

# Worldwide Effectiveness of Various Non-Pharmaceutical Intervention Control Strategies on the Global COVID-19 Pandemic: A Linearised Control Model

Joshua Choma<sup>1</sup>, Fabio Correa, PhD<sup>5</sup>, Salah-Eddine Dahbi, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Barry Dwolatzky, PhD<sup>4</sup>, Leslie Dwolatzky<sup>3</sup>, Kentaro Hayasi<sup>3</sup>, Benjamin Lieberman<sup>1</sup>, Caroline Maslo, MD, PhD<sup>6</sup>, Bruce Mellado, PhD<sup>1,2</sup>, Kgomotso Monnakgotla<sup>1</sup>, Jacques Naudé<sup>7</sup>, Xifeng Ruan, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Finn Stevenson<sup>1</sup>

---

## Abstract

**Background** COVID-19 is a virus which has led to a global pandemic. Worldwide, more than 100 countries have imposed severe restrictions regarding freedom of movement amongst their citizens in a bid to slow the spread of the virus. These restrictions, which are part of a set of non-pharmaceutical interventions, have recently been classified by the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT) team and a nominal index measure has been defined for use by the wider international community. We address the use of this index measure to establish the degree and characteristics of control of the transmission rate of the virus within a representative sample of countries in the World and states in the United States of America.

**Methods** Country specific, Susceptible-Infected-Recovered-Deaths (SIRD)

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

models with latent dynamics were constructed using publicly available data for 23 countries and 25 states of the United States of America. Each of the models were linearised and classical frequentist error propagation was applied to them individually. The time varying, observable model parameters were extracted for each day that data was made available. The OxCGRT stringency index,  $p$ , was used to regress against these model parameters. The regression of the transmission rate as a function of  $p$  in each locale was through a linear parameter  $\alpha_s$ . In addition, macroscopic indices from the World Bank were used to explore inter-country variation in the measured parameters.

**Results** The world average was  $\alpha_s = 0.01$  (95% CI 0.0102 - 0.0112) with an ensemble standard deviation of 0.0017 (95% C.I. 0.0014 - 0.0021), strongly indicating a universal behavior. While lockdown measures have been successful in curbing the spread, our study indicates that removing them too swiftly will result in the resurgence of the spread within one to two months. Reducing the stringency index by 10 will delay reaching the apex by about 6 months, where reducing it by 20 will delay by only four months. During the post-lockdown period it is essential to increase  $\alpha_s$ . For the system to remain sub-critical, the rate with which  $\alpha_s$  increases should outpace that of the decrease of the stringency index. The spread of the virus is found to be insensitive to the Gini index and other socio-economic indexes. The typical adjustment time to see the effects of control,  $b_r^{-1}$  varied between 1.49 days for Peru and 38.09 days for Sweden. In the United States, the typical adjustment time to see the effects of control,  $b_r^{-1}$  varied between 1.41 days for Colorado to 15.91 days for Ohio.

**Interpretation** Given the measured characterisations of each locale, the effects of any change in non-pharmaceutical intervention may be anticipated and predictions can be made regarding the possible case load which is specific to that environment. This is accomplished by specifying an acceptable level of transmission,  $\beta_f$ , given the prevailing economic and social constraints which uniquely determines an overall stringency of intervention level  $p$ . As a policy maker, there are possible intervention combinations to choose from and a combination must be selected that achieves  $p$  or greater.

*Keywords:* COVID-19, Model, Control

---

## 1 1. Introduction

2 A novel corona virus, named COVID-19, was detected in the Hubei  
3 province of China in late December 2019 and rapidly spread resulting in  
4 a confirmed global pandemic by 11 March 2020<sup>1</sup>. As at 26 April 2020, the  
5 total number of infections has exceeded 3.1 million confirmed cases with more  
6 than 210 thousand deaths worldwide attributable to the effects of the virus<sup>2</sup>.  
7 A large, worldwide modeling effort is currently underway to improve health  
8 policy decision making with regards to the COVID-19 pandemic<sup>3-7</sup>. Many  
9 research groups and national response teams have looked into country spe-  
10 cific intervention strategies<sup>4,6-10</sup>.

11 The insight our research offers is a worldwide survey of the dynamics and  
12 characteristics various countries possess with regards to the control of the  
13 pandemic, through non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI)s. We have used  
14 sufficient statistics and a mechanistic model with latent dynamics and er-  
15 ror propagation to classify the dynamic behaviour of each country for which  
16 data is available. This means that characteristic variations between (and  
17 within) countries are comparable for the first time. The purpose is to allow  
18 policy makers to gradually control their local epidemic within their contex-  
19 tual situation without having to rely on the parameters derived from other  
20 country-specific intervention studies.

## 21 2. Method

22 For a fair comparison of the effect of interventions, carefully curated,  
23 comprehensive and frequently updated data is a requirement. Data was,  
24 therefore, sourced from the John's Hopkins COVID-19 data repository be-  
25 cause it fulfilled both the due diligence and frequency of updating needed for  
26 this research<sup>11</sup>.

27 Using this existing data up to and including 26 April 2020, multiple SIRD  
28 with latent dynamics and error propagation models were employed to cap-  
29 ture the salient features of the present pandemic within each country for  
30 which reliable information was available. The chosen modeling method is far  
31 simpler than some of the most comprehensive models employed during this  
32 pandemic<sup>7,8</sup>. Its simplicity is its strength and the model is 'mind-sized'; it  
33 has a number of sufficient statistics which entirely capture the models be-  
34 haviour and allow for measurement of the efficacy of control measures on  
35 the key variables of interest for policy makers and public health authorities.

36 Moreover, these parameters may be compared between and within countries.  
37 Individual based models cannot do this at a global scale without being prop-  
38 erly calibrated and sufficient statistics being defined.

39 An initial cohort of 23 countries and 25 states within the United States of  
40 America were chosen to be as representative and diverse as possible. These  
41 countries and states have implemented a wide variety of non-pharmaceutical  
42 intervention strategies. Both timing and level of interventions were fairly  
43 represented in this cohort.

44 Levels of control were measured by the Oxford COVID-19 Government Re-  
45 sponse Tracker (OxCGRT) stringency index<sup>12</sup>. This index, denoted  $p$  in our  
46 work, takes values from 0 to 100 and is indicative of the severity and num-  
47 ber of discrete measures that have been taken to try to curb the spread of  
48 COVID-19. It is sensitive enough to differentiate between situations where  
49 an intervention measure is suggested by government but not enforced<sup>12</sup>.

50 At the time of writing; America did not have a stringency index published. A  
51 best fit, using the methodology in Hale et al.<sup>12</sup> and publicly available coarse  
52 grained intervention information, was employed to align the results. This is  
53 described fully in Appendix A.

54 Daily parameter estimates of the models were extracted from the data using  
55 a least-squares framework and candidate kernel functions were regressed on  
56 the daily parameter estimates. These kernel functions represent the time  
57 domain response of a model parameter to a given level of control and are  
58 based on dynamic hypotheses regarding the time evolution of the paramet-  
59 ers in response to the NPI changes which are measured with the OxCGRT  
60 stringency index.

61 Given the large scale, the dynamic hypotheses were generated by the recogni-  
62 tion that additive effects of random variables contribute to the time domain  
63 behaviour of the effects of intervention; this is the reason for the prominence  
64 of the exponential approach a hypothesised steady state (for constant NPI  
65 level)<sup>13</sup>.

66 This sort of exponential behaviour will cease to be representative if there is a  
67 systematic breakdown in roll-out of the interventions; i.e. there exist delays  
68 which should be modeled with random variables that have poorly defined  
69 variance (so called 'fat tails')<sup>14</sup>. If such a systematic breakdown in roll-out  
70 were to happen, our proposed control model would cease to be valid.

71 *2.1. Model*

72 The characteristics of the present pandemic are atypical, a key fact that  
73 is difficult to capture directly with the classic deterministic differential equa-  
74 tions of epidemiology is that infected individuals may be asymptomatic and  
75 infectious<sup>15</sup>.

76 An SIRD (with latent dynamics) is one of the simplest models which cap-  
77 tures the essential features of the present COVID-19 outbreak and allows for  
78 clear interpretation with regards to control and decision making. This model  
79 is depicted in Figure 1 and has several key parameters which summarise the  
80 evolution of the disease, in sympathy with situations which admit the exist-  
81 ence of sufficient statistics which completely characterise the behaviour of a  
82 random variable<sup>13</sup>.

83 The latent dynamics are essential to capture the following clinical properties  
84 of COVID-19:

- 85 1. Asymptomatic cases are infectious<sup>16,17</sup>.
- 86 2. It is possible for deaths to be overstated since positive tests are not a  
87 requirement in some locales for establishing the basic underlying cause  
88 of death in this pandemic; reasonable clinical judgement is<sup>18</sup>. In addi-  
89 tion, overstatements in clinical cases may be due to the highly infectious  
90 nature of the virus; patients with severe co-morbidities may not neces-  
91 sarily die with the virus as the basic underlying cause even though it  
92 is likely to be present in the patient if they are admitted to a facility  
93 with many active COVID-19 cases.
- 94 3. There are early reports that the latent prevalence (using a seropreva-  
95 lence study) may be as high as 14% of one of the most densely populated  
96 cities in the World<sup>19</sup>.
- 97 4. There have been serious calls for protection of front-line health care  
98 workers as a result of early experiences with the epidemic<sup>20,21</sup>. The  
99 nosocomial infections within hospital care providers as a group may be  
100 non-negligible, though for the large scale model we are considering, this  
101 group has not been partitioned separately.

102 The observable (directly measurable) dynamics capture the standard features  
103 of susceptible portions of the population becoming infected and then either  
104 recovering with perpetual immunity or dying.

105 There is evidence that relapse is possible, where recovered patients would  
106 become susceptible again<sup>22</sup>. This model variation has not been explicitly

107 considered because do not know the significance of this yet; it is possible  
 108 that these are people who were not fully cured<sup>22</sup>, they may have been rein-  
 109 fected with a different strain<sup>17</sup>, the reverse transcription polymerase chain  
 110 reaction (RT-PCR) test can give a positive result due to extracellular RNA,  
 111 shedding of non-viable virions etc.

112

113 Of note is that the implicit assumption with this approach is that there  
 114 is a single viral strain which is being modelled. If there are multiple strains,  
 115 each of which is observable and differentiable through specialised testing then  
 116 refinements on the labelling and parameters are possible.

117




Figure 1: SIRD model with Unobserved Latent Dynamics.

118 *2.2. Observable Dynamics*

119 Under the stated clinical conditions which limit nosocomial infections  
 120 through effective monitoring and personal protective equipment use; the  
 121 transmissions between known infected patients and susceptible individuals  
 122 (in the broadest sense possible) should be rare. The typical disease progres-  
 123 sion time frame<sup>15,23</sup> implies that latent infections leading to deaths should be  
 124 rare, it is presumed that patients with severe symptoms are brought in for  
 125 treatment. Under these conditions the latent dynamics in the model simplify

126 with  $\delta_L \approx 0$  and  $\beta \approx 0$  and this mode simplification is used throughout.  
127 What is observed then, in terms of increase in measured infections  $I$ , is  
128 achieved strictly through  $\phi I_L$ . These are the detected infections and depen-  
129 dent on the detection rate,  $\phi$ , and test efficiency. The modeling assumption  
130 of effective known positive patient quarantining means that new infections  
131 must be latent, initially. Said another way, susceptible patients,  $S$ , are in-  
132 fected through interaction with latent infected individuals,  $I_L$  and these new  
133 latent infections are detected,  $I$  in a way which is dependent on the daily  
134 observed infection rate  $\phi$ .

135

### 136 *2.3. Daily observed infection rate, $\phi$*

137 The daily observed infection rate is related to the efficiency of the testing  
138 procedure, the number of tests which are conducted, the fraction of those  
139 carrying the virus who present with symptoms (in order for them to be con-  
140 sidered for testing) and a few other factors besides.

141 The units of  $\phi$  are *observed infections per latent infection per day*.

142 An important component for estimating  $\phi$  is the number of positive individ-  
143 uals who do not know their status and are asymptomatic. Random testing  
144 has proven useful in this regard in Iceland<sup>17</sup> and New York<sup>19</sup>. Exhaustive  
145 testing was possible in the small populations in the municipality of Vo, Italy  
146 and on the Diamond Princess cruise ship with each study including more  
147 than 3,000 individuals.

148 Reliable estimates of asymptomatic cases due to either extensive randomised  
149 testing or exhaustive testing in closed populations are presented in Table 1.  
150 Unfortunately, the number of asymptomatic cases are approximately 50%  
151 of all positive COVID-19 patients. The fraction of asymptomatic cases in  
152 enclosed populations, the number of patients with antibodies present (due to  
153 randomised population seroprevalence studies) and patients with symptoms  
154 who are subclinical and do not warrant admission and formal testing will  
155 also all influence the rate measured by  $\phi$ .

### 156 *2.4. Kernel functions*

157 The roll-out of any country-wide control measure is subject to random  
158 variations in timing and levels of civil compliance dependent on the execution  
159 plan and the populace's disposition. To capture these stylised facts, there is  
160 a typical adjustment time associated with a country-wide lock-down which  
161 is unique to that country.

Study	Asympt. positive tests
Diamond Princess <sup>15</sup> [n=4,062]	55% (95% CI 52%-59%)
Vo Italy <sup>24</sup> [n=3,300]	50% - 75%
Japanese nationals evacuated <sup>25</sup> [n=565]	31% (95% CI: 7.7% - 54%)
Nursing home, Washington <sup>26</sup> [n=23]	43% (95% CI 26% - 63%)
Iceland (Open Invite) <sup>17</sup> [n=10,797]	41% (95% CI 32% - 52%)
Iceland (Random) <sup>17</sup> [n=2,283]	54% (95% CI 30% - 77%)
Northern Italy blood donors <sup>27</sup> [n=60]	66% (95% CI 54% - 77%)

Table 1: Results from various studies regarding the number of asymptomatic cases amongst those testing positive for COVID-19.

162 This was modeled with the kernel function, conditioned on the control measure  $p$ :  
 163

$$\beta_p(t) = (1 + b_0 e^{-b_r \Delta t}) \beta_f(p), \quad (1)$$

164 where  $\beta_f(p)$  is the asymptotic value of the observed daily transmission rate,  $b_r$   
 165 is the typical adjustment rate and  $b_0$  is used to model the initial transmission  
 166 rate before the control  $p$  is applied. A characteristic plot is depicted in Figure  
 167 2.

168 As a starting point, it is hypothesised that the typical adjustment rate  $b_r$  is  
 169 characteristic of a nation and that  $\beta_f(p)$  is dependent on the stringency of  
 170 control  $p$  through:

$$\beta_f(p) = \beta_0(1 - \alpha_s p), \quad (2)$$

171 where  $\alpha_s$  is the effect of stringency on transmission rate.

172 The kernel function for  $\gamma(t)$  is:

$$\gamma_p(t) = \gamma_0, \quad (3)$$

173 regardless of control. The clinical and physical justification for this model  
 174 is that the inherent properties of the recovery process do not change with  
 175 non-pharmaceutical control, assuming the hospital system has not been over-  
 176 whelmed yet.

177

178 The kernel function for  $\delta(t)$  is:

$$\delta_p(t) = d_0 t^{d_1} e^{-d_r \Delta t}, \quad (4)$$






Figure 2: The transmission rate kernel function depicting the typical adjustment rate,  $b_r$  and final transmission rate  $\beta_f$ . The control index  $p$  affects the total reduction in transmission.

179 which is the result that would be theoretically expected from a cascade of  
 180 first order processes<sup>28</sup>. The temporary increase in this parameter is due to  
 181 the reduced number of severe infections which will artificially raise it since  
 182  $\delta \propto I^{-1}$ , see (B.7). This function captures the transients inherent in the  
 183 daily death count as a result of intervention only. The steady state value  
 184 which is asymptotically approached as the epidemic reaches steady state.

### 185 2.5. Control

186 The capacity of countries to properly address the risk that COVID-19  
 187 poses is varied; with less than half being fully positioned to prevent, detect,  
 188 and respond appropriately<sup>29</sup>. The World Health Organisation identifies as a  
 189 key strategic objective within the current global pandemic, the need to reduce  
 190 human-to-human transmission of the virus<sup>2</sup>. Further, the WHO recommends  
 191 combinations of public health measures which would jointly work to achieve  
 192 this such as rapid identification of infections, contact tracing, infection pre-  
 193 vention and control at healthcare facilities, additional health measures for  
 194 traveling to name a few<sup>2</sup>.

195 A feasibility study of contact tracking and tracing in the UK was established  
 196 using the known basic reproductive number, various initial conditions and  
 197 various successful traces<sup>6</sup>. The results were that a prolific disease with a high  
 198  $R_0$  required a large percent of traces to be found<sup>6</sup>.

199

200 Of note is that the basic reproductive number depends on the conditions  
 201 under which it is measured; it has been proven that various interventions  
 202 bring down the basic reproductive number and these would make the fea-  
 203 sibility of tracking and tracing more attractive. In addition, tracking and  
 204 tracing is known to reduce the basic reproductive number further (see Sin-  
 205 gapore and Taiwan).  
 206 These results are well known in non-linear feedback system theory; interven-  
 207 tions taken all contribute to make the control of the disease easier since they  
 208 change the system parameters<sup>30</sup>. In a very real sense, COVID-19 under inter-  
 209 vention is not the same (from a systems perspective) as COVID-19 without  
 210 intervention; they each have their own dynamics and this makes control of  
 211 one fundamentally easier than the other.  
 212 In terms of the proposed latent dynamics model, the effect of various control  
 213 policies are depicted in Figure 3. This Figure clearly demonstrates the value  
 214 of the proposed methodology; one may holistically view the epidemic and  
 215 various policy actions in a single framework and be able to anticipate the  
 216 consequences.




Figure 3: The Effects of Various Interventions on the Model

217

### 218 2.6. NPIs and the OxCGRT Stringency Index

219 The OxCGRT has developed a valuable database for comparing countries  
 220 response strategies.<sup>31</sup> The database contains the following levels of control  
 221 (coded using ordinal numbers) and timing for 139 countries:

- 222 1. S1 - School closure
- 223 2. S2 - Workplace closure
- 224 3. S3 - Cancel public events
- 225 4. S4 - Close public transport
- 226 5. S5 - Public information campaign
- 227 6. S6 - Domestic travel bans
- 228 7. S7 - International travel bans

229 Also included in this data set is a Stringency Index,  $p$  in our notation,  
230 which provides a single number that captures the overall level of interven-  
231 tion implied by combinations of the ordinal numbers S1-S7. The Oxford  
232 stringency index is calculated using a weighted average of the above seven  
233 non-pharmaceutical interventions<sup>32</sup>.

234

235 These interventions were rolled-out at different times for different levels  
236 depending on the number of days since the first reported case.




Figure 4: Timing and Severity of NPIs in the set of representative countries and US

### 237 Recovery rate

238 The kernel in (3) is effectively stating that the daily recovery rate is constant,  
239 in the absence of improved clinical treatment regimes or viral physiology  
240 (the virus has not sufficiently mutated so that its resolution time has been  
241 substantially altered within the population under consideration). Since the  
242 control measures considered,  $p$  are all non-pharmaceutical, the recovery rate

243 dynamics are dictated by  $\gamma(t) = \gamma_0 = \text{const.}$ , whatever the value of  $p$ . This is  
244 true provided that the health care system has not been overwhelmed; which  
245 is the purpose of the control system.

246 In the absence of data on the population dynamics during withdrawal of  
247 some NPI's, our model is conservative and uses the same typical adjustment  
248 rate for the withdrawal of NPI's as for the addition of NPIs.

### 249 3. Results

250 The research output, using the foregoing methodology are shown in Ta-  
251 ble 2 for various countries and in Table 3 for various States of the US. Results  
252 are expressed in terms of  $\gamma_0$ ,  $d_0$ ,  $\beta_0$ ,  $b_r^{-1}$ ,  $p_{max}$  and  $\alpha_s$  in Table 2. Table 3  
253 does not display  $\gamma_0$ , as the data for the number of recoveries has not been  
254 reported since late March.

255 The first salient feature of Tables 2 and 3 is that the evolution of the  
256 pandemic in different countries share strong similarities. Some variations are  
257 observed in the parameters  $\gamma_0$ ,  $d_0$ ,  $\beta_0$ , where  $b_r^{-1}$  is subjected to features of  
258 the data most likely to specifics in the reporting.

259 The most important result from Tables 2 and 3 revolves around the obser-  
260 vation that the bulk of countries and US States display values of  $\alpha_s \approx 0.01$ .  
261 It is remarkable that this occurs whilst other parameters are measured to  
262 have a great variety, especially  $\beta_0$ . This striking result also speaks to the  
263 universal character of the stringency index used here to quantify NPIs. This  
264 observation will be reinforced by results reported in Section 4.3, where the  
265 rate of spread does not seem to depend on socio-economic factors but rather  
266 on the fraction of the population in large cities.

267 The results of  $\alpha_s$  display some deviations from the average value, espe-  
268 cially in some States of the US. Section 4.4 will touch upon an analysis of  
269 these outliers and how these appear to be related to population sparsity.

### 270 4. Discussion

#### 271 4.1. Predictive capabilities of the model

272 The primary intent of this paper is to provide a framework with which  
273 to issue country-specific predictions for the temporal evolution of the spread  
274 and other outcomes in the post-lockdown period (for a variety of control  
275 policies). A few weeks of containment measures have yielded valuable data  
276 across the World to understand the observable dynamics, where the latent

Country	$\gamma_0$	$d_0$	$\beta_0$	$b_r^{-1}$ [days]	$p_{max}$	$\alpha_s$
Austria	0.045	0.00342	0.26	7.15	95	0.010
Belgium	0.019	0.00070	0.24	19.12	86	0.012
Brazil	0.034	0.01670	0.39	2.97	76	0.009
Canada	0.026	0.00333	0.31	13.53	86	0.010
Chile	0.036	0.00150	0.30	5.74	81	0.009
Ecuador	0.006	0.00004	0.42	2.89	100	0.009
Egypt	0.027	0.00058	0.15	9.18	100	0.005
France	0.019	0.00012	0.33	0.07	95	0.011
Germany	0.042	0.00258	0.28	10.50	86	0.011
Ireland	0.015	0.00372	0.34	23.46	86	0.012
Israel	0.018	0.00003	0.27	8.89	100	0.009
Italy	0.020	0.00107	0.24	10.26	95	0.010
Morocco	0.011	0.0021	0.25	16.58	86	0.010
Netherlands	0.001	0.00050	0.22	16.21	86	0.012
Peru	0.051	0.00163	0.33	1.49	86	0.007
Portugal	0.002	0.00045	0.31	8.28	100	0.009
South Africa	0.018	0.00050	0.28	2.19	100	0.008
South Korea	0.032	0.00031	0.07	16.24	81	0.012
Spain	0.037	0.00006	0.34	11.96	95	0.010
Sweden	0.003	0.00002	0.12	38.09	52	0.019
Switzerland	0.036	0.00045	0.46	8.12	81	0.012
Turkey	0.012	0.00047	0.64	14.41	95	0.011
UK	0.001	0.00027	0.23	14.37	71	0.013

Table 2: Results for various representative countries around the World. Results are given in terms of  $\gamma_0$ ,  $d_0$ ,  $\beta_0$ ,  $b_r^{-1}$ ,  $p_{max}$  and  $\alpha_s$  (see text). Parameters have been obtained with data up until April 26 2020.

277 dynamics are significantly less understood. The framework proposed here  
 278 allows for the modeller to factorise latent and observable dynamics, with the  
 279 intent to address the evolution of the latter without major hindrance from  
 280 limited knowledge of the former. In this setup the temporal evolution of  
 281 observable dynamics are weakly coupled to that that of the latent dynamics  
 282 through the term  $\phi I_L$  (see Figure 1). In practice, the presence of this term  
 283 implies that the total population of observed infections will be bound by  
 284 the parameter  $\phi$ , which can be viewed as the fraction of true infections that




Figure 5: Implications of the model on observed transmission rate and stringency index for representative countries.

285 become symptomatic enough to warrant testing and, therefore, become clas-  
 286 sified as an observed infection upon a positive result. Provided that  $\gamma \leq \gamma_L$   
 287 the maximum number of observed infections will be limited to  $\phi N$ .

288 The temporal evolution will depend on the initial parameters relevant  
 289 to the spread and the parameters that are chosen to depend on time. For  
 290 illustration purposes, we chose to freeze  $d$  to the last values measured, or  $d_0$ ,  
 291 as reported in Tables 2 and 3.

292 From Eqs. 1 and 2 one gets for the post-lockdown period:

$$\beta(t, p) = \beta_f - (1 + e^{-b_r t})\beta_0 \alpha_s \Delta p, \quad (5)$$

293 where  $t = 0$  corresponds to the end of the lockdown period and the enacting  
 294 of new interventions, such that  $p < p_{max}$ . The implementation of new less  
 295 restrictive measures will yield  $\Delta p = p - p_{max} < 0$ , where  $\beta(t, p) > \beta_f$ . It  
 296 is reasonable to infer that the typical adjustment time leading to the asymptotic  
 297 value of  $\beta_f$  may also apply here.

298 For illustration purposes, we choose the configuration of parameters ob-  
 299 tained with Italian data, where  $\phi = 0.1$  is used (see Section 2.2. The scenario




Figure 6: Effect of NPIs on the transmission rate parameter in the set of representative countries (ordered by  $\beta_f$ )

300 considered here assumes that variations of the index occur after the last avail-  
 301 able data with  $\Delta p = -10, -30$ . Figure 9 the time dependence of the num-  
 302 ber of symptomatic population, the active cases and the cumulative number  
 303 of cases and fatalities. One can appreciate that going from  $\Delta p = -10$  to  
 304  $\Delta p = -30$  has serious consequences in terms of the time it takes to achieve  
 305 the peak in active case as well as the amplitude of the peak. This is further  
 306 illustrated in Figure 10, where the number of active cases and daily fatalities  
 307 are shown as a function of time for different  $\Delta p$  ranging from -10 to -50.  
 308 One can appreciate the swift change in the in the dynamics when going form  
 309  $\Delta p = -10$  to  $\Delta p = -20$ , where the time required for the peak to occur would  
 310 go from over six months to about four and where the amplitude of the peak  
 311 would increase by a factor of two.

312 Two main sources of uncertainty are considered here. The leading source  
 313 stems from the variation of the parameter  $\alpha_s$ . The statistical error of  $\alpha_s$   
 314 are of order of few % depending on the country. Here a more conservative  
 315 approach is adopted. The country-to-country variation, which is of order of  
 316 10%, as discussed in Section 4.5, is considered to be a more realistic estimate  
 317 of the potential deviation from the linear behavior assumed in Eq. (2). A




Figure 7: Effect of NPIs on the transmission rate parameter in the US (ordered by  $\beta_f$ )

318 sub-leading source of uncertainty is related to the uncertainty in the deter-  
 319 mination of  $\gamma_0$ , the daily recovery rate. This second source is much smaller  
 320 in the Italian case compared to that assumed for  $\alpha_s$ . Graphs in Figure 9  
 321 display the bands that incorporate the uncertainties described here.

322 Results shown in Figures 9 and 10 speak to the importance of a phased  
 323 approach during the post-lockdown period. Swiftly releasing containment  
 324 measures would lead to the resurgence of very large peaks of symptomatic  
 325 infections within a month or two, leading to even worse outcomes compared  
 326 to those observed so far.

#### 327 4.2. Inequality for Sub-critical Behavior of the System

328 It will be argued that one of strategies for the post-lockdown period is  
 329 to increase  $\alpha_s$  as  $p$  decreases in order to sustain quasi-linear behavior in the  
 330 time evolution of the number of active cases, as seen in Figures 9 and 10  
 331 for  $\Delta p = -10$ . In practice, all relevant parameters that enter the temporal  
 332 evolution described above need to be tuned such that the expected peak of  
 333 the number of cases and ICU usage falls below the thresholds characteristic  
 334 to each country. One can denote a vector of critical parameters for which a



Country	$d_0$	$\beta_0$	$b_r^{-1}$ [days]	$p_{max}$	$\alpha_s$
Alabama	0.00074	0.40	9.01	90	0.011
Arizona	0.00009	0.34	5.88	62	0.014
California	0.00093	0.23	10.56	90	0.010
Colorado	0.00011	0.30	1.41	90	0.011
Connecticut	0.00057	0.54	12.19	76	0.013
Georgia	0.00015	0.35	15.53	76	0.013
Illinois	0.00036	0.39	9.20	90	0.010
Indiana	0.00127	0.33	5.99	90	0.010
Louisiana	0.00044	0.63	5.59	90	0.011
Maryland	0.00282	0.34	10.66	90	0.010
Massachusetts	0.00251	0.25	8.98	76	0.011
Michigan	0.00102	0.97	8.11	90	0.011
Missouri	0.00003	0.58	3.45	76	0.012
Nebraska	0.00079	0.23	3.12	62	0.013
New Jersey	0.00002	0.50	8.20	90	0.011
New York	0.00006	0.45	10.71	90	0.011
North Carolina	0.00131	0.39	9.49	90	0.010
North Dakota	0.00022	0.44	10.04	48	0.018
Ohio	0.00066	0.48	15.91	90	0.011
Oklahoma	0.00025	0.44	4.75	76	0.012
Pennsylvania	0.00005	0.38	6.81	90	0.010
Texas	0.00009	0.35	8.17	76	0.012
Utah	0.00049	0.46	4.86	62	0.015
Virginia	0.00135	0.34	5.38	76	0.011
Washington	0.00035	0.19	5.50	90	0.010

Table 3: Same as Table 2 for various States of the United States.

335 country's healthcare system is not overwhelmed:

$$\vec{v}_c(t) = (\gamma_c, d_c, \beta_c, \alpha_s^c). \quad (6)$$

336 One can assume that  $\gamma_c$  and  $d_c$  display a weak time dependence in that  
 337 they primarily depend on medical advances, rather than on policy interven-  
 338 tions. In this setup the condition for the system to remain sub-critical can




Figure 8: Implications of the model on observed transmission rate and stringency index for selected states in the US.

339 be expressed as follows:

$$\left. \frac{\partial \alpha_s}{\partial t} \right|_c \geq - \left. \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} \right|_c, \quad (7)$$

340 where the temporal partial derivatives are evaluated at the point of critical-  
 341 ity defined by  $\vec{v}_c(t)$ . The inequality 7, while seemingly straightforward from  
 342 the mathematical standpoint, it has serious consequences for policy makers.  
 343 While lockdown measures have been successful in bringing the reproductive  
 344 factor down to one and below, it is evident that these are having devastating  
 345 effects on the economic landscape. In African countries, lockdown measures  
 346 necessary to control the epidemic are leading to widespread malnutrition in  
 347 vast sections of the population. On the other hand, the illustrative exam-  
 348 ple shown in Section 4.1, indicates that for fixed  $\alpha_s$ , reducing  $p$  significantly  
 349 would lead to the advent of an epidemic of unprecedented proportions. Un-  
 350 der these conditions, the inequality 7 speaks to the need to ensure that the  
 351 rate with which  $\alpha_s$  grows should outpace that of easing non-pharmaceutical  
 352 interventions. Governments, policy makers and society as a whole need to  
 353 embark in a titanic effort to increase  $\alpha_s$  by all means. Strict adherence to  
 354 social distancing and other advisories is paramount for this endeavor to suc-




Figure 9: Post-lockdown scenarios for Italy for  $p = 85$  (upper plot),  $p = 65$  (lower plot). Results are given using  $\phi = 0.1$  of the susceptible population population, or vulnerable population, active cases and the cumulative distribution of total cases and fatalities. The bands correspond to the uncertainties in the model (see text).

355 ceed. Careful monitoring will also pivotal as ever during the post-lockdown  
 356 phase. Particular attention needs to be given to the temporal evolution of  
 357  $\alpha_S$ .

#### 358 4.3. Correlation with Macroscopic Indexes

359 The phases of the spread and its parameters bear strong similarities in a  
 360 wide range of countries considered here. However, non-trivial differences in  
 361 terms of parameters can be observed when scrutinising country by country  
 362 variations. It is relevant to correlate variances with respect to macroscopic




Figure 10: Number of active cases and new fatalities as a function for time for Italy by assuming different values of  $\Delta p$  ranging from -10 to -50. Results are computed with  $\phi = 0.1$ .

363 indexes. For this purpose the number positive cases is analysed as a function  
 364 of time using the parametric expression:

$$I(t) = \frac{I_{tot}}{1 + e^{-\xi_I(t-C)}}, \quad (8)$$

365 where  $I_{tot}$  denotes the total expected number of positive cases for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  
 366  $\xi_I$  is the slope of the exponential growth that characterises the first phase  
 367 of the spread, and  $C$  can be interpreted as a measure of the time needed to  
 368 deviate from the initial exponential growth leading to containment. Time is  
 369 expressed in number of days. A total number of 67 countries are selected,

370 where containment measures have proven effective in curbing the spread.  
371 These include countries in all continents and with a wide span in terms of  
372 socio-economic development, inequality and population density.

373 Macroscopic indicators are organised according to relevant themes: socio-  
374 economic vulnerabilities, demographics, social expenditures and aggregate  
375 economic indicators. A total of 34 indicators from the World Bank data base  
376 are selected and are correlated with the parameter  $\xi_I$  from each country.

377 The Gini index quantifies the extent to which the distribution of income  
378 among individuals or households deviates from perfect equality. The selected  
379 sample of countries displays a minimum and a maximum Gini index of 24  
380 and 50, respectively. It is found that the parameter  $\xi_I$  is almost insensitive to  
381 the Gini index. This is illustrated in Figure 11 where the red line correspond  
382 to a first order polynomial that is consistent with zero slope. In order to  
383 exclude statistical fluctuations in the sample a similar study is performed  
384 using the percentage share of income held by the lowest 10% and 20% of the  
385 income bracket. No significant correlation is found for either of the indexes.  
386 This indicates that social inequality is not strongly correlated with the rate  
387 of spread of the virus.




Figure 11: Correlation of  $\xi_I$  (see text) with the Gini index (left) and the population in urban agglomerations of more than one million to the country's population living in metropolitan areas (right). The red lines correspond to first order polynomials that illustrate the degree of correlation.

388 This observation is further strengthened by evaluating the correlation  
389 with the proportion of the urban population living in slum households. Ac-  
390 cording to the World Bank, a slum household is defined as a group of in-  
391 dividuals living under the same roof lacking one or more of the following  
392 conditions: access to improved water, access to improved sanitation, suffi-

393 cient living area, and durability of housing. Out of the 67 countries under  
394 scrutiny, 18 report a significant fraction of urban population living in slums.  
395 In this sample of countries the fraction ranges from 8% to 53%. No signifi-  
396 cant correlation is found between this index and  $\xi_I$ . In addition, the average  
397 value of  $\xi_I$  for these 18 countries is compatible with that of the rest of the  
398 ensemble studied.

399 As per the physical picture underlying the model used to describe the  
400 spread, it is expected that population density should play a significant role.  
401 No significant correlation is found with the average population density. This  
402 can be explained by the fact that the average population density is not neces-  
403 sarily a good metric for population density in urban areas, where the spread  
404 is most likely to occur. It should be noted that the correlation with the frac-  
405 tion of the population in urban areas is not statistically significant. In order  
406 to scrutinise the relevance of localised population density, the index made  
407 of the population in urban agglomerations of more than one million to the  
408 country's population living in metropolitan areas in percentiles is used, as  
409 illustrated in Figure 11. It is found that the correlation can be parametrised  
410 with a first order polynomial with a slope of  $(1 \pm 0.3) \cdot 10^{-3}$  per day. The  
411 significance of the correlation greater than a  $3\sigma$  Confidence Level. This the  
412 most significant correlation out of all the indexes considered here.

#### 413 *4.4. Insights from Outliers*

414 It is appropriate to comment on some of outliers identified in the estima-  
415 tion of  $\alpha_s$  in the US. This refers to North Dakota and to a less extent Utah,  
416 where  $p_{max} = 48, 62$ , respectively, are among the lowest in the US. For North  
417 Dakota  $\alpha_s = 0.018$  and it is the highest in the country. As indicated in Sec-  
418 tion 4.3, the slope of the exponential growth is sensitive to the fraction of the  
419 population living in large cities. None of the above mentioned States have  
420 cities with population greater than one million residents. Therefore, these  
421 States have been able to keep the rate of growth of positive cases at low  
422 enough levels without the implementation of more stringent interventions.  
423 This is in contrast to other States where significant portions of their popu-  
424 lation reside in large cities. In these cases  $\alpha_s$  is consistent with the World  
425 average from Table 2. A similar picture emerges in South Africa, where two  
426 thirds of positive cases are concentrated in the Western Cape and Gauteng  
427 Provinces, which host the largest and most densely populated cities in the  
428 country.

429 Some countries, such as Switzerland and most prominently Sweden, have  
430 achieved containment without the application of stringent lockdown mea-  
431 sures. In these countries citizens are allowed to go out for walks while re-  
432 specting social distancing. The value of  $\alpha_s$  for Sweden is particularly high.  
433 Similar reasoning used for the above mentioned US States can be applied  
434 here, in that this country lacks large urban agglomerations. It can also be  
435 argued that the level of social awareness and observance of social distanc-  
436 ing in these countries may play a significant role in the management of the  
437 epidemic. It need not be ignored that the prolonged spread of the virus dur-  
438 ing the early stages of the pandemic in Italy and Spain were driven by lack  
439 homogeneity in the adherence to advisories. This prompted governments to  
440 introduce severe restrictions to movement, where law enforcement agencies  
441 became heavily involved in ensuring compliance. This speaks to the impor-  
442 tance of awareness and compliance to increase  $\alpha_s$  and with which to reduce  
443 the severity of interventions (see Section 4.2).

444 One is tempted to speculate about the possibility of non-linear behavior  
445 in Eq. 2, where could data would favor  $\alpha_s$  to increase as  $p$  decreases. This  
446 would be good news in terms of the effort required to manage the pandemic in  
447 that the effectiveness of containment measures could increase as  $p$  decreases.  
448 This argumentation is hindered by the fact that the lapse of time between  
449 changes in the observed non-pharmaceutical interventions was not significant.  
450 Measuring the effect of each individual intervention is therefore difficult. As  
451 a result of swift action by Governments, we observe the effect of an ensemble  
452 of more or less stringent measures, as opposed to their sequential application.  
453 To this end, we lack the evidence that would support the above mentioned  
454 non-linear behavior. As pointed out in Section 4.2, it is paramount to closely  
455 monitor the evolution of  $\alpha_s$  as NPIs are released.

#### 456 *4.5. Semi-Empirical Analysis of $\alpha_s$*

457 It is remarkable that  $\alpha_s$  has such a stable value across locales and over  
458 these different scales; from states in the US to entire countries  $\alpha_s \approx 0.01$ .  
459 As proof of this assertion, Figure 12 is a depiction of the histogram of  $\alpha_s$   
460 values found during our study. There are 2 outliers in the right tail of the  
461 plot which have been removed for the remainder of the analysis.

462 Using  $N = 46$  locales and Jeffrey's prior probability<sup>13</sup> for the ensemble  
463 variance of  $\alpha_s$ , the posterior probability for the ensemble variance,  $v = \sigma_{\alpha_s}^2$ ,




Figure 12: Ensemble of measurements of  $\alpha_s$  from Tables 2 and 3.

464 is given by:

$$\Pr(v|\alpha_s[1], \alpha_s[2], \dots, \alpha_s[N]) = \frac{v^{-N/2-1} e^{-\frac{Q}{v}}}{Z}, \quad (9)$$

465 where

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\alpha_s[i] - \hat{\mu}_{\alpha_s})^2}{2}, \quad (10)$$

466  $\hat{\mu}_{\alpha_s}$  is the empirical mean and  $Z$  is a normalisation constant. Equation (9)  
 467 is an inverse gamma distribution and it may be used to calculate the range  
 468 of probable ensemble variances of  $\alpha_s$  across the world, given the sample  
 469 of locales used in this study.

470 The results are that the standard deviation of the ensemble  $\sigma_{\alpha_s}$  is 0.0017  
 471 (95% CI 0.0014 - 0.0021).

472

473 Hence, across 46 countries and states of a wide variety, the sensitivity  
 474 of these locales to control of the epidemic through NPIs is remarkably well  
 475 captured by:

$$\alpha_s = 0.01 \pm 0.0017, \quad (11)$$



476 and, therefore, almost all locales will (in the limit as  $p \rightarrow 100$ ) eventually  
477 extinguish the epidemic under tight enough control. The outliers which were  
478 removed from the analysis show an even greater sensitivity and our models  
479 predict that these locales are more easily controlled with softer NPIs.

#### 480 *4.6. Recommendations*

481 There is large existing body of theory on control which may be brought  
482 to bare on the present pandemic situation<sup>30,33</sup>. The control engineering lit-  
483 erature includes methods to balance the economic effects of various public  
484 health initiatives with their likely effect on the epidemic under control and fa-  
485 cilitate decision making which is optimal, in a well established mathematical  
486 framework<sup>30</sup>. In addition, there are known timing constraints on the rate of  
487 control required to keep the epidemic from running away<sup>34</sup>. A metric known  
488 as the 'stability margin' is calculable from the known timing constraints and  
489 it has implications for how much one can expect to reduce the transmission  
490 characteristics when random events disturb the control loop<sup>34</sup>. This calcu-  
491 lation and its implications are recommended for another paper to follow the  
492 present one.

493 While lockdown measures have been successful in curbing the spread, our  
494 study indicates that removing them too swiftly will result in the resurgence  
495 of the spread within one to two months. Reducing the stringency index by  
496 10 will delay reaching the apex by about 6 months, where reducing it by  
497 20 will delay by only four. The amplitude of the apex increases by about a  
498 factor of two by moving from  $\Delta p = -10$  to  $\Delta p = -20$ . This indicates that  
499 post-lockdown measures should be staged and the reduction of the stringency  
500 index should be slow.

501 Assuming constant  $\gamma$  and  $d$  it is essential to increase  $\alpha_s$ . For the system  
502 to remain sub-critical, the rate with which  $\alpha_s$  increases should outpace that  
503 of the decrease of the stringency index. Monitoring of  $\alpha_s$  becomes essential  
504 to controlling the post-lockdown phase.

## 505 **5. Acknowledgements**

506 Authors are indebted to the South African Department of Science and  
507 Innovation and the National Research Foundation for different forms of sup-  
508 port. This includes, but it is not limited to, support through the SA-CERN  
509 Program and the National E-science Postgraduate Teaching and Training  
510 Platform. Authors are also grateful for grant support from the IEEE.

## 511 Appendix A. Stringency Index for United States of America

512 For each policy response measure S1-S7, OxCGRT use the ordinal value  
513 (and add one if the policy is general rather than targeted). This creates a  
514 score between 0 and 2 and for S5, and 0 and 3 for the other six responses<sup>31</sup>.

515

516 The OxCGRT stringency index is given by:

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

517 where  $p_J$  is defined by:

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

518 with  $G_J = 1$  if the effect is general (and 0 otherwise), and  $N_J$  is the cardinal-  
519 ity of the intervention measure<sup>31,32</sup>. In the case where there is no requirement  
520 of general vs. targeted (S7), the +1 in the denominator and the  $G_J$  in the  
521 numerator are omitted from the equation to form:

$$p_7 = \frac{S_7}{N_7}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

522 The OxCGRT database contains data for 133 countries however it does  
523 not contain specific data for US states. It is important to be able to compare  
524 the US states non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) with those of other  
525 countries around the World in a unified framework.

526

527 To this end, we coded the known levels of intervention in America to  
528 match as nearly as possible, the OxCGRT system. We used the Institute  
529 for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) dashboard to obtain six dates at  
530 which specific states imposed different NPIs<sup>35</sup>.

531

532 In order to compare the US intervention data it was necessary to make  
533 a stringency index for the US states that mimics that of the index that was  
534 made for the World data by OxCGRT.

535

536 The following decisions were made during the process of mapping the re-  
537 ported US NPIs to the OxCGRT index:

Label	NPI
$U1$ :	Stay at Home Order
$U2$ :	Educational Facilities Closed
$U3$ :	Non-essential Services Closed
$U4$ :	Travel Severely Limited
$U5$ :	Initial Workplace Closure
$U6$ :	Banned Mass Gatherings

Table A.4: Table Showing US Interventions Acquired from the IHME.

- 538 • The US *Mass Gatherings Banned*  $U5$  can be mapped directly to the  
539 Oxford *Cancel Public Events*  $S3$ .
- 540 • The US *Initial Business Closure*  $U6$  can be mapped to the Oxford  
541 *Work Place Closure*  $S2$
- 542 • The US *Travel Severely Limited*  $U4$  can be mapped to the Oxford *Do-*  
543 *mestic Travel Bans*  $S6$  and *International Travel Bans*  $S7$  combined.

Label	Interventions Not Directly Interchangeable
US NPIs:	
$U1$ :	Stay at Home Order
$U3$ :	Non-essential Services Closed
OxCGRT NPIs:	
$S4$ :	Close Public Transport
$S5$ :	Public Information Campaign

Table A.5: Table Showing Unmapped NPIs.

544 Although some of the above US interventions were not directly compa-  
545 rable to the OxCGRT indicators, their individual impact on the stringency  
546 index is still valid and should be included in the index. By including  $U1$  and  
547  $U3$  with the appropriate weight into the same calculation OxCGRT used for  
548 their index, an equivalent US index is created. The following equation was  
549 developed:

$$p = \frac{1}{7}(1(v_1) + 1(v_2) + 1(v_3) + 2(v_4) + 1(v_5) + 1(v_6)), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

550 where  $v_i$  is a number out of 100 indicating the extent each of the inter-  
551 ventions are imposed.

552  
553 Due to lack of data on the *Travel Severely Limited* intervention in the  
554 IHME database. It was necessary to source US travel restrictions information  
555 from other US news sources. There have been a number of travel interven-  
556 tions that have been implemented however there have not been widespread  
557 travel bans between states.<sup>36</sup> The first significant travel restriction was a  
558 US-Europe travel ban to 26 European countries, which was announced on  
559 11 March 2020.<sup>37</sup> On 19 March 2020 the US issued a level 4 "Do not travel"  
560 advisory which is the highest travel restriction in the US. US citizens were  
561 informed that they can travel back to the US if they were out of the country  
562 when the ban was announced but if they do not do so timely they might find  
563 themselves having to stay abroad for an extended period of time. Foreign  
564 nationals who have been to the 26 EU countries or the UK, China, Iran or  
565 Ireland are not allowed entrance to the US.<sup>38</sup> In terms of the interstate travel  
566 restrictions. There have been no full travel bans but in some states you are  
567 required to quarantine for 14 days after arrival.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, it was necessary  
568 to introduce a leveled implementation of the U4 *Travel Severely Restricted*  
569 measure. Using the same logic used by the Oxford COVID-19 Government  
570 Response Tracker (OxCGRT) the following equation for  $v_i$  was introduced:

$$v_i = 100 \frac{U_i}{N_i}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

571 where  $U_i$  is ordinal and can vary from 0 to the cardinality of the inter-  
572 vention measure,  $N_i$ . This is for the purpose of incorporating levels of imple-  
573 mentation of specific interventions into the stringency calculation. Based on  
574 the data the only intervention that requires levels of implementation is the  
575  $U_4$  intervention.

576 The following ordinal levels were employed for  $U_4$ :

- 577 0. No travel restrictions (US before the 11 March 2020)  
578  
579 1. US preliminary travel ban to 26 EU Countries (Commenced 11 March  
580 2020)  
581  
582 2. Level 4 "Do not travel" advisory issued (19 March 2020)  
583  
584

585 3. Interstate Travel bans (No interstate travel bans are currently imposed)

586 The specification for comparable  $p$  among countries within the OxCGRT  
587 database and the United States of America is completed with the above  
588 definitions.

## 589 **Appendix B. Model Details**

590 An explanation of the model is warranted. It has a causal structure and  
591 may be clinically interpreted as well, both of which are desirable properties  
592 for a model which needs to be controlled<sup>39</sup>. The causal structure gives insight  
593 into *what* to control and the clinical interpretation gives insights into *how*.

594  
595 **Susceptible individuals,  $S$**  : These are the unexposed and suscepti-  
596 ble individuals within the population and include healthcare workers as well  
597 general members of the public.

598  
599 **Observed infections,  $I$**  : These infections represent patients who have  
600 tested positive for COVID-19 and are actively reported on<sup>11</sup>. Any contacts of  
601 these patients who subsequently test positive, any nosocomial infections due  
602 to these patients (for example, healthcare workers who contract the disease)  
603 or any other individuals who knowingly interact with COVID-19 positive  
604 patients are modeled by  $\beta$ , the transmission rate of COVID-19 amongst ob-  
605 served infections. Well prepared countries with strict healthcare protocols for  
606 known positive patients, for example quarantining, effective use of personal  
607 protective equipment for healthcare providers, and physically separate care  
608 pathways for positive patients all essentially work to ensure that  $\beta$  is kept as  
609 small as possible.

610 Asymptomatic also transmissible Some of these observed infections,  $I$  are  
611 due to some mild or asymptomatic cases which become severe enough to  
612 warrant testing or cause patients to seek medical attention. These cases are  
613 modeled by  $\phi I_L$ , where  $\phi$  is dependent on the probability that a latent in-  
614 fection  $I_L$  becomes a known positive case,  $I$ . Latent infections are addressed  
615 next.

616  
617 **Latent infections,  $I_L$**  : There is evidence of a non-trivial fraction of  
618 cases going undetected as a result of presenting with mild symptoms or be-  
619 ing asymptomatic<sup>40-42</sup>. This is the reason for including the latent variable

620 dynamics within our modification of the standard SIRD model.  
621 Table 1 in the main text has good estimates of asymptomatic cases; together  
622 with the patients who have subclinical manifestations of Covid-19, these cases  
623 are all included in the latent infection group,  $I_L$ .  
624 It is the susceptible group's interaction with these asymptomatic and mild  
625 cases which produce new latent infections and this is modeled through  $\beta_L$ ,  
626 the non-negligible latent transmission rate.

627  
628 **Latent recoveries,  $R_L$**  : A majority of these asymptomatic and mild  
629 symptom patients resolve the virus using their natural immunity without ever  
630 being tested. Early reports indicate that this may be a substantial number of  
631 latent infections<sup>17,19</sup>. These cases eventually form part of the latent recovered  
632 group,  $R_L$ . The rate of recovery of the latent infected group is captured by  $\gamma_L$ .

633  
634 **Latent infections dying,  $\delta_L I_L$**  : These counts are considered weakly ob-  
635 servable and rare. The weak observability is present with the revised, erratic  
636 death counts by some officials when home visits uncover additional cases<sup>11</sup>.  
637 It is unclear that these may be directly attributable to the virus in that con-  
638 firmation would be required via post-mortem COVID-19 testing<sup>?</sup>. Given  
639 the existing testing burden posed on most countries, this sort of testing is  
640 rare and, therefore, the uncertainty in this parameter will remain high<sup>19</sup>.

641  
642 **Known recoveries,  $R$**  : These are patients who are known to test posi-  
643 tive for COVID-19 and are known to have recovered fully from the virus.  
644 The recovery rate,  $\gamma$ , models how quickly known infections are resolved and  
645 discharged out of the healthcare system. This rate is physically dependent  
646 on treatment regime and the patient's own physical condition.

647  
648 **Deceased patients,  $D$**  : The number of deceased individuals is denoted  
649 by  $D$ ; and it is mostly affected by the known individuals who have tested  
650 positive and are currently being treated in the prevailing healthcare system.  
651 The implications for the model are that  $\delta \gg \delta_L$  i.e. under normal treatment  
652 and monitoring situations, the implied probability of fatality for a known  
653 infection is much larger than the implied probability of fatality for a latent  
654 infection.

655 Under the above conditions, the model explicitly caters explicitly for the  
656 situation that the latent infections are asymptomatic or mild.

657 It is trivial to show that  $S + I + I_L + R_L + R + D = N$  at every instant

658 in time. Furthermore, the model in Figure 1 implies that:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta_L \frac{S I_L}{N}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\frac{dI_L}{dt} = \beta_L \frac{S I_L}{N} - \phi I_L - \gamma_L I_L, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \phi I_L - \delta I - \gamma I, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma I, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = \delta I. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

659 *Appendix B.1. Linearisation*

660 Each of the equations in (B.1) - (B.5) were linearised using the approx-  
661 imation that  $S = N - \epsilon$ , which gives equivalent results to the Jacobian  
662 method<sup>28</sup>. This operating point corresponds to the case where the epidemic  
663 is still in the early/controllable phase and the number of infected individuals  
664 is small compared with the size of the total population  $N$ .  
665 The derivatives with respect to time were approximated using first order  
666 backward difference approximations at a daily level. Classical frequentist er-  
667 ror propagation was applied to this linear approximation using the Gaussian  
668 process assumption.

669 Theoretically, these approximations are valid provided that:

- 670 1. the number of infected are a small fraction of the susceptible popula-  
671 tion.
- 672
- 673 2. the dynamics of the disease process are slow compared with a single  
674 day. This is justified by the work from Weiss and Murdoch<sup>42</sup>.
- 675

676 The final form, used for analysis of the time variation of the parameters  
677 as various forms of control are applied is:

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{\Delta R}{I[t-1]} \pm \sigma_\gamma(t), \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\delta(t) = \frac{\Delta D}{I[t-1]} \pm \sigma_\delta(t), \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$\beta(t) = \frac{\Delta R + \Delta D + \Delta I}{I[t-1]} \pm \sigma_\beta(t), \quad (\text{B.8})$$

678 where  $\sigma_x(t)$  is the noise estimate at day  $t$ ,  $\Delta x := x[t] - x[t-1]$  and  $x$  is  
 679 either  $R$ ,  $D$  or  $I$ .

### 680 *Appendix B.2. Error propagation*

681 Using the coefficient of variation and propagating the error in the linear  
 682 approximation, assuming that the errors in the daily counts are within 10%<sup>43</sup>,  
 683 the probable noise levels in the daily time variations are calculated by:

$$\sigma_\gamma(t) = \gamma(t) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\Delta R} + \frac{1}{I[t-1]}}, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$\sigma_\beta(t) = \beta(t) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\Delta R + \Delta I + \Delta D} + \frac{1}{I[t-1]}}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

684 and

$$\sigma_\delta(t) = \delta(t) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\Delta D} + \frac{1}{I[t-1]}}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

685 These results depend on the count data being Poisson processes and the fact  
 686 that the coefficient of variation of a Poisson process is  $\lambda^{-1/2}$ . Recall that the  
 687 general coefficient of variation of a division of two random variables is the  
 688 quadrature sum of the numerator and denominator coefficients of variation;  
 689 the results follow<sup>43</sup>.

### 690 **Appendix C. Details of Linearisation**

691 If  $dt$  is taken as one day,  $t$  is the day index and  $\Delta x = x[t] - x[t-1]$ , then  
 692 with the modeling assumptions the differential equations simplify to:

$$\Delta S = -\beta_L I_L[t-1], \quad (\text{C.1})$$

$$\Delta I_L = (\beta_L - \gamma_L - \phi) I_L[t-1], \quad (\text{C.2})$$



$$\Delta I = \phi I_L[t - 1] - \gamma I[t - 1] - \delta I[t - 1], \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$\Delta R = \gamma I[t - 1], \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$\Delta D = \delta I[t - 1]. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

693 Use of (C.4) and (C.5) yield the daily estimates of the observable recovery rate,  $\gamma$  and fatality rate  $\delta$ . Combining (C.4), (C.5) and (C.3) give the  
694 daily estimate of the transmission rate, as observed through the detection  
695 efficiency.  
696

### 697 *Appendix C.1. Control Dynamics*

698 Efforts to control the pandemic do not happen everywhere, all at once and  
699 this is the reason that the control efforts can be said to be dynamic. Indeed,  
700 the form of the kernel functions in equations (1) - (4) state this implicitly.  
701 Each of the observed parameters will be looked at it in this section and their  
702 dynamics described. These forms have non-trivial implications for control of  
703 the pandemic and will be expounded upon in a follow up paper.

#### 704 **Transmission rate**

705 The beta kernel in (1) and the steady state behaviour modeled by (2) imply  
706 that the transmission dynamics, under stringency of control  $p$ , behave as a  
707 first order control system<sup>28</sup>:

$$b_r \frac{d\beta}{dt} = \beta_0 - \beta(t) - \beta_0 \alpha_s p, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

708 where  $b_r$  is the typical adjustment time for a control measure to take full  
709 effect,  $\alpha_s$  is the societal sensitivity (estimated for each country in our work)  
710 to control measures  $p \in [0, 100]$ , and  $\beta_0$  is the uncontrolled transmission rate  
711 within a society.

712 As a sense check; when  $p = 0$  then the equilibrium condition of (C.6) is found  
713 by solving (C.6) with  $\beta(t) = \beta_f = \text{const}$ . The non-trivial solution is  $\beta_f = \beta_0$   
714 and shows that, without control, the transmission rate becomes  $\beta_0$ . This is  
715 defined as the uncontrolled transmission rate and is as it should be.

716 If  $p \neq 0$ , then the equilibrium condition is  $\beta_f = \beta_0 - \beta_0 \alpha_s p$  which is exactly  
717 equation (2). The general analytic solution to (C.6) is precisely the kernel  
718 function in (1).

719

720 It is this form which allows for the use of classic and modern control  
721 methods to shape  $\beta(t)$  to a form that is acceptable for the desired goals of  
722 the pandemic control system eg. minimise total deaths, minimise the peak  
723 load on the health care system, maximise the economic activity etc. These  
724 aspects will be dealt with in detail in a follow up paper.

## 725 References

- 726 [1] W.H.O, Who director-general’s opening remarks at the  
727 media briefing on covid-19 - 11 march 2020, online  
728 [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19—11-march-2020)  
729 [opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19—11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19—11-march-2020),  
730 accessed 25 Apr, 2020.
- 731 [2] W.H.O, Coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19) situation report 89 -  
732 18 april 2020, online [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)  
733 [coronavirus-2019/situation-reports](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports), accessed 19 Apr, 2020.
- 734 [3] S. Flaxman, S. Mishra, A. Gandy, H. Unwin, H. Coupland, T. Mellan,  
735 H. Zhu, T. Berah, J. Eaton, P. Perez Guzman, N. Schmit, L. Cilloni,  
736 K. Ainslie, M. Baguelin, I. Blake, A. Boonyasiri, O. Boyd, L. Cattarino,  
737 C. Ciavarella, L. Cooper, Z. Cucunuba Perez, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg,  
738 A. Dighe, A. Djaafara, I. Dorigatti, S. Van Elsland, R. Fitzjohn, H. Fu,  
739 K. Gaythorpe, L. Geidelberg, N. Grassly, W. Green, T. Hallett, A. Ham-  
740 let, W. Hinsley, B. Jeffrey, D. Jorgensen, E. Knock, D. Laydon, G. Ned-  
741 jati Gilani, P. Nouvellet, K. Parag, I. Siveroni, H. Thompson, R. Verity,  
742 E. Volz, C. Walters, H. Wang, Y. Wang, O. Watson, P. Winskill, X. Xi,  
743 C. Whittaker, P. Walker, A. Ghani, C. Donnelly, S. Riley, L. Okell,  
744 M. Vollmer, N. Ferguson, S. Bhatt, Report 13: Estimating the num-  
745 ber of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on  
746 covid-19 in 11 european countries (2020).
- 747 [4] K. Leung, J. T. Wu, D. Liu, G. M. Leung, First-wave covid-19 transmis-  
748 sibility and severity in china outside hubei after control measures, and  
749 second-wave scenario planning: a modelling impact assessment, *The*  
750 *Lancet* (2020).
- 751 [5] R. M. Anderson, H. Heesterbeek, D. Klinkenberg, T. D. Hollingsworth,  
752 How will country-based mitigation measures influence the course of the  
753 covid-19 epidemic?, *The Lancet* 395 (2020) 931–934.

- 754 [6] J. Hellewell, S. Abbott, A. Gimma, N. I. Bosse, C. I. Jarvis, T. W.  
755 Russell, J. D. Munday, A. J. Kucharski, W. J. Edmunds, S. Funk, R. M.  
756 Eggo, F. Sun, S. Flasche, B. J. Quilty, N. Davies, Y. Liu, S. Clifford,  
757 P. Klepac, M. Jit, C. Diamond, H. Gibbs, K. van Zandvoort, Feasibility  
758 of controlling covid-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts, *The  
759 Lancet Global Health* 8 (2020) e488–e496.
- 760 [7] N. Ferguson, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati Gilani, N. Imai, K. Ainslie,  
761 M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, Z. Cucunuba Perez, G. Cuomo-  
762 Dannenburg, A. Dighe, I. Dorigatti, H. Fu, K. Gaythorpe, W. Green,  
763 A. Hamlet, W. Hinsley, L. Okell, S. Van Elsland, H. Thompson, R. Ver-  
764 ity, E. Volz, H. Wang, Y. Wang, P. Walker, P. Winskill, C. Whit-  
765 taker, C. Donnelly, S. Riley, A. Ghani, Report 9: Impact of non-  
766 pharmaceutical interventions (npis) to reduce covid19 mortality and  
767 healthcare demand (2020).
- 768 [8] J. M. Gardner, L. Willem, W. van der Wijngaart, S. C. L. Kamerlin,  
769 N. Brusselaers, P. Kasson, (medrxiv preprint) intervention strategies  
770 against covid-19 and their estimated impact on swedish healthcare ca-  
771 pacity (2020).
- 772 [9] K. Prem, Y. Liu, T. W. Russell, A. J. Kucharski, R. M. Eggo, N. Davies,  
773 M. Jit, P. Klepac, S. Flasche, S. Clifford, C. A. B. Pearson, J. D. Munday,  
774 S. Abbott, H. Gibbs, A. Rosello, B. J. Quilty, T. Jombart, F. Sun,  
775 C. Diamond, A. Gimma, K. van Zandvoort, S. Funk, C. I. Jarvis, W. J.  
776 Edmunds, N. I. Bosse, J. Hellewell, The effect of control strategies to  
777 reduce social mixing on outcomes of the covid-19 epidemic in wuhan,  
778 china: a modelling study, *The Lancet Public Health* (2020).
- 779 [10] B. J. Cowling, S. T. Ali, T. W. Y. Ng, T. K. Tsang, J. C. M. Li, M. W.  
780 Fong, Q. Liao, M. Y. Kwan, S. L. Lee, S. S. Chiu, J. T. Wu, P. Wu, G. M.  
781 Leung, Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions against  
782 coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in hong kong: an observational  
783 study, *The Lancet Public Health* (2020).
- 784 [11] E. Dong, H. Du, L. Gardner, An interactive web-based dashboard to  
785 track covid-19 in real time, *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 786 [12] T. Hale, A. Petherick, T. Phillips, S. Webster, Variation in government  
787 responses to covid-19, bsg-wp-2020/031 4.0, 2020.

- 788 [13] E. T. Jaynes, Probability theory : the logic of science, Cambridge Uni-  
789 versity Press, Cambridge, UK New York, NY, 2003.
- 790 [14] N. Taleb, The Black Swan : The Impact of the Highly Improbable,  
791 Random House, New York, 2007.
- 792 [15] R. Verity, L. C. Okell, I. Dorigatti, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, N. Imai,  
793 G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, H. Thompson, P. G. T. Walker, H. Fu, A. Dighe,  
794 J. T. Griffin, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, A. Cori, Z. Cu-  
795 cunubá, R. FitzJohn, K. Gaythorpe, W. Green, A. Hamlet, W. Hinsley,  
796 D. Laydon, G. Nedjati-Gilani, S. Riley, S. van Elsland, E. Volz, H. Wang,  
797 Y. Wang, X. Xi, C. A. Donnelly, A. C. Ghani, N. M. Ferguson, Estimates  
798 of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis, *The*  
799 *Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 800 [16] S. Law, A. W. Leung, C. Xu, Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)  
801 and coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): From causes to preventions  
802 in hong kong, *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 803 [17] D. F. Gudbjartsson, A. Helgason, H. Jonsson, O. T. Magnusson, P. Mel-  
804 sted, G. L. Norddahl, J. Saemundsdottir, A. Sigurdsson, P. Sulem,  
805 A. B. Agustsdottir, B. Eiriksdottir, R. Fridriksdottir, E. E. Gardars-  
806 dottir, G. Georgsson, O. S. Gretarsdottir, K. R. Gudmundsson, T. R.  
807 Gunnarsdottir, A. Gylfason, H. Holm, B. O. Jenson, A. Jonasdottir,  
808 F. Jonsson, K. S. Josefsdottir, T. Kristjansson, D. N. Magnusdottir,  
809 L. le Roux, G. Sigmundsdottir, G. Sveinbjornsson, K. E. Sveinsdot-  
810 tir, M. Sveinsdottir, E. A. Thorarensen, B. Thorbjornsson, A. Löve,  
811 G. Masson, I. Jonsdottir, A. D. Möller, T. Gudnason, K. G. Kristins-  
812 son, U. Thorsteinsdottir, K. Stefansson, Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the  
813 icelandic population, *New England Journal of Medicine* (2020).
- 814 [18] Cdc guidance for certifying covid-19 deaths, online  
815 [https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvss/coronavirus/Alert-1-Guidance-](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvss/coronavirus/Alert-1-Guidance-for-Certifying-COVID-19-Deaths.pdf)  
816 [for-Certifying-COVID-19-Deaths.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvss/coronavirus/Alert-1-Guidance-for-Certifying-COVID-19-Deaths.pdf), accessed 27 April, 2020.
- 817 [19] New york releases antibody testing data: 14% of  
818 population may be infected with coronavirus, online  
819 [https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2020/04/23/coronavirus-](https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2020/04/23/coronavirus-new-york-millions-residents-may-have-been-infected-antibody-test/3012920001/)  
820 [new-york-millions-residents-may-have-been-infected-antibody-](https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2020/04/23/coronavirus-new-york-millions-residents-may-have-been-infected-antibody-test/3012920001/)  
821 [test/3012920001/](https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2020/04/23/coronavirus-new-york-millions-residents-may-have-been-infected-antibody-test/3012920001/), accessed 27 April, 2020.

- 822 [20] T. Lancet, COVID-19: protecting health-care workers, *The Lancet* 395  
823 (2020) 922.
- 824 [21] S.-Y. Wong, R.-S. Kwong, T. Wu, J. Chan, M. Chu, S. Lee, H. Wong,  
825 D. Lung, Risk of nosocomial transmission of coronavirus disease 2019:  
826 an experience in a general ward setting in hong kong, *Journal of Hospital*  
827 *Infection* (2020).
- 828 [22] Y. Shi, Y. Wang, C. Shao, J. Huang, J. Gan, X. Huang, E. Bucci, M. Pi-  
829 acentini, G. Ippolito, G. Melino, COVID-19 infection: the perspectives  
830 on immune responses, *Cell Death & Differentiation* 27 (2020) 1451–1454.
- 831 [23] Y. Liu, L.-M. Yan, L. Wan, T.-X. Xiang, A. Le, J.-M. Liu, M. Peiris,  
832 L. L. M. Poon, W. Zhang, Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of  
833 COVID-19, *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 834 [24] M. Day, Covid-19: identifying and isolating asymptomatic people helped  
835 eliminate virus in italian village, *BMJ* (2020) m1165.
- 836 [25] H. Nishiura, T. Kobayashi, A. Suzuki, S.-M. Jung, K. Hayashi, R. Ki-  
837 noshita, Y. Yang, B. Yuan, A. R. Akhmetzhanov, N. M. Linton,  
838 T. Miyama, Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus  
839 infections (COVID-19), *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*  
840 (2020).
- 841 [26] A. Kimball, K. M. Hatfield, M. Arons, A. James, J. Taylor, K. Spicer,  
842 A. C. Bardossy, L. P. Oakley, S. Tanwar, Z. Chisty, J. M. Bell, M. Meth-  
843 ner, J. Harney, J. R. Jacobs, C. M. Carlson, H. P. McLaughlin, N. Stone,  
844 S. Clark, C. Brostrom-Smith, L. C. Page, M. Kay, J. Lewis, D. Russell,  
845 B. Hiatt, J. Gant, J. S. Duchin, T. A. Clark, M. A. Honein, S. C.  
846 Reddy, J. A. Jernigan, A. Baer, L. M. Barnard, E. Benoliel, M. S. Fa-  
847 galde, J. Ferro, H. G. Smith, E. Gonzales, N. Hatley, G. Hatt, M. Hope,  
848 M. Huntington-Frazier, V. Kawakami, J. L. Lenahan, M. D. Lukoff,  
849 E. B. Maier, S. McKeirnan, P. Montgomery, J. L. Morgan, L. A. Mum-  
850 mert, S. Pogosjans, F. X. Riedo, L. Schwarcz, D. Smith, S. Stearns, K. J.  
851 Sykes, H. Whitney, H. Ali, M. Banks, A. Balajee, E. J. Chow, B. Cooper,  
852 D. W. Currie, J. Dyal, J. Healy, M. Hughes, T. M. McMichael, L. Nolen,  
853 C. Olson, A. K. Rao, K. Schmit, N. G. Schwartz, F. Tobolowsky, R. Za-  
854 cks, S. Zane, , , and, Asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2  
855 infections in residents of a long-term care skilled nursing facility — king

- 856 county, washington, march 2020, MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality  
857 Weekly Report 69 (2020) 377–381.
- 858 [27] Coronavirus, castiglione d’adda è un caso di studio: ‘il 70% dei donatori  
859 di sangue è positivo’, online <https://www.lastampa.it/topnews/primopiano/2020/04/02/news/coronavirus-castiglione-d-adda-e-un-caso-di-studio-il-70-dei-donatori-di-sangue-e-positivo-1.38666481>, accessed 27  
860  
861 April, 2020.  
862
- 863 [28] K. Astrom, M. Murray, Feedback systems : an introduction for scientists  
864 and engineers, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2008.
- 865 [29] N. Kandel, S. Chungong, A. Omaar, J. Xing, Health security capacities  
866 in the context of covid-19 outbreak: an analysis of international health  
867 regulations annual report data from 182 countries, The Lancet 395  
868 (2020) 1047–1053.
- 869 [30] C. Nowzari, V. M. Preciado, G. J. Pappas, Analysis and control of  
870 epidemics: A survey of spreading processes on complex networks, IEEE  
871 Control Systems Magazine 36 (2016) 26–46.
- 872 [31] Oxford coronavirus government response tracker, online  
873 <https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker>, accessed 14 April, 2020.  
874
- 875 [32] University of oxford, calculation and presentation  
876 of the stringency index 2.0, online  
877 <https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Calculation%20and%20presentation%20of%20the%20Stringency%20Index.pdf>, accessed 14  
878 April, 2020.  
879
- 880 [33] K. Lin, F. and Muthuraman, M. Lawley, An optimal control theory  
881 approach to non-pharmaceutical interventions, BMC Infectious Diseases  
882 10 (2010).
- 883 [34] G. Stein, Respect the unstable, IEEE Control Systems Magazine 23  
884 (2003) 12–25.
- 885 [35] University of washington, institute for health metrics and evaluation  
886 covid-19 projections, 2020.

- 887 [36] K. Schwartz, Driving and travel restrictions across the united states,  
888 2020.
- 889 [37] P. Baker, U.s. to suspend most travel from europe as world scrambles  
890 to fight pandemic, 2020.
- 891 [38] A. Salcedo, S. Yar, G. Cherelus, Coronavirus travel restrictions, across  
892 the globe, 2020.
- 893 [39] R. McElreath, Statistical rethinking : a Bayesian course with examples  
894 in R and Stan, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2020.
- 895 [40] A. Haines, E. F. de Barros, A. Berlin, D. L. Heymann, M. J. Harris,  
896 National UK programme of community health workers for covid-19 re-  
897 sponse, *The Lancet* 395 (2020) 1173–1175.
- 898 [41] H. V. Fineberg, Ten weeks to crush the curve, *New England Journal of*  
899 *Medicine* (2020).
- 900 [42] P. Weiss, D. R. Murdoch, Clinical course and mortality risk of severe  
901 covid-19, *The Lancet* 395 (2020) 1014–1015.
- 902 [43] D. T. Holmes, K. A. Buhr, Error propagation in calculated ratios,  
903 *Clinical Biochemistry* 40 (2007) 728–734.