

# Supplementary Information: The unintended consequences of inconsistent pandemic control policies

Benjamin M. Althouse<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Brendan Wallace<sup>4</sup>, Brendan Case<sup>5,6</sup>, Samuel V. Scarpino<sup>7</sup>,  
Andrew M. Berdahl<sup>8</sup>, Easton R. White<sup>9,10</sup>, and Laurent Hébert-Dufresne<sup>5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Disease Modeling, Bellevue, WA 98005

<sup>2</sup>University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98105

<sup>3</sup>New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM 88003

<sup>4</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

<sup>5</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, USA

<sup>6</sup>Vermont Complex Systems Center, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, USA

<sup>7</sup>Network Science Institute, Northeastern University, Boston, MA

<sup>8</sup>School of Aquatic & Fishery Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

<sup>9</sup>Department of Biology, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, USA


<sup>10</sup>Gund Institute for Environment, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, USA

\*balthouse@idmod.org

**This supplementary material presents:** (1) additional analysis of the mobility data on a state-by-state basis, and (2) additional mathematical analysis of the model introduced in the main text.

## Mobility data correlates

We used the social, demographic, and economical variables compiled by White & Laurent Hébert-Dufresne<sup>1</sup> to examine potential correlates for the mobility data. We found that none of these variables strongly correlated with either percentage decreases in visits or percent change in distance traveled (results not shown). However, increases in state-level “tightness” was correlated with larger decreases in church visits and farther distanced traveled (Fig. S1). Tight cultures are typically defined as those with strong social norms and little tolerance for deviance<sup>2</sup>.



**Figure S1.** (a) Percent decreases in numbers of unique visitors to churches versus tightness by state. (b) Percent change in distances traveled to churches versus tightness by state.

## Mathematical analysis of final outbreak size

The mathematical simplicity of the classic SIR model, on which our model is based, allows for a number of more detailed analyses of the role of  $X$  and  $Y$  on the final outbreak size. In general, the final outbreak size for a given  $\lambda$ ,  $X$  and  $Y$  in our model is given by

$$R(\infty) = (1 - X)R_o(\infty) + XR_c(\infty) \quad (\text{S1})$$

We assume here that  $t_c = 0$ , and that  $S_o(0) \approx 1$ ,  $I_o(0) \ll 1$ , and  $R_o(0) = 0$ . These assumptions serve as a natural motivating example while allowing for a less cumbersome mathematical analysis. In this case,  $R_o(t_c)$  becomes 0 and so Eq. S1 simplifies to  $(1 - X)R_o(\infty)$ . therefore for notational convenience we simply write  $R$  and  $S$  to denote the open compartments, since closed compartments will always be empty.

Note that after redistribution, the population sizes for open compartments are no longer normalized to 1. Therefore to help prevent confusion we let  $r/s(t)$  be the proportion of recovered/susceptible individuals. After redistribution the population size in open compartments is  $1 + \frac{XY}{1-X} =: P$ , so  $s(t) = S(t)/P$  and  $r(t) = R(t)/P$ .

By Eq. (4) in Ma & Earn (2006)<sup>3</sup>, for open compartments we then have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\infty) &= 1 - s(\infty) \\ &= 1 - s(0) \exp(-R_0(r(\infty) - r(0))) \\ &= 1 - \exp(-R_0 r(\infty)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2})$$

where we have used that  $s(0) = 1 - \varepsilon$  and  $r(0) = 0$ . Note the reproductive number  $R_0$  here is defined  $\lambda P$ . This transcendental equation can then be solved for  $r(\infty)$  with respect to a particular set of parameters though numerical means or using the Lambert W function. Following Appendix A of Ma & Earn (2006)<sup>3</sup> and elsewhere,  $s(\infty) = -\frac{1}{R_0} W(-R_0 e^{-R_0})$ , where  $W$  is the principal branch of the Lambert W function. Therefore we may write (S2) in closed-form, which in turn gives

$$\begin{aligned} R(\infty) &= (1 - X)P \left( 1 + \frac{W(-R_0 e^{-R_0})}{R_0} \right) \\ &= (1 - X + XY) \left( 1 + \frac{W(-R_0 e^{-R_0})}{R_0} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S3})$$

### Finding critical $Y$ for a given $\lambda$

We first show how Eq. S2 can be used to find the value of  $Y$  past which, for any  $\lambda$ , any choice of  $X > 0$  will cause a worse final outbreak than compared to  $X = 0$ ; i.e. critical  $Y$ .

Let  $\beta$  be the initial infectiousness  $\lambda(1 + \frac{XY}{1-X})$ , and as above we use  $R$  to denote the open compartment. The total outbreak size in open churches is:

$$R(\infty) = 1 - e^{-\beta R(\infty)} \quad (\text{S4})$$

To find critical  $Y$  as defined, we want to solve for the following stationary point:


$$\frac{\partial}{\partial X} \left( R(\infty)(1 - X)(1 + \frac{XY}{1-X}) \right) \Big|_{X=0} = 0 \quad (\text{S5})$$

Taking the partial derivative of S4 implicitly with respect to  $X$  yields:

$$\partial_X(R(\infty)) = (\partial_X(\beta)R(\infty) + \beta \partial_X(R(\infty)))e^{-\beta R(\infty)}, \quad (\text{S6})$$

which leads to the following system, which is solvable for  $Y$  given any  $\lambda$ .

$$\begin{aligned} R(\infty) - 1 + e^{-\lambda R(\infty)} &= 0 \\ \partial_X R(\infty) - R(\infty) + R(\infty)Y &= 0 \\ \partial_X R(\infty) - e^{-\lambda R(\infty)}(\lambda Y R(\infty) + \lambda \partial_X R(\infty)) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$



**Figure S2.** Value of  $X$  giving the minimum value of Eq. (S3), as a function of  $Y$  and  $\lambda$ , based on numerical simulation of the clorSIR model. A clear transition from  $X = 0$  (yellow) to  $X = 1$  (blue) is seen, with no intermediary values. The solid black line corresponds to the theoretical closed-form solution from Eq. (S7), while the dashed grey line corresponds to the rough approximation  $Y > 1 - e^{-\lambda}$  past which it is best to not have any closures.

### Finding Optimal Closure Percentage

We now turn to finding the value of  $X$  which minimizes (S1) for a given  $Y$  and  $\lambda \geq 1$  (when  $\lambda < 1$ ,  $X = 0$  is clearly as optimal as anything else). When  $\lambda \geq 1$ , one can see from Figure 4 in the main text that  $R(\infty)$  as a function of  $X$  has either a single intermediate peak higher values of  $Y$ , or is monotone decreasing for lower values of  $Y$ . This pervasive downward parabolic shape arises from the fact that  $R(\infty)$  is the product of the linearly decreasing, positive function  $f(X) = 1 - X + XY$ , and the sigmoidal, positive function  $g(X) = 1 + (W(-R_0 e^{-R_0}))/R_0$ , where  $\frac{dg}{dX}$  approaches 0 as  $X$  approaches 1. This guarantees that  $R(\infty)$  is maximized at one of the extreme values  $X = 0$  or  $X = 1$ .

While Eq. (S3) is not defined at  $X = 1$ , we can obtain a right-hand limit. Using that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1^+} -R_0 e^{-R_0} = 0$  and  $W(x) \approx x$  for  $x$  small, we have as  $X \rightarrow 1$  that

$$\begin{aligned} R(\infty) &= (1 + e^{-R_0})P(1 - X) \\ &= 1 - X + XY + e^{-R_0}(1 - X + XY) \\ &\rightarrow Y. \end{aligned}$$

This result makes sense, since we would expect that  $r(\infty)$  be equal to 1 when  $R_0 \rightarrow \infty$ , so plugging this into Eq. (S2) and simplifying gives  $R(\infty) = Y$  for  $X = 1$ .

This leads to the section's main result, which is summarized in Figure S2.

$$\arg \min_X R(\infty) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } Y > \left(1 + \frac{W(-\lambda e^{-\lambda})}{\lambda}\right) \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{S7})$$

While this is in closed form,  $W$  cannot be expressed with elementary functions and hence poses similar interpretability issues to practitioners as implicit solutions or numerical approximations. Thankfully, a number of useful approximations for  $W$  exist. For example, here we can use the crude estimate  $W(x) < x$  for  $-1/e \leq x < 0$  to obtain the bound  $Y > 1 - e^{-\lambda}$ , which serves as sufficient criteria to be certain that no closure is the best option.

### References

1. White, E. R. & Hébert-Dufresne, L. State-level variation of initial covid-19 dynamics in the united states: The role of local government interventions. *medRxiv* (2020).

2. Gelfand, M. J. *et al.* The importance of cultural tightness and government efficiency for understanding covid-19 growth and death rates. *Preprint*. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/m7f8a> (2020).
3. Ma, J. & Earn, D. J. Generality of the final size formula for an epidemic of a newly invading infectious disease. *Bulletin mathematical biology* **68**, 679–702 (2006).