Draft Date: 4.30.2020

Words = 2010 (without abstract, references, authors, affiliations)

Continued and Serious Lockdown Could Minimize Many Newly Transmitted Cases of COVID-19 in the U.S.: Wavelets, Deterministic Models, and Data

Arni S.R. Srinivasa Rao, Ph.D.^{a,*},
Steven G. Krantz, Ph.D.^b

Summary: All the newly reported COVID-19 cases of April in the U.S. have not acquired the virus in the same month. We estimate that there was an average of 29,000/day COVID-19 cases in the U.S. transmitted from infected to susceptible during April 1-24, 2020 after adjusting for under-reported and under-diagnosed. We have provided model-based predictions of COVID-19 for the low and high range of transmission rates and with

^aProfessor, Division of Health Economics and Modeling, Department of Population Health Sciences, Medical College of Georgia, Augusta University, Augusta, USA.

Director, Laboratory for Theory and Mathematical Modeling, Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, GA 30912, USA.

Professor, Department of Mathematics, Augusta University, Augusta, GA 30912.

*Corresponding author

(email: arrao@augusta.edu)

^b Professor, Department of Mathematics, Washington University in St. Louis, Campus Box 1146, One Brookings Drive, St. Louis, Missouri 63130, USA.

varying degrees of preventive measures including the lockdowns. We predict that even if 10% of the susceptible and 20 % of the infected who were not identified as of April 23, 2020, do not adhere to proper care or do not obey lockdown, then by the end of May and by end of June 50,000 and 55,000 new cases will emerge, respectively. These values for the months of May and June with worse adherence rates of 50% by susceptible and infected (but not identified) will be 251,000 and 511,000, respectively. Continued and serious lockdown measures could bring this average daily new cases to a further low at 4,300/day to 8,000/day in May.

Introduction

As the cumulative number of novel coronavirus cases in the U.S. is still very high at more than 895,766 as of April 24, 2020, and more than 709,665 of these cases were reported during April 1-24, 2020 [1], we have asked a couple of questions: namely, did the lockdown implemented by various states in the U.S. by the end of March 2020 have any impact so far, especially in preventing the new COVID-19 cases in the recent weeks in the U.S.? Will there be any degree of damage in further controlling the spread of COVID-19 in the U.S. by relaxing the lockdown measures to keep-up the economy? We found that relaxing ongoing efforts on controlling the pandemic in the U.S. could have striking impact on the number of new cases for the months of May and June

2020. A 50% relaxed approach in the lockdown or poor preventive measures in the U.S. could lead to additional new COVID cases up to 200,000 to 370,000. We provide several other scenarios too which are in Table 1 to Table 6.

It is not always easy to conduct experiments to get the parameters of transmissions during the lockdowns [2]. One can indirectly obtain the number of people who were infected in a geographical area within a specified time and obtain population-level incidence rates based on the newly reported cases. But we know that often not all cases are reported or diagnosed or both [3]. That means a true incidence rate in the population is not easy to obtain unless we adjust the reported cases with the number not reported and

retrospectively adjust the past reported data [3].

Methods, Models and Data

We want to understand through simple transmission dynamics principles what fraction of these cases were possibly acquired during April. We want to understand these numbers by adjusting for under-reporting including the under-diagnosis during the period. Further, we develop age-structured population models of COVID-19 spread and, combining the outcomes with wavelet analysis, we have provided impact of not adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures combined in the U.S. for the period May-June, 2020. Our methods, models and the data are described in the next paragraphs.

Figure 1. Estimated Transmissions occurred during each day and the number of reported per day during April 1-23, 2020. The estimated cases are skewed because some of the transmission occurred before April 19 might be reported at a later date.

Let f_n be the cumulative number of COVID-19 cases reported at the end of the n^{th} day and $f_0 = 0$ be the number of COVID-19 cases at the beginning. Let f_1 be the number of cases at the end of 1^{st} day. Let $I_i = f_{i+1} - f_i$ for $i =$

$0, 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ be the new cases on the each day. Let $c_i \in (0, 1)$ be the fraction of I_i those are infected on the i^{th} day such that

$$c_j l_j d = 1, \text{-----} (1)$$

where d is the average incubation period. That is,

$$c_j I_i + c_i I_j + \dots c_j I_i (\text{d times}) = I_i, \text{-----} (2)$$

is satisfied. Through the equation (A.1), we have distributed newly reported cases on the i^{th} day into i^{th} day and $d - 1$ number of days prior to i^{th} day. We assumed that c_i is constant in (1), so that, I_i is uniformly distributed during $[i^{th}$ day, d days prior]. Instead of uniform distribution of I_i as considered in (1), one can consider a skewed or non-uniform or some random

distribution if there is strong evidence of the same. Under such non-uniform situations as well we will have $\sum_{i=1}^d c_i I_i = I_i$, and $\sum_{i=1}^d c_i = 1$. Once each I_i value is partitioned into $d - 1$ days prior to the i^{th} day, then the number of transmuted cases in each day is computed using the below set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1 I_1 + c_1 I_2 + \cdots + c_1 I_d &= A(I_1) \\
c_2 I_2 + c_2 I_3 + \cdots + c_2 I_{d+1} &= A(I_2) \\
&\vdots \\
c_d I_d + c_d I_{d+1} + \cdots + c_d I_{2d-1} &= A(I_d) \\
c_{d+1} I_{d+1} + c_{d+1} I_{d+2} + \cdots + c_{d+1} I_{2d} &= A(I_{d+1}) \\
c_{d+2} I_{d+2} + c_{d+2} I_{d+3} + \cdots + c_{d+2} I_{2d+1} &= A(I_{d+2}) \\
&\vdots \\
c_{2d} I_{2d} + c_{2d} I_{2d+1} + \cdots + c_{2d} I_{3d-1} &= A(I_{2d})
\end{aligned}
\tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{d+2} I_{d+2} + c_{d+2} I_{d+3} + \cdots + c_{d+2} I_{2d+1} &= A(I_{d+2}) \\
&\vdots \\
c_{2d} I_{2d} + c_{2d} I_{2d+1} + \cdots + c_{2d} I_{3d-1} &= A(I_{2d})
\end{aligned}
\tag{4}$$

These continue until the last reported cases are available for a given population. For the computations in this article we considered uniform c_i values over d days by assuming $c_i = c$ within the period of study. Then we assumed that the daily new cases April 1 to April 13 were uniformly distributed into 1/14th, 2/14th, 3/14th and so on until 13/14th fractions of the reported and we assumed all the cases from April 14 were the result of those transmitted

during the month of April. A similar backward adjustment of reported cases was theoretically demonstrated in our earlier article with advanced network structures [5].

Let Y be the total number of newly infected cases who were not traced into the system. Let $Y = Y_1 + Y_2 + Y_3$, where Y_k is the size of infected in the ag-group k for $k = 0-17, 18-64, 65+$, respectively. Let X be the total number of susceptible

individuals and $X = \sum_{k=1}^3 X_k$, where X_k is the size of susceptible in the ag-group k . Let $L(X_k) = \phi_k X_k$ be the fraction ϕ_k of

susceptible X_k who do not practice lockdown or other preventive measures in the age-group k , such that

$$L(X) = L(X_1 + X_2 + X_3) = \phi_1 X_1 + \phi_2 X_2 + \phi_3 X_3, \text{-----} (5)$$

where $\phi = \sum_{k=1}^3 \phi_k$ is the total fraction of susceptibles in the population who do not adhere to any preventive measures

including the lockdown. Similarly, we will assume that

$$L(Y) = L(Y_1 + Y_2 + Y_3) = \psi_1 Y_1 + \psi_2 Y_2 + \psi_3 Y_3, \text{-----} (6)$$

where $\psi = \sum_{k=1}^3 \psi_k$ is the total fraction of infected (who are not traced) in the population who do not adhere to any preventive measures including the lockdown. The differential equations describing the transmission dynamics from infected to susceptible are given below:

$$\frac{dL(Y_3)}{dt} = [L(X_3) \sum_{k=1}^3 \beta_{k3} L(Y_k)] - \gamma_3 L(Y_3) \text{-----} (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL(X_1)}{dt} &= -[L(X_1) \sum_{k=1}^3 \beta_{k1} L(Y_k)] \\ \frac{dL(X_2)}{dt} &= -[L(X_2) \sum_{k=1}^3 \beta_{k2} L(Y_k)] \\ \frac{dL(X_3)}{dt} &= -[L(X_3) \sum_{k=1}^3 \beta_{k3} L(Y_k)] \\ \frac{dL(Y_1)}{dt} &= [L(X_1) \sum_{k=1}^3 \beta_{k1} L(Y_k)] - \gamma_1 L(Y_1) \\ \frac{dL(Y_2)}{dt} &= [L(X_2) \sum_{k=1}^3 \beta_{k2} L(Y_k)] - \gamma_2 L(Y_2) \end{aligned}$$

Here β_{kl} is the average transmission rate from an infected in the age group k to a susceptible in the age group l and γ_k is the recovery rate for the age-group k . Similar age structure population models for the COVID-19 were developed by us in predicting the U.S. population aged 65+ with underlying medical conditions [7]. Once we obtain predicted values of new COVID-19 cases we will use Meyer's wavelets to demonstrate the difference of magnitudes between observed and predicted cases and wavelets for the difference between various degrees of not adhering to lockdown or other preventive measures. Meyer's wavelets are a natural improvement over the Fourier series and transforms. A Fourier series $f(x)$ is written in terms of coefficients a_0, a_n and b_n for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of natural numbers, and with trigonometric functions as below

$$f(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n \cos nx + b_n \sin nx), \text{-----} (8)$$

where $\cos nx + i \sin nx = e^{inx}$. Further, if $f(x)$ is Lebesgue integrable on an

interval $[0, a]$ with a period a , then we write

$$f(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(a_n \cos \frac{2\pi nx}{a} + b_n \sin \frac{2\pi nx}{a} \right),$$

where

$$a_n = \frac{2}{a} \int_0^a f(s) \cos \frac{2\pi ns}{a} ds,$$

$$b_n = \frac{2}{a} \int_0^a f(s) \sin \frac{2\pi ns}{a} ds.$$

Once we have Fourier series, one can obtain Fourier transformations, f_T , through (9), written as

$$f_T(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-izs} f(s) ds, \text{--- -- -- -- -- (9)}$$

where z is a complex numbers and $f(s)$ is a Fourier series function (8).

accompanying function v are given below.

The Meyer wavelets $\psi(\omega)$ also use trigonometric functions which are infinitely differentiable on a certain domain. Several useful resources on wavelets are available in [8-14]. We have used such wavelets in COVID-19 modeling [3,5,7,15]. These wavelets when plotted helps us to distinguish the degree of difference in the magnitude between various levels of relaxation of lockdown and other preventive measures during COVID-19 lockdowns. The Meyer wavelets $U(\omega)$ together with

What is interesting about this new wavelet technique is the following. The traditional trigonometric functions sine and cosine do not localize well. Once we know a trigonometric function on a small interval then it is uniquely determined on the entire real line. But wavelets localize nicely in both the space and phase variables. This makes them particularly useful for image compression, signal processing, and data analysis. Wavelets are the key to our new approach to understanding the corona pandemic.

$$U(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{2} v \left(\frac{3|\omega|}{2\pi} - 1 \right) \right) e^{\frac{i\omega}{2}} & \text{if } 2\pi/3 < |\omega| < 4\pi/3 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{2} v \left(\frac{3|\omega|}{2\pi} - 1 \right) \right) e^{\frac{i\omega}{2}} & \text{if } 4\pi/3 < |\omega| < 8\pi/3 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

----- (10)

Here $v(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$, and

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{for } x \in (0,1) \\ 1 & \text{for } x > 1 \end{cases}.$$

----- (11)

General population age-structure models are well-known in epidemiology, population biology, ecology, see for example [16-25]. However, the novelty of our work lies in linking the wavelets in conceptualizing the differences between the magnitudes of $L(Y_1)$, $L(Y_2)$,

Data:

As of April 23, 2020 the age distribution of the COVID-19 cases in the U.S. among those whose age can be ascertained are as follows: 2,791 (aged <18), 475,659 (aged 18-64), 149,243 (aged 65+). The number of infected during April 1-22, 2020 who were not reported are estimated at 224,785 by our previous calculation of under-reporting in the U.S. [6]. These new cases of April we have divided into the age groups as per the CDC data above. This would provide us $Y_1 = 999$, $Y_2 = 170,339$, and $Y_3 = 53,446$. Demographic data from census.gov [26] and adjusting

$L(Y_3)$ with varying ϕ and ψ values. Such exposure of Meyer's wavelets or other wavelets were done earlier. For a more general application potential and beauty of applicability of wavelets one can refer to [31].

it for annual growth that was observed over the past decadal growth gives us susceptible populations X_1, X_2, X_3 . We considered the lack of adherence from 10% to 70% for both susceptible and infected. We could provide combinations of these and provide more predictions, but we prepared for these finite number of combinations. One can try all other permutations and combinations. Distributing ϕ and ψ within each age-groups, we have considered the following ratio [10%: 60%: 30%]. The β values for low range of predictions considered are

$$\beta(\text{low}) = \begin{Bmatrix} 2.0833 \times 10^{-10} & 1.84615 \times 10^{-10} & 2.0833 \times 10^{-10} \\ 2.0833 \times 10^{-10} & 1.84615 \times 10^{-10} & 2.0833 \times 10^{-10} \\ 2.0833 \times 10^{-10} & 2.0833 \times 10^{-10} & 2.0833 \times 10^{-10} \end{Bmatrix}.$$

These low range of predictions are calibrated just as in our previous medium range of values in the study [7]. Originally, these transmission rates were calibrated earlier for the U.S. data

on reported COVID-19 cases during March 1-14 and March 15-April 6, 2020 which were calibrated from our paper [3]. The high range transmission parameters considered are,

$$\beta(\text{high}) = \begin{Bmatrix} 4.1667 \times 10^{-10} & 2.3077 \times 10^{-11} & 4.1667 \times 10^{-10} \\ 2.3077 \times 10^{-11} & 2.3077 \times 10^{-11} & 4.1667 \times 10^{-10} \\ 4.1667 \times 10^{-10} & 4.1667 \times 10^{-10} & 4.1667 \times 10^{-10} \end{Bmatrix}.$$

Results

Out of the 709,665 COVID-19 cases newly reported during April 1-24, 2020, we have estimated that 560,524 cases were the result of transmissions within this period. To do this we have assumed a few things, the first being the average incubation period as per CDC as 2-14 days [4]. Adjusting the reported cases with the not-reported cases computed as of April 6, 2020, in the ratio of 1:1.5 as noted in [6] the true acquired

estimated numbers during April 1-19 stands at 674,354. According to the CDC data released on April 23, 23% of the cases are in the age group 65+ [1]. This implies that 23% of 551,630, that is, 155,101 number of new cases who are aged 65+ occurred during the period. This number is consistent with another modeling study on 65+ [7] which predicts the number of new cases during April – June 2020.

Figure 2. Meyer wavelets for the difference between magnitudes of predicted new COVID-19 cases in the U.S. for the months of May and June, 2020. All four sets are drawn based on $\psi = 20\%$ with $\phi = 10\%, 40\%, 70\%$. We have provided details of terminology and methods adopted in the Appendix and actual predicted values are in Tables 1 through Table 6. (a) Difference of magnitude in the month of May for Low range predictions, (b) Difference of magnitude in the month of June for Low range predictions, (c) Difference of magnitude in the month of May for High range predictions, (d) Difference of magnitude in the month of June for High range predictions.

In-addition to backward computation of newly transmitted cases in the month of April 2020 explained above and also in

the Appendix, we have also developed dynamics models to understand the spread of COVID-19 for the immediate months in the U.S. We further used

wavelets to demonstrate the difference in the spread that could occur due to varying degrees of seriousness of the lockdown implementation by susceptible and infected (who are not aware of their status). We assumed all the detected cases are been either self-quarantined or adhering to the preventive measures.

Serious preventive measures and continued lockdown could bring down the new cases in May at In-addition to the main results of our study mentioned in the introduction. We also note that relaxed approach towards lockdown and other preventive measures might be a burden on the hospital system.

Figure 3. Meyer wavelets for the difference between magnitudes of predicted new COVID-19 cases in the U.S. for the months of May and June, 2020. All the four sets are drawn based on $\psi = 50\%$ with $\phi = 10\%, 40\%, 70\%$. (a) Difference of magnitude in the month of May for Low range predictions, (b) Difference of magnitude in the month of June for Low range predictions, (c) Difference of magnitude in the month of May for High range predictions, (d) Difference of magnitude in the month of June for High range predictions.

Concluding Remarks

In summary, we see that on average about 29,000/day new cases occurred that were transmitted during April 1-23, 2020. This is very high. This possibly indicates that the lockdowns and prevention measures have not been adhered to at the fullest. A complete

lockdown could bring new infections to a much lower level in the next few weeks. Average daily cases with strict measures can be brought down to 4,300/day to 8,000/day in May. There is reason to believe that under-reporting is skewing our understanding of coronavirus infection and spread. It can be shown that lockdown measures are

among the most effective for controlling virus development and spread.

As an ending remark, we want to emphasize that one could build more complex models for the transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in the US or for any population if there is strong evidence of transmission level parameters at the sub-population level. Making models more complex unnecessarily without any supportive evidence would not yield any better results and sometimes such exercises could bring misleading results [33]. There are two levels of complexities one can introduce, one at the level of the parameters and another at the sub-population selection level but that needs very careful assessment of the situation, and modeling should not stand as a mere mathematical exercise.

References:

1. CDC
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/cases-in-us.html>
(Assessed on April 20, 2020).
2. Boccia S, Ricciardi W, Ioannidis JPA. What Other Countries Can Learn From Italy During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Intern Med. Published online April 07, 2020. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1447
3. Krantz, S.G. & Rao, A.S.R.S (2020). Level of under-reporting including under-diagnosis before the first peak of COVID-19 in various countries: Preliminary Retrospective Results Based on Wavelets and Deterministic Modeling. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, 1-8. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.116
4. CDC Clinical Questions about COVID-19: Questions and Answers
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/faq.html>
5. Krantz S.G., Polyakov P.G. Rao, A.S.R.S. (2020). True epidemic growth construction through harmonic analysis. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* (Elsevier). Volume 494, 7 June 2020, 110243
6. Mathematical modeling draws more accurate picture of coronavirus cases by Toni Baker
https://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2020-04/mcog-mm041020.php
(Accessed on April 20, 2020).
7. Rao A.S.R.S, Miller, D.D, Berman, A.E., Hess, D., Krantz, S.G.(2020). Immediate and Near Future Prediction of COVID-19 Patients in the U.S. Population Aged 65+ With the Prior Medical Conditions of Hypertension, Cardiovascular and Lung Diseases: Methods, Models and Acute Care Estimates. *medRxiv* doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.12.20062166>
8. Meyer, Y, Ryan, R.D. (1993). *Wavelets: Algorithms and Applications*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia.
9. Krantz S.G. (1999). *A Panorama of Harmonic Analysis*, Carus Mathematical Monographs, 27, Mathematical Association of America, Washington.
10. Hernández, E, Weiss G(1996). *A First Course on Wavelets*, CRC Press, LLC
11. Labate, D, Weiss, G, Wilson, E (2013). Wavelets. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 60, pp. 66-76.
12. Meyer Y. (1998). *Wavelets, Vibrations and Scalings*. With a preface in French by the author. CRM Monograph Series, 9, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
13. Kaiser, G (1994). A friendly guide to wavelets, Birkhäuser, Basel and Boston, MA, 1994, xviii + 300 pp., ISBN 0-8176-3711-7
14. Krantz S.G. (2020). *Differential Equations A Modern Approach with Wavelets*, CRC press.
15. Rao, A.S.R.S, Krantz S.G., Kurien T, Bhat, R, Sudhakar K (2020). Model-Based Retrospective Estimates for COVID-19 or Coronavirus in India: Continued Efforts Required to Contain

- the Virus Spread, *Current Science*, 118, 7: 1023-1025.
16. Shukla, J., Dubey, B. Modelling the depletion and conservation of forestry resources: effects of population and pollution. *J Math Biol* 36, 71–94 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002850050091>
 17. Anderson, R., May, R. Population biology of infectious diseases: Part I. *Nature* 280, 361–367 (1979). <https://doi.org/10.1038/280361a0>
 18. Kakehashi M (1998). A mathematical analysis of the spread of HIV/AIDS in Japan, *Mathematical Medicine and Biology: A Journal of the IMA*, Volume 15, Issue 4, December 1998, Pages 299–311, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imammb/15.4.299>
 19. Rao, A.S.R.S and Anderson, R.M. (2017). Helminth Dynamics: Mean Number of Worms, Reproductive Rates. *Handbook of statistics* 36, 397-404.
 20. C.T. Bauch, Rao, A.S.R.S, B.Z. Pham, M. Krahn, V. Gilca, B. Duval, M.H. Chen, A.C. Tricco, A dynamic model for assessing universal Hepatitis A vaccination in Canada, *Vaccine*, Volume 25, Issue 10, 2007, Pages 1719-1726.
 21. Rao A.S.R.S (2014). Population stability and momentum. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 9, 1062-1065
 22. Rao, A.S.R.S. and JR Carey (2019). On the Three Properties of Stationary Populations and knotting with Non-Stationary Populations, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* (Springer) 81 (10), 4233-4250
 23. P.D.N. Srinivasu, B.S.R.V. Prasad, M. Venkatesulu, Biological control through provision of additional food to predators: A theoretical study, *Theoretical Population Biology*, Volume 72, Issue 1, 2007, Pages 111-120
 24. Castillo-Chavez, C., Hethcote, H. W., Andreasen, V., Levin, S. A., Liu, W.: Cross-immunity in the dynamics of homogeneous and heterogeneous populations. In: Gross, L., Hallam, T. G., Levin, S. A. (eds.) *Mathematical ecology*. Proceedings, Autumn Course Research Seminars, Trieste 1986, pp. 303–316. Singapore: World Scientific Publ. Co. 1988
 25. S Dey, A Joshi (2017). Two Decades of Drosophila Population Dynamics: Modeling, Experiments, and Implications, *Handbook of Statistics* 39, 275-312
 26. Levin S.A. (1989) Ecology in Theory and Application. In: Levin S.A., Hallam T.G., Gross L.J. (eds) *Applied Mathematical Ecology*. Biomathematics, vol 18. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg
 27. Rao, A.S.R.S, K Thomas, S Kurapati, R Bhat (2012). Improvement in survival of people living with HIV/AIDS and requirement for 1st-and 2nd-line art in India: a mathematical model. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 59 (4), 560-562
 28. Mandal S, Bhatnagar T, Arinaminpathy N, et al. Prudent public health intervention strategies to control the coronavirus disease 2019 transmission in India: A mathematical model-based approach. *Indian J Med Res* 2020;151. doi:10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_504_20
 29. Rao, A. S. R. S., Thomas, K., Sudhakar, K., & Maini, P. K. (2009). HIV/AIDS epidemic in India and predicting the impact of the national response: mathematical modeling and analysis. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* 4: 779-813
 30. www.census.gov/
 31. Hubbard, B. and J. (2010). *The World According to Wavelets: The Story of a Mathematical Technique in the Making*, Second Edition 2nd Edition.
 32. Walker J.S. (2008). *A Primer on Wavelets and Their Scientific Applications* (Studies in Advanced Mathematics) 2nd Edition, Kindle Edition.
 33. Jewell NP, Lewnard JA, Jewell BL. Predictive Mathematical Models of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Underlying Principles and Value of Projections. *JAMA*. Published online April 16, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6585

Authors contributions: Both the authors contributed in writing. ASRS Rao designed the study, developed the methods, models, collected data,

performed analysis, computing, creating Figures and Tables, wrote the first draft. SG Krantz participated in the design, interpretation of results, and contributed in

editing the draft, approving the methods.

Both the authors approved the final manuscript.

Conflicts: None.

Funding: None to report to this study.

Table 1. Predicted COVID-19 cases in the U.S. under the varying degrees of adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures from May 1 to June 30, 2020 (Medium range)

End of the Month in 2020	Predicted New COVID-19 Cases by Age groups (Medium Range) (with percentage of people among Infected but not yet detected who are not adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures is = 20)				Percentage of susceptible people not adhering to Lockdown and other preventive precautions
	<18	18-64	65+	Total	
May	259	37,876	12,275	50,410	10
June	312	41,275	13,701	55,288	
May	326	42,123	14,054	56,503	20
June	455	50,215	17,407	68,077	
May	402	46,929	16,048	63,379	30
June	605	61,294	21,971	83,870	
May	489	52,340	18,285	71,114	40
June	860	75,018	27,600	103,478	
May	588	58,432	20,796	79,816	50
June	1,142	92,011	34,542	127,695	
May	700	65,289	23,614	89,603	60
June	1,493	113,043	43,111	157,647	
May	827	73007	26778	100,612	70
June	1931	139067	53690	194,688	

Table 2. Predicted COVID-19 cases in the U.S. under the varying degrees of adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures from May 1 to June 30, 2020 (High range)

End of the Month in 2020	Predicted New COVID-19 Cases by Age groups (High Range) (with percentage of people among Infected but not yet detected who are not adhering lockdown and other preventive measures is = 20)				Percentage of susceptible people not adhering to Lockdown and other preventive precautions
	<18	18-64	65+	Total	
May	315	38,012	13,918	52,245	10
June	430	41,961	16,923	59,314	
May	460	42,991	17,684	61,135	20
June	775	53,741	25,234	79,750	
May	642	49,186	22,104	71,932	30
June	1,277	70,781	36,482	108,540	
May	866	56,818	27,315	84,999	40
June	1,992	95,007	51,854	148,853	
May	1,140	66,151	33,484	100,775	50
June	3,002	129,108	72,982	205,092	
May	1,475	77,507	40,807	119,789	60
June	4,418	176,827	102,126	283,371	
May	1,882	91,270	49,521	142,673	70
June	6,396	243,366	142,408	392,170	

Table 3. Predicted COVID-19 cases in the U.S. under the varying degrees of adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures from May 1 to June 30, 2020 (Low range)

End of the Month in 2020	Predicted New COVID-19 Cases by Age groups (Low Range) (with percentage of people among Infected but not yet detected who are not adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures is = 50)				Percentage of susceptible people not adhering to Lockdown and other preventive precautions
	<18	18-64	65+	Total	
May	647	94,637	30,687	125,971	10
June	781	103,182	34,248	138,211	
May	815	105,303	35,131	141,249	20
June	1,138	125,521	43,506	170,165	
May	1,006	117,315	40,115	158,436	30
June	1,587	153,203	54,908	209,698	
May	1,223	130,840	45,705	177,768	40
June	2,150	187,486	68,962	258,598	
May	1,470	146,065	51,979	199,514	50
June	2,854	229,525	86,295	318,674	
May	1,750	163,201	59,020	223,971	60
June	3,732	282,440	107,679	393,851	
May	2,067	182,486	66,925	251,478	70
June	4,824	347,401	134,072	486,297	

Table 4. Predicted COVID-19 cases in the U.S. under the varying degrees of adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures from May 1 to June 30, 2020 (High range)

End of the Month in 2020	Predicted New COVID-19 Cases by Age groups (High Range) (with percentage of people among Infected but not yet detected who are not adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures is = 50)				Percentage of susceptible people not adhering to Lockdown and other preventive precautions
	<18	18-64	65+	Total	
May	787	95,029	34,791	130,607	10
June	1,075	104,893	42,290	148,258	
May	1,150	107,472	44,199	152,821	20
June	1,937	134,318	63,033	199,288	
May	1,604	122,953	55,238	179,795	30
June	3,189	176,861	91,092	271,142	
May	2,164	142,020	68,253	212,437	40
June	4,975	237,308	129,403	371,686	
May	2,850	165,336	83,657	251,843	50
June	7,493	322,333	182,010	511,836	
May	3,683	193,699	101,938	299,320	60
June	11,020	441,204	254,480	706,704	
May	4,702	228,070	123,685	356,457	70
June	159,40	606,754	354,478	961,232	

Table 5. Predicted COVID-19 cases in the U.S. under the varying degrees of adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures from May 1 to June 30, 2020 (Medium range)

End of the Month in 2020	Predicted New COVID-19 Cases by Age groups (Medium Range)				Percentage of susceptible people not adhering to Lockdown and other preventive precautions
	<18	18-64	65+	Total	
May	1293	189270	61370	251933	10
June	1562	206345	68482	276389	
May	1629	210594	70254	282477	20
June	2274	250987	86976	340237	
May	2012	234608	80215	316835	30
June	3172	306295	109746	419213	
May	2447	261664	91388	355499	40
June	4297	374772	137801	516870	
May	2940	292078	103924	398942	50
June	5703	459510	172386	637599	
May	3500	326328	117993	447821	60
June	7455	564324	215034	786813	
May	4133	364869	133786	502788	70
June	9636	693920	267638	971194	

Table 6. Predicted COVID-19 cases in the U.S. under the varying degrees of adhering to lockdown and other preventive measures from May 1 to June 30, 2020 (High range)

End of the Month in 2020	Predicted New COVID-19 Cases by Age groups (High Range)				Percentage of susceptible people not adhering to Lockdown and other preventive precautions
	<18	18-64	65+	Total	
May	1,573	190,051	69,566	261,190	10
June	2,148	209,755	84,521	296,424	
May	2,300	214,924	88,360	305,584	20
June	3,870	268,519	125,895	398,284	
May	3,206	245,862	110,407	359,475	30
June	6,370	353,414	181,803	541,587	
May	4,325	283,959	136,393	424,677	40
June	9,929	473,922	258,039	741,890	
May	5,696	330,535	167,137	503,368	50
June	14,942	643,223	362,546	1,020,711	
May	7,366	387,176	203,612	598,154	60
June	21,954	879,549	506,202	1,407,715	
May	9,393	455,793	246,982	712,168	70
June	31,716	1,208,000	703,876	1,943,592	