

RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Mechanistic modelling of coronavirus infections and the impact of confined neighbourhoods on a short time scale

Danish A Ahmed<sup>1\*</sup>, Ali R Ansari<sup>1</sup>, Mudassar Imran<sup>1</sup>, Kamaludin Dingle<sup>1</sup>, Naveed Ahmed<sup>1</sup> and Michael B Bonsall<sup>2</sup>

\*Correspondence:

Ahmed.D@gust.edu.kw

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Applied Mathematics and Bioinformatics, Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Gulf University for Science and Technology, 32093 Hawally, Kuwait

<sup>2</sup>Mathematical Ecology Research Group, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Mansfield Road, OX1 3SZ Oxford, UK  
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

## Abstract

**Background:** To mitigate the spread of the COVID-19 coronavirus, some countries have adopted more stringent non-pharmaceutical interventions in contrast to those widely used (for e.g. the state of Kuwait). In addition to standard practices such as enforcing curfews, social distancing, and closure of non-essential service industries, other non-conventional policies such as the total confinement of highly populated areas has also been implemented.

**Methods:** In this paper, we model the movement of a host population using a mechanistic approach based on random walks, which are either diffusive or super-diffusive. Infections are realised through a contact process, whereby a susceptible host may be infected if in close spatial proximity of the infectious host. Our focus is only on the short-time scale prior to the infectious period, so that no further transmission is assumed.

**Results:** We find that the level of infection depends heavily on the population dynamics, and increases in the case of slow population diffusion, but remains stable for a high or super-diffusive population. Also, we find that the confinement of homogeneous or overcrowded sub-populations has minimal impact in the short term.

**Conclusions:** Our results indicate that on a short time scale, confinement restrictions or complete lock down of whole residential areas may not be effective. Finally, we discuss the possible implications of our findings for total confinement in the context of the current situation in Kuwait.

**Keywords:** COVID-19; Coronavirus; SARS-CoV2; Random walks; Diffusion; Population dispersal; Lockdown; Confinement; Movement restrictions; Kuwait

## 1 Introduction

2 The novel coronavirus SARS-CoV2 referred to by the World Health Organization  
3 (WHO) as COVID-19 (Coronavirus Disease 2019) is believed to have started from an  
4 animal source in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China in December 2019 [1, 2]. Since  
5 then, the disease has spread worldwide, across 188 countries, territories and regions,  
6 making it a global health emergency [3, 4]. On 11<sup>th</sup> March, the WHO officially class-  
7 fied the COVID-19 outbreak as a pandemic. As of July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2020, COVID-19 has  
8 infected 14,960,136 individuals of which 616,769 deaths have occurred and 8,480,064  
9 have recovered, making the total active infected cases 6,480,072 [3]. Whilst most  
10 symptomatic cases are mild, characterised by a persistent cough and fever, a sig-

11 nificant proportion of cases are more serious, where individuals develop pneumonia  
12 - leading to acute respiratory failure, which can possibly be fatal. A combination  
13 of vastly different non-pharmacological measures have been adopted by national  
14 governments to suppress the growth of the epidemic, such as: travel bans, school  
15 closures, social distancing, imposed curfews, household quarantine, complete lock-  
16 downs, etc [5]. The extent to which of these strategies are most effective, including  
17 their timing, is not entirely clear. Although studies have attempted to identify key  
18 intervention policies [6, 7], others have highlighted those which are ineffective [8, 9].

19 COVID-19 is highly contagious and more infectious than initially thought, where  
20 improved estimates have shown that during the early stages of the epidemic spread,  
21 the number of infected individuals can double every 2.4 days [10]. The virus contin-  
22 ues to spread in a similar way to influenza, via respiratory droplets from coughing  
23 or sneezing. Therefore, the primary mode of transmission is attained through a  
24 ‘contact’ process, i.e. if susceptible individuals are in close spatial proximity of in-  
25 fectious hosts [11]. Once a person is infected, for most people (approx. 81%), no  
26 symptoms will show [12]. For others, the time between exposure to the virus (be-  
27 coming infected) and symptom onset, is on average 5-6 days, but can range from  
28 2-14 days [13, 14]. It is also estimated that a virus carrier will typically only become  
29 infectious around 1-3 days before symptoms appear [15]. How long it takes, and to  
30 what extent asymptomatic individuals transmit the disease is not completely un-  
31 derstood [16, 17]. The preceding suggests that given contact between susceptible  
32 and infectious hosts, for an initial period of many days, the only, or at least pri-  
33 mary means of the virus spreading will be from the initial infected individual to  
34 others, without further transmission. This early period will have qualitatively dif-  
35 ferent virus spreading characteristics as compared to the later stages, where newly  
36 infected individuals can also spread the disease. Hence it is of interest to study  
37 the short-time dynamics of infection levels and of the subtle interplay between the  
38 processes involved on this time scale [18, 19].

39 Mechanistic movement models provide an alternative modelling approach to con-  
40 ventional epidemiological models (SIR, SEIR), as a means to better understand  
41 the dynamics of disease spread [20, 21, 22, 11]. One advantage is that the spatial  
42 proximity between individuals is explicitly accounted for through individual move-  
43 ment rules, where susceptible individuals come into close contact with infectious  
44 hosts, and are possibly infected. Therefore, movement behaviours and the contact  
45 patterns that emerge due to these encounters directly relate to disease transmis-  
46 sion. In terms of mathematical modelling, Random Walks (RWs) serve as a useful  
47 modelling tool to track the movement of individuals in a population across space  
48 and time [23, 24]. A basic description is given by the Correlated Random Walk  
49 (CRW), where the orientations between successive steps are correlated, resulting  
50 in a localized directional persistence [25, 26, 27, 28]. This means that individuals  
51 in the short term are more likely to keep moving in the same direction than to  
52 perform abrupt turns. In the absence of directional persistence, the CRW reduces  
53 to the Simple Random Walk (SRW), which can be considered as a special case, so  
54 that the movement is uncorrelated and completely random [29, 30]. In the case of  
55 a population of non-interacting individuals, such movement processes are known to  
56 be diffusive, particularly at large spatial scales [31, 32]. In movement ecology, the

57 CRW is supported by empirical evidence from animal movement data, and thus fre-  
58 quently used to model animal movement paths [33, 28, 34, 35]. However, in the case  
59 of more complicated movement types, such as that observed for humans, the CRW  
60 does not provide an adequate description, but can still serve as a null model. To the  
61 best of our knowledge, no epidemiological studies have considered host movement  
62 as a CRW - even in disease ecology.

63 Another conceptual tool for modelling movement is the Lévy Walk (LW), where  
64 the individual performs short steps forming clusters, with the occasional longer step  
65 in between them [36, 37, 38]. If the LW is oriented during the clustering phases, the  
66 corresponding movement type is referred to as the Correlated Lévy Walk (CLW).  
67 In contrast to the CRW, the movement pattern is much faster, and super-diffusive.  
68 It is now generally accepted that some animal species perform LWs [39, 40, 41],  
69 particularly in context-specific scenarios such as foraging, and known to describe  
70 an efficient searching strategy where resources are scarce and randomly distributed  
71 [42, 43, 44]. Alongside this, there is growing empirical evidence that human move-  
72 ments may also exhibit Lévy type characteristics. Such inferences have been reached  
73 from studies on the daily movement patterns of humans, traces of bank notes, mo-  
74 bile phone users' locations and GPS trajectories [45, 46, 47, 48, 49]. Therefore, a  
75 LW description could be useful to study a wide variety of challenging issues; such  
76 as traffic prediction, urban planning, and in the context of our study, epidemic spread  
77 [50]. Despite the clear motivation, few studies have focused on epidemics in popula-  
78 tions where the host population performs a LW. As an example, it was demonstrated  
79 in [51] that a disease outbreak is more likely for similar density populations where  
80 individuals perform the LW, instead of the SRW.

81 In this paper we use a mechanistic description based on RWs to model the move-  
82 ment of susceptible and infectious hosts in 2D space. We consider the early stage of  
83 epidemic development, during the incubation phase prior to the infectious period,  
84 where it is assumed that the virus cannot be further transmitted. We demonstrate  
85 how different modes of host movements can lead to varying levels of infections.  
86 In addition, we consider various confinement scenarios for both homogeneous and  
87 overcrowded populations, where the movement is restricted to a certain area. Thus,  
88 we reveal whether confinement is effective in mitigating disease spread, at least on  
89 a short time scale.

## 90 **Methods**

### 91 **Random walk framework**

92 The movement of a walker in 2D space along a curvilinear path in continuous  
93 space-time,  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  can be modelled using a discrete time random  
94 walk (RW) which links individual location  $\mathbf{x}_{i-1}$  at time  $t_{i-1}$  to the next location  
95  $\mathbf{x}_i$  at time  $t_i$ . Each location is recorded at  $t_i = i\Delta t = \{t_0, t_1, t_2, \dots\}$  where  $\Delta t$  is  
96 considered as a constant time step, independent of  $i$ . The step length defined as the  
97 distance between any two successive steps is  $l_i = |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i-1}| = \{l_1, l_2, l_3, \dots\}$  with  
98 average velocity  $\mathbf{u}_i = \frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i-1}}{\Delta t}$  [28, 52]. The complete movement path which begins  
99 at location  $\mathbf{x}_0$  can then be expressed through the equation:

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_{i-1} + (\Delta\mathbf{x})_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (1)$$

100 where  $(\Delta \mathbf{x})_i = (\Delta x_i, \Delta y_i)$  is a random step vector for the  $i^{th}$  step along the walk.

101 Any 2D RW can also be described in polar co-ordinates, by expressing the step  
102 vector in terms of step lengths  $l$  and turning angle  $\theta$  (i.e. the angle between two  
103 consecutive headings), using the transformation:

$$\Delta x = l \cos(\theta), \quad \Delta y = l \sin(\theta), \quad l \in [0, \infty), \quad \theta \in (-\pi, \pi] \quad (2)$$

104 with inverse transformation:

$$l = \sqrt{(\Delta x)^2 + (\Delta y)^2}, \quad \theta = \text{atan}_2(\Delta y, \Delta x), \quad (3)$$

105 where  $\text{atan}_2(\Delta y, \Delta x)$  is equal to  $\arctan\left(\frac{\Delta y}{\Delta x}\right)$  for  $\Delta x > 0$  and to  $\arctan\left(\frac{\Delta y}{\Delta x}\right) \pm \pi$   
106 for  $\Delta x < 0$ . The 2D RW can then be characterized by the statistical properties of  
107 the probability distributions of step length  $\lambda(l)$  and turning angle  $\psi(\theta)$ .

### 108 Simple random walk

109 The earliest models of movement based on RWs are uncorrelated and unbiased,  
110 referred to as simple random walks (SRW). This means that the direction of move-  
111 ment is independent of previous directions moved and completely random [53, 23].  
112 For our modelling purposes, we consider each component of the step vector to be  
113 distributed as a zero-centered Gaussian distribution with the same scale parameter  
114  $\sigma$ , so that:

$$\phi(\Delta x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\Delta x)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad \phi(\Delta y) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\Delta y)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (4)$$

115  $\Delta x, \Delta y \in \mathbb{R}$ , with mean  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta x] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta y] = 0$  and variance  $\text{Var}[\Delta x] = \text{Var}[\Delta y] = \sigma^2$   
116 which quantifies the mobility of the walker [54].

117 It can readily be shown that the corresponding step length and turning angle  
118 distributions are given by:

$$\lambda(l) = \frac{l}{\sigma^2} \exp\left(-\frac{l^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad \psi(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi}, \quad (5)$$

119 where  $\lambda(l)$  is the Rayleigh distribution and  $\psi(\theta)$  is the uniform distribution ranging  
120 from  $-\pi$  to  $\pi$ , see [52] for a derivation. For this step length distribution, the mean  
121 step length and second moment is:

$$\mathbb{E}[l] = \sigma \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2}, \quad \mathbb{E}[l^2] = 2\sigma^2. \quad (6)$$

### 122 Correlated random walk

123 A correlated random walk (CRW) allows for short term directional persistence, so  
124 that the movement direction is the same as that of the previous step. For a bal-  
125 anced CRW, the probability of left and right turns are equal, and the turning angle  
126 distribution is now considered as a zero centered symmetric circular distribution.  
127 An example of such, is the von-Mises distribution:

$$\psi(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi I_0(\kappa)} \exp(\kappa \cos \theta), \quad \kappa \in [0, \infty), \quad (7)$$


128 where  $\kappa$  is the concentration parameter and  $I_m(\kappa)$  is the modified Bessel  
 129 function of the first kind of order  $m$ , defined through the integral  $I_m(\kappa) =$   
 130  $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos(m\theta) e^{\kappa \cos \theta} d\theta$ . Note that, other types of circular distributions can also  
 131 be used, for e.g. the wrapped Cauchy or wrapped normal distributions [55]. The  
 132 mean cosine of the distribution of turning angles quantifies the strength of the short  
 133 term directional persistence, defined as:

$$c = \mathbb{E} \cos \theta = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi(\theta) \cos \theta d\theta, \quad c \in [0, 1] \quad (8)$$

134 and in the particular case of the von-Mises distribution, this reads:

$$c = \frac{I_1(\kappa)}{I_0(\kappa)}. \quad (9)$$

135 Note that, the SRW corresponds to a special case of the CRW when  $c = 0$  (or iden-  
 136 tically  $\kappa = 0$ ), as the von-Mises distribution reduces to the uniform distribution,  
 137 as seen in equation (5). Details of useful metrics which are used to analyse move-  
 138 ment patterns, such as the Mean Squared Displacement (MSD) which measures  
 139 the squared beeline distance between a walkers' initial and final positions, and the  
 140 Sinuosity Index ( $S$ ), which measures the amount of turning in a walkers' movement  
 141 path, can be found in Appendix .



142 Figure 1 illustrates a movement path for the SRW and the CRW. With increasing  
 143 mean cosine  $c$ , there is an increase in short-term directional persistence, and the path  
 144 is more diffusive. This demonstrates that the walker is more likely to keep moving  
 145 in the same direction as that of the previous step, with a decrease in sinuosity.

#### 146 The correlated Lévy walk

147 Different types of movement behaviours can be characterized by the rate of asymp-  
 148 totic decay in the end tail of the step length distribution  $\lambda(l)$ . If the end tail de-  
 149 cays exponentially or faster (referred to as a 'thin' tail), then the variance of step

lengths is finite, and therefore the movement process is scale-specific and diffusive [28, 23, 56]. See for example, the case of the SRW with Rayleigh distributed step lengths in equation (5). Lévy walks (LWs) are another conceptual tool used to model movement paths. The main difference between this class of walks, and those prior, is that the end tail decays much more slowly (known as a fat or heavy tail), according to the power law:

$$\lambda(l) \sim l^{-\mu}, \quad 1 < \mu < 3, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mu$  is the Lévy exponent. As a result, the walker can execute rare but longer steps, and the movement pattern is much faster. In contrast to RWs with a thin end tail, the variance is divergent, the MSD does not exist and the corresponding movement is scale-free and super-diffusive [57, 38]. Similar to the SRW, the LW is also uncorrelated and unbiased, and the distribution of turn angles is uniform, corresponding to completely random movement. For a correlated Lévy walk (CLW), this distribution is a zero centered circular distribution, where the LW can be considered as a special case.

Without loss of generality, we choose to rely on the folded Cauchy distribution for step lengths:

$$\lambda(l) = \frac{2\gamma}{\pi(\gamma^2 + l^2)}, \quad (11)$$

which has quadratic decay in the end tail  $\lambda(l) \sim \frac{1}{l^2}$  corresponding to Lévy exponent  $\mu = 2$ . Alongside this, we consider the distribution of turn angles to be the von Mises distribution, see equation (7) with mean cosine given by equation (9). The case  $0 < c \leq 1$  now corresponds to a CLW and  $c = 0$  to a LW.

To compare between a CRW and CLW, with identical distributions of turn angles, it remains to simply relate  $\lambda(l)$ . This can be done by considering the survival probability  $\mathbb{P}(l > L) = \delta$ , i.e. the probability of occurrence of move lengths longer than some characteristic scale length  $L$ , and considering  $\delta$  and  $L$  to be the same for both distributions. In addition, by imposing an optimization constraint such as minimizing the  $\mathbb{L}_2$  norm, one can compute an optimal value for  $\delta$ , and therefore a relationship between scale parameters. As an example, to 'fairly' compare between distinct movement types, such as a CRW with step length distribution given by equation (5) and a CLW with distribution given by equation (11), one gets:


$$\frac{\gamma}{\sigma} = 1.536. \quad (12)$$

See [58] supplementary information for details of this result.<sup>[1]</sup>

Figure 2 (a) illustrates the movement path of a LW, a specialised type of RW composed of clusters of multiple short steps with longer steps in between them [38]. Plots (b)-(c) show the CLW, which allows for localized directional persistence

---

<sup>[1]</sup>[58] compute a relationship between distribution scale-parameters, but consider the probability  $\epsilon$  that move lengths do not exceed  $L$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{P}(l < L) = \epsilon = 1 - \delta$ . In either case, the result in equation (12) is the same.



183 during the clustering phases, with increase in persistence for larger  $c$ . In each case,  
 184 the individual is confined within the square domain, see next section for details of  
 185 the boundary condition.

### 186 Simulations

187 Consider a susceptible population of  $N$  individuals initially homogeneously dis-  
 188 tributed across a residential area  $\Omega$  represented by a square domain of side lengths  
 189  $2d$ :

$$\Omega = \{(x, y) : |x| < d, |y| < d\}. \quad (13)$$

190 How the population disperses in space can be actualised by modelling the individual  
 191 movement paths using a  $n$  step RW, given by the equation:

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_{i-1} + \Delta \mathbf{x}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n \quad (14)$$

192 and different movement behaviours can be simulated using the movement rules  
 193 prescribed by the different types of RWs in §. During the course of the movement,  
 194 individuals may encounter the spatial boundary. We assume that the population  
 195 is confined, so that no individual(s) can leave or enter, and therefore the domain  
 196 boundary is considered to be impenetrable. In our simulations, we choose to rely  
 197 on a 'no-go' condition, so that if any individual attempts to overstep the boundary  
 198 at any instant in time, then an alternative step is chosen at the previous location  
 199 [59]. In the case that the walk is correlated, a new orientation is assigned in the  
 200 opposite direction, i.e. in the perpendicular direction to the boundary.


201 In addition, an infectious host is introduced into the susceptible population at the  
 202 centre of the domain at location  $\xi_0 = (0, 0)$ , whose movement is modelled as a RW  
 203 in 2D space:

$$\xi_i = \xi_{i-1} + \Delta \xi_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n \quad (15)$$

204 where  $\xi_i$  represents the location of the infectious host at each step, and  $\Delta\xi_i$  is a  
 205 random step vector. Note that,  $\xi_i$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i$  are uncorrelated, so that the movement  
 206 of the infectious host is completely independent of the movement of any susceptible  
 207 individual in the population. At each subsequent step, the virus is only transmitted  
 208 to those susceptible individual(s) that are within a close spatial proximity of less  
 209 than a distance  $r$  from the infectious host [21], with condition:

$$|\mathbf{x}_i - \xi_i| < r, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n. \quad (16)$$

210 Since the coronavirus is highly infectious, we assume that the probability of disease  
 211 transmission given a contact is 1. This can be considered as an upper limit of a more  
 212 general scenario, where host-host contacts can lead to unsuccessful transmission  
 213 events, known as ‘near misses’. Also, given that our focus is on the short-term  
 214 dynamics, during the incubation period but prior to the infectious period, we assume  
 215 that infected individuals do not go on to further transmit the virus. However, the  
 216 primary infectious host continues to browse throughout the population, as per the  
 217 RW model, and continues to infect others as a result of further contacts. Levels of  
 218 infection can be computed as the proportion of individuals that are infected over  
 the course of time.



219


220 Figure 3 shows that as the infectious host browses through space, the virus is  
 221 transmitted to those susceptible individuals in close spatial proximity less than a  
 222 distance  $r = 10$ , and therefore the proportion of infected individuals increase over  
 223 time. The blank space in plots (b)-(d) emerge, as those infected are not shown. Note  
 224 that, if the residential area is considered to be 500m by 500m, a more realistic value  
 225 for  $r$  is 1m, which is used in further simulations, and reflects the current public  
 226 social-distancing policy in Kuwait.

## 227 Results

### 228 Variation in infection levels due to host movement

229 Figure (4) shows that the proportion of infections depend on the interplay between  
 230 the susceptible population and the infectious host movement. Plot (a) demonstrates







231 that in the case of slow population diffusion (i.e. low values of  $c$ ), infection levels  
 232 increase at a much faster rate with respect to the directional persistence of the  
 233 infectious host, but this rate decreases with larger  $c$ . This suggests a mechanistic  
 234 explanation for 'super-spreaders' based on the movement of the host population  
 235 as a driver for increasing epidemic spread. In the case of much faster population  
 236 diffusion (i.e.  $c$  close to 1), infection levels tend to remain constant - which is also  
 237 observed if the population is super-diffusive, as seen in Plot (b). Interestingly, the  
 238 Lévy movement patterns suggest that the rapid movement of individuals cannot  
 239 explain rising levels of infection.

#### 240 Impact of confined neighbourhoods


241 Figure 5 (a)-(b) illustrates the free movement of four infectious hosts amongst a  
 242 homogeneous population. In (c)-(d), confinement restrictions are imposed by sepa-  
 243 rating the residential area into four neighbourhoods, demarcated by solid red lines.  
 244 The proportion of infections can be computed due to contacts between individuals  
 245 in the susceptible population and each infectious host. In this manner, we aim to  
 246 assess the impact of sub-population confinement.

247 Figure 6 represents a similar scenario, whereas now we consider an overcrowded  
 248 neighbourhood. Note that in plots (d)-(f), due to the super-diffusive properties of  
 249 the LW, the sub-population mixes much faster with the remainder of the population,  
 250 c.f. with plots (a)-(c).

251 Figure 7 plot (a) shows that for susceptible individuals that perform a SRW, the  
 252 disease spread depends on the movement of the infectious host, with an increase



253 observed for larger  $c^*$ , however, from plot (c), in the case of a LW population they  
 254 remain the same - as seen previously in Figure 4. Plots (b) and (d) confirm that  
 255 this also applies to heterogeneous populations, for e.g. in the case of overcrowded



256 neighbourhoods. This suggests that infection levels depend on the underlying move-  
257 ment behaviours which govern contacts between individuals, but not on the spatial  
258 distribution of the host population. On comparing free movement across the whole  
259 residential area (solid lines) and restricted movement within confined space (dotted  
260 lines), the impact on infection counts is negligible, at least in the short-term.

## 261 Discussion

262 Traditional models of infectious diseases usually assume that susceptible and host  
263 populations mix readily, and fail to capture the interactions between individuals  
264 [60, 61, 62, 63], whereas mechanistic models account for the spatial proximity be-  
265 tween individuals and explicitly model the contact process - which is directly related  
266 to the disease transmission process [20, 11]. Also, much focus in the literature is  
267 on the long term effects of epidemic spread, which is important to address ques-  
268 tions related to disease spread/control and the resulting socio-economic impacts  
269 etc. [7, 64]. In contrast, very few studies focus on the short time scale of infection  
270 dynamics following an outbreak. There is growing attention towards asymptomatic  
271 yet infectious carriers, as they are hard to track and could be a critical factor in  
272 the spread of some diseases [65, 66, 67], however, not much information is available  
273 at very early stages i.e. prior to when individuals become infectious. In this paper,  
274 we set out to investigate how infection levels are driven by the interplay between a  
275 susceptible population and a single infectious host on a short time scale, whilst con-  
276 sidering different types of movement behaviours, heterogeneous population spatial  
277 distributions and the role of neighbourhood confinement. An individual mechanistic  
278 modelling approach was used based on RWs, which is increasingly recognised as a  
279 fundamental tool of infectious disease epidemiology [20, 11].

280 We found that infection levels increased more rapidly for a slowly diffusive sus-  
281 ceptible population with increase in short term persistence in host movement, but

282 remained stable in case of faster or super-diffusive population diffusion. The for-  
283 mer may be more relevant in the context of disease ecology with infectious disease  
284 spread amongst animals [68, 69, 70, 71], whereas the latter is more applicable to  
285 human movement, due to the plausible evidence that human mobility patterns con-  
286 tain statistically similar features observed in super diffusive spread or Lévy walks  
287 [45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 72]. This suggests that the rapid movement of humans fails  
288 to explain rising levels of infections. We also investigated whether there were any  
289 changes in infection levels based on the population spatial distribution (i.e. over-  
290 crowded scenarios) and/or neighbourhood confinement. We found that, on a short  
291 time scale, there was no noticeable difference.

292 The state of Kuwait is a typical example amongst many other countries that have  
293 implemented strict intervention policies to curb the spread of the disease. The first  
294 case was recorded on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020. As of July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2020, the total number of  
295 infected cases is 60,434, with 412 deaths, 50,919 recoveries and the number of active  
296 cases is currently 9,515 [3, 73]. Some standard approaches such as discontinuation  
297 of commercial flights, school closures, social distancing policies, quarantine etc. are  
298 common, whilst others are unique to Kuwait, for e.g. extreme household curfew  
299 timings up to 22 hours, imposed movement restrictions so that residents can only  
300 purchase groceries in their locality subject to prior appointment, total confinement  
301 of overcrowded neighbourhoods etc. For the latter, barricades were set up at all  
302 entry and exit points and monitored at all times by security officials, ensuring that  
303 people were not allowed to leave or enter these areas, except under very special  
304 circumstances. See [74] for a detailed timeline of all government interventions. Al-  
305 though, these strict measures have far-reaching consequences beyond the spread of  
306 the disease, with clear social-economic impacts [64], the swift response by Kuwait  
307 has been recognized and generally praised by the WHO [75]. Given that this strat-  
308 egy is unique, some theoretical questions need to be addressed regarding its efficacy  
309 c.f. [76], and whether they can be implemented at larger spatial scales, i.e. it may be  
310 challenging or even non-feasible for countries with large populations, particularly  
311 in case of cities which are densely populated.

312 Our results indicate that during the early stages of infectious spread, imposed  
313 confinement restrictions or complete lock down of whole residential areas may be  
314 ineffective, irrespective of the population demographics, and therefore other types  
315 of measures are more likely to be beneficial. On a much larger time scale, lockdowns  
316 are known to be effective and there are recommendations that they should remain  
317 in place for a time period of about 60 days [77]. This highlights that there is an  
318 optimal time frame, precisely when and how a lockdown should be enforced [78, 79].  
319 It is plausible that the exact timing may depend on the population characteristics  
320 (movement, spatial structure etc.) and the rate of initial spread, and this would  
321 constitute an important research line of enquiry in a future study. Such informa-  
322 tion is vital for stakeholders (government, health officials, policy makers etc.), as  
323 some countries are past their (first) epidemic peak, and a second wave of the pan-  
324 demic is predicted [80, 81]. One important aspect of this study is that no further  
325 disease transmission was assumed once individuals in the susceptible population  
326 were infected, which is adequate on a short time scale. However, to investigate the  
327 long-term effects, one would need to account for further transmission from newly

328 infected individuals. It would be interesting to analyse the infection dynamics based  
329 on population spatial distributions, the interplay between host movements and var-  
330 ious confinement scenarios on this time scale. Considering this, one could estimate  
331 variations in a key epidemiological metric - the effective reproduction number ( $R$ ),  
332 i.e. the average number of secondary cases per infectious case in a population [82].  
333 In terms of contact specifics, we assumed that those individuals who were in close  
334 spatial proximity of the infectious host to be instantly infected – which could be  
335 justified in the case of highly contagious viruses. A more realistic scenario would  
336 assign a transmission probability, so that the virus is transmitted to only a pro-  
337 portion of those individuals who come into close contact. This would allow disease  
338 modellers to identify and quantify ‘near misses’ and to explore possible alternative  
339 epidemic outcomes given shifts in epidemiological parameters [11]. Moreover, if con-  
340 tact rates and transmission probabilities can be estimated from epidemic/movement  
341 data, mechanistic models could prove to provide a powerful modelling framework  
342 for a broader category of diseases [11].

## 343 Conclusions

344 Our findings indicate that infection levels can vary depending on the movement  
345 rules that govern host-host movement. In the case of a slowly diffusive susceptible  
346 population, the level of infection increases, but remains the same for a highly or  
347 super diffusive population. We also found that in the short-term, prior to when  
348 susceptible individuals becomes infectious, confinement restrictions are ineffective,  
349 even in the case of overcrowded populations. This study demonstrates how useful  
350 insights of disease dynamics can be obtained from a random walk framework, in  
351 contrast to traditional modelling approaches.

## 352 Appendix A: Useful metrics for CRWs

353 The Mean Squared Displacement (MSD), which is defined as the expected value of  
354 the squared beeline distance between a walkers’ initial and final positions in a  $n$   
355 step RW, serves as a useful metric to analyse movement patterns. For a balanced  
356 CRW, this can be computed as:

$$\mathbb{E} [R_n^2] = n\mathbb{E} [l^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[l]^2 \frac{c}{1-c} \left( n - \frac{1-c^n}{1-c} \right), \quad (\text{A1})$$

357 which is expressed in terms of moments of step length  $l$ , mean cosine  $c$  and the  
358 number of steps  $n$  [26]. In the special case of a SRW ( $c = 0$ ), the MSD reduces to:

$$\mathbb{E} [R_n^2] = n\mathbb{E} [l^2]. \quad (\text{A2})$$

359 For a large number of steps  $n$  (or equivalently in the long term), the MSD ap-  
360 proaches:

$$\mathbb{E} [R_n^2]_a = n \left( \mathbb{E} [l^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[l]^2 \frac{c}{1-c} \right), \quad (\text{A3})$$

361 where the subscript ‘ $a$ ’ is included here, to distinguish between the asymptotic  
362 MSD and the actual MSD in equation (A1). Note that, the asymptotic MSD grows

363 linearly with  $n$  and therefore the RW becomes diffusive in the large step limit, and  
364 can be related to the diffusion coefficient  $D$  [83, 84, 85, 23, 86], through the relation:

$$\mathbb{E}[R_n^2]_a = 4Dn\Delta t. \quad (\text{A4})$$

365 Another useful metric is the sinuosity index  $S$ , which quantifies the amount of  
366 turning in a walkers' movement path (tortuosity), defined as:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{u}{D}} = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[l]}{D\Delta t}}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

367 where  $u = \frac{\mathbb{E}[l]}{\Delta t}$  is the mean speed [87]. On combining equations (A4)-(A5), an  
368 equivalent expression for the sinuosity index can be written as:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{4n\mathbb{E}[l]}{\mathbb{E}[R_n^2]_a}}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

369 In the particular case of a balanced CRW with Gaussian increments, this index is  
370 given by:

$$S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{1 + \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \frac{c}{1-c}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (\text{A7})$$

371 where the moments are computed in equation (6).

#### 372 List of abbreviations

WHO	World Health Organization
RW	Random Walk
SRW	Simple Random Walk
373 CRW	Correlated Random Walk
LW	Lévy Walk
CLW	Correlated Lévy Walk

#### 374 Acknowledgements

375 None

#### 376 Authors' contributions

377 DAA, ARA, MI and NA conceived the study. DAA conducted the simulations. DAA and KD provided a formal  
378 analysis. DA, AA, MI and NA were involved in the funding acquisition. All authors wrote the draft and critically  
379 revised the manuscript, and all authors approved the submission.

#### 380 Funding

381 This research was funded by the Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences (KFAS) grant number:  
382 CORONA PROP 31.

#### 383 Availability of data and materials

384 No data was used.

#### 385 Ethics approval and consent to participate

386 Not applicable.

#### 387 Consent for publication

388 Not applicable.

#### 389 Competing interests

390 All authors have read and agreed to the final version of the manuscript, and declare no conflict of interest.

#### 391 Author details

392 <sup>1</sup>Centre for Applied Mathematics and Bioinformatics, Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Gulf  
393 University for Science and Technology, 32093 Hawally, Kuwait. <sup>2</sup>Mathematical Ecology Research Group,  
394 Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Mansfield Road, OX1 3SZ Oxford, UK.

395 **References**

- 396 1. Wu, J.T., Leung, K., Bushman, M., Kishore, N., Niehus, R., de Salazar, P.M., Cowling, B.J., Lipsitch, M.,  
397 Leung, G.M.: Estimating clinical severity of covid-19 from the transmission dynamics in wuhan, china. *Nature*  
398 *Medicine* **26**(4), 506–510 (2020)
- 399 2. Zhou, F., Yu, T., Du, R., Fan, G., Liu, Y., Liu, Z., Xiang, J., Wang, Y., Song, B., Gu, X., et al.: Clinical course  
400 and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with covid-19 in wuhan, china: a retrospective cohort study.  
401 *The lancet* (2020)
- 402 3. John Hopkins university and medicine: Coronavirus research center. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>. Date  
403 accessed: 22-07-2020
- 404 4. Sohrabi, C., Alsafi, Z., O'Neill, N., Khan, M., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., Agha, R.: World health  
405 organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (covid-19). *International*  
406 *Journal of Surgery* (2020)
- 407 5. WHO: Non-pharmaceutical Public Health Measures for Mitigating the Risk and Impact of Epidemic and  
408 Pandemic Influenza. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO
- 409 6. Prem, K., Liu, Y., Russell, T.w., Kucharski, A.J., Eggo, R.M., Davies, N., Jit, M., Klepac, P.: The effect of  
410 control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the covid-19 epidemic in wuhan, china: a modelling  
411 study. *The Lancet Public Health* **5**(5), 261–270 (2020)
- 412 7. Ferguson, N.M., Laydon, D., Nedjati-Gilani, G.e.a.: Report 9: Impact of Non-pharmaceutical Interventions  
413 (NPIs) to Reduce COVID-19 Mortality and Healthcare Demand. Imperial College, London
- 414 8. Munro, A.P.S., Faust, S.N.: Children are not covid-19 super spreaders: time to go back to school. *Archives of*  
415 *Disease in Childhood* **105**(7), 618–619 (2020)
- 416 9. Viner, R.M., Russell, S.J., Croker, H., Packer, J., Ward, J., Stansfield, C., Mytton, O., Bonell, C., Booy, R.:  
417 School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including covid-19: a rapid systematic  
418 review. *The Lancet Child Adolescent Health* **4**(5), 397–404 (2020)
- 419 10. Sanche, S., Lin, Y.T., Xu, C., Romero-Severson, E., Hengartner, N., Ke, R.: The novel coronavirus, 2019-ncov,  
420 is highly contagious and more infectious than initially estimated. Preprint from medRxiv (2020)
- 421 11. Fofana, A.M., Hurford, A.: Mechanistic movement models to understand epidemic spread. *Philos Trans R Soc*  
422 *Lond B Biol Sci.* **372**(1719), 20160086 (2017)
- 423 12. Wu, Z., McGoogan, J.M.: Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019  
424 (covid-19) outbreak in china: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the chinese center for disease control  
425 and prevention. *Jama* **323**(13), 1239–1242 (2020)
- 426 13. Linton, N.M., Kobayashi, T., Yang, Y., Hayashi, K., Akhmetzhanov, A.R., Jung, S.M., Yuan, B., Kinoshita, R.,  
427 Nishiura, H.: Incubation period and other epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus infections  
428 with right truncation: A statistical analysis of publicly available case data. *J. Clin. Med.* **9**(538) (2020)
- 429 14. Lauer, S.A., Grantz, K.H., Bi, Q., Jones, F.K., Zheng, Q., Meredith, H.R., Azman, A.S., Reich, N.G., Lessler,  
430 J.: The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases:  
431 estimation and application. *Annals of internal medicine* **172**(9), 577–582 (2020)
- 432 15. Wei, W.E., Li, Z., Chiew, C.J., Yong, S.E., Toh, M.P., Lee, V.J.: Presymptomatic transmission of  
433 sars-cov-2—singapore, january 23–march 16, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **69**(14), 411 (2020)
- 434 16. Bai, Y., Yao, L., Wei, T., Tian, F., Jin, D.-Y., Chen, L., Wang, M.: Presumed asymptomatic carrier  
435 transmission of covid-19. *Jama* **323**(14), 1406–1407 (2020)
- 436 17. Rothe, C., Schunk, M., Sothmann, P., Bretzel, G., Froeschl, G., Wallrauch, C., Zimmer, T., Thiel, V., Janke,  
437 C., Guggemos, W., et al.: Transmission of 2019-ncov infection from an asymptomatic contact in germany. *New*  
438 *England Journal of Medicine* **382**(10), 970–971 (2020)
- 439 18. Volpert, V., Banerjee, M., d'Onofrio, A., Lipniacki, T., Petrovskii, S., Tran, V.: Coronavirus – scientific  
440 insights and societal aspects. *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom* **15** (2020)
- 441 19. Kucharski, A.J., Russell, T.W., Diamond, C., Liu, Y., Edmunds, J., Funk, S., Eggo, R.M., Sun, F., Jit, M.,  
442 Munday, J.D., et al.: Early dynamics of transmission and control of covid-19: a mathematical modelling study.  
443 *The lancet infectious diseases* (2020)
- 444 20. Lessler, J., Azman, A.S., Grabowski, M.K., et al.: Trends in the mechanistic and dynamic modeling of  
445 infectious diseases. *Curr Epidemiol Rep.* **3**, 212–222 (2016)
- 446 21. Frasca, M., Buscarino, A., Rizzo, A., Fortuna, L., Boccaletti, S.: Dynamical network model of infective mobile  
447 agents. *Phys Rev E* **74**(036110) (2006)
- 448 22. Buscarino, A., Fortuna, L., Frasca, M., Latora, V.: Disease spreading in populations of moving agents.  
449 *Europhys. Lett.* **82**(38002) (2008)
- 450 23. Codling, E., Plank, M.J., Benhamou, S.: Random walk models in biology. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **5**(25), 813–834  
451 (2008)
- 452 24. Gallotti, R., Louf, R., Luck, J., Barthelemy, M.: Tracking random walks. *J. R. Soc. Interface* (1520170776)  
453 (2018)
- 454 25. Patlak, C.S.: Random walk with persistence and external bias. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics* **15**,  
455 311–338 (1953)
- 456 26. Hall, R.: Amoeboid movements as a correlated walk. *J. Math. Biol.* **4**, 327–335 (1977)
- 457 27. Bovet, P., Benhamou, S.: Spatial analysis of animals' movements using a correlated random walk model. *J.*  
458 *Theor. Biol.* **131**(4), 419–433 (1988)
- 459 28. Kareiva, P.M., Shigesada, N.: Analyzing insect movement as a correlated random walk. *Oecologia* **56**(2 – 3),  
460 234–238 (1983)
- 461 29. Lin, C.C., Segel, L.A.: *Mathematics Applied to Deterministic Problems in the Natural Sciences*. New York, NY:  
462 Macmillan, ??? (1974)
- 463 30. Okubo, A.: *Diffusion and Ecological Problems: Mathematical Models*. Springer, ??? (1980)
- 464 31. Skellam, J.G.: Random dispersal in theoretical populations. *Biometrika* **38**, 196–218 (1951)
- 465 32. Spitzer, F.: *Principles of Random Walk*. Berlin, Germany: Springer, ??? (1976)

- 466 33. Kareiva, P.M.: Local movement in herbivorous insecta: applying a passive diffusion model to mark-recapture  
467 field experiments. *Oecologia* (Berlin) (56:234) (1983). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00379695>
- 468 34. Fortin, D., Morales, J.M., Boyce, M.S.: Elk winter foraging at fine scale in yellowstone national park. *Oecologia*  
469 **145**, 335–343 (2005)
- 470 35. Albertsen, C.M.: Generalizing the first-difference correlated random walk for marine animal movement data.  
471 *Scientific Reports* **9**(4017) (2019)
- 472 36. Viswanathan, G., Afanasyev, V., Buldyrev, S., Havlin, S., da Luz, M., R., Stanley, H.: Levy flights in random  
473 searches. *Physica* **282**, 1–12 (2000)
- 474 37. Klafter, J., Sokolov, I.M.: *First Steps in Random Walks: From Tools to Applications*. Oxford University Press  
475 Inc., New York, ??? (2011)
- 476 38. Reynolds, A.M.: Current status and future directions of Lévy walk research. *Biology Open* (2018). Published by  
477 The Company of Biologists Ltd
- 478 39. Viswanathan, G.M., Afanasyev, V., Buldyrev, S.V., Murphy, E.J., Prince, P.A., Stanley, H.E.: Lévy flight search  
479 patterns of wandering albatrosses. *Nature* **381**, 413–415 (1996)
- 480 40. Ramos-Fernandez, G., Mateos, J.L., Miramontes, O., Cocho, G., Larralde, H., Ayala-Orozco, B.: Lévy walk  
481 patterns in the foraging movements of spider monkeys (*ateles geoffroyi*). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **55**, 223–230  
482 (2004)
- 483 41. Sims, D., Southall, E., Humphries, N., Hays, G., Bradshaw, C., Pitchford, J., James, A., Ahmed, M., Brierley,  
484 A., Hindell, M., Morritt, D., Musyl, M., Righton, D., Shepard, E., Wearmouth, V., Wilson, R., Witt, M.,  
485 Metcalfe, J.: Scaling laws of marine predator search behaviour. *Nature* **451**, 1098–102 (2008)
- 486 42. Viswanathan, G.M., Buldyrev, S.V., Havlin, S., Luz, M.G.E., Raposo, E.P., Stanley, H.E.: Optimizing the  
487 success of random searches. *Nature* **401**, 911–914 (1999)
- 488 43. Bartumeus, F., Catalan, J.: Optimal search behavior and classic foraging theory. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*  
489 **42**(43), 569–580 (2009)
- 490 44. Reynolds, A.: *Beyond Optimal Searching: Recent Developments in the Modelling of Animal Movement Patterns*  
491 *as Levy Walks*. Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, ??? (2013). In *Dispersal, individual movement and*  
492 *spatial ecology*, pp. 53 – 76
- 493 45. Gonzalez, M., Hidalgo, C.A., Barabasi, A.L.: Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *Nature* **453**,  
494 779–782 (2008)
- 495 46. Song, C., Koren, T., Wang, P., Barabasi, A.L.: Modelling the scaling properties of human mobility. *Nat. Phys.*  
496 **6**, 818–823 (2010)
- 497 47. Rhee, I., Shin, M., Hong, S., Lee, K., Kim, S.J., Chong, S.: On the levy-walk nature of human mobility.  
498 *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.* **19**, 630–643 (2011)
- 499 48. Zhou, Y., Kot, M.: Discrete-time growth-dispersal models with shifting species ranges. *Theoretical Ecology* **4**,  
500 13–25 (2011)
- 501 49. Gallotti, R., Bazzani, A., Rambaldi, S.: Understanding the variability of daily travel-time expenditures using gps  
502 trajectory data. *EPJ Data Sci.* **4**, 1–14 (2015)
- 503 50. Balcan, D., Colizza, V., Goncalves, B., Hu, H., Ramasco, J.J., Vespignani, A.: Multiscale mobility networks and  
504 the spatial spreading of infectious diseases. *PNAS* **106**(51), 21484–89 (2009)
- 505 51. Buscarino, A., Di Stefano, A., Fortuna, L., Frasca, M.: Effects of motion on epidemic spreading. *Int. J.*  
506 *Bifurcation Chaos* **20**, 765–773 (2010)
- 507 52. Petrovskii, S., Petrovskya, N., Bearup, D.: Multiscale approach to pest insect monitoring: random walks,  
508 pattern formation, synchronization and networks. *Phys. Life Rev.* **11**(3), 467–525 (2014)
- 509 53. Weiss, G.H.: *Aspects and Applications of the Random Walk*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: North Holland  
510 Press, ??? (1994)
- 511 54. Petrovskii, S., Ahmed, D.A., Blackshaw, R.: Estimating insect population density from trap counts. *Ecol.*  
512 *complexity* **10**, 69–82 (2012)
- 513 55. Mardia, K., Jupp, P.: *Directional Statistics*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, ??? (2000)
- 514 56. Ahmed, D.A., Petrovskii, S., Tilles, P.F.C.: The Lévy or Diffusion Controversy: How Important Is the Movement  
515 Pattern in the Context of Trapping? *Mathematics* **6**(77) (2018). <https://doi.org/10.3390/math6050077>
- 516 57. Viswanathan, G., Afanasyev, V., Buldyrev, S., Havlin, S., da Luz, M., R., Stanley, H.: *The Physics of Foraging*.  
517 Cambridge University Press, ??? (2011)
- 518 58. Ahmed, D.A., Petrovskii, S.: Analysing the impact of trap shape and movement behaviour of ground-dwelling  
519 arthropods on trap efficiency. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **10**(8), 1246–1264 (2019)
- 520 59. Bearup, D., Petrovskii, S.: On time scale invariance of random walks in confined space. *J. Theor. Biol.* **367**,  
521 230–245 (2015)
- 522 60. Kermack, W.O., McKendrick, A.G.: A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proc. R. Soc.*  
523 *Lond. A* **115**, 700–721 (1927)
- 524 61. Hethcote, H.W.: The mathematics of infectious diseases. *SIAM Rev.* **42**, 599–653 (2000)
- 525 62. Allen, L.J., Brauer, F., Van den Driessche, P., Wu, J.: *Mathematical Epidemiology*. Berlin, Germany: Springer,  
526 ??? (2008)
- 527 63. Diekmann, O., Heesterbeek, H., T., B.: *Mathematical Tools for Understanding Infectious Disease Dynamics*.  
528 Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, ??? (2012)
- 529 64. Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., Agha, M., Aghaf, R.: The  
530 socio-economic implications of the coronavirus pandemic (covid-19): A review. *Int. J. Surg.* **78**, 185–193 (2020)
- 531 65. Fraser, C., Riley, S., Anderson, R.M., N.M., F.: Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak controllable.  
532 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* **101**, 6146–6151 (2004)
- 533 66. Park, S.W., Cornforth, D.M., Dushoff, J., Weitz, J.S.: The time scale of asymptomatic transmission affects  
534 estimates of epidemic potential in the covid-19 outbreak. *Epidemics* **31**, 100392 (2020)
- 535 67. Chan, J.F., Yuan, S., Kok, K., To, K.K., Chu, H., Yang, J., et al.: A familial cluster of pneumonia associated  
536 with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *Lancet*  
537 **395**, 514–523 (2020)



- 538 68. J.D., M., E.A., S., D.L., B.: On the spatial spread of rabies among foxes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*  
539 *London Series B.* **229**, 111–150 (1986)
- 540 69. Ostfeld, R.S., Keesing, F., Eviner, V.: *Infectious Disease Ecology: Effects of Ecosystems on Disease and of*  
541 *Disease on Ecosystems.* Princeton University Press, ??? (2010)
- 542 70. Craft, M.E.: Infectious disease transmission and contact networks in wildlife and livestock. *Philos Trans R Soc*  
543 *Lond B Biol Sci.* **370**(1669), 20140107 (2015)
- 544 71. Berg, S.S., Forester, J.D., Craft, M.E.: *Infectious Disease in Wild Animal Populations: Examining Transmission*  
545 *and Control with Mathematical Models,* (2018). In: Hurst C. (eds) *The Connections Between Ecology and*  
546 *Infectious Disease. Advances in Environmental Microbiology,* vol 5. Springer, Cham
- 547 72. Skwara, U., Mateus, L., Filipe, R.: Superdiffusion and epidemiological spreading. *Ecol. Complex.* **36**, 168–183  
548 (2018)
- 549 73. Covid-19 updates, State of Kuwait <https://corona.e.gov.kw/En/>. Date accessed: 22-07-2020
- 550 74. Almeshal, A.M., Almazrouee, A.I., Alenizi, M.R., Alhajeri, S.N.: Forecasting the spread of covid-19 in kuwait  
551 using compartmental and logistic regression models. *Appl. Sci.* **10**(3402) (2020)
- 552 75. Kuwait News Agency (KUNA) <https://www.kuna.net.kw/ArticleDetails.aspx?id=2886534&language=en>. Date  
553 accessed: 22-07-2020
- 554 76. Alvarez, F.E., Argente, D., Lippi, F.: A simple planning problem for covid-19 lockdown. Technical report,  
555 National Bureau of Economic Research (2020)
- 556 77. Lopez, L., Rodo, X.: The end of social confinement and covid-19 re-emergence risk. *Nat Hum Behav,* year =  
557 2020, volume = 4, pages = 746 – 755
- 558 78. Chang, S., Harding, N., Zachreson, C., Cliff, O., Prokopenko, M.: Modelling transmission and control of the  
559 covid-19 pandemic in australia. Preprint at arXiv <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.10218>
- 560 79.
- 561 80. Xu, S., Li, Y.: Beware of the second wave of covid-19. *Lancet* **395**(10233), 1321–1322 (2020)
- 562 81. Wilder-Smith, A., Bar-Yam, Y., Fisher, D.: Lockdown to contain covid-19 is a window of opportunity to  
563 prevent the second wave. *Journal of Travel Medicine* (2020)
- 564 82. Rothman, K.J., Lash, T., Greenland, S.: *Modern Epidemiology* (3rd Ed.). Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, ???  
565 (2013)
- 566 83. Crank, J.: *The Mathematics of Diffusion,* 2nd edn. Oxford University Press, ??? (1975)
- 567 84. Turchin, P.: *Quantitative Analysis of Movement. Measuring and Modelling Population Redistribution in*  
568 *Animals and Plants.* Sinauer Associates, Inc. Sunderland, Massachusetts., ??? (1998)
- 569 85. Sornette, D.: *Critical Phenomena in Natural Sciences,* 2nd edn. Berlin, Springer, ??? (2004)
- 570 86. Ahmed, D.A., Petrovskii, S.: Time Dependent Diffusion as a Mean Field Counterpart of Lévy Type Random  
571 Walk. *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom.* **10**(2), 5–26 (2015)
- 572 87. Benhamou, S.: How to reliably estimate the tortuosity of an animal's path: straightness, sinuosity, or fractal  
573 dimension? *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **229**(2), 209–220 (2004)