Impact of self-imposed prevention measures and short-term government intervention on mitigating and delaying a COVID-19 epidemic

Appendix

Alexandra Teslya[*†1], Thi Mui Pham[*1], Noortje G. Godijk[*1], Mirjam E. Kretzschmar[1,2], Martin C.J. Bootsma[1,3], and Ganna Rozhnova[1,2,4]

[1]Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

[2]Center for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, The Netherlands

[3]Mathematical Institute, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

[4]BioISI—Biosystems & Integrative Sciences Institute, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

[*]**Contributed equally**

[†]**Corresponding author:**

Dr. Alexandra Teslya

Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care

University Medical Center Utrecht

P.O. Box 85500 Utrecht

The Netherlands

Email: A.I.Teslya@umcutrecht.nl

Phone: +31 639315931

Contents

1 Transmission model without disease-awareness

We developed a deterministic compartmental model describing SARS-CoV-2 transmission in a population stratified by disease status (see Figure 1 in the main text). In the baseline model, individuals are classified as susceptible (S), latently infected (E), infectious with mild or no symptoms (I_M), infectious with severe symptoms (I_S), diagnosed and isolated (I_D), and recovered (R_M and R_S after infection with mild or severe symptoms, respectively). Susceptible individuals (S) become latently infected (E) through contact with infectious individuals (I_M and I_S) with the force of infection λ_{inf} dependent on the fractions of the population in I_M and I_S. Latently infected individuals (E) become infectious at a rate α; a proportion p of the latently infected individuals will go to the I_M compartment, a proportion $(1-p)$ to the I_S compartment. We assume that infectious individuals with mild symptoms (I_M) do not require medical attention, recover undiagnosed (R_M) with rate γ_M. After recovery, these individuals are not conscious of having contracted the infection. Individuals with severe symptoms (I_S) are diagnosed with rate ν and know their disease status when they are detected. After detection, they are kept in isolation (I_D) until recovery (R_S) which occurs at rate γ_S. Diagnosed individuals are assumed to be perfectly isolated, and, hence, neither contribute to transmission nor to the contact process. Recovered individuals cannot be reinfected. The infectivity of individuals with mild symptoms is lower by a factor $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$ than the infectivity of individuals with severe symptoms. Natural birth and death processes are neglected as the time scale of the epidemic is short compared to the mean life span of individuals. However, severely symptomatic patients in isolation may be removed from the population due to disease-associated mortality at rate η.

The transmission model without awareness is given by the following system of ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -S(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}E(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= S(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t) - \alpha E(t) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_M(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= p\alpha E(t) - \gamma_M I_M(t) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= (1-p)\alpha E(t) - \nu I_S(t) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_D(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \nu I_S(t) - \gamma_S I_D(t) - \eta I_D(t) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}R_M(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \gamma_M I_M(t) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}R_S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \gamma_S I_D(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t) = \frac{\beta}{N(t)}\left[\sigma I_M(t) + I_S(t)\right] \tag{2}$$

is the force of infection and $N(t) = S(t) + E(t) + I_M(t) + I_S(t) + R_M(t) + R_S(t)$ is the total number of individuals who participate in the contact process.

2 Transmission model with disease-awareness

In the extended model with awareness, the population is stratified not only by the disease status but also by the awareness status into disease-aware (S^a, E^a, I_M^a, I_S^a, I_D^a, and R_M^a) and disease-unaware (S, E, I_M, I_S, and R_M) (Figure 2 A in the main text). Disease-aware individuals are distinguished from unaware individuals in two essential ways. First, infectious individuals with severe symptoms who are disease-aware (I_S^a) get diagnosed faster (I_D^a) with rate ν^a, stay shorter in isolation (recovery rate γ_S^a) and have lower disease-associated mortality (rate η^a) than unaware individuals. Disease-aware individuals recognize the symptoms on average faster than disease-unaware individuals and receive treatment earlier which leads to a better prognosis. Second, disease-aware individuals are assumed to use self-imposed measures such as handwashing, mask-wearing and self-imposed social distancing that can lower their susceptibility, infectivity and/or contact rate. Individuals who know their disease status (I_D and R_S) are excluded from the awareness process since detected individuals (I_D) are isolated and after recovery from a severe infection (R_S) these individuals know that they cannot contract the disease again. Hence we assume their behaviour in the contact process is identical to disease-unaware individuals.

A schematic representation of the awareness dynamics is given in Figure 2 B in the main text. Individuals of type

S, E, I_M, I_S, and R_M become aware of the disease with the awareness acquisition rate $\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t)$ proportional to the current number of diagnosed individuals via information shared by the government or media

$$\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) = \delta \cdot [I_D(t) + I_D^a(t)]\,,$$

where δ is a constant which describes how fast unaware individuals become aware per unit of time. This formulation is based on Eq. (7) in Perra et al.[1]

We assume that awareness fades and individuals return to the unaware state at a constant rate. The latter means that they no longer use self-imposed measures. We propose that awareness acquisition and fading rates are the same for individuals who are susceptible (S), latently infected (E), infectious with mild symptoms (I_M) and recovered from mild infection (R_M). The rate of awareness acquisition for these individuals is a factor $0 \leq k \leq 1$ lower than the rate of awareness acquisition for infectious individuals with severe symptoms (I_S). Also, severely symptomatic individuals are more cautious and, therefore, lose awareness at a slower rate than other individuals. Thus, we use μ to denote the decay rate in compartments S^a, E^a, I_M^a, and R_M^a and μ_S for compartment I_S, such that $\mu > \mu_S$.

The difference in severity of symptoms and state of awareness affects the transmission rates and we define the following matrix to summarize transmission rates between different types of susceptible and infected individuals

$$M(t) = \begin{array}{c} \\ \textit{unaware } S \\ \textit{aware } S \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccc} \textit{unaware } I_M & \textit{unaware } I_S & \textit{aware } I_M & \textit{aware } I_S \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} M_{11}(t) & M_{12}(t) & M_{13}(t) & M_{14}(t) \\ M_{21}(t) & M_{22}(t) & M_{23}(t) & M_{24}(t) \end{bmatrix} \end{array}. \tag{3}$$

Here $[M]_{11}$ captures transmission of infection from unaware I_M to unaware S, $[M]_{12}$ from unaware I_S to unaware S, $[M]_{13}$ from aware I_M to unaware S, $[M]_{14}$ from from aware I_M to unaware S. Similarly, the second row of the matrix captures transmission of infection to susceptible individuals who are aware, S^a. To sum up,

$$\begin{aligned}
S + I_M &\xrightarrow{[M]_{11}} E + I_M\ ,\ S + I_S \xrightarrow{[M]_{12}} E + I_S \\
S + I_M^a &\xrightarrow{[M]_{13}} E + I_M^a\ ,\ S + I_S^a \xrightarrow{[M]_{14}} E + I_S^a \\
S^a + I_M &\xrightarrow{[M]_{21}} E^a + I_M\ ,\ S^a + I_S \xrightarrow{[M]_{22}} E^a + I_S \\
S^a + I_M^a &\xrightarrow{[M]_{23}} E^a + I_M^a\ ,\ S^a + I_S^a \xrightarrow{[M]_{24}} E^a + I_S^a.
\end{aligned}$$

The transmission model with awareness is given by the following system of ordinary differential equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -S(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t) - kS(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) + \mu S^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}E(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= S(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t) - \alpha E(t) - kE(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) + \mu E^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_M(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= p\alpha E(t) - \gamma_M I_M(t) - kI_M(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) + \mu I_M^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= (1-p)\alpha E(t) - \nu I_S(t) - I_S(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) + \mu_S I_S^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_D(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \nu I_S(t) - \gamma_S I_D(t) - \eta I_D(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}S^a(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -S^a(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}^a(t) + kS(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) - \mu S^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}E^a(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= S^a(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}^a(t) - \alpha E^a(t) + kE(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) - \mu E^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_M^a(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= p\alpha E^a(t) - \gamma_M I_M^a(t) + kI_M(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) - \mu I_M^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_S^a(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= (1-p)\alpha E^a(t) - \nu^a I_S^a + I_S(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) - \mu_S I_S^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}I_D^a(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \nu^a I_S^a(t) - \gamma_S^a I_D^a(t) - \eta^a I_D^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}R_M(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \gamma_M I_M(t) - kR_M(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) + \mu R_M^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}R_M^a(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \gamma_M I_M^a(t) + kR_M(t)\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) - \mu R_M^a(t)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}R_S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \gamma_S I_D(t) + \gamma_S^a I_D^a(t),
\end{aligned}
\tag{4}
$$

where

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{aware}}(t) = \delta \cdot [I_D(t) + I_D^a(t)] \tag{5a}$$

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t) = [M(t)]_{11} I_M(t) + [M(t)]_{12} I_S(t) + [M(t)]_{13} I_M^a(t) + [M(t)]_{14} I_S^a(t) \tag{5b}$$

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}^a(t) = [M(t)]_{21} I_M(t) + [M(t)]_{22} I_S(t) + [M(t)]_{23} I_M^a(t) + [M(t)]_{24} I_S^a(t). \tag{5c}$$

For the population where disease-aware individuals do not use self-imposed measures matrix M takes the following form

$$M_0(t) = \frac{\beta}{N_T(t)} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & 1 & \sigma & 1 \\ \sigma & 1 & \sigma & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

with $N_T(t) = S(t) + E(t) + I_M(t) + I_S(t) + S^a(t) + E^a(t) + I_M^a(t) + I_S^a(t) + R_M(t) + R_M^a(t) + R_S(t)$.

Estimates of epidemiological parameters were obtained from previous studies and are shown in Table 1 in the main text.

3 Prevention measures

We considered short-term government intervention aimed at fostering social distancing in the population and a suite of measures self-imposed by disease-aware individuals, i.e., mask-wearing, hand washing, and self-imposed social distancing.

3.1 Mask-wearing

Mask-wearing does not reduce the individual's susceptibility because laypersons, i.e., not medical professionals, are unfamiliar with correct procedures for its use and may often engage in face-touching and mask adjustment.[2] The efficacy of mask wearing is described by a reduction in infectivity of disease-aware infectious individuals (I_S^a and I_M^a) and is represented by a factor r_1, $0 \leq r_1 \leq 1$. The respective transmission matrix is given by

$$M_1 = \frac{\beta}{N_T(t)} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & 1 & r_1\sigma & r_1 \\ \sigma & 1 & r_1\sigma & r_1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{7}$$

with $N_T(t) = S(t) + E(t) + I_M(t) + I_S(t) + R_M(t) + R_S(t) + S^a(t) + E^a(t) + I_M^a(t) + I_S^a(t) + R_M^a(t)$.

3.2 Handwashing

Since infectious individuals may transmit the virus to others without direct physical contact, we assume that handwashing only reduces one's susceptibility. The efficacy of handwashing is described by a reduction in susceptibility (i.e., probability of transmission of infection per single contact) of susceptible disease-aware individuals (S^a) and is represented by a factor r_2, $0 \leq r_2 \leq 1$. The respective transmission matrix is given by

$$M_2 = \frac{\beta}{N_T(t)} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & 1 & \sigma & 1 \\ r_2\sigma & r_2 & r_2\sigma & r_2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{8}$$

with $N_T(t) = S(t) + E(t) + I_M(t) + I_S(t) + R_M(t) + R_S(t) + S^a(t) + E^a(t) + I_M^a(t) + I_S^a(t) + R_M^a(t)$.

3.3 Self-imposed social distancing

Disease awareness may also lead to individuals to practice social distancing, i.e., maintaining distance to others and avoiding congregate settings.[3] Social distancing of disease-aware individuals is modeled as a reduction in their contact rate. As a consequence, this measure leads to a change in mixing patterns in the population. We model the reduction in contact rate of aware individuals by using the parameter r_3, $0 \leq r_3 \leq 1$. Recall that individuals who recovered from a mild infection may still think of themselves as susceptible, which implies that they are affected by the awareness contagion process. They can, therefore, practice social distancing after they recover. The respective

transmission matrix is given by

$$M_4 = \frac{\beta}{N(t) + r_3 N^a(t)} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & 1 & r_3\sigma & r_3 \\ r_3\sigma & r_3 & r_3^2\sigma & r_3^2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

where $N(t) = S(t) + E(t) + I_M(t) + I_S(t) + R_M(t) + R_S(t)$ and $N^a(t) = S^a(t) + E^a(t) + I_M^a(t) + I_S^a(t) + R_M^a(t)$.

3.4 Short-term government-imposed social distancing

Governments may decide to promote social distancing policies through interventions such as school and workplace closures, or by issuing a ban on large gatherings, if the number of diagnosed individuals exceeds a certain threshold. Such a policy will cause a community-wide contact rate reduction, regardless of the awareness status. We model government-imposed social distancing by reducing the average contact rate in the population by a factor r_4, $0 \leq r_4 < 1$. This intervention is initiated if the number of diagnosed individuals is above a certain threshold $\tilde{I}$ (e.g., $10 - 1000$ individuals) and terminates after a fixed period of time denoted $t_{\text{intervention}}$ (e.g., $1 - 3$ months). As such, we assume that the intervention is implemented early in the epidemic. If t_{start} is the time for which $I_D(t) + I_D^a(t) \geq \tilde{I}$, then the transmission matrix is given by

$$M_5(t) = \frac{\beta}{N_T(t)} \cdot \tilde{r} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & 1 & \sigma & 1 \\ \sigma & 1 & \sigma & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

where

$$\tilde{r} = \begin{cases} r_4, & \text{if } I_D(t) + I_D^a(t) \geq \tilde{I} \text{ and } t \leq t_{\text{start}} + t_{\text{intervention}} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $N_T(t) = S(t) + E(t) + I_M(t) + I_S(t) + R_M(t) + R_S(t) + S^a(t) + E^a(t) + I_M^a(t) + I_S^a(t) + R_M^a(t)$.

4 Impact of awareness process on probability of infection

We compared changes in the probability of infection for individuals who are aware and who are unaware over the studied period of $T_{max} = 2.5$ years for various scenarios of self-imposed measures and government-imposed social

distancing (Figure 1). The probabilities were calculated using the following equations

$$\text{Prob. of acquisition by aware individuals} = 1 - \exp\left[-\int_0^{T_{max}} \lambda_{\text{inf}}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right] \tag{11a}$$

$$\text{Prob. of acquisition by unaware individuals} = 1 - \exp\left[-\int_0^{T_{max}} \lambda^a_{\text{inf}}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right], \tag{11b}$$

where $\lambda_{\text{inf}}(t)$ and $\lambda^a_{\text{inf}}(t)$ are given by Eq. (5b) and (5c).



Figure 1. TOP figures were obtained for a slow rate of awareness spread. **BOTTOM** figures were obtained for a fast rate of awareness spread. The dashed red line indicates probability of infection in the model with awareness and no prevention measures.

We observe that when aware individuals adapt mask wearing, the probability of infection is equally reduced for aware and unaware individuals, as it reduces the infectivity of a part of the population. This measure is most efficient when the rate of awareness spread is fast and infectivity reduction due to mask use is above 40%.

In the case of handwashing, the probability is reduced for both aware and unaware individuals. However, aware individuals experience a larger reduction. Handwashing yields direct protection to the aware individuals, while unaware individuals benefit indirectly from the overall reduced infection level. Similar to mask wearing, the infection probabilities for both aware and unaware individuals decrease drastically when the efficacy of handwashing exceeds

40% and the rate of awareness spread is fast.

Effects of self-imposed social distancing depend on the rate of awareness spread as well. While aware individuals have reduced probability of infection regardless of the rate of awareness spread, the unaware individuals will only benefit from it when the rate of awareness spread is fast. This is due to modified mixing patterns that emerge as a result of heterogeneous contact rates.

Finally, government-imposed short-term social distancing which lasts for 3 months has no effect on acquisition rates for aware and unaware individuals. The respective probability of infection is marked with dashed red line in Figure 1.

5 Sensitivity analyses of the transmission model with disease-awareness



Figure 2. Sensitivity analyses of the transmission model with disease-awareness. Part 1.



Figure 3. Sensitivity analyses of the transmission model with disease-awareness. Part 2.

6 Sensitivity analyses of government-imposed social distancing intervention



Figure 4. Sensitivity analyses of government-imposed social distancing intervention. Part 1.



Figure 5. Sensitivity analyses of government-imposed social distancing intervention. Part 2.

References

[1] Perra N, Balcan D, Gonçalves B, Vespignani A. Towards a characterization of behavior-disease models. PLOS ONE. 2011 08;6(8):1–15. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023084.

[2] World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the public: When and how to use masks; 2020 [cited 2020 February 24]. Available from: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public/when-and-how-to-use-masks.

[3] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim US guidance for risk assessment and public health management of persons with potential coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) exposure in travel-associated or community settings; 2020 [updated 2020 March 7; cited 2020 March 9]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/risk-assessment.html.