

# Risk Adjusted Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions for the Management of COVID-19 in South Africa

Joshua Choma<sup>1</sup>, Fabio Correa, PhD<sup>5</sup>, Salah-Eddine Dahbi, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Kentaro Hayasi<sup>3</sup>, Benjamin Lieberman<sup>1</sup>, Caroline Maslo, MD, PhD<sup>6</sup>, Bruce Mellado<sup>1,2</sup>, Kgomotso Monnakgotla<sup>1</sup>, Jacques Naudé<sup>7</sup>, Xifeng Ruan, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Finn Stevenson<sup>1</sup>

---

## Abstract

A global analysis of the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) on the dynamics of the spread of the COVID-19 indicates that these can be classified using the stringency index proposed by the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT) team. The world average for the coefficient that linearises the level of transmission with respect to the OxCGRT stringency index is  $\alpha_s = 0.01 \pm 0.0017$  (95% C.I.). The corresponding South African coefficient is  $\alpha_s = 0.0078 \pm 0.00036$  (95% C.I.), compatible with the world average. Here, we implement the stringency index for the recently announced 5-tier regulatory alert system. Predictions are made for the spread of the virus for each alert level. Assuming constant rates of recovery and mortality, it is essential to increase  $\alpha_s$ . For the system to remain sub-critical, the rate with which  $\alpha_s$  increases should outpace that of the decrease of the stringency index. Monitoring of  $\alpha_s$  becomes essential to controlling the post-lockdown phase. Data from the Gauteng province obtained in May 2020 has been used to re-calibrate the model, where  $\alpha_s$  was found increase by 20% with respect to the period before lockdown. Predictions for the province are made in this light.

*Keywords:* COVID-19, South Africa, Risk Adjusted Strategy, Control Interventions

---

---

<sup>1</sup>School of Physics and Institute for Collider Particle Physics, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Wits 2050, South Africa

<sup>2</sup>iThemba LABS, National Research Foundation, P.O. Box 722, Somerset West 7129, South Africa

<sup>3</sup>School of Computer Science and Applied Mathematics, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Wits 2050, South Africa

<sup>4</sup>Joburg Centre for Software Engineering, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Wits 2050, South Africa

<sup>5</sup>Department of Statistics, Rhodes University, Grahamstown 6139, South Africa

<sup>6</sup>Department of Quality Leadership, Netcare Hospitals, Johannesburg, South Africa

<sup>7</sup>Biomedical Engineering Research Group, School of Electrical and Information Engineering, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

## 1. Introduction

Stringent lockdown measures, such as those implemented in South Africa and other countries, have been successful in curbing the spread. Epidemiological control would favor prolonging the lockdown in order to prevent the resurgence of the spread. However, stringent lockdown measures have devastating effects on the economy. As a result, the control of the epidemic needs to enter a new phase, where lockdown measures are expected to be relaxed while maintaining the rate of spread so as not to overwhelm the health care system. This would then allow for a gradual reactivation of the economy.

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April 2020 President Cyril Ramaphosa announced a 5 tier COVID-19 regulatory alert system to gradually relax the stringency level of the initial response and imposed interventions. This regulatory system will be implemented in South Africa from the beginning of May 2022.<sup>1</sup> This system aims to sufficiently contain the spread whilst gradually opening all of the sectors of the economy in different alert levels. The decision of whether to open different sectors of the economy will be based on a number of complex factors including the risk of infection associated with the particular work environment and the overall economic value of the sector. The 5 tiers are enumerated  $L1 - L5$ ; level one ( $L1$ ) is the least stringent and  $L5$  is the most stringent. The lock-down implemented in South Africa on the 26<sup>th</sup> of March 2020 can be equated to  $L5$ .

### 1.1. On Modeling and Control

Mathematical modelling of the COVID-19 virus within South Africa is essential for making informed decisions with regards to the restrictions necessary at any given time. The decision to elevate or demote the South African Alert Level must be made with caution and with all factors considered. Predictions based on an epidemiologically informed mathematical model have been developed in a parent paper<sup>2</sup>. The SIRD model used therein incorporated both latent and dynamic infection characteristics of the virus. This means that the model takes into account both the asymptomatic and symptomatic people infected with the virus in the mathematics. This is crucial because there has been research that suggests that people who are asymptomatic make up a large portion of the total people infected.<sup>3</sup> A detailed explanation on the country specific SIRD models and a global overview of the effectiveness of the various NPIs that have been implemented around the world can be seen in the parent paper<sup>2</sup>. The mathematical model's parameters were fit to the COVID-19 time-series case data for 24 countries and 25 States of the United States and certain important parameters were extracted in order to develop predictions and make comparisons. Each parameter's time variation was captured with a kernel function which was used to characterise the dynamic characteristics of the epidemic to changes in the host environment.

Levels of control were measured by the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT) stringency index. This index, denoted  $p$  in our work, takes values from 0 to 100 and is indicative of the severity and number of discrete measures that have been taken to try to curb the spread of COVID-19. The measures of control

44 of each country within the OxCGRT set are comprehensive and therefore there are  
 45 more than 5 levels of control in  $p$ . It is possible though to characterise the 5 South  
 46 African alert levels in terms of the Oxford indicators S1-S7.

## 47 2. Explanation of the OxCGRT Stringency Index

48 The OxCGRT has developed a valuable database for comparing countries re-  
 49 sponse strategies.<sup>45</sup> The database contains the following levels of control (coded  
 50 using ordinal numbers) and timing for 139 countries:

| OxCGRT Indicator | Intervention Response       |
|------------------|-----------------------------|
| S1:              | School closure              |
| S2:              | Workplace closure           |
| S3:              | Cancel public events        |
| S4:              | Close public transport      |
| S5:              | Public information campaign |
| S6:              | Domestic travel bans        |
| S7:              | International travel bans   |

Table 1: Table Showing Indicators and their Corresponding Responses.

51 Also included in this data set is a Stringency Index<sup>6</sup>,  $p$ , in our notation, which  
 52 provides a single number that captures the overall level of intervention implied by  
 53 combinations of the ordinal numbers S1-S7. The Oxford stringency index is calcu-  
 54 lated using a weighted average of the above seven non-pharmaceutical interventions<sup>6</sup>.  
 55 For each policy response measure S1-S7, OxCGRT use the ordinal value (and add  
 56 one if the policy is general rather than targeted). This creates a score between 0 and  
 57 2 and for S5, and 0 and 3 for the other six responses<sup>5</sup>.

58

59 The OxCGRT stringency index is given by:

$$p = \frac{1}{7} \sum_{J=1}^7 p_J, \quad (1)$$

60 where  $p_J$  is defined by:

$$p_J = \frac{S_J + G_J}{N_J + 1}, \quad (2)$$

61 with  $G_J = 1$  if the effect is general (and 0 otherwise), and  $N_J$  is the cardinality of  
 62 the intervention measure<sup>5,6</sup>. In the case where there is no requirement of general vs.  
 63 targeted (S7), the +1 in the denominator and the  $G_J$  in the numerator are omitted  
 64 from the equation to form:

$$p_J = \frac{S_J}{N_J}, \quad (3)$$

### 65 3. Adaption of the OxCGRt Stringency Index for the South African Alert 66 Levels

67 It is necessary for the South African Alert Levels (L1-L5) to be characterised in  
68 terms of the Oxford indicators (NPIs) S1-S7 so that predictions can be made using  
69 the aforementioned model.

70 The calculation of a stringency index for South Africa will be similarly based  
71 on the average of all the individual intervention measures using Eq.(1). However,  
72 in South Africa it is not necessary to include the notion of general vs. targeted  
73 interventions, therefore Eq.(3) will be utilised for the calculation of individual  $p_J$   
74 values;  $p_J \in [0, 1]$ . This calculation method is used in order to incorporate degrees  
75 of implementation for each NPI (S1-S7) that is appropriate for the specific South  
76 African Alert Levels.

77 The chosen cardinality of the interventions in a South African Context can be  
78 seen in Table 2.

| Intervention | Cardinality |
|--------------|-------------|
| S1:          | $N_1 = 4$   |
| S2:          | $N_2 = 4$   |
| S3:          | $N_3 = 1$   |
| S4:          | $N_4 = 4$   |
| S5:          | $N_5 = 1$   |
| S6:          | $N_6 = 4$   |
| S7:          | $N_7 = 2$   |

Table 2: Table Showing Interventions and their Corresponding Cardinality for South Africa.

79 The above cardinalities were chosen based on the following criteria:

- 80 • If  $N_J = 1$ , there is no need for the incorporation of levels of intervention  
81 implementation in the South African context.
- 82 • If  $N_J = 2$ , there is a need for there to be 2 levels of intervention implementation  
83 in the South African context.
- 84 • If  $N_J = 4$ , there is a need for there to be 4 levels of intervention implementation  
85 in the South African context.

#### 86 3.1. Assumptions

87 The following assumptions are made for S1, S3 and S5 control interventions<sup>7</sup>:

- 88 • The "School Closure" S1 intervention will be a function of both the alert level  
89 and the stage of school reopening.
- 90 • The "Cancel Public Events" S3 intervention measure will be implemented for  
91 all of the South African Alert Levels. This assumption is made based on  
92 the following statement from the South African Government: "The following

93 *restrictions will remain in place after the national lock-down, and regardless*  
 94 *of the level of alert at any given time: Sit-in restaurants and hotels; Bars and*  
 95 *shebeens; Conference and convention centres; Entertainment venues, including*  
 96 *cinemas, theatres, and concerts; Sporting events; Religious, cultural and social*  
 97 *gatherings. No gatherings of more than 10 people outside of a workplace will*  
 98 *be permitted.”*

- 99 • The "Public Information Campaign" S5 intervention measure will be imple-  
 100 mented for all of the South African Alert Levels. This assumption was made  
 101 because the government should not stop distributing COVID-19 information  
 102 and recommendations until the COVID-19 virus is no longer a epidemic in  
 103 South Africa.

### 104 3.2. South African Stringency Index Results

105 The results reported in Table 3 were obtained using Eq. (3). This includes the  
 106 cardinality values  $N_1 - N_7$  and the appropriate  $S_J$  values that align with the level of  
 107 intervention of the specific South African Alert Level. Note that the S1 indicator is  
 108 not only a function of the SA Alert Level but also of the stage of school reopening  
 109 in South Africa.

|                      | South African Alert Level |         |         |         |         |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                      | Level 1                   | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
| OxCGRT Indicator     |                           |         |         |         |         |
| $S1$                 | –                         | –       | –       | –       | –       |
| $S2$                 | 0                         | 0.25    | 0.5     | 0.75    | 1       |
| $S3$                 | 1                         | 1       | 1       | 1       | 1       |
| $S4$                 | 0                         | 0       | 0.25    | 0.5     | 1       |
| $S5$                 | 1                         | 1       | 1       | 1       | 1       |
| $S6$                 | 0                         | 0.25    | 0.5     | 1       | 1       |
| $S7$                 | 0.5                       | 1       | 1       | 1       | 1       |
| Total (Excl. $S1$ ): | 2.5                       | 3.5     | 4.25    | 5.25    | 6       |

Table 3: Table Showing Indicator Contribution to the Stringency Index for different South African Alert Levels. The impact of the S1 indicator is estimated separately (see text).

110 The rationale for the scoring of the indicators S2, S4, S6 and S7 can be found  
 111 in Appendix A. Explanation of the effects of the S1 indicator on the stringency  
 112 index can be found in Appendix B. It should be noted that the S1 indicator is time  
 113 dependent. This is driven by the staged resumption of classes announced by the  
 114 Minister of Basic education. As a result, the stringency index at all levels becomes  
 115 time dependent as well. This is illustrated in Figure 1, where the stringency index  
 116 for each level gradually decreases as classes resume in a staged fashion.




Figure 1: Time Varying Stringency Index for each South African Alert Levels 1-5.

117 *3.3. Further Recommendations for Stringency Calculation*

118 Further improvements could be made by more accurately quantifying the  $N_j$   
 119 values based on a more thorough analysis of the control criteria related to the specific  
 120 interventions:

- 121 • The S2 associated cardinality  $N_2$  can be scaled based on an in-depth analysis  
 122 of the businesses that are allowed to operate at each level to more accurately  
 123 represent what percentage of persons are back at their workplaces the different  
 124 levels.

125 *3.4. Stringency Index Comparison*

126 The achieved stringency index boundaries for the South African alert system  
 127 compare favourably with those of countries around the world.

| Level | Achievable SA Index | Countries                                     |
|-------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1     | $36 < p < 50$       | Taiwan - 38                                   |
| 2     | $50 < p < 64$       | Sweden - 52                                   |
| 3     | $61 < p < 75$       | Japan - 67, Australia - 71, UK - 71           |
| 4     | $75 < p < 89$       | Canada - 86, Germany - 86                     |
| 5     | $86 < p < 100$      | South Africa - 100, India - 100, Israel - 100 |

Table 4: Table Showing Stringency Index Boundaries for the 5 tier South African Alert System with Comparison to Countries around the World.

## 128 4. South African Predictions

129 The predictions performed here conform to the prescription detailed in the par-  
 130 ent paper<sup>2</sup>, where two steps are followed. Firstly, the parameters of the model are  
 131 extracted before and during the lockdown using South African data provided by the  
 132 NICD and the Department of Health. These parameters constitute the initial condi-  
 133 tions for the forward temporal evolution of a SIRD model. Secondly, a SIRD model  
 134 is used by reasoning that the daily recovery rate and daily mortality parameter,  $\gamma_0$   
 135 and  $d_0$ , respectively, remain constant and the transmission rate follows the functional  
 136 form:

$$\beta(t, p) = \beta_f - (1 + e^{-b_r t})\beta_0\alpha_s\Delta p, \quad (4)$$

137 where  $t = 0$  corresponds to the end of the initial lockdown period and the removal  
 138 of some interventions, such that  $p < p_{max}$ .

139 The implementation of new less restrictive measures will yield  $\Delta p = p - p_{max} <$   
 140  $0$ , where  $\beta(t, p) > \beta_f$ . Here,  $\beta_f$  is the asymptotic value of the transmission rate  
 141 achieved during lockdown with  $p_{max}$ , which in South Africa is considered to be equal  
 142 to 100. The parameters  $\beta_0$ ,  $\alpha_s$  are obtained from the data reported before and  
 143 after the lockdown was enacted. Table 5 reports the parameter values used here for  
 144 predictions. It should be noted that due to the specifics of the South African data  
 145 the typical adjustment time, denoted  $b_r^{-1}$ , is about one day, which is too small to be  
 146 attributed to a well motivated adjustment time. Several checks have been performed  
 147 to ensure that this feature does not affect the stability of critical parameters, such as  
 148  $\alpha_s$ . Global analysis of the data indicates that  $b_r^{-1} \approx 10$  days<sup>2</sup>. This value is used for  
 149 the temporal evolution based on Eq. 4. The value of  $d_0$  is chosen so as to achieve a  
 150 mortality rate of 2.5%. The uncertainty of this estimate is 25% (68% C.I.) and it is  
 151 based on a combination of inputs. This comprises a mortality matrix obtained from  
 152 Wuhan data and multi-dimensional data from the Gauteng City-Region Observatory.  
 153 Documenting the details of this study goes beyond the scope of this paper. The  
 154 estimate used here is consistent with the current mortality rate for SA, which seems  
 155 to have stabilised at 2% for the moment.

| $\gamma_0$ | $\beta_0$ | $\beta_f$ | $p_{max}$ | $\alpha_s$ |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 0.022      | 0.28      | 0.06      | 100       | 0.0078     |

Table 5: Parameters obtained with South African data up until May 2<sup>th</sup> 2020 (see text).

156 Figure 2 displays the differential distributions of active cases in South Africa for  
 157 different alert levels. The  $x$ -axis shows time in days. Results are presented in terms  
 158 of the differential fractional distribution of cases. This is with respect to the total  
 159 number of symptomatic individuals. If one takes 10% as the fraction of susceptible  
 160 individuals that develop symptoms and test positive, one arrives at 6 million people  
 161 in South Africa. This implies for Level 3 that, that about 3 million people would test  
 162 positive at the apex. In practice, the number of severe cases that need hospitalisation  
 163 or even ICU usage are derived from these estimates by using inputs from clinicians  
 164 and practitioners.




Figure 2: Predictions for South Africa in terms of the differential distribution of active cases for the different alert levels (see text).

165 One can appreciate the strong effect in terms of the position of the apex that  
 166 the different restrictions have. This effect becomes more pronounced for smaller  
 167 deviations from Level 5 restrictions. This speaks to how the outcomes are sensitive  
 168 to the movement restriction. Level 4 restrictions would effectively delay the peak of  
 169 the pandemic, where the number of active cases would remain small for about two  
 170 months followed by rapid growth leading to the peak around September.

171 Two main sources of uncertainty are considered here. The leading source stems  
 172 from the variation of the parameter  $\alpha_s$ . The statistical error of  $\alpha_s$  ranges between  
 173 2% and 3%. Here a more conservative approach is adopted. The country-to-country  
 174 variation, which is of order of 10% (68% C.I.), is considered to be a more realistic  
 175 estimate of the potential deviation from the linear behavior assumed<sup>2</sup> in Eq. (4).  
 176 The uncertainty driven by  $\beta_0 = 0.28 \pm 0.003$  (68% C.I.) is uncorrelated with the above  
 177 mentioned uncertainty in  $\alpha_s$  and it is also considered here. A sub-leading source of  
 178 uncertainty is related to the uncertainty in the determination of  $\gamma_0 = 0.022 \pm 0.001$   
 179 (68% C.I.), the daily recovery rate. Figures 3 and C.7 illustrate the effect of these  
 180 uncertainties in regard to predictions. Results in Figures 3 and C.7 are given in terms  
 181 of the cumulative number of cases, recovered and mortality with the corresponding  
 182 band. The relative differential distribution for active cases and the symptomatic  
 183 population are also reported. The format used here is the same as the one used in  
 184 Figure 2.

#### 185 4.1. Gauteng Predictions and model re-calibration

186 The parameters obtained for South Africa, shown in Table 5, are initially applied  
 187 to the Gauteng Province data to produce estimate predictions for Levels 4 and 5.  
 188 These predictions are compared to Gauteng’s May data in Figure 4.






Figure 3: Uncertainties of the model for Level 3 restrictions. The upper and lower graphs correspond to uncertainties in  $\alpha_s$ ,  $\beta_0$  and  $\gamma_0$ , respectively (see text).

189 The discrepancies in the number of active and recovered cases were due to a  
 190 fluctuation in the number of recoveries that took place in the middle of May. It is  
 191 relevant to compare the total number of cases as predicted with parameters obtained  
 192 in Section 4 to the data. One can appreciate that at the total number of cases lie  
 193 below what would have been the expectation of Level 4 and even Level 5. This is  
 194 indicative of the fact that adherence to social distancing by the province population  
 195 increased significantly with respect to what was observed before the lockdown. This  
 196 is expected, although it is very difficult to predict. Here we adopt a semi-empirical  
 197 approach where the parameter responsible for the efficiency of the NPIs is re-adjusted




Figure 4: Gauteng province predictions versus data for alert Levels 4 and 5 using the parameters obtained during lockdown (see text).

198 with the data in order to make further predictions regarding the evolution of the  
 199 pandemic.

200 The  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha$  parameters are re-calibrated for Gauteng Province alert Level 4  
 201 data. Towards the end of May the province experienced a significant increase in the  
 202 number of cases due to the emergence of "hot-spots", whose dynamics is different  
 203 and depend strongly on the characteristics of local fluctuations. The dynamics of  
 204 local fluctuations is not included in the modelling here. As a result, the recovery  
 205 rate  $\gamma_{gp}$  is recalculated to include Level 4 data until May 26<sup>th</sup>:

$$\gamma_{gp} = \frac{\sum_{t=0}^n \gamma_{gp}(t)}{n}, \quad (5)$$

206 where  $t$  ranges from March 15<sup>th</sup> to May 26<sup>th</sup> 2020. The  $\beta$  equation for re-  
 207 calibration becomes of the form:

$$\beta_4(t, p) = \beta_f - (1 + e^{-b_r t})\beta_0(\alpha_4 p_4(t) - \alpha_s p_{max}). \quad (6)$$

208 The value of  $\alpha_4$  is then determined through a regression fit on Gauteng's May  
 209 data. The re-calibration parameters are shown in Table 6. It is important to note  
 210 that the efficiency of the NPIs, or the adherence to social distancing, has increased  
 211 by 20%. Figure 5 shows the alert Level 4 modelling for Gauteng versus data with the  
 212 re-calibrated parameters applied. Predictions from for the Gauteng province based  
 213 on this re-calibration procedure are shown in Appendix Appendix C for the different  
 214 alert levels.

|               |            |
|---------------|------------|
| $\gamma_{gp}$ | $\alpha_4$ |
| 0.035         | 0.0089     |

Table 6: Parameters obtained with Gauteng’s data up until May 26<sup>th</sup> 2020.




Figure 5: Gauteng province predictions versus data with re-calibrated parameters using Level 4 stringency (see text).

215 **5. Discussion and Conclusions**

216 While lockdown measures have been successful in curbing the spread, our study  
 217 indicates that removing them too swiftly will result in the resurgence of the spread  
 218 within one to two months. Reducing the stringency index by 10 will delay reaching  
 219 the apex by about 6 months, where reducing it by 20 will delay by only four months<sup>2</sup>.  
 220 The amplitude of the apex increases by about a factor of two by moving from  $\Delta p =$   
 221  $-10$  to  $\Delta p = -20$ .<sup>2</sup> This indicates that post-lockdown measures should be staged  
 222 and the reduction of the stringency index should be slow if they are to be applied in  
 223 a sustained fashion.

224 All relevant parameters that enter the temporal evolution of the spread need to  
 225 be tuned such that the expected peak of the number of cases and ICU usage falls  
 226 below the thresholds characteristic to the country. One can denote a vector of critical  
 227 parameters for which a country’s healthcare system is not overwhelmed:

$$\vec{v}_c(t) = (\gamma_c, d_c, \beta_c, \alpha_c^c). \tag{7}$$

228 It can be reasoned that  $\gamma_c$  and  $d_c$  should display a weak time dependence in that

229 they primarily depend on medical advances, rather than on NPIs. In this setup the  
230 condition for the system to remain sub-critical can be expressed as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_s} \frac{\partial \alpha_s}{\partial t} \Big|_c \geq -\frac{1}{p} \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} \Big|_c, \quad (8)$$

231 where the temporal partial derivatives are evaluated at the point of criticality defined  
232 by  $\vec{v}_c(t)$ .

233 Given constant  $\gamma$  and  $d$ , it is essential to increase  $\alpha_s$ . For the system to remain  
234 sub-critical, the rate with which  $\alpha_s$  increases should outpace that of the decrease  
235 of the stringency index. Monitoring of  $\alpha_s$  becomes essential to controlling the post-  
236 lockdown phase. Equation 8 also serves as a recipe for policy-makers to determine  
237 whether an administrative unit is prepared for the transition from one level to an-  
238 other. In particular, Equation 8 supported the transition from alert Level 4 to Level  
239 3 that took place in the province in June 2020.

240 In the South African case, and given the still relatively low value of  $\alpha_s$ , it seems  
241 evident that it will be difficult to pass from Level 3 to Level 2 in the short to mid  
242 term without a significant increase of the efficiency of the NPIs. The data that will  
243 be collected in July will be critical to understand the evolution of  $\alpha_s$  and its potential  
244 enhancement due to adherence to social distancing measures in a system where the  
245 stringency index moves relatively slowly.

246 Given the emergence of "hot-spots" dynamics in South Africa, it is essential to  
247 implement local dynamics in the model in order to extract the macroscopic efficiency  
248 of NPIs from the data.

## 249 6. Discussion of Control Strategies

250 A brief overview of the model developed in the parent paper<sup>2</sup> is presented here  
251 before enumerating on two broad classes of epidemic control strategies which are  
252 possible now using our work. The model is depicted in Figure 6 where there are  
253 three sub-systems; each of which is coloured differently.

254 The observable dynamics (orange) are what we can actually see during this epidemic;  
255 we know the number of people who are susceptible ( $S$ ), the number of observable  
256 infected patients ( $I$ ), the number of deaths attributed to COVID-19 ( $D$ ) and the  
257 number of recoveries from a known state of infection ( $R$ ). The latent dynamics  
258 (grey) are what we cannot see and must infer; these are the latent infections ( $I_L$ )  
259 and the latent recoveries ( $R$ ). The latent dynamics affect the observed dynamics  
260 through the  $\phi I_L$  term which represents the rate at which hidden infections become  
261 known to us. The proposed COVID-19 control system (green) is depicted as receiving  
262 information about  $I$ , activating the level of control from the list of NPIs which in  
263 turn implies  $p$  and this value of  $p$  filters through the adjustment system to eventually  
264 affect  $\beta_L$ , the latent infection transmission rate. The adjustment system takes into  
265 consideration the typical time it takes to implement and withdraw the NPIs and the  
266 level of effect of each NPI for the population under consideration. As such, if the  
267 decision maker tries to change the latent infection rate through NPI's; the results  
268 will not be seen immediately and we have quantified this fact within our model.




Figure 6: Latent SIRD model with NPI controller of the latent transmission parameter  $\beta_L$ . Extended from Choma et al.<sup>2</sup>

269 Control theory has a rich history of successful applications including space flight,  
 270 computer networking, robotic arm manipulation, automatic military defense systems,  
 271 magnetic levitation of high speed trains and much else.<sup>8</sup> This theory has been  
 272 applied extensively on the present problem of epidemic control.<sup>9</sup>

273

274 There are essentially two options for control given the current NPI framework:

- 275 1. Open-loop (time based) control.
- 276 2. Closed-loop (infections and time based) control.

277 There are a myriad of possible control strategies which may be designed for important  
 278 metrics like, peak infection numbers or time to reach a certain level or total number  
 279 of deaths etc. A follow up paper is intended to address these rigorously using the  
 280 models we have developed and offer multiple options with which to augment the  
 281 current virus containment efforts.

## 282 7. Acknowledgements

283 Authors are indebted to the South African Department of Science and Innovation  
 284 and the National Research Foundation for different forms of support. This includes,  
 285 but it is not limited to, support through the SA-CERN Program and the National  
 286 E-science Postgraduate Teaching and Training Platform. Authors are also grateful  
 287 for grant support from the IEEE.

288 **Appendix A. Rationale for Indicator Scoring**

289 Tables A.7-A.11 outline the rationale for the scoring of the S2, S4, S6 and S7 indica-  
 290 tors in terms of the South African alert levels.

291

| OxCGRT Indicator | Value | Rationale                                                             |
|------------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S2:              | 0     | All businesses are allowed to operate.                                |
| S4:              | 0     | All public transport is operational with strict hygiene requirements. |
| S6:              | 0.    | Inter-provincial travel is allowed.                                   |
| S7:              | 0.5   | There is an international travel restriction.                         |

**Stringency Level**  $36 + (100 * S1/7)$

Table A.7: Table Showing Indicator Scoring Rationale for South African **Alert Level 1**.

| OxCGRT Indicator | Value | Rationale                                                                                                                                          |
|------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S2:              | 0.25  | Most businesses are allowed to operate. Some businesses that have a work environment that has a high risk of transmission are not allowed to open. |
| S4:              | 0     | All public transport is operational at this level with strict hygiene requirements.                                                                |
| S6:              | 0.25  | Inter-provincial travel is allowed, with restrictions on travel between level 1 and level 2 areas.                                                 |
| S7:              | 1     | There is an international travel ban.                                                                                                              |

**Stringency Level**  $50 + (100 * S1/7)$

Table A.8: Table Showing Indicator Scoring Rationale for South African **Alert Level 2**.

| OxCGRT Indicator                            | Value | Rationale                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S2:                                         | 0.5   | A large portion of business are allowed to operate that have a low risk of transmission environment and are large contributors to the economy and jobs in South Africa. Other business remain closed. |
| S4:                                         | 0.25  | Most public transport is operational with strict hygiene requirement.                                                                                                                                 |
| S6:                                         | 0.5   | Some public rail services are operational. Inter-provincial travel is restricted and only possible with valid authorisation for travel.                                                               |
| S7:                                         | 1     | There is an international travel ban.                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Stringency Level</b> $61 + (100 * S1/7)$ |       |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

Table A.9: Table Showing Indicator Scoring Rationale for South African **Alert Level 3**.

| OxCGRT Indicator                            | Value | Rationale                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S2:                                         | 0.75  | A small portion of businesses are allowed to operate that have low risk of transmission environments and are large contributors to the economy and jobs in South Africa. Other business remain closed. |
| S4:                                         | 0.5   | Some public transport is operational at this level with strict hygiene and max capacity regulation. No public rail routes are open.                                                                    |
| S6:                                         | 1     | Inter-provincial travel is not allowed, except for transportation of goods and exceptional circumstances (e.g. funerals).                                                                              |
| S7:                                         | 1     | There is an international travel ban.                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Stringency Level</b> $75 + (100 * S1/7)$ |       |                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

Table A.10: Table Showing Indicator Scoring Rationale for South African **Alert Level 4**.

| OxCGRT Indicator                            | Value | Rationale                                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S2:                                         | 1     | All non-essential services are closed.                                                                |
| S4:                                         | 1     | All non-essential public movement is banned. Only essential workers may use limited public transport. |
| S6:                                         | 1     | Inter-provincial travel not allowed                                                                   |
| S7:                                         | 1     | There is an international travel ban.                                                                 |
| <b>Stringency Level</b> $86 + (100 * S1/7)$ |       |                                                                                                       |

Table A.11: Table Showing Indicator Scoring Rationale for South African **Alert Level 5**.

## 292 Appendix B. Effect of the Varying S1 Indicator

293 The government announced that the staged reopening of schools will not coin-  
 294 cide exactly with the demotion of the alert levels. Instead the staged reopening will  
 295 commence on the 1 of June 2020. This date is subject to change due to unforeseen cir-  
 296 cumstances related to the Covid-19 crisis. The staged reopening will be undertaken  
 297 by periodically allowing strategically paired grades to go back to school in predomi-  
 298 nantly two week intervals. Numbers were extracted from the "2017 School Realities  
 299 Report"<sup>10</sup> for all necessary school level (Pre Gr. R - Gr. 12) student and educator  
 300 information. The "Statistics on Post-School Education and Training in South Africa  
 301 2017"<sup>11</sup> report was used for all the tertiary numbers for students and staff. Data  
 302 from 2017 was used instead of 2019 because the 2019 and 2018 statistics report on  
 303 post-school education have not yet been completed. The *S1* indicator will represent  
 304 the portion of total students and staff, in all levels of education in South Africa, that  
 305 have gone back to work/school. The overall total used for this calculation consists  
 306 of the following sub-totals:

- 307 1. Total number of students in the school system public and private (Pre Gr. R  
 308 - Gr. 12)
- 309 2. Total number of educators in the school system public and private
- 310 3. Total number of contact (not distance) students in Higher Education Institutes  
 311 (HEIs)
- 312 4. Total staff of public HEIs
- 313 5. Total number of students in private HEIs
- 314 6. Total staff in private HEIs
- 315 7. Total number of students in Technical and Vocational Education and Training  
 316 (TVET) colleges
- 317 8. Total number of TVET college Staff (estimation based on CET student/staff  
 318 ratio)
- 319 9. Total number of students in Community Education and Training (CET) col-  
 320 leges



- 321 10. Total number of CET staff
- 322 11. Total number of private college students
- 323 12. Total number of private college staff

324 All required numbers were attainable from the aforementioned sources except for  
325 the total number of TVET staff. An estimate for this number was calculated by  
326 using the student to staff ratio from the CET Colleges in South Africa.

327  
328 The chosen grade pairs, the corresponding percentage of total students and staff  
329 and the appropriate  $S_1$  equation for different stages of school opening can be seen in  
330 Table B.12.

|                 | Population    |                    | Equation for $S_1$                  |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                 | Grade Totals* | % of Total Persons |                                     |
| Stage 1:        |               |                    |                                     |
| Gr.7            | 924167        | 6.0%               | $S_1 = (1 - \frac{10.3}{100})$      |
| & Gr.12         | 661116        | 4.3%               |                                     |
| Total Combined: | 1657888       | 10.3%              |                                     |
| Stage 2:        |               |                    |                                     |
| Gr.6            | 978130        | 6.3%               | $S_1 = (1 - \frac{10.3+12.1}{100})$ |
| & Gr.11         | 892784        | 5.8%               |                                     |
| Total Combined: | 1935262       | 12.1%              |                                     |
| Stage 3:        |               |                    |                                     |
| Gr.5            | 1046370       | 6.8%               | $S_1 = (1 - \frac{36.1}{100})$      |
| & Gr.10         | 892784        | 5.8%               |                                     |
| Total Combined: | 2195289       | 13.7%              |                                     |
| Stage 4:        |               |                    |                                     |
| Gr.4            | 1130949       | 7.3%               | $S_1 = (1 - \frac{49.2}{100})$      |
| & Gr.9          | 894113        | 5.8%               |                                     |
| Total Combined: | 2094711       | 13.1%              |                                     |
| Stage 5:        |               |                    |                                     |
| Gr.3            | 1124312       | 7.3%               | $S_1 = (1 - \frac{62.8}{100})$      |
| & Gr.8          | 971367        | 6.3%               |                                     |
| Total Combined: | 2167757       | 13.6%              |                                     |
| Stage 6:        |               |                    |                                     |
| Gr.2            | 1141325       | 7.4%               | $S_1 = (1 - \frac{77.9}{100})$      |
| & Gr.1          | 1186829       | 7.7%               |                                     |
| Total Combined: | 2408228       | 15.1%              |                                     |
| Stage 7:        |               |                    |                                     |
| Gr.R            | 868389        | 5.4%               | $S_1 = (1 - \frac{83.3}{100})$      |
| Total:          | 868389        | 5.4%               |                                     |

Table B.12: Table Showing Indicator Contribution to the Stringency Index for different South African Alert Levels. \*Grade Totals Include Educators

331 Table B.13 shows the effect that the S1 indicator has on the Stringency Index for  
332 different Alert Levels:

|                 | South African Alert Level |         |         |         |         |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                 | Level 1                   | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
| $S1 = 0$        |                           |         |         |         |         |
| Stringency Min: | 35.7                      | 50.0    | 60.7    | 75.0    | 85.71   |
| $S1 = 1$        |                           |         |         |         |         |
| Stringency Max: | 50.0                      | 64.3    | 75.0    | 89.3    | 100     |

Table B.13: Table Showing Indicator Contribution to the Stringency Index for different South African Alert Levels.

### 333 Appendix C. Additional Graphs

334 This appendix contains additional graphs that are referred to in the body of the  
335 text. Figure C.7 shows predictions for South Africa for Level 4 restrictions.




Figure C.7: Uncertainties of the model for Level 4 restrictions. The upper and lower graphs correspond to uncertainties in  $\alpha_s$  and  $\gamma_0$ , respectively (see text).

336 Figure C.8 displays the long term predictions for the Gauteng Province with the  
337 re-calibration performed with data collected in May, as described in Section 4.1. The  
338 graph assumes that 10% of the population will become symptomatic. The graphs  
339 assume that no changes in alert level takes place. Currently, the Gauteng province  
340 is in alert Level 3.




Figure C.8: Long term re-calibrated predicted number of active cases in Gauteng Province

## 341 References

- 342 [1] C. Ramaphosa, President cyril ramaphosa: South africa’s response to  
343 coronavirus covid-19 pandemic — south african government, online  
344 [https://www.gov.za/speeches/president-cyril-ramaphosa-south-africas-](https://www.gov.za/speeches/president-cyril-ramaphosa-south-africas-response-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic-23-apr-2020)  
345 [response-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic-23-apr-2020](https://www.gov.za/speeches/president-cyril-ramaphosa-south-africas-response-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic-23-apr-2020), accessed on 26 April  
346 2020, 2020.
- 347 [2] J. Choma, F. Correa, S. Dahbi, B. Dwolatzky, L. Dwolatzky,  
348 K. Hayasi, C. B. Lieberman, B. Mellado, K. Monnakgotla,  
349 J. Naude, X. Ruan, F. Stevenson, Worldwide effectiveness of  
350 various non-pharmaceutical intervention control strategies on the  
351 global covid-19 pandemic: A linearised control model, medRxiv,  
352 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/05/12/2020.04.30.20085316>  
353 (2020).
- 354 [3] D. F. Gudbjartsson, A. Helgason, H. Jonsson, O. T. Magnusson, P. Melsted,  
355 G. L. Norddahl, J. Saemundsdottir, A. Sigurdsson, P. Sulem, A. B. Agusts-  
356 dottir, B. Eiriksdottir, R. Fridriksdottir, E. E. Gardarsdottir, G. Georgsson,  
357 O. S. Gretarsdottir, K. R. Gudmundsson, T. R. Gunnarsdottir, A. Gylfason,  
358 H. Holm, B. O. Jensson, A. Jonasdottir, F. Jonsson, K. S. Josefsdottir, T. Krist-  
359 jansson, D. N. Magnusdottir, L. le Roux, G. Sigmundsdottir, G. Sveinbjorns-  
360 son, K. E. Sveinsdottir, M. Sveinsdottir, E. A. Thorarensen, B. Thorbjornsson,

- 361 A. Löve, G. Masson, I. Jonsdottir, A. D. Möller, T. Gudnason, K. G. Kristins-  
362 son, U. Thorsteinsdottir, K. Stefansson, Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the icelandic  
363 population, *New England Journal of Medicine* (2020).
- 364 [4] T. Hale, A. Petherick, T. Phillips, S. Webster, Variation in government responses  
365 to covid-19, bsg-wp-2020/031 4.0, 2020.
- 366 [5] Oxford coronavirus government response tracker, online  
367 [https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker)  
368 [response-tracker](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker), accessed 14 April 2020, 2020.
- 369 [6] University of oxford, calculation and presentation of the stringency index 2.0,  
370 online <https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk>, accessed 14 April, 2020.
- 371 [7] Covid-19 risk adjusted strategy - sa corona virus online portal 2020, on-  
372 line <https://sacoronavirus.co.za/covid-19-risk-adjusted-strategy/> accessed on 27  
373 April 2020, 2020.
- 374 [8] K. Astrom, M. Murray, *Feedback systems: an introduction for scientists and*  
375 *engineers*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2008.
- 376 [9] C. Nowzari, V. M. Preciado, G. J. Pappas, Analysis and control of epidemics:  
377 A survey of spreading processes on complex networks, *IEEE Control Systems*  
378 *Magazine* 36 (2016) 26–46.
- 379 [10] S. A. D. of Basic Education, 2017 School Realities, Department of Basic Edu-  
380 cation, 2018.
- 381 [11] S. A. D. of Higher Education, Training, Statistics on Post-School Education and  
382 Training in South Africa: 2017, 2019.