Estimate of the rate of unreported COVID-19 cases during the first outbreak in Rio de Janeiro

M.S. Aronna¹, R. Guglielmi^{2,*}, L.M. Moschen¹

Abstract

In this work we fit an epidemiological model SEIAQR (*Susceptible - Exposed - Infectious - Asymptomatic - Quarantined - Removed*) to the data of the first COVID-19 outbreak in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Particular emphasis is given to the unreported rate, that is, the proportion of infected individuals that is not detected by the health system. The evaluation of the parameters of the model is based on a combination of error-weighted least squares method and appropriate B-splines. The structural and practical identifiability is analyzed to support the feasibility and robustness of the parameters' estimation. We use the bootstrap method to quantify the uncertainty of the estimates. For the outbreak of March-July 2020 in Rio de Janeiro, we estimate about 90% of unreported cases, with a 95% confidence interval (85%, 93%).

Keywords: COVID-19 model, parameter estimation, identifiability, least squares, B-splines, bootstrap method

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: soledad.aronna@fgv.br (M.S. Aronna), roberto.guglielmi@uwaterloo.ca (R. Guglielmi), lucas.moschen@fgv.edu.br (L.M. Moschen)

¹Escola de Matemática Aplicada - EMap, FGV, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

²Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada

Preprint submitted to Infectious Disease Modelling

October 4, 2021

1. Introduction

In late December 2019, health professionals in the city of Wuhan (Hubei, China) identified several cases of pneumonia (The 2019 nCoV Outbreak Joint Field Epidemiology Investigation Team and Q. Li, 2020) caused by a new coronavirus, which was named SARS-CoV-2. The disease induced by SARS-CoV-2, called COVID-19, rapidly spread around the world. Most COVID-19 cases are asymptomatic patients or with mild symptoms, but in more severe cases the disease may progress to viral pneumonia and multi-organ failure (World Health Organization, 2020) and can lead to hospitalization and death.

Brazil declared the disease as a public health emergency in February 2020, before the first COVID-19 cases were reported in Brazil. With the aim of protecting the population, several measures were implemented, including the adjustment of a legal framework to carry out isolation and quarantine (Croda et al., 2020). In March 2020, the governor of the state of Rio de Janeiro declared a public health emergency and ordered to avoid gatherings, closing down schools, restaurants, and theaters, and restricting access to beaches, shopping centers, and non-essential commerce (Dantas et al., 2020). Nevertheless, these measures could not prevent the outbreak of the virus in the region, fueled by the large portion of asymptomatic individuals and by the long incubation period of the virus (Li et al., 2020). The objective of this work is to provide a quantitative estimate of crucial parameters related to the COVID-19 outbreak in the city of Rio de Janeiro during the period March-July 2020. The analysis is based on the fitting of the SEIAQR compartmental model introduced in (Aronna et al., 2021) to real data retrieved

from the public health agency (Municipal Health Department, City Hall of Rio de Janeiro, 2021). This epidemiological model takes into account isolation, quarantine of confirmed cases, and testing of asymptomatic individuals as non-pharmaceutical strategies to contain the spread of the virus among the population (more details in Section 2.1). The main purpose of the study is to estimate the rate of unreported cases in the city of Rio de Janeiro. This is a crucial step to gauge the real extent and impact of the disease in the population, since most of the infections do not result in severe symptoms and are therefore likely to remain undetected.

The text is organized as follows: Section 2 collects different information regarding the mathematical model; the structure of the data as retrieved for the city of Rio de Janeiro; and the representation chosen for the parameters' estimation. Section 3 describes the notions of identifiability analyzed in the paper. Section 4 presents the results of the fitting of the data to the model and the resulting estimates of the parameters. Finally, the last two sections conclude the paper with some discussions and final comments.

1.1. Data Availability

No new data are released as part of this research. This paper relies on publicly available datasets, with references provided in the text. The code required to reproduce our analysis is available in the GitHub repository (Moschen, 2021).

47 2. Material and methods

48 2.1. The epidemiological model

49 We recall the key features of the compartmental model from (Aronna
50 et al., 2021). The population is split into the compartments S , E , I , A , Q ,
51 R , and D , corresponding to the compartments of susceptible, exposed, infec-
52 tious, infectious and asymptomatic, quarantined or hospitalized, recovered,
53 and dead individuals, respectively. These compartments are linked in the
54 following way (see Figure 1): the individuals in S move to compartment E
55 when exposed to the virus. After a given latent period, they become infec-
56 tious and thus pass to compartment I . At this stage, an individual in I may
57 either report symptoms and thus move (after testing) to the compartment
58 Q , or result in an asymptomatic/paucisymptomatic infection and move to
59 the compartment A . Individuals from E and A may move to Q as a result
60 of the testing strategy among the asymptomatic population, as described in
61 more detail in the following. Finally, the compartment R collects the re-
62 covered individuals from either A or Q , whereas the compartment D counts
63 the COVID-19-related deaths. By normalizing the total population to 1, the
64 value of each variable S , E , I , A , Q , R , and D represents the proportion of
65 that given compartment in the total population. Moreover, we neglect the
66 birth and natural death rates, given the limited time horizon chosen for the
67 data fitting. The dynamics is described by the following set of differential

Figure 1: Diagram of the compartmental model

equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{E} &= \beta(t)S(I + A) - \rho\delta E - \tau E \\
 \dot{I} &= \tau E - \sigma I - \rho I \\
 \dot{A} &= \sigma\alpha I - \rho A - \gamma_1 A \\
 \dot{Q} &= \sigma(1 - \alpha)I + \rho(\delta E + I + A) - \gamma_2 Q - \mu(t)Q \\
 \dot{S} &= -\beta(t)S(I + A) \\
 \dot{R} &= \gamma_1 A + \gamma_2 Q \\
 \dot{D} &= \mu(t)Q,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

which is a simplified version of the model studied in (Aronna et al., 2021). More precisely, the simplification is done by considering the population as a sole homogeneous group that is subject, in average, to the same mobility restrictions, while the model from (Aronna et al., 2021) allowed for a distinction between two groups - one with high mobility consisting of essential workers and the other with restricted mobility composed by the remainder of the population. The parameters $\tau, \sigma, \omega, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, and μ related to the pathogen

76 and the induced disease are described in Table 1. The function $\beta(t)$ is the
77 *effective contact rate* at time t , which takes into account the average contact
78 rate - directly affected by social distancing, public policies, use of Personal
79 Protective Equipment (PPE), etc. - and the transmissibility of the virus -
80 probability of infection given a contact between an infected and a susceptible
81 individual. A constant of particular interest in our analysis is the parameter
82 $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, which represents the proportion of asymptomatic infectious cases.
83 Among these cases, only those found positive through either testing induced
84 by contact tracing or simply random testing are reported to the health sys-
85 tem. All the others will remain unreported, being paucisymptomatic (but
86 infectious) cases. In view of the scarcity of testing kits during the first out-
87 break in Rio de Janeiro, we consider the parameter α as a proxy for the
88 *unreported rate* of infections. It is clear that estimating such parameter α
89 is crucial to assess the effective size of the epidemic since such unreported
90 cases may fuel the ongoing outbreak. Moreover, having an approximation
91 of the size of the recovered population is also an essential information for
92 epidemiological management and the comprehension of the virus behaviour.
93 At the same time, estimating α may be very difficult, since it accounts for
94 those cases not detected by the radar of the health system (Nogrady, 2020).

95 As mentioned above, the unreported rate is strictly related to the avail-
96 ability of testing kits and to the effectiveness of tracing, tracking, and testing
97 in place during the outbreak. Such measures are described in model (1) by
98 both the detection rate $1 - \alpha$ and the parameter ρ , the latter representing
99 the *rate of testing among asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic individuals*. We
100 point out that the value of the unreported rate α is not sensitive to small

101 variations of values of ρ (see Section 2.3.1).

102 For clarity of exposition, in model (1) we do not describe important fea-
 103 tures such as the *sensitivity* and the *specificity* of the testing kits, although
 104 these attributes may play a crucial role in consideration of new variants of
 105 the virus (see (Aronna et al., 2021, Remark 2.3) for more details). With this
 106 premise, in our model we assume that a person in the compartments I or
 107 A will always test positive, in S always negative, and in E positive with a
 108 probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We also introduce the counter $T(t)$ of total positive
 109 tests, which follows the dynamics

$$\dot{T} = \sigma(1 - \alpha)I + \rho(\delta E + I + A) . \quad (2)$$

Par.	Description
τ^{-1}	latent period, from exposure to infectiousness
σ^{-1}	time from infectiousness to possible symptoms onset
ω^{-1}	incubation period (i.e. $\omega^{-1} = \tau^{-1} + \sigma^{-1}$)
γ_1	recovery rate for paucisymptomatic individuals
γ_2	recovery rate for detected positive cases
μ	mortality rate among detected positive cases

Table 1: Parameters of COVID-19

110 2.1.1. The basic reproduction number

111 Assuming a constant contact rate β , the basic reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0$
 112 associated with the model (1) is given by the relation

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\varphi + \sqrt{\varphi^2 + \frac{4\sigma\alpha}{\rho + \gamma_1}\varphi} \right), \quad (3)$$

where

$$\varphi = \frac{\beta\tau}{(\rho\delta + \tau)(\sigma + \rho)}$$

(see (Aronna et al., 2021)). However, as the epidemic evolves, the recovered and immune portion of the population becomes more relevant, impacting the force of the spread. For this reason we introduce the effective (time-dependent) reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_t$, which decreases as the susceptible population $S(t)$ decreases and it is expressed by the same relation (3) of $\mathcal{R}_0$ with φ replaced by

$$\varphi(t) = \frac{\beta(t)\tau S(t)}{(\rho\delta + \tau)(\sigma + \rho)}.$$

2.2. Data description

We retrieve data from the public health agency (Municipal Health Department, City Hall of Rio de Janeiro, 2021), collecting information on COVID-19 confirmed cases and deaths in the municipality of Rio de Janeiro from March 01, 2020 to July 31, 2020. The format of the data is displayed in Table 2. The

Notification date	Symptom onset date	Neighborhood	Sex	Age group	Outcome	Outcome date	Ethnicity
05/18/20	05/03/20	PACIENCIA	M	50 - 59	death	05/17/20	Black
04/25/20	04/02/20	BARRA DA TIJUCA	M	80 - 89	death	05/01/20	White
05/06/20	05/06/20	CACHAMBI	M	70 - 79	death	05/07/20	Ignored
06/12/20	06/02/20	BARRA DA TIJUCA	M	70 - 79	death	06/12/20	White
06/13/20	04/26/20	MARECHAL HERMES	M	60 - 69	death	06/16/20	Ignored

Table 2: Extract of the data: notification date, symptom onset date, neighborhood of residence, sex, age group, outcome, outcome date, ethnicity.

123

column `Symptom onset date` denotes the symptom onset date reported by the patient, and `Outcome date` marks the date on which the person recovers or dies (respectively `recovered` or `death` in the column `Outcome`), thus ceasing to be an active case. The column `Outcome date` was incomplete having about 3.7% of empty fields, so we were not able to use the recovery date as an input in our data fitting and missing death dates were imputed randomly according to the empirical distribution of the time difference between notification and evolution dates. Finally, we normalize the data by the size of the population in Rio de Janeiro, which we assume to be 6.7 millions (IBGE, 2021).

2.2.1. Smoothed and cumulative curves

There is a weekly seasonality in confirmed cases and deaths in the outbreak with a negative deviation on weekends. This variation affects the model since it has no seasonal adjustment. For this reason, the data is smoothed using a centered *moving average* with 7 days. Thus, given a set of initial data $\{x_s\}_{1 \leq s \leq n}$ of confirmed positive cases or deaths, we replace it with

$$\hat{x}_t = \frac{1}{2k+1} \sum_{s=-k}^k x_{t+s} ,$$

where $2k+1 = 7$. Although this choice may seem arbitrary, it is directly related to the weekly periodicity of the data. Figures 2 and 3 display daily new cases and deaths, respectively. In particular, in Figure 2 we can observe that the first wave ends at the end of July, which justifies our choice to set the horizon of the data fitting on July 31st. Moreover, we calculate the curves of cumulative positive cases and deaths by evaluating

$$y_t = \sum_{i=-14}^t \hat{x}_i, \quad (t = 0, \dots, n) .$$

146 The curves of cumulative cases, considering the self-reported symptoms on-
 147 set, and cumulative deaths will be compared to the compartments T and D
 148 from model (1).

Figure 2: Daily new cases considering the self-reported symptoms onset in Rio de Janeiro between March and September of 2020. The 7-days moving average is displayed in red.

149 2.3. Choice and modeling of parameters

150 We split the set of parameters between a first group, consisting of epi-
 151 demiological constants $\tau, \sigma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, and δ , whose values we retrieve from the
 152 literature (see Table 3), and a second group of parameters $\beta(t)$, α , ρ , and $\mu(t)$
 153 estimated from the data. The model used to represent the effective contact
 154 rate $\beta(t)$ and the mortality $\mu(t)$ is described in Section 2.3.2. We start by
 155 estimating the testing rate ρ .

Figure 3: Daily new COVID-19 related deaths in Rio de Janeiro between March and September of 2020. The 7-days moving average is displayed in red.

156 2.3.1. Estimation of ρ

157 We consider the testing data from the state of Rio de Janeiro (IBGE,
 158 2020), summarized in Table 4: about 2% of the population is tested each
 159 month, with a positive rate of about 20% among the tests done. We thus
 160 evaluate a daily testing of about 0.013% of the population, that is, we shall
 161 choose $\rho \leq 1.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$. In this range of values, the impact of the choice of ρ
 162 on α is negligible, as we verify in Table 6. For this reason, we assign to ρ
 163 the value of $\rho = 10^{-5}$. Unfortunately, the data do not allow to discern the
 164 tests due to symptom onset from the testing of asymptomatic cases, due to
 165 the effectiveness of the trace, track, and test strategy.

166 2.3.2. Representation of β and μ

167 The parameter β in model (1) varies in time according to the different
 168 public policies in place in Rio de Janeiro in different periods (Official Journal
 169 of the State of Rio de Janeiro, 2020b; Estadão, 2020), and according to

Par.	Value	Reference
ω^{-1}	5.74 days	Rai et al. (2021)
τ^{-1}	3.69 days	Li et al. (2020)
σ^{-1}	$\omega^{-1} - \tau^{-1}$	Li et al. (2020)
γ_1^{-1}	7.5 days	Byrne et al. (2020)
γ_2^{-1}	13.4 days	Byrne et al. (2020)
δ	0.01	Kucirka et al. (2020)

Table 3: Value of parameters retrieved from the literature.

	July	August	September	October
Percentage (%)	6.8	8.6	10.2	11.9
Positive rate (%)	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.4

Table 4: Percentage of cumulative total and positive tests among the population.

the compliance of the population with these measures. For this reason, we approximate β by *B-splines* in the form

$$\beta(t) \approx \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_j B_{j,k}(t) ,$$

where β_j are the coefficients to be estimated and $\{B_{j,k}(t)\}_{j=1}^s$ is the basis of functions of order k (De Boor, 1978). A similar representation is used for the mortality rate $\mu(t)$,

$$\mu(t) \approx \sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j B_{j,k}(t) ,$$

which has to be understood as relative to the number of confirmed deaths. This reflects the fact that the relative mortality may vary in periods of dis-

177 tress for the health system and lack of testing kits. We therefore define the
178 vector of $s + r + 1$ parameters to be estimated

$$\theta = (\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_s, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) . \quad (4)$$

179 We assume that the *knots*, i.e. the time points where the polynomials
180 connect, are equally spaced. The number of knots is equal to the number of
181 parameters (s for β and r for μ) plus the order of the B-spline (k) plus 1.

182 To determine the order k and the number of coefficients s, r , for the B-
183 spline approximation, we use the *Akaike Information Criterion (AIC)* (Liang
184 et al., 2010), which under the normality hypothesis of the errors is given by
185 the formula

$$AIC = n \ln \left(\frac{RSS}{n} \right) + 2(s + r + 1) ,$$

186 such that RSS is the sum of squares of the model’s residuals. For the numer-
187 ical experiments in Section 4, we compare models with 3 and 4 coefficients,
188 as models with less than 3 coefficients are unable to capture temporal varia-
189 tions over the timeframe of the outbreak, while models with s and r greater
190 than 4 are computationally difficult to handle.

191 2.4. Parameter estimation

192 For the parameter estimation, we follow the methods applied in (Cao
193 et al., 2012; Liang et al., 2010; Ramsay et al., 2007). The first 15 days of
194 March were used to estimate the initial conditions (see Section 2.4.1) and
195 thus set up the model starting from March 16th, when the first contain-
196 ment measures were imposed (Official Journal of the State of Rio de Janeiro,

2020a). Denoting by $\hat{x}_i^{(1)}$ and $\hat{x}_i^{(2)}$ the daily new cases and deaths, respectively, on the i -th day, where $i = 0$ and $i = n$ indicate March 16th and July 31th, respectively, we assume that

$$\hat{x}_i^{(1)} = (T(i) - T(i-1)) + \varepsilon_i^{(1)}, \quad i = -14, \dots, n, \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{x}_i^{(2)} = (D(i) - D(i-1)) + \varepsilon_i^{(2)}, \quad i = -14, \dots, n, \quad (6)$$

where the sequences $\{\varepsilon_i^{(1)}\}_{-14 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\{\varepsilon_i^{(2)}\}_{-14 \leq i \leq n}$ are independent and normally distributed random variables with unknown variances σ_k^2 , $k = 1, 2$. Summing up we get

$$y_i^{(1)} = T(i) + \xi_i^{(1)}, \quad i = 0, \dots, n, \quad (7)$$

$$y_i^{(2)} = D(i) + \xi_i^{(2)}, \quad i = 0, \dots, n, \quad (8)$$

for the cumulative quantities, where $\xi_i^{(k)} = \sum_{j=-14}^i \varepsilon_j^{(k)}$ for $k = 1, 2$. Therefore, for any $i \leq j \leq n$ and $k = 1, 2$, the *covariance matrix* is defined by

$$\text{Cov}(\xi_i^{(k)}, \xi_j^{(k)}) = (i+15)\sigma_k^2. \quad (9)$$

At this point, we introduce the notations $\hat{T}(\theta)$ and $\hat{D}(\theta)$ for the numerical approximations of the functions T and D , obtained by integrating equations (2) and (1), respectively, through the Runge-Kutta method and corresponding to the parameter vector θ introduced in (4).

2.4.1. Initial values estimation

Considering $S \approx 1$ in the first 15 days of the epidemic, and focusing on the compartments E, I, A , and T , the system (1) reduces to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{E} \\ \dot{I} \\ \dot{A} \\ \dot{T} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\tau & \beta & \beta & 0 \\ \tau & -\sigma & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma\alpha & -\gamma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma(1-\alpha) & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} E \\ I \\ A \\ T \end{bmatrix},$$

whose solution is a linear combination of exponential functions. The daily testing of asymptomatic individuals at the beginning of the pandemic is assumed to be negligible, thus $\rho \approx 0$, while the parameters γ_1, τ , and σ are taken from the existing literature (see Table 3). The parameters α and β are fixed in this period. The value $T(-14)$ corresponds to the confirmed cases on March 2 and $T(-15)$ is set to zero. Therefore, the parameters to be estimated in this period are reduced to $\theta_0 = (\alpha, \beta, E(-14), I(-14), A(-14))$. Considering $\hat{T}(\theta_0)_i$ the approximation for T as function of θ_0 at day i , we aim to minimize the expression

$$\sum_{i=-14}^0 w_i \left(y_i^{(1)} - \hat{T}(\theta_0)_i \right)^2,$$

where the weights $w_i = \frac{i+14}{14}$ are chosen to give less importance to the initial days. With these estimates, we obtain the values $(E(0), I(0), A(0))$. Since $R(-14) = 0$, we get that $Q(-14) = T(-14)$, and thus we can integrate the curves Q and R to obtain the values $Q(0)$ and $R(0)$. Finally, we deduce $S(0) = 1 - E(0) - I(0) - A(0) - Q(0) - R(0)$.

Remark 2.1. In order to analyze the sensitivity of the curves $\hat{T}$ and $\hat{D}$ with respect to the initial guess of the parameter θ_0 , we perform a series of random realizations and compare the final values $\hat{T}(\theta_0)_n$ and $\hat{D}(\theta_0)_n$ for all guesses.

229 2.4.2. Curve fitting

230 We use the *weighted least squares* method to estimate the unknown pa-
 231 rameters by the data of daily confirmed cases and deaths given by equa-
 232 tions (7)-(8). This approach is based on the solution of a constrained non-
 233 linear minimization problem. We consider the following objective functional

$$F(\theta) = (y^{(1)} - \hat{T}(\theta))^T \Sigma^{-1} (y^{(1)} - \hat{T}(\theta)) + \psi (y^{(2)} - \hat{D}(\theta))^T \Sigma^{-1} (y^{(2)} - \hat{D}(\theta)) , \quad (10)$$

234 where M^T denotes the transpose matrix of M , $\sigma_1^2 \Sigma$ and $\sigma_2^2 \Sigma$ are the covari-
 235 ance matrices given by equations (9), and ψ is a weight proportional to the
 236 ratio of the variances σ_1^2 / σ_2^2 . We solve the minimization problem by means
 237 of the L-BFGS-B algorithm (Byrd et al., 1995), which combines the gradient
 238 projection method and the BFGS algorithm with optimized use of computa-
 239 tional memory, implemented in the SciPy library in Python (Virtanen et al.,
 240 2020).

241 2.5. Uncertainty quantification over the parameters

242 Uncertainty is intrinsic in the parameters' estimation, owing to a com-
 243 bination of different factors, such as the natural variability of the data, the
 244 measurement errors of the data collection, and the biases of the estimation
 245 method. In order to tackle this problem, we construct confidence intervals
 246 for each unknown parameter. We rely on the *Bootstrap method* (Efron and
 247 Tibshirani, 1986), which involves a constructive approach based on the data.
 248 Starting from a series Y , it generates replicated data $Y_1^*, \dots, Y_N^*$ and per-
 249 forms the estimations for each one. The confidence interval for the value

of interest is then given by the corresponding percentile of the N replicated samples (Joshi et al., 2006).

As a consequence of the error structure presented in equation (5), we generate each replicated curve $T^{(B)}$ with the initial value $T^{(B)}(0) = y_0^{(1)}$ and satisfying $T^{(B)}(i+1) = T^{(B)}(i) + \varepsilon_{i+1}$ for any $i \geq 1$, where $\varepsilon_{i+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{x}_{i+1}^1, \hat{\sigma}_1^2)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_1^2$ (see Appendix A) is an estimate for σ_1^2 . An analogous construction is carried out for equation (6). In the estimation process, in order to avoid local minima, we randomize the initial guess of the optimization algorithm: for every $j = 1, \dots, r + s + 1$, we select initial guesses $\theta_j^{\text{initial}}$ randomly chosen with uniform distribution in a prescribed range (l_j, u_j) , that represents the interval of admissible values for that parameter. After m iterations of this process, we pick the best solution minimizing the objective functional (10).

3. Theory

3.1. Identifiability

From a structural-theoretical point of view, we are interested in analyzing the *identifiability* of model (1). In general, this analysis identifies whether unknown parameters can be estimated in a unique way from the available measurements on the system (Audoly et al., 2001; Saccomani and Thomaseth, 2019). There are two conceptually different ways to develop this analysis: the structural approach (a priori) and the practical approach (a posteriori). The former is a theoretical property that resides in the structure of the model itself: the parameters are *structurally identifiable* if they can be (globally) uniquely identified from the available measurements; they are called *locally structurally identifiable* if they are structurally identifiable

274 within a neighbourhood of the solution. On the other hand, the practical
275 approach is based on the outcome of the data fitting, and it is evaluated by
276 means of the *correlation matrix* of the parameters.

277 3.2. Structural identifiability

278 Consider a dynamical system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x(t), \theta), \quad x(0) = x_0 \\ y(t) &= h(x(t), \theta) \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

279 where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and f and h are rational functions of the variable
280 x and $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, Θ being the set of admissible values of the parameter θ .
281 The variable y is the output of the system, that is the observable component.
282 In the model, y is the number of confirmed cases and deaths. When $x(0) =$
283 x_0 , the measurement with initial value x_0 is $y = \psi_{x_0}(\theta)$. The structural
284 identifiability (Ljung and Glad, 1994) of system (11) at a fixed $\theta^* \in \Theta$ is
285 related to the number of solutions of the equation

$$\psi_{x_0}(\theta) = \psi_{x_0}(\theta^*) . \tag{12}$$

286 The system (11) is *globally identifiable* at θ^* if equation (12) has a unique
287 solution $\theta = \theta^*$, or, equivalently if the mapping ψ_{x_0} is invertible. System (11)
288 is *locally identifiable* if ψ_{x_0} is invertible in a neighborhood of θ^* . In Appendix
289 B we describe a computational method to verify structural identifiability
290 using the DAISY software (Bellu et al., 2007).

291 3.3. Practical identifiability

292 The structural identifiability process developed in Section 3.2 is based
293 on two hypotheses: the model structure is accurate and measurement errors

are absent. These hypotheses are not valid in practice and, therefore, it is necessary to assess whether the parameters can be reliably and accurately estimated from noisy data (Miao et al., 2011). Let $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_r)$ be the vector of parameters estimated from the data fitting, and $\hat{T}$, $\hat{D}$, $\hat{\sigma}_1$ and $\hat{\sigma}_2$ the model approximations for the confirmed cases, deaths, and their respective estimated variances, as introduced in Section 2.4. The correlation matrix quantifies the interdependence between model parameters, and can be computed as follows: starting from the *Fisher Information matrix (FIM)*

$$FIM = \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}_1^2} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{T}}{\partial \theta} \right) \bigg|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}}^T \Sigma^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{T}}{\partial \theta} \right) \bigg|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}} + \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}_2^2} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{D}}{\partial \theta} \right) \bigg|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}}^T \Sigma^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{D}}{\partial \theta} \right) \bigg|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}},$$

we compute the *covariance matrix* C as the inverse of FIM . Then, the element r_{ij} , $1 \leq i, j \leq r + s + 1$ of the *correlation matrix* R is defined as

$$r_{ij} = \frac{C_{ij}}{\sqrt{C_{ii}C_{jj}}}$$

which measures the correlation between $\hat{\theta}_i$ and $\hat{\theta}_j$. A value close to 1 indicates that the parameters are strongly interconnected, and that each of them varies according to the other.

4. Results

We first set the initial conditions according to Section 2.4.1 and we approximate the curve of the first two weeks of the outbreak, as represented in Figure 4. Following Remark 2.1, the fitting with respect to the initial guess for θ_0 is robust: the final values on July 31st range from 0.0127 to 0.0131. As summarized in Table 5, the best fitting over the outbreak period March-July

2020 is obtained by choosing an approximation with 4 coefficients for the two parameters β and μ , and B-spline of order 2 for β and order 1 for μ .

B-splines		Parameter μ						
		(3,0)	(3,1)	(3,2)	(4,0)	(4,1)	(4,2)	(4,3)
Parameter β	(3,0)	-2.021	-2.029	-2.023	-2.025	-2.028	-2.032	-2.001
	(3,1)	-2.228	-2.241	-2.266	-2.288	-2.298	-2.311	-2.298
	(3,2)	-2.246	-2.230	-2.253	-2.294	-2.337	-2.331	-2.309
	(4,0)	-1.967	-1.979	-1.979	-1.998	-2.002	-2.000	-1.987
	(4,1)	-2.262	-2.304	-2.277	-2.302	-2.372	-2.348	-2.338
	(4,2)	-2.346	-2.243	-2.262	-2.300	-2.374	-2.357	-2.332
	(4,3)	-2.213	-2.233	-2.251	-2.294	-2.363	-2.347	-2.323

Table 5: Model selection according to AIC (10^3 scale): (r, k) represents the number of coefficients and the order of the B-spline.

314

315 We fit the available data using the L-BFGS-B algorithm explained in
316 Section 2.4.2. Figure 5 shows a very good matching between the available
317 data and the fitting curves. To analyze the robustness of the estimate of
318 α with respect to the epidemiological parameters, we perform the following
319 analysis: choosing a grid of values based on the confidence interval of each
320 parameter, we estimate the parameters for each possible combination and we
321 determine the variation in the estimated value of α , as reported in Table 6.

Figure 4: Fitting the curve of cumulative cases at the beginning of the outbreak

Figure 5: Fitting the curves of cumulative cases and deaths

Parameters	Interval	Range of values of α
τ^{-1}	$[2, 4]$	$[0.897, 0.902]$
σ^{-1}	$[2, 4.5]$	$[0.897, 0.9]$
ρ	$[0, 10^{-4}]$	$[0.898, 0.899]$
γ_1^{-1}	$[6.5, 9.5]$	$[0.894, 0.903]$
γ_2^{-1}	$[11, 16]$	$[0.896, 0.898]$

Table 6: Range of values of α corresponding to admissible intervals of the parameters according to the references of Table 3

Figure 6: Graphical analysis of the model's residuals with histogram e Q-Q plot.

322 We also verify whether the model residuals approximate the errors, which
323 are assumed to have a Gaussian distribution. The histograms of the residuals
324 and the *Q-Q plots* (comparison of the quartiles of the Gaussian distribution
325 with the quartiles of the sampling distribution of the residuals) are shown
326 in Figure 6. In addition to this visual analysis, we can also apply statistical
327 tests to verify correlation and normality: the *Ljung-Box test* (Ljung and
328 Box, 1978) returns a p-value 0 which indicates that the residuals are not
329 uncorrelated; the *Jarque-Bera test* (Jarque and Bera, 1980) does not reject
330 the null hypothesis at the 5% level, which is an evidence supporting the
331 normality of the residuals.

332 Another important outcome of the study is the estimate of the effective
333 (time-varying) reproductive number $\mathcal{R}_t$. Figure 7 describes the evolution of

334 $\mathcal{R}_t$ in the period under consideration.

Figure 7: Effective (time-varying) reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_t$. The dashed red line indicates the threshold value $\mathcal{R}_t = 1$

335 The correlation matrix among the estimated parameters (Section 3.3) is
 336 depicted in Figure 8. It is worth noticing that the parameter α and the
 337 second coefficient of the B-spline of β have a strong inverse correlation.

Figure 8: Correlation matrix of the estimated model's parameters.

Figure 9: The blue curve is the median of the estimated curves and the gray represents the confidence interval for each time. The dashed red line is the threshold 1 for $\mathcal{R}_t$.

338 Relying on the Bootstrap method from Section 2.5 we derive confidence
 339 intervals for the parameters of the fitting: after $N = 500$ simulations with
 340 $m = 10$, we conclude that the 95% confidence interval for the unreported
 341 rate α is $(0.849, 0.931)$. Figure 9 displays the confidence interval of $\mathcal{R}_t$ over
 342 time. Figure 10 provides a scatter plot and histogram visualization for the
 343 estimated correlations in Figure 8. Finally, Table 7 summarizes the estimates
 344 for all parameters.

345 5. Discussion

346 The range of values for the unreported rate α is in line with the results of
 347 other works on this issue: in Rio de Janeiro, (Prado et al., 2020) estimated
 348 the notification at 7.2%; at a Brazilian national level, (Canzian, 2020; Prado,
 349 2021; Portal COVID-19 Brasil, 2021) estimated the notification of cases in
 350 the range $[7.8\%, 8.1\%]$.

351 It is also interesting to compare the estimates of $\mathcal{R}_t$ over time: in (Mellan
 352 et al., 2020), the point estimate for May 9, 2020 from the state of Rio de

Figure 10: Scatter plots for each pair of two parameters, and their corresponding histogram.

Parameter	Median	Confidence interval
α	0.903	[0.849, 0.93]
β_1	0.144	[0.142, 0.147]
β_2	0.073	[0.069, 0.079]
β_3	0.101	[0.098, 0.104]
β_4	0.126	[0.123, 0.132]
μ_1	0.0101	[0.0092, 0.011]
μ_2	0.0159	[0.0154, 0.0164]
μ_3	0.0103	[0.0098, 0.0108]
μ_4	$7.03 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$[6.73 \cdot 10^{-3}, 7.38 \cdot 10^{-3}]$

Table 7: Estimates of the median and confidence intervals for each parameter.

Janeiro was 1.1 with 95%-confidence interval [0.9, 1.3], which includes our range of values. The curve estimated by (Observatório COVID-19 BR, 2021) for the city of Rio de Janeiro has a very similar trend as in Figure 7: at the beginning of May, the $\mathcal{R}_t$ has an estimated value smaller than 1 and it grows again until it is greater than 1 at the end of July. These values corroborate our fitting.

The correlation between α and β_2 represents a limitation in terms of identifiability of the system. In order to achieve a structural identifiability result it is necessary to know the recovered curve (see Appendix B), whereas for the practical identifiability it would be useful to approximate the transmission and mortality functions with a different model.

364 6. Conclusions

365 In this work, we combine tools from the analysis of differential equations,
 366 statistics, and optimization to estimate the unreported rate of COVID-19
 367 in the city of Rio de Janeiro during the first outbreak in March-July 2020.
 368 We determine that the rate of unreported positive cases is about 90%, with
 369 a confidence interval between 85% and 93%. This means that every case
 370 reported by the health system corresponds to about 9 – 10 cases that were not
 371 detected. This estimation shall be considered as a statistical approximation
 372 of the unreported rate: in addition to the lack of testing kits during the period
 373 under evaluation, other delays and errors at all stages of the notification
 374 process may generate bad inferences. Data analysis techniques have been
 375 deployed to deal with the low quality of data.

376 Concerning the modeling chosen for the fitting, it is of great importance to
 377 underline that the initialization of the parameters has little influence on the
 378 final estimation of α , supporting the robustness of our analysis. However,
 379 the fact that the residuals of the estimation are normally distributed but
 380 correlated needs more attention and will be addressed in future works.

381 Finally, the outcome of this work provides a description of the evolution
 382 in time of the disease reproductive number. This estimation provides a useful
 383 tool to determine periods of growth or decrease of the epidemic force at a
 384 geo-localized level, and thus to inform policymakers in their decision process
 385 to limit the spread of the virus and its consequences on the population.

386 Appendix A. Variance estimate

387 For the variances σ_1^2 and σ_2^2 , we follow the estimates from (Seber and
388 Wild, 2005, p. 21-28) given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_1^2 = \frac{1}{n-K} (y^{(1)} - \hat{T}(\hat{\theta}))^T \Sigma^{-1} (y^{(1)} - \hat{T}(\hat{\theta})) ,$$

389 where $K = r + s + 1$ and n is the number of data points. In a similar way,

$$\hat{\sigma}_2^2 = \frac{1}{n-K} (y^{(2)} - \hat{D}(\hat{\theta}))^T \Sigma^{-1} (y^{(2)} - \hat{D}(\hat{\theta})) .$$

390 Appendix B. DAISY

391 DAISY - Differential Algebra for Identifiability of SYstems - is a software
392 based on the programming language *Reduce*, specific to the problem of iden-
393 tifiability in dynamical systems. DAISY requires certain specific conditions
394 on the system, that allow to apply algebraic methods to the model under
395 consideration. In order to rewrite our system (1) in terms of the DAISY al-
396 gorithm, we treat all model parameters' in Section 2.1 as constant in time. If
397 we assume to know the curve R of recovered cases, we verify that model (1)
398 is globally identifiable. However, the knowledge of R may sometimes be
399 only partially available, as discussed in Section 2.2. Without access to these
400 data, DAISY has not been able to certify the structural identifiability of the
401 system.

402 Acknowledgements

403 The authors wish to thank Luiz Max Carvalho (FGV EMap) and Marcelo
404 Fernandes (FGV EESP) for fruitful discussions about several statistical meth-

405 ods applied in this research.

406 The first and third authors were supported by FAPERJ and CNPq, Brazil.

407 The second author acknowledges the funding of the Natural Sciences and En-

408 gineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). The third author thanks

409 the Center for the Development of Mathematics and Science (FGV CDMC)

410 for their support.

411 References

412 Aronna, M., Guglielmi, R., Moschen, L., 2021. A model for COVID-19

413 with isolation, quarantine and testing as control measures. *Epidemics* 34,

414 100437. URL: [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1755436521000025)

415 [pii/S1755436521000025](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1755436521000025), doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100437)

416 2021.100437.

417 Audoly, S., Bellu, G., D’Angio, L., Saccomani, M., Cobelli, C., 2001. Global

418 identifiability of nonlinear models of biological systems. *IEEE Transactions*

419 on Biomedical Engineering 48, 55–65. doi:10.1109/10.900248.

420 Bellu, G., Saccomani, M.P., Audoly, S., D’Angiò, L., 2007. DAISY: A new

421 software tool to test global identifiability of biological and physiological

422 systems. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* 88, 52–61.

423 Byrd, R.H., Lu, P., Nocedal, J., Zhu, C., 1995. A limited memory algorithm

424 for bound constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Comput-*

425 *ing* 16, 1190–1208.

426 Byrne, A.W., McEvoy, D., Collins, A.B., Hunt, K., Casey, M., Barber, A.,

427 Butler, F., Griffin, J., Lane, E.A., McAloon, C., et al., 2020. Inferred

428 duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping review and
429 analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-
430 19 cases. *BMJ Open* 10, e039856.

431 Canzian, F., 2020. Estados e municípios no país relatam subnotificação gigan-
432 tesca de casos (States and cities alert on a huge underreporting of cases).
433 Available at [https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/equilibrioesaude/](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/equilibrioesaude/2020/04/estados-e-municipios-no-pais-relatam-subnotificacao-gigantesca-de-casos.shtml)
434 [2020/04/estados-e-municipios-no-pais-relatam-subnotificacao-](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/equilibrioesaude/2020/04/estados-e-municipios-no-pais-relatam-subnotificacao-gigantesca-de-casos.shtml)
435 [gigantesca-de-casos.shtml](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/equilibrioesaude/2020/04/estados-e-municipios-no-pais-relatam-subnotificacao-gigantesca-de-casos.shtml). Folha de São Paulo Newspaper.

436 Cao, J., Huang, J.Z., Wu, H., 2012. Penalized nonlinear least squares estima-
437 tion of time-varying parameters in ordinary differential equations. *Journal*
438 *of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 21, 42–56.

439 Croda, J., Oliveira, W.K.d., Frutuoso, R.L., Mandetta, L.H., Baia-da Silva,
440 D.C., Brito-Sousa, J.D., Monteiro, W.M., Lacerda, M.V.G., 2020. COVID-
441 19 in Brazil: advantages of a socialized unified health system and prepara-
442 tion to contain cases. *Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Medicina Tropical*
443 53.

444 Dantas, G., Siciliano, B., França, B.B., da Silva, C.M., Arbilla, G., 2020.
445 The impact of COVID-19 partial lockdown on the air quality of the city
446 of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Science of the Total Environment* 729, 139085.

447 De Boor, C., 1978. A practical guide to splines. volume 27. Springer Verlag
448 New York.

449 Efron, B., Tibshirani, R., 1986. Bootstrap methods for standard errors,

450 confidence intervals, and other measures of statistical accuracy. Statistical
451 Science , 54–75.

452 Estadão, 2020. Governo do Rio cria classificação em 3 bandeiras para flex-
453 ibilizar isolamento (Government of Rio creates classification in 3 flags to
454 make isolation more flexible). Available at [https://revistapegn.globo.](https://revistapegn.globo.com/Noticias/noticia/2020/05/pegn-governo-do-rio-cria-classificacao-em-3-bandeiras-para-flexibilizar-isolamento.html)
455 [com/Noticias/noticia/2020/05/pegn-governo-do-rio-cria-](https://revistapegn.globo.com/Noticias/noticia/2020/05/pegn-governo-do-rio-cria-classificacao-em-3-bandeiras-para-flexibilizar-isolamento.html)
456 [classificacao-em-3-bandeiras-para-flexibilizar-isolamento.](https://revistapegn.globo.com/Noticias/noticia/2020/05/pegn-governo-do-rio-cria-classificacao-em-3-bandeiras-para-flexibilizar-isolamento.html)
457 [html](https://revistapegn.globo.com/Noticias/noticia/2020/05/pegn-governo-do-rio-cria-classificacao-em-3-bandeiras-para-flexibilizar-isolamento.html).

458 IBGE, 2020. Brazilian Institute for Geography and Statistics. Brazilian
459 National Household Survey Sample - PNAD COVID-19. Available at
460 [https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/trabalho/27946-](https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/trabalho/27946-divulgacao-semanal-pnadcovid1.html?=&t=downloads)
461 [divulgacao-semanal-pnadcovid1.html?=&t=downloads](https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/trabalho/27946-divulgacao-semanal-pnadcovid1.html?=&t=downloads).

462 IBGE, 2021. Brazilian Institute for Geography and Statistics. Cities and
463 States. Available at [https://www.ibge.gov.br/cidades-e-estados/](https://www.ibge.gov.br/cidades-e-estados/rj/rio-de-janeiro.html)
464 [rj/rio-de-janeiro.html](https://www.ibge.gov.br/cidades-e-estados/rj/rio-de-janeiro.html).

465 Jarque, C.M., Bera, A.K., 1980. Efficient tests for normality, homoscedastic-
466 ity and serial independence of regression residuals. Economics Letters 6,
467 255–259.

468 Joshi, M., Seidel-Morgenstern, A., Kremling, A., 2006. Exploiting the boot-
469 strap method for quantifying parameter confidence intervals in dynamical
470 systems. Metabolic Engineering 8, 447–455.

471 Kucirka, L.M., Lauer, S.A., Laeyendecker, O., Boon, D., Lessler, J., 2020.
472 Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain

473 reaction-based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure. *Annals of In-*
474 *ternal Medicine* 173, 262–267.

475 Li, R., Pei, S., Chen, B., Song, Y., Zhang, T., Yang, W., Shaman, J., 2020.
476 Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of
477 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* 368, 489–493.

478 Liang, H., Miao, H., Wu, H., 2010. Estimation of constant and time-varying
479 dynamic parameters of HIV infection in a nonlinear differential equation
480 model. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 4, 460.

481 Ljung, G.M., Box, G.E., 1978. On a measure of lack of fit in time series
482 models. *Biometrika* 65, 297–303.

483 Ljung, L., Glad, T., 1994. On global identifiability for arbitrary model
484 parametrizations. *Automatica* 30, 265–276.

485 Mellan, T.A., Hoeltgebaum, H.H., Mishra, S., Whittaker, C., Schnekenberg,
486 R.P., Gandy, A., Unwin, H.J.T., Vollmer, M.A., Coupland, H., Hawryluk,
487 I., et al., 2020. Subnational analysis of the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil.
488 *MedRxiv*.

489 Miao, H., Xia, X., Perelson, A.S., Wu, H., 2011. On identifiability of non-
490 linear ODE models and applications in viral dynamics. *SIAM Review* 53,
491 3–39.

492 Moschen, L.M., 2021. Repository COVID-19. Github. Available at [https :](https://github.com/lucamoschen/covid-19-model)
493 [//github.com/lucamoschen/covid-19-model](https://github.com/lucamoschen/covid-19-model).

494 Municipal Health Department, City Hall of Rio de Janeiro, 2021. Dados
495 individuais dos casos confirmados de COVID-19 no município do Rio de
496 Janeiro (Individual data of COVID-19 confirmed cases in the city of Rio
497 de Janeiro). Available at [https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?](https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=f314453b3a55434ea8c8e8caaa2d8db5)
498 [id=f314453b3a55434ea8c8e8caaa2d8db5](https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=f314453b3a55434ea8c8e8caaa2d8db5).

499 Nogrady, B., 2020. What the data say about asymptomatic COVID infec-
500 tions. Nature .

501 Observatório COVID-19 BR, 2021. R efetivo no Rio de Janeiro (Effective
502 R in Rio de Janeiro. Available at [https://covid19br.github.io/](https://covid19br.github.io/municipios.html?aba=aba3&uf=RJ&mun=Rio_de_Janeiro)
503 [municipios.html?aba=aba3&uf=RJ&mun=Rio_de_Janeiro](https://covid19br.github.io/municipios.html?aba=aba3&uf=RJ&mun=Rio_de_Janeiro).

504 Official Journal of the State of Rio de Janeiro, 2020a. Ordinance number
505 46.973, March 16th 2020. Available at [https://pge.rj.gov.br/comum/](https://pge.rj.gov.br/comum/code/MostrarArquivo.php?C=MTAyMjI)
506 [code/MostrarArquivo.php?C=MTAyMjI](https://pge.rj.gov.br/comum/code/MostrarArquivo.php?C=MTAyMjI).

507 Official Journal of the State of Rio de Janeiro, 2020b. Law number 8859,
508 June 3rd, 2020. Available at [http://www.aeerj.net.br/file/04-06-](http://www.aeerj.net.br/file/04-06-2020-leiestadomascara.pdf)
509 [2020-leiestadomascara.pdf](http://www.aeerj.net.br/file/04-06-2020-leiestadomascara.pdf).

510 Portal COVID-19 Brasil, 2021. COVID-19 BRASIL. Available at [https :](https://ciis.fmrp.usp.br/covid19/)
511 [//ciis.fmrp.usp.br/covid19/](https://ciis.fmrp.usp.br/covid19/).

512 Prado, M.F.d., Antunes, B.B.d.P., Bastos, L.d.S.L., Peres, I.T., Silva,
513 A.d.A.B.d., Dantas, L.F., Baião, F.A., Maçaira, P., Hamacher, S., Bozza,
514 F.A., 2020. Análise da subnotificação de COVID-19 no Brasil (Analy-
515 sis of COVID-19 underreporting in Brazil). Revista Brasileira de Terapia
516 Intensiva .

517 Prado, M.F.d.*et al.*, 2021. Análise de subnotificação do número de casos
518 confirmados da COVID-19 no Brasil (Analysis of underreporting of the
519 number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 in Brazil). Available at [https :](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_whlqZnGgvqHuWCG4-JyiL2X9WXpZAe3/view)
520 [//drive.google.com/file/d/1_whlqZnGgvqHuWCG4-JyiL2X9WXpZAe3/](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_whlqZnGgvqHuWCG4-JyiL2X9WXpZAe3/view)
521 [view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_whlqZnGgvqHuWCG4-JyiL2X9WXpZAe3/view).

522 Rai, B., Shukla, A., Dwivedi, L.K., 2021. Incubation period for COVID-19:
523 a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Public Health* , 1–8.

524 Ramsay, J.O., Hooker, G., Campbell, D., Cao, J., 2007. Parameter estimation
525 for differential equations: a generalized smoothing approach. *Journal of the*
526 *Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 69, 741–796.

527 Saccomani, M.P., Thomaseth, K., 2019. Calculating all multiple parameter
528 solutions of ODE models to avoid biological misinterpretations. *Mathe-*
529 *matical Biosciences and Engineering* 16, 6438–6453.

530 Seber, G., Wild, C., 2005. *Nonlinear Regression*. Wiley Series in Probability
531 and Statistics, Wiley. URL: [https://books.google.com.br/books?id=](https://books.google.com.br/books?id=YBY1CpBNo_cC)
532 [YBY1CpBNo_cC](https://books.google.com.br/books?id=YBY1CpBNo_cC).

533 The 2019 nCoV Outbreak Joint Field Epidemiology Investigation Team and
534 Q. Li, 2020. An Out-break of NCIP (2019-nCoV) Infection in China -
535 Wuhan, Hubei Province, 2019 - 2020. Available at [http : / / weekly .](http://weekly.chinacdc.cn/en/article/id/e3c63ca9-dedb-4fb6-9c1c-d057adb77b57)
536 [chinacdc . cn / en / article / id / e3c63ca9 - dedb - 4fb6 - 9c1c -](http://weekly.chinacdc.cn/en/article/id/e3c63ca9-dedb-4fb6-9c1c-d057adb77b57)
537 [d057adb77b57](http://weekly.chinacdc.cn/en/article/id/e3c63ca9-dedb-4fb6-9c1c-d057adb77b57).

538 Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T.E., Haberland, M., Reddy, T.,
539 Cournapeau, D., Burovski, E., Peterson, P., Weckesser, W., Bright, J.,

540 et al., 2020. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in
541 Python. Nature Methods 17, 261–272.

542 World Health Organization, 2020. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Avail-
543 able at [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19)
544 [coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19)
545 [coronase-disease-covid-19](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19).