medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Compartmental mixing models for vaccination-status-based segregation regarding viral respiratory diseases

Joseph Hickey, PhD[1,*] and Denis G. Rancourt, PhD[1]

[1] Correlation Research in the Public Interest (correlation-canada.org)

*Corresponding author: joseph.hickey@ucalgary.ca

PRE-PRINT UPLOADED TO https://www.medrxiv.org/ ON 2022-11-24 (Version 2)

Abstract

Background: Segregation of unvaccinated people from public spaces has been a novel and controversial COVID-era public health practice in many countries. Models can be used to explore potential consequences of vaccination-status-based segregation. The models must be simple enough to provide reliable predictions of possibilities, while including the essential ingredients to make them sufficiently realistic. We systematically investigate implementing effects of segregation on person-to-person contact frequencies and show this critically determines the predicted epidemiological outcomes.

Methods: We describe a susceptible-infectious-recovered (SIR) two-population model for vaccinated and unvaccinated groups of individuals that transmit an infectious disease by person-to-person contact. The degree of segregation between the two groups, ranging from zero to complete segregation, is implemented using the like-to-like mixing approach developed by Garnett and Anderson (1996) for sexually-transmitted diseases, adapted for presumed SARS-CoV-2 transmission. We allow the contact frequencies for individuals in the two groups to be different and depend, with variable strength, on the degree of segregation.

Results: Model predictions for a broad range of model assumptions and respiratory-disease epidemiological parameters are calculated to examine the predicted effects of segregation. Segregation can either increase or decrease the attack rate among the vaccinated, depending on the type of segregation (isolating or compounding), and the contagiousness of the disease. For diseases with low contagiousness, segregation can cause an attack rate in the vaccinated, which does not occur without segregation.

Interpretation: There is no blanket epidemiological advantage to segregation, either for the vaccinated or the unvaccinated. Negative epidemiological consequences can occur for both groups.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Models can be used to investigate infectious disease dynamics under different hypotheses about the characteristics of a disease and the effects of health policy. In such applications, it is crucial to base the model on the simplest-possible sufficiently realistic conceptual foundation and only add extensions incrementally (Garnett & Anderson, 1996; Siegenfeld et al., 2020). This optimizes relevance and minimizes confounding the results with complexity and intangible propagation of error. Following this approach, researchers have extended the foundational SIR-type model to explore diseases with birth and death dynamics, maternal- or vaccine-derived immunity, latency of infection, and so on (Hethcote, 2000; Keeling & Rohani, 2008; Martcheva, 2015).

Recently, simple susceptible-infectious-recovered (SIR) models of epidemic dynamics have been implemented with two interacting societal groups (vaccinated and unvaccinated) to examine epidemic outcomes for variable degrees of interaction between the two groups, including whether the unvaccinated put the vaccinated unduly or disproportionately at risk, using epidemiological parameters presumed to be representative of SARS-CoV-2 (Fisman et al., 2022; Virk, 2022; Kosinski, 2021).

These prior implementations take the person-to-person contact frequencies of the majority and socially-excluded groups to be equal and held constant, irrespective of the degree of segregation (or exclusion or “like-to-like mixing”). In other words, in the previous models, the total number of contacts that an individual from either of the two societal groups experiences per day is constant and unaffected by the degree of segregation between the two groups.

Here, we implement person-to-person contact frequencies that can be different for the two groups and that vary with the degree of segregation, in different ways. We explore different modes and amplitudes of the variations of frequencies with degree of segregation, and their consequences on the predicted epidemiological outcomes. This is necessary because, for example, in many actual regulatory policies the excluded unvaccinated group is barred from public venues or services where people gather and from public transport where people are in close proximity for various durations.

In general, the person-to-person contact frequency of the excluded group decreases with increasing segregation if isolation is in effect, and increases with increasing segregation if the excluded individuals are in-effect put into compounds or camps. Implementing these essential model features gives rise to a rich and more complex epidemiological behaviour, whatever epidemiological parameters are used.

The Model

We adopt the standard SIR framework with two sub-populations, as has been done with sexually-transmitted diseases and was recently done with vaccination status.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Following the usual SIR model structure, a person can be in one of three states: susceptible to infection (S), infectious (I), or recovered and immune (R). If a susceptible person comes into contact with an infectious person, the susceptible person can become infectious, and infectious people eventually recover.

Our model population is divided into two groups: vaccinated and unvaccinated. Vaccination is "all or nothing", such that a proportion VE of the vaccinated population is immune (are in the R state from the outset of the simulation), where the parameter VE represents vaccine efficacy. The model also includes a natural immunity parameter, NI, equal to the proportion of unvaccinated that are immune from the outset.

The model parameter η controls the degree of segregation between vaccinated and unvaccinated people. When η = 0, there is no segregation, and the two groups mix randomly. When η = 1, there is complete segregation, such that vaccinated only come into contact with other vaccinated, and unvaccinated only come into contact with other unvaccinated.

The parameter η follows from Garnett and Anderson (1996), who modeled sexually-transmitted disease spread in a population divided into groups with different frequencies of sexual contacts. Since it is reasonable to assume that the level of desire for sexual contact is an intrinsic characteristic of individuals, it is reasonable to assume that segregation does not change the contact frequencies in either group in Garnett and Anderson's model. However, contact frequency is not generally and solely an intrinsic individual characteristic, and segregation based on vaccination status may increase or decrease contact frequencies, depending on how the segregation is implemented.

In our model, the contact frequencies of either vaccinated or unvaccinated individuals (or both) can increase, decrease, or remain constant as the two groups are segregated. This is controlled by the parameters m_v and m_u, which determine the degree of increase or decrease of the contact frequency in either group, as η is varied.

For example, when $m_u < 0$, as segregation is increased, the contact frequency of unvaccinated people, c_u, decreases. This corresponds to segregation policy that excludes unvaccinated people from public spaces, e.g., using vaccination passports. Conversely, when $m_u > 0$, then as segregation is increased, c_u increases. This corresponds to segregation policy that compounds unvaccinated people, for example in prisons or camps.

In principle, the vaccinated and unvaccinated contact frequencies may be different even when the two groups are completely unsegregated. The unsegregated (η = 0) contact frequencies are set by the parameters c_v^0 and c_u^0. Similarly, the probability that contact between a susceptible and infectious person results in transmission is β_v (β_u) for a susceptible vaccinated (unvaccinated) person and the rates of recovery from infection for the vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals are γ_v and γ_u, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

There are thus two "β parameters", two "*c* parameters" and two "γ parameters" in our model. Since each β parameter always occurs as part of a product with its respective *c* parameter, the β parameters can freely be set equal to 1: this imposes that the "contacts" considered in the model are, by definition, only those contacts that are of sufficiently close proximity and long duration that an infection is guaranteed to occur when a susceptible and an infectious person meet. We set $\beta_v = \beta_u = 1$ in this paper, without any loss of generality. For a more contagious virus, more of an individual's contacts are long and close enough that transmission would be guaranteed, corresponding to higher c_v^0 and c_u^0.

The model of Fisman et al. (2022) is the special case of our model with $m_u = m_v = 0$, $c_v^0\beta_v = c_u^0\beta_u$ and $\gamma_v = \gamma_u$. When $m_u = m_v = 0$, the contact frequencies of both vaccinated and unvaccinated remain constant regardless of the level of segregation. Segregation then implies two parallel societies, where each population has its own public spaces (such as restaurants, airplanes, etc.) and within these spaces maintain the same contact frequencies they would have with no segregation. Fisman et al.'s implementation does not represent how segregation has been applied during the COVID era in Canada and many countries (Looi, 2021; Lawson et al., 2022), since unvaccinated people were excluded from public spaces while vaccinated people were allowed access.

We do not use the "basic reproduction number", R_0, since it would be derived from the fundamental parameters of the model. In a model with multiple sub-populations, the dynamics are not characterized by a single R_0 because the infection probabilities (β parameters), contact frequencies (*c* parameters) and recovery rates (γ parameters) are different for each sub-population, in general.

The parameters of our model are listed in Table 1; calculated quantities in Table 2. Technical details of the model are in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Model parameters

Parameter description	Symbol	Typical value	Bound
Degree of segregation between vaccinated and unvaccinated groups	η	(varied)	0 to 1
Probability of transmission per contact between a susceptible vaccinated person and an infectious person	β_v	1	0 to 1
Probability of transmission per contact between a susceptible unvaccinated person and an infectious person	β_u	1	0 to 1
Contact frequency of vaccinated people when η=0	c_v^0	438 contacts/yr	≥ 0
Contact frequency of unvaccinated people when η=0	c_u^0	438 contacts/yr	≥ 0
Degree of increase $(m_v > 0)$ or decrease $(m_v < 0)$ of vaccinated contact frequency as a function of η	m_v	0	≥ -1
Degree of increase $(m_u > 0)$ or decrease $(m_u < 0)$ of unvaccinated contact frequency as a function of η	m_u	(varied)	≥ -1
Rate of recovery of a vaccinated person (per year)	γ_v	73 yr^{-1}	≥ 0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Rate of recovery of an unvaccinated person (per year)	γ_u	73 yr^{-1}	≥ 0
Population fraction of vaccinated people	P_v	0.8	0 to 1
Vaccine efficacy	VE	0.2	0 to 1
Proportion of unvaccinated population with natural immunity	NI	0.2	0 to 1
Population of entire society	N	10^7	> 0

Table 2: Quantities calculated from model results (mathematical definitions in Appendix 1, Section A1.3)

Name	Symbol
Attack rate in the vaccinated population	A_v
Attack rate in the unvaccinated population	A_u
Share of infections among vaccinated people that were due to contacts with infectious unvaccinated people	B_v

Results

The attack rate among the vaccinated population is defined as the proportion of initially-susceptible vaccinated people who become infected during the epidemic: $A_v = \left(S_v(t_0) - S_v(t_f)\right)/S_v(t_0)$, where $S_v(t_0)$ is the number of susceptible vaccinated people at the beginning of the epidemic and $S_v(t_f)$ is the number of susceptible vaccinated people remaining once there are no longer any infectious people in the entire (vaccinated and unvaccinated) population. A_u is defined equivalently, for the unvaccinated.

We also define B_v as the share of infections among vaccinated people that were due to contacts with infectious unvaccinated people.

We focus on segregation types that are targeted at the unvaccinated group. We assume, for simplicity, that segregation has no impact on the contact frequency of vaccinated people (m_v = 0). We also assume that the contact frequencies in both groups are the same when there is no segregation ($c_v^0 = c_u^0$). We use the same values as used by Fisman et al. (2022) for the remaining parameters: P_v = 0.8, VE=0.8, NI=0.2, $\gamma_v = \gamma_u = 73$ yr^{-1}, and N = 10^7. These values were presumed to be representative for COVID-19 and vaccination.

Appendix 2 contains supplementary figures with results for different parameter combinations, including $m_v \neq 0$ and $c_v^0 \neq c_u^0$. In all results in this paper, simulations were initiated with a seed number of 100 infectious individuals distributed proportionately among the two sub-populations.

Fig. 1 shows results for a moderate value of $c_v^0 = c_u^0 = 300$. For reference, in a single-population model, c = 300, β = 1 and γ = 73 corresponds to R_0 = 4.1.

As can be seen in Fig. 1a, when $m_u < 0$ (exclusion and isolation of unvaccinated people) the vaccinated attack rate, A_v decreases with increasing segregation. However, when $m_u > 0$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(compounding of unvaccinated people), there is a maximum in A_v for moderate values of η. Therefore, with compounding segregation, very large values of η are required for A_v to be lower than its value with no segregation (η = 0). Fig. 1b is the unvaccinated attack rate, A_u versus degree of segregation, η. Fig. 1c shows that B_v, the share of vaccinated infections that are due to unvaccinated people, has a shape similar to $A_v(\eta, m_u)$. In all panels, 20% of the total population is unvaccinated (P_v = 0.8; Table 1).

Fig. 1 therefore demonstrates that whether segregation increases or decreases the vaccinated-population attack rate depends on how segregation is implemented.



Figure 1: Three different quantities as functions of the degree of segregation, η, for different values of m_u: (a) Attack rate among the vaccinated sub-population, (b) Attack rate among the unvaccinated sub-population, (c) Share of vaccinated infections that were due to contacts with unvaccinated people. Values of fixed model parameters are indicated at the top of the figure.

Figs. 2 and 3 show results for larger $c_v^0 = c_u^0$. Compared to Fig. 1a, A_v in Figs. 2a and 3a does not increase much with η when $m_u > 0$, and A_v no longer has a maximum when $m_u = 0$. Comparing with Fig. 1a, it can also be seen that A_v increases with increasing $c_v^0 = c_u^0$ when there is no segregation (η = 0).



Figure 2: Same as Fig. 1, except that $c_v^0 = c_u^0 = 437$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Same as Fig. 1, except that $c_v^0 = c_u^0 = 600$.

For smaller $c_v^0 = c_u^0$ (Figs. 4 and 5), $A_v(\eta = 0)$ is decreased, and larger η can dramatically increase A_v. Even with an isolating segregation policy ($m_u = -0.5$ in Fig. 4a), A_v is increased for moderate values of η.

When $c_v^0 = c_u^0$ are small enough ($c_v^0 = c_u^0 = 200$ in Fig. 5), there is no epidemic among the vaccinated in the absence of segregation ($A_v(\eta = 0) = 0$). However, a non-zero vaccinated-population attack rate ($A_v > 0$) occurs if η is sufficiently large, and emerges regardless of whether one isolates or compounds the unvaccinated. Therefore, for small values of $c_v^0 = c_u^0$, any type of segregation can only harm the vaccinated.



Figure 4: Same as Fig. 1, except that $c_v^0 = c_u^0 = 250$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 5: Same as Fig. 1, except that $c_v^0 = c_u^0 = 200$.

Appendix 2, contains supplementary figures showing that when VE is decreased (e.g. VE=0.4), A_v is not strongly influenced by η, regardless of m_u; therefore, any beneficial effect of segregation on A_v is reduced as VE decreases.

Appendix 2 also explores $c_v^0 \neq c_u^0$. For example, when $c_v^0 > c_u^0$, the unvaccinated contact frequency is reduced even when there is no segregation; increasing η can then increase A_v significantly for parameter values for which a similar increase of A_v does not occur when $c_v^0 = c_u^0$ (e.g. $c_v^0 = 437$, $m_u = 1$, $m_v = 0$, VE = 0.8, in Section A2.6).

Interpretation

Our model shows that vaccination-status-based segregation can have significantly different and counter-intuitive impacts on the outcome of an epidemic, depending on how the segregation is applied, and depending on cultural and population-density factors, for example, that co-determine c_v^0 and c_u^0.

Regarding segregation, the key feature is that the contact frequencies of people in each of the segregated sub-populations depend on the degree and type of segregation applied. Segregation that compounds the unvaccinated ($m_u > 0$ and $m_v = 0$) generally causes an increase in the vaccinated-population attack rate, A_v, for small and intermediate degrees of segregation, η. Segregation that isolates and excludes the unvaccinated ($m_u < 0$ and $m_v = 0$) decreases A_v for "more contagious viruses" (i.e. large $c_v^0 = c_u^0$); however, for "less contagious viruses" (smaller $c_v^0 = c_u^0$), both isolating and compounding types of segregation can increase A_v beyond its value in an unsegregated society. For "viruses that are not very contagious" (small $c_v^0 = c_u^0$), applying segregation can cause a sizeable epidemic among the vaccinated even though virtually no vaccinated people would be infected in an unsegregated society.

We find that B_v, the share of vaccinated infections that are due to contact with unvaccinated people, follows a similar behaviour to A_v as a function of the degree of segregation, when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

segregation has no impact on the vaccinated contact frequency ($m_v = 0$). For this type of segregation, A_v and B_v either increase or decrease simultaneously with increasing η, depending on the value of m_u, and B_v is minimized for complete segregation. When $m_v = 0$, there is therefore no type or degree of segregation that reduces the vaccinated attack rate while simultaneously "enhancing the degree of risk" to vaccinated people from unvaccinated people (Fisman et al., 2022).

In contrast, when $m_v \neq 0$, such that segregation affects the contact frequencies of vaccinated people, segregation can produce an increased A_v along with a decreased B_v and vice-versa, as shown in Appendix 2 (Sections A2.3 and A2.4).

The broad range of results emerging from our simple model highlights the importance of the impact of segregation on contact frequencies, which has not been considered in other epidemic models, including network-based models in which unvaccinated people cluster together in "cliques" or households (Salathé & Bonhoeffer, 2007; De Leon & Aran, 2022; Achitouv, 2022).

Limitations

SIR models and their variations, including agent-based versions (Hinch et al., 2021; Achitouv, 2022) are based on the paradigm of transmission due to pairwise contact between a recently infected and a susceptible individual. However, this paradigm is unable to account for important features of viral respiratory disease incidence, in particular its seasonal pattern that is strongly dependent on latitude and its rapid emergence and disappearance occurring at essentially the same time at widely dispersed locations (Hope-Simpson, 1992). Seasonality of viral respiratory disease may be driven by the seasonality of absolute humidity and its effect on transmission via aerosols (Shaman & Kohn, 2009; Shaman et al., 2010). However air-borne transmission via long-lived suspended aerosol particles is not directly compatible with pairwise transmission, since it occurs in built environments where many people may transit or be present (Bulfone et al., 2021). These fundamental limitations of present viral respiratory disease models are caveats to any use of such models in health policy.

Conclusion

Using SIR modelling, we have shown that vaccination-status-based segregation can lead to significantly different and counter-intuitive epidemic outcomes depending on how segregation is applied, and depending on complex cultural and physical factors that co-determine infectious contact frequencies (i.e., the products βc), including negative health consequences for either segregated group, even disregarding the expected deleterious health impacts of the segregation policies themselves (Cohen, 2004; Cohen et al., 1991; Cohen et al., 1997). Given the lack of reliable empirical evaluations of needed infectious contact frequency values, given the now proven outcome sensitivities to the infectious contact frequencies, and given the intrinsic limitations of SIR models in this application, we cannot recommend that SIR modelling be used to motivate or justify segregation policies regarding viral respiratory diseases, in the present state of knowledge.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

I. Achitouv, "Propagation of epidemics in a polarized society: impact of clustering among unvaccinated individuals", arXiv:2206.00357 (2022), https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.00357.

T.C. Bulfone, M. Malekinejad, G.W. Rutherford, and N. Razani, "Outdoor Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Other Respiratory Viruses: A Systematic Review", *J. Infect. Dis*. 223 (2021) 550-561, https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa742.

S. Cohen, "Social relationships and health", *Amer. Psych.* 59 (2004) 676-684.

S. Cohen, D.A.J. Tyrell, and A.P. Smith, "Psychological stress and susceptibility to the common cold", *New Eng. J. Med.* 325 (1991) 606-612, doi: 10.1056/NEJM199108293250903.

S. Cohen, W.J. Doyle, and D.P. Skoner, "Social Ties and Susceptibility to the Common Cold", *J. Amer. Med. Assoc.* 277 (1997) 1940-1944, doi: 10.1001/jama.1997.03540480040036.

H. De-Leon & D. Aran, "Over- and under-estimation of vaccine effectiveness", *medRxiv*, 25 January 2022, https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.24.22269737.

D.N. Fisman, A. Amoako, and A.R. Tuite, "Impact of population mixing between vaccinated and unvaccinated subpopulations on infectious disease dynamics: implications for SARS-CoV-2 transmission", *Can. Med. Assoc. J.* 194 (2022) E573-80, doi: 10.1503/cmaj.212105.

G.P. Garnett and R.M. Anderson, "Sexually Transmitted Diseases and Sexual Behavior: Insights from Mathematical Models", *J. Infect. Dis.* 174 (1996) S150-S161, https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/174.Supplement_2.S150.

H.W. Hethcote, "The Mathematics of Infectious Diseases", *SIAM Rev.* 42 (2000) 599-653, https://www.jstor.org/stable/2653135.

R. Hinch, W.J. M. Probert, A. Nurtay, M. Kendall, C. Wymant, M. Hall, K. Lythgoe, A. Bulas Cruz, L. Zhao, A. Stewart, L. Ferretti, D. Montero, J. Warren, N. Mather, M. Abueg, N. Wu, O. Legat, K. Bentley, T. Mead, K. Van-Vuuren, D. Feldner-Busztin, T. Ristori, A. Finkelstein, D.G. Bonsall, L. Abeler-Dörner, and C. Fraser, "OpenABM-Covid19—An agent-based model for non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19 including contact tracing", *PLoS Comp. Biol.*, 17(7):e1009146 (2021), https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009146.

R.E. Hope-Simpson, "The Transmission of Epidemic Influenza", Springer (New York, NY, 1992), doi: 10.1007/978-1-4899-2385-1.

M.J. Keeling and P. Rohani, "Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals", Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ, 2008), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvcm4gk0.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279035; this version posted November 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

R.J. Kosinski, "The Failures of an Ideal COVID-19 Vaccine: A Simulation Study", *medRxiv*, 24 November 2021, https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266669.

M.-K. Looi, "Vaccine passports around the world", *BMJ* 374 (2021) n2142, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2142.

T. Lawson, L. Nathans, A. Goldenberg, M. Fimiani, D. Boire-Schwab, G. Waschuk, C. Simard-Zakaib, G. Querry, N. Fitz-Simon, C.-A. Bernier, and A. Sinha, "COVID-19: Emergency Measures Tracker", McCarthy Tétrault LLP, 26 May 2022 (accessed 12 August 2022), https://www.mccarthy.ca/en/insights/articles/covid-19-emergency-measures-tracker.

M. Martcheva, "An Introduction to Mathematical Epidemiology", Springer (New York, NY, 2015), doi: 10.1007/978-1-4899-7612-3.

M. Salathé & S. Bonhoeffer, "The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks", *J. R. Soc. Interface*, 5 (2008) 1505-1508, https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2008.0271.
J. Shaman and M. Kohn, "Absolute humidity modulates influenza survival, transmission, and seasonality", *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 106 (2009) 3243-3248, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0806852106.

J. Shaman, V.E. Pitzer, C. Viboud, B.T. Grenfell, and M. Lipsitch, "Absolute Humidity and the Seasonal Onset of Influenza in the Continental United States", *PLoS Biol.*, 8(2): e1000316 (2010), https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000316.

A.F. Siegenfeld, N.N. Taleb, and Y. Bar-Yam, "What models can and cannot tell us about COVID-19", *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 117 (2020) 16092-16095, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2011542117.

N. Virk, "Epidemic modeling of a simple respiratory pathogen", University of British Columbia (MSc thesis), August 2022, https://dx.doi.org/10.14288/1.0417535.