Postlockdown Dynamics of COVID-19 in New York, Florida, Arizona, and Wisconsin

Sherry Scott³, Keisha J. Cook², Kamal Barley¹

⁴ Department of Mathematics, formerly MSOE, Department of Mathematics, Tulane University. Applied Mathematics
 ⁵ Statistics, Stony Brook University.

6 Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic is widely studied as it continues to threaten many populations of people especially in the USA, the leading country in terms of both deaths and cases. More and more reports show that the 8 spread of COVID-19 involves infected individuals first passing through a pre-symptomatic infectious stage q in addition to the incubation period and that many of the infectious individuals are asymptomatic. In this 10 study, we design and use a mathematical model to primarily address the question of who are the main 11 drivers of COVID-19 - the symptomatic infectious or the presymptomatic and asymptomatic infectious in 12 the states of Florida, Arizona, New York, Wisconsin and the entire United States. We emphasize the benefit of lockdown by showing that for all four states, earlier and later lockdown dates decrease the number of 14 cumulative deaths. This benefit of lockdown is also evidenced by the decrease in the infectious cases for 15 Arizona and the entire US when lockdown is implemented earlier. When comparing the influence of the symptomatic infectious versus the presympomatic/asymptomatic infectious, it is shown that, in general, the 17 larger contribution comes from the latter group. This is seen from several perspectives (1) in terms of daily 18 cases, (2) in terms of daily cases when the influence of one group is targeted over the other by setting the 19 effective contact rate(s) for the non-targeted group to zero, and (3) in terms of cumulative cases and deaths for the US and Arizona when the influence of one group is targeted over the other by setting the effective 21 contact rate(s) for the non-targeted group to zero. The consequences of the difference in the contributions 22 of the two infectious groups is simulated in terms of testing and these simulations show that an increase 23 in testing and isolating for the presymptomatic and asymptomatic infectious group has more impact than 24 an increase in testing for the symptomatic infectious. For example, for the entire US, a 50% increase in testing for the presymptomatic and asymptomatic infectious group results in a 35% decrease in deaths as 26 opposed to a lower 6% decrease in deaths when a 50% increase in testing rate for the symptomatic infectious 27 is implemented. We also see that if the testing for infectious symptomatic is kept at the baseline value and the testing for the presymptomatic and asymptomatic is increased from 0.2 to 0.25, then the control 29 reproduction number falls well below 1. On the other hand, to get even close to such a result when keeping the 30 presymptomatic and asymptomatic at baseline fitted values, the symptomatic infectious testing rate must be 31 increased considerably more - from 0.25 to 1.7. Lastly, we use our model to simulate an implementation of a 32 natural herd immunity strategy for the entire U.S. and for the state of Wisconsin (the most recent epicenter) 33 and we find that such a strategy requires a significant number of deaths and as such is questionable in terms of success. We conclude with a brief summary of our results and some implications regarding COVID-19 35 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. control and mitigation strategies. 36 Keywords: COVID-19, symptomatic infectious, asymptomatic infectious, presymptomatic infectious, 37

³⁸ natural herd immunity

39 1. Introduction

The coronavirus, known as COVID-19, emerged in Wuhan, China in December 2019, and has since then spread to all countries on earth. As of 12/10/2020, the United States has reported 15,535,565 cases and 291,403 deaths and although the leading country in both deaths and cases, the U.S. did not implement a national pandemic control initiative. Instead, many states and cities implemented their own initiatives at various times, and the transmission of COVID-19 has varied from state to state. States also implemented

December 28, 2020

³Email: sscott@msri.org, corresponding author

their own testing initiatives. Around 12-10-2020, the reported testing rates are as follows: Arizona testing at 45 a rate of 347.7 tests per 100,000 people, Florida testing at a rate of 497.2 tests per 100,000 people, New York 46 testing at a rate of 985.7 tests per 100,000 people, and Wisconsin testing at a rate of 562.4 tests per 100,000 47 people [2]. With regard to mask usage, the observed mask usage percentage in the US has increased since 48 the beginning of the pandemic. From March 1, 2020 to May 1, 2020, the mask use percentage increased from 49 5% to 40%. From May 1, 2020 to November 22, 2020, the mask use percentage increased from 71%. Social 50 distancing has also played a role in the transmission of COVID-19. On March 8, 2020 to April 4, 2020, the 51 US experienced a 53% decrease in mobility. From April 4, 2020 to June 24, 2020, the decrease in mobility 52 changed to only -22%. From June 24, 2020 to November 22, 2020, the mobility oscillated between -18% and 53 -25% [3]. The social distancing statistics are due to the fact that different states implemented stay-at-home periods for various intervals of time. All of these factors play a part in the transmission of COVID-19 in the 55 US as a whole, and effectively in each state. Although we do not consider all of these measures directly, we 56 do discuss the effect that lockdown has on the number of cases and deaths. We do include mask usage, and 57 we use a different mask compliance value for each period per state [10]. To study social distancing, we fit 58 the values for the effective contact rate for each time period per state and per time period. 59

Mathematical modelling can help us better understand how COVID-19 cases and mortality is affected based on when and how long lockdown periods are enforced. Modelling can also help us identify the main 61 drivers of the disease and give insight on how best to use the standard control and mitigation strategies. We 62 expand on the standard SIR model, which uses a system of ordinary differential equations to model disease 63 spread through multiple compartments over time. In this study, we do not consider a time-varying system. 64 Prior studies consider susceptible individuals transitioning to exposed and then to infectious. We include 65 a presymptomatic compartment for individuals who are infectious before the onset of symptoms. We also consider individuals who were tested, resulting in an asymptomatic or symptomatic classification, as well 67 as the population of people who may have self-isolated after being exposed by an infected individual. It is 68 known that over the course of the pandemic, hospitals have been highly stressed and over-crowded due to the influx of COVID-19 patients. In order to study mortality due to the pandemic, we also include compartments 70 that keep track of the number of patients admitted to the hospital and the ICU. 71 We explore scenarios where lockdown is started earlier or extended past the reported date. We show 72

that both scenarios decrease the number of deaths. We can use these type of simulations to predict future mortality populations and use the information to help with determining when lockdown periods should start and how long the lockdown period should be enforced.

Finally, in response to the increase in public discussions of a natural herd immunity approach, we use our model to run some basic scenarios for implementing such a strategy in the state of Wisconsin and the US as a whole. We simulate the number of deaths that would occur before herd immunity is achieved.

79 2. Main Questions

The overall purpose of this study is to explore the postlockdown dynamics of COVID-19 and in the process, explore the notion that the main drivers of COVID19 are the asymptomatic and presymptomatic infectious individuals. Because both the asymptomatic and presymptomatic infectious spread COVID-19 without showing symptoms we group these two compartments together and compare that group to the symptomatic infectious. More specifically, we use a mathematical model to address the following questions for New York, Arizona, Florida, Wisconsin, and in some cases, the entire US. The section of the paper in which each question is addressed is given after the question.

- How do changes in lockdown dates (i.e., earlier or later lockdown dates) affect the number of deaths and cases? (Section 4.3.1)
- How does the contribution of the presymptomatic and asymptomatic infectious individuals compare to that of the symptomatic infectious in terms of cases and deaths? (Section 4.3.2)

- If we isolate all symptomatic infectious individuals or all asymptomatic and presymptomatic infectious individuals, how will this impact deaths and cases? (Section 4.3.3)
- How might a minimum testing rate for presymptomatic and asymptomatic compare to that for the
- symptomatic infectious individuals in order to obtain a reproduction number below 1? (section 4.3.4)
- How many deaths will occur in a natural herd immunity simulation for Wisconsin and the entire US?
 (Section 4.4)

97 2.1. COVID-19

In order to assess and deliver guidelines for individuals to avoid coronavirus infection, the CDC has 98 implemented models equipped with the many stages of the virus [1]. A person who has been infected is 99 considered pre-symptomatic (an individual who is infectious but did not show symptoms at the time of 100 testing) or asymptomatic (a person who is infectious and does not show symptoms throughout the course 101 of the infection). The CDC built pandemic planning scenarios varying the infectiousness of asymptomatic 102 individuals compared to symptomatic, varying the percent of asymptomatic individuals, and varying the 103 percentage of transmission of presymptomatic individuals. In this paper, we use similar methods to build 104 our model and determine parameter values for the locations and time periods of interest. Figure 1 shows 105 the stages of COVID-19, especially the incubation period, infectious period, presymptomatic period, and 106 symptomatic period. It should be noted that a presymptomatic infectious individual can become either 107 asymptomatic or symptomatic infectious. 108



Figure 1: The Stages of COVID-19

We are interested in modeling COVID-19 in the United States as a whole, as well as focusing on four states. We consider New York (Northeast), which started as an epicenter in the US. We consider Florida (Southeast) and Arizona (Southwest) due to the fact that they became hot spots with significant numbers of daily cases and overwhelming numbers in their healthcare facilities. Lastly, we consider Wisconsin (Midwest), which became a hot spot later in the year. Table 1 shows the differences between the states with regards to the number of cumulative deaths.

	Beginning of lockdown	End of lockdown	on August 11, 2020	on November 23, 2020
United States	16767	104803	164519	257779
Arizona	25	651	4199	6464
Florida	170	1399	8553	18085
New York	249	30482	32770	34339
Wisconsin	10	594	1006	3158

Table 1: This table gives the cumulative deaths for each state and the United States. The lockdown dates depend on the state.

115 3. Methods

116 3.1. Model with presymptomatic compartment and face masks

We use a modified Kermack-McKendrik-type epidemic (no human demography) model to better under-117 stand the dynamics of COVID-19. Since a main objective of this study is to analyze the role of infectious 118 individuals who show no symptoms, the model (2) includes a presymptomatic compartment as the foundation 119 for parameter estimation. We use a deterministic susceptible, exposed, presymptomatic, symptomatically-120 infectious, asymptomatically-infectious, self-isolated, hospitalized, recovered, and ICU patients modeling 121 framework, with the classes denoted as S(t), E(t), $E_P(t)$, I(t), A(t), J(t), H(t), R(t), C(t) respectively; 122 we also include D(t) to track deaths. The model also includes the mitigation/control interventions of face 123 mask usage (with a compliance parameter as well as a face mask efficacy parameter) and testing/detection 124 implementation for each of the infectious classes. 125



Figure 2: Schematic flow diagram of the model

126 3.2. Data Collection

We obtain the observed cumulative deaths and cases data for the states of Arizona, Florida, New York and Wisconsin from the COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (2020). The repository contains data beginning at January 22, 2020 (the marked beginning of the pandemic in the US), however, we focus primarily on the data from March 1, 2020 through October 13, 2020. Using these data sets we determine the initial conditions for the number of cases and deaths for a given time period.

The model has 24 parameters and we use values from the literature for 18 of these and estimate the 133 remaining 6 by fitting the model to the observed cumulative mortality data for each state. The parameters 134 that are estimated are as follows: the effective contact rate for the symptomatically-infectious individuals β_I , 135 the effective contact rate for the asymptomatically-infectious individuals β_A , the effective contact rate for 136 presymptomatically-infectious individuals β_P , the rate at which presymptomatically-infectious individuals 137 self-isolate τ_P , the rate at which asymptotomatically-infectious individuals self-isolate τ_A , and the hospitaliza-138 tion rate for self-isolating individuals α_J . Parameter fitting was performed using a non-linear sum-of-squares 139 estimate - i.e. determining the best parameters set that minimizes the sum of the square of the difference between the model outputs for death and the observed values for deaths. 141

142

Our model for the transmission dynamics of COVID-19 is given by the following deterministic system of non-linear differential equations.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta_I (1 - \epsilon_m c_m) \frac{SI}{N} - \beta_A (1 - \epsilon_m c_m) \frac{SA}{N} - \beta_P (1 - \epsilon_m c_m) \frac{SE_P}{N} = -\lambda S \\ \frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta_I (1 - \epsilon_m c_m) \frac{SI}{N} + \beta_A (1 - \epsilon_m c_m) \frac{SA}{N} + \beta_P (1 - \epsilon_m c_m) \frac{SE_P}{N} - \sigma_e E = \lambda S - \sigma_e E \\ \frac{dE_P}{dt} &= \sigma_e E - \sigma_P E_P - \tau_P E_P \\ \frac{dI}{dt} &= r \sigma_P E_P - \alpha_I I - \tau_I I - \gamma_I I - \delta_I I \\ \frac{dA}{dt} &= (1 - r) \sigma_P E_P - \alpha_A A - \tau_A A - \gamma_A A - \delta_A A \\ \frac{dH}{dt} &= \alpha_I I + \alpha_A A + \alpha_J J - \psi_H H - \gamma_H H - \delta_H H \\ \frac{dC}{dt} &= \psi_H H - \gamma_C C - \delta_C C \\ \frac{dJ}{dt} &= \tau_P E_P + \tau_A A + \tau_I I - \alpha_J J - \gamma_J J \\ \frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma_I I + \gamma_A A + \gamma_C C + \gamma_J J + \gamma_H H \\ \frac{dD}{dt} &= \delta_A A + \delta_I I + \delta_H H + \delta_C C \end{aligned}$$
(1)

where N(t) = S + E + EP + I + A + H + J + C + R is the total population at time t. Let ϵ_m be the efficacy 145 of face masks to prevent transmission and acquisition of infection, c_m the compliance in face mask usage in 146 the community $(0 < c_m \leq 1)$, σ the progression rate from exposed (E) to infectious classes (I or A), r the 147 fraction of exposed individuals who show clinical symptoms at the end of the incubation period, τ_{I} the rate 148 self-quarantined symptomatically-infectious humans self-isolate, γ_I , γ_A , γ_J , γ_H , γ_C the recovery rates for the 149 subscripted population, $\psi_{\scriptscriptstyle H}$ the rate of ICU admission for hospitalized individuals, $\alpha_{\scriptscriptstyle I}$ the hospitalization 150 rate for symptomatically-infectious individuals, $\alpha_{\scriptscriptstyle A}$ the hospitalization rate for asymptomatically-infectious 151 individuals, δ_I the disease-induced mortality rate for symptomatically-infectious individuals, δ_A the disease-152 induced mortality rate for asymptomatically-infectious individuals, $\delta_{\scriptscriptstyle H}$ the disease-induced mortality rate 153 for hospitalized individuals, δ_c the disease-induced mortality rate individuals in ICU. We assume that 154 hospitalized individuals do not come in contact with the general population. 155

156 4. Results

157 4.1. Computation of Reproduction Numbers

The basic reproduction number \mathcal{R}_0 is the average number of secondary infections produced when one infected individual is introduced into a host population of susceptibles. For our model's \mathcal{R}_0 , we have $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_{0A} + \mathcal{R}_{0I} + \mathcal{R}_{0P}$ where

$$\mathcal{R}_{0A} = \frac{\beta_A (1-r)}{\alpha_A + \gamma_A + \delta_A}$$
$$\mathcal{R}_{0I} = \frac{\beta_I r}{\alpha_I + \gamma_I + \delta_I}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{0P} = \frac{\beta_P}{\sigma_P}.$$

The control reproduction number \mathcal{R}_C is the average number of new cases generated by a typical infectious individual introduced into a host population of susceptibles with some control measures/interventions in place. Using the next generation operator method and notation found in [12] we have the following computation for the control reproduction number \mathcal{R}_C . If take the column vector ($E = E_P = I = A$) representing the compartments of infected, we have the associated next generation matrices, F and V, for the new infection terms and the transition terms are given respectively as

where, $G_1 = \sigma_P + \tau_P$, $G_2 = \alpha_I + \gamma_I + \delta_I + \tau_I$, $G_3 = \alpha_A + \gamma_A + \delta_A + \tau_A$. \mathcal{R}_C is the spectral radius of the next generation matrix given by,

$$\mathcal{R}_C = \rho\left(FV^{-1}\right) = \mathcal{R}_I + \mathcal{R}_A + \mathcal{R}_P$$

where $\mathcal{R}_I = \frac{(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\beta_I r \sigma_P}{G_1 G_2}$, $\mathcal{R}_A = \frac{(1-\epsilon_m c_m)(1-r)\beta_A \sigma_P}{G_1 G_3}$, and $\mathcal{R}_P = \frac{(1-\epsilon_m c_m)\beta_P}{G_1}$. In absence of interventions, 164 i.e. with $\tau_I = \tau_A = \tau_P = \tau_A = \epsilon_m = c_m = 0$, we get the basic reproduction number for model (1), \mathcal{R}_0 , as 165 given earlier. 166

Theorem 1. The disease-free equilibrium (DFE) of the model 1 is locally-asymptotically stable if $\mathcal{R}_C < 1$, 167 and unstable if $\mathcal{R}_C > 1$. 168

A basic implication of Theorem 1 is that in order to control the COVID-19 outbreak (to not generate 169 more), it suffices to keep $\mathcal{R}_C < 1$. 170

4.2. Goodness of Fit 171

We analyze how well our model fits the data from John Hopkins using the T-Test in R. The T-Test measures the difference between two sets of continuous data. We want to compare two sample means to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the model and the data. We use a paired T-test where each vector has the same amount of entries and the values are taken from the same independent variable. The T-Test assumes that the data in each vector is normally distributed and that they have approximately equal variances. To test for normality, we use the Shapiro-Wilk Test in R. The null hypothesis for this test is that the values in the vector are normally distributed. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, then the distribution of the values in the vector are not significantly different from the normal distribution. I.e. we fail to reject the null hypothesis. We can visualize this using a Q-Q plot. We assume normality if all the points fall along the reference line. We then check the variances of the values in the two vectors using the standard variance equation from probability. Let the null hypothesis for the T-Test be that the difference between the two groups is 0. The T-statistic is defined as

$$T = \frac{\bar{x_1} - \bar{x_2}}{\sqrt{(s_1^2/n_1) + (s_2^2/n_2)}}.$$

173 174

We conclude that the model for each state, cumulative death population, during the lockdown period 172 does indeed fit the data. Table 2 shows the resulting p-values of the T-Test for each state and the United States as a whole during the lockdown period. The goodness of fit plots can be found in the appendix

(section 6.3) in Figures 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21. 175

Daily p-value Daily T-st		Daily T-statistic	Cumulative p-value	Cumulative T-statistic
United States	0.9722	0.035037	0.7839	0.27581
Florida	0.9083	0.11621	0.4947	0.69165
Arizona	0.6002	-0.52796	0.0004622	3.7845
New York	0.8781	-0.15396	0.007702	2.749
Wisconsin	0.02353	-2.323	2.2e-16	-17.953

Table 2: Goodness of Fit for the T-Test. This table gives the p-values and T-statistic for each test for each state and the United States during the lockdown period. The daily column denotes the model vs the data of the daily deaths. The cumulative column denotes the model vs the data of the cumulative deaths.

176 4.3. Simulated Epidemics

We fit our model using the cumulative and daily mortality data for Florida, Arizona, Wisconsin, and New York over the pre-lockdown, lockdown, and post-lockdown periods based on the state's respective decisions. 178 Florida, Arizona, New York, and Wisconsin pre-lockdown period is defined from March 10, 2020 to April 3, 179 2020, March 21, 2020 to March 31, 2020, March 2, 2020 to March 22, 2020, and March 19, 2020 to March 180 25, 2020 respectively. The lockdown period is defined from April 3, 2020 to May 4, 2020, March 31, 2020 181 to May 15, 2020, March 22, 2020 to May 28, 2020, March 25, 2020 to May 26, 2020 respectively. For the 182 entire US the pre-lockdown and postlockdown dates are January 22, 2020 to April 7, 2020 and April 7, 2020 183 to May 28, 2020, as given in [10]. The post-lockdown periods begin at the end of the prescribed lockdown 184 period for each state and for most of our results ends on August 11, 2020. Figure 3 shows the fit for our 185 model with the cumulative deaths data during the lockdown period. 186 187



Figure 3: Data fitting of the model using COVID-19 mortality data for the states of Florida, Arizona, New York and Wisconsin during their respective lockdown periods. The plots show the model (blue) against the data (red).

The state variables and the parameters for our model are given in the Appendix in Tables 3 and 4 respectively.

190 4.3.1. Lockdown starting earlier or later

For all of the states, the first lockdown (and for most states, the only lockdown so far) was implemented in the month of March. Since an earlier lockdown would have most likely prevented the disease from gaining a foothold in these areas, when we simulate an earlier lockdown, we find that the number of cumulative deaths decreases significantly for each state. This decrease occurs each time we add one week to the beginning of the lockdown period - see Figure 4.

196



Figure 4: Row 1: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown began 1 week earlier. Row 2: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown began 2 weeks earlier.

In general, an earlier lockdown also results in a decrease in daily cases for both the symptomatic and asymptomatic/presymptomatic compartments, as shown in the daily cases plots for Arizona and the entire US in Figure 5.



Figure 5: Daily cases for the asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic individuals (cyan curve) versus the symptomatic individuals (red curve) for the entire US and Arizona if **Row 1**: Lockdown began 1 week earlier and if **Row 2**: Lockdown began 2 weeks earlier.

On the other hand, if we use the original lockdown start dates but extend the lockdown periods by 2 and 4 weeks for each state, we again see a decrease in cumulative deaths as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6: Row 1: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown was lifted 2 weeks later. Row 2: The cumulative deaths for each state if lockdown was lifted 4 weeks later.

These varying lockdown dates scenarios can be used to assess the efficacy of lockdowns and to guide the manner in which the lockdowns are implemented. For example, one interesting lockdown scenario is to consider what would happen if the entire U.S. implemented a lockdown during the month of December 2020 for two weeks. In order to simulate such a strategy we reduce the contact rate parameters - i.e., the betas - by 40% [7] and run the simulation forward. As shown in Figure 7 below, the simulations give that such a lockdown would result in a marked decrease in the number of deaths.



Figure 7: Cumulative deaths in US with lockdown in December (green) versus without lockdown (blue)

208 4.3.2. Simulations for Asymptomatic, Presymptomatic, and Symptomatic

²⁰⁹ In this section, we focus more on comparing the contributions of the symptomatic infectious group versus

²¹⁰ the asymptomatic and presymptomatic infectious group. To this end, we first consider plotting the daily

 $_{211}$ cases for the two groups against each other. In all states and time periods, we find that the number of daily

212 cases for the asymptomatic and presymptomatic is more than the daily cases for the symptomatic as shown

²¹³ in the following figure.



Figure 8: The plots show the presymptomatic and asymptomatic versus symptomatic individuals for each state during their respective **Row 1**: Pre-lockdown period, **Row 2**: Lockdown period, and **Row 3**: Post-lockdown period.

The parameter β_I represents the contacts by the symptomatically infectious individuals that could trans-214 mit the disease. By setting $\beta_I = 0$, we eliminate that transmission and focus on the effect of the presymp-215 tomatic and asymptomatic individuals. Similarly, fixing $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$, targets the effect of the symptomat-216 ically infectious. In order to further discern the role of the asymptomatic and presymptomatic infectious 217 versus that of the symptomatic infectious, we consider these zero contact rate scenarios in terms of the num-218 ber of daily cases for all of the states and the entire U.S. In Figure 9, we show the results for the pre-lockdown 219 and post-lockdown periods and for those periods, we again get that the larger contribution comes from the 220 asymptomatic and presymptomatic individuals. For the lockdown period we obtain mixed results and these 221 are considered in the appendix (Figure 16). 222



Figure 9: The plots show the daily cases for each state with $\beta_I = 0$ (cyan curve) and with $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (red curve) during their respective **Row 1**: Pre-lockdown period and **Row 2**: Post-lockdown period.

In Figure 10, we again take the $\beta_I = 0$ (green curve) versus the $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (magenta curve) scenario, but here we consider the effect in terms of cumulative cases and cumulative deaths for the entire US and the state of Arizona. Both types of plots indicate that the main drivers are the asymptomatic and presymptomatic individuals.



Figure 10: The cumulative cases and deaths for the U.S. and Arizona over the respective lockdown period where **Case 1** corresponds to $\beta_I = 0$ (green curve; so focuses on the impact of asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic individuals) and **Case 2** corresponds to $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (magenta curve; so focuses on the impact of symptomatic individuals)

227 4.3.3. Isolating Symptomatic and Asymptomatic/Pre-symptomatic

Recall that the τ values give the rate for testing/detection of infected individuals and subsequent self-228 isolation. In this section we compare and contrast the effect of isolating the symptomatic against the effect 229 of isolating the asymptomatic and presymptomatic by changing the appropriate τ values. For example, to 230 address the effect of isolating symptomatic infectious individuals, we can increase the value of τ_I (the rate 231 that symptomatically infectious individuals self-isolate) while keeping all other rates the same. We consider 232 this scenario for the entire U.S. and find that when τ_I increases (so that the number of symptomatically 233 infectious individuals that are self-isolated and taken out of the general population increases), the number of 234 cumulative deaths decreases by as much as 12.5%. Alternatively, if the rate of self-isolation for the asymp-235 tomatic and presymptomatic infectious individuals - τ_A and τ_P respectively - are increased and the τ_I is kept 236 at the baseline value for the U.S., the number of cumulative deaths decreases by about 35% at the end of the 237 period - see Figure 11. Thus, the decrease is more pronounced when the τ_A and τ_P are increased than when 238 the τ_I is increased which indicates that the asymptomatic and presymptomatic have more impact. Figure 239

 $_{240}$ 12 focuses on the difference in impact with 50% increase in testing and shows that the asymptomatic and

presymptomatic testing gives up to about four times as much percent decrease as the symptomatic. 241

242

244

245

We can also compare the effect of these type of testing scenarios for different states. For example, 243 although Wisconsin and Florida had similar testing rates around 12/10/2020, we find that a 50% increase in τ_A and τ_P , results in roughly a 20% decrease in cumulative deaths for Wisconsin compared to a 50% decrease in cumulative deaths for Florida - Figure 13. Note that the results for both states show the greater 246

influence of the aysmptomatic and presymptomatic infectious. 247



Figure 11: The effect of an increase in testing of symptomatic individuals versus asymptomatic and presymptomatic individuals on the cumulative deaths in the US during postlockdown period 5/15 to 8/11.



Figure 12: The effect of a 50% increase in testing of asymptomatic and presymptomatic versus symptomatic on the cumulative deaths in the US during postlock down period 5/28 to 8/11.



Figure 13: The effect of a 50 percent increase in testing of asymptomatic and presymptomatic (green curve) versus symptomatic (magenta curve) individuals on the cumulative deaths for Wisconsin and Florida.

4.3.4. Minimum testing needed 248

In this section we consider the question concerning the minimum rate of testing/detection required to 249 lower the control reproduction number, \mathcal{R}_C below one. This question is more difficult to answer directly, 250 but we can begin to get at an answer by again considering the effect of increasing testing. For example, for 251 the entire U.S. from May 28 to Aug 11 (after lifting of lockdown) if the testing is ramped up to the rate of 252

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.28.20248967; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

0.2 for asymptomatic and presymptomatic - that is, if τ_A and τ_P are both set to 0.2, while $\tau_I = 0.25$, then 253 the reproduction control number \mathcal{R}_C is 0.9819 (so just below 1). If τ_A and τ_P are bumped above 0.2, for 254 example to 0.25, while τ_I remains at 0.25, then \mathcal{R}_C falls well below 1 - to 0.8858 - and the resulting decrease 255 in cumulative deaths and daily cases is shown in Figure 14. To get a better appreciation of the impact of testing for asymptomatic and presymptomatic cases, note that if τ_A and τ_P are kept at their baseline fitted 257 values, then τ_I must be increased to 1.7 to get $\mathcal{R}_C = 0.9119$. Of course, the challenge with all of these 258 testing scenarios is that the testing of asymptomatic and presymptomatic individuals is more difficult since 259 those individuals do not have symptoms, so in order to achieve these testing rates, widespread and frequent 260 testing should be implemented. 261

262



Figure 14: The effect of an increase in τ_A and τ_P

263 4.4. Forward Simulation of the Pandemic

Natural herd immunity refers to the process by which enough of the population achieves immunity 264 via natural recovery from the disease, so that the remaining population that is not immune also receives 265 protection against the acquisition of the disease. The process involves a natural herd immunity threshold, 266 that is, the minimum number of people required to achieve disease-acquired immunity. For a disease with 267 a basic reproduction number of \mathcal{R}_0 , the necessary minimum fraction of people who must achieve immunity 268 can be given as $1 - 1/\mathcal{R}_0$. We simulate for both Wisconsin (a state which was considered an epicenter later 269 in 2020) and the entire U.S., a scenario in which COVID-19 is allowed to run its natural course (with no 270 implementation of any new control or mitigation strategies) until natural herd immunity is achieved . For 271 both Wisconsin and the entire US, the number of deaths that occur before reaching the herd immunity 272 threshold, is considerably high; thus, making the success of a natural herd immunity strategy for COVID-19 273 questionable (at the very least). For the state of Wisconsin, the number of deaths that occurs is approximately 274 450,000 and for the entire U.S., the number of deaths is more than 10 million - see Figure 15. 275



Figure 15: The number of deaths that will occur before natural herd immunity threshold is achieved for the state of Wisconsin and the entire US. The simulations are run starting on October 13.

276 5. Discussion

From various perspectives, our analysis indicates that overall, the drivers of COVID-19 are the asymp-277 tomatic and presymptomatic infectious individuals. We see that if testing is increased, these asymptomatic 278 and presymptomatic infectious have a greater impact than the symptomatic infectious; hence, widespread 279 and frequent testing is key to controlling the spread of the disease. This is especially true after holiday 280 periods and large gathering events which are often notorious for reduced and lax implementation of control 281 and mitigation strategies such as social distancing. Thus, in the schools and workplaces, testing should be 282 intentionally and systematically increased after such occurrences in order to control the silent transmission 283 by the newly infectious individuals who do not (yet) have symptoms. Our simulations also show that al-284 though lockdown might be difficult in terms of economic impact, the benefit of even a short lockdown (2 285 weeks) in reducing deaths is considerable.

287 6. Appendix A

288 6.1. Tables of State Variables and Parameter Values

State Variable	Description	
S	Population of susceptible individuals	
E	Population of non-quarantined exposed individuals (infected but not	
	showing symptoms and cannot transmit infection; newly-infected but not	
	infectious)	
E_{P}	Population of presymptomatic (infectious) individuals	
Ι	Population of symptomatically-infectious individuals	
A	Population of asymptomatically-infectious individuals	
J	Population of self-isolated individuals	
Н	Population of hospitalized individuals	
R	Population of recovered individuals	
C	Population of individuals in intensive care unit (ICU)	
D	Population of COVID-19 deceased individuals	

Table 3: State variables for the Model 1

Parameter	Description	Range	Baseline value	References
β_{I}	Effective contact rate for symptomatically-infectious	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
	individuals	-	_	_
β_A	Effective contact rate for asymptomatically-infectious	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
	individuals			
β_P	Effective contact rate for	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
	presymptomatically-infections individuals			
ϵ_m	Efficacy of face masks to prevent transmission and	0.4 -0.6	0.5	[10]
	acquisition of infection $(0 < \epsilon_m \leq 1)$			
c_m	Compliance in face mask usage in the community	0.01-0.19	per state	[10]
	$(0 < c_m \le 1)$			
σ_e	Progression rate from exposed (E) to	$1/2.5 \text{ day}^{-1}$	$1/2.5 \text{ day}^{-1}$	[10]
	presymptomatic infectious class (E_P) infectious class			
σ_{P}	Progression rate from presymptomatic infectious	$1/2.5 \text{ day}^{-1}$	$1/2.5 \text{ day}^{-1}$	[10]
	class (E_P) to asymptomatically infectious or			
	symptomatically infectious			
r	Fraction of exposed individuals who show clinical	0.4 - 0.6	0.5	[9, 6, 5]
	symptoms at the end of the incubation period			
$ au_P$	Rate at which presymptomatic infectious individuals	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
	self-isolate			
$ au_I$	Rate self-quarantined symptomatically-infectious	$1 - 2.5 \text{ day}^{-1}$	2.5 day^{-1}	[13, 4, 11, 8]
	humans self-isolate			
τ_{A}	Rate at which asymptomatically-infectious humans	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
	self-isolate			
γ_{I}	Recovery rate for individuals in the I class	$1/30 - 1/3 \text{ day}^{-1}$	$1/7 day^{-1}$	[9, 6, 5]
γ_A	Recovery rate for individuals in the A class	$1/14 - 1/3 \text{ day}^{-1}$	$1/7 day^{-1}$	[9, 6, 5]
$\gamma_{\scriptscriptstyle J}$	Recovery rate for self-isolated individuals	$0.1 - 0.15 \text{ day}^{-1}$	$1/8 day^{-1}$	[9]
$\gamma_{\scriptscriptstyle H}$	Recovery rate for hospitalized patients	$1/30 - 1/3 \text{ day}^{-1}$	$1/14 \text{ day}^{-1}$	[9, 6, 5]
γ_c	Recovery rate for ICU patients	$0.018 - 0.027 \text{ day}^{-1}$	0.0225 day^{-1}	[9]
ψ_{H}	Rate of ICU admission for hospitalized individuals	$0.02 - 0.1 \text{ day}^{-1}$	0.083 day^{-1}	[9, 5]
α_{I}	Hospitalization rate for symptomatically-infectious	$0.1595 - 0.2803 \text{ day}^{-1}$	0.2199 day^{-1}	[6, 5]
	individuals			
α_A	Hospitalization rate for asymptomatically-infectious	$0.2 - 0.3 \ day^{-1}$	$1/4 day^{-1}$	[9]
	individuals			
α_J	Hospitalization rate for self-isolated individuals	Fitting	Fitting	Fitting
δ_{I}	Disease-induced mortality rate for	$0.018 - 0.027 \text{ day}^{-1}$	0.0225 day^{-1}	[5, 7, 9]
	symptomatically-infectious individuals			
δ_A	Disease-induced mortality rate for	$0.006 - 0.009 \text{ day}^{-1}$	0.0075 day^{-1}	[5]
	asymptomatically-infectious individuals			
δ_{H}	Disease-induced mortality rate for hospitalized	$0.001 - 0.1 \mathrm{day^{-1}}$	0.015 day^{-1}	[6, 5, 7]
	individuals			
δ_{c}	Disease-induced mortality rate individuals in ICU	$0.018 - 0.027 \text{ day}^{-1}$	0.0225 day^{-1}	[6, 5]

Table 4: Parameter notation, description, values and sources for the Model 1. Some values change depending on the state and time period.

289 6.2. Lockdown period with separated symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals

In Figure 9, the results for the pre-lockdown and post-lockdown periods confirm the hypothesis that the asymptomatic and presymptomatic are the primary contributors to the spread of COVID-19. However, when we consider this scenario of targeting the asymptomatic and presymptomatic (by setting $\beta_I = 0$) versus the symptomatic (with $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$) for lockdown, we get mixed results. In particular for New York and Wisconsin we get more symptomatic infectious cases than asymptomatic and presymptomatic - see Figure 16.



Figure 16: The plots show the daily cases for each state with $\beta_I = 0$ (cyan curve) and $\beta_A = \beta_P = 0$ (red curve) for the lockdown period.

296 6.3. Goodness of Fit

In this section, we show the plots for the goodness of fit of the lockdown period for each state and the US as a whole.



Figure 17: US **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 18: Florida **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 19: Arizona **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 20: New York **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.



Figure 21: Wisconsin **Row 1**: Q-Q plots for the (1) Daily death values from the model (2) Daily death values from the data (3) Cumulative death values from the model (4) Cumulative death values from the data. **Row 2**: Box plot of the (1) Daily death values from the model and data (2) Cumulative death values from the model and data.

299 Acknowledgements

³⁰⁰ The authors thank MSRI and the AJOINT program for their continued support.

301 References

- [1] Coronavirus. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-84ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html.
 Accessed: 2020-12-10.
- ³⁰⁴ [2] Covid-19 dashboard by the center for systems science and engineering. https://coronavirus.jhu.
 ^{a05} edu/map.html. Accessed: 2020-12-10.

[3] Covid-19 statistics. https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-america?view=
 mask-use&tab=trend1. Accessed: 2020-12-10.

[4] Gerardo Chowell, Diego Chowell, Kimberlyn Roosa, Ranu Dhillon, and Devabhaktuni Srikrishna. Sustainable social distancing through facemask use and testing during the covid-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*, pages 2020.04.01.20049981–2020.04.01.20049981, 2020.

- [5] Steffen E. Eikenberry, Marina Mancuso, Enahoro Iboi, Tin Phan, Keenan Eikenberry, Yang Kuang,
 Eric Kostelich, and Abba B. Gumel. To mask or not to mask: Modeling the potential for face mask use
 by the general public to curtail the covid-19 pandemic. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 5:293–308, 2020.
- [6] Abba B. Gumel, Enahoro Iboi, and Calistus N. Ngonghala. Using mathematics to understand covid-19 dynamics. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, (Under review), 2020.

³¹⁶ [7] Enahoro Amos Iboi, Calistus N. Ngonghala, and Abba B Gumel. Will an imperfect vaccine curtail the ³¹⁷ covid-19 pandemic in the u.s.? *medRxiv*, page 2020.05.10.20097428, 01 2020.

- [8] Adam J Kucharski and et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing
 on reducing transmission of sars-cov-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 06 2020.
- [9] Calistus N. Ngonghala, Enahoro Iboi, Steffen Eikenberry, Matthew Scotch, Chandini Raina MacIntyre,
 Matthew H. Bonds, and Abba B. Gumel. Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical
 interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel coronavirus. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 325:108364, 2020.
- ³²⁴ [10] N. Iboi Enahoro A. Gumel Abba B. Ngonghala, Calistus. Could masks curtail the post-lockdown ³²⁵ resurgence of COVID-19 in the US? *Mathematical Biosciences*, 329:1–18, 2020.
- [11] Timothy P Sheahan and et al. An orally bioavailable broad-spectrum antiviral inhibits sars-cov-2 in
 human airway epithelial cell cultures and multiple coronaviruses in mice. Science Translational Medicine,
 12(541):eabb5883–eabb5883, 04 2020.
- ³²⁹ [12] P. van den Driessche and J. Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria
 ³³⁰ for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*, pages 29–48.

[13] Lee Worden, Rae Wannier, Seth Blumberg, Alex Y. Ge, George W. Rutherford, and Travis C. Porco.
 Estimation of effects of contact tracing and mask adoption on covid-19 transmission in san francisco: a
 modeling study. *medRxiv*, pages 2020.06.09.20125831–2020.06.09.20125831, 2020.



Ian M Mackay for virologydownunder.com Created: 10MAR2020




























































































































































































