> An operationally implementable model for predicting the effects of an infectious disease on a comprehensive regional healthcare system

Daniel Chertok^{1*}, Chad Konchak¹, Nirav Shah^{1,2}, Kamaljit Singh¹, Loretta Au¹, Jared Hammernik¹, Brian Murray¹, Anthony Solomonides¹, Ernest Wang¹, Lakshmi Halasyamani^{1,2}

NorthShore University HealthSystem, Evanston, Illinois, United States of America
 University of Chicago Pritzker School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, United States of America

* dchertok@northshore.org

Abstract

An operationally implementable predictive model has been developed to forecast the number of COVID-19 infections in the patient population, hospital floor and ICU censuses, ventilator and related supply chain demand. The model is intended for clinical, operational, financial and supply chain leaders and executives of a comprehensive healthcare system responsible for making decisions that depend on epidemiological contingencies. This paper describes the model that was implemented at NorthShore University HealthSystem and is applicable to any communicable disease whose risk of reinfection for the duration of the pandemic is negligible.

Introduction

Upon its emergence in 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic presented immediate challenges to the operation of NorthShore University HealthSystem, a comprehensive regional healthcare system located in the northern part of Chicago, IL, and its suburbs. The need to forecast the expected demand on floor and ICU beds, ventilators and requisite supplies became pressing at the onset of the disease. The lack of reliable population data posed additional difficulty in implementing a usable model. Additional constraints of robustness, distributability and transparency imposed further requirements on the choice of the governing equations, solution algorithm and software implementation. During the initial stage of the pandemic, the model was delivered to the operational stakeholders daily; as time progressed, the frequency of dissemination was changed to once or twice a week, depending on the severity of the situation.

At the onset of the pandemic, the Clinical Analytics team was tasked with providing a reliable, scalable solution relevant to the local epidemiological situation [6]. While abundant literature exists on the theoretical aspects of the problem [1] - [5], [10] - [20], few specific worked examples that could be used by practitioners for immediate implementation are widely available¹. While most of the existing publications that offer applicable practical solutions focus on country-wide statistics [25], those dealing with local conditions are scarce. In order to find a satisfactory answer to this challenge, we had to quickly construct a flexible, scalable model easily adaptable to rapidly changing 1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

 $^{^{1}}$ For a concise but comprehensive description of challenges facing a researcher attempting to develop a workable model see, e.g., [27]

> conditions that could be quickly communicated to a growing number of stakeholders while affording them an opportunity to create area-specific "back-of-an-envelope" analyses suitable for their needs. This task was accomplished by augmenting the industry-standard SIR model [1] with bootstrapping estimates and interpolation and extrapolation approximations of patient flow dynamics. The resulting model was robust enough to exhibit accuracy sufficient for predicting floor, general intensive care unit (ICU), ventilator census and mortality up to two weeks in advance. The main accomplishments of the foregoing approach were the ability to quickly adapt the model to the observed coefficient of transmission (R_0) prevalent in the hospital service area, compute the forward expected length of stay on the hospital floor, in the ICU and on the ventilator, and incorporate actual and projected vaccination rates into the model.

> The paper is organized as follows. First, we review generally accepted modeling principles for forecasting the progression of the disease (COVID-19). Next, we provide empirical formulas for approximating dynamically observed rates of hospitalizations, ICU and ventilator placement, mortality and vaccination. Following that, we present the results and discuss their accuracy. We conclude with a summary of findings and directions for further research.

Materials and methods

General equations

The most widely accepted practical approach to modeling the spread of a highly infectious communicable disease is the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model [1], [2] with a time-dependent coefficient of transmission [3] and vaccination effects. From the practical standpoint, the need to develop a workable model prior to the publication of [3], as well as the need to have a robust, distributable software solution, necessitated the adoption of a simplified time-dependent form¹

$$dS(t) = -(\beta(t)S(t)I(t) + V(t))dt, \qquad (1)$$

$$dI(t) = (\beta(t)S(t) - \gamma)I(t)dt , \qquad (2)$$

where

S(t) - fraction of the population susceptible to the disease, 41 I(t) - fraction of the population currently infected with the disease, 42 $\beta(t)$ - coefficient of transmission, 43 V(t) - fraction of the population that has been vaccinated, γ - fraction of the infected population removed from further consideration due to 45 (permanent) recovery or death. 46 We are not concerned with the dynamics of the recovered population, and hence leave 47 the "R" term out of Eq. (1 - 2). Since the dynamics for $\beta(t)$ and V(t) are not known 48 beforehand, they are not included in the differential equations as separate terms, and

¹Note that the time dependency of β precludes the use of an analytical solution described in [4].

are instead left to be determined at a later discretization stage. For simplicity, we

disregarded mobility considerations reviewed in [24] and [28].

50

51

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

Numerical solution	52
Data extrapolation and scenario analysis	53
At the onset of the pandemic, there is no reliable way to determine the true number of infected patients and hence the transmission coefficient $\beta(t)$. While initial attempts were made to infer likely epidemiological dynamic from countries where the initial stage had by that time already passed [5], the validity of this approach was questionable even at that time since different locales exhibited different curve characteristics. In view of this, the approach adopted for the purpose of constructing a robust model applicable to local conditions was as follows:	54 55 56 57 58 59 60
1. assume that the number of observed NorthShore (NS) cases reflected the actual count of the disease in the population ¹ ;	61 62
2. extrapolate the evolution of $\beta(t)$ implied by the historical data ² ;	63
3. repeat 1 - 2 for the Chicago / Cook / Lake county (CCL) area containing the majority of the NS catchment area;	64 65
4. construct a dynamic (time-dependent) ratio of NS to CCL cases and assume that it accurately reflects the proportion of CCL patients attributable to NS;	66 67
5. solve Eq. $(1 - 2)$ separately for CCL and NS;	68
6. use the minimum and maximum case number estimates from step 5 as boundaries for the expected number of NS cases.	69 70
Specifically, for step 2, we need to find the value of $\beta(t)$ that delivers an exact solution to $(1 - 2)$ at t (more on this in subsection below). We can do this by equating the number of newly discovered cases in the NS population less the number of those newly vaccinated to the instantaneous decline in the susceptible population ³ :	
$dI_{+}(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} I(t + \Delta t) - I(t) = -dS(t) - dV(t) . $ (3)	
Eq. (3) applies to the CCL population as well.	71
Numerical solution of the SIR equations	72
Conventionally, (1 - 2) are solved numerically using the 4-th order explicit Runge-Kutta method [7]:	
$k_1 = -(\beta(t)S(t)I(t) + V(t)) , \qquad (4)$	

$$l_1 = \left(\beta(t)S(t) - \gamma\right)I(t) , \qquad (5)$$

$$k_2 = -\left[\beta(t)\left(S(t) + \frac{h}{2}k_1\right)\left(I(t) + \frac{h}{2}l_1\right) + V(t)\right] , \qquad (6)$$

$$l_2 = \left[\beta(t)\left(S(t) + \frac{h}{2}k_1\right) - \gamma\right]\left[I(t) + \frac{h}{2}l_1\right] , \qquad (7)$$

$$k_3 = -\left[\beta(t)\left(S(t) + \frac{h}{2}k_2\right)\left(I(t) + \frac{h}{2}l_2\right) + V(t)\right],\qquad(8)$$

 $^{^{1}}$ While this was certainly not the case initially, the accuracy of that number increase over time as testing became more prevalent and comprehensive; moreover, it is fair to assume that those inaccurate numbers reflected the qualitative dynamic of the pandemic.

 $^{^2}$ Initially, piecewise-constant; subsequently, polynomial or 7-day moving average

³Since susceptible population is monotonically decreasing, i.e., dS(t) < 0, -dS(t) > 0 represents the number of patients who have been infected or vaccinated at time t.

$$l_3 = \left[\beta(t)\left(S(t) + \frac{h}{2}k_2\right) - \gamma\right]\left[I(t) + \frac{h}{2}l_2\right] , \qquad (9)$$

$$k_4 = -\left[\beta(t)(S(t) + hk_3)(I(t) + hl_3) + V(t)\right], \qquad (10)$$

$$l_4 = [\beta(t) (S(t) + hk_3) - \gamma] [I(t) + hl_3] , \qquad (11)$$

$$S(t+h) = S(t) + \frac{h}{6} \left[k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3 + k_4 \right] , \qquad (12)$$

$$I(t+h) = I(t) + \frac{h}{6} \left[l_1 + 2l_2 + 2l_3 + l_4 \right] .$$
(13)

The Runge-Kutta method (4 - 13) is explicit and therefore inherently unstable, however, it is conventionally applied for h = 1. The justification of this can be found, e.g., in [8].

Estimating the number of potential NS patients

Eq. (1 - 2) are written in terms of population percentages, i.e.,

$$S(t) = \frac{\mathcal{S}(t)}{N(t)}, \qquad (14)$$

$$I(t) = \frac{\mathcal{I}(t)}{N(t)} , \qquad (15)$$

$$V(t) = \frac{\mathcal{V}(t)}{N(t)} , \qquad (16)$$

where

 $\mathcal{S}(t)$ - NS population susceptible to the disease,

 $\mathcal{I}(t)$ - NS population currently infected with the disease,

 $\mathcal{V}(t)$ - NS population that has been vaccinated,

$$N(t)$$
 - NS population at time t.

In order to estimate N(t), we assumed that the current proportion of NS cases relative to the observed CCL cases is indicative of the fraction of the CCL population that potential NS patients represent. In other words,

$$\frac{\Delta \mathcal{I}_{+NS}(t)}{\Delta I_{+CCL}(t)} = \frac{N(t)}{N_{CCL}} , \qquad (17)$$

where

$$\Delta \mathcal{I}_{+NS}(t)$$
 - newly discovered NS cases at time t ,
 $\Delta \mathcal{I}_{+CCL}(t)$ - newly discovered CCL cases at time t ,

 N_{CCL} - CCL population (deemed constant).

The left hand side of (17) is time-dependent. This seemingly contradicts the static assumption for N implied by the form of (1 - 2). One could, at least partially, refute this objection by pointing out that N is an *estimate at time t* of the true NS population. It is presumed to approach the exact (steady-state) value asymptotically. In fact, as can be inferred from Fig 1, empirical data suggests exponential decay of $\frac{N}{N_{CCL}}$ that can be approximated by

75

73

74

76

80

81

82

83

84

87

89

90

91 92



time from the beginning of the pandemic, days

Fig 1. The ratio of NS and CCL populations. *x*-axis: elapsed time in days since March 10, 2020 (first identified NS case); *y*-axis: NS / CCL population ratio less 0.452 (asymptotic limit).

$$\frac{N}{N_{CCL}}(t) = \alpha + \beta e^{\mu t} , \qquad (18)$$

where

 $\begin{aligned} \alpha > 0, \beta > 0, \mu < 0 \text{ - empirically determined constants}^1: \\ \alpha = 0.452, \beta = 1.61, \mu = -0.012. \end{aligned}$

U.S. Census Bureau [9] estimates the population of the CCL area to be 5,846,768 residents as of July 2019^2 . From (18), we can obtain the population estimate for NS to be approximately 392,000.

Projecting the number of hospitalizations, ICU and vent placements and deaths

In order to forecast the number of patients requiring general beds, ICU placement or intubation, we assume that, at any given time, a patient can be observed in any of the following states:

- on the floor but not in the ICU (and not intubated; lower acuity);
- in the ICU but not intubated (elevated acuity),

97

98

qq

105

 $^{^1{\}rm The}$ presented empirical fit was performed on the data between Oct. 31, 2020 and May 30, 2021. $^2{\rm The}$ latest data available at the time of writing.

- intubated (highest acuity).	107
The flowchart in Fig. 2 represents the progression of a hospitalized patient through his	108
or her stay in the hospital. The following simplifying assumptions have been made:	109

- floor (lower acuity), ICU and intubated patients are accounted for separately, i.e., those are mutually exclusive groups;
- a patient is initially placed on the floor. If their condition is grave, transfer to ICU and / or intubation occurs (almost) instantly;
- upon deterioration, a patient proceeds from the floor to the ICU to intubation.
 No stages in this sequence are skipped, but a patient can spend almost no time in
 any state and be transferred to a higher acuity stage instantly¹;
- upon improvement, a patient proceeds from intubation to the ICU to the floor as applicable. No stages in this sequence are skipped but a patient can spend almost no time and be transferred to a lower acuity stage instantly;
- there is no formal restriction on how many times a patient can deteriorate or improve.

Under those assumptions, the state equations describing the population dynamics inside the hospital are 122

$$H_{F}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathcal{H}_{+F}(t;N_{F})}{\mathcal{I}_{+NS}(t;N_{F})} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{F}-1} \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t_{i})}{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{F}-1} \Delta \mathcal{I}_{+NS}(t_{i})}, & T_{0} <= t_{0} < t_{N_{F}-1} <= T , \\ \frac{1}{N_{F}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{F}-1} H_{F}(t_{i}), & t_{N_{F}-1} > T \end{cases}$$

$$H_{ICU}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t;N_{ICU})}{\mathcal{H}_{+F}(t;N_{ICU})} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{ICU}-1} \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t_{i})}{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{ICU}-1} \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t_{i})}, & T_{0} <= t_{0} < t_{N_{ICU}-1} <= T , \\ \frac{1}{N_{ICU}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{ICU}-1} H_{ICU}(t_{i}), & t_{N_{ICU}-1} > T \end{cases}$$

$$H_{vent}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t;N_{vent})}{\mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t;N_{vent})} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{vent}-1} \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t_{i})}{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{vent}-1} \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t_{i})}, & T_{0} <= t_{0} < t_{N_{vent}-1} <= T , \\ \frac{1}{N_{vent}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{vent}-1} H_{ICU}(t_{i}), & t_{N_{ICU}-1} > T \end{cases}$$

$$H_{vent}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t;N_{vent})}{\mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t;N_{vent})} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{vent}-1} \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t_{i})}{\sum_{i=0}^{N_{vent}-1} \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t_{i})}, & T_{0} <= t_{0} < t_{N_{vent}-1} <= T , \\ \frac{1}{N_{vent}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{vent}-1} H_{vent}(t_{i}), & t_{N_{vent}-1} > T \end{cases}$$

$$t_{i} = t_{i-1} + \Delta t . \end{cases}$$

where

125

112

113

120

121

 N_F - length of lookback period for floor patients (at the time of this writing, 14 days), 126

 $^{^1\}mathrm{In}$ other words, if a severely ill patient expires without being transferred to the ICU and / or being intubated, we consider that patient to have instantaneously transitioned through those two stages to mortality.



Fig 2. Progression of a hospitalized patient through their stay.

N_{ICU} - length of lookback period for ICU patients (14 days),	127
N_{vent} - length of lookback period for ventilated patients (14 days),	128
$H_F(t)$ - hospitalization rate at time t ,	129
$\mathcal{H}_{+F}(t; N_F)$ - total number of new patients placed on the floor during the lookback period N_F ,	130 131
$\mathcal{I}_{+NS}(t;N_F)$ - total number of new infections identified among NS patients during lookback period $N_F,$	132 133
$H_{ICU}(t)$ - ICU placement rate at time t ,	134
$\mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t;N_{ICU})$ - total number of new patients placed in the ICU during lookback period $N_{ICU},$	135 136
$\mathcal{H}_{+F}(t; N_{ICU})$ - total number of new patients placed on the floor during the lookback period N_{ICU} ,	137 138
$H_{vent}(t)$ - intubation rate at time t ,	139
$\mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t; N_{vent})$ - total number of new patients placed on the ventilator during lookback period N_{vent} ,	140 141
$\mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t;N_{vent})$ - total number of new patients placed on the floor during the lookback period $N_{vent},$	142 143
$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t)$ - number of new patients placed on the floor at time t ,	144
$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t)$ - number of new patients placed in the ICU at time t ,	145
$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t)$ - number of new intubations at time t ,	146
T_0 - time of the start of the pandemic,	147
T - time of observation ("today").	148
Setting $t = t_{N_F} = t_{N_{ICU}} = t_{N_{vent}}$, i.e., setting the length of the lookback period N_B to be the same for all three groups of patients, $N_B \equiv N_F = N_{ICU} = N_{vent}$ reduces (19 - 21) to	149 150 151
$\left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_{+F}(t;N_B)}{\mathcal{T}_{+F}(t;N_B)}, T_0 <= t_0 < t_{N_B-1} <= T \right),$	

$$H_F(t) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{I}_{+NS}(t; N_B), & 10 < 0, 0 < 0, 0 < 0, 0 < 10 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10, 0 < 10,$$

$$H_{ICU}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}_{+F}(t;N_B)}, & T_0 <= t_0 < t_{N_B-1} <= T, \\ \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{i=0}^{N_B-1} H_{ICU}(t_i), & t_{N_B-1} > T \end{cases}, \qquad (23)^{-152} \\ H_{vent}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t;N_B)}{\mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t;N_B)}, & T_0 <= t_0 < t_{N_B-1} <= T, \\ \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{i=0}^{N_B-1} H_{vent}(t_i), & t_{N_B-1} > T \end{cases}. \qquad (24)$$

In other words, hospitalization, ICU and vents rates are computed exactly as rolling N-day averages up until the current time, and then extrapolated as averages over the same time period going forward¹.

The numbers of hospitalizations, ICU and vent placements are specific to the population served by a healthcare system and can be extrapolated to other entities only with caution. At the beginning of the pandemic, state-wide and regional data was either not available or unreliable thus necessitating an approximation using NS census and deaths. In doing so, the number of patients entering the hospital floor, ICU units and being intubated was assumed to be proportional to the observed number of cases.

In order to predict the counts (censuses) of the patient population currently hospitalized, placed in the ICU and intubated, it is necessary to model the flow of patients through each of those units. This can be done by backing out ("bootstrapping") recovery rates from the observed population dynamics as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}_F(T) = \mathcal{H}_F(T - \Delta T) + \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t) - \Delta \mathcal{H}_{-F}(t) , \qquad (25)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{ICU}(T) = \mathcal{H}_{ICU}(T - \Delta T) + \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t) - \Delta \mathcal{H}_{-ICU}(t) , \qquad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{vent}(T) = \mathcal{H}_{vent}(T - \Delta T) + \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t) - \Delta \mathcal{H}_{-vent}(t) , \qquad (27)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t) = H_F(t) \Delta \mathcal{L}_{+NS}(t) , \qquad (28)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+FCU}(t) = H_{FCU}(t) \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t) \qquad (29)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t) = H_{ICU}(t) \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t) , \qquad (29)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t) = H_{-icu}(t) \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t) \qquad (30)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+vent}(l) = \mathcal{H}_{vent}(l) \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(l) , \qquad (30)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{-}(t) = (\mu_{-}(t) - 1) \mathcal{H}_{-}(t - \Delta t) + \mathcal{H}_{-}(t) \qquad (31)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{-F}(t) = (\mu_F(t) - 1)\mathcal{H}_{-F}(t - \Delta t) + \mathcal{H}_{-F}(t) , \qquad (31)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{-ICU}(t) = (\mu_{ICU}(t) - 1)\mathcal{H}_{-ICU}(t - \Delta t) + \mathcal{H}_{-ICU}(t) , \qquad (32)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{-vent}(t) = (\mu_{vent}(t) - 1)\mathcal{H}_{-vent}(t - \Delta t) + \mathcal{H}_{-vent}(t) , \qquad (33)$$

where

$\mathcal{H}_F(T)$ - floor census at time t ,	163
$\mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t)$ - ICU census at time t ,	164
$\mathcal{H}_{vent}(t)$ - number of ventilated patients at time t.	165
$H_F(t)$ - hospitalization rate at time t ,	166
$H_{ICU}(t)$ - ICU placement rate at time t ,	167
$H_{vent}(t)$ - intubation rate at time t ,	168
$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{-F}(t)$ - number of patients removed ² from the floor at time t,	169
$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{-ICU}(t)$ - number of patients removed ³ from the ICU at time t,	170
$\Delta \mathcal{H}_{-vent}(t)$ - number of extubations ⁴ at time t ,	171
N_F - length of lookback period for floor patients (at the time of this writing, 7 days),	172
N_{ICU} - length of lookback period for ICU patients (7 days),	173
N_{vent} - length of lookback period for intubated patients (14 days),	174

¹It does not appear possible to define those rates smoothly since the calculation of the rate itself depends on the predicted number of affected patients which, in turn, depends on the rate creating a "circular reference".

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

²Due to discharge, placement in the ICU or death.

³Due to return to the general floor population, intubation or death.

⁴Due to extubation or death.

 $\mu_F(t)$ - observed floor removal rate at time t, 175

 $\mu_{ICU}(t)$ - observed ICU placement rate at time t, 176

 $\mu_{vent}(t)$ - observed extubation rate at time t.

Eq. (31 - 33) can be used to determine the values of μ_F , μ_{ICU} and μ_{vent} for $t \leq T$. For t > T, moving average extrapolations are used (cf.(22 - 24)):

$$\mu_F(t) = \frac{1}{N_F} \sum_{i=0}^{N_F - 1} \mu_F(t_i) , \qquad (34)$$

$$\mu_{ICU}(t) = \frac{1}{N_{ICU}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{ICU}-1} \mu_{ICU}(t_i) , \qquad (35)$$

$$\mu_{vent}(t) = \frac{1}{N_{vent}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{vent}-1} \mu_{vent}(t_i) , \qquad (36)$$

$$t \equiv t_{N_F} \equiv t_{N_{ICU}} \equiv t_{N_{vent}} , t_i = t_{i-1} + \Delta t$$
 .

Following the patient flow assumptions reflected in Fig. 1, mortality rate is computed as

$$M(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N} \mathcal{M}(t_i)}{\sum_{i=0}^{N} \mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t_i)},$$
(37)

where

M(t) - mortality rate at time t ,	179
$\mathcal{M}(t)$ - cumulative number of deaths at time t ,	180

$$t \equiv t_N$$
 - current time .

Projecting vaccination rates

Vaccination rates in the CCL area at the time of this writing followed a quartic trajectory with remarkable accuracy, as shown in Fig. 3.

177

178

181



Fig 3. CCL vaccination rates, Jan. 3. - May 30, 2021.

Empirically, the shape of the quartic parabola is determined using the usual least squares best fit to be^1

$$\mathcal{V}_{CCL}^{(4)}(t) = -5.667435 \times 10^{-3} t^4 + 7.590466 t^3 - 3.619223 \times 10^3 t^2 + 7.302425 \times 10^5 t - 5.232056 \times 10^7 .$$
(38)

Imposing the upper limit of 100% of the population and requiring that the number of vaccinated individuals be monotonically nondecreasing, we obtain²

$$\mathcal{V}_{CCL}(t) = \min\left[N_{CCL}, \max(\mathcal{V}_{CCL}^{(4)}(t), \mathcal{V}_{CCL}(t-\Delta t))\right] .$$
(39)

The number of fully vaccinated NS patients is then obtained from (18) as

$$\mathcal{V}_{NS}(t) = \frac{N}{N_{CCL}} \left(t \right) \mathcal{V}_{CCL}(t) \ . \tag{40}$$

Results and discussion

Worked example

In the example below, we assume that CCL population is 5,846,768, relevant NS patient 188 population estimated by (18) is 392,000 and infection transmission period $1/\gamma = 15$. We 189 set the pandemic start date to March 10, 2020. 190

186

185

¹The number of significant digits here is extended for consistency.

²Based on the official CCL vaccination data from Jan. 3, 2021 to May 30, 2021.

The date for this example was arbitrarily chosen from past history with the requirements that the number of new cases, patient admissions and censuses on the floor, in the ICU and attached to a ventilator be reasonable large to avoid instability and that the trajectory of the pandemic be fairly well established.

NS case and admission data as of Feb. 26, 2021 is presented in Table 1.

The last row of the table is incomplete because, while reliable case data is generally available up to and including the next-but-last day, case and hospitalization data is relatively reliable for the preceding day.

Calculations for the Runge-Kutta implementation of the model for CCL as of Feb. 26, 2021 are presented in Table 2, and for NS they are displayed in 3.

With the line corresponding to the date of 2/24/2021 as an example, the algorithm proceeds as follows:

1. Using Excel Solver¹ (or any other optimization routine), find the value of β on the preceding day that minimizes the square of the residual between the predicted and observed number of cases at time t:

$$\beta(t_{i-1}) = \operatorname{argmin}(\hat{\mathcal{I}}(t_0, t_i) - \mathcal{I}(t_0, t_i))^2 , \qquad (41)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}}(t_0, t_i) = \hat{\mathcal{I}}(t_0, t_{i-1}) + [(\mathcal{S}(t_i) - \mathcal{S}(t_{i-1}))]$$

$$- \left(\mathcal{V}(t_{i-1}) - \mathcal{V}(t_{i-2}) \right) N(t_i) , i = \overline{2, L} , t_L \equiv t , \qquad (42)$$

where

- $\hat{\mathcal{I}}(t_0, t_i)$ predicted cumulative number of identified positive cases from the beginning of the pandemic t_0 to time t_i ,
- $\mathcal{I}(t_0, t_i)$ *actual* cumulative number of identified positive case from the beginning of the pandemic t_0 to time t_i ,
- N(t) NS population at time t_i (i.e., the asymptotic limit of (18) .

 t_i - current time at the *i*-th time step.

The value of β at which this minimum is achieved corresponds to the preceding time step, 2/23/2021, and is equal to 0.043^2 .

2. Compute the transmission rate

$$R_0(t_i) = \frac{\beta}{\gamma} , i = \overline{2, L} , t_L \equiv t , \qquad (43)$$

for future reference $(\frac{1}{\gamma} = 15 \text{ days}, R_0 = 0.043 \times 15 = 0.65).$

3. Compute the NS susceptible rate (cf. 12)

$$S(t_i) = S(t_{i-1}) + k(t_{i-1})dt , \qquad (44)$$

$$k(t_{i-1}) = \frac{h}{6} \left[k_1(t_{i-1}) + 2k_2(t_{i-1}) + 2k_3(t_{i-1}) + k_4(t_{i-1}) \right] , \qquad (45)$$
$$h = t_i - t_{i-1} , i = \overline{2, L} , t_L \equiv t .$$

The above yields
$$S(t_i) = 0.8604 - 6.35 \times 10^{-4} \times 1 = 0.8598$$
.

203 204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

212

¹unconstrained GRG nonlinear optimization using centered difference approximation and automatic scaling with constraint precision = convergence tolerance = 10^{-3} .

²Rounded to two significant digits.

Chicago+Cook CCL CCL	+Cook CCL	+Lake	Nort] NS	nShore	SN	SN	$_{ m NS}$	$ m N_{S}$	$_{ m NS}$	GAU I	NS 1	Vs S	$^{ m NS}$	$N_{\rm S}$	$_{ m NS}$	$N_{\rm S}$	NS	ghts re SCt NS
Cases Vac act Vac	Vac act Vac	act Vac	Vac		act.	act.	act.	act.	act		ct.	ict.	act.	act.	act.	act.	act.	Mort.
cases	Cases	cases			Inp.	Inp.	ICU	add'l	ICU	Π	CU I	CU	Vent	add'l	vent	vent	Mort.	Rate
						Cen-		ICU	only	0	en- r	ate		vent	cen-	rate		I. IN
						sus				ω.	sn				sus			o r
510592 106260 35701 7430	106260 35701 7430	35701 7430	7430		2,899	61	546	0	×	0	×	0.12	270	0	5	0.38	496	0.908a
511409 110902 35748 7752	110902 35748 7752	35748 7752	7752		2,910	58	548	2	6	0	6	0.14	272	2	9	0.44	498	906.0 0.909
512613 117264 35808 8191	117264 35808 8191	35808 8191	8191		2,920	54	549	1	6	0	6	0.13	272	0	ũ	0.41	500	0.911
513929 122009 35861 8514	122009 35861 8514	35861 8514	8514		2,926	51	553	4	11	0	11	0.21	273	1	ŋ	0.3	502	0.908 M
515469 126389 35901 8803	126389 35901 8803	35901 8803	8803		2,931	49	554	1	10	0	10	0.18	276	e S	7	0.4	502	0.906
516772 127857 35942 8893	127857 35942 8893	35942 8893	8893		2,940	51	555	1	10	0	10	0.18	277	1	7	0.47	503	0.906
517677 132925 35967 9235	132925 35967 9235	35967 9235	9235		2,943	49	555	0	6	0	6	0.16	277	0	9	0.44	504	0.908
518344 138618 36022 9633	138618 36022 9633	36022 9633	9633		2,953	52	556	1	6	0	6	0.19	277	0	ũ	0.47	505	0.908
519080 146292 36074 10167	146292 36074 10167	36074 10167	10167		2,960	49	557	1	6	0	6	0.18	277	0	4	0.41	506	0.908
520153 159414 36124 11071	159414 36124 11071	36124 11071	11071		2,967	45	558	1	×	0	×	0.19	278	1	က	0.47	508	0.910
521218 171525 36155 11898	171525 36155 11898	36155 11898	11898		2,976	45	559	1	4	0	2	0.12	278	0	e S	0.44	509	0.911
522383 179935 36190 12466 3	179935 36190 12466	36190 12466	12466		2,982	43	560	1	2	0	2	0.12	278	0	2	0.5	510	0.911
523254 184662 36228 12785 2	184662 36228 12785 2	36228 12785 2	12785 2	64	2,987	43	560	0	4	0	2	0.11	279	1	က	0.6	511	0.913
523920 187490 36256 12975 3	187490 36256 12975 36256 36256 36275	36256 12975	12975		2,994	45	560	0	9	0	9	0.1	279	0	1	0.64	513	0.916
524508 192601 36288 13325	192601 36288 13325	36288 13325	13325		2,999	45	562	2	×	0	×	0.13	280	1	2	0.63	513	0.913
525044 203676 36319 14089	203676 36319 14089	36319 14089	14089		3,003	43	562	0	×	0	×	0.12	280	0	2	0.57	514	0.915
525722 217944 36358 15073	217944 36358 15073	36358 15073	15073		3,008	37	562	0	×	0	×	0.1	280	0	0	0.62	515	0.916
526379 231601 36391 16012	231601 36391 16012	36391 16012	16012		3,016	37	564	2	6	0	6	0.13	280	0	2	0.64	516	0.915
527198 234098 36425 16174	234098 36425 16174	36425 16174	16174		3,018	31	565	Ч	x	0	∞	0.14	281	1	က	0.45	516	0.913
527997 248822 36437 17171 :	248822 36437 7171 $($	36437 17171 3	17171	··.,	3,020	27	565	0	×	0	∞	0.15	281	0	က	0.4	518	0.917
528646 257625 36456 17766	257625 36456 17766	36456 17766	17766		3,025	30	565	0	5	0	5 C	0.16	281	0	2	0.4	519	0.919
529161 271716 36494 18739	271716 36494 18739	36494 18739	18739		3,032	34	567	2	7	0	2	0.15	284	က	5	0.64	519	0.915
529797 293847 36520 20255	293847 36520 20255	36520 20255	20255		3,035	34	567	0	2	0	2	0.16	284	0	ŋ	0.7	519	0.915
530681						30		0	9					0	4		519	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.19.21260769; this version posted July 22, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. NS COVID-19 case and admission data, Feb. 1 - 24, 2021.

reserv	ed. No re	use	<u>a</u>	llo'	We.	¢۲	wiith	Q	۱	Per	mi	SSI	<u>o</u> n	7	34	34	34	74	35	35	35	94	35	35	05
-	_	-1.02E-(-1.17E-(-9.06E-(-4.69E-(-8.39E-(-1.46E-(-1.77E-(-1.54E-(-8.66E-(-8.24E-(-6.01E-(-1.06E-(-1.34E-(-1.38E-(-1.38E-(-1.05E-(-1.02E-(-6.80E-(-6.70E-(-8.80E-(-1.05E-(-7.77E-(-3.01E-(-6.80E-(
-	ч	-1.05E-03	-1.00E-03	-1.32E-03	-1.08E-03	-9.77E-04	-4.09E-04	-9.83E-04	-1.10E-03	-1.50E-03	-2.43E-03	-2.27E-03	-1.59E-03	-9.25E-04	-5.86E-04	-9.68E-04	-2.01E-03	-2.56E-03	-2.48E-03	-5.66E-04	-2.63E-03	-1.60E-03	-2.52E-03	-7.25E-04	-7.50e-03
:	14	-1.01E-04	-1.17E-04	-9.05E-05	-4.69E-05	-8.38E-05	-1.45E-04	-1.76E-04	-1.53E-04	-8.65E-05	-8.23E-05	-6.01E-05	-1.06E-04	-1.33E-04	-1.38E-04	-1.38E-04	-1.05E-04	-1.02E-04	-6.79E-05	-6.69E-05	-8.78E-05	-1.05E-04	-7.76E-05	-3.00E-05	-6.76E-05
2	K4	-1.04E-03	-1.00E-03	-1.32E-03	-1.08E-03	-9.76E-04	-4.09 E-04	-9.83E-04	-1.10E-03	-1.50E-03	-2.43E-03	-2.27E-03	-1.59E-03	-9.24E-04	-5.86E-04	-9.68E-04	-2.01E-03	-2.55E-03	-2.48E-03	-5.66E-04	-2.63E-03	-1.60 E - 03	-2.52E-03	-7.24e-04	-7.50e-03
ç	13	-1.02E-04	-1.17E-04	-9.05E-05	-4.69E-05	-8.38E-05	-1.45E-04	-1.76E-04	-1.53E-04	-8.65E-05	-8.23E-05	-6.01E-05	-1.06E-04	-1.33E-04	-1.38E-04	-1.38E-04	-1.05E-04	-1.02E-04	-6.79E-05	-6.69E-05	-8.78E-05	-1.05E-04	-7.76E-05	-3.01E-05	-6.80E-05
c -	2	-1.05E-03	-1.00E-03	-1.32E-03	-1.08E-03	-9.76E-04	-4.09E-04	-9.83E-04	-1.10E-03	-1.50E-03	-2.43E-03	-2.27E-03	-1.59E-03	-9.24E-04	-5.86E-04	-9.68E-04	-2.01E-03	-2.55E-03	-2.48E-03	-5.66E-04	-2.63E-03	-1.60E-03	-2.52E-03	-7.25e-04	-7.50e-03
ç	71	-1.02E-04	-1.17E-04	-9.05E-05	-4.69E-05	-8.38E-05	-1.45E-04	-1.76E-04	-1.53E-04	-8.65E-05	-8.23E-05	-6.01E-05	-1.06E-04	-1.33E-04	-1.38E-04	-1.38E-04	-1.05E-04	-1.02E-04	-6.79E-05	-6.69E-05	-8.78E-05	-1.05E-04	-7.76E-05	-3.01E-05	-6.80E-05
- -	K2	-1.05E-03	-1.00E-03	-1.32E-03	-1.08E-03	-9.76E-04	-4.09E-04	-9.83E-04	-1.10E-03	-1.50E-03	-2.43E-03	-2.27E-03	-1.59E-03	-9.24E-04	-5.86E-04	-9.67E-04	-2.01E-03	-2.55E-03	-2.48E-03	-5.66E-04	-2.63E-03	-1.60E-03	-2.52E-03	-7.25e-04	-7.50e-03
z	=	-1.02E-04	-1.18E-04	-9.11E-05	-4.69E-05	-8.44E-05	-1.48E-04	-1.80E-04	-1.56E-04	-8.72E-05	-8.28E-05	-6.03 E - 05	-1.07E-04	-1.36E-04	-1.41E-04	-1.41E-04	-1.07E-04	-1.03E-04	-6.84E-05	-6.76E-05	-8.89E-05	-1.07E-04	-7.85E-05	-3.02 E - 05	-6.84E-05
Į	KI	-1.05E-03	-1.01E-03	-1.32E-03	-1.08E-03	-9.78E-04	-4.11E-04	-9.85E-04	-1.10E-03	-1.50E-03	-2.43E-03	-2.28E-03	-1.59E-03	-9.27E-04	-5.88E-04	-9.69E-04	-2.01E-03	-2.56E-03	-2.48E-03	-5.68E-04	-2.63E-03	-1.60E-03	-2.52E-03	-7.26e-04	-7.50e-03
c 	rate	0.0051	0.0050	0.0048	0.0048	0.0047	0.0046	0.0045	0.0043	0.0041	0.0041	0.0040	0.0039	0.0038	0.0037	0.0035	0.0034	0.0033	0.0032	0.0031	0.0031	0.0030	0.0029	0.0027	0.0027
100	UCL Vac rate	0.018	0.019	0.020	0.021	0.022	0.022	0.023	0.024	0.025	0.027	0.029	0.031	0.032	0.032	0.033	0.035	0.037	0.040	0.040	0.043	0.044	0.046	0.047	0.054
100	CCL Sus- cept rate	0.8958	0.8947	0.8937	0.8924	0.8913	0.8903	0.8899	0.8889	0.8878	0.8863	0.8839	0.8816	0.8800	0.8791	0.8785	0.8776	0.8755	0.8730	0.8705	0.8699	0.8673	0.8657	0.8629	0.8622
ç	KU	0.472	0.718	0.803	0.955	0.820	0.584	0.447	0.513	0.771	0.783	0.874	0.669	0.529	0.485	0.460	0.604	0.605	0.777	0.776	0.648	0.532	0.680	0.967	0.721
f	Beta	0.031	0.048	0.054	0.064	0.055	0.039	0.030	0.034	0.051	0.052	0.058	0.045	0.035	0.032	0.031	0.040	0.040	0.052	0.052	0.043	0.035	0.045	0.064	0.048
F	Date	2/1/2021	2/2/2021	2/3/2021	2/4/2021	2/5/2021	2/6/2021	2/7/2021	2/8/2021	2/9/2021	2/10/2021	2/11/2021	2/12/2021	2/13/2021	2/14/2021	2/15/2021	2/16/2021	2/17/2021	2/18/2021	2/19/2021	2/20/2021	2/21/2021	2/22/2021	2/23/2021	2/24/2021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.19.21260769; this version posted July 22, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission at a transformed at a transformed at the permission at a transformed at the perpendicular terms and the permission at a transformed at the perpendicular terms and the perpendicular terms at a transformed at the perpendicular terms at the perpendicular te

Table 2. Runge-Kutta implementation for the CCL COVID-19 model, Feb.1 - 24, 2021.

Vent ?	0 6	0	1	ŝ	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	ŝ	0	0
Cu- mul Vent	$270 \\ 272$	272	273	276	277	277	277	277	278	278	278	279	279	280	280	280	280	281	281	281	284	284	284
NS pred vent rate	0.38 0.44	0.41	0.30	0.40	0.47	0.44	0.47	0.41	0.47	0.44	0.50	0.60	0.64	0.63	0.57	0.62	0.64	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.64	0.70	0.55
ICU cen- sus	» с	6	11	10	10	6	6	6	x	1-	2	4	9	x	x	x	6	x	x	ഹ	2	1-	2
NS ICU disch rate	$0.11 \\ 0.125$	0.111	0.222	0.182	0.100	0.100	0.111	0.111	0.222	0.250	0.143	0.000	0.143	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.125	0.222	0.000	0.375	0.000	0.000	0.106
Δ	0 %	ı —	4	-	-	0	1	1	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Cu- ICU #	546 548	549	553	554	555	555	556	557	558	559	560	560	560	562	562	562	564	565	565	565	567	567	568
NS pred ICU rate	0.138 0.140	0.145	0.174	0.179	0.167	0.167	0.153	0.156	0.159	0.168	0.150	0.144	0.131	0.158	0.149	0.146	0.121	0.125	0.123	0.12	0.136	0.13	0.140
IP cen- sus	$61 \\ 58 \\ 58 \\ 58 \\ 58 \\ 58 \\ 58 \\ 58 \\ 5$	54	51	49	51	49	52	49	45	45	44	44	45	45	43	37	37	31	27	30	35	35	30
NS inp disch rate	0.167 0.230	0.241	0.167	0.137	0.143	0.098	0.143	0.192	0.224	0.200	0.178	0.114	0.136	0.111	0.133	0.256	0.216	0.216	0.194	0.074	0.100	0.086	0.170
Δp Ho-	11	10	9	5	6	ŝ	10	4	1-	6	2	ъ	4	ъ	4	ъ	x	2	0	ъ	x	က	1
Cu- mul hosp	$2905 \\ 2916$	2926	2932	2937	2946	2949	2959	2966	2973	2982	2989	2994	3001	3006	3010	3015	3023	3025	3027	3032	3040	3043	3044
NS pred hosp rate	0.135 0.138	0.143	0.146	0.151	0.156	0.153	0.160	0.159	0.159	0.164	0.175	0.170	0.177	0.172	0.165	0.162	0.172	0.168	0.164	0.170	0.172	0.173	0.169
Inf cu- mul	35,683 $35,730$	35,790	35,843	35,883	35,924	35,949	36,004	36,057	36,107	36,138	36,173	36,211	36,239	36,271	36,301	36, 340	36,373	36,406	36,418	36,437	36,475	36,501	36,525
Inf #	1,151 1,122	1,108	1,088	1,056	1,028	986	975	964	950	919	893	872	843	820	796	782	764	746	710	682	675	657	638
Inf rate	2.94E-03 $2.86F_{-03}$	2.83E-03	2.77E-03	2.69E-03	2.62E-03	2.51E-03	2.49E-03	2.46E-03	2.42E-03	2.34E-03	2.28E-03	2.23E-03	2.15E-03	2.09E-03	2.03E-03	2.00E-03	1.95E-03	1.90E-03	1.81E-03	1.74E-03	1.72E-03	1.68E-03	1.63E-03
Not sus- cept #	42,315 42,854	43,225	43,705	44,063	44,398	44,521	44,916	45,351	45,915	46,826	47,673	48,275	48,620	48,841	49,214	49,996	50,985	51,934	52,113	53,119	53,748	54,718	54,967
Vac Rate	0.018 0.019	0.020	0.021	0.022	0.022	0.023	0.024	0.025	0.027	0.029	0.031	0.032	0.032	0.033	0.035	0.037	0.040	0.040	0.043	0.044	0.046	0.047	0.054
NS Sus- cept rate	0.8921 0.8907	0.8897	0.8885	0.8876	0.8867	0.8864	0.8854	0.8843	0.8829	0.8805	0.8784	0.8768	0.8760	0.8754	0.8745	0.8725	0.8699	0.8675	0.8671	0.8645	0.8629	0.8604	0.8598
NS R0	0.70	0.81	0.63	0.67	0.42	0.95	0.93	0.89	0.56	0.66	0.74	0.56	0.66	0.64	0.85	0.74	0.75	0.29	0.47	0.97	0.68	0.65	0.91
NS beta	0.046	0.054	0.042	0.044	0.028	0.063	0.062	0.059	0.038	0.044	0.049	0.037	0.044	0.042	0.057	0.049	0.050	0.019	0.032	0.065	0.045	0.043	0.061
Day	$321 \\ 322$	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344
Date	2/1/21 2/2/21	$\frac{2}{3}/21$	2/4/21	2/5/21	2/6/21	2/7/21	2/8/21	2/9/21	2/10/21	2/11/21	2/12/21	2/13/21	2/14/21	2/15/21	2/16/21	2/17/21	2/18/21	2/19/21	2/20/21	2/21/21	2/22/21	2/23/21	2/24/21

Table 3. Runge-Kutta implementation for the NS COVID-19 model, Feb. 1 - 24, 2021.

	Date	NS	Vent	NS	NS	NS	k1	11	k2	12	k3	13	k4	14	k	1
Tate mo- mo- mo- $111111111111111111111111111111111111$		disch	sus	ed -	ed -id	inf										
tr at the transformation of the second seco		rate		-om	-om											
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$				rt	\mathbf{rt}											
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				rate												
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	2/1/21	0.00	ŋ	0.910	497	50	-1.38E-03	-7.42E-05	-1.38E-03	-7.34E-05	-1.38E-03	-7.34E-05	-1.38E-03	-7.25E-05	-1.38E-03	-7.34E-05
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	2/2/21	0.20	9	0.911	499	47	-9.48E-04	-3.67E-05	-9.47E-04	-3.65E-05	-9.47E-04	-3.65 ± -05	-9.46E-04	-3.64E-05	-9.47E-04	-3.65E-05
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	2/3/21	0.17	ŋ	0.913	501	00	-1.22E-03	-5.19E-05	-1.22E-03	-5.15E-05	-1.22E-03	-5.15E-05	-1.22E-03	-5.11E-05	-1.22E-03	-5.15E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	2/4/21	0.20	ŋ	0.910	503	53	-9.15E-04	-8.14E-05	-9.14E-04	-8.02E-05	-9.14E-04	-8.02E-05	-9.12E-04	-7.91E-05	-9.14E-04	-8.02E-05
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	2/5/21	0.20	2	0.908	503	40	-8.55E-04	-7.35E-05	-8.54E-04	-7.26E-05	-8.54E-04	-7.26E-05	-8.52E-04	-7.17E-05	-8.54E-04	-7.26E-05
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	2/6/21	0.14	4	0.908	504	41	-3.16E-04	-1.10E-04	-3.15E-04	-1.07E-04	-3.15E-04	-1.07E-04	-3.14E-04	-1.05E-04	-3.15E-04	-1.07E-04
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	2/7/21	0.14	9	0.910	505	25	-1.01E-03	-2.65E-05	-1.01E-03	-2.64E-05	-1.01E-03	-2.64E-05	-1.01E-03	-2.64E-05	-1.01E-03	-2.64E-05
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2/8/21	0.17	ъ	0.910	506	55	-1.11E-03	-2.98E-05	-1.11E-03	-2.97E-05	-1.11E-03	-2.97E-05	-1.11E-03	-2.96E-05	-1.11E-03	-2.97E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	2/9/21	0.20	4	0.910	507	53	-1.44E-03	-3.53E-05	-1.44E-03	-3.52E-05	-1.44E-03	-3.52E-05	-1.44E-03	-3.50E-05	-1.44E-03	-3.52E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	/10/21	0.50	ŝ	0.912	509	50	-2.32E-03	-8.10E-05	-2.32E-03	-7.98E-05	-2.32E-03	-7.98E-05	-2.32E-03	-7.86E-05	-2.32E-03	-7.98E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	/11/21	0.00	3	0.912	510	31	-2.16E-03	-6.56E-05	-2.16E-03	-6.48E-05	-2.16E-03	-6.48E-05	-2.16E-03	-6.40E-05	-2.16E-03	-6.48E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	12/21	0.33	2	0.913	511	35	-1.54E-03	-5.37E-05	-1.54E-03	-5.32E-05	-1.54E-03	-5.32E-05	-1.53E-03	-5.26E-05	-1.54E-03	-5.32E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	(13/21)	0.00	°	0.914	512	38	-8.81E-04	-7.57E-05	-8.80E-04	-7.44E-05	-8.80E-04	-7.44E-05	-8.79E-04	-7.32E-05	-8.80E-04	-7.44E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	/14/21	0.67	-	0.918	514	28	-5.67E-04	-6.06E-05	-5.65E-04	-5.97E-05	-5.65E-04	-5.98E-05	-5.64E-04	-5.89E-05	-5.65E-04	-5.98E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	(15/21)	0.00	2	0.915	514	32	-9.52E-04	-6.17E-05	-9.51E-04	-6.08E-05	-9.51E-04	-6.08E-05	-9.50E-04	-6.00E-05	-9.51E-04	-6.08E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	16/21	0.00	2	0.916	515	30	-1.99E-03	-3.49E-05	-1.99E-03	-3.47E-05	-1.99E-03	-3.47E-05	-1.99E-03	-3.45E-05	-1.99E-03	-3.47E-05
2/18/21 0.00 2 0.917 517 33 -2.42E-03 -4.46E-05 -2.42E-03 -4.42E-05 -2.42E-03 -4.42E-05 -2.42E-03 -4.25FE-03 -4.25FE-03 -4.25FE-03 -4.257E-03 -5.242E-03 -5.257E-03 -5.919 5.0 -5.0 -2.57E-03 -5.919 5.0 -5.0 -2.57E-03 -5.91E-05 -2.248E-03 -4.55E-05 -1.60E-03 -1.85E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-03 -2.548E-03 -2.548E-03 -2.548E-03 -2.548E-03 -2.548E-03 -2.548E-03 -2.65E-04 -2.95E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-03 -2.548E-03 -2.65E-04 -2.6	17/21	0.00	2	0.918	516	39	-2.53E-03	-4.77E-05	-2.52E-03	-4.73E-05	-2.52E-03	-4.73E-05	-2.52E-03	-4.68E-05	-2.52E-03	-4.73E-05
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	18/21	0.00	2	0.917	517	33	-2.42E-03	-4.46E-05	-2.42E-03	-4.42E-05	-2.42E-03	-4.42E-05	-2.42E-03	-4.38E-05	-2.42E-03	-4.42E-05
2/20/21 0.00 3 0.919 519 12 -2.57E-03 -7.12E-05 -2.57E-03 -6.99E-05 -2.57E-03 -6.99E-05 -2.57E-03 -6.292E-05 -2.57E-03 -6.292E-05 -1.60E-03 -1.85E-05 -2.48E-03 -1.85E-05 -2.48E-03 -1.85E-05 -2.8E-03 -1.85E-05 -2.8E-03 -1.85E-05 -2.8E-03 -2.8E-03 -2.8E-05	19/21	0.00	ŝ	0.915	517	34	-4.58E-04	-9.55E-05	-4.58E-04	-9.32E-05	-4.58E-04	-9.32E-05	-4.57E-04	-9.09E-05	-4.58E-04	-9.32E-05
2/21/21 0.33 2 0.920 520 19 -1.60E-03 -1.85E-05 -1.60E-03 -1.85E-05 -1.60E-03 -1.85E-05 -1.60E-03 -1.252-05 -1.60E-03 -1.252-05 -1.60E-03 -1.85E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-05 -2.48E-03 -2.635E-04 -2.82E-03 -2.635E-04 -4.95E-05 -6.35E-04 -4.98E-05 -6.35E-04 -4.88E-05 -6.35E-04 -4.88E-05 -6.35E-04 -2.88E-05 -6.88E-05 -6.88E-05 -6.88E-05 -6.88E-05	/20/21	0.00	ŝ	0.919	519	12	-2.57E-03	-7.12E-05	-2.57E-03	-6.99E-05	-2.57E-03	-6.99E-05	-2.57E-03	-6.86E-05	-2.57E-03	-6.99E-05
2/22/21 0.00 5 0.917 520 38 $-2.48E-03 -4.75E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-05 -2.48E-03 -4.69E-05 -2.48E-03 -2.248E-03 -2.222/23/21 0.00 5 0.917 520 26 -6.35E-04 -4.95E-05 -6.35E-04 -4.88E-05 -6.35E-04 -4.88E-05 -6.35E-04 -2.22E-04 -2.22E-04$	(21/21)	0.33	0	0.920	520	19	-1.60E-03	-1.85E-05	-1.60E-03	-1.85E-05	-1.60E-03	-1.85E-05	-1.60E-03	-1.85E-05	-1.60E-03	-1.85E-05
2/23/21 0.00 5 0.917 520 26 -6.35E-04 -4.95E-05 -6.35E-04 -4.88E-05 -6.35E-04 -4.88E-05 -6.34E-04 - 0.013 A 0.017 550 24 -7.48E.03 -2.34E.03 -2.347E.03	(22/21)	0.00	5	0.917	520	38	-2.48E-03	-4.75E-05	-2.48E-03	-4.69E-05	-2.48E-03	-4.69E-05	-2.48E-03	-4.64E-05	-2.48E-03	-4.69E-05
2/24/21 0.13 / 0.017 5.20 2/ -7.48E-03 -2.3.85E.05 -7.47E.03 -2.3.87E.05 -7.47E.03 -2	(23/21)	0.00	ъ	0.917	520	26	-6.35E-04	-4.95E-05	-6.35E-04	-4.88E-05	-6.35E-04	-4.88E-05	-6.34E-04	-4.81E-05	-6.35E-04	-4.88E-05
- 00-7011-11- 00-701017- 00-7011-11- 00-7011-11- 00-7007- 00-7011- 17 070 11000 1- 010 17 /17 /7	/24/21	0.13	4	0.917	520	24	-7.48E-03	-2.35E-05	-7.47E-03	-2.37E-05	-7.47E-03	-2.37E-05	-7.47E-03	-2.39E-05	-7.47E-03	-2.37E-05

Table 3. (cont.) Runge-Kutta implementation for the NS COVID-19 model, Feb. 1 - 24, 2021.

4. Compute the NS vaccination rate from (39 - 40) and Table 3¹

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{CCL}}(t_i) &= \min\{5, 846, 768; -5.667435 \times 10^{-3} \times 351^4 + 7.590466 \times 351^3 \\ &\quad -3.619223 \times 10^3 \times 351^2 + 7.302425 \times 10^5 \times 351 \\ &\quad -5.232056 \times 10^7\} = 318, 279 , \\ V_{CCL}(t_i) &= V_{NS}(t_i) = \frac{318, 279}{5, 846, 768} = 0.054437 , \\ \mathcal{V}_{NS}(t) &= 0.054437 \times 392, 000 = 21, 339 . \end{aligned}$$

5. Compute the number of patients who are no longer susceptible to the disease

 $\rho_{NS}(t_i) = (1 - S(t_i))N(t_i) = (1 - 0.8598) \times 392,000 = 54,967 ,$

6. Compute the infection rate

$$I(t_i) = I(t_{i-1}) + l(t_{i-1})dt , \qquad (46)$$

$$l(t_{i-1}) = \frac{h}{6} \left[l_1(t_{i-1}) + 2l_2(t_{i-1}) + 2l_3(t_{i-1}) + l_4(t_{i-1}) \right], \qquad (47)$$
$$h = t_i - t_{i-1}, i = \overline{2, L}, t_L \equiv t.$$

The above yields $I(t_i) = 1.63 \times 10^{-3} - 4.88 \times 10^{-5} = 1.63 \times 10^{-3}$.

7. Compute the predicted cumulative number of positive cases from (42) to arrive at

$$\mathcal{I}(t_i) = 36,501 + \left[(0.86041 - 0.85978) - (0.0493 - 0.0470) \times 10^{-3} \right] \\ \times 392,000 = 36,525 .$$

The predicted number of new infections is 36,525 - 36,501 = 24.

8. Compute the predicted hospitalization rate from (22)

$$H_F(t_i) = 0.1687$$

9. Compute cumulative hospitalizations

$$\mathcal{H}_F(t_0; t_i) = \max(\mathcal{H}_F(t_0; t_i), \mathcal{H}_F(t_0; t_{i-N_F}) + H_F(t_i)(\Delta \mathcal{I}(t_0; t_i) - \Delta \mathcal{I}(t_0; t_i - N_F))) = \max(3, 043, 2, 973 + 0.1687 \times (36, 525 - 36, 107)) = 3,044.$$

and $\Delta \mathcal{H}_{+F}(t_i) = 3,044 - 3,043 = 1$ new patient.

- 10. Compute the predicted floor removal rate from (34) : $\mu_F(t_i) = 0.170$.
- 11. Compute the predicted floor census from (25)

$$\mathcal{H}_F(t_i) = 4 + 35 \times (1 - 0.170) = 33$$

215

214

¹Significant digits added for consistency

 $^{^{2}}$ In reality, this calculation is performed in reverse order.

12. Repeat steps 8 - 11 for ICU and vented patients to obtain from (26 - 29)

$$\begin{split} H_{ICU}(t_i) &= 0.140;,\\ \mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t_0;t_i) &= \max(\mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t_0;t_i), \mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t_0;t_{i-N_F}) \\ &+ H_{ICU}(t_i)(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}(t_0;t_i) - \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}(t_0;t_i - N_F)) \\ &= \max(567,558 + 0.140 \times (3,044 - 2,973)) = 568 ,\\ \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+ICU}(t_i) &= 568 - 567 = 1 ,\\ \mu_{ICU}(t_i) &= 0.106 ,\\ \mathcal{H}_{ICU} &= 1 + 7 \times (1 - 0.106) = 7 ,\\ \mathcal{H}_{vent}(t_0;t_i) &= \max(\mathcal{H}_{vent}(t_0;t_i), \mathcal{H}_{vent}(t_0;t_{i-N_F}) \\ &+ H_{vent}(t_i)(\mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t_0;t_i) - \mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t_0;t_i - N_F)) \\ &= \max(284,278 + 0.55 \times (567 - 558)) = 284 ,\\ \Delta \mathcal{H}_{+vent}(t_i) &= 0.130 ,\\ \mathcal{H}_{vent} &= 0 + 5 \times (1 - 0.13) = 4 . \end{split}$$

13. Compute expected mortality rate and mortality from (37)

$$M(t_i) = \frac{\mathcal{M}(t_i)}{\mathcal{H}_{ICU}(t_0; t_i)} = \frac{520}{567} = 0.917 \; .$$

Model accuracy

An analysis of the accuracy of predictions was performed for the period starting on Mar. 219 10, 2020 and ending on May 24, 2021. Predictions were initially generated daily, then weekly, then twice a week, on Mondays and Thursdays with a few exceptions around statutory holiday. Forecasts produced between the periods of calculation were classified as "one-day-ahead" (even though they may have been issued 1 to 6 days in advance); one- and two-week-ahead predictions were also considered. Two sets of predictions were issued on each occasion: one based on the NS data, the other extrapolated from the CCL data adjusting for the then-current share that NS population represented in the CCL pool according to (17 - 18). The synthesis of two disparate sources required a different metric than, e.g., weighted interval score, employed for this purpose in [23], [22]. For practical purposes, we adopted a simplified approach described below¹. The minima and maxima of projections thus generated were considered the lower and upper forecast boundaries. If subsequently realized values fell within those boundaries, the corresponding error was set to zero, otherwise it was taken to be the absolute relative error of the most accurate boundary (upper or lower). The results are presented in Table 4. Evidently, the best predictions in terms for the number of positive cases, floor, ICU and vent censuses are achieved one day in advance, and the accuracy deteriorates with the increase in the time horizon. This was to be expected. The accuracy of mortality predictions is less dependent on the time horizon, and the relationship between the former and the latter is less pronounced. This could be explained by the relative stability of the number of mortality cases and the relatively static nature of (37).

Accuracy trajectories for the number of positive cases, inpatient, ICU and vent censuses are presented in Fig. 4. It can be observed that the most accurate predictions

218

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

 $^{^{1}}$ In general, our conclusions about the accuracy of the developed model, although arrived at through different means, are similar in nature to those reached in [23] with respect to the short-term forecasting model for Germany and Poland.

Cumul. Mortality	Pred. Pred. Pred	1 1 2	day wk. wks.	ago ago ago	34% 33% 32%	1% 1% 2%	2% 3% 3%	30% 30% 30%
ns	Pred.	5	wks. o	ago	28%	24%	47%	2008
nt cens	Pred.	1	wk.	ago	27%	18%	39%	67%
Ve	Pred.	1	day	ago	20%	18%	30%	470%
ns	Pred.	2	wks.	ago	23%	20%	40%	106%
U cens	Pred.	1	wk.	ago	31%	11%	26%	55%
Ξ	Pred.	1	$_{\rm day}$	ago	25%	13%	21%	35%
snsu	Pred.	2	wks.	ago	29%	18%	33%	05%
tient ce	Pred.	1	wk.	ago	37%	6%	15%	2066
Inpat	Pred.	1	day	ago	38%	4%	10%	14%
ases	Pred.	2	wks.	ago	21%	1%	16%	130%
sitive ce	Pred.	1	wk.	ago	27%	%0	5%	20%
P_{OE}	Pred.	1	$_{\rm day}$	ago	32%	%0	2%	2%
	Variable				$\% \ correct$	med $\% \text{ err.}$	av. % err.	std % err

Table 4. Accuracy of the NS COVID-19 model, Mar. 10, 2020 - May 24,2021













(c) Accuracy of the prediction for the ICU census

(d) Accuracy of the prediction for the vent census

Fig 4. Historical accuracy of predictions for the number of positive NS cases, floor, ICU and vent censuses, March 10, 2020 - May 24, 2021.

> to date have been made during periods of relative "calm", i.e., those times when the 243 infection curve followed a declining or quasi-static pattern (approximately, May -244 September 2020). Periods of elevated error include "regime changes" at the end of May 245 2020 and September 2020 to mid-January 2021. This was also to be expected given the 246 uncertainty not captured by the moving average or polynomial extrapolation of the 247 future transmission coefficient, R_0 . Overall, the model appears to have "erred on the 248 side of caution" overestimating the expected patient census while ICU and vent censuses 249 tend to be underestimated more often, especially during the periods of "regime change". 250

Conclusion

The model provided acceptable predictive accuracy for the operational stakeholders to use it as an additional data point in their decision-making process. It was consistent with similar operational models adopted by healthcare and government entities in the region. While specifically designed for COVID-19, it could be repurposed for any communicable disease with high transmission, significant hospitalization, near zero reinfection and moderate mortality rates, provided sufficient requisite data describing its evolution in the community is available.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Emily Carter for thoroughly proofreading the manuscript and NorthShore University HealthSystem for the permission to use operational data in the publication of this research.

References

- Kermack William Ogilvy and McKendrick A. G. A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A, 1927;115:700-721. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspa.1927.0118
- Cooper I, Mondal A, Antonopoulos CG. A SIR model assumption for the spread of COVID-19 in different communities. Chaos, Solitons & Fractals. 2020;139:110057. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2020.110057.
- Chen YC, Lu PE, Chang CS, Liu TH. A Time-Dependent SIR Model for COVID-19 With Undetectable Infected Persons. IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering. 2020;7(4):3279–3294. doi:10.1109/tnse.2020.3024723.
- Harko T, Lobo FSN, Mak MK. Exact analytical solutions of the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) epidemic model and of the SIR model with equal death and birth rates. Applied Mathematics and Computation. 2014;236:184–194. doi:10.1016/j.amc.2014.03.030.
- S SC, Selles MA PM, E PB. An Efficient COVID-19 Prediction Model Validated with the Cases of China, Italy and Spain: Total or Partial Lockdowns? J Clin Med. 2020; p. 1547. doi:10.3390/jcm9051547.
- Konchak CW, Krive J, Au L, Chertok D, Dugad P, Granchalek G, et al. From Testing to Decision-Making: A Data-Driven Analytics COVID-19 Response. Academic Pathology. 2021;8:23742895211010257. doi:10.1177/23742895211010257.

251

259

260

261

- 7. Atkinson KE, Han W, Stewart D. Numerical Solution of Ordinary Differential Equations. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2009. Available from: http://homepage.math.uiowa.edu/~atkinson/papers/NAODE_Book.pdf.
- Ralston A. Runge-Kutta methods with minimum error bounds Math Comp. 1962; p. 431–437. doi:10.1090/S0025-5718-1962-0150954-0.
- U.S. Census Bureau: Quick facts; 2019. https://factfinder.census.gov/ faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t.
- Charles F. Manski and Francesca Molinari Estimating the COVID-19 infection rate: Anatomy of an inference problem. Journal of Econometrics. 2021, 220 (1), 181-192. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.04.041. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304407620301676.
- 11. Ellen Brooks-Pollock, Leon Danon, Thibaut Jombart and Lorenzo Pellis Modelling that shaped the early COVID-19 pandemic response in the UK. UK. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2021 Jul 19;376(1829):20210001. doi:10.1098/rstb.2021.0001
- Jonathan M. Read, Jessica R. E. Bridgen, Derek A. T. Cummings, Antonia Ho and Chris P. Jewell Novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV (COVID-19): early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic size estimates UK. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2021 Jul 19;376(1829):20200265. doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0265
- 13. Leon Danon, Ellen Brooks-Pollock, Mick Bailey and Matt Keeling A spatial model of COVID-19 transmission in England and Wales: early spread, peaktiming and the impact of seasonality UK. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2021 Jul 19;376(1829):20200265. doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0272
- 14. Paul Birrell, Joshua Blake, Edwin van Leeuwen, Nick Gent and Daniela De Angelis Real-time nowcasting and forecasting of COVID-19 dynamics in England: the first wave doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0279
- 15. Thibaut Jombart, Stéphane Ghozzi, Dirk Schumacher, Timothy J. Taylor, Quentin J. Leclerc, Mark Jit, Stefan Flasche, Felix Greaves, Tom Ward, Rosalind M. Eggo, Emily Nightingale, Sophie Meakin, Oliver J. Brady, Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working Group, Graham F. Medley, Michael Höhle and W. John Edmunds Real-time monitoring of COVID-19 dynamics using automated trend fitting and anomaly detection UK. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2021 Jul 19;376(1829):20200266. doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0266
- Global convergence of COVID-19 basic reproduction number and estimation from early-time SIR dynamics PLoS One. 2020 Sep 24;15(9):e0239800 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0239800
- Nguemdjo U, Meno F, Dongfack A, Ventelou B. Simulating the progression of the COVID-19 disease in Cameroon using SIR models. PLoS One. 2020 Aug 25;15(8):e0237832. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0237832
- Calafiore GC, Novara C, Possieri C. A time-varying SIRD model for the COVID-19 contagion in Italy. Annu. Rev. Control. 2020;50:361-372. doi:doi: 10.1016/j.arcontrol.2020.10.005

- Alanazi SA, Kamruzzaman MM, Alruwaili M, Alshammari N, Alqahtani SA, Karime A. Measuring and Preventing COVID-19 Using the SIR Model and Machine Learning in Smart Health Care. J. Healthc. Eng. 2020 Oct 29;2020:8857346. doi:10.1155/2020/8857346
- Mandal M, Jana S, Khatua A, Kar TK. Modeling and control of COVID-19: A short-term forecasting in the context of India. Chaos. 2020 Nov;30(11):113119. doi:10.1063/5.0015330
- Huang, Q., Mondal, A., Jiang, X., Horn, M. A., Fan, F., Fu, P., Wang, X., Zhao, H., Ndeffo-Mbah, M., Gurarie, D. SARS-CoV-2 transmission and control in a hospital setting: an individual-based modelling study. Royal Society open science, 2021, 8(3), 201895. doi:10.1098/rsos.201895
- Bracher J, Ray EL, Gneiting T, Reich NG Evaluating epidemic forecasts in an interval format. PLOS Computational Biology 2021, 17(2): e1008618. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008618
- 23. J. Bracher, D. Wolffram, J. Deuschel, K. Görgen, J.L. Ketterer, A. Ullrich, S. Abbott, M.V. Barbarossa, D. Bertsimas, S. Bhatia, M. Bodych, N.I. Bosse, J.P. Burgard, L. Castro, G. Fairchild, J. Fuhrmann, S. Funk, K. Gogolewski, Q. Gu, S. Heyder, T. Hotz, Y. Kheifetz, H. Kirsten, T. Krueger, E. Krymova, M.L. Li, J.H. Meinke, I.J. Michaud, K. Niedzielewski, T. Ożański, F. Rakowski, M. Scholz, S. Soni, A. Srivastava, J. Zieliński, D. Zou, T. Gneiting, M. Schienle Short-term forecasting of COVID-19 in Germany and Poland during the second wave a preregistered study, medRxiv 2020.12.24.2024882 doi:10.1101/2020.12.24.20248826
- Tim K. Tsang, Peng Wu, Eric H. Y. Lau, Benjamin J. Cowling Accounting for imported cases in estimating the time-varying reproductive number of COVID-19 medRxiv 2021.02.09.21251416 doi:10.1101/2021.02.09.21251416
- 25. Jessica T. Davis, Matteo Chinazzi, Nicola Perra, Kunpeng Mu, Ana Pastore y Piontti, Marco Ajelli, Natalie E. Dean, Corrado Gioannini, Maria Litvinova, Stefano Merler, Luca Rossi, Kaiyuan Sun, Xinyue Xiong, M. Elizabeth Halloran, Ira M. Longini Jr., Cécile Viboud, Alessandro Vespignani Cryptic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and the first COVID-19 wave in Europe and the United States medRxiv 2021.03.24.21254199 doi:10.1101/2021.03.24.21254199
- 26. Singh, B. B., Ward, M. P., Lowerison, M., Lewinson, R. T., Vallerand, I. A., Deardon, R., Gill, J., Singh, B., Barkema, H. W. Meta-analysis and adjusted estimation of COVID-19 case fatality risk in India and its association with the underlying comorbidities. One health (Amsterdam, Netherlands), 2021, 13. doi:10.1016/j.onehlt.2021.100283
- Chiara Poletto, Samuel V Scarpino, Erik M Volz, Applications of predictive modelling early in the COVID-19 epidemic. The Lancet Digital Health, Volume 2, Issue 10, 2020, Pages e498-e499. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30196-5
- Mattia Mazzoli, David Mateo, Alberto Hernando, Sandro Meloni, José J. Ramasco Effects of mobility and multi-seeding on the propagation of the COVID-19 in Spain medRxiv 2020.05.09.20096339 doi:10.1101/2020.05.09.20096339