

Modeling the evolution of SARS-CoV-2 under non-pharmaceutical interventions

Authors

Yael Gurevich¹, Yoav Ram², Lilach Hadany¹

Affiliations

¹School of Plant Sciences and Food Security, Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, 6997801, Israel

²School of Zoology, Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, 6997801, Israel

Correspondence: Lilach Hadany (lilach.hadany@gmail.com)

Abstract

Social and behavioral non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), such as mask-wearing, social distancing, and travel restrictions, as well as diagnostic tests, have been broadly implemented in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Epidemiological models and data analysis affirm that wide adoption of NPIs helps to control the pandemic. However, SARS-CoV-2 has extensively demonstrated its ability to evolve. Therefore, it is crucial to examine how NPIs may affect the evolution of the virus. Such evolution could have important effects on the spread and impact of the pandemic.

We used evo-epidemiological models to examine the effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions and testing on two evolutionary trajectories for SARS-CoV-2: attenuation and test evasion. Our results show that when stronger measures are taken, selection may act to reduce virulence.

Additionally, the timely application of NPIs could significantly affect the competition between viral strains, favoring reduced virulence. Furthermore, a higher testing rate can select for a test-evasive viral strain, even if that strain is less infectious than the detectable competing strain.

Importantly, if a less detectable strain evolves, epidemiological metrics such as confirmed daily cases may distort our assessment of the pandemic. Our results highlight the important implications NPIs can have on the evolution of SARS-CoV-2.

Introduction

Social and behavioral non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) have been broadly applied to contain the COVID-19 pandemic. These interventions include use of face masks, implementation of social distancing, closure of educational institutions, individual movement restrictions, and quarantining cases confirmed using RT-PCR or serological testing. The role of NPIs in controlling the COVID-19 pandemic has been studied extensively¹. Epidemiological models²⁻⁷ have been used to assess the impact of these NPIs on the pandemic, aiming to forecast the levels of infection, hospitalization, and mortality^{8,9}. Both theoretical models^{6,7} and data analysis¹⁰⁻¹³ affirm that wide and early adoption of interventions, such as limiting social contacts and wearing face masks, helps to control the pandemic. However, SARS-CoV-2 has broadly demonstrated its ability to evolve¹⁴: it has been suggested that a mutation conferring ability to infect humans¹⁵ preceded its transmission to humans from bats¹⁶. Similar to other RNA viruses¹⁷, the mutation rate of SARS-CoV-2 is estimated at $\sim 10^{-6}$ per site/cycle, relatively high¹⁸ (although lower than influenza¹⁹). Additionally, there is already significant variation in the viral population^{14,20} due to a high rate of recombination¹⁶, a very high number of copies produced in each infection¹⁸, a rapid replication cycle (around 10 hours¹⁸), and the large effective size of the SARS-CoV-2 population. This variation can potentially lead to adaptive evolution²¹, as seen before, for example, in Influenza²², HIV²³ and Ebola²⁴.

Because the virus only recently emerged in humans, further adaptation of SARS-CoV-2 to its new host is likely. Indeed, new strains have recently emerged carrying mutations that may

increase transmission, lower detectability, and perhaps even reduce vaccine efficiency^{25–27}.

Importantly, by limiting the transmission of the virus, NPIs may exert strong selection on SARS-CoV-2²⁸. Hence, it is crucial to examine how NPIs could affect the evolution of the virus. Such evolution may have important effects on the spread and control of the pandemic. To examine how the virus may evolve in response to NPIs, we have developed evo-epidemiological models^{29,30} that track both the infection status of the human hosts and the strain of the infecting virus. We use these models to examine how NPIs are expected to affect two evolutionary trajectories for SARS-CoV-2: attenuation and test evasion.

Attenuation. An important epidemiological feature of the virus is the high frequency of asymptomatic infections^{2,3,31–33}. It is suggested that asymptomatic individuals are infectious³⁴ and can transmit the disease but are less infectious than those who are symptomatic^{33,35}. Due to limited resources, the COVID-19 testing policy in many countries does not include routine screening of asymptomatic individuals, unless they have been in direct contact with a confirmed case or are routinely exposed to infected individuals (e.g., health workers). Thus, these asymptomatic cases largely go undetected. Asymptomatic infection allows the individual to maintain their normal routine and social contact levels throughout the entire course of the infection, thus potentially producing many secondary infections. The tendency to develop asymptomatic infection is affected both by the individual characteristics, such as prior health status³⁶, and by the virus itself. As asymptomatic cases are less likely to be diagnosed and isolated, we hypothesized that a decrease in the frequency of symptomatic cases can be favored by selection, leading to the evolution of an attenuated pathogen³⁷. For example, a mutation causing decreased viral load may cause a higher frequency of asymptomatic cases and milder disease. However, asymptomatic individuals are likely less infectious³³, and if the relative

transmissibility of asymptomatic cases is low enough, the more virulent strain may evolve.

Increased awareness to the epidemic and application of NPIs may select for further increase in the frequency of asymptomatic infections. NPIs change the overall infection rate by reducing the number of contacts per individual, hence we expect that NPIs will have an important role in determining the outcome of competitions between attenuated and virulent strains.

Test evasion. An active COVID-19 infection can be diagnosed using an RT-PCR test on a nasopharyngeal swab specimen³⁸, detecting specific sites in the viral genome. The detected sites were chosen such that they are critical for virus function^{39,40}. COVID-19 tests have been evaluated for their sensitivity, the expected fraction of infected individuals who receive a positive test result, and specificity, the fraction of uninfected individuals who erroneously receive a positive test result⁴¹. The conditions under which individuals are tested may differ between and even within different countries⁴². Given that individuals who receive a positive test result are isolated until recovery, largescale testing can exert strong selection pressure on the virus. The detectability of the virus may be directly under selection, potentially favoring two classes of mutants: (i) mutants presenting atypical infections, including affecting different age groups (e.g. children) or different tissues (e.g. gastrointestinal system⁴³, heart and liver infections^{44,45}). Undiagnosed COVID-19 patients may not be quarantined even when sick – heart disease, for example, is not usually infectious – and therefore might infect others, including healthcare workers and other patients. (ii) As PCR-based tests are used to determine who must be quarantined, selection might favor viruses with modifications in the RNA sequence used for the test⁴⁶. We hypothesize that when testing is frequent and NPIs are significant, selection could favor strains that are harder to detect, even at the cost of lower transmissibility.

Model

We use a SEIR compartmental epidemic model^{2,3,10}. The model follows two viral strains simultaneously spreading in an initially susceptible population (Figure 1). We neglect births and deaths due to non-disease related causes and assume no superinfection and total cross-immunity, such that recovered individuals from either strain are immune to both strains⁴⁷. For COVID-19, the latter is likely true in some strains for at least several months, due to the presence of antibodies⁴⁷. Thus, we divide the host population to susceptible individuals (S), individuals exposed to one of the strains (E_1, E_2 for strain 1 and strain 2, respectively), asymptomatic (I_1^a, I_2^a), presymptomatic (I_1^p, I_2^p), and symptomatic individuals (I_1^s, I_2^s), and “removed” individuals (R_1, R_2), which effectively include both recovered individuals and fatalities.




Figure 1. Evo-epidemiological model. Our model follows two viral strains simultaneously spreading in an initially susceptible population. Susceptible (S) individuals become exposed (E) after contact with an infected individual with rate β^x (where $x=p, s$, or a is the class of infected individual). Exposed individuals (E) undergo an incubation period during which they are not infectious. After an average incubation period of Z days, exposed individuals become infected, with either a presymptomatic (I^p) or asymptomatic (I^a) infection, with probability α and $(1 - \alpha)$, respectively. Asymptomatic individuals (I^a) are infectious but asymptomatic from disease onset until recovery. Presymptomatic individuals (I^p) are infectious and may be asymptomatic or exhibit mild symptoms for several days, after which they exhibit clinical manifestation of the disease (I^s) and are therefore isolated. Symptomatic and asymptomatic cases become recovered (R) after an average of D_s and D_a days, respectively.

Susceptible individuals become exposed through contact with an infected individual with rate β^x (where $x=p, s$ or a is the class of infected individual). The distinction between β^p, β^s , and β^a is central: asymptomatic infection is assumed to be less infectious ($\beta^a < \beta^p$), for example due to lower viral load, and β^s can be very low if symptomatic cases are isolated.

The basic model is described by the following equations ($i = 1,2$):

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta \cdot \frac{S}{N} \cdot (I_1^p + \mu_1 \cdot I_1^a + I_2^p + \mu_2 \cdot I_2^a) \quad (1.1)$$

$$\frac{dE_i}{dt} = \beta \cdot \frac{S}{N} \cdot (I_i^p + \mu_i \cdot I_i^a) - \frac{E_i}{Z} \quad (1.2)$$

$$\frac{dI_i^p}{dt} = \alpha_1 \cdot \frac{E_i}{Z} - \frac{I_i^p}{D_p} \quad (1.3)$$

$$\frac{dI_i^s}{dt} = \frac{I_i^p}{D_p} - \frac{I_i^s}{D_s} \quad (1.4)$$

$$\frac{dI_i^a}{dt} = (1 - \alpha_i) \cdot \frac{E_i}{Z} - \frac{I_i^a}{D_a} \quad (1.5)$$

$$\frac{dR_i}{dt} = \frac{I_i^a}{D_a} + \frac{I_i^s}{D_s} \quad (1.6)$$

Note that $S, E_1, E_2, I_1^p, I_2^p, I_1^s, I_2^s, I_1^a, I_2^a, R_1, R_2 \geq 0$ and $S + E_1 + E_2 + I_1^p + I_2^p + I_1^s + I_2^s + I_1^a + I_2^a + R_1 + R_2 = N$, where N is the constant host population size.

Basic reproduction number and stability analysis. The basic reproduction number R_0 of an epidemic can be interpreted as the expected number of secondary cases produced by a typical infected individual in a completely susceptible population⁴⁸. It testifies for the transmissibility of the epidemic in a new host population. We define R_0^i , ($i = 1,2$) as the basic reproductive number for each of the viral strains in our system.

We applied the next-generation approach⁴⁹⁻⁵¹ to compute the basic reproduction number. The infected compartments are $E_1, E_2, I_1^p, I_2^p, I_1^s, I_2^s, I_1^a, I_2^a$. The next-generation (i.e., transition) matrix is defined as FV^{-1} , where F describes the production of new infected and V describes transitions between infected states. The matrix has two nonzero eigenvalues, corresponding to the

reproductive numbers for each strain: $R_0^i = \underbrace{\alpha_i \cdot D_p \cdot \beta}_{\text{presymptomatic}} + \underbrace{(1 - \alpha_i) \cdot D_a \cdot \mu \cdot \beta}_{\text{asymptomatic}}$ (see details in

SI). Only the presymptomatic and the asymptomatic compartments contribute to R_0 , as individuals in the other compartments do not produce new infections. This can be interpreted as the probability that a given individual is either presymptomatic (α_i) or asymptomatic ($1 - \alpha_i$), multiplied by the number of days from beginning of infectiousness until recovery (D_p, D_a for presymptomatic and asymptomatic, respectively) and the transmission rate (β). In the case of the

test-evasive strain, the reproduction number for each strain is $R_0^i = \underbrace{\frac{\alpha_i \cdot \beta}{(p \cdot d_i + \frac{1}{D_p})}}_{\text{presymptomatic}} +$

$\underbrace{\frac{(1 - \alpha_i) \cdot \mu \cdot \beta}{(p \cdot d_i + \frac{1}{D_a})}}_{\text{asymptomatic}}$ (see details in SI). The numerators are the expected numbers of secondary

infections per day, and the denominators are the sums of removal rates from each infected compartment, where $p \cdot d_i$ is the daily detection rate.

The disease-free equilibrium ($I^a = I^p = I^s = 0$) is locally unstable⁵² to the introduction of new exposed or infected individuals if $R_0^i > 1$ for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. Using parameters adjusted to realistic SARS-CoV-2 values (Table 1), and specifically a transmission rate $\beta \geq 0.35$, we ensure that the disease-free equilibrium in our model is locally unstable, allowing the outbreak of the epidemic for both strains.

Numerical solution. To analyze the model, we use parameters estimated from COVID-19 literature (Table 1) and solve Eqs. (1.1)-(1.6) numerically using Python⁵³. For the initial conditions, we assume a population of mostly susceptible individuals ($S_0 \sim N$), with a small number of exposed individuals, divided equally between the two strains (the attenuated strain can

also evolve from rarity, see Fig. S1). New hosts are not introduced, so after enough time has passed, the population reaches a disease-free equilibrium ($I^a = I^p = I^s = 0$). At this equilibrium, $S^* + R_1^* + R_2^* = N$, meaning all individuals are either susceptible or have recovered from the disease.

Selection coefficient. The selection coefficient⁵⁴ of the attenuated strain is $s =$

$$\frac{R_2^*}{R_1^*} \left/ \frac{(I_2^a + I_2^p + I_2^s + E_2)}{(I_1^a + I_1^p + I_1^s + E_1)} \right|_{t=0}, \text{ where } R_1^* \text{ and } R_2^* \text{ are the number of hosts at the disease-free equilibrium that}$$

have been infected by the virulent and attenuated strains, respectively, throughout the course of the epidemic. In the denominator is the ratio of initial frequencies of hosts infected by the attenuated and the virulent strain at $t = 0$. When $s > 1$, this signifies that selection favors the attenuated virus and so the frequency of the attenuated strain increases, otherwise ($s < 1$) selection favors the virulent strain. That is, the attenuated strain is expected to evolve when $s > 1$.

Parameter	Description	Estimate	Source
N	Total population size	328,000,000	US population size (2019), U.S. Census Bureau ⁵⁵
β^p	Transmission rate in presymptomatic infected individuals	0.35-1.2	Li, Ruiyun, et al. 2020 ² .
β^a	Transmission rate in asymptomatic infected individuals	$\mu \cdot \beta^p$	Byambasuren, Oyungerel, et al. 2020 ³³ .
β^s	Transmission rate in symptomatic infected individuals	0	Simplifying assumption that all symptomatic individuals are isolated.
α_1, α_2	Fraction of presymptomatic infections	0.6	Oran, Daniel P., Topol, Eric J. 2021 ⁵⁶ .
μ	Relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals	0.65-0.75	Byambasuren, Oyungerel, et al. 2020 ³³ .
D_p	Number of days in the presymptomatic phase	3	Casey, Miriam, et al. 2020 ⁵⁷ .
D_a	Number of days in the asymptomatic phase	6	Byrne, Andrew William, et al. 2020 ⁵⁸ .
D_s	Number of days in the symptomatic phase	13	Byrne, Andrew William, et al. 2020 ⁵⁸ .
Z	Length of incubation period, or number of days in the exposed phase	5	McAloon, Conor, et al. 2020 ⁵⁹ .
p	Daily tests per thousand people	0.01-25	Coronavirus (COVID-19) Testing - Statistics and Research - Our World in Data ⁶⁰ . Accessed Dec. 30, 2020.
d_1, d_2	Detectability of detectable and test-evasive strain, respectively (true positive rate)	$d_1 = 0.9$	Arevalo-Rodriguez, Ingrid, et al. 2020 ⁴¹ .

Table 1. Model parameters with estimated values.

Results

Attenuation

We first consider competition between a virulent strain and an attenuated strain, where the attenuated strain has a lower fraction of symptomatic cases compared to the virulent strain. The advantage of an attenuated strain is the longer period in which individuals are infectious, as asymptomatic individuals are generally not isolated nor seek medical treatment. The

disadvantage of the attenuated strain is a lower expected transmission rate (β), as the relative infectiousness of asymptomatic individuals is lower compared to that of presymptomatic individuals ($\mu < 1$). We consider constant NPIs as a fixed reduction in the transmission rate during the entire intervention. Thus, when the impact of NPIs on transmission rates is low, the virus spreads rapidly, and the susceptible population is quickly infected by the more virulent strain. In contrast, when the impact of NPIs on transmission rates is high, the epidemic lasts longer (the curve is “flattened”), allowing the attenuated strain more time to spread. Additionally, when transmission rates are reduced, the transmission difference between the two strains is smaller. Indeed, Figure 2 shows that selection for the attenuated strain increases with the impact of NPIs and with the relative infectiousness of the attenuated strain (μ). We note that for a given μ and impact of NPI, the threshold for evolution of each strain (Fig. 2, contour line) is independent of α_2 , the fraction of symptomatic infected by the attenuated strain (Fig. S2).




Figure 2. Effective NPIs facilitate the evolution of the attenuated virus. This figure presents the conditions for evolution of either the attenuated (purple) or the virulent (orange) strains under constant NPIs. High impact NPIs (right side) facilitate the evolution of the attenuated strain, while low impact NPIs (left side) facilitate the evolution of the virulent strain. The attenuated strain can also evolve if asymptomatic individuals are infectious enough relative to presymptomatic individuals (μ is high, top side). Here, $\beta_{\max} = 1.2$, $\alpha_1 = 0.6$, $\alpha_2 = 0.05$.

NPIs have been implemented with various schedules, determined by epidemiological metrics⁶¹, economic pressures⁶¹, public opinion⁶², and in some cases have probably started later than planned⁶³. Next, we explore the effects of temporal application of NPIs^{7,64} on the competition between attenuated and virulent strains. Figure 3 shows the effect of the number of days between the outbreak and start of NPIs on the competition between the two viral strains. Overall, if NPIs are implemented earlier, then the attenuated strain is more likely to evolve. As above (Figure 2), lower impact NPIs favor the virulent strain, while higher impact NPIs favor the attenuated strain.




Figure 3. Earlier start of NPIs favors the evolution of the attenuated strain. Each curve corresponds to a different relative transmissibility of infection by asymptomatic individuals, μ . The colored areas below each curve show the regions in which the attenuated strain evolves. The areas above each of the curves show the regions in which the virulent strain evolves. Here, $\beta_{\min} = 0.35$, $\beta_{\max} = 1.2$, $\alpha_1 = 0.6$, $\alpha_2 = 0.05$.

Figure 4 compares the dynamics without NPIs (left) and with NPIs that begin a certain number of days after the outbreak and are lifted after a limited time (right). We find that NPIs significantly affect the competition between the two strains, changing the direction of selection on the virus and leading to the evolution of the attenuated strain (compare panels *a* and *b*). While NPIs reduce the peak number of symptomatic cases (compare panels *c* and *d*), a “second wave” of infections may occur when NPIs are over (panels *d* and *f*). Here, this “second wave” is dominated by the attenuated strain (panel *f*) that produces more asymptomatic infections compared to the virulent strain (compare purple dashed line and orange solid line in panel *d*).




Figure 4. Temporal application of NPIs favors the evolution of the attenuated strain.

Without NPIs (left), the virulent strain takes over the viral population. When NPIs are applied (right, shaded area), the virulent strain is more frequent among symptomatic (panel *d*), but the attenuated strain becomes more frequent in exposed individuals during the NPIs (panel *f*), and after the NPIs end it is the dominant strain (panel *b*). Parameters: NPIs start on day 31 and end on day 150. $\mu = 0.6$, $\beta_{\min} = 0.42$, $\beta_{\max} = 1.2$.

Test evasion

We assume that a proportion p of the population is tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection every day and consider the evolution of a test-evasive strain. *Detectability* is defined here as the test sensitivity, or the true positive rate: the probability that an infected individual will be correctly detected by a single test. The detectability of the detectable and test-evasive strains is d_1, d_2 respectively, where $d_2 < d_1$. All else being equal, the test-evasive strain will evolve due to its lower detectability (Fig. S3a). However, lower detectability likely incurs a cost for the virus, as the target sequences for SARS-CoV-2 tests are in regions essential for replication and other critical aspects of the viral life cycle³⁹. We assume this cost, c , is expressed in decreased

infectiousness, such that $\beta_2 = (1 - c) \cdot \beta_1$ (see Eq. S2.1 in supplementary). Thus, we examine a competition between a detectable and a test-evasive strain that is less infectious compared to the virulent strain, $c > 0$.




Figure 5. High testing rate and effective NPIs favor the evolution of test-evasive strains.

This figure presents the conditions for the evolution of test-evasive strains despite a cost of infectiousness (see Fig. S3b for further decreased infectiousness). Each line corresponds to a different testing rate, p . The colored areas below each line show the regions in which the test-evasive strain evolves. The areas above each of the lines show the regions in which the detectable strain evolves. Test-evasive strains can also evolve if the detectability of the test-evasive strain is low enough. For example, given that the impact of NPIs is 0.5, a test-evasive strain with detectability $d_2 = 0.4$ (marked here with 'X') would evolve in Israel and the UK, but in the USA the more detectable strain would evolve. Here, $\alpha_1 = 0.6$, $\alpha_2 = 0.6$, $\mu = 0.6$, $c = 0.01$, $d_1 = 0.9$. Estimated values for testing rates in different countries were accessed on December 30, 2020 (Table 1).

Figure 5 shows that a higher testing rate (p) may select for a test-evasive strain, even when reduced detectability incurs decreased infectiousness. When the impact of NPIs is higher (right), the test-evasive strain evolves even when the testing rate is low (solid line).




Figure 6. Effects of decreased detectability on epidemiological metrics. These results demonstrate the outcomes of two separate outbreaks: (i) exclusively by a detectable strain (black lines) and (ii) exclusively by a test-evasive strain (green lines), under three testing regimes (solid, dashed, and dotted lines). Panels *a* and *c* show the maximum number of actual and test-confirmed daily cases, respectively. Panels *b* and *d* show a timeline of these epidemiological metrics for a relatively high testing rate and low detectability. Higher detectability of the test-evasive strain increases the daily number of confirmed cases (panel *c*, green lines) and decreases the daily number of actual cases (panel *a*, green lines). The effect of detectability on the number of daily actual cases is associated with the cost of infectiousness, c , producing a detectability threshold (panel *a*, marked with 'X'), above which the number of actual daily cases for the test-evasive strain is lower than for the detectable strain (see Fig. S4 for the effect of decreased detectability without cost of infectiousness). A higher testing rate increases the number of confirmed cases (panel *c*, compare solid, dashed and dotted lines) and decreases the number of actual cases (panel *a*, compare solid, dashed and dotted lines). Overall, when testing rate is high and the epidemic is driven by a test-evasive strain with low detectability (panels *b* and *d*), the number of confirmed cases is lower compared to an epidemic driven by a detectable strain, while the number of actual cases is higher. Here, $\beta = 0.42$ (Impact of NPI = 0.65), $\mu = 0.6$, $\alpha_1 = 0.6$, $\alpha_2 = 0.6$, $d_1 = 0.9$, $c = 0.01$. For panels *b* and *d*, $d_2 = 0.3$, $p = 10.9$ per 1K people.

In Figure 6, we examine the effects of decreased detectability on epidemiological metrics. We explore two scenarios of epidemic outbreaks: exclusively by a detectable strain (black lines), and exclusively by a test-evasive strain (green lines). The number of confirmed daily cases increases with the testing rate (Fig. 6c, compare solid, dashed, and dotted lines), while the number of actual daily cases decreases with it (Fig. 6a, compare solid, dashed and dotted lines). When the epidemic is driven by a test-evasive strain (green lines), the daily number of confirmed cases and daily percent of positive tests (Fig. S5) increase with the detectability of the test-evasive strain (Fig. 6c), while the daily number of actual cases decreases (Fig. 6a). Overall, when testing rate is high and the epidemic is driven by a test-evasive strain with low detectability (Figs. 6b and 6d), the number of confirmed cases can be misleading: it is significantly lower for the test-evasive strain, despite the number of actual cases being higher.

Discussion

We examined the expected selection pressures exerted by non-pharmaceutical interventions and testing on virulence and detectability of SARS-CoV-2. We found that when stronger NPIs are applied, selection may act to reduce virulence. Additionally, the timely application of NPIs could significantly affect the competition between viral strains, favoring reduced virulence.

Furthermore, a higher testing rate can select for a test-evasive viral strain, even if that strain is less infectious than the competing detectable strain. Our results also show that if a test-evasive strain evolves, reductions in epidemiological metrics such as confirmed daily cases may be due to reductions in test sensitivity rather than reductions in the actual number of cases.

Our model makes several simplifying assumptions. We assume that individuals exhibiting clinical symptoms are isolated and therefore do not transmit the virus ($\beta_c = 0$). However, such individuals may still be able to infect others, whether it is in a medical facility, within the

household, or due to non-compliance with isolation guidelines. Nevertheless, practical strategies have been put in place to reduce nosocomial transmission⁶⁵, and evidence suggests that the overall risk of hospital-acquired COVID-19 is low⁶⁵. In our model, when the impact of NPIs is low, the susceptible population is infected rapidly by the more virulent strain. Our model could be extended by allowing individuals that recovered from one strain to become infected with another strain, and in that case the attenuated strain may evolve even when the impact of NPIs is low. We assume that the entire population is tested daily with a testing rate estimated by realistic parameters (Figs. 5 and 6). However, the average testing rate likely underestimates the rate for infected cohorts, as individuals who experience symptoms or have been exposed to a confirmed case are more inclined to be tested. Applying a higher testing rate would make the evolution of the test-evasive strain even more likely (Fig. 5).

The recent emergence of novel SARS-CoV-2 variants has raised widespread concern^{26,27}. SARS-CoV-2 is likely a pathogen of recent zoonotic origin, and can therefore further adapt to its new human host⁶⁶. Some existing mutations have been said to increase infectiousness⁶⁷ and be associated with a younger patient age⁶⁸. Some variants are suspected of ‘immune escape’, eluding the human immune response^{69,70}, such that more recovered individuals remain susceptible to reinfection and possibly causing a reduction in the effectiveness of vaccines^{69,70}. The future evolutionary and epidemiological trajectories of the virus are difficult to predict^{71,72}, and it may evolve into different variants differing in their level of virulence and transmissibility⁶⁶. Our results show that non-pharmaceutical interventions and testing policies, primarily designed and applied to control the spread of the pandemic, may also steer the evolution of the virus towards attenuation and test-evasion.

Acknowledgements and funding

This project was supported by Israel Science Foundation grant 3811/19 (L.H. and Y.R.) and Minerva Stiftung Center for Lab Evolution (L.H. and Y.R.). We thank Uri Obolski for discussions.

Author Contributions

Y.G., Y.R., and L.H. designed the study and formulated the model. Y.G. derived the equations and implemented the code. Y.G., Y.R., and L.H. analysed the results and wrote the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Bugalia, S., Pal Bajiya, V., Prakash Tripathi, J., Li, M.-T. & Sun, G.-Q. Mathematical modeling of COVID-19 transmission: the roles of intervention strategies and lockdown. *Math. Biosci. Eng.* **17**, 5961–5986 (2020).
2. Li, R. *et al.* Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science (80-.)*. **368**, 489–493 (2020).
3. Pei, S. & Shaman, J. Initial Simulation of SARS-CoV2 Spread and Intervention Effects in the Continental US. *medRxiv* 2020.03.21.20040303 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.03.21.20040303
4. Walker, P. G. T. *et al.* The impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation and suppression in low- And middle-income countries. *Science (80-.)*. **369**, 413–422 (2020).
5. Lourenço, J. *et al.* Fundamental principles of epidemic spread highlight the immediate need for large-scale serological surveys to assess the stage of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic. *medRxiv* 2020.03.24.20042291 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.03.24.20042291
6. Thompson, R. N. *et al.* Key questions for modelling COVID-19 exit strategies. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **287**, 20201405 (2020).
7. Karin, O. *et al.* Cyclic exit strategies to suppress COVID-19 and allow economic activity. *medRxiv* (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.04.04.20053579
8. Francis, A. *et al.* Projected ICU and Mortuary Load Due to Covid-19 in Sydney. *medRxiv* 1–10 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.03.31.20049312
9. Maslov, S. & Goldenfeld, N. Window of Opportunity for Mitigation to Prevent Overflow of ICU capacity in Chicago by COVID-19. *arXiv* 1–6 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.03.20.20040048
10. Gatto, M. *et al.* Spread and dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 10484–10491 (2020).
11. Wu, Y., Huang, M., Xie, G. & Chen, X. People behavior changes in China during COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv* 2020.05.15.20097667 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.05.15.20097667
12. Banholzer, N. *et al.* Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on documented cases of COVID-19. *medRxiv* (2020).
13. Flaxman, S. *et al.* Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature* **584**, 257–261 (2020).
14. Tang, X. *et al.* On the origin and continuing evolution of SARS-CoV-2. *Natl. Sci. Rev.* **7**, 1012–1023 (2020).
15. Benvenuto, D. *et al.* The 2019-new coronavirus epidemic: Evidence for virus evolution. *J. Med. Virol.* **92**, 455–459 (2020).

16. Boni, M. F. *et al.* Evolutionary origins of the SARS-CoV-2 sarbecovirus lineage responsible for the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat. Microbiol.* **5**, 1408–1417 (2020).
17. Lauring, A. S., Frydman, J. & Andino, R. The role of mutational robustness in RNA virus evolution. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **11**, 327–336 (2013).
18. Bar-On, Y. M., Flamholz, A., Phillips, R. & Milo, R. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) by the numbers. *Elife* **9**, (2020).
19. Sanjuán, R., Nebot, M. R., Chirico, N., Mansky, L. M. & Belshaw, R. Viral Mutation Rates. *J. Virol.* (2010). doi:10.1128/jvi.00694-10
20. Deng, X. *et al.* Genomic surveillance reveals multiple introductions of SARS-CoV-2 into Northern California. *Science (80-.)*. **369**, 582–587 (2020).
21. Day, T., Gandon, S., Lion, S. & Otto, S. P. On the evolutionary epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2. *Curr. Biol.* **30**, R849–R857 (2020).
22. Taubenberger, J. K. & Kash, J. C. Influenza virus evolution, host adaptation, and pandemic formation. *Cell Host and Microbe* (2010). doi:10.1016/j.chom.2010.05.009
23. Gelbart, M. & Stern, A. Site-Specific Evolutionary Rate Shifts in HIV-1 and SIV. *Viruses* **12**, 1312 (2020).
24. Urbanowicz, R. A. *et al.* Human Adaptation of Ebola Virus during the West African Outbreak. *Cell* **167**, 1079-1087.e5 (2016).
25. Hou, Y. J. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 D614G variant exhibits efficient replication ex vivo and transmission in vivo. *Science (80-.)*. **370**, eabe8499 (2020).
26. Lauring, A. S. & Hodcroft, E. B. Genetic Variants of SARS-CoV-2 - What Do They Mean? *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association* (2021). doi:10.1001/jama.2020.27124
27. Kupferschmidt, K. Fast-spreading U.K. virus variant raises alarms. *Science* **371**, 9–10 (2021).
28. Ali, S. T. *et al.* Serial interval of SARS-CoV-2 was shortened over time by nonpharmaceutical interventions. *Science (80-.)*. **369**, 1106–1109 (2020).
29. Pečerska, J., Wood, J., Tanaka, M. M. & Stadler, T. Mathematical models for the epidemiology and evolution of mycobacterium tuberculosis. in *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology* **1019**, 281–307 (2017).
30. Hamblin, S. R., White, P. A. & Tanaka, M. M. Viral niche construction alters hosts and ecosystems at multiple scales. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **29**, 594–599 (2014).
31. Davies, N. G. *et al.* Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nat. Med.* **26**, 1205–1211 (2020).
32. Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A. & Chowell, G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **25**, (2020).

33. Byambasuren, O. *et al.* Estimating the extent of asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Off. J. Assoc. Med. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. Canada* **5**, 223–234 (2020).
34. Furukawa, N. W., Furukawa, N. W., Brooks, J. T. & Sobel, J. Evidence Supporting Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 while Presymptomatic or Asymptomatic. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26**, E1–E6 (2020).
35. Yanes-Lane, M. *et al.* Proportion of asymptomatic infection among COVID-19 positive persons and their transmission potential: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **15**, e0241536 (2020).
36. Zhang, X. *et al.* Viral and host factors related to the clinical outcome of COVID-19. *Nature* (2020). doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2355-0
37. Chisholm, R. H. & Tanaka, M. M. The emergence of latent infection in the early evolution of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **283**, (2016).
38. Laboratory testing for 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in suspected human cases. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/10665-331501>. (Accessed: 5th February 2021)
39. Significance and Difference between Target Regions for SARS-CoV-2. Available at: <https://perkinelmer-appliedgenomics.com/2020/04/06/significance-and-difference-between-target-regions-for-sars-cov-2/>. (Accessed: 5th February 2021)
40. Gene-Target Strategies for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Testing | ZYMO RESEARCH. Available at: <https://www.zymoresearch.com/blogs/blog/what-makes-a-good-covid-19-rt-pcr-test>. (Accessed: 5th February 2021)
41. Anderson, R. M., Medley, G. F., May, R. M. & Johnson, A. M. A Preliminary Study of the Transmission Dynamics of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), the Causative Agent of AIDS. *Math. Med. Biol.* **3**, 229–263 (1986).
42. How do COVID-19 testing criteria differ across countries? – Cross-Country Analysis. Available at: <https://analysis.covid19healthsystem.org/index.php/2020/04/16/how-do-covid-19-testing-criteria-differ-across-countries/>. (Accessed: 5th February 2021)
43. Gu, J., Han, B. & Wang, J. COVID-19: Gastrointestinal Manifestations and Potential Fecal–Oral Transmission. *Gastroenterology* **158**, 1518–1519 (2020).
44. Clerkin, K. J. *et al.* COVID-19 and Cardiovascular Disease. *Circulation* **141**, 1648–1655 (2020).
45. Zhang, C., Shi, L. & Wang, F.-S. Liver injury in COVID-19: management and challenges. *Lancet Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **5**, 428–430 (2020).
46. Khan, K. A. & Cheung, P. Presence of mismatches between diagnostic PCR assays and coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 genome. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* (2020). doi:10.1098/rsos.200636
47. Kellam, P. & Barclay, W. The dynamics of humoral immune responses following SARS-CoV-2 infection and the potential for reinfection. *J. Gen. Virol.* **101**, 791–797 (2020).

48. Shaw, C. L. & Kennedy, D. A. What the reproductive number R_0 can and cannot tell us about COVID-19 dynamics. *Theoretical Population Biology* **137**, 2–9 (2021).
49. Van Den Driessche, P. & Watmough, J. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Math. Biosci.* **180**, 29–48 (2002).
50. Diekmann, O., Heesterbeek, J. A. P. & Roberts, M. G. The construction of next-generation matrices for compartmental epidemic models. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **7**, 873–885 (2010).
51. Diekmann, O., Heesterbeek, J. A. P. & Metz, J. A. J. On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio R_0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous populations. *J. Math. Biol.* **28**, 365–382 (1990).
52. Otto, S. P. & Day, T. *A Biologist's Guide to Mathematical Modeling in Ecology and Evolution. A Biologist's Guide to Mathematical Modeling in Ecology and Evolution* (Princeton University Press, 2011). doi:10.2307/j.ctvc4m4hnd
53. van Rossum, G. & Drake, F. L. *Python 3 Reference Manual*. Scotts Valley, CA (2009).
54. Chevin, L. M. On measuring selection in experimental evolution. *Biol. Lett.* (2011). doi:10.1098/rsbl.2010.0580
55. U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States; . Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST040219>. (Accessed: 5th February 2021)
56. Oran, D. P. & Topol, E. J. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **173**, 362–367 (2020).
57. Casey, M. *et al.* Pre-symptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a secondary analysis using published data. *medRxiv* (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.05.08.20094870
58. Byrne, A. W. *et al.* Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19 cases. *BMJ Open* **10**, e039856 (2020).
59. McAloon, C. *et al.* Incubation period of COVID-19: A rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open* **10**, e039652 (2020).
60. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Testing - Statistics and Research - Our World in Data. Available at: <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-testing#how-many-tests-are-performed-each-day>. (Accessed: 30th December 2020)
61. Han, E. *et al.* Lessons learnt from easing COVID-19 restrictions: an analysis of countries and regions in Asia Pacific and Europe. *The Lancet* **396**, 1525–1534 (2020).
62. Udow-Phillips, M. & Lantz, P. M. Trust in public health is essential amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Hospital Medicine* (2020). doi:10.12788/jhm.3474
63. Kohanovski, I., Obolski, U. & Ram, Y. Inferring the effective start dates of non-pharmaceutical interventions during COVID-19 outbreaks. *medRxiv* (2020).

doi:10.1101/2020.05.24.20092817

64. Loewenthal, G. *et al.* COVID -19 pandemic-related lockdown: response time is more important than its strictness . *EMBO Mol. Med.* (2020). doi:10.15252/emmm.202013171
65. Rhee, C. *et al.* Incidence of Nosocomial COVID-19 in Patients Hospitalized at a Large US Academic Medical Center. *JAMA Netw. open* (2020). doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.20498
66. van Dorp, L. *et al.* Emergence of genomic diversity and recurrent mutations in SARS-CoV-2. *Infect. Genet. Evol.* **83**, 104351 (2020).
67. Li, Q. *et al.* The Impact of Mutations in SARS-CoV-2 Spike on Viral Infectivity and Antigenicity. *Cell* **182**, 1284-1294.e9 (2020).
68. Volz, E. *et al.* Evaluating the Effects of SARS-CoV-2 Spike Mutation D614G on Transmissibility and Pathogenicity. *Cell* **184**, 64-75.e11 (2021).
69. Starr, T. N. *et al.* Prospective mapping of viral mutations that escape antibodies used to treat COVID-19. *Science* (80-.). eabf9302 (2021). doi:10.1126/science.abf9302
70. Kupferschmidt, K. New mutations raise specter of ‘immune escape’: SARS-CoV-2 variants found in Brazil and South Africa may evade human antibodies. *Science* (80-.). **371**, 329–330 (2021).
71. Wilke, C. O. & Bergstrom, C. T. Predicting an epidemic trajectory is difficult. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* (2020). doi:10.1073/pnas.2020200117
72. Arthur, R. F., Jones, J. H., Bonds, M. H., Ram, Y. & Feldman, M. W. Adaptive social contact rates induce complex dynamics during epidemics. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **17**, e1008639 (2021).