Initial Model for the Impact of Social Distancing on CoVID-19 Spread

Genghmun Eng

PhD Physics 1978, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

April 12, 2020, updated April 21, 2020

Abstract

The initial stages of the CoVID-19 coronavirus pandemic all around the world exhibit a nearly exponential rise in the number of infections with time. Planners, governments, and agencies are scrambling to figure out "*How much? How bad?*" and how to effectively treat the potentially large numbers of simultaneously sick people. Modeling the CoVID-19 pandemic using an exponential rise implicitly assumes a nearly unlimited population of uninfected persons ("*dilute pandemic*"). Once a significant fraction of the population is infected ("*saturated pandemic*"), an exponential growth no longer applies. A new model is developed here, which modifies the standard exponential growth function to account for factors such as *Social Distancing*. A *Social Mitigation Parameter [SMP]* α_S is introduced to account for these types of society-wide changes, which can modify the standard exponential growth function, as follows:

$$N(t) = N_o \exp[+K_o t / (1 + \alpha_S t)].$$

The *doubling-time* $t_{dbl} = (\ln 2)/K_o$ can also be used to substitute for K_o , giving a $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ parameter pair for comparing to actual CoVID-19 data. This model shows how the number of CoVID-19 infections can self-limit before reaching a *saturated pandemic* level. It also provides estimates for: (a) the timing of the *pandemic peak*, (b) the maximum number of new daily cases that would be expected, and (c) the expected total number of CoVID-19 cases. This model shows fairly good agreement with the presently available CoVID-19 pandemic data for several individual States, and the for the USA as a whole (*6 Figures*), as well as for various countries around the World (*9 Figures*). An augmented model with two *Mitigation Parameters*, α_S and β_S , is also developed, which can give better agreement with the daily new CoVID-19 data. Data-to-model comparisons also indicate that using α_S by itself likely provides a worst-case estimate, while using both α_S and β_S likely provides a best-case estimate for the CoVID-19 spread.

1 Introduction

The Coronavirus 2019 disease (CoVID-19), caused by the SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) pathogen, is now a world-wide pandemic. In many localities, the number of cases $N(t)$ was found to have an initial period of nearly exponential growth:

$$N(t) = N_o \exp[+K_D t], \quad [1.1a]$$

$$K_D \equiv (\ln 2) / t_D, \quad [1.1b]$$

aside of the first few cases, which may be untraceable. In Eqs. [1.1a]-[1.1b], N_o is the initial number of infections at the $t = 0$ start of data tracking, K_D is an exponential growth factor, and t_D is the *doubling-time*. Each locality can have its own $\{N_o, t_D, t = 0\}$ values, and K_D and t_D should be nearly constant during this initial period of CoVID-19 spread.

Standard epidemiology identifies the number of people N_G a known infected individual had recent contact with. Contacts of that N_G group are tracked next, followed by additional tracking stages. This process sets the K_D value.

Society-wide *Mitigation Measures* such as: (a) *Social Distancing*, (b) wearing face masks in public, (c) prohibiting large gatherings, (d) implementing large-scale population testing, (e) disinfecting high-touch surfaces in public areas, (f) enhanced cleaning of items brought into homes, and (g) minimizing human contact with likely virus-containing materials and matter; all can help reduce $N(t)$ growth. These *Mitigation Measures* can modify the Eq. [1.1a] epidemiology model by causing the local t_D values to lengthen.

In order to model these *Mitigation Measures*, t_D and K_D become explicit functions of time, $t_D(t)$ and $K_D(t)$. Using a linear function for $t_D(t)$ lengthening is one of the simplest time-varying extensions. A linear function of time also corresponds to the first term of a *Taylor's Series* expansion of some more general $t_D(t)$ analytic function, giving this epidemiology extension:

$$t_D(t) \equiv t_{dbl} (1 + \alpha_S t), \quad [1.3a]$$

$$K_D(t) \equiv \frac{(\ln 2)}{t_D(t)} = (\ln 2) / [t_{dbl} (1 + \alpha_S t)] \equiv K_o / (1 + \alpha_S t). \quad [1.3b]$$

The $t = 0$ initial values for $t_D(t)$ and $K_D(t)$ become the new constants t_{dbl} and K_o , which characterize the initial exponential growth phase. The α_S coefficient in Eq. [1.3a] is a new *Social Mitigation Parameter [SMP]* that helps quantify the effectiveness of the society-wide *Mitigation Measures* as a whole.

The α_S value expresses how well non-infected people manage to avoid the virus contagion. As a lumped parameter, it likely reflects an average value over many processes, known and unknown, which comprise mitigation, to supplement the contact-to-contact tracking that initially sets t_{dbl} or K_o .

Substituting Eq. [1.3b] into Eq. [1.1a] gives:

$$N(t) = N_o \exp[+K_o t / (1 + \alpha_S t)], \quad [1.4]$$

as one of the simplest models for CoVID-19 spread. A pure exponential growth (or decay) has no *memory*, while Eq. [1.4], for $\alpha_S > 0$, has a *memory*. The $t = 0$ start time of first mitigation changes the future history. To include $t < 0$ requires replacing Eq. [1.3a] by $t_D(t) \equiv t_{dbl} (1 + \max[0, \alpha_S t])$, which has a corner at $t = 0$ that preserves the *memory* of when mitigation first started.

2 Model Features

The Eq. [1.1a] exponential growth pandemic model implicitly assumes a large uninfected population allows the disease to easily spread ("*dilute pandemic*"). When almost everybody is infected ("*saturated pandemic*"), exponential growth shuts off, and Eq. [1.1a] no longer applies.

On 3/10/2020, German Chancellor Angela Merkel¹ noted that she "*estimates that 60% to 70% of the German population will contract the coronavirus*", indicating that *saturated pandemic* models are being considered as a worst-case.

Even that worst-case condition assumes: (i) recovered coronavirus patients are no longer infectious, and (ii) surviving a CoVID-19 infection confers absolute immunity to re-infection. Recently, South Korea² found 91 cases of clinically recovered patients later testing as CoVID-19 positive. They may also shed viable coronaviruses in their phlegm and fecal matter³, furthering disease spread. Although these effects are not modeled here, those additional transmission modes could turn a 60%-70% hope into a 99+% consequence.

These factors show why CoVID-19 modeling beyond Eq. [1.1] is needed, especially to see if society-wide *Mitigation Measures* can naturally halt disease spread, without necessitating a *saturated pandemic* condition. We show next that Eq. [1.4] allows for this pandemic shut-off, even in the *dilute pandemic* case. Since both K_o and α_S in Eq. [1.4] have the same units, their ratio is dimensionless. The long-term limit of Eq. [1.4] gives:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} [N(t) / N_o] = \exp[+K_o / \alpha_S], \quad [2.1]$$

setting an average value for the total number of all follow-on infections arising from a single individual. Since it depends only on the ratio of the original pandemic growth factor K_o to the α_S *SMP*, this model shows the impact of accounting for a broader environment beyond individual contact tracking.

The early spread of CoVID-19 cases outside of China⁴, and the early USA CoVID-19 data⁵ both had nearly exponential rises, as shown in **Figure 1**. A purely exponential rise gives a straight line on a *log-plot* $\{\log(\# \text{ of cases}) \text{ vs linear time}\}$. The initial *doubling-time* for the USA was $t_{dbl} \approx 2.02 \text{ days}$, giving $K_o \approx 0.343 / \text{day}$ using Eqs. [1.1a]-[1.1b]. This initial CoVID-19 data was prior to any significant *Mitigation Measures* being implemented.

On March 19, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom of California ordered a CoVID-19 "stay-at-home" lockdown of virtually all of California's ~40 million residents. Similar statewide CoVID-19 lockdowns were ordered by the Governors of Illinois, New York, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

The slowing of CoVID-19 spread by implementing large-scale societal *Mitigation Measures* can be fairly rapid, as illustrated by the USA CoVID-19 data of **Figure 2**, which covers March 2020.

The impact of these multi-state *Mitigation Measures* is evident in **Figure 2** as a sudden transition on the *log-plot* from a straight-line to having downward curvature, which the α_S *Social Mitigation Parameter (SMP)* aims to quantify. The local slope in **Figure 2** also decreases right after the onset of *Mitigation Measures*, indicating further slowing of CoVID-19 spread.

A well-documented South Korean coronavirus cluster can also be used to help estimate the expected size of the α_S SMP. That CoVID-19 cluster determined that a single infected person at the *Shinjeongji Church* caused infection of about 4,482 people⁴ within the 47-day time interval between January 20, 2020 and March 8, 2020. Those data provide this α_S estimate:

$$\ln(4,482) \approx (0.343 / \text{day}) (47 \text{ days}) / [1 + \alpha_S (47 \text{ days})] , \quad [2.2a]$$

$$\alpha_S = 0.01952 / \text{day} \approx 0.02 / \text{day}, \quad [2.2b]$$

as indicative of minimal mitigation. If additional deliberate mitigation measures doubled α_S to $\alpha_S \approx (0.04 / \text{day})$, Eq. [2.1] would give:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} [N(t) / N_o] = \exp\left[+ \frac{(0.343 / \text{day}) (47 \text{ days})}{1 + (0.04 / \text{day}) (47 \text{ days})} \right] \approx 270 , \quad [2.3]$$

for the number of infections per person, a 16.6 X reduction from 4,482.

Since $N(t)$ in Eq. [1.4] represents a total number of cases, it is similar to a *cumulative distribution function (cdf)*, which is used in reliability and also has time as its fundamental variable. The derivative of Eq. [1.4], $dN(t) / dt$, is analogous to an unnormalized *probability density function (pdf)*, which can be used to predict a *pandemic peak*:

$$\{pdf\} \equiv \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{N(t)}{N_o} \right] = \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \exp[+K_o t / (1 + \alpha_S t)] \right\} = +K_o \left(\frac{1}{1 + \alpha_S t} \right)^2 \exp[+K_o t / (1 + \alpha_S t)] , \quad [2.4a]$$

$$\{pdf\} = +K_o \left[\frac{N(t)}{N_o} \right] / (1 + \alpha_S t)^2 , \quad [2.4b]$$

The time t_P of the *pandemic peak* is set by:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \{pdf\} \equiv 0 , \quad [2.5a]$$

$$\alpha_S t_P = \frac{1}{2} [K_o / \alpha_S] - 1 , \quad [2.5b]$$

where Eq. [2.5b] simplification arises from the Eq. [2.5a] constraint. Substituting $K_o = 0.343 / \text{day}$ and $\alpha_S = 0.02 / \text{day}$ from Eq. [2.2b] into Eq. [2.5b] gives $t_P \approx 379 \text{ days}$. Increasing mitigation to $\alpha_S = 0.04 / \text{day}$, keeping the same $K_o = 0.343 / \text{day}$, now gives $t_P \approx 82 \text{ days}$, which is a $\sim 4.6 X$ reduction in the *pandemic peak* timing for doubling (2X) the mitigation effect from its original baseline value. These examples highlight the tremendous impact that even a small amount of enhanced social mitigation can have.

While the $\alpha_S = 0$ limit of Eq. [2.4b] recovers the Eq. [1.1a] standard exponential growth, both the $\{pdf\}$ and $[N(t) / N_o]$ growth are then unbounded. However, even a small $\alpha_S > 0$ value in Eq. [2.4b] will have an enormous impact on the predicted long-time behavior. Since Eq. [2.1] showed that $[N(t) / N_o]$ now approaches a finite value for all $\alpha_S > 0$, this new $\{pdf\}$ asymptotic limit:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, \alpha_S > 0} [\{pdf\}] \sim \frac{\{\text{Constant}\}}{(\alpha_S t)^2} , \quad [2.6]$$

also results. The $\{pdf\}$ that arises from this model all have an initial exponential rise, coupled with the Eq. [2.6] "long tail" at large times, which means that new CoVID-19 cases may arise for a long time, even if significant *Mitigation Measures* are in place.

The Eq. [2.6] $\{pdf\}$ prediction also differs substantially from the widely-used *University of Washington IHME (Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation)* projections, which use symmetric Gaussians for both the $\{pdf\}$ rise and fall⁶. Thus, these methods provide an alternative risk-bound for evaluating potential CoVID-19 worst-case scenarios.

3 Determining $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ from CoVID-19 Data

Explicit numerical values for $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ parameters were determined from the CoVID-19 data as follows. Rewriting Eq. [1.4] as:

$$\ln[N(t) / N_o] = [+K_o t / (1 + \alpha_S t)] \equiv (\ln 2) t / [t_{dbl}(1 + \alpha_S t)]. \quad [3.1]$$

allowed data fitting to be done on a $Y - vs - X$ *log-plot*, using $Y = \ln[N(t) / N_o]$ as the ordinate and $X \leftrightarrow t$ as the abscissa, to calculate and minimize the *root-mean-square (rms) error*.

The $t = 0$ point in Eq. [3.1] sets N_o . To best model *Mitigation Measures*, this point was usually chosen at the start of a downward curvature on a *log-plot*, so that $N(t = 0) \equiv N_I$, where the N_I is now the first data point in the analysis. The prior $t < 0$ regime can often have a nearly pure exponential growth, as in **Figure 2**, and those regions should not be part of *rms-error* minimization for evaluating *Mitigation Measures*.

The N_F final data point, measured at the most recent $t = t_F$ time:

$$N(t = t_F) \equiv N_F. \quad [3.2]$$

was also fixed for each dataset, so that only $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ value pairs that meet both $N(t = 0) \equiv N_I$ and Eq. [3.2] were used.

In practice, an α_S was chosen first. The *ExcelTM_Tools_Goal-Seek* function was used to adjust t_{dbl} to obey Eq. [3.2], setting the *rms-error* between the dataset and Eq. [3.1], with the final $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ having the least *rms-error*.

In the following figures, all CoVID-19 raw data came from the publicly available MicrosoftTM "COVID-19 Tracker" site⁷. When no updates were available, that site repeated the prior day data, whereas we used the geometric mean of the day-prior and day-after data for interpolation.

4 Effects of Varying the Initial Zero-Time Point

Starting with:

$$N(t) = \mathbf{1} \exp[+K_o t / (1 + \alpha_S t) + \ln(N_o)], \quad [4.1a]$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} [N(t)] = \mathbf{1} \exp[+(K_o / \alpha_S) + \ln(N_o)], \quad [4.1b]$$

$$t_{dbl}^o \equiv (\ln 2) / K_o, \quad [4.1c]$$

using a shifted time-scale normalization point is examined next:

$$N_S(t') = \mathbf{1} \exp[+K_o (t' + t_A) / [1 + \alpha_S (t' + t_A)] + \ln(N_o)], \quad [4.2]$$

This $N_S(t')$ function should closely match Eq. [4.1a], with a shifted time axis: $t = t' + t_A$, but the best fit parameter numerical values change. Since:

$$[1 + \alpha_S (t' + t_A)] = [1 + \alpha_S t_A] [1 + \frac{\alpha_S t'}{(1 + \alpha_S t_A)}], \quad [4.3a]$$

$$\frac{K_o (t' + t_A)}{[1 + \alpha_S (t' + t_A)]} = [1 + \frac{t_A}{t'}] \frac{(K_o t')}{[1 + \alpha_S t_A]} / [1 + \frac{\alpha_S t'}{(1 + \alpha_S t_A)}], \quad [4.3b]$$

then defining:

$$\alpha_A \equiv \alpha_S / (1 + \alpha_S t_A), \quad [4.4a]$$

$$K_A \equiv K_o / (1 + \alpha_S t_A), \quad [4.4b]$$

$$t_{dbl}^A \equiv (\ln 2) / K_A = (1 + \alpha_S t_A) t_{dbl}^o = (1 + \alpha_S t_A) (\ln 2) / K_o, \quad [4.4c]$$

it gives:

$$\frac{K_o (t' + t_A)}{[1 + \alpha_S (t' + t_A)]} = [1 + \frac{t_A}{t'}] K_A t' / [1 + \alpha_A t']$$

$$= K_A t' / [1 + \alpha_A t'] + K_A t_A / [1 + \alpha_A t'] . \quad [4.5]$$

These equations highlight the net effect of time-shifting. For $t_A > 0$, when t' begins after *Mitigation Measures* have started, the shifted-time-axis results in a larger calculated *doubling-time* and a smaller *SMP* α_A -value. For $t_A < 0$, when t' may include *Mitigation Measures* already in place at the Eqs. [4.1a]-[4.1c] $t = 0$ point, this shifted-time-axis results in a smaller calculated *doubling-time* and a larger *SMP* α_A -value.

Finally, for small t' , where $\alpha_A t' < 1$, using Eqs. [4.1b] and [4.5] gives:

$$\mathbf{1} \exp\left[\frac{+K_o t}{(1+\alpha_S t)} + \ln(N_o)\right] \approx \mathbf{1} \exp\left[\frac{+K_A t'}{(1+\alpha_A t')} + \ln(N_A)\right], \quad [4.6a]$$

$$\ln(N_A) = \ln(N_o) + K_A t_A, \quad [4.6b]$$

which shows that the $t' = 0$ new initial state should have an N_A starting value obeying $N_A > N_o$ for $t_A > 0$, and $N_A < N_o$ for $t_A < 0$. However, whether $\{N_o, K_o, \alpha_S\}$, or an alternative $\{N_A, K_A, \alpha_A\}$, are used to parameterize a given data set, the net overall function fit and predictions, as a function of calendar date, should remain fairly self-consistent, even when some ambiguity exists as to when *Mitigation Measures* first were noticeably effective.

5 USA and Selected States Model Results

The model predictions for CoVID-19 spread in the USA is shown in **Figure 3**. This analysis only included data after mid-March 2020, when several State Governors first instituted mandatory *Mitigation Measures*. Results give an *SMP* estimate of $\alpha_S \approx 0.5945/\text{day}$, a USA initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 2.1758 \text{ days}$, which lengthens to $t_{dbl}^{\{at Peak\}} \approx 5.83 \text{ days}$ at the projected *pandemic peak* of $\sim 4/19/2020$. The predicted total number of CoVID-19 cases is $\sim 5,464,000$, giving a projected $\sim 1.67\%$ final infection rate, if the present level of *Mitigation Measures* or their equivalent, are continued.

These predictions assume no "second wave" of infection or re-infection. They also do not include the effect of additional *Mitigation Measures*, which could further increase the $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ values, and significantly reduce the projected final number of CoVID-19 cases.

Figure 4 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in California. Only data after 3/21/2020 was included in the analysis, after California Governor Gavin Newsom instituted mandatory *Mitigation Measures*. It gives an *SMP* estimate of $\alpha_S \approx 0.03546/\text{day}$, with an initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 2.5017 \text{ days}$, which lengthens to $t_{dbl}^{\{at Peak\}} \approx 9.774 \text{ days}$ at the projected *pandemic peak* of $\sim 6/07/2020$. The predicted total number of CoVID-19 cases is $\sim 1,123,700$, giving a projected $\sim 2.813\%$ final infection rate, at the present level of *Mitigation Measures*.

Figure 5 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in New York. A relatively high *SMP* estimate of $\alpha_S \approx 0.1031/\text{day}$ was found, coupled with a relatively short initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 0.9395 \text{ days}$, which creates a high narrow spike in daily new cases. The present model projects a New York *pandemic peak* around 4/10/2020, with an estimated at-peak *doubling-time* of

$t_{dbl}^{\{at\ Peak\}} \approx 3.36 \text{ days}$. The predicted total number of cases at $\sim 1,218,000$, giving a projected $\sim 6.072\%$ final infection rate.

Figure 6 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in Washington State. An initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 2.189 \text{ days}$ and an *SMP* value of $\alpha_S \approx 0.0687/\text{day}$ were found, with a projected *pandemic peak* around 6/04/2020. The relatively low number of cases at the *Mitigation Measures* start helps to give a predicted total number of cases of $\sim 557,600$, corresponding to a $\sim 7.15\%$ final infection rate.

Figure 7 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in Illinois. An initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 2.457 \text{ days}$ and moderate *SMP* value of $\alpha_S \approx 0.0373/\text{day}$ combine to give a projected *pandemic peak* around 6/04/2020, similar to Washington State, but having a higher predicted total number of cases at $\sim 1,277,000$, and a projected $\sim 11.47\%$ final infection rate.

Figure 8 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in Florida. Many Florida counties instituted their own *Mitigation Measures* prior to a state-wide lockdown, slowing CoVID-19 growth. A somewhat high *SMP* value of $\alpha_S \approx 0.0526/\text{day}$, and an initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 1.494 \text{ days}$ results. A *pandemic peak* is estimated at around 5/20/2020, with a predicted total number of cases at $\sim 1,090,000$, and a projected $\sim 4.96\%$ final infection rate.

6 World and Selected Countries Model Results

Figure 9 shows model predictions of CoVID-19 evolution for the whole World. The present-day *doubling-time* value of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 5.761 \text{ days}$ likely represents a combination of small urban, large urban, and rural area results. However, the calculated low *SMP* estimate of $\alpha_S \approx 0.01712/\text{day}$ shows that nearly $\sim 4.43\%$ of the World's population could be at risk for eventual CoVID-19 infection. At these present levels, the projected *pandemic peak* is around 8/15/2020, with potentially hundreds of millions of people being infected.

Figure 10 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in China, covering their "*first wave*" of early exposure and early mitigation. Data were included that was prior to a "*New Reporting Method*" being used, which started off with one sudden data jump, and nearly level CoVID-19 follow-on results. The present model predicts what number of cases could have resulted, had the reporting method not changed. Draconian *Mitigation Measures* helped to contain the pandemic to *Hubei Province* and *Wuhan*. These projections show that those *Mitigation Measures* have impressively contained CoVID-19 spread.

Figure 11 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in South Korea, covering the period of their country's early exposure and initial mitigation methods. Pre-pandemic *Mitigation Measures*, including extensive contact-tracing and large-scale CoVID-19 testing, were implemented. These projections show that those *Mitigation Measures*, as an alternative to China's methods, also have impressively contained CoVID-19 spread.

Figure 12 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in Italy. An initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 1.4648 \text{ days}$ and *SMP* estimate of $\alpha_S \approx$

0.05282/day give a *pandemic peak* around 4/29/2020, with a predicted number of total cases at $\sim 1,764,000$, and a projected $\sim 2.92\%$ final infection rate.

Figure 13 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in Germany. The relatively high *SMP* estimate of $\alpha_S \approx 0.07614/\text{day}$ with an initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 1.4177 \text{ days}$ combine to give a projected *pandemic peak* at around 4/08/2020, with a predicted total number of cases of $\sim 700,100$, and a projected $\sim 0.84\%$ final infection rate. These values would make Germany one of the less impacted countries in Europe. They represent predicted final CoVID-19 infection rates that are significantly lower than the original $60\% - 70\%$ early worst-case estimates highlighted by *German Chancellor Angela Merkel*.

Figure 14 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in Spain. An *SMP* estimate of $\alpha_S \approx 0.07058/\text{day}$, which is comparable to Germany, and a smaller initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 1.1778 \text{ days}$ combine to give more predicted CoVID-19 cases than Germany. The estimated *pandemic peak* is around 4/21/2020, with a predicted number of total cases at $\sim 1,526,000$, and a projected $\sim 3.26\%$ final infection rate.

Figure 15 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in Ecuador. Reports of chaos in Ecuador have been alarming. Yet the present data show a significant and somewhat unexpected leveling off in the number of reported CoVID-19 cases. This result could mean that some as yet unknown *Mitigation Measures* may be operating. Alternatively, the data could mean that there is a dire CoVID-19 testing and reporting shortfall operating amidst the chaos.

Figure 16 shows model predictions for CoVID-19 evolution in India. These initial data show virtually no mitigation at present, having one of the lowest calculated *SMP* estimates of $\alpha_S \approx 0.0148/\text{day}$, with an initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 3.135 \text{ days}$. At this rate, nearly 17.38% of the population of India could eventually become infected. The estimated *pandemic peak* is around 5/30/2021, which would be 441 days after the first CoVID-19 fatality was reported, on 3/14/2020. Additional *Mitigation Measures*, further increasing the $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ values, as well as adding in additional modeling parameters may significantly reduce these projected number of CoVID-19 cases.

7 Augmented Peak Shape Modeling

Using a new *Social Mitigation Parameter [SMP]* α_S , as in Eq. [1.3a], successfully models pandemic shut-off, even in the *dilute pandemic* limit. However, as the **Figures 3-16** insets show, many of the data-vs-model comparisons have the data trending above the model near the final $t = t_F$ data point.

Since Eq. [1.3a] for $t_D(t)$ is linear, using an *Additional Modeling Parameter [AMP]* β_S in a higher order polynomial, may fit the $\{pdf\}$ shape better. A quadratic function for t_D :

$$t_D = t_{dbl} (1 - \beta_S Z + \alpha_S Z^2), \quad [5.1]$$

where $N(t)/N_o$ still approaches a constant at long times, as in Eq. [2.1a], then sets $Z^2 \equiv t$, giving this extension of Eq. [1.3a]:

$$t_D(t) = t_{dbl} (1 - \beta_S \sqrt{t} + \alpha_S t). \quad [5.2]$$

Values of $\beta_S > 0$ in Eq. [5.2] allow the predicted $[N(t) / N_o]$ values to rise above the $\beta_S = 0$ model predictions, and to have a smaller *doubling-time*, for the same $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$. However, the best fit $\{t_{dbl}, \alpha_S\}$ values will also differ between the $\beta_S > 0$ and $\beta \equiv 0$ cases, so these changes are relative.

The new $\{pdf\}$ function for Eq. [5.2] is:

$$\{pdf\} \equiv \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{N(t)}{N_o} \right] = \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \exp \left[+K_o t / (1 - \beta_S \sqrt{t} + \alpha_S t) \right] \right\} = \\ +K_o \left[\frac{N(t)}{N_o} \right] \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \beta_S^2 t \right) / \left[(1 + \alpha_S t)^2 (1 + \frac{1}{2} \beta_S \sqrt{t}) \right]. \quad [5.3]$$

When $\{pdf\} = 0$ in Eq. [5.3], it estimates an end-point for the pandemic at:

$$t_{END} = (4 / \beta_S^2), \quad [5.4]$$

while predicting this maximum number of pandemic cases at t_{END} :

$$N(t) = N_o \exp \left[K_o / (\alpha_S - \frac{1}{4} \beta_S^2) \right]. \quad [5.5]$$

An example, this augmented model was applied to CoVID-19 evolution in Italy. As shown in **Figure 17**, this Eq. [5.3] $\{pdf\}$ function gives a better fit to the observed number of daily new CoVID-19 cases.

The initial *doubling-time* of $t_{dbl}^{initial} \approx 2.5566$ days, along with estimates for the *Mitigation Measure* parameters of $\alpha_S \approx 0.04583/\text{day}$ and $\beta_S \approx -0.1725$, in this augmented model, combine to significantly reduce the projected maximum number of CoVID-19 cases down to $\sim 264,820$, which is an $\sim 7X$ less compared to using α_S alone, as in **Figure 12**. This augmented model sets an estimated *pandemic peak* at 3/29/2020, with a projected pandemic end-point around 7/7/2020, which is also significantly more optimistic.

The true CoVID-19 pandemic progress is likely to be in between **Figure 12** as a worst-case, and **Figure 17** as a best-case projection. The geometric mean of the **Figure 12** and **Figure 17** results set an average of $\sim 683,500$ cases for Italy at the CoVID-19 pandemic end. These bounds also highlight the amount of uncertainty that is intrinsic to these empirically based methods.

8 Summary and Conclusions

The standard exponential for modeling pandemics starts with an N_o known number of initial cases at some reference time $t = 0$. Epidemiologists work to determine a pandemic growth factor K_D , which sets the *doubling-time* t_D for the number of pandemic cases.

The CoVID-19 disease, caused by the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus pathogen, initially showed both regional and global exponential growth. It resulted in a *doubling-time* of $t_D \approx 2.02$ days for the US, as highlighted in **Figure 1**.

An exponential growth normally only halts when it runs out of materials. In epidemiology that point often occurs when there are virtually no more uninfected people left, which we call a *saturated pandemic*. The exponential growth function is only applicable when infection rates are much lower than saturation, which we call a *dilute pandemic*.

A modification to exponential growth is developed here, which allows ratio of the number of pandemic cases, $N(t)$, compared to its N_o initial value at $t = 0$:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} [N(t) / N_o] = \mathbf{M}, \quad [6.1]$$

to approach a final constant, denoted $\mathbf{M}$, while still being in a *dilute pandemic* condition. This result is attributed to the inclusion of society-wide *Mitigation Measures* to stop pandemic growth, before the value of $\mathbf{M}$ reaches the whole population value.

Society-wide *Mitigation Measures* aim to progressively lengthen the t_D doubling-time, essentially making $t_D(t)$. Most analyses presented here used a linear function of time as a simplest non-constant model for $t_D(t)$:

$$t_D(t) \equiv t_{dbl} (1 + \alpha_S t), \quad [6.2a]$$

$$K_D(t) \equiv \frac{(\ln 2)}{t_D(t)} = (\ln 2) / [t_{dbl} (1 + \alpha_S t)] \equiv K_o / (1 + \alpha_S t), \quad [6.2b]$$

where $t_D(t=0) \equiv t_{dbl}$, and $K_D(t=0) \equiv K_o$. Here, α_S is a new *Social Mitigation Parameter (SMP)*, to quantify societal *Mitigation Measures*. This Eq. [6.2a] extension of a pure exponential growth gives:

$$N(t) = N_o \exp[+K_o t / (1 + \alpha_S t)], \quad [6.3]$$

as an empirical equation for modeling CoVID-19 spread. Since both K_o and α_S in Eq. [1.4] have the same units, their ratio is a dimensionless number. The long-term limit of Eq. [6.3] gives:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} [N(t) / N_o] = \exp[+K_o / \alpha_S], \quad [6.4]$$

setting a final value for the Eq. [6.1] constant $\mathbf{M}$, allowing these predictions to be applicable to the *dilute pandemic* limit. The CoVID-19 number of estimated cases per day is given by:

$$\{pdf\} = \frac{d}{dt} [N(t) / N_o], \quad [6.5a]$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, \alpha_S > 0} [\{pdf\}] \sim \frac{\{\text{Constant}\}}{(\alpha_S t)^2}, \quad [6.5b]$$

which combines an initial exponential rise with "long tail" at large times. In this model, new CoVID-19 cases can continue to arise for a long time, even with significant *Mitigation Measures* in place.

Analysis of available CoVID-19 data using this model shows that it can match observed data fairly well, both from various US states [Figures 3-8], as well as for different global countries [Figures 9-17]. However, using a single parameter to encompass all societal *Mitigation Measures* often gives a slightly larger slope on a *log-plot*, compared to the latest measured data values, which makes this model a likely worst-case estimate.

A second data-fitting parameter β_S was also used in an augmented model, to better fit the $\{pdf\}$ data:

$$N(t) = N_o \exp[+K_o t / (1 - \beta_S \sqrt{t} + \alpha_S t)], \quad [6.6a]$$

$$\max [N(t) / N_o] = \exp[+K_o / (\alpha_S - \frac{1}{4}\beta_S^2)], \quad [6.6b]$$

$$t_{END} = (4 / \beta_S^2), \quad [6.6c]$$

where t_{END} becomes an estimated pandemic end-point, where zero new CoVID-19 cases per day could occur.

As a representative example, this augmented model was applied to the CoVID-19 data from Italy [Figure 17]. Those results show that this augmented model allows a better fit to the observed number of new daily CoVID-19 cases, but the absence of a CoVID-19 tail in its $\{pdf\}$ function makes this $\{K_o, \alpha_S, \beta_S\}$ augmented model a likely best-case result, with the original $\{K_o, \alpha_S\}$ model being a likely worst-case estimate.

This class of CoVID-19 pandemic models all enable pandemic shut-off even in the *dilute pandemic* limit, with only a small fraction of the total population being infected. These models also provide estimates for: (a) the maximum number of cases near pandemic shutoff, (b) the size and shape of the *pandemic peak* $[dN(t)/dt]$, and (c) pandemic peak timing $[t_P]$. These models and analyses may help enhance planning and preparation to maximize resource use, potentially increasing individual and collective CoVID-19 pandemic survival rates.

9 List of Figures

Figure 1: Early CoVID-19 Cases: (a) Outside of China, and (b) Just in the US. Both graphs show nearly exponential growth.

Figure 2: USA CoVID-19 data, pre-vs-post mid-March 2020. Multi-State *Mitigation Measures* slowed growth, transitioning from straight-line to downward curvature.

Figure 3: USA Model Predictions. To allow better mitigation predictions, only data after mid-March 2020 was included, when several Governors instituted mandatory lockdowns.

Figure 4: Predicted California CoVID-19 results. After Gov. Gavin Newsom instituted widespread *Mitigation Measures*, projections showed significant improvement.

Figure 5: Predicted New York CoVID-19 results. A relatively high *Mitigation Measure* level and a short intrinsic doubling time creates a narrow spike in daily new cases.

Figure 6: Predicted Washington State CoVID-19 results. The relatively low number of cases at *Mitigation Measure* start helps to give a relatively low final number of cases.

Figure 7: Predicted Illinois CoVID-19 results. The slow *doubling-time* and moderate amount of *Mitigation Measures* gives a slow increase to the predicted CoVID-19 peak.

Figure 8: Predicted Florida CoVID-19 results. Many Florida counties instituted their own *Mitigation Measures* prior to a state-wide lockdown, substantially slowing CoVID-19 growth.

Figure 9: Model predictions for the WORLD, showing present-day low level of mitigation.

Figure 10: Predicted CHINA CoVID-19 results, using pre-“*New Reporting Method*” data. Draconian *Mitigation Measures* helped to contain pandemic to *Hubei Province* and *Wuhan*.

Figure 11: Predicted SOUTH KOREA CoVID-19 results. Pre-pandemic contact-tracing and large-scale CoVID-19 testing as *Mitigation Measures* have contained the pandemic.

Figure 12: Predicted ITALY CoVID-19 results. Additional curvature in the actual CoVID-19 data vs Model makes these predictions a likely worst-case.

Figure 13: Predicted GERMANY CoVID-19 results. This model gives a

more gradual function for the Daily New CoVID-19 cases, making these predictions a likely worst-case.

Figure 14: Predicted SPAIN CoVID-19 results. This model gives a more gradual function for Daily New CoVID-19 cases, making these predictions a likely worst-case.

Figure 15: Predicted ECUADOR CoVID-19 results. Reports of chaos in Ecuador have been alarming. Poor CoVID-19 tracking and low testing may have skewed these results.

Figure 16: Predicted INDIA CoVID-19 results. Data shows only minimal mitigation at present. Further mitigations should help make these predictions a worst-case result.

Figure 17: Predicted ITALY CoVID-19 results, using an augmented 2-parameter $\{\alpha_S, \beta_S\}$ *Social Mitigation* model. Total number of CoVID-19 cases is much less than **Figure 12**, but the model post-peak drop is much steeper, making this a likely best-case result.

10 References

1. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/11/world/europe/coronavirus-merkel-germany.html>
2. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/recovered-coronavirus-patients-test-positive-161747102.html>
3. <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/health-environment/article/3075609/coronavirus-can-be-transmitted-through-faeces> {South China Morning Post/Hong Kong/Health and Environment}
4. <https://medium.com/@tomaspueyo/coronavirus-act-today-or-people-will-die-f4d3d9cd99ca>; "Chart 2".
5. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2020_coronavirus_pandemic_in_South_Korea; "Timeline - March".
6. <https://www.MedRxiv.org/ID=MEDRXIV/2020/043752v1>, 03.25.2020, "Forecasting COVID-19 impact on hospital bed-days, ICU-days, ventilator-days and deaths by US state in the next 4 months", IHME COVID-19 Health Service Utilization Forecasting Team.
7. <https://www.bing.com/covid?form=CPVD07>.

Early Stages of CoVID-19 Growth Outside of China

Initial USA Data shows Doubling Time of ~2.02 Days

Left Side: Chart 2 from 3/11/2020 article “*Coronavirus: Why You Must Act Now*” by Thomas Pueyo
<https://medium.com/@ThomasPueyo/coronavirus-act-today-or-people-will-die-f4d3d9cd99ca>
Right Side: Initial Number of USA CoVID-19 Cases, Bing.com Coronavirus Daily Compilations

Figure 1: Early CoVID-19 Cases: (a) Outside of China, and (b) Just for the US. Both graphs show nearly exponential growth.

Societal *Mitigation Measures* Slows Down CoVID-19 Growth

- 3/16-19/2020: CA Gov. Newsom Orders Closure of Schools followed by full lockdown of all Non-Essential Business; other states soon follow.
- CoVID-19 growth slows post-3/19/2020 Closures

Figure 2: USA CoVID-19 data, pre-vs-post mid-March 2020. Multi-State *Mitigation Measures* slowed growth, transitioning from straight-line to downward curvature.

Model for USA CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/19/20 Update: Peak= 4/19/2020

init. $t/dbl = 2.1758$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.05945$, Peak= 28 days, $t/dbl = 5.83$ days at peak

Figure 3: USA Model Predictions. To allow better mitigation predictions, only data after mid-March 2020 was included, when several Governors instituted mandatory lockdowns.

Model for California CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/17/20 Update: Peak= 6/07/2020

init. t/dbl =2.5017 days, α/s =0.03546, Peak= 82 days, t/dbl =9.774 days at peak

Figure 4: Predicted California CoVID-19 results. After Gov. Gavin Newsom instituted widespread *Mitigation Measures*, projections showed significant improvement.

Model for New York CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/14/20 Update, Peak=4/10/2020

Init $t/dbl = 0.9395$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.1031/\text{day}$. Peak=25 days, $t/dbl = 3.36$ days at Peak

Figure 5: Predicted New York CoVID-19 results. A relatively high *Mitigation Measure* level and a short intrinsic doubling time creates a narrow spike in daily new cases.

Model for WASHINGTON STATE CoVID-19 Pandemic

$t/dbl = 2.2005$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.0366/\text{day}$, Peak = 90 days, Max = 557,500

Figure 6: Predicted Washington State CoVID-19 results. The relatively low number of cases at *Mitigation Measure* start helps to give a relatively low final number of cases.

Model for ILLINOIS CoVID-19 Pandemic

$t/dbl = 2.457$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.0373/\text{day}$, Peak = 75 days, Max = 1,277,000

Figure 7: Predicted Illinois CoVID-19 results. The slow doubling time and moderate amount of *Mitigation Measures* gives a slow increase to the predicted CoVID-19 peak.

Model for Florida CoVID-19 Pandemic

$t/dbl = 1.494$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.0526/\text{day}$, Peak = 65 days, Max = 1,090,000

Figure 8: Predicted Florida CoVID-19 results. Many Florida counties instituted their own *Mitigation Measures* prior to a state-wide lockdown, substantially slowing CoVID-19 growth.

Model for WORLD CoVID-19 Pandemic

$t_{dbl} = 5.7606$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.01712/\text{day}$, Peak = 147 days, Max = 344,400,000

Figure 9: Model predictions for the WORLD, showing present-day low level of mitigation.

Model for CHINA CoVID-19 Pandemic

$t/dbl = 1.1653$ days, $a/s = 0.08775$, Peak = 27 days, Max = 507,200

Figure 10: Predicted CHINA CoVID-19 results, using pre-“*New Reporting Method*” data. Draconian *Mitigation Measures* helped to contain pandemic to *Hubei Province* and *Wuhan*.

Figure 11: Predicted SOUTH KOREA CoVID-19 results. Pre-pandemic contact-tracing and large-scale CoVID-19 testing as *Mitigation Measures* have contained the pandemic.

Model for ITALY CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/18/20 Update: Peak= 4/29/2020

init. $t/dbl = 1.465$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.0528$, Peak= 66 days, $t/dbl = 6.56$ days at Peak

Figure 12: Predicted ITALY CoVID-19 results. Additional curvature in the actual CoVID-19 data vs Model makes these predictions a likely worst-case.

Model for GERMANY CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/19/20 Update: Peak= 4/08/2020

init. $t/dbl = 1.4177$ days, $\alpha/s = 0.07614/\text{day}$. Model Peak= 33 days, $t/dbl = 4.98$ days at calc. peak

Figure 13: Predicted GERMANY CoVID-19 results. This model gives a more gradual function for the Daily New CoVID-19 cases, making these predictions a likely worst-case.

Model for SPAIN CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/19/20 Update: Peak= 4/21/2020

init/ t/dbl \=1.1778 days, α/s \=0.07058/day, Peak= 45 days, t/dbl \= 4.91 days at model.peak

Figure 14: Predicted SPAIN CoVID-19 results. This model gives a more gradual function for Daily New CoVID-19 cases, making these predictions a likely worst-case.

Figure 15: Predicted ECUADOR CoVID-19 results. Reports of chaos in Ecuador have been alarming. Poor CoVID-19 tracking and low testing may have skewed these results.

Model for INDIA CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/16/20 Update, Minimal Mitigation, 5/30/2021 Peak

init.t/dbl=3.135 days, $\alpha/s=0.0148/\text{day}$, Peak= 441 days, t/dbl= 9.67 days at Peak

Figure 16: Predicted INDIA CoVID-19 results. Data shows only minimal mitigation at present. Further mitigations should help make these predictions a worst-case result.

$\{K_0, \alpha/s, \beta/s\}$ Augmented Model, ITALY CoVID-19 Pandemic, 4/18/20 Update: Peak= 3/29/2020

init.t/dbl=2.56 days, $\alpha/s=.04583/\text{day}$, $\beta/s=-0.1725$, Peak=36 days, t/dbl=4.13 days at peak

Figure 17: Predicted ITALY CoVID-19 results, using an augmented 2-parameter $\{\alpha/s, \beta/s\}$ *Social Mitigation* model. Total number of CoVID-19 cases is significantly less than Fig. 12, but the model post-peak drop is much steeper, making this a likely best-case result.