Covid-19 transmission dynamics during unlock phase and significance of testing

Abhijit Paul[†], Samrat Chatterjee[†], Nandadulal Bairagi[‡], [*]

[†]Complex Analysis Group, Translational Health Science and Technology Institute,
NCR Biotech Science Cluster, Faridabad-121001, India
[‡]Centre for Mathematical Biology and Ecology,
Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata-700032, India.

Supplementary Information

The lockdown starting dates for Italy, Spain, Germany and Switzerland are March 10, 14, 23 and 17, respectively [1, 2]. So, these dates are chosen as the first critical time-point for the respective country. To find the second critical time point, we used the time point corresponding to the peak value of active cases for each country (see Supplementary Figure S1 for Italy) as an initial guess. We first manually searched initial parameters corresponding to BLS, ELS and LLS that give a good fit (R-squared value > 0.9) between the simulated and actual data [5, 6] (see Supplementary Methods S1). We were careful in selecting the minimum number of parameters that have to vary during these three stages. Thus, a global sensitivity analysis was performed to get the minimal varying parameter set and got five sensitive parameters (α, β_0, ν, δ_d and μ_d) of the system (1) (see Supplementary Methods S2 and Supplementary Figure S2). We observed that it was enough to vary these five parameters to get R-squared value > 0.9. The initial parameter set for four countries is provided in supplementary Table S1. We used this initial parameter guess to get an optimal parameter set by using the "lsqcurvefit" function from the Optimization Toolbox of MATLAB (see Supplementary Methods S3). Next we seek for the second critical time point that gives the best result in terms of curve fitting. We were not able to use "lsqcurvefit" for finding the optimal value of the second critical time point because it uses floating numbers in each iteration step. Thus, we defined a new measure MNED according to the basis of euclidean distances between the simulation and actual data (see Supplementary Methods S4). We varied the time-points around the initial guess and measured MNED. Finally, the second critical time point was selected based on the lowest MNED. For Italy, Spain, Germany and Switzerland, the second critical time points are 37 days, 23 days, 14 days and 15 days after the lockdown starting date (Supplementary Figure S3) and the corresponding optimal parameter set is given in Table 1. With this optimal parameter set, the model (1) was simulated for each country and the results were compared with the available data (see Figure 2).

The lockdown starting dates for India and the US are 25th March and 20th March, respectively, [1] and these dates were used as their first critical time-point. Following the

[*]Corresponding author. Email: **nbairagi@yahoo.co.in (NB)**

earlier protocol, we obtained the optimal parameter set (Table 2) and the second critical time point (Supplementary Figure S3) for India and USA using an initial parameter guess and randomly chosen second critical time point (Supplementary Table S2).The unlock started in India from 1st June [3, 4] and in US (New York) from 14th July [1]. So, in these two countries we have added another phase with unlock stage after the late lockdown stage starting from their respective unlock start date, which is refer as the third critical point. For the unlock stage the disease spreading rate of the detected infected individuals is restricted to the rate of LLS, while the undetected infected individuals is assumed to transmit the disease with a rate same as ELS. Accordingly, we fixed the values of β_0 and ν as obtained in LLS and ELS for the two classes respectively (β_{0_1} and ν_1 for detected class and β_{0_2} and ν_2 for undetected class).

Supplementary Methods

S1 Initial parameter and initial critical time-point guess for model analysis

Simulation of the model for each country was done separately. The simulation started with the time-point when the first confirmed case was reported [5, 6] and continued till July 27, 2020. As a first step, the entire study period was divided into two segments by the lockdown starting date of each country, and termed them as before lockdown stage (BLS) and lockdown stage (LS). We then tried to fit the actual data of BLS and LS periods separately with the simulated data. Simulation results showed that the model does not give a good fit for the data of entire LS period with a single set of parameter values. This is reasonable because significant changes in some parameters might have occurred as an effect of lockdown. For example, the value of ν, measuring the strength of lockdown, will certainly increase as the lockdown period becomes longer. We, therefore, further divided the LS data into small windows and tried to fit the model with the real data. Here, we looked for minimum number of windows and allowed changes in minimum number of parameters. We observed that minimum two windows are required to fit the model with the LS data. Thus, we divided the LS data into two parts, viz. early lockdown stage (ELS) data and later lockdown stage (LLS) data, to obtain a better fit of the actual data. In this process, we would get two critical time-points in the considered study period which will divide the whole time-frame into three stages, BLS, ELS and LLS. It is worth mentioning that the strength of lockdown in LLS is higher than its immediate early stage. Thus, we varied the parameter values of ν in the range $0.5 < \nu < 1$ and $0 < \nu < 0.5$ for LLS and ELS, respectively, and set $\nu = 0$ for BLS, and obtained three best fitted parameter sets to represent the entire data of the study period. To get the minimal set of varying parameters global sensitivity analysis was performed by using Partial Ranked Correlation Coefficient (PRCC) technique (see Supplementary methods S2) and got five sensitive parameters (α, β_0, ν, δ_d and μ_d) of the system (1) (Supplementary Figure S2).

S2 Sensitivity analysis

The Global Sensitivity Analysis (GSA) of a system helps to identify the parameters that have significant effect on the system dynamics and can be used as controlling parameters. Here, we used Partial Ranked Correlation Coefficient (PRCC) technique for the GSA. Latin

Hypercube Sampling (LHS) was used to randomly generate vectors of parameter set which were further used for each run of PRCCs calculation [7]. Over 10,000 parameter sets were generated through LHS between the 5 fold up-down range of each parameter, except for γ, ξ, ω and ν, whose upper bounds were set to 1 following the model assumptions. For each parameter set, the system was run for desired time and the maximum level of all the state variables were noted. Then PRCCs were calculated for the parameters with the maximum level of the desired state variables.

S3 Estimation of optimal parameter set

To get the optimal parameter set, "lsqcurvefit" function from the Optimization Toolbox of MATLAB was used. Basically, "lsqcurvefit" attempts to computes those parameter sets which will give the minimum value of the expression

$$\Phi = \sum_i (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2,$$

where Y_i is the actual value at the ith data point and $\hat{Y}_i$ is the predicted value for any parameter set. Here we have to define a set of lower and upper bounds on the parameter set so that the solutions lie in that range. Also, in the input arguments of this function, the algorithm that we want to use for the optimization can be defined. In our case, Y is a matrix of temporal data of active cases, recovered cases and death cases, and $\hat{Y}$ returns the time-series simulation for I_d, R_d and D_d, with inputs initial parameter guess and total time span as total number of data point. Here, "trust-region-reflective" [8] algorithm was considered for the optimization and the bounds of the parameters were defined by the two fold up-down values of the initial values of each parameter. As the values of α, γ, ξ and ω can't exceed 1 (see the model assumptions), so the upper bounds were set to 1 for these parameters. Besides these, the upper bound for ν was set 0.5 for the BLS, and the lower bound of ELS was set 0.5.

S4 Calculation of mean normalized Euclidean distances (MNED)

The normalized Euclidean distance between two vectors x and y are evaluated by

$$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{std(x-y)^2}{std(x)^2 + std(y)^2},$$

where $std(x)$ denotes the standard deviation of the vector x. Here, we have calculated the normalized Euclidean distances between simulation time-series results of I_d, R_d, D_d and $(I_d + R_d + D_d)$ with the corresponding available data of active, recovered, death and cumulative infected cases and then obtained their mean values to get the mean normalized Euclidean distance (MNED).

Supplementary figures and tables

Table S1: Initial parameter and second critical time-point guess which gives a good fit between simulated and actual data (R-squared value > 0.9). For the curve fit we looked for minimum parameters that have to change during the three stages. We observed that it was enough to vary six parameters to get R-squared value > 0.9 while keeping other parameters fixed.

Parameter	**Italy**	**Spain**	**Germany**	**Switzerland**
l	4	4	4	4
γ	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.2
ξ	0.33	0.33	0.67	0.67
ω	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.2
δ_u	0.033	0.033	0.02	0.033
μ_u	0.003	0.003	0.001	0.002
Before lockdown stage (BLS)				
α	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.18
β_0	1.38	1.28	0.64	1.3
ν	0	0	0	0
δ_d	0.019	0.019	0.0018	0.001
μ_d	0.016	0.007	0.0008	0.0045
Early lockdown stage (ELS)				
α	0.17	0.17	0.12	0.145
β_0	0.72	1.15	0.55	0.45
ν	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42
δ_d	0.025	0.07	0.04	0.02
μ_d	0.013	0.02	0.002	0.003
Later lockdown stage (LLS)				
α	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
β_0	0.42	0.42	0.4	0.35
ν	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.7
δ_d	0.033	0.033	0.075	0.075
μ_d	0.003	0.003	0.0038	0.0045
Second critical time-point (Number of days after lockdown starting data)				
Initial guess	40	34	14	14

Table S2: Initial parameter and second critical time-point guess for India and US which gives a good fit between simulated and actual data (R-squared value > 0.9). For the four European countries, we obtained the second critical time points between 14-37 days after the lockdown starting date (supplementary Figure S3). As there was no peak in case of India and USA then our assumption was that the second critical time points will lie between these range.

Parameter	**India**	**USA**
l	6	6
γ	0.4	0.4
ξ	0.3	0.5
ω	0.4	0.4
δ_u	0.033	0.033
μ_u	0.001	0.002
Before lockdown stage (BLS)		
α	0.1	0.19
β_0	0.9	0.78
ν	0	0
δ_d	0.01	0.0014
μ_d	0.0026	0.0035
Early lockdown stage (ELS)		
α	0.25	0.19
β_0	0.9	0.75
ν	0.3	0.2
δ_d	0.02	0.009
μ_d	0.006	0.007
Later lockdown stage (LLS)		
α	0.23	0.1
β_0	0.64	0.5
ν	0.5	0.6
δ_d	0.046	0.009
μ_d	0.0026	0.0013
Unlock stage (ULS)		
β_{0_1}	0.62	0.365
ν_1	0.529	0.724
β_{0_2}	0.659	0.498
ν_2	0.41	0.41
γ	0.34	0.34
ω	0.33	0.2
δ_d	0.048	0.0087
δ_u	0.04	0.033
μ_d	0.0023	0.0013
μ_u	0.0012	0.002
Second critical time-point (Number of days after lockdown starting data)		
Initial guess	21	21



Figure S1: In Italy, the first confirmed cases was reported on 31st January, 2020 and the lockdown started on 10th March. So 31st January to 10th March is the before lockdown stage (BLS). The peak in active cases was attained on 19th April (40 days after the lockdown starting date). So, we considered the early lockdown stage (ELS) period as 11th March to 19th April and the later lockdown stage (LLS) is the period from 20th April to the end of study period. Hence, 10th March and 19th April are, respectively, considered as the first and second critical time-points for Italy.



Figure S2: Global sensitivity analysis (GSA) was performed for all the four countries to get the minimal varying parameter set. PRCC values of each parameters are represented by the length of the bar for each of the state variables. There are five common parameters (α, β_0, ν, δ_d and μ_d) that are sensitive to all the four countries.



Figure S3: Variation in the mean normalized Euclidean distances (MNED) between simulation result and actual data with respect to the changes in second critical time-point around the initial guess. Initial guess of second critical time-points for Italy, Spain, Germany, Switzerland, India and US were respectively 40, 34, 14, 14, 21 and 21 days after the lockdown starting date. Here, the red circled points represent the day where minimum value of MNED were obtained and these dates were further selected as the revised second critical time-point.

References

[1] National responses to the Covid-19 pandemic. *https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_responses_to_the_Covid-19_pandemic#United_States*.

[2] Covid-19 pandemic in Switzerland. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Covid-19_pandemic_in_Switzerland#Government_response.

[3] https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/mha-issues-guidelines-lockdown-5-coronavirus-covid19-open-closed-containment-zones-hotspots-1683744-2020-05-30.

[4] https://english.jagran.com/india/religious-places-hotels-restaurants-and-malls-to-open-from-june-8-as-centre-issues-phase-wise-guidelines-for-lockdown5-10012421.

[5] 2019 Novel Coronavirus Covid-19 (2019-nCoV) Data Repository by Johns Hopkins CSSE. https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/Covid-19

[6] John Hopkins University, "Coronavirus Map," John Hopkins University, 17 March 2020. [Online]. Available: https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html.

[7] Blower SM, Dowlatabadi H. Sensitivity and uncertainty analysis of complex models of disease transmission: an HIV model, as an example. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*. 1994 Aug 1:229-243.

[8] Coleman, T.F. and Y. Li. "An Interior, Trust Region Approach for Nonlinear Minimization Subject to Bounds." SIAM Journal on Optimization, Vol. 6, 1996, pp. 418–445.