

*Cost-effectiveness analysis of social distancing strategies to prevent SARS-CoV2 spread*

*Amir Shlomai MD,PhD<sub>1</sub>, Ari Leshno MD<sub>2</sub>, Ella H. Sklan PhD<sub>3</sub>\*+, Moshe Leshno MD,PhD<sub>4</sub>\**

*\* equal contribution +Corresponding author*

*Ella H. Sklan [sklan@tauex.tau.ac.il](mailto:sklan@tauex.tau.ac.il)*

**This file includes:**

1. Tables S1-S3
2. Figures S1-S5

	<b>Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Number of deaths</b>	<b>ICER (\$)</b>
<b>Strategy 1</b>	1.0694e+10	322	-
<b>Strategy 2</b>	8.8015e+07	464	7.5111e+07

**Table S1: Summary of the costs and number of deaths in each strategy.**

	<b>Quarantine (Global)</b>	<b>Social distancing</b>	<b>Isolation</b>	<b>14-day isolation</b>
<b>Strategy 1</b>	All susceptible individuals	Individuals that are not under quarantine for exceptional reasons	All infected individuals	Individuals at high exposure risk
<b>Strategy 2</b>	None	All susceptible Individuals	All infected Individuals	Individuals at high exposure risk

**Table S2: Summary of the two proposed strategies.**

<b>Strategy 1</b>	<b>Base</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	
r1_HR_c	0.007	0.005	0.009	proportion of the population under focused isolation due to high-exposure risk
r1_S2	0.8	0.7	0.9	proportion of the S population under global quarantine
r1_I	0.9	0.8	0.95	proportion of the I population under isolation
r1_E	0.3	0.2	0.4	proportion of the E population under isolation
<b>Strategy 2</b>	<b>Base</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	
r2_HR_c	0.003	0.001	0.005	proportion of the population under focused isolation due to high-exposure risk
r2_S2	0	0	0	proportion of the S population under global quarantine
r2_S1	0.9	0.8	1	proportion of S population to adopt social distancing measures
r2_I	0.9	0.8	0.95	proportion of the I population under isolation
r2_E	0.3	0.2	0.4	proportion of the E population of under isolation

**Table S3: Assumptions according to the two tested strategies.**




Fig S1

**Figure S1. Sensitivity analysis.** Sensitivity analysis comparing the relative effect of the transmission rate ( $\beta$ , upper panel) and mortality rate ( $\delta$ , lower panel) on the incremental cost effectiveness ratio (ICER).





Fig S2

**Figure S2. One-way sensitivity analysis.** Tornado diagram of the number of deaths in strategy 1 (top) and strategy 2 (bottom).




Fig S3

**Figure S3: Infection dynamics without interventions.** The graphs display the dynamics within the six compartments over time. Susceptible (S, blue); Infected (I, red); Carrier (Yellow, E); Carrier asymptomatic (Yellow, EA); Recovered (R, Green), Dead (D, Black).




Fig S4

Figure S4. An illustration of the modified SIER model used in this study.




Fig S5

**Figure S5. Calibration analysis of the model parameters.** Comparison of the expected number of deaths according to our model to the actual observed number in Israel between March 27 to May 3, 2020.