

Participatory syndromic surveillance as a tool for tracking COVID-19 in Bangladesh

Mahmud et al.

Supplementary Methods

S1. Syndromic surveillance screening questions

Individuals interacting with the self-reported system via any of the three channels are asked the following common set of questions (all of which requires a Yes/No response):

- 1) Are you experiencing shortness of breath?
- 2) Have you been experiencing fever and/or cough?
- 3) In the last 14 days, have you been near someone experiencing shortness of breath, fever and/or cough?
- 4) In the last 14 days, have you been someone who has tested positive for COVID-19?
- 5) Are you more than 60 years old?
- 6) Would you like someone from the public health department to contact you?

Individuals that answer 'Yes' to at least four of questions 1-5, and 'Yes' to question 6 are connected with a human verifier over the phone. The human verifier then makes an assessment on whether or not the individual is at 'High' or 'Low' risk for COVID-19.

Additionally, for all calls to the hotline number, the four mobile operators in Bangladesh use their own in-house algorithm for determining which calls are forwarded to a telemedicine doctor. In addition to the self-reported data, these algorithms also take into account an individual's frequency of interacting with the syndromic surveillance system, deviations from normal calling patterns, and locations visited within a certain time window. These algorithms are likely to differ in their ability to correctly identify suspected cases of COVID-19 and may well be biased in different ways; here we focus only on establishing the utility of the system within the constraints of measurable proxies for transmission.

S2. Validation of syndromic data with confirmed case counts

We estimated the association between the syndromic data and the confirmed case counts by estimating the following model for each syndromic indicator:

$$Y_{ik} = \beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j X_{j,ik} + u_k$$
$$u_k \sim Normal(0, \sigma_k^2)$$

where Y_{ik} is the number of cases in week i in upazila, k ; β_0 is the intercept (grand mean across all weeks and all upazilas); $X_{j,ik}$ are the syndromic indicator at various lags; β_j are the corresponding estimated fixed effects; and u_k are the estimated random effects (upazila-specific deviation from the grand mean). The random effects are assumed to be normally distributed with a mean of 0 and a variance of σ_k^2 . The 95% confidence intervals for the fixed effect estimates were computed using a simulation method developed by Gelman and

Hill [1], implemented in the R package *merTools*. The confidence intervals for the fixed effects are estimated assuming that the conditional modes of the random effects are fixed [1].

S3. Predicted importation from Dhaka

We use previously described methods to construct population mobility estimates from mobile phone call detail records [2]. We use previously collected anonymized and aggregated CDR data from Telenor Group's mobile phone operator Grameenphone in Bangladesh with over 64 million subscribers, for April 2017 [3], [4]. Here, we make the assumption that mobility patterns in April 2017 are equivalent to mobility patterns for March 2020. Previous work has shown that while there are significant temporal fluctuations in population mobility (for instance on weekends and holidays), the day-to-day patterns are relatively similar over long periods of time. Further, we expect the relative distribution of travelers from Dhaka to all other destinations to be relatively unchanged over the course of three years, while the volume of travel is likely to have changed reflecting changes in population size. We tested the validity of this assumption by comparing the CDR data for April 2017 to CDR data available for May 2020. We find a strong correlation in the proportion of travelers traveling from Dhaka to all other upazilas in 2017 and in 2020 (Figure S3). Unfortunately, the CDR data for 2020 is unavailable for the pre-lockdown business-as-usual period in March. We, therefore, use the 2017 mobility estimates to derive the relative distribution of travelers from Dhaka to each upazila outside Dhaka district, and adjust the volume of travel with the 2020 population estimate for Dhaka.

We estimate the probability of importing at least one infected person, using the mobility estimates and an estimated prevalence for Dhaka. Using previously described methods for the spread of COVID-19 [5], we estimate the probability of importing one or more infected cases in the first 16 days of the outbreak (i.e. prior to any travel restrictions) for each upazila outside Dhaka district. Specifically, the probability of introducing at least one case of COVID-19 from Dhaka to upazila j by time t is given by:

$$1 - \exp \left[- \int_{u=t_0}^t (M_{j,u} \times K_u \times N \times I_u) du \right]$$

where $M_{j,u}$ is the proportion of travelers from Dhaka traveling to upazila j at time u , K_u is the proportion of the population that are traveling out of Dhaka at time u , N is the population size of Dhaka (12.04 million) and I_u is the estimated prevalence in Dhaka at time u .

We estimate daily prevalence in Dhaka assuming that the outbreak started on March 8 and grew exponentially in the first 16 days before the implementation of physical distancing measures and travel bans across the country. We assume a doubling time of 7.4 days and an incubation period of 5.2 days based on early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China [6]. Our results hold across a range of plausible parameter values, i.e. we see a significant positive association between importation probability and the syndromic data, with parameter values that fall within the 95% confidence intervals for the doubling time (4.2 to 14 days) and incubation period (4.1 to 7 days) from [6].

Supplementary Figures




Figure S1: Correlation between number classified as high risk per 100,000 and confirmed cases per 100,000 by calendar week




Figure S2: Correlation between number reporting symptoms per 100,000 and confirmed cases per 100,000 by calendar week




Fig S3: Comparison of mobility estimates derived from CDR data for April 2017 and May 2020. The scatterplot shows the proportion of all travelers traveling from Dhaka district to all upazilas outside Dhaka in 2017 (y axis) versus 2020 (x axis).




Figure S4: Timeseries of response volume for each of the three self-reported data streams from April 15 to June 15. Data prior to April 15 are not comparable as several of the systems were not set up until April 15 and are, thus, not shown here. The blue line shows the seven-day rolling average.




Figure S5: Associations between syndromic indicators and confirmed cases estimated from linear mixed effects model. The estimated coefficients represent the estimated association between each of the independent variables (syndromic indicators at various lags) and the confirmed cases, holding all else fixed (including random effects). The red dashed line indicates no association.

References

- [1] A. Gelman and J. Hill, *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [2] A. Wesolowski *et al.*, “Impact of human mobility on the emergence of dengue epidemics in Pakistan,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 112, no. 38, pp. 11887–11892, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1504964112.
- [3] A. S. Mahmud *et al.*, “Megacities as drivers of national outbreaks: the role of holiday travel in the spread of infectious diseases,” *bioRxiv*, p. 737379, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1101/737379.
- [4] H.-H. Chang *et al.*, “Mapping imported malaria in Bangladesh using parasite genetic and human mobility data,” *eLife*, vol. 8, p. e43481, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.7554/eLife.43481.
- [5] Z. Du *et al.*, “Risk for Transportation of Coronavirus Disease from Wuhan to Other Cities in China - Volume 26, Number 5—May 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC,” doi: 10.3201/eid2605.200146.
- [6] Q. Li *et al.*, “Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia,” *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 382, no. 13, pp. 1199–1207, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316.