

1 **Supplementary material**

2 A. Economic and behavioral analysis of the Controlled Avalanche (CA) strategy

3 Analysis of the proposed strategy must take into account not only its epidemiological
4 impact, but also its behavioral assumptions (1). We first analyze the individual
5 incentives whether to voluntarily expose to the virus, then demonstrate that under
6 societal closure voluntary exposure is socially desirable, and then examine the expected
7 equilibrium level of exposure if it is unregulated and explore when such exposure must
8 be limited.

9 An individual who contracts the disease imposes negative externalities on people he
10 infects (*infection externalities*). Isolation reduces the number of contacts among people
11 and therefore reduces the infection externalities. However, isolation itself is costly since
12 it limits the isolated person's productive and utility creating activities.

13 There is incomplete information about the infectiousness of people who have not been
14 identified to have contracted the virus. Anyone who is not immune may be infectious,
15 due to the overlap between the incubation asymptomatic period and the infectious
16 period. Therefore, prior to being identified as sick, any such individual creates negative
17 externalities over all people who must be isolated from him to avoid infection (*isolation*
18 *externalities*).

19 It follows that immunization of a person eliminates not only infection externalities, but,
20 through verification of immunity, also isolation externalities. Since each individual
21 only considers his own risks, costs and benefits, he does not internalize the social
22 benefits created from eliminating the infection and isolation externalities. Hence, his
23 incentives to vaccinate or, in the absence of vaccination, to be exposed to the virus, are
24 insufficient from a social welfare perspective.

25 An optimal level of societal isolation is one where its marginal social costs equal its
26 marginal social benefits (in terms of lives saved, health resources spent, and economic
27 costs of infection and isolation) (2). However, for any societal isolation level, a Pareto
28 improvement can be implemented by allowing voluntary controlled exposure to the
29 virus. Any person who is informed about the potential risks of exposure to the virus,
30 understands these risks, and opts for it in order to end his isolation, must be improving
31 his individual welfare. If he is isolated during exposure from anyone who does not wish

32 to be infected, then he does not create any infection externality. If he recovers then he
33 eliminates any future infection externalities as well as future isolation costs for anyone
34 he may now contact.

35 Exposure is costly, both for the exposed person and for society, if he requires medical
36 treatment. Hence, any voluntary exposure program is subject to two concerns: First, it
37 must be verified that the person exposed to the risk fully understands it ex-ante, when
38 making the exposure decision. It should be noted that knowing when an infection occurs
39 may actually reduce the individual's risk from exposure as he is subject to medical
40 supervision and receives treatment at an earlier stage of his disease. Further, he can
41 choose a convenient timing for him to be infected. Second, if the social costs of ex-post
42 treatment are high, especially if the health system is operating at its full capacity, this
43 may require limiting the rate of voluntary exposure. Whether such a limitation is
44 necessary depends on the equilibrium level of voluntary exposure, which we now
45 describe.

46 Assuming rational decision making, the decision problem faced by each person is the
47 following: given the isolation measures taken and expected in the future, and given the
48 expected number of people who will contract the virus, either intentionally or not,
49 compare the increased risk from voluntary exposure to the virus with the benefits of
50 ending isolation and being able to resume normal life. Individuals whose expected
51 fatality rate is sufficiently low and their benefits from ending isolation are sufficiently
52 high would choose to be exposed.

53 The number of people willing to participate in the program would thus depend on the
54 following factors: their probability of contracting the virus if they do not participate in
55 the program; their probability of suffering serious harm or death if they contract the
56 virus; their benefit from resuming normal life; and the time it would take all non-
57 certified individuals to resume normal life. All else equal, an individual is more likely
58 to join the program, the lower his expected fatality rate from the virus, the higher his
59 probability of contracting the virus if he does not join the program, the higher his benefit
60 from resuming normal life, and the longer he expects the social and economic closure
61 to remain in place.

62 As our epidemiologic model demonstrates, the more people join the program, the lower
63 is the probability of contracting the virus for non-participants and the shorter it would

64 take to obtain herd immunity so that isolation measures can be lifted (since certified
65 participants mix in the population and increase the level of herd immunity). Hence,
66 there is an equilibrium percentage of voluntary exposure such that all people who want
67 to join the program are allowed to join it. This percentage is equivalent to a maximum
68 risk threshold level, below which people are allowed to be exposed to the virus.

69 It follows that to implement the program, the chosen threshold risk must be equal or
70 lower than the equilibrium threshold. Any higher risk would not be feasible, as
71 individuals whose risk is higher than the equilibrium threshold would not join the
72 program. Since ethical considerations (which we analyze below) may limit the allowed
73 risk to a level below the above threshold, it may well be the case that the demand for
74 participation in the program would exceed the threshold risk allowed. Implementation
75 may then require preventing higher risk individuals from voluntarily contracting the
76 virus.

77

78 B. Ethical analysis of the CA strategy

79 This section examines the moral aspects of regulated exposure of consenting young
80 adults to the virus. We maintain that while such exposure raises moral concerns, these
81 concerns are comparable to other, morally acceptable societal practices.

82 We examine the proposal according to three distinct ethical considerations that bear on
83 the permissibility of exposure: consent, paternalism and public health. Consent
84 considerations apply to exposure to risks that the person herself is willing to take.
85 Paternalism applies to risks that society permits or prohibits a person to expose herself
86 to in order to promote her own good (even against the person's will). This can happen
87 either when the risks are too grave and hence, the restrictions are designed to protect
88 the person from an irrational decision on his part, or in cases in which at least some of
89 those who consent to be exposed to a particular risk do not fully understand or
90 comprehend the risks and hence, the restrictions are designed to protect them from an
91 uninformed or mistaken consent. Public health criteria apply to the type of risks which
92 society requires individuals to expose themselves to or to avoid exposing themselves to
93 in order to promote the interests of the public as a whole.

94 These criteria are not independent of each other. Sometimes the fact that a person
95 consented to a risk indicates that the risk is one which promotes his interests – and
96 therefore consent and paternalistic considerations converge. It may also be the case that
97 the exposure to risk promotes public health. However, there are cases where these
98 considerations conflict with each other.

99 In ordinary vaccination situations, there is a threshold percentage of vaccinated people
100 above which the risk to any individual from vaccination is greater than the risk of being
101 infected. In such cases, rational individuals would be reluctant to vaccinate, but the
102 public health consideration may require them to do so.

103 When no person is vaccinated, some people consent to be vaccinated and vaccination
104 also promotes their interests. Hence, we allow people to consent to vaccination and for
105 paternalistic reasons we may also impose a duty to vaccinate those who refuse to do so
106 even though it promotes their interests. Once the risk from infection is lower than the
107 risk from vaccination, paternalistic reasons cannot justify mandatory vaccination any
108 more (3). Yet, the public health argument may justify forced vaccination even in such
109 cases, since each person who is not vaccinated creates an additional risk – a negative
110 externality – to all other non-vaccinated people (4). Hence, some states impose sanctions
111 on individuals who refuse to be vaccinated for various ethical considerations (5-7). The
112 public health considerations override the consent and the paternalistic considerations
113 and individuals are sometimes forced to vaccinate against their individual will and
114 interest.

115 Since at present there is no vaccination against Covid-19, the current situation is
116 different. The only way to get immune is through infection by the virus. Since we
117 propose a regulated voluntary exposure, which allows low risk individuals (whose risk
118 of death and severe health consequences is below some threshold level) – call them the
119 young - and only them to get exposed to the virus, there are two concerns that must be
120 addressed: First, whether it is justified to allow the young to get exposed to the risk.
121 Second, whether it is justified to deny the old exposure to the risk.

122 i. Allowing the young to voluntarily be exposed to the risk

123 Clearly, since exposure under our proposal is voluntary, consent-based criteria support
124 the infection of young people. Furthermore, since exposed people are isolated, and once
125 they recover and become immune, they rejoin the general population, their exposure

126 reduces negative externalities to other people, and hence public health (and
127 furthermore, social welfare) concerns also support their exposure. The question,
128 therefore, is whether such exposure is justified on paternalistic terms.

129 The difficulty is to properly evaluate the relevance of paternalistic reasons. Clearly,
130 some of them are addressed by adequately informing the young who are willing to be
131 exposed of the pertaining risks and making sure they understand them. Yet, this seems
132 insufficient, as society is not willing to expose individuals to any risk they are
133 knowingly willing to take. At times the risk seems to be too high and therefore is
134 unacceptable (8).

135 The answer must therefore depend to a large extent on the probability that grave harms
136 will be realized. If the probability is above a certain threshold, the state may prohibit
137 individuals from exposing themselves to risk. At the same time there are cases in which
138 the state is justified in imposing a duty on the individuals (against their consent and
139 against their interests) to expose themselves to low risks of a grave harm. This is true
140 for many practices, including vaccinations, as well as participation in medical
141 experiments which expose participants to certain low probability risks, subject to some
142 conditions. It is therefore not categorically prohibited to allow individuals to voluntarily
143 expose themselves to low probability risks for the sake of promoting the health of the
144 population at large. There can be debates as to what the threshold probability is, but for
145 any reasonable probability, we may identify a group which satisfies it.

146 Given the low fatality rate among individuals aged 20-40 it seems that paternalism does
147 not preclude their exposure as it is not unreasonable to assume that it is ex ante
148 conducive to their interests. Yet, even if this is not so in the absence of other
149 considerations it seems permissible (if not mandatory) on the part of the state to expose
150 young people who consent to be infected to the virus in order to promote the interests
151 of the public as a whole.

152 ii. Denying the old the right to be exposed to the risk

153 Our proposal requires the state to provide the option to be infected only to the young.
154 Denying this option from older, higher risk individuals, must therefore be justified. The
155 justification rests on both paternalistic and public health considerations. As we
156 explained, informed consent is insufficient to justify exposure to risk if that risk is too

157 high. Hence, some threshold probability may be established, above which exposure
158 would not be allowed for paternalistic reasons.

159 This threshold may prove, however, too high, from a public health perspective, if the
160 critical care capacity is lower than the one necessary to give adequate medical care to
161 all people who contracted the virus. Hence, in case of full capacity, each additional
162 infected person generates a negative externality to all other people who got infected and
163 require medical care. Public health considerations therefore justify imposing further
164 limitation on the exposure of high risk, older people, beyond that which is mandated by
165 paternalistic considerations.

166 We should emphasize that while the young benefit from the proposed arrangement, the
167 old also gain from a healthier and more robust economy. They may also value the
168 immunity of the young who can then socialize with them and provide medical and other
169 services. A different distributive concern may be raised, that people who would be
170 willing to bear the risks are ones who disproportionately come from deprived
171 background. The poorer the person is the more likely the economic benefits would
172 induce her to expose herself to the risks. The force of this consideration also hinges
173 upon various empirical considerations which we cannot develop here. Yet, it is quite
174 standard that we allow the poor to take greater risks than rich people, e.g. in the case of
175 military service. We do not think that this fact alone precludes the justifiability of our
176 proposal.

177 To sum up, voluntary regulated exposure of young people to the risk of infection raises
178 an ethical concern. There are however considerations which mitigate this concern.
179 Given the low probability of serious harm, given that the risk is voluntarily taken, and
180 the public health benefits that would ensue, it seems morally justifiable to seriously
181 consider this proposal.

182

183 C. The CA strategy model details

184 The model in this study is an expansion of an earlier model used to describe Israel's
185 COVID-19 mitigation policy during the first month of the outbreak (9). It is a
186 deterministic compartmental model which is based on the SEIRD framework, which

187 was used to describe the dynamics of COVID-19 spread in a given population (10-12).
188 The model consists of three coupled system of equations. The first set describes the
189 general population, the second describes the low-risk labor-age population and the third
190 describes the Controlled Avalanche (CA) program.

191 **The general population**

192

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta \frac{S(t)}{N} \{I(t) + I_L(t) + \varepsilon_E [E(t) + E_L(t)]\}$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \beta \frac{S(t)}{N} \{I(t) + I_L(t) + \varepsilon_E [E(t) + E_L(t)]\} - \kappa E(t)$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \kappa E(t) - \gamma I(t)$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = (1 - \delta)\gamma I(t)$$

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = \delta\gamma I(t)$$

193

194

195 **The low-risk labor-age population**

196

$$\frac{dS_L}{dt} = -\beta \frac{S_L(t)}{N} \{I(t) + I_L(t) + \varepsilon_E [E(t) + E_L(t)]\} - v(t)N_A$$

$$v(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t < t_{end} \text{ and } \lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor = \frac{t}{\tau} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{dE_L}{dt} = \beta \frac{S_L(t)}{N} \{I(t) + I_L(t) + \varepsilon_E [E(t) + E_L(t)]\} - \kappa E_L(t)$$

$$\frac{dI_L}{dt} = \kappa E_L(t) - \gamma I_L(t)$$

$$\frac{dR_L}{dt} = (1 - \delta_L)\gamma [I_L(t) + I_A(t)]$$

$$\frac{dD_L}{dt} = \delta_L\gamma [I_L(t) + I_A(t)]$$

197

198 **The CA volunteers**

199

$$\frac{dS_A}{dt} = -\beta_A \frac{S_A(t)}{S_A(t) + E_A(t) + I_A(t)} \{I_A(t) + \varepsilon_E E_A(t)\} + v(t)N_A$$

$$\frac{dE_A}{dt} = \beta_A \frac{S_A(t)}{S_A(t) + E_A(t) + I_A(t)} \{I_A(t) + \varepsilon_E E_A(t)\} - \kappa E_A(t)$$

$$\frac{dI_A}{dt} = \kappa E_A(t) - \gamma I_A(t)$$

200

201 It should be noted that in the main text, the expression T_I is used to describe the group

202 of infectious individuals, i.e., $T_I(t) = \frac{1}{N} \{I(t) + I_L(t) + \varepsilon_E [E(t) + E_L(t)]\}$ and the

203 expression T_A is used to describe the group of infectious individuals among the CA

204 program volunteers $T_A(t) = \frac{1}{S_A(t) + E_A(t) + I_A(t)} \{I_A(t) + \varepsilon_E E_A(t)\}$

205 Where, the model's parameters are as follows:

- 206 • β - Effective contact rate ($S \rightarrow E$ and $S_L \rightarrow E_L$)

- 207 • β_A - Effective contact rate for the “Avalanche” volunteers ($S_A \rightarrow E_A$)
- 208 • ϵ_E – modification factor for the infectivity of the exposed class
- 209 • N – total size of the population
- 210 • γ - Recovery rate from the infectious class ($I \rightarrow R$ or $I \rightarrow D$)
- 211 • κ - Rate of development of clinical symptoms for the asymptomatic class ($E \rightarrow I$)
- 212 • δ, δ_L - infection fatality ratio of the general population or that of the low-risk
- 213 population, correspondingly
- 214 • τ - time period, for which a new batch of volunteers join the “Avalanche”
- 215 program
- 216 • t_{end} – the time the “Avalanche” program ends

217 The value of β was determined by using the following equation:

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$$

218 This equation describes the basic reproduction number, R_0 , which is the expected
 219 number of secondary infections produced by a single index case, in an epidemic
 220 described by a SEIR model (13).

221 As representative R_0 for a COVID-19 outbreak without any control measures a value
 222 of 3.28 was chosen. This is the mean of 12 studies that estimated the basic reproduction
 223 number of the COVID-19 pandemic (14). This value is close to the value of 3.15 which
 224 is the estimated R_0 in China, before control measures were implemented (15). For R_0
 225 that represents implementation of control measures, a value of 1.7 was chosen. This
 226 value is the median of the R_0 values estimated for each of 29 provinces that were
 227 affected by the COVID-19 epidemic in China, for the time period between January 21st
 228 to February 11th (16). This value is close 2.01, the value describing provinces that
 229 implemented moderate lockdown in China. Although all cities in China implemented

230 control measures that included school closure, isolation of suspected and confirmed
231 patients and disclosure of information, only 64% of the cities in China banned public
232 gathering and enforced closure of entertainment venues and suspension of inter-city
233 travel and only 40% prohibited Intra city transport (15).

234 For the CA program an estimated for the “free” R_0 of 6.2 was used (16). The model
235 was programmed in R (17) using the deSolve package (18).

236

237

238

239 TABLE. S1. Parameter values for the Controlled Avalanche model

Parameter	Value	Reference	Notes
β	0.2262 day ⁻¹ Scenarios 1, 4 0.1172 day ⁻¹ Scenarios 2, 3	Calculated via the R_0 equation	Scenarios 1, 4: R_0 value of 3.28; (19) Scenarios 2, 3: R_0 value of 1.7; (16)
β_A	0.4276 day ⁻¹	Calculated via the R_0 equation	“free” R_0 value of 6.2 (16)
κ	(5.6 days) ⁻¹	(20)	mean incubation time including Wuhan residents
γ	(14.5 days) ⁻¹	(20)	mean time from onset to death
N	8,882,500 people	(21)	Population of Israel by the end of 2018
N_L	3,457,800 people	(21)	Population in the age range 20-49 in Israel by the end of 2018
N_A	93,963	(22)	75% of the bed in active hotel in Israel in 2018
δ	0.0123	(21, 23)	Weighted average of the COVID- 19 infection fatality ratio by age range and the corresponding Israeli population in these age ranges
δ_L	8×10^{-4}	(21, 23)	Weighted average of the COVID- 19 infection fatality ratio by age range and the corresponding Israeli population in these age ranges
ϵ_E	0.126	(24)	
τ	7 days		
t_{end}	210		

240

241

242

243

244

245

246 **References**

- 247 1. Perrings C, Castillo-Chavez C, Chowell G, Daszak P, Fenichel EP, Finnoff D, et
248 al. Merging economics and epidemiology to improve the prediction and
249 management of infectious disease. *Ecohealth*. 2014;11(4):464-75.
- 250 2. Fenichel EP. Economic considerations for social distancing and behavioral based
251 policies during an epidemic. *J Health Econ*. 2013;32(2):440-51.
- 252 3. Dawson A. Vaccination Ethics In: Dawson A, editor. *Public Health Ethics: Key*
253 *Concepts and Policy and Practice*: Cambridge; 2011.
- 254 4. Serpell L, Green J. Parental decision-making in childhood vaccination. *Vaccine*.
255 2006;24(19):4041-6.
- 256 5. Amin ANE, Parra MT, Kim-Farley R, Fielding JE. Ethical Issues Concerning
257 Vaccination Requirements. *Public Health Reviews*. 2012;34(1):14.
- 258 6. Giubilini A. *The Ethics of Vaccination*: Palgrave Macmillan; 2019.
- 259 7. Navin M. *Values and Vaccine Refusal: Hard Questions in Ethics Epistemology*
260 *and Health Care* New-York: Routledge; 2016.
- 261 8. Nys TRV. Paternalism in Public Health Care. *Public Health Ethics*. 2008;1(1):64-
262 72.
- 263 9. Klausner Z, Fattal E, Hirsch E, Shapira SC. A single holiday was the turning
264 point of the COVID-19 policy of Israel. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.03.26.20044412.
- 265 10. Cao Z, Zhang Q, Lu X, Pfeiffer D, Jia Z, Song H, et al. Estimating the effective
266 reproduction number of the 2019-nCoV in China. *medRxiv*.
267 2020:2020.01.27.20018952.
- 268 11. Read JM, Bridgen JR, Cummings DA, Ho A, Jewell CP. Novel coronavirus
269 2019-nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic
270 predictions. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.01.23.20018549.
- 271 12. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic
272 and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan,
273 China: a modelling study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10225):689-97.
- 274 13. Martcheva M. *An Introduction to Mathematical Epidemiology*. . New York:
275 Springer; 2015.
- 276 14. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of
277 COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *Journal of Travel Medicine*.
278 2020;27(2).

- 279 15. Tian H, Liu Y, Li Y, Wu C-H, Chen B, Kraemer MUG, et al. An investigation of
280 transmission control measures during the first 50 days of the COVID-19
281 epidemic in China. *Science*. 2020:eabb6105.
- 282 16. Maier BF, Brockmann D. Effective containment explains sub-exponential growth
283 in confirmed cases of recent COVID-19 outbreak in Mainland China. *medRxiv*.
284 2020:2020.02.18.20024414.
- 285 17. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical Computing. R
286 Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.2019 [Available from:
287 <https://www.R-project.org/>].
- 288 18. Soetaert K, Petzoldt T, Setzer RW. Solving Differential Equations in R: Package
289 deSolve. 2010. 2010;33(9):25.
- 290 19. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission
291 Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J*
292 *Med*. 2020.
- 293 20. Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, Hayashi K, Akhmetzhanov AR, Jung SM, et
294 al. Incubation Period and Other Epidemiological Characteristics of 2019 Novel
295 Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A Statistical Analysis of Publicly
296 Available Case Data. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(2).
- 297 21. Statistical Abstract of Israel 2019 - No.70. [Internet]. 2019. Available from:
298 [https://www.cbs.gov.il/en/publications/Pages/2019/Statistical-Abstract-of-Israel-](https://www.cbs.gov.il/en/publications/Pages/2019/Statistical-Abstract-of-Israel-2019-No-70.aspx)
299 [2019-No-70.aspx](https://www.cbs.gov.il/en/publications/Pages/2019/Statistical-Abstract-of-Israel-2019-No-70.aspx).
- 300 22. Tourism and Hotel Services Statistics - Quarterly 4 2019. [Internet]. 2019.
301 Available from: [https://www.cbs.gov.il/en/publications/Pages/2019/Tourism-and-](https://www.cbs.gov.il/en/publications/Pages/2019/Tourism-and-Hotel-Services-Statistics-Quarterly-4-2019.aspx)
302 [Hotel-Services-Statistics-Quarterly-4-2019.aspx](https://www.cbs.gov.il/en/publications/Pages/2019/Tourism-and-Hotel-Services-Statistics-Quarterly-4-2019.aspx).
- 303 23. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates
304 of the severity of COVID-19 disease. *Lancet*. 2020:2020.03.09.20033357.
- 305 24. Du Z, Xu X, Wu Y, Wang L, Cowling BJ, Meyers LA. The serial interval of
306 COVID-19 from publicly reported confirmed cases. *medRxiv*.
307 2020:2020.02.19.20025452.
- 308
309
310
311
312

313 Reference for similar ideas:

314

315 [https://thefederalist.com/2020/03/25/how-medical-chickenpox-parties-could-turn-the-](https://thefederalist.com/2020/03/25/how-medical-chickenpox-parties-could-turn-the-tide-of-the-wuhan-virus/)
316 [tide-of-the-wuhan-virus/](https://thefederalist.com/2020/03/25/how-medical-chickenpox-parties-could-turn-the-tide-of-the-wuhan-virus/)

317

318 Certified Corona-Immunity as a Resource and Strategy to Cope with Pandemic
319 Costs†

320 Reiner Eichenberger, Rainer Hegselmann , David Savage, David Stadelmann &
321 Benno Torgler March 2020, KYKLOS - International Review for Social
322 Sciences(forthcoming)

323

324 <http://www.overcomingbias.com/2020/02/consider-controlled-infection.html>

325

326 <https://www.haaretz.co.il/health/corona/.premium-1.8709305>

327