

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}

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

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

³Mathematical Institute, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

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

March 19, 2020

***These authors 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	Baseline transmission model	2
2	Transmission model with disease awareness	3
3	Prevention measures	6
3.1	Mask-wearing	6
3.2	Handwashing	6
3.3	Self-imposed social distancing	6
3.4	Short-term government-imposed social distancing	7
4	Impact of awareness process on the probability of infection	7
5	Sensitivity analyses of combinations of self-imposed prevention measures	9
6	Sensitivity analyses of government-imposed social distancing intervention	10
7	Sensitivity analyses of the transmission model with disease awareness	11

1 Baseline transmission model

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 .

18

19

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

20

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS(t)}{dt} &= -S(t)\lambda_{\text{inf}}(t) \\
 \frac{dE(t)}{dt} &= S(t)\lambda_{\text{inf}}(t) - \alpha E(t) \\
 \frac{dI_M(t)}{dt} &= p\alpha E(t) - \gamma_M I_M(t) \\
 \frac{dI_S(t)}{dt} &= (1-p)\alpha E(t) - \nu I_S(t) \\
 \frac{dI_D(t)}{dt} &= \nu I_S(t) - \gamma_S I_D(t) - \eta I_D(t) \\
 \frac{dR_M(t)}{dt} &= \gamma_M I_M(t) \\
 \frac{dR_S(t)}{dt} &= \gamma_S I_D(t),
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where

21

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

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.

22

23

2 Transmission model with disease awareness

24

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.

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 A schematic representation of the awareness dynamics is given in Figure 2 B in the main text. Individuals of type
 39 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
 40 the current number of diagnosed individuals via information shared by the government or media

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

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

43
 44 We assume that awareness fades and individuals return to the unaware state at a constant rate. The latter means
 45 that they no longer use self-imposed measures. We propose that awareness acquisition and fading rates are the same
 46 for individuals who are susceptible (S), latently infected (E), infectious with mild symptoms (I_M) and recovered
 47 from mild infection (R_M). The rate of awareness acquisition for these individuals is a factor $0 \leq k \leq 1$ lower than
 48 the rate of awareness acquisition for infectious individuals with severe symptoms (I_S). Also, severely symptomatic
 49 individuals are more cautious and, therefore, lose awareness at a slower rate than other individuals. Thus, we
 50 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 $\mu > \mu_S$.

51
 52 The difference in severity of symptoms and state of awareness affects the transmission rates and we define the
 53 following matrix to summarize transmission rates between different types of susceptible and infected individuals

$$M(t) = \begin{array}{c} \text{unaware } S \\ \text{aware } S \end{array} \begin{array}{cccc} \text{unaware } I_M & \text{unaware } I_S & \text{aware } I_M & \text{aware } I_S \\ \left[\begin{array}{cccc} M_{11}(t) & M_{12}(t) & M_{13}(t) & M_{14}(t) \\ M_{21}(t) & M_{22}(t) & M_{23}(t) & M_{24}(t) \end{array} \right]. \end{array} \quad (3)$$

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,

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS(t)}{dt} &= -S(t)\lambda_{\text{inf}}(t) - kS(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) + \mu S^a(t) \\
\frac{dE(t)}{dt} &= S(t)\lambda_{\text{inf}}(t) - \alpha E(t) - kE(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) + \mu E^a(t) \\
\frac{dI_M(t)}{dt} &= p\alpha E(t) - \gamma_M I_M(t) - kI_M(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) + \mu I_M^a(t) \\
\frac{dI_S(t)}{dt} &= (1-p)\alpha E(t) - \nu I_S(t) - I_S(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) + \mu I_S^a(t) \\
\frac{dI_D(t)}{dt} &= \nu I_S(t) - \gamma_S I_D(t) - \eta I_D(t) \\
\frac{dS^a(t)}{dt} &= -S^a(t)\lambda_{\text{inf}}^a(t) + kS(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) - \mu S^a(t) \\
\frac{dE^a(t)}{dt} &= S^a(t)\lambda_{\text{inf}}^a(t) - \alpha E^a(t) + kE(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) - \mu E^a(t) \\
\frac{dI_M^a(t)}{dt} &= p\alpha E^a(t) - \gamma_M I_M^a(t) + kI_M(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) - \mu I_M^a(t) \\
\frac{dI_S^a(t)}{dt} &= (1-p)\alpha E^a(t) - \nu^a I_S^a(t) + I_S(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) - \mu I_S^a(t) \\
\frac{dI_D^a(t)}{dt} &= \nu^a I_S^a(t) - \gamma_S^a I_D^a(t) - \eta^a I_D^a(t) \\
\frac{dR_M(t)}{dt} &= \gamma_M I_M(t) - kR_M(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) + \mu R_M^a(t) \\
\frac{dR_M^a(t)}{dt} &= \gamma_M I_M^a(t) + kR_M(t)\lambda_{\text{aware}}(t) - \mu R_M^a(t) \\
\frac{dR_S(t)}{dt} &= \gamma_S I_D(t) + \gamma_S^a I_D^a(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where

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

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

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

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.

61 **3 Prevention measures**

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

65 **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

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

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

67 **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

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

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

69 **3.3 Self-imposed social distancing**

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

transmission matrix is given by

76

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

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

77

78

3.4 Short-term government-imposed social distancing

79

Governments may decide to promote social distancing policies through interventions such as school and workplace closures, or by issuing a ban on large gatherings,^{3,4,5,6} 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

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

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

80

4 Impact of awareness process on the probability of infection

81

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

$$\text{Probability of infection of aware individuals} = 1 - \exp \left[- \int_0^{T_{max}} \lambda_{inf}(t) dt \right] \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{Probability of infection of unaware individuals} = 1 - \exp \left[- \int_0^{T_{max}} \lambda_{inf}^a(t) dt \right], \quad (11b)$$

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




Figure 1. Impact of awareness process on the probability of infection. TOP panels were obtained for a slow rate of awareness spread. BOTTOM panels 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.

83 We observe that when aware individuals adapt mask wearing, the probability of infection is equally reduced for
84 aware and unaware individuals, as it reduces the infectivity of a part of the population. This measure is most
85 efficient when the rate of awareness spread is fast and infectivity reduction due to mask use is above 40%.
86 In the case of handwashing, the probability is reduced for both aware and unaware individuals. However, aware
87 individuals experience a larger reduction. Handwashing yields direct protection to aware individuals, while unaware
88 individuals benefit indirectly from the overall reduced infection level. Similar to mask wearing, the infection
89 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 combinations of self-imposed prevention measures




Figure 2. Sensitivity analyses of combinations of self-imposed prevention measures. TOP and BOTTOM panels show the peak number of diagnoses and time until the peak of diagnoses (months) since the first case for all combinations of self-imposed prevention measures as their efficacy was varied from 0% to 100%. The figures were obtained for a fast rate of awareness spread and population of 17 million individuals. The model predicts that the effect of combinations of self-imposed measures is additive. This means that a large outbreak can be prevented by, for example, a combination of handwashing and self-imposed social distancing each with an efficacy of around 25% (or other efficacies adding up to 50%).

100 **6 Sensitivity analyses of government-imposed social distancing inter-**
 101 **vention**




Figure 3. Sensitivity analyses of government-imposed social distancing intervention. TOP and BOTTOM figures show the peak number of diagnoses and time until the peak of diagnoses (months) since the first case for intervention that lasts 3, 8 and 12 months (left, middle, and right row, respectively). The efficacy of government-imposed contact rate reduction was varied from 0% to 100% (y-axis), and the threshold for initiation of intervention was between 1 and 1000 diagnoses (x-axis). The figures were obtained for a fast rate of awareness spread and population of 17 million individuals. The model predicts that government intervention introduced later into the epidemic and imposed for a longer period of time not only delays the peak of the epidemic but also reduces it for intermediate efficacy values.

7 Sensitivity analyses of the transmission model with disease awareness




Figure 4. Sensitivity analyses of the transmission model with disease awareness. Part 1. The analyses demonstrate that the transmission model with disease awareness is sensitive with respect to changes in the delay from the onset of infectiousness to diagnosis for disease-aware individuals and to the rate of awareness spread.




Figure 5. Sensitivity analyses of the transmission model with disease awareness. Part 2. The analyses demonstrate that the transmission model with disease awareness is not sensitive with respect to changes in the relative susceptibility to awareness and duration of awareness.

References

- ¹ Perra N, Balcan D, Goncalves B, Vespignani A. Towards a Characterization of Behavior-Disease Models. PLOS ONE. 2011 Aug;6(8):1–15. Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0023084>.
- ² World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the public: When and how to use masks; 2020. Accessed March 13, 2020. Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public/when-and-how-to-use-masks>.
- ³ Wilder-Smith A, Freedman DO. Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community containment: pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) outbreak. Journal of Travel Medicine. 2020 Feb; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa020>.
- ⁴ Moberly T. Covid-19: school closures and bans on mass gatherings will need to be considered, says England's CMO. BMJ. 2020;368. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m806>.
- ⁵ Cauchemez S, Ferguson NM, Wachtel C, Tegnell A, Saour G, Duncan B, et al. Closure of schools during an influenza pandemic. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2009;9:473–481. Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099\(09\)70176-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(09)70176-8/fulltext).
- ⁶ Jackson C, Vynnycky E, Hawker J, Olowokure B, Mangtani P. School closures and influenza: systematic review of epidemiological studies. BMJ Open. 2013;3(2). Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/3/2/e002149>.