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Abstract

We analyse 'stop and go' containment policies which produce infection cycles as periods of tight lock-downs are followed by periods of falling infection rates, which then lead to a relaxation of containment measures, allowing cases to increase again until another lock-down is imposed. The policies followed by several European countries seem to fit this pattern. We show that 'stop and go' should lead to lower medical costs than keeping infections at the midpoint between the highs and lows produced by 'stop and go'. Increasing the upper and reducing the lower limits of a stop and go policy by the same amount would lower the average medical load. But increasing the upper and lowering the lower limit while keeping the geometric average constant would have the opposite impact. We also show that with economic costs proportional to containment, any path that brings infections back to the original level (technically a closed cycle) has the same overall economic cost.
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1 Introduction

As governments grapple with the second wave in Europe, they are usually taking a much more gradual and graduated approach than during the initial phase of the pandemic. At that time the number of seriously ill increased so rapidly that it overwhelmed health systems and in particular hospital capacities in several countries. The second wave, which started with the onset of the flu season in the autumn of 2020, has so far led to a somewhat moderated challenge for health systems.

After the first peak, the urgency to ‘flatten the curve’ [1] has subsided to a certain extent. However, governments still feel the need to take measures to slow down the spread of the virus when the medical load is high. One key strategic issue facing the authorities is whether they should try to preserve a status quo, or whether to alternate lock-downs with periods of easing.

In Italy and England, the central governments have instituted a tiered system with different levels of social distancing restrictions. In regions with a higher incidence of COVID-19, the restrictions are tighter. Within such a ’traffic light’ system a region (city or other subdivision) can graduate to a lower level of restrictions if its epidemiological parameters improve, and, vice versa, restrictions will be tightened if cases increase again. These countries have thus adopted de facto a ’stop and go’ policy at the regional level.

A change into a higher or lower category will of course become more frequent the closer the parameters defining the various tiers are. One key issue for this ’regional traffic light’ approach is thus how wide apart these parameters should be set. We investigate this issue keeping in mind that social distancing measures have an economic cost, which increases with their severity. The choice of parameters should be informed by their economic cost, relative to the health benefits in terms of lower infections, hospitalizations and deaths [2].

We do not consider a general optimal control problem. Our aim is limited to comparing policies that make intuitive sense and that describe the choices of different European countries. At the national level one can observe that Germany’s curve is relatively flat, compared to that of France, Belgium or Spain. See Figure 1.

There is one simple economic argument that would favour the ’stop and go’ strategy of alternating harsh restrictions with wide easing. The economic cost of closing restaurants, closing schools or imposing restrictions on movements is the same whether the current rate of infections is high or low. This implies that one should use harsh restrictions when the case count is high because one would then achieve the largest fall in cases (in absolute numbers).

The argument against the ’stop and go’ strategy is that the cost of the harsh restrictions to achieve a quick fall in infection is likely to be convex. A small proportional reduction in infections (or rather the reproduction number) can be achieved by measures which have little impact on the economy (e.g. mask wearing, etc.). Achieving a more rapid deceleration in the diffusion of the virus requires substantially stronger restrictions of the type mentioned above.

One could of course argue that stop and go policies are inferior to the ‘East
Figure 1: **Examples of second-wave control strategies.** For the control of the second Covid-19 wave in Europe, most countries imposed comparatively strict lock-downs. Illustrative examples are, as shown, France, Belgium and Spain. As an exception, Germany, starting around the beginning of November 2020 opted for a ‘semi-lockdown’, which resulted in near constant infections. Graphic generated using the Goethe Interactive Covid-19 Analyser [6].

Asian’ option of eradicating the virus [3], which then allows a total reopening of the economy. But this option has been abandoned in Europe as the draconian measures, including border closures that would be required, have apparently been widely judged as unacceptable. Note, however, that it is currently yet to be settled whether additional factors, like evolutionary adaptions, contribute to differences in the path the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 pathogen took in European and East-Asian populations [4].

The remainder of our contribution is organised as follows: We start by briefly reviewing the standard SIR model to which we add a relationship which describes the economic cost of reducing the spread of the virus. This framework is then used to examine the economic control costs of two alternative policies: keeping the medical load constant [5] versus a stop and go policy. We then compute the medical load implied by these two policies over a given time path and compare the resulting relative economic costs against the benefits in terms of a lower overall number of infected. Finally, we consider the implications of a time varying native reproduction factor, for example an increase due to colder weather, leading to more indoor interactions.

Throughout, our purpose is not to describe and solve a general optimal control problem, but to compare the economic cost of different concrete policy options. Figure 2 illustrates schematically the ‘stop-and-go’ epidemic control which we model below.
2 Modelling framework

We start with a short presentation of the standard SIR model where we denote with $S = S(t)$ the fraction of susceptible (non-affected) people, with $I = I(t)$ the fraction of the population that is currently ill (active cases, which are also infectious), and with $R = R(t)$ the fraction of recovered. Normalization demands $S + I + R = 1$ at all times. We write the continuous-time SIR model as

$$\tau \dot{S} = -gSI, \quad \tau \dot{I} = (gS - 1)I, \quad \tau \dot{R} = I,$$

which makes clear that $\tau$ is a characteristic time scale. Normalization is conserved, as $\dot{S} + \dot{I} + \dot{R} = 0$. Infection and recovery rates are $g/\tau$ and $1/\tau$. The number of infected grows as long as $\dot{I} > 0$, namely when $gS > 1$. Herd immunity is consequently attained when the fraction of yet unaffected people dropped to $S = 1/g$. The total number of past and present infected is $X = 1 - S = I + R$.

From (1) one sees that $g/\tau$ governs the transition between two compartments, from susceptible to infected. This transition rate is constant within the basic version of the SIR model. There are two venues to relax this condition:

• **Non-linear reproduction rates.** The basic reproduction factor $g$ may depend functionally on the actual number of infected $I$ [7, 8], or on the total number $X$, [2]. This happens when societies react on an epidemic outbreak.

• **Time-dependent reproduction rates.** From the viewpoint of the pathogen, certain changes in the transmission rate $g = g(t)$ are external, e.g. because hosts decide more often to quarantine.

Here we focus on time-dependent $g = g(t)$, mostly as induced by stop and go politics, as illustrated in Figure 2. We assume a stop and go cycle which repeats after $T = T_{\text{up}} + T_{\text{down}}$:

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} 
g_{\text{up}} > 1 & t \in [0, T_{\text{up}}] 
g_{\text{down}} < 1 & t \in [T_{\text{up}}, T] \end{cases}.$$  

(2)

The time spans during which epidemics expands/contracts are respectively $T_{\text{up}}$ and $T_{\text{down}}$. The policy is cyclic if $I(0) = I(T)$, viz when the starting case number is reached again.

2.1 Low incidence approximation

We assume that infection counts are substantially lower than the population, viz that $I \ll 1$. For example, even in a highly affected country like Italy, the total number of daily infections has rarely exceeded thirty thousand [9], which corresponds to less than 0.0005 of total population. The total number of cases has reached 1.5 million, which is equivalent to $S \approx 0.975$. The number
Figure 2: **Stop-and-go epidemic control.** Containment policies that alternate periodically between $I_{\text{low}}$ and $I_{\text{large}}$. When relaxing, the number of daily cases $I = I(t)$ expands at a rate $g(\text{up}) \equiv g_{\text{up}} > 1$. Policies are tightened again when case number are too high. Daily case numbers then contract with a rate $g(\text{down}) \equiv g_{\text{down}} < 1$. In the example shown, up- and down times are $T_{\text{up}} = 1$ and $T_{\text{down}} = 2$. For a presumed time scale of one month the period $T_{\text{up}} + T_{\text{down}}$ of the control cycle would be here three months. Also indicated are the arithmetic and the geometric means of $I_{\text{low}}$ and $I_{\text{large}}$, as used in Sect. 4.1. Note that constant control is recovered in the limit $I_{\text{low}} \to I_{\text{large}}$.

of susceptibles remains then close to one, essentially constant and we can set $S \to 1$. Hence we need to deal only with

$$\tau \dot{I} = (g - 1) I, \quad I(t) = I(t_0) e^{(t-t_0)(g-1)/\tau}.$$  

(3)

In the quasi-stationary state we have simple exponential growth/decay. For stop-and-go control the reproduction factor is piece-wise constant, which allows us to evaluate explicitly the time evolution of case numbers, and with this the associated economic costs.

### 3 Economic costs of disease control

The economic costs of imposing social distancing on a wider population, closing restaurants or retail trade, are at the core of policy discussions. The key issue here is how these costs vary with the social distancing measures (so-called Non-Pharmacological Interventions, NPI) imposed. They increase in severity from mask requirements, abstaining from travel or restaurant meals to more invasive interventions like closure of schools, lock-downs or curfews. Limiting social interaction necessarily reduces economic activity. This suggests that the economic cost of the social distancing, measured as the proportional loss of GDP, should
increase with the reduction in the transmission rate described by $g$, 

\[ E = c_e \frac{g_0 - g}{g_0}, \]

(4)

where $g_0$ is the native reproduction factor. Here we assumed that social distancing costs are proportional to the percentage-wise reduction of the reproduction factor, viz to $(g_0 - g)/g_0$.

Our basic assumption, that social distancing costs are proportional to the reduction in the reproduction parameter, differs from the assumptions underlying matching models, as used in [10] or [11], which typically arrive at a quadratic relationship between the economic cost and the reduction in contagion, whereas [12] postulates simply a convex cost curve.

A concrete example can illustrate the key mechanism behind the matching framework, which usually assumes that the 'lock-down' takes the form of the confinement of a proportion of the population, and that contagion is possible only outside. If one half of the population has to stay at home, only the other half can go out and get potentially infected. But the half which is not confined will find only one half of their potential partners outside, resulting in one fourth of the number of matches. Contagion should thus be reduced by a factor of four when confining one half of the population.

In the matching framework, the economic cost is assumed to be proportional to the percentage of the population which is confined - not the number of matches. This framework thus separates social activity (matches, meetings of people) from economic activity, assuming that contagion is fostered only through social activity. Another implicit assumption behind this view is that those who are not confined will not have longer meetings with the ones they still find outside; or that those who are free to move accept to have only half of matches, and do not decide to meet somebody else if their preferred match is not available. These implicit assumptions are crucial. For example, contagion would only be halved if those not confined would meet twice as long with the remaining matches they find. Some authors, e.g. [11] acknowledge these considerations by allowing for different economies of scale in matching.

Our view of lock-down or rather social distancing is that governments mandate the closure of some part of the economy, in reality mainly the services sector (restaurants, bars, shops, etc.). This is different from a strict confinement of a part of the population. A restaurant which is closed (or limited in its opening hours) results in less value added created and diminishes at the same time the potential for contagion. But the restaurant owners and their workers are not confined, they can meet others. There is thus no quadratic effect in terms of contacts. We thus start from the assumption that economic activity involves occasions for contagion, implying that the loss of economic activity should be directly proportional to the reduction in occasions for contagion and thus the effective reproductions rate. For related approaches see [2], [13], [14] [15].

This view of 'lock-down' corresponds closer to the measures adopted by many governments during this second wave. The matching model might have been more appropriate during the first wave when indeed in some countries large
parts of the entire population were forbidden to leave their home, except for essential business.

Finally we note that social distancing measures (NPIs) cannot affect the number of infected, only the rate at which their number grows over time. Eq. 4 implies that the only way to avoid all contagion is to completely shut down the economy. The parameter $c_e$ represents a scaling factor, which would depend on the structure of the economy (importance of services requiring close contact, like tourism) and the degree to which the population effectively adheres to official restrictions. It has been estimated that $c_e$ is of the order of 0.25 [2].

3.1 Uniform control

We first briefly examine the implications of a policy which keeps the number of infected [5] and thus the medical load constant. Such a policy is of course not optimal, but it serves as a useful benchmark for our more general results. It can be considered as the limiting case of the ‘traffic light’ system in which the difference in parameters between tiers or levels becomes very small.

Formally, uniform control implies a constant fraction $I \rightarrow I_{\text{const}}$ of infected. This is achieved for $g = 1$, independent of the value of $I_{\text{const}}$. The economic cost $E_{\text{const}}$ per time unit is therefore

$$E_{\text{const}} = c_e \left. \frac{g u - g}{g_0} \right|_{g=1} = c_e \frac{g_0 - 1}{g_0},$$

(5)

Note that $E_{\text{const}}$ is independent of the value of the medical load one wants to retain. As already mentioned above, the economic costs of keeping the reproduction factor at one is independent of how many infected there are.

3.2 Stop and go control

Stop and go, or ‘bang bang’, control corresponds to an on-off policy as illustrated in Figure 2 above, which can be described within the framework developed here by the following rule: Control is increased when $I = I(t)$ reaches an upper threshold $I_{\text{large}}$, and decreased when $I = I(t)$ falls below a lower threshold $I_{\text{low}}$.

We denote with $g_{\text{down}} < 1$ the small reproduction rate corresponding to strong control, and with $g_{\text{up}} > 1$ the large reproduction factor corresponding to weak control. Using the low-incidence approximation (3) we find

$$T_{\text{up}} = \frac{\tau}{g_{\text{up}} - 1} \ln \left( \frac{I_{\text{large}}}{I_{\text{low}}} \right), \quad T_{\text{down}} = \frac{\tau}{g_{\text{down}} - 1} \ln \left( \frac{I_{\text{low}}}{I_{\text{large}}} \right),$$

(6)

for the time $T_{\text{up}}$ needed for $I(t)$ to grow from $I_{\text{low}}$ to $I_{\text{large}}$, with a respective expression for the down-time $T_{\text{down}}$. On a per time basis the economic costs are then

$$E_{\text{bang}} = c_e \frac{g_0 - g}{g_0} \left[ (g_0 - g_{\text{up}}) T_{\text{up}} + (g_0 - g_{\text{down}}) T_{\text{down}} \right] \frac{1}{T_{\text{up}} + T_{\text{down}}}$$

(7)

for band-bang, viz stop-and-go control.
3.3 Vanishing cost differential

The cost difference between bang-bang and constant control is

\[ E_{\text{bang}} - E_{\text{const}} = \frac{c_e}{g_0} \left[ 1 - \frac{g_{\text{up}}T_{\text{up}} + g_{\text{down}}T_{\text{down}}}{T_{\text{up}} + T_{\text{down}}} \right]. \quad (8) \]

Note that \( \ln(I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}}) = -\ln(I_{\text{low}}/I_{\text{large}}) \), which implies that both \( \tau \) and \( \ln(I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}}) \) drop out of (8), which vanishes as

\[ E_{\text{bang}} - E_{\text{const}} = \frac{c_e}{g_0} \left[ 1 - \frac{g_{\text{up}}(g_{\text{down}} - 1) - g_{\text{down}}(g_{\text{up}} - 1)}{g_{\text{down}} - g_{\text{up}}} \right] \equiv 0. \quad (9) \]

This implies that both control types, constant and stop-and-go control, come with the same economic costs.

3.4 Neutrality theorem

The result, that the cost differential between constant and stop-and-go control vanishes, can be generalised if we rewrite (3) as

\[ \tau \dot{I}_{\log} = g - 1, \quad I_{\log} = \ln(I), \quad (10) \]

where \( g = g(t) \) is now an arbitrary function of time. We then have

\[ I_{\log}(t_{\text{end}}) - I_{\log}(t_{\text{start}}) = \int_{t_{\text{start}}}^{t_{\text{end}}} \dot{I}_{\log} dt = \int_{t_{\text{start}}}^{t_{\text{end}}} \frac{g(t) - 1}{\tau} dt, \quad (11) \]

which proves that

\[ \frac{1}{t_{\text{start}} - t_{\text{end}}} \int_{t_{\text{start}}}^{t_{\text{end}}} g(t) dt = 1 \quad (12) \]

for closed trajectories, viz when \( I_{\log}(t_{\text{end}}) = I_{\log}(t_{\text{start}}) \). Comparing with (5) shows that average economic costs are independent of which timeline \( g(t) \) is used for controlling the epidemic. Note that the case of constant control, \( g(t) \equiv g \), is included as a special case. If the economic costs of control are proportional to the reduction in the reproductions rate, one finds thus a 'neutrality theorem' for epidemic control. All trajectories which return to the point of departure (in terms of the infection rate) will lead to the same economic cost.

4 Mean number of infected under different control policies

The number of infected becomes the key criterion if the economic cost of different control policies (over complete cycles) is the same.
For constant infection rates $g$, the cumulative number of infected between two times $t = t_0$ and $t = t_1$ is

$$X_{0,1} = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} I(t)dt = I(t_0) \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{(t-t_0)(g-1)/\tau} dt$$

$$= \frac{I_0 \tau}{g-1} \left( e^{(t_1-t_0)(g-1)/\tau} - 1 \right) = \frac{(I_1 - I_0) \tau}{g-1}$$

(13)

when using (3) and that $I_1 = I_0 \exp((t_1 - t_0)(g-1)/\tau)$. Noting that (6) holds generally for constant $g$, we have

$$\Delta T_{0,1} = t_1 - t_0 = \frac{\tau}{g-1} \ln \left( \frac{I_1}{I_0} \right),$$

(14)

which leads to

$$\frac{X_{0,1}}{\Delta T_{0,1}} = \frac{I_1 - I_0}{\ln(I_1/I_0)}$$

(15)

for the overall number of infected, on the average per time unit. Note that

$$\ln \left( \frac{I_1}{I_0} \right) = \ln \left( \frac{I_1 - I_0 + I_0}{I_0} \right) \approx \frac{I_1 - I_0}{I_0}$$

(16)

for $I_1 \approx I_0$, from which the limit

$$\lim_{I_0 \to I_1} \frac{X_{0,1}}{\Delta T_{0,1}} = I_0$$

(17)

is recovered. Empirically it been observed that the cumulative medical load during the 'down phase' is about 30% higher than the cumulative load which follows the peak [16].

4.1 Bang-bang infection numbers

For stop-and-go control we have two periods with constant $g$, when $I$ goes up and respectively down. With (15) we find that the total cumulative fraction of infected is determined by;

$$X_{\text{bang}} = \frac{I_{\text{large}} - I_{\text{low}}}{\ln(I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}})} T_{\text{up}} + \frac{I_{\text{low}} - I_{\text{large}}}{\ln(I_{\text{low}}/I_{\text{large}})} T_{\text{down}}$$

(18)

for bang-bang control, and hence

$$\bar{I}_{\text{bang}} = \frac{X_{\text{bang}}}{T_{\text{up}} + T_{\text{down}}} = \frac{I_{\text{large}} - I_{\text{low}}}{\ln(I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}})}$$

(19)

for the time-averaged number $\bar{I}_{\text{bang}}$ of infections.

Here we are interested in on-the-average stationary control strategies, for which the level $I$ of infections is kept at the average. In Sect. 3.4 we did show
that stationary control results always in identical economic costs. This holds however not for the medical load, which can be considered to be the proportional to the average infection number \( \bar{I} \). It is in particular of interest to compare the medical \( \bar{I}_{\text{bang}} \), of stop-and-go control, with the policies keeping \( I \) at a constant, intermediate level or benchmark. A natural choice for this benchmark could the arithmetic mean, or midpoint, \( I_{\text{mid}} = (I_{\text{large}} + I_{\text{low}}) / 2 \). However, we will consider as well the geometric mean \( I_{\text{geo}} = \sqrt{I_{\text{large}} I_{\text{low}}} \).

For the arithmetic mean, the ratio \( \bar{I}_{\text{bang}} / \bar{I}_{\text{mid}} \) in mean infection numbers is

\[
\delta \bar{I} = \frac{\bar{I}_{\text{bang}}}{\bar{I}_{\text{mid}}} = \frac{x_{\text{bang}}}{T_{\text{up}} + T_{\text{down}}} \frac{2}{I_{\text{large}} + I_{\text{low}}} = \frac{x - 1}{\ln(x)} \frac{2}{x + 1} \leq 1, \tag{20}
\]

when denoting \( x = I_{\text{large}} / I_{\text{low}} \). In the lines \( I_{\text{large}} \to I_{\text{low}} \), viz \( x \to 1 \), one has \( \lim_{x \to 1} \delta \bar{I} = 1 \), as expected. The lines \( x \to 1 \) is performed using the small \( x - 1 \) expansion \( \ln(x) = \ln(1 + (x - 1)) \approx x - 1 \).

That \( \bar{I}_{\text{bang}} / \bar{I}_{\text{mid}} \) is strictly smaller than unity for \( x > 1 \) can be seen, e.g., by plotting (20) as a function of \( x \), as done in Figure 3. Numerically one finds a reduction of 29% at \( x = 10 \), which is somewhat higher than ratio of 7 to 1 observed in the actual values displayed in Fig. 1. Note that one has \( 2/(x+1) \leq 1 \) when \( x \geq 1 \), for the second term in (20), with \( (x-1)/\ln(x) \leq 1 \) holding for the first term. The last relation holds because the log-function is concave, with a slope \( d\ln(x)/dx = 1 \) at \( x = 1 \).

The result that \( \bar{I}_{\text{bang}} \leq \bar{I}_{\text{mid}} \) implies that a policy of stop and go is superior to (less bad than) a policy of keeping infections constant half-way between the
peak and trough. The two policies would have the same economic cost, but stop and go would lead to a lower overall medical load. Neither policy would of course be optimal in an unconstrained policy space. But our aim is merely to consider policies that have been adopted. The intuition behind this result can be seen from Figure 2 above. The infection curve lies more time below than above the arithmetic average, a well-known property of exponential growth.

The constant control policy serves only as benchmark. The results are much more general: As can be seen from (20) the average medical load falls as the ratio of the upper limit to the lower limit increases, while holding the (arithmetic) average constant. This implies that the medical load resulting from a 'stop and go' policy improves as one increases the upper and reduces the lower limit by the same amount.

Regarding the comparison to the geometric mean $I_{\text{geo}}$, we consider

$$\frac{I_{\text{bang}}}{I_{\text{geo}}} = \frac{I_{\text{large}} - I_{\text{low}}}{\ln(I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}}}}$$

$$= \frac{x - 1}{\ln(x)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} \geq 1,$$

(21)

where we used $x = I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}}$, as for (20). The functional dependence is included in Figure 3. It can be seen that it is favorable to keep the incidence at the geometric mean, instead of letting it oscillate between $I_{\text{low}}$ and $I_{\text{large}}$. Moreover, the ratio of the respective average medical loads increases only modestly as the ratio between upper and lower limit increases. Letting case number vary by a factor of ten leads to an increase of 24%. It should not be surprising that keeping infections at the geometric mean is worse, given that the distance between the two means increases as the ratio of the upper to the lower limit becomes larger. For $9 = I_{\text{large}}/I_{\text{low}}$, the arithmetic mean is equal to 5 whereas the geometric mean is 3. Choosing the geometric as the intermediate point thus amounts to choosing a higher benchmark.

From a general viewpoint, it follows from (21) that the average medical load increases as the ratio of the upper limit to the lower limit increases, when holding the geometric average constant. This implies that the medical load resulting from a 'stop and go' policy increases as one increases the upper and reduces the lower limit by the identical factor. These considerations suggest that the decision regarding how wide apart to set the limits of a 'stop and go' or a regional 'traffic light' policy depends on whether one wants to keep the arithmetic or the geometric average constant.

### 4.2 Significance

The results discussed above apply only within the limits of hospital capacity. Once that limit has been reached any further increase in the medical load would imply rapidly rising medical and ethical costs. A lower medical load constitutes a sufficient criterion for preferring the stop and go policy, given that the respective economic costs vanish for different control paths as long as the initial infection
incidence is reached again. Note that the medical load can be translated into economic costs [15], [17], [18], [19].

Most of the literature focuses on the economic value of the lives lost. However, that might be a mistake [2], as infections with less severe symptoms can also lead to considerable economic costs. One example of the economic cost of infections would be the loss of working time of those infected and with mild symptoms, when these individuals have to self-isolate and cannot work for a certain time. This loss could be calculated as the number of weeks of working time due to symptoms (and self-isolation needs) and would be equal to a proportion of GDP [2]. To this one would have to add the hospitalisation costs for those with stronger symptoms and finally the economic value of lives lost. The lower medical load implied by a stop and go policy would thus also lead to lower overall economic costs.

A key difference between the present study and most existing literature concerns the kind of policies examined. Here we focus on a comparison between two representative, real-world policies, stop and go vs. constant control. Optimal control, which usually does not result in reversals of restrictions, is in contrast the goal for the majority of studies published so far. Contributions like [10] and [11] employ the matching framework, which is based on confinement as the main policy instrument and allows for economies of scale in lowering contagion as explained above. In such a framework it is clear that the optimal policy would be to impose tight restrictions from the start until the desired incidence is attained. For example, [10] finds that “the optimal confinement policy is to impose a constant rate of lock-down until the suppression of the virus in the population.”.

Other contributions, which do not incorporate economies of scale in containment policies (either because they use constant returns in matching or because of a different view of social distancing restrictions) arrive at somewhat differentiated conclusions. For example, [15] where containment works like a consumption tax, find that containment should build up gradually and peak early when there exists the perspective of a vaccine being discovered.

5 Changing epidemic parameters

The native reproduction factor $g_0$ is, as a matter of principle, an intrinsic property of the virus. As such it can be measured only at the very start of a pandemic, namely when nobody is yet aware of what is happening. However, this reproduction factor can change over time, for example with the season. It is well known that the danger of contagion is much higher indoors than outdoors. It is in fact nearly impossible to catch the Coronavirus outside [20]. In the case of influenza virus this change in the reproduction rate leads to the typical ‘flu season’, which starts with the onset of colder weather (late in the year in the Northern Hemisphere).

One thus needs to consider time-dependent $g_t$, which would correspond to the underlying spreading rate in a given societal state, ‘without explicit,
government-imposed restrictions’.

We assume that \( g_0 \) changes right at the top for the case of bang-bang control. Going up/down we then have \( g_0 = g_0^{(up)} \) and \( g_0 = g_0^{(down)} \). As a further simplification we postulate

\[
T_{up} = T_{down}, \quad g_{up} - 1 = 1 - g_{down},
\]

which is equivalent to \( g_{up} + g_{down} = 2 \). Compare (6).

### 5.1 Costs for the economy

Given that we assume that \( T_{up} = T_{down} \), the per time economic costs of keeping constant infection numbers is

\[
E_{const} = \frac{c_e}{2} \left[ \frac{g_0^{(up)} - 1}{g_0^{(up)}} + \frac{g_0^{(down)} - 1}{g_0^{(down)}} \right].
\]

(23)

For bang-bang control we have instead

\[
E_{bang} = \frac{c_e}{2} \left[ \frac{g_0^{(up)} - g_0^{(down)}}{g_0^{(up)}} + \frac{g_0^{(up)} - g_0^{(down)}}{g_0^{(down)}} \right].
\]

(24)

The difference is

\[
E_{bang} - E_{const} = \frac{c_e}{2} \left[ \frac{1 - g_{up}}{g_0^{(up)}} + \frac{1 - g_{down}}{g_0^{(down)}} \right],
\]

(25)

which simplifies to

\[
E_{bang} - E_{const} = \frac{c_e}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{g_0^{(down)}} - \frac{1}{g_0^{(up)}} \right] \left( 1 - g_{down} \right) > 0
\]

(26)

when using the \( T_{up} = T_{down} \) condition that \( g_{up} - 1 = 1 - g_{down}, \) see (22). Going doing down we restrict, viz \( g_{down} < 1 \) holds.

Bang-bang control is therefore favorable when \( g_0^{(down)} > g_0^{(up)} \). This result would support the pattern observed in Europe where during the summer (when \( g_0 \) was lower than before) governments eased restrictions, imposing them again during the fall when \( g_0 \) increased again. The economic cost of the restrictions could thus be concentrated during the period when they had a higher yield in terms of infections avoided.

### 6 Conclusions

During the first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic the key concern was to ‘flatten the curve’. Harsh lock-down measures were needed when health systems were
overwhelmed by the sudden increase in hospitalizations, many of which required intensive care units. The second wave has so far resulted in a somewhat lower medical load, but it proved nevertheless indispensable to re-introduce some social distancing measures as otherwise the case load would have continued to increase at a near exponential rate. Countries have taken in this regard different approaches. In some, the measures have been just enough to stabilize infections. In others, the measures have led to a strong fall in new cases and governments plan to lift restrictions soon - which is likely to lead to a renewed increase.

Several countries introduced, interestingly, regionally graduated systems, which allow regions and cities to oscillate between periods of harsh restrictions that are triggered when infection numbers surpass certain thresholds, and periods of lower restrictions which start when numbers have fallen again, now below a given threshold. These kind of quasi-automatized threshold containment policies are graded realization of the stop and go policy examined in the present study.

We have shown in the context of our model, that any time path of restrictions which returns to the point of departure in terms of the infection rate, a scenario like to occur within rule-based ‘traffic light’ systems, imply the same overall economic costs. Our analysis suggests furthermore that stop and go policies might not be as costly as it might appear at first sight, at least if compared to the alternative of keeping the incidence rate constantly the midpoint. The economic cost would be the same, but the overall medical load of stop and go should be lower. The result is reversed for the alternative of keeping infections at the (lower) geometric mean. Compare Figure 2.

Applied to regional ‘traffic light’ systems, our results imply that increasing the upper, and reducing at the same time the lower threshold by the same absolute amount $\Delta I$, via $I_{\text{upper}} \rightarrow I_{\text{upper}} + \Delta I$ and $I_{\text{lower}} \rightarrow I_{\text{lower}} - \Delta I$ leads to a lower medical load. The opposite would be true if one were to increase the upper, and at the same time reduce the lower threshold by the same proportion, $f_I > 1$, this time using the rescaling $I_{\text{upper}} \rightarrow I_{\text{upper}} f_I$ and $I_{\text{upper}} \rightarrow I_{\text{upper}} / f_I$. The latter procedure would increase the arithmetic average since the absolute increase in the upper limit would be now higher than the fall in the lower limit. This implies that any choice regarding the range between the upper and lower thresholds in a regional ‘traffic light’ must take this difference between arithmetic and geometric mean into account.

We also show that it makes sense for policies to react to seasonal variations in the native reproduction factor. The economic cost of tight social distancing should be incurred in winter, when infections would otherwise be high and rising. Bang hard on the virus when Santa Claus knocks at the door.
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