decrease in working hours, the SDM is the social distancing measure, the SH is the stay-at-home restriction (in weekends and in weekdays), Vac is the vaccinated ratio.

Plotting for all simulations is hindered due to the multidimensionality of the results. Deducing a closed-form solution is also almost impossible. Instead, we wanted to approximate the solutions by fitting a multidimensional linear surface (Taylor expansion).

$$Re_{WT} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot DW + \alpha_2 \cdot SH + \alpha_3 \cdot Vac + \alpha_4 \cdot SDM \quad (5)$$

$$Re_{delta} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot DW + \beta_2 \cdot SH + \beta_3 \cdot Vac + \beta_4 \cdot SDM \quad (6)$$



Figure 5: Representing the influence of stay-at-home restriction during the weekends, under social distance policy, in the spread of COVID-19.
(a) shows the basic reproduction number in three stay-at-home restriction scenarios: free weekend without restrictions (graph with square marks) restriction on Sunday (graph with triangular marks), restriction on Sunday and Saturday (graph with diamond marks). x-axis demonstrate the percentage of reduction in transmission probability (see method for more information). Here agents are only applied social distance measure in the non-household. (b)-(d) show the infection occurrence ratio with respect to R_0 in the household (blue graph), workplaces (green graph), and social environment (red graph), for (b) 1st, (c) 2nd, and (d) 3rd stay-at-home restriction scenarios, respectively. The shaded areas in (a)-(d) give 95th confidence intervals.

The linear surfaces yielded a poor fit. A nonlinear dependence is clearly observed when the data is plotted against varying SDM. The mathematical expressions are updated semi-intuitively by introducing non-linearity for SDM. The mathematical expression is designed so that the fit parameters will allow us to understand the trade-offs between the DW, SH, and Vac.

$$Re_{WT} = (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot DW + \alpha_2 \cdot SH + \alpha_3 \cdot Vac) \cdot \sqrt{1 - SDM} \quad (7)$$

$$Re_{delta} = (\beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot DW + \beta_2 \cdot SH + \beta_3 \cdot Vac) \cdot \sqrt{1 - SDM} \quad (8)$$



Figure 6: The edge frequencies of the altered work hour.

For (a) No decrease, (b) 1 hour decrease in work, (c) 2 hours decrease in work, (d) 3 hours decrease in work, (e) 4 hours decrease in work

The expressions are valid for the range of the simulations, 0 to 4 hours for the DW, 0 to 3 for the SH, 0 to 0.9 for the Vac (90 per cent vaccination), and 0 to 1 for the SDM. The scatter plots for the simulated and estimated values are given in Figures 7a-7b. The coefficients of determination



Figure 6: Errors of the functions.
The estimations from the functions and the simulations have been plotted. (a) for the wild type, (b) delta variant

are 0.9697, and 0.9756 for WT and delta variant, respectively. After rearranging the equations 7 and 8, the expressional relations are as follows:

$$Ro_{WT} = 2.73 \cdot (1 - 0.0125 \cdot DW - 0.072 \cdot SH - 0.54 \cdot Vac) \cdot \sqrt{1 - SDM} \quad (9)$$

$$Ro_{delta} = 3.66 \cdot (1 - 0.015 \cdot DW - 0.074 \cdot SH - 0.35 \cdot Vac) \cdot \sqrt{1 - SDM} \quad (10)$$

According to equations 5 and 6, the trade-offs are easily measured. Changing working hours has a minor effect for both the WT and delta variants, while vaccination has the most effect. More specifically, for the WT, one day of the weekend restriction equals more than 4 hours of work per weekday. In comparison, one day of restriction is equal to 13.3% vaccination. For the delta variant, the effect of the decrease in working hours and weekend restrictions act the same, while one day of restriction is equal to 20% per cent of vaccination. However, the relative effect of vaccination is 20% less effective than the WT.

It is important to note that the validity of functions is limited to the simulated ranges of parameters. Of course, full vaccination is expected to lower Re below 1. However, this is not the case for functions in equations (5) and (6). This is expected because our simulated range is 0 to 90 per cent. After 90% vaccination Re depends non-linearly on Vac until reaching Re = 0. The same discussion can be done for other parameters as well.

The SDM (transmission probability) varies from 0 to 100 per cent, unlike other parameters. As seen in Fig. 2a, the reduction in transmission probability reduces Re significantly after an 80% reduction. The square root function approximates the non-linearity. However, at the limit of SDM near 0, Vac is 0, DW is 0, and the SH is 0, the SDM dependence has a coefficient of -0.5 from the Taylor expansion. The effect of SDM at the mentioned limit is close to that of the vaccination.

The parameters that we have simulated, DW and SH, vary marginally. For example, DW (Decrease in Work hours) only changes from 0 to 4 hours. In terms of working hours, the DW varies from 9 hours to 5 hours of work. In the simulated range, Re is not significantly affected. Perhaps simulating for the remaining hours, from 9 to 0 hours of work, would show the non-linearity that we have suspected. However, the point we want to make is that a marginal decrease in working hours (several hours) leads to a minimal decrease in Re. The working hours must be decreased substantially to decrease Re significantly. However, its burden on economic activity would be profound.

The range for SH (stay-at-home restrictions) has been simulated from 0 to 4 days. The meaningful range is 0 to 2 days, the weekend. 2 days of restrictions are equal to 26 % vaccination for the WT, 42% for the delta type. However, it should be noted that the simulations on the delta variant with 90 % vaccination and weekend restrictions have about Re = 2 as the delta variant starts with a higher Re. The weekend restriction on the wild type is more meaningful. The simulations with 90 % vaccination with weekend restrictions have Ro = 0.98.

In our simulations, 90% vaccination had not brought Ro below 1 (when no other measure was implemented), even for the wild type. Many countries, such as Singapore and the United Arab Emirates, have more than 80% [56] vaccination ratios, but they had cases when the delta variant was dominated [57,58].

Discussion

Numerous valuable theoretical deductions are made on simpler models [51,52,53,61]. Also, valuable numerical deductions are made on complex models [54,55]. Here, we have performed complicated simulations on the real network. This network is also inherently heterogeneous. Understanding the numerical solutions is troublesome when there are many parameters. We have

guessed a simple mathematical expression for the whole simulation to circumvent that problem. Indeed, the results can be approximated with a simple form. The simple functions allowed us to compare the decrease in working hours, weekend restrictions, vaccination percentage, and the decrease in transmission probability (social distancing measures).

First of all, the restrictions can be added to each other. All measures are worth considering. However, any measure that is not taken to almost completion does not significantly affect the outbreak. This means that at least one measure must be performed to its maximum level. Mixing marginal effects would not be strong enough so that Re = 1. For example, the required reduction in transmission probability for Re = 1 is 86%. With weekend restrictions, it only decreases to 82%. Worse off, the required reduction of 3 hours the working hour is 85.5%. Vaccination and transmission reduction are almost interchangeable. Thus, our simulations show that changing the working hours or weekend restrictions will only make people more frustrated without vaccination or teaching people how to lower their transmission probability significantly.
There are some areas for improvement in our work. The children under thirteen were not included in this data [32]. Children play a crucial role in bringing infection into the household [33]. Since there are only three days of data, we reuse the data five times. We tried to decrease the effect of this by only performing brief simulations. Simulations last for 14 days, and we only allow for a maximum of around twenty infections per simulation. We recommend for social network data miners increase their sample size during data collecting from a population. It is important to note that our results depend heavily on the real-world network. We claim that our results are correct on our real-world network.

Conclusions

This paper investigates the influence of human behaviour, economic activity, vaccination, and social distancing in the context of control and containment of COVID-19. In this respect, an agent-based model based on a time-dynamic real network with stochastic transmission events has been constructed. The network has been successfully categorized into the household, workplace, and social environment.

The conditions needed to mitigate the spread of wild-type COVID-19 and the delta variant have been analyzed. Complicated simulations have been performed by our agent-based model on the real network. The results of simulations have been interpolated with a simple form. Consequently, the interplay between pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical intervention in the containment of COVID-19 has been investigated.

The computed results showed that the restrictions could be added to each other. All measures are worth considering. Vaccination and transmission reduction are almost interchangeable. Our simulations have been shown that without vaccination or teaching people how to lower their transmission probability significantly, changing work hours or weekend restrictions will only make people more frustrated.

This study reassures us to investigate the influence of human behavior, economic activity, vaccination, and social distancing by using a more realistic network. The real network that has been used in this study does not include children under thirteen. We also recommend for social network data miners increase their sample size during data collecting from a population.

References

[1] Liu J, Xie W, Wang Y, et al. A comparative overview of COVID-19, MERS and SARS: Review article. Int J Surg. 2020;81:1-8. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.07.032

[2] Dotis J, Roilides E. H1N1 influenza A infection. Hippokratia. 2009;13(3):135-138

[3] "SARS (severe acute respiratory syndrome) – NHS". National Health Service. 24 October 2019

[4] Goeyvaerts Nele, Santermans Eva, Potter Gail, Torneri Andrea, Van Kerckhove Kim, Willem Lander, Aerts Marc, Beutels Philippe and Hens Niel, Household members do not contact each other at random: implications for infectious disease modelling, Proc. R. Soc. B.28520182201 http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2201

[5] van Seventer, Jean Maguire. And Natasha S. Hochberg. “Principles of Infectious Diseases: Transmission, Diagnosis, Prevention, and Control.” International Encyclopedia of Public Health (2017): 22–39. Doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-803678-5.00516-6

[6] Nande A, Adlam B, Sheen J, Levy MZ, Hill AL (2021) Dynamics of COVID-19 under social distancing measures are driven by transmission network structure. PLOS Computational Biology 17(2): e1008684. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008684

[7] erguson, N., Cummings, D., Fraser, C. et al. Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic. Nature 442, 448–452 (2006). https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04795

[8] Guest JL, del Rio C, Sanchez T, The Three Steps Needed to End the COVID-19 Pandemic: Bold Public Health Leadership, Rapid Innovations, and Courageous Political Will JMIR Public Health Surveill 2020;6(2):e19043 doi: 10.2196/19043 PMID: 32240972 PMCID: 7171587

[9] Tognotti E. Lessons from the History of Quarantine, from Plague to Influenza A—Volume 19, Number 2—February 2013—Emerging Infectious Diseases journal—CDC. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1902.120312,

[10] Markel H, Lipman HB, Navarro JA, Sloan A, Michalsen JR, Stern AM, et al. Nonpharmaceutical interventions implemented by US cities during the 1918–1919 influenza pandemic. JAMA. 2007;298: 644–654. Pmid:17684187

[11] Savaris, R.F., Pumi, G., Dalzochio, J. et al. Stay-at-home policy is a case of exception fallacy: an internet-based ecological study. Sci Rep 11, 5313 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84092-1

[12] WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 – 13 April 2020. https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19--13-april-2020.

[13] Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Herd immunity, lockdowns and COVID-19. https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/herd-immunity-lockdowns-and-covid-19

[14] Governor Cuomo Signs the 'New York State on PAUSE' Executive Order. Governor Andrew M. Cuomo https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-signs-new-york-state-pause-executive-order (2020)

[15] Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. Government advice on home moving during the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. (2020).

[16] Stay-at-home requirements during the COVID-19 pandemic, https://ourworldindata.org/covid-stay-home-restrictions

[17] The Connexion French news and views, Explained: France's weekend lockdown new dates and rules, https://www.connexionfrance.com/French-news/Explained-France-s-weekend-lockdown-new-dates-and-rules

[18] 24 France, France extends weekend lockdown to northern Pas-de-Calais region, Issued on: 06/03/2021, https://www.france24.com/en/europe/20210306-france-extends-weekend-lockdown-to-pas-de-calais

[19] Daily Sabah, Turkey reinstates Saturday lockdowns to curb COVID-19 https://www.dailysabah.com/turkey/turkey-reinstates-saturday-lockdowns-to-curb-covid-19/news

[20] COVID-19 Information, 2021, U.S Embassy and Consulate in Turkey, available at: https://tr.usembassy.gov/covid-19-information-2/

[21] Manmath Nayak, 2021, Weekend Curfew Across States: Check Full List of Restrictions That Are in Place to Contain Coronavirus, [online] India news, available at: https://www.india.com/news/india/coronavirus-lockdown-latest-news-today-april-2021-weekend-lockdown-across-states-full-list-of-restrictions-coronavirus-latest-updates-4591855/

[22] Funk Sebastian, Salathé Marcel and Jansen Vincent A. A.2010 Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread of infectious diseases: a reviewJ. R. Soc. Interface.71247–1256http://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2010.0142

[23] Shen M, Peng Z, Guo Y, etal. Assessing the effects of metropolitan-wide quarantine on the spread of COVID-19 in public space and households. Int J Infect Dis 2020;96:503-5. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.019 pmid: 32416146

[24] Grijalva CG, Rolfes MA, Zhu Y, et al. Transmission of SARS-COV-2 Infections in Households — Tennessee and Wisconsin, April–September 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020;69:1631–1634. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6944e1external icon

[25] Bulfone TC, Malekinejad M, Rutherford GW, Razani N. Outdoor Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Other Respiratory Viruses, a Systematic Review. J Infect Dis. 2020 Nov 29:jiaa742. Doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiaa742. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33249484; PMCID: PMC7798940.

[26] Hua Qian, Te Miao, Li Liu, Xiaohong Zheng, Danting Luo, Yuguo Li, Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2, doi: International journal of indoor environment and health, https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12766

[27] Billah MA, Miah MM, Khan MN (2020) Reproductive number of coronavirus: A systematic review and meta-analysis based on global level evidence. PLOS ONE 15(11): e0242128. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242128

[28] R. Breban, J. Riou, A. Fontanet Interhuman transmissibility of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: estimation of pandemic risk Lancet, 382 (2013), pp. 694-699

[29] D.N. Fisman, G.M. Leung, M. Lipsitch Nuanced risk assessment for emerging infectious diseases Lancet, 383 (2014), pp. 189-190

[30] S. Cauchemez, C. Fraser, M.D. Van Kerkhove, C.A. Donnelly, S. Riley, A. Rambaut, et al. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: quantification of the extent of the epidemic, surveillance biases, and transmissibility Lancet Infect Dis, 14 (2014), pp. 50-56

[31] WHO MERS Global Summary and Assessment of Risk, WHO/MERS/RA/August18

[32] Goeyvaerts N, Santermans E, Potter G, Torneri A, Van Kerckhove K, Willem L, Aerts M, Beutels P, Hens N. 2018 Household members do not contact each other at random: implications for infectious disease modelling. Proc. R. Soc. B 285: 20182201.http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2201

[33] in-Long Jing, Ming-Jin Liu, Zhou-Bin Zhang, Li-Qun Fang, Jun Yuan, Household secondary attack rate of COVID-19 and associated determinants in Guangzhou, China: a retrospective cohort study, The Lancet Infectious Diseases, Volume 20, Issue 10, 2020, Pages 1141-1150, ISSN 1473-3099, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30471-0.

[34] Kanika Kuwelker, Fan Zhou, Bjørn Blomberg, Sarah Lartey, Karl Albert Brokstad, Mai Chi Trieu, “High attack rates of SARS-Cov-2 infection through household-transmission: a prespective study”,medRxiv 2020, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20224485

[35] Iavicoli S, Boccuni F, Buresti G, Gagliardi D, Persechino B, et al. (2021) Risk assessment at work and prevention strategies on COVID-19 in Italy. PLOS ONE 16(3): e0248874. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248874

[36] Nisreen A Alwan, Rochelle Ann Burgess, Simon Ashworth, Rupert Beale, Nahid Bhadelia, Debby Bogaert et al. “Scientific consensus on the COVID-19 pandemic: we need to act now”, The Lancet Journal, VOLUME 396, ISSUE 10260, E71-E72, OCTOBER 31, 2020, DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32153-X

[37] Stephen M. Kissler, Petra Klepac, Maria Tang, Andrew J.K. Conlan and Julia R. Gog, ” Supplemental Information for: Sparking “The BBC Four Pandemic”: Leveraging citizen science and mobile phones to model the spread of disease, April 7, 2019

[38] C M Macal & M J North (2010) Tutorial on agent-based modelling and simulation, Journal of Simulation, 4:3, 151-162, DOI: 10.1057/jos.2010.3

[39] Melissa Tracy, Magdalena Cerdá, Katherine M. Keyes, “Agent-Based Modeling in Public Health: Current Applications and Future Directions”, Annual Review of Public Health 2018 39:1, 77-94

[40] Aleta, A., D. Martin-Corral, A. Pastore y Piontti, M. Ajelli, M. Litvinova, M. Chinazzi, N. E. Dean, M. E. Halloran, I. M. Longini, Jr, S. Merler, A. Pentland, A. Vespignani, E. Moro, and Y. Moreno. 2020. “Modeling the Impact of Social Distancing, Testing, Contact Tracing and Household Quarantine on Second-Wave Scenarios of the COVID-19 Epidemic.” Nature Human Behavior 4: 964−71.

[41] Hoertel, N., M. Blachier, C. Blanco, M. Olfson, M. Massetti, M. Sánchez Rico, F. Limosin, and H. Leleu. 2020. “A Stochastic Agent-Based Model of the SARS-CoV-2 Epidemic in France.” Nature Medicine 26: 1417−21.

[42] Braun, B., B. Taraktaş, B. Beckage, and J. Molofsky. 2020. “Simulating Phase Transitions and Control Measures for Network Epidemics Caused by Infections with Presymptomatic, Asymptomatic, and Symptomatic Stages.” PloS One 15: e0238412.

[43] Kissler, S. M., Klepac, P., Tang, M., Conlan, A. J. K. & Gog, J. R. Sparking ‘The BBC Four Pandemic’: leveraging citizen science and mobile phones to model the spread of disease. Preprint at bioRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/479154 (2018).

[44] Delamater, P. L., Street, E. J., Leslie, T. F., Yang, Y., & Jacobsen, K. H. (2019). Complexity of the Basic Reproduction Number (R0). *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, *25*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2501.171901

[45] Sy KTL, White LF, Nichols BE (2021) Population density and basic reproductive number of COVID-19 across United States counties. PLoS ONE 16(4): e0249271

[46] Anderson RM, May RM. Infectious Diseases of Humans, Dynamics and Control: OUP Oxford; 1992.

[47] CDC (Central for Disease Control and Prevention), "Delta Variant: What We Know About the Science", https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/delta-variant

[48] Jamie Lopez Bernal, Nick Andrews, Charlotte Gower, D.Phil., Eileen Gallagher, Ruth Simmons, " Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant", New England Journal of Medicine, 2021, DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2108891

[49] Zhongxing Ding, Kai Wang, Mingwang Shen, Kai Wang, Shi Zhao, Wenyu Song, Rui Li, Estimating the time interval between transmission generations and the presymptomatic period by contact tracing surveillance data from 31 provinces in the mainland of China, Fundamental Research, Volume 1, Issue 2, 2021, Pages 104-110, ISSN 2667-3258, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fmre.2021.02.002.

[50] Faes C, Abrams S, Van Beckhoven D, et al. Time between Symptom Onset, Hospitalisation and Recovery or Death: Statistical Analysis of Belgian COVID-19 Patients. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(20):7560. Published 2020 Oct 17. doi:10.3390/ijerph17207560

[51] Estadilla, C.D.S., Uyheng, J., de Lara-Tuprio, E.P. *et al.* Impact of vaccine supplies and delays on optimal control of the COVID-19 pandemic: mapping interventions for the Philippines. *Infect Dis Poverty* **10,** 107 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-021-00886-5

[52] Abba B. Gumel, Enahoro A. Iboi, Calistus N. Ngonghala, Elamin H. Elbasha, A primer on using mathematics to understand COVID-19 dynamics: Modeling, analysis and simulations, Infectious Disease Modelling, Volume 6, 2021, Pages 148-168, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2020.11.005.

[53] Enahoro A. Iboi, Calistus N. Ngonghala, Abba B. Gumel, Will an imperfect vaccine curtail the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S.?, Infectious Disease Modelling, Volume 5, 2020, Pages 510-524, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2020.07.006.

[54] Sam Moore, Edward M Hill, Michael J Tildesley, Louise Dyson, Matt J Keeling, Vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study, The Lancet Infectious Diseases, Volume 21, Issue 6, 2021, Pages 793-802, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00143-2.

[55] Björn Goldenbogen, Stephan O Adler, Oliver Bodeit, Judith AH Wodke, Ximena Escalera-Fanjul, “Optimality in COVID-19 vaccination strategies determined by heterogeneity in human-human interaction networks”, medRxiv 2020.12.16.20248301; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248301

[56] Gurman Bhatia, Prasanta Kumar Dutta, Chris Canipe and Jon McClure, COVID-19 Vaccination tracker, [online] Local state agencies, local media, Oxford Coronavirus Government Response Tracker, Our World in Data, The World Bank, Reuters research, available at: <https://graphics.reuters.com/world-coronavirus-tracker-and-maps/vaccination-rollout-and-access/> [Accesse 11.23.2021]

[57] Coronavirus United Arab Emirates, [online] Worldometer. Available at: < https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/united-arab-emirates> [Accesse 11.23.2021]

[58] Coronavirus Signapor, [online] Worldometer. Available at: < https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/singapore/> [Accesse 11.23.2021]

[59] Moreland A, Herlihy C, Tynan MA, et al. Timing of State and Territorial COVID-19 Stay-at-Home Orders and Changes in Population Movement - United States, March 1-May 31, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(35):1198-1203. Published 2020 Sep 4. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6935a2

[60] Czeisler MÉ, Tynan MA, Howard ME, et al. Public Attitudes, Behaviors, and Beliefs Related to COVID-19, Stay-at-Home Orders, Nonessential Business Closures, and Public Health Guidance - United States, New York City, and Los Angeles, May 5-12, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(24):751-758. Published 2020 Jun 19. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6924e1

[61] Isabelle J. Rao, Margaret L. Brandeau, Optimal allocation of limited vaccine to control an infectious disease: Simple analytical conditions, Mathematical Biosciences, Volume 337, 2021, 108621, ISSN 0025-5564, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2021.108621.

[62] Hannah Ritchie, Edouard Mathieu, Lucas Rodés-Guirao, Cameron Appel, Charlie Giattino, Statistics and Research Coronavirus (COVID-19) Cases, [online] Our World In Data, < https://ourworldindata.org/covid-cases> [Accesse 11.24.2021].

[63] Das, P., Upadhyay, R.K., Misra, A.K. et al. Mathematical model of COVID-19 with comorbidity and controlling using non-pharmaceutical interventions and vaccination. Nonlinear Dyn 106, 1213–1227 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11071-021-06517-w

[64] Colomer, M.À.; Margalida, A.; Alòs, F.; Oliva-Vidal, P.; Vilella, A.; Fraile, L. Modeling of Vaccination and Contact Tracing as Tools to Control the COVID-19 Outbreak in Spain. Vaccines 2021, 9, 386. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9040386

[65] Betti Matthew, Bragazzi Nicola Luigi, Heffernan Jane M., Kong Jude and Raad Angie 2021Integrated vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions based strategies in Ontario, Canada, as a case study: a mathematical modelling studyJ. R. Soc. Interface.182021000920210009 http://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2021.0009

[66] Patel MD, Rosenstrom E, Ivy JS, et al. The Joint Impact of COVID-19 Vaccination and Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions on Infections, Hospitalizations, and Mortality: An Agent-Based Simulation. Preprint. medRxiv. 2021;2020.12.30.20248888. Published 2021 Jan 10. doi:10.1101/2020.12.30.20248888

[67] Luyao Kou, Xinzhi Wang, Yang Li, Xiaojing Guo, Hui Zhang, A multi-scale agent-based model of infectious disease transmission to assess the impact of vaccination and non pharmaceutical interventions: The COVID-19 case, Journal of Safety Science and Resilience, Volume 2, Issue 4, 2021, Pages 199-207, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnlssr.2021.08.005.

[68] Raphael Sonabend, Lilith K Whittles, Natsuko Imai, Pablo N Perez-Guzman, Edward S Knock, Thomas Rawson, Katy A M Gaythorpe, Bimandra A Djaafara, Wes Hinsley, Richard G FitzJohn, John A Lees, Divya Thekke Kanapram, Erik M Volz, Azra C Ghani, Neil M Ferguson, Marc Baguelin, Anne Cori, Non-pharmaceutical interventions, vaccination, and the SARS-CoV-2 delta variant in England: a mathematical modelling study, The Lancet, Volume 398, Issue 10313, 2021, Pages 1825-1835, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02276-5.

[69] Trevor S. Farthing, Cristina Lanzas, Assessing the efficacy of interventions to control indoor SARS-Cov-2 transmission: An agent-based modeling approach, Epidemics, Volume 37, 2021, 100524, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100524.

[70] Srinivasan Venkatramanan, Bryan Lewis, Jiangzhuo Chen, Dave Higdon, Anil Vullikanti, Madhav Marathe, Using data-driven agent-based models for forecasting emerging infectious diseases. Epidemics 22, 43–49 (2018).

[71] Colomer, M.À., Margalida, A., Alòs, F., Oliva-Vidal, P., Vilella, A., Fraile L., Modeling of Vaccination and Contact Tracing as Tools to Control the COVID-19 Outbreak in Spain. Vaccines 2021, 9, 386. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9040386

[72] Trevor S. Farthing, Cristina Lanzas, Assessing the efficacy of interventions to control indoor SARS-Cov-2 transmission: An agent-based modeling approach, Epidemics, Volume 37, 2021, 100524, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100524.

[73] Sam Moore, Edward M Hill, Michael J Tildesley, Louise Dyson, Matt J Keeling, Vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study, The Lancet Infectious Diseases, Volume 21, Issue 6, 2021, Pages 793-802, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00143-2.

[74] Das, P., Upadhyay, R.K., Misra, A.K. et al. Mathematical model of COVID-19 with comorbidity and controlling using non-pharmaceutical interventions and vaccination. Nonlinear Dyn 106, 1213–1227 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11071-021-06517-w

[75] Betti Matthew, Bragazzi Nicola Luigi, Heffernan Jane M., Kong Jude and Raad Angie 2021Integrated vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions based strategies in Ontario, Canada, as a case study: a mathematical modelling studyJ. R. Soc. Interface.182021000920210009 http://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2021.0009

[76] Patel MD, Rosenstrom E, Ivy JS, The Joint Impact of COVID-19 Vaccination and Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions on Infections, Hospitalizations, and Mortality: An Agent-Based Simulation. Preprint. medRxiv. 2021;2020.12.30.20248888. Published 2021 Jan 10. doi:10.1101/2020.12.30.20248888

[77] Raphael Sonabend, Lilith K Whittles, Natsuko Imai, Pablo N Perez-Guzman, Edward S Knock, Thomas Rawson, Non-pharmaceutical interventions, vaccination, and the SARS-CoV-2 delta variant in England: a mathematical modelling study, The Lancet, Volume 398, Issue 10313, 2021, Pages 1825-1835, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02276-5.

[78] R. Breban, J. Riou, A. Fontanet Interhuman transmissibility of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: estimation of pandemic risk Lancet, 382 (2013), pp. 694-699

[79] D.N. Fisman, G.M. Leung, M. Lipsitch Nuanced risk assessment for emerging infectious diseases Lancet, 383 (2014), pp. 189-190

[80] S. Cauchemez, C. Fraser, M.D. Van Kerkhove, C.A. Donnelly, S. Riley, A. Rambaut, et al. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: quantification of the extent of the epidemic, surveillance biases, and transmissibility Lancet Infect Dis, 14 (2014), pp. 50-56

[81] WHO MERS Global Summary and Assessment of Risk, WHO/MERS/RA/August18, 18 Auguest 2021

[82] Luyao Kou, Xinzhi Wang, Yang Li, Xiaojing Guo, Hui Zhang, A multi-scale agent-based model of infectious disease transmission to assess the impact of vaccination and non pharmaceutical interventions: The COVID-19 case, Journal of Safety Science and Resilience, Volume 2, Issue 4, 2021, Pages 199-207, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnlssr.2021.08.005.

[83] Kotil, S.E., 2021. Emergent effects of contact tracing robustly stabilize outbreaks. medRxiv.

[84] Klepac, P., Kissler, S. and Gog, J., 2018. Contagion! the bbc four pandemic–the model behind the documentary. Epidemics, 24, pp.49-59.