

# Initial Model for USA CoVID-19 Resurgence

Genghmun Eng

PhD Physics 1978, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
geng001@socal.rr.com

September 4, 2020

## Abstract

Early CoVID-19 growth obeys:  $N\{\hat{t}\} = N_I \exp[+K_o \hat{t}]$ , with  $K_o = [(\ln 2)/(t_{dbl})]$ , where  $t_{dbl}$  is the pandemic growth *doubling time*. Given  $N\{\hat{t}\}$ , the daily number of new CoVID-19 cases is  $\rho\{\hat{t}\} = dN\{\hat{t}\}/d\hat{t}$ . Implementing society-wide *Social Distancing* increases the  $t_{dbl}$  *doubling time*, and a linear function of time for  $t_{dbl}$  was used in our *Initial Model*:

$$N_o[t] = \mathbf{1} \exp[+K_A t / (1 + \gamma_o t)] \equiv e^{+G_o} \exp(-Z_o[t]),$$

to describe these changes, where the  $[t]$ -axis is time-shifted from the  $\{\hat{t}\}$ -axis back to the pandemic start, and  $G_o \equiv [K_A/\gamma_o]$ . While this  $N_o[t]$  successfully modeled the USA CoVID-19 progress from 3/2020 to 6/2020, this equation could not easily model some quickly decreasing  $\rho[t]$  cases ("*fast pandemic shutoff*"), indicating that a second process was involved. This situation was most evident in the initial CoVID-19 data from *China*, *South Korea*, and *Italy*. Modifying  $Z_o[t]$  to allow exponential cutoffs:

$$Z_A[t] \equiv +[G_o / (1 + \gamma_o t)] [\exp(-\delta_o t)] = Z_o[t] \exp(-\delta_o t),$$

$$N_A[t] = e^{+G_o} \exp(-Z_A[t]),$$

resulted in an *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM)* that significantly improved data fits for these cases.

After 6/2020, many regions of the USA "*opened up*", loosening their *Social Distancing* requirements, which led to a sudden USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence*. Extrapolating the USA  $N_o[t]$  3/2020-6/2020 results to 9/2020 as an *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)*, and subtracting this *IMB* from the newer USA data gives a *Resurgence Only* function, which is analyzed here. This USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* function differs significantly from the  $N_o[t]$  *IMB* functional form, but it was well-modeled by the  $N_A[t]$  *fast pandemic shutoff* function. These results indicate that: (a) the gradual increase in  $t_{dbl}$  *doubling time* from society-wide shut-downs is likely due to eliminating of a large number of population gathering points that could have enabled CoVID-19 spread; and (b) having a non-zero  $\delta_o$  *fast pandemic shutoff* is likely due to more people wearing masks more often [with 12 Figures].

# 1 Introduction

The CoVID-19 pandemic started late in 2019, becoming world-wide in early 2020, with CoVID-19 spread evolving differently in various areas. Many publicly available databases were set up to track the disease, to assist epidemiologists, scientists, and policy makers in visualizing CoVID-19 spread. The widely available *bing.com*<sup>1</sup> CoVID-19 database was used here. These databases underpin model projections, allowing quick evaluation of how different inputs affect the predicted outcome. Our goal was to empirically model a wide range of data with a small number of parameters, where different values for these parameters could span the range of observed CoVID-19 evolution among regions.

The  $N\{\hat{t}\}$  number of CoVID-19 cases starts with an exponential growth:

$$N\{\hat{t}\} \approx N_I \exp[+K_o \hat{t}], \quad [1.1a]$$

$$K_o \equiv (\ln 2) / t_{dbl}, \quad [1.1b]$$

$$dN\{\hat{t}\} / d\hat{t} = +K_o N\{\hat{t}\}, \quad [1.1c]$$

where  $N_I$  at time  $\hat{t} = 0$  is the number of infected people,  $K_o$  is a *rate constant* for how fast an infected person spreads CoVID-19 to others, and  $t_{dbl}$  is the pandemic *doubling time*. This is the basis for a large number of **SEIR** (*Susceptible, Exposed, Infected, and Recovered or Removed*) pandemic models, which are often implemented as systems of local differential equations.

Implementing society-wide measures for non-infected people is inherently a non-local process. How it impacts pandemic spread is often not the main focus of **SEIR** models, which are local. However, when governments mandated *Social Distancing*, starting with shut-down of large-scale gathering places at some  $\hat{t} = 0$  point, the  $N\{\hat{t}\}$  response was fairly quick. Within days, the  $t_{dbl}$  was empirically observed to gradually lengthen, likely due to these shut-downs preventing a large number of people from gathering together and spreading CoVID-19.

Our prior work<sup>2-3</sup> showed that an *Initial Model*<sup>2</sup>, with a linear function of time for gradual  $t_{dbl}$  changes:

$$N\{\hat{t}\} = N_I \exp[+K_o \hat{t} / (1 + \alpha_S \hat{t})], \quad [1.2a]$$

$$\lim_{\hat{t} \rightarrow \infty} [N\{\hat{t}\}] = N_I \exp[+K_o / \alpha_S], \quad [1.2b]$$

successfully fit a lot of early CoVID-19 pandemic data. More importantly, Eq. [1.2b] showed that this *Initial Model* allows for CoVID-19 pandemic shut-off, prior to infecting the whole population.

An exception was CoVID-19 spread in Italy, having a much faster pandemic shut-off than Eq. [1.2a] predicted. We attributed this to a second CoVID-19 mitigation process that was modeled with a  $\delta_o$  exponential decay time constant:

$$U_A\{\hat{t}\} \sim \exp(-\delta_o \hat{t}), \quad [1.3]$$

where  $\delta_o = 0$  is the absence of this second process. Including this second process<sup>4</sup> gave an *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM)*, which then successfully modeled CoVID-19 spread in Italy.

While the *Initial Model*<sup>2-3</sup> successfully predicted the USA CoVID-19 evolution from March 2020 through early June 2020, widespread "opening-up" of various gathering places (such as *local bars* and *hair and nail salons*) in mid-June 2020 created a large-scale USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence*.

A new model for USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* is developed here. Our prior (3/2020-6/2020) USA CoVID-19 function was used as an *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)*. This *IMB* was projected out to 9/2020, and subtracted from all follow-on USA data, to give a *Resurgence Only* function. As detailed next, the number of USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* cases can substantially exceed the expected pre-*Resurgence* total. More importantly, this CoVID-19 *Resurgence* was also found to require a  $\delta_o \neq 0$  *EIM* in order to achieve a good data fit.

This  $\delta_o \neq 0$  result is similar to the prior analysis of CoVID-19 spread in Italy<sup>4</sup>. The fact that the  $\delta_o \neq 0$  *EIM* function is needed to model *Resurgence*, instead of an Eq. [1.2a] *IMB*-type function, helps to identify the CoVID-19 second process. After the *Social Distancing* period of 3/20-6/20, new post-6/20 society-wide recommendations or mandates to wear masks were put in place, which likely gives rise to this faster *Resurgence* pandemic shut-off.

## 2 Background

Let  $N\{\hat{t}\}$  model the total number  $N_{data}\{\hat{t}\}$  of CoVID-19 cases in a locality, with  $N_{data}\{\hat{t}\}$  having end-points  $\{N_I, N_F\}$ . Then  $N\{\hat{t} = 0\} = N_I$ , and:

$$N\{\hat{t}\} = \int_{t^*=0}^{t^*=\hat{t}} \rho\{t^*\} dt^* + N_I, \quad [2.1a]$$

$$\rho\{\hat{t}\} = dN\{\hat{t}\} / d\hat{t}, \quad [2.1b]$$

where  $\rho\{\hat{t}\}$  is the predicted number of daily new CoVID-19 cases. Early CoVID-19 growth obeys  $N\{\hat{t}\} \approx N_I \exp[+K_o \hat{t}]$ , with  $K_o = [(\ln 2)/t_{dbl}]$ , where  $t_{dbl}$  is the pandemic *doubling time*, but if society-wide *Social Distancing* starts at  $\hat{t} = 0$ , then  $t_{dbl}$  can lengthen for  $\hat{t} > 0$ . The prior  $\hat{t} < 0$  exponential growth phase, before *Social Distancing* started, is not applicable for estimating *Social Distancing* parameters.

Our *Initial Model* for CoVID-19 spread and  $t_{dbl}$  lengthening<sup>2-3</sup> is given in the above Eqs. [1.2a]-[1.2b]. In Eq. [1.2a], different  $N_I$  values alter the  $\hat{t} = 0$  points. However, all these time axes can be shifted to a new  $t = 0$  point that estimates the CoVID-19 pandemic start:

$$N_o[t] = \mathbf{1} \exp[+K_A t / (1 + \gamma_o t)] \equiv \exp[+G_o] \exp(-Z_o[t]), \quad [2.2a]$$

$$Z_o[t] = +[G_o / (1 + \gamma_o t)], \quad [2.2b]$$

$$G_o \equiv (K_A / \gamma_o), \quad [2.2c]$$

$$\rho_o[t] \equiv dN_o[t] / dt, \quad [2.2d]$$

along with the boundary conditions that  $N_o[t = t_I] \approx N_I$  and  $N_o[t = t_F] \approx N_F$  occur over the  $(t_F - t_I)$  time interval. The  $t_I$  value is set by the prior  $\{K_o, \alpha_S\}$  values. Specifically, at  $\hat{t} = [-t_I]$ , Eq. [1.2b] must give:

$$\mathbf{1} \equiv N_I \exp\{+K_o [-t_I] / (1 + \alpha_S [-t_I])\}, \quad [2.3]$$

which then individually sets  $\{t_I, t_F\}$  as follows:

$$t_I = \ln(N_I) / [K_o + \alpha_S \ln(N_I)], \quad [2.4a]$$

$$t_F = \ln(N_I) / [K_o + \alpha_S \ln(N_I)] + (t_F - t_I), \quad [2.4b]$$

with the  $\{N_I, t_I, N_F, t_F\}$  group uniquely determining  $\{\bar{K}_A, \bar{\gamma}_o\}$ :

$$\gamma_o = \{[\ln(N_I) / t_I] - [\ln(N_F) / t_F]\} / [\ln(N_F) - \ln(N_I)], \quad [2.5a]$$

$$K_A = [(1 / t_I) - (1 / t_F)] / \{[1 / \ln(N_I)] - [1 / \ln(N_F)]\}, \quad [2.5b]$$

which sets the Eq. [2.2b]  $Z_o[t]$  function. The total number of cases ( $N_{\max}^o$ ) at the pandemic end, and the long-time tail for  $\rho_o[t]$  are each given by:

$$N_o[t \rightarrow \infty, Z_o \rightarrow 0] \approx \mathbf{1} \exp[+K_A / \gamma_o] = \exp[+G_o] \equiv N_{\max}^o, \quad [2.6a]$$

$$\rho_o[t] = dN_o[t] / dt \approx N_o[t] [G_o \gamma_o / (1 + \gamma_o t)^2] \rightarrow N_{\max}^o \{G_o / [\gamma_o t^2]\}. \quad [2.6b]$$

The  $\{0 < t < t_I\}$  period, prior to *Social Distancing* start, estimates what the pandemic would have looked like, had *Social Distancing* begun at  $t = 0$ .

Using USA CoVID-19 data from *bing.com*<sup>1</sup> from 3/21/2020 through 6/7/2020, we derived the following *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)* best fit as shown in **Figs. 1-2**, using these parameter values:

pre- Resurgence	Initial Model Value	Date or Parameter	# Cases or Value
$t = 0$	0.0 days	3/11/2020	$N_{00} \approx 1$
data $t_I =$	9.936 days	3/21/2020	$N_I = 23,710$
data $t_F =$	87.936 days	6/7/2020	$N_F = 1,920,628$
calc. $t_{Peak} =$	34.936 days	4/15/2020	$(\rho_o[t_{Peak}] \approx)$ <b>30,727 / day</b>
$(N_{\max}^o) =$	4,499,494 cases	Max.# cases	4,499,494
calc. $K_o =$	0.347169 /day	calc. $K_A =$	2.960744 /day
calc. $\alpha_S =$	0.06618 /day	calc. $\gamma_o =$	0.193267 /day
$(\frac{[K_o / \alpha_S]^+}{\ln(N_I)}) =$	15.31948	$(\frac{[K_A / \gamma_o]^+}{\ln(N_{00})}) =$	15.31945

[2.7]

Shortly after 6/7/2020, many states and cities around the USA "opened up" nearly simultaneously, loosening *Social Distancing* restrictions. This optimistic action led to a sudden USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence*.

### 3 Initial Model for CoVID-19 Resurgence

To model CoVID-19 *Resurgence*, the **Figs. 1-2** *IMB* curve values were subtracted from the new USA data totals. When the total number of CoVID-19 *Resurgence* cases,  $\bar{N}_{data}\{\hat{t}'\}$ , showed a trend above the *IMB* baseline, then  $\{\bar{N}_I, \bar{N}_F\}$  could be used as the  $\bar{N}_{data}\{\hat{t}'\}$  data end-points. Let  $\bar{N}\{\hat{t}'\}$  model this CoVID-19 *Resurgence* data, so that  $\bar{N}\{\hat{t}' = 0\} = \bar{N}_I$ . Then:

$$\bar{N}\{\hat{t}'\} = \int_{t^*=0}^{t^*=\hat{t}'} \bar{\rho}\{t^*\} dt^* + \bar{N}_I, \quad [3.1a]$$

$$\bar{\rho}\{\hat{t}'\} = d\bar{N}\{\hat{t}'\} / d\hat{t}', \quad [3.1b]$$

where  $\bar{\rho}\{\hat{t}'\}$  is the predicted number of daily new CoVID-19 *Resurgence* cases. Early CoVID-19 *Resurgence* can obey  $\bar{N}\{\hat{t}'\} \approx \bar{N}_I \exp[+\bar{K}_o \hat{t}']$ , where  $\bar{K}_o = [(\ln 2) / \bar{t}_{dbl}]$  and  $\bar{t}_{dbl}$  is the pandemic *Resurgence doubling time*. Using an *Initial Resurgence Model (IRM)* that parallels the prior section *IMB* gives:

$$\bar{N}\{\hat{t}'\} = \bar{N}_I \exp[+\bar{K}_o \hat{t}' / (1 + \bar{\alpha}_S \hat{t}')], \quad [3.2a]$$

$$\text{Lim}_{\hat{t}' \rightarrow \infty} [\bar{N}\{\hat{t}'\}] = \bar{N}_I \exp[+\bar{K}_o / \bar{\alpha}_S]. \quad [3.2b]$$

The best  $\{\bar{K}_o, \bar{\alpha}_S\}$  are set by minimizing the *rms* error between the Eq. [3.2a] function and the measured CoVID-19 *Resurgence* data. In Eq. [3.2a], the  $\hat{t}' < 0$  data, where  $\bar{N}\{\hat{t}'\} < \bar{N}_I$ , are not used to estimate the  $\{\bar{K}_o, \bar{\alpha}_S\}$  pandemic

*Resurgence* parameters. As Eq. [3.2b] shows, this *IRM* allows pandemic shut-off before the CoVID-19 *Resurgence* infects the whole population. In Eq. [3.2a], different  $\bar{N}_I$  values alter the  $\hat{t}' = 0$  points, but all these time axes can be shifted to a new  $t' = 0$  point that estimates the CoVID-19 *Resurgence* start:

$$\bar{N}_o[t'] = \mathbf{1} \exp[+\bar{K}_A t' / (1 + \bar{\gamma}_o t')] \equiv \exp[+\bar{G}_o] \exp(-\bar{Z}_o[t']), \quad [3.3a]$$

$$\bar{Z}_o[t'] = +[\bar{G}_o / (1 + \bar{\gamma}_o t')], \quad [3.3b]$$

$$\bar{G}_o \equiv (\bar{K}_A / \bar{\gamma}_o), \quad [3.3c]$$

$$\bar{\rho}_o[t'] \equiv d\bar{N}_o[t'] / dt'. \quad [3.3d]$$

Since the  $\{\bar{N}_I, \bar{N}_F\}$  data end points span a time interval of  $(\bar{t}_F - \bar{t}_I)$ , the constraints  $\bar{N}_o[t' = \bar{t}_I] = \bar{N}_I$  and  $\bar{N}_o[t' = \bar{t}_F] = \bar{N}_F$  determines  $\{\bar{K}_A, \bar{\gamma}_o\}$  as follows. Using a method similar to Eq. [2.3] and Eqs. [2.4a]-[2.4b], the best fit  $\{\bar{K}_o, \bar{\alpha}_S\}$  values from Eq. [3.2a] set  $\{\bar{t}_I, \bar{t}_F\}$ :

$$\bar{t}_I = \ln(\bar{N}_I) / [\bar{K}_o + \bar{\alpha}_S \ln(\bar{N}_I)], \quad [3.4a]$$

$$\bar{t}_F = \ln(\bar{N}_I) / [\bar{K}_o + \bar{\alpha}_S \ln(\bar{N}_I)] + (\bar{t}_F - \bar{t}_I), \quad [3.4b]$$

with the  $\{\bar{N}_I, \bar{t}_I, \bar{N}_F, \bar{t}_F\}$  group uniquely determining  $\{\bar{K}_A, \bar{\gamma}_o\}$ :

$$\bar{\gamma}_o = \{[\ln(\bar{N}_I) / \bar{t}_I] - [\ln(\bar{N}_F) / \bar{t}_F]\} / [\ln(\bar{N}_F) - \ln(\bar{N}_I)], \quad [3.5a]$$

$$\bar{K}_A = [(1 / \bar{t}_I) - (1 / \bar{t}_F)] / \{[1 / \ln(\bar{N}_I)] - [1 / \ln(\bar{N}_F)]\}, \quad [3.5b]$$

which sets the Eq. [3.3b]  $\bar{Z}_o[t']$  function. The total number of cases ( $\bar{N}_{\max}^o$ ) at pandemic end, and the long-term tail for  $\bar{\rho}_o[t']$  are each given by:

$$\bar{N}_o[t' \rightarrow \infty, \bar{Z}_o \rightarrow 0] \approx \mathbf{1} \exp[+\bar{K}_A / \bar{\gamma}_o] = \exp[+\bar{G}_o] \equiv \bar{N}_{\max}^o, \quad [3.6a]$$

$$\bar{\rho}_o[t'] = d\bar{N}_o[t'] / dt' = \quad [3.6b]$$

$$\bar{N}_o[t'] [\bar{G}_o \bar{\gamma}_o / (1 + \bar{\gamma}_o t')^2] \rightarrow \bar{N}_{\max}^o [\bar{G}_o / \{\bar{\gamma}_o (t')^2\}],$$

showing that  $\bar{\rho}_o[t'] > 0$ . Either  $\{\bar{K}_A, \bar{\gamma}_o\}$  or  $\{\bar{G}_o, \bar{\gamma}_o\}$  can be used as the primary variables. The *IRM* analysis results for the USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* are shown in **Figs. 3-4**, using the best-fit  $\{\bar{G}_o, \bar{\gamma}_o\}$  values. The prior  $\{0 < t' < \bar{t}_I\}$  period in **Fig. 3** estimates what the pandemic would have looked like, if *Resurgence Social Distancing* had begun at  $t' = 0$ . The best fit parameter values for **Figs. 3-4** are:

<i>Resurgence</i>	<i>Initial Model Value</i>	<i>Date or Parameter</i>	<i># Cases or Value</i>
$t' = 0$	0.0 days	5/31/2020	$\bar{N}_{00} \approx 1$
data $\bar{t}_I =$	12.72 days	6/13/2020	$\bar{N}_I = 15,650$
data $\bar{t}_F =$	68.72 days	8/8/2020	$\bar{N}_F = 2,213,058$
calc. $\bar{t}_{Peak} =$	66.72 days	8/6/2020	$(\bar{\rho}_o[\bar{t}_{Peak}]) \approx$ <b>54,866 / day</b>
$(\bar{N}_{\max}^o) =$	15,179,600 cases	<i>Max.# cases</i>	15,179,600
$\bar{K}_o =$	0.3158 /day	$\bar{K}_A =$	1.82566 /day
$\bar{\alpha}_S =$	0.04592 /day	$\bar{\gamma}_o =$	0.11041 /day
$(\frac{[\bar{K}_o / \bar{\alpha}_S]}{\ln(\bar{N}_I)} +) =$	16.5354	$(\frac{[\bar{K}_A / \bar{\gamma}_o]}{\ln(\bar{N}_{00})} +) =$	16.5353

[3.7]

Unfortunately, **Fig. 3** shows that the  $\bar{\rho}_o[t']$  *IRM* data fit is not that good. The  $\bar{\rho}_o[t']$  function has a long tail, which overestimates  $\bar{N}_{\max}^o$ , as the maximum number of CoVID-19 *Resurgence* cases at the pandemic end.

## 4 Enhanced Model: USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence*

Since the observed  $\bar{\rho}_o[t']$  *Resurgence* data decreases much quicker than the *IRM* prediction, the USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* has a fast pandemic shutoff, which is similar to our prior study<sup>3-4</sup> of Italy CoVID-19 data. That Italy data was most successfully modeled by introducing a second process having an exponential decay in time. Generalizing the *IRM* model of Eq. [3.3a] similarly gives this *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM)* for *Resurgence*, where  $\bar{\delta}_o \neq 0$  in Eq. [4.1c] characterizes this second process:

$$N_A(t') = \mathbf{1} \exp[+\bar{G}_o] \exp[-Z_A(t')], \quad [4.1a]$$

$$Z_A(t') = \bar{Z}_o[t'] U_A(t') > 0, \quad [4.1b]$$

$$U_A(t') \equiv + \exp(-\bar{\delta}_o t'), \quad [4.1c]$$

$$\bar{Z}_o[t'] = +[\bar{G}_o / (1 + \bar{\gamma}_o t')], \quad [4.1d]$$

$$Z_A(t' = 0) \equiv +\bar{G}_o = (\bar{K}_A / \bar{\gamma}_o), \quad [4.1e]$$

The above Eqs. [4.1a]-[4.1e] have these limits:

$$Z_A(t' \rightarrow \infty) \equiv 0, \quad [4.2a]$$

$$N_A(t' = 0) = \mathbf{1}, \quad [4.2b]$$

$$U_A(t' = 0) \equiv +1, \quad [4.2c]$$

$$U_A(t' \rightarrow \infty) \equiv 0, \quad [4.2d]$$

$$N_A(t' \rightarrow \infty) = \mathbf{1} \exp[+\bar{G}_o]. \quad [4.2e]$$

For easier data fitting when  $\delta_o \neq 0$ , the Eq. [4.2b] condition that  $N_A(t' = 0) = \mathbf{1}$  can be relaxed. Adjusting  $N_A(t' = 0)$  allows  $N_A(t' = \bar{t}_I) = \bar{N}_I$  to be preserved. Then both  $\{\bar{t}_I, \bar{N}_I\}$  can be treated as model inputs. The  $\bar{G}_o$  prefactor in Eq. [4.1a] can be modified to give:

$$N_A(t') = \mathbf{1} \exp[+\bar{G}_o - \bar{h}_A] \exp[-Z_A(t')], \quad [4.3]$$

so that  $\bar{h}_A$  can adjust  $N_A(t' = 0)$ , while keeping the same  $t' = 0$  point:

$$N_A(t' = 0) = \mathbf{1} e^{-\bar{h}_A}, \quad [4.4a]$$

$$N_A(t' = \bar{t}_I) = \mathbf{1} e^{-\bar{h}_A} \exp[+\bar{G}_o] \exp[-Z_A(\bar{t}_I)] \equiv \bar{N}_I. \quad [4.4b]$$

$$\lim_{t' \rightarrow \infty} [N_A(t')] \equiv \mathbf{1} e^{-\bar{h}_A} \exp[+\bar{G}_o] = \mathbf{1} e^{-\bar{h}_A} \exp[+\bar{K}_o / \bar{\gamma}_o] = N_A^{\max}. \quad [4.4c]$$

Here  $N_A^{\max}$  is the total number of CoVID-19 *Resurgence* cases at the pandemic end for this *EIM* model. Given values for  $\{\bar{G}_o, \bar{\gamma}_o, \bar{\delta}_o, \bar{t}_I, \bar{N}_I\}$ , Eq. [4.4b] uniquely sets  $\bar{h}_A$  via:

$$\bar{h}_A \equiv \bar{G}_o - Z_A(\bar{t}_I) - \ln(\bar{N}_I). \quad [4.5a]$$

$$Z_A(\bar{t}_I) \equiv \bar{Z}_o(\bar{t}_I) U_A(\bar{t}_I) > 0. \quad [4.5b]$$

The  $N_A(t')$  of Eq. [4.3] then gives this  $\rho_A(t')$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_A(t') \equiv \frac{d}{dt'} N_A(t') &= \mathbf{1} \exp[+\bar{G}_o] \frac{d}{dt'} \exp[-Z_A(t')] = \\ &+ [N_A(t') Z_A(t')] \{ \bar{\delta}_o + \bar{\gamma}_o / (1 + \bar{\gamma}_o t') \} > 0. \end{aligned} \quad [4.6]$$

for the daily number of new CoVID-19 cases, providing a self-consistent analytic function for  $\rho_A(t')$ , instead using  $\rho_A(t') \approx \Delta N_A(t') / \Delta t'$  as a numerical approximation. For long times, Eq. [4.6] becomes:

$$\rho_A(t') \approx \mathbf{1} \{ \bar{\delta}_o \bar{G}_o \exp[+\bar{G}_o] \} \{ [1 / (1 + \bar{\gamma}_o t')] \exp(-\bar{\delta}_o t') \} > 0, \quad [4.7]$$

which exhibits a nearly exponentially decaying tail. Minimizing the *rms* error using a *Logarithmic Y-axis* vs linear-time axis gives **Figs. 5-6**, with these best fit parameter values and results:

<i>Log</i> <i>Y-axis</i>	<i>EIM</i> ( $\bar{\delta}_o \neq 0$ ) <i>Value</i>	<i>Date or</i> <i>Parameter</i>	<i># Cases or</i> <i>Value</i>
$t' = 0$	0.0 <i>days</i>	5/30/2020	$\bar{N}_{00} \approx 0.477$
<i>data</i> $\bar{t}_I =$	13.157 <i>days</i>	6/13/2020	$\bar{N}_I = 15,650$
<i>data</i> $\bar{t}_F =$	88.157 <i>days</i>	8/27/2020	$\bar{N}_F = 2,912,774$
<i>calc.</i> $\bar{t}_{Peak} =$	57.157 <i>days</i>	7/28/2020	$(\bar{\rho}_o[\bar{t}_{Peak}] \approx)$ <b>52,301/day</b>
$(N_A^{\max}) =$	---	<i>Max.# cases</i>	6,621,180
$\bar{K}_o =$	0.24152 / <i>day</i>	$\bar{K}_A =$	1.778635 / <i>day</i>
$\bar{\alpha}_S =$	0.0510 / <i>day</i>	$\bar{\gamma}_o =$	0.108151 / <i>day</i>
$(\frac{[\bar{K}_o / \bar{\alpha}_S] +}{\ln(\bar{N}_I)}) =$	( <i>Not</i> <i>Applicable</i> )	$(\bar{G}_o - \bar{h}_A) =$	15.7058
$\bar{h}_A =  \ln(\bar{N}_{00})  =$	0.74	$\bar{\delta}_o / \text{day}$	0.0081 / <i>day</i>

[4.8]

The **Fig. 6** *Logarithmic Y-axis* data fit is quite good, as is **Fig. 5** when compared to the *IRM* **Fig. 3**. The faster decaying **Fig. 5**  $\rho_A(t')$  tail gives a significantly lower prediction for the total number of *Resurgence* cases at the pandemic end. Finally, a similar data fit is shown in **Figs. 7-8**, except the *rms* error was minimized using a *Linear Y-axis* vs linear-time axis for the  $\rho_A(t')$  *Resurgence* data. It has the following best fit parameters, which are similar to the above Eq. [4.8] table results:

<i>Linear</i> <i>Y-axis</i>	<i>EIM</i> ( $\bar{\delta}_o \neq 0$ ) <i>Value</i>	<i>Date or</i> <i>Parameter</i>	<i># Cases or</i> <i>Value</i>
$t' = 0$	0.0 <i>days</i>	5/31/2020	$\bar{N}_{00} \approx 0.427$
<i>data</i> $\bar{t}_I =$	12.060 <i>days</i>	6/13/2020	$\bar{N}_I = 15,650$
<i>data</i> $\bar{t}_F =$	87.060 <i>days</i>	8/27/2020	$\bar{N}_F = 2,912,774$
<i>calc.</i> $\bar{t}_{Peak} =$	49.060 <i>days</i>	7/20/2020	$(\bar{\rho}_o[\bar{t}_{Peak}] \approx)$ <b>50,300/day</b>
$(N_A^{\max}) =$	---	<i>Max.# cases</i>	5,143,380
$\bar{K}_o =$	0.24067	$\bar{K}_A =$	1.96486 / <i>day</i>
$\bar{\alpha}_S =$	0.0580	$\bar{\gamma}_o =$	0.12052 / <i>day</i>
$(\frac{[\bar{K}_o / \bar{\alpha}_S] +}{\ln(\bar{N}_I)}) =$	( <i>Not</i> <i>Applicable</i> )	$(\bar{G}_o - \bar{h}_A) =$	15.4532
$\bar{h}_A =  \ln(\bar{N}_{00})  =$	0.85	$\bar{\delta}_o =$	0.0108 / <i>day</i>

[4.9]

These values form our best estimate for USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence*. Combining these results with the pre-*Resurgence* data fit of **Figs. 1-2**, gives **Figs. 9-10** for the full USA CoVID-19 evolution, covering the entire 3/21/2020-8/27/2020 time frame. This final data fit captures virtually all of the shape nuances in the actual data. The predicted final number of USA CoVID-19 Cases at the pandemic end, from Eq. [2.7] and Eq. [4.9] is:

$$N_{\max}^{TOTAL} = N_{\max}^o + N_A^{\max} = 4,499,494 + 5,143,380 = 9,642,874. \quad [4.10]$$

For CoVID-19 in the USA, **Fig. 11** plots the ratio of the total number of deaths versus total number of cases (% vs time), based on the *bing.com* database<sup>1</sup>, which gives  $\sim 2.9325\% = (169,108) / (5,766,718)$ , as of 8/27/2020. This value is similar to the IHME 8/27/2020 value<sup>5</sup> of  $\sim 3.1065\%$ , which is shown as a horizontal line on **Fig. 11**.

Using the slightly higher IHME mortality rate allows our **Fig. 10** predictions

to be compared with the most recent IHME predictions<sup>5</sup>, as shown in **Fig. 12**. The IHME predictions include the presumption of a 2<sup>nd</sup> *Resurgence*, due to factors<sup>6</sup> of "*seasonality and declining vigilance*". Each IHME projection shown in **Fig. 12** is also an IHME Model average<sup>5</sup>, with the magnitude of their lower and upper bound deviations (not graphed) being < 2.5% by 9/26/2020, increasing to < 42% by 1/1/2021. The IHME 2<sup>nd</sup> *Resurgence* assumptions are evident in the upward (+) curvature in all IHME predictions, as compared to the downward (-) curvature of the present *Resurgence* model, indicating progress to a CoVID-19 pandemic shut-off, assuming **NO** 2<sup>nd</sup> *Resurgence* occurs.

The causes of a 2<sup>nd</sup> *Resurgence* could include a large-scale set of new reopenings, creating another rapid rise in CoVID-19 cases, similar to **Fig. 9**. A follow-on analysis would be needed for this 2<sup>nd</sup> *Resurgence*. The possibility of multiple CoVID-19 waves was highlighted early on by the University of Minnesota CoVID-19 team<sup>7-8</sup>, but each wave was assumed to have **minimal overlap**. Instead, these results, and the IHME projections (which already includes a 2<sup>nd</sup> *Resurgence*), support the idea that USA CoVID-19 evolution is likely to have **multiple overlapping** waves of *Resurgence*.

## 5 Discussion and Conclusions

The *Initial Resurgence Model (IRM)* for USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence*, given by Eqs. [3.3a]-[3.3d] and Eqs. [3.6a]-[3.6b] has the  $\gamma_o$  parameter accounting for the effects of society-wide *Social Distancing*. Our prior work<sup>2</sup> showed that the effects of implementing society-wide shut-downs changed the CoVID-19 pandemic evolution within days of the start of its implementation. Thus, the size of  $\gamma_o$  likely reflects the degree to which society-wide large gatherings were eliminated. It is a non-local parameter that is generally not part of the traditional **SEIR** (*Susceptible, Exposed, Infection, and Recovered or Removed*) pandemic modeling, which are governed by local differential equations.

Our analysis shows that the USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* data decreased faster than the *IRM* model predictions. A similar situation<sup>3-4</sup> was seen in the CoVID-19 pandemic evolution in Italy, which was successfully modeled by introducing a second process:

$$\bar{\rho}_{data}\{\hat{t}'\} \sim [\exp(-\delta_o \hat{t}')] , \quad [5.1]$$

which has an exponentially decaying tail. This second process is independent of the gradually changing  $t_{dbl}$  *doubling time*, which gave rise to the *IRM*  $\{\bar{K}_A, \bar{\gamma}_o\}$  parameters.

For USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence*, an *Enhanced Resurgence Model (ERM)* was developed to include this second process. This *ERM* essentially replaces the  $\bar{N}_o[t']$  and  $\bar{Z}_o[t']$  of Eqs. [3.3a]-[3.3b] with:

$$Z_A[t] = +[\bar{G}_o / (1 + \bar{\gamma}_o t)] \exp(-\delta_o t) , \quad [5.2a]$$

$$N_A(Z_A) = [e^{+\bar{G}_o}] \exp(-Z_A[t]) . \quad [5.2b]$$

The necessity of using a second process ( $\delta_o \neq 0$ ) to model the USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* has a potentially important implication. This  $\delta_o$  is a second non-local parameter that may not be part of a traditional **SEIR** (*Susceptible,*



*Exposed, Infection, and Recovered or Removed*) pandemic model. Pre- vs Post-*Resurgence*, what else changed? The most likely explanation is that  $\delta_o$  measures the degree to which people wear and wore masks to mitigate and prevent CoVID-19 spread during the *Resurgence*.

## 6 List of Figures

**Figure 1.** *Initial Model Baseline (IMB):* USA CoVID-19 Projections vs data to 6/7/2020. Predicted Number of Daily CoVID-19 Cases has a peak of 30,727 cases/day on 4/15; with 4,499,494 cases total; and  $\sim 5,783$  new cases/day at Day 200 on 9/27/2020.

**Figure 2.** *Initial Model Baseline (IMB):* USA CoVID-19 Projections vs data to 6/7/2020. Revised *bing.com* data, circa 5/3/2020, changed all values back to the pandemic start. *Initial Model* appears to be a good data fit.

**Figure 3.** *Initial Model* fit for CoVID-19 *Resurgence*: USA Data 6/13/20 to 8/8/20. The **Fig. 1** *IMB* has data through 6/7/2020. It was extrapolated to 8/27/2020, then subtracted from the actual data to create *Resurgence Only* data, which was then fitted using the *Initial Model*.

**Figure 4.** USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence Only*: Data vs *Initial Model* Fit, 6/13/20 to 8/8/20. *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)* was subtracted from actual data to set *Resurgence Only* Data. *Resurgence Start Day #1* was set to 6/13/2020 with  $N = 15,650$  cases above *IMB*.

**Figure 5.** *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM):* USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* 6/7/20-8/27/20. *EIM* best fit with  $N_A[t] \sim \exp(-Z_A[t])$  using enhanced  $Z_A[t]$  function with exponential decay term, which significantly improves fit. Best fit uses *Logarithmic Y-axis*:  $\ln(N_A[t])$  vs time.

**Figure 6.** *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM):* USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* 6/7/20-8/27/20. *EIM* best fit with  $N_A[t] \sim \exp(-Z_A[t])$  using enhanced  $Z_A[t]$  function with exponential decay term. Datafit minimizes *rms* error on *Logarithmic Y-axis*.

**Figure 7.** *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM):* USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* 6/7/20-8/27/20. *EIM* best fit with  $N_A[t] \sim \exp(-Z_A[t])$  using enhanced  $Z_A[t]$  function with exponential decay term. Bestfit minimizes error on *Linear Y-axis* vs time w/  $\mathbf{Y} = dN_A[t] / dt =$  Daily # New CoVID-19 cases.

**Figure 8.** *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM):* USA CoVID-19 *Resurgence* 6/7/20-8/27/20. *EIM* best fit with  $N_A[t] \sim \exp(-Z_A[t])$  using enhanced  $Z_A[t]$  function with exponential decay term. Deviations on *Logarithmic Y-axis* due to minimizing error using *Linear Y-axis* as given in **Fig. 7**.

**Figure 9.** USA CoVID-19 Totals: *IMB* Plus *EIM* for *Resurgence* 3/21/20-8/27/20. Combination of *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)*, starting from 3/21/20 [**Fig. 1**]; plus *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM)* for CoVID-19 *Resurgence*, starting from  $\sim 6/7/2020$  [**Fig. 7**].

**Figure 10.** USA CoVID-19 Totals: *IMB* Plus *EIM* for *Resurgence* 3/21/20-8/27/20. Combination of *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)* from 3/21/20 [**Fig. 2**];


plus *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM)* for CoVID-19 *Resurgence* from  $\sim 6/7/2020$  [Fig. 8] gives 9,642,874 total at pandemic end.

**Figure 11.** Net Percent USA CoVID-19 Deaths: Ratio of Total # of USA Deaths to Total # of *bing.com* reported USA CoVID-19 Cases, 3/21/20 through 8/27/2020. Some USA CoVID-19 restrictions lifted  $\sim 6/7/2020$  leading to CoVID *Resurgence*; IHME used 3.1065% as of 8/27/20.


**Figure 12.** Net Predicted USA CoVID-19 Deaths: The 8/27/20 IHME 3.1065% Mortality Rate for USA CoVID-19 cases was applied to **Fig. 10** to estimate USA CoVID-19 mortality, assuming **NO 2nd Resurgence**; enabling comparison to IHME's model, which has *2nd Resurgence* effects.

## 7 References


1. [www.bing.com/covid: 'Bing COVID-19 Tracker'](https://www.bing.com/covid?form=CPVD07), and <https://www.bing.com/covid?form=CPVD07>.
2. <https://www.MedRxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.04.20091207v1>, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20091207>, "*Initial Model for the Impact of Social Distancing on CoVID-19 Spread*", Genghmun Eng.
3. <https://www.MedRxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.30.20143149v1>, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.30.20143149>, "*Orthogonal Functions for Evaluating Social Distancing Impact on Covid-19 Spread*", G. Eng.
4. <https://www.MedRxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169904v1>, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169904>, "*Model to Describe Fast Shutoff of CoVID-19 Pandemic Spread*", Genghmun Eng.
5. <https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-america?view=total-deaths&tab=trend>, Institute of Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), University of Washington, 9/3/2020.
6. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-usa/u-s-coronavirus-deaths-projected-to-more-than-double-to-410000-by-january-idUSKBN25V2A7>, "*U.S. Coronavirus Deaths Projected to More Than Double to 410,000 by January*", Daniel Trotta; additional reporting by P. Szekely; editing by H. Goller, 9/4/2020
7. K. A. Moore, M. Lipsitch, J. M. Barry, M. T. Osterholm, "*Future of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Lessons Learned from Pandemic Influenza*". Center for Infectious Disease and Research [CIDRAP], Academic Health Center, University of Minnesota, April 30, 2020, pp. 1-9.
8. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/coronavirus-may-last-2-years-172805061.html>, "*Coronavirus May Last 2 Years, Study Warns. Its 2nd wave could be Worse*", Dennis Wagner, USA Today, 5/1/20, 10:07 PM PDT.




**Figure 1. Initial Model Baseline (IMB): USA CoVID-19 Projections vs data to 6/7/2020.** Predicted Number of Daily CoVID-19 Cases has a peak of 30,727 cases/day on 4/15; with 4,499,494 cases total; and ~5,783 new cases/day at Day 200 on 9/27/2020.




**Figure 2. Initial Model Baseline (IMB): USA CoVID-19 Projections vs data to 6/7/2020.** Revised *bing.com* data, circa 5/3/2020, changed all values back to the pandemic start. *Initial Model* appears to be a good data fit.




**Figure 3. Initial Model fit for CoVID-19 Resurgence: USA Data 6/13/20 to 8/8/20.** The Fig. 1 *IMB* has data through 6/7/2020. It was extrapolated to 8/27/2020, then subtracted from The actual data to create *Resurgence Only* data, which was then fitted using the *Initial Model*.



**Figure 4. USA CoVID-19 Resurgence Only: Data vs Initial Model Fit, 6/13/20 to 8/8/20.** *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)* was subtracted from actual data to set Resurgence Only Data. Resurgence Start Day #1 was set to 6/13/2020 with  $N=15,650$  cases above *IMB*.




**Figure 5. Enhanced Initial Model (EIM): USA CoVID-19 Resurgence 6/7/20-8/27/20.** EIM best fit with  $NA[t] \sim \exp(-ZA[t])$  using enhanced  $ZA[t]$  function with exponential decay term, which significantly improves fit. Best fit uses *Logarithmic Y-axis:  $\ln(NA[t])$*  vs time.




**Figure 6. Enhanced Initial Model (EIM): USA CoVID-19 Resurgence 6/7/20-8/27/20.**  
 EIM best fit with  $NA[t] \sim \exp(-ZA[t])$  using enhanced  $ZA[t]$  function with exponential decay term.  
 Datafit minimizes rms error on Logarithmic Y-axis.







**Figure 7. Enhanced Initial Model (EIM): USA CoVID-19 Resurgence 6/7/20-8/27/20.**  
*EIM* best fit with  $NA[t] \sim \exp(-ZA[t])$  using enhanced  $ZA[t]$  function with exponential decay term.  
 Bestfit minimizes error on *Linear Y-axis* vs time w/  $Y = dNA[t]/dt = \text{Daily \# New CoVID-19 cases}$ .




**Figure 8. Enhanced Initial Model (EIM): USA CoVID-19 Resurgence 6/7/20-8/27/20.**  
 EIM best fit with  $NA[t] \sim \exp(-ZA[t])$  using enhanced  $ZA[t]$  function with exponential decay term.  
 Deviations on *Logarithmic Y-axis* due to minimizing error using *Linear Y-axis* as given in Fig. 7.




**Figure 9. USA CoVID-19 Totals: *IMB* Plus *EIM* for Resurgence 3/21/20-8/27/20.**  
 Combination of *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)*, starting from 3/21/20 [Fig. 1]; plus *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM)* for CoVID-19 Resurgence, starting from ~6/7/2020 [Fig.7].



**Figure 10. USA CoVID-19 Totals: *IMB* Plus *EIM* for Resurgence 3/21/20-8/27/20.**  
 Combination of *Initial Model Baseline (IMB)* from 3/21/20 [Fig. 2]; plus *Enhanced Initial Model (EIM)* for CoVID-19 Resurgence from ~6/7/2020 [Fig. 8] gives **9,642,874** total at pandemic end.



**Figure 11. Net Percent USA CoVID-19 Deaths:** Ratio of Total # of USA Deaths to Total # of *bing.com* reported USA CoVID-19 Cases, 3/21/20 through 8/27/2020. Some USA CoVID-19 restrictions lifted ~6/7/2020 leading to CoVID *Resurgence*; IHME used **3.1065%** as of 8/27/20.



**Figure 12. Net Predicted USA CoVID-19 Deaths:** The 8/27/20 IHME **3.1065%** Mortality Rate for USA CoVID-19 cases was applied to **Fig. 10** to estimate USA CoVID-19 mortality, assuming **NO 2nd Resurgence**; enabling comparison to IHME's model, which has *2nd Resurgence* effects.