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ABSTRACT

The real epidemic spreading has generally two different types of transmission routes. One is the random anonymous infection and the other one is the transmission through regular and fixed contacts. When the infectious disease has high mortality and there is no available vaccine or medicine, many health authorities rely on non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) through traceable fixed contacts, such as isolation of the infected. In our study, such realistic situations are implemented by the susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) model with isolation on multiplex networks. The multiplex networks are composed of a time-varying random interaction layer and a fixed interaction layer. We quantitatively compare the efficiency of two isolation protocols imposed on the SIR dynamics. One of them is the most popular protocol adopted by many health organizations over the globe. From the numerical simulations we find that the isolation of the second nearest neighbors of the hospitalized individuals on the layer for fixed contacts significantly reduces both the final epidemic size and the number of the isolated per unit time. Our finding suggests a better NPI for any type of epidemic even though the contact tracing is only partially available.

INTRODUCTION

An outbreak of a new disease, such as the bubonic plague pandemic in the 14th century, the 1918 influenza pandemic, and the recent outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome, has been a large threat throughout human history. Despite great advances in medical science and pharmacology, immediate use of an effective vaccine or antiviral drug is not always possible when new infectious diseases emerge. For example, due to the absence of vaccines or antiviral drugs for new severe acute respiratory coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) during the early stage of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, more than 172 million people have been infected and has caused more than 3.7 million deaths until March 2021. Thus, finding an efficient NPI is crucial to mitigate the pandemic situation for new emerging diseases.

The best NPI for a new disease is a perfect lockdown, under which all individuals are strictly isolated. For example, during the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic, strict lockdown measures had been successfully applied in mainland China and many European countries. However, the strict lockdown policy is not sustainable if the pandemic period continues long enough to cause a severe recession of economic activity and to increase social fatigue. Thus, it is necessary to find NPIs that minimize the impact on the social and economic systems. The efficacy of various NPIs has been intensively studied based on real data and theoretical models to alleviate the recent pandemic situations.

Among the various NPIs, the quarantine of the infected individuals and their contacts is one of the most intuitive measures and commonly shared by many health authorities over the world. Thus, the isolation of the infected and tracing the contacts are two important factors. However, if the infection from asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic patients are potential transmission routes like the COVID-19 case, then finding the contacts with such patients are not trivial. Furthermore, when airborne transmission is another important route of spreading, the tracing becomes much harder due to the random anonymous contacts through the publicly opened environments. In this study, such random anonymous transmission is implemented by the double-layered multiplex networks (DLMNs). To model the situation with the pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic transmissions, we assume that individuals in our models have one of the following disease states, susceptible (S), infected (I), and recovered (R). Furthermore, the contact tracing probability and isolation states are introduced to account for more realistic situations in our model. As we will show we first model the most popular protocol for NPI adopted by many health authorities, and also introduce a reinforced protocol model. From the quantitative comparison of the two models, we suggest a simple and efficient NPI strategy for epidemic controls of any emerging infectious disease by using only the known topology of the fixed interaction layer.
MODEL

Individuals are denoted by nodes and the interactions between them are represented by links in the DLMN. Let $F$ and $W$ be the two layers in the DLMN (see Fig. 1(a)). On $F$ each node is connected with randomly chosen $k$ nodes drawn from a given degree distribution $P_F(k)$. The topology of networks on $F$ does not change in time. At the same time, each node interacts with $k'(t)$ random nodes on $W$, where $k'(t)$ is drawn from another degree distribution $P_W(k')$ at each time $t$. Thus, the interaction topology on $W$ changes at each $t$. Under severe epidemic situations, the government tries to cordon people off public facilities, and each individual refrains from social activities. Thus, the number of contacts of each individual is significantly restricted and homogeneous. To generate such homogeneous interaction structures, we use the Poisson distribution for both $P_F(k)$ and $P_W(k')$ [31,33,34] (see ‘Underlying networks’ in Methods).

The state of each node at time $t$ in the DLMN is described by a two-component variable $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. $\sigma_1$ has one of the three disease states: $S$, $I$, and $R$. $\sigma_2$ denotes the state for isolation measure. When the disease causes severe symptoms, two isolated states are possible: i) self-isolation at home when an individual feels mild symptoms or recognizes a suspicious contact but has not been confirmed yet, and ii) hospitalization by the health authority when the patient is confirmed to be infected. If an individual is not isolated then it is in the unisolated state. Thus, $\sigma_2$ can be one of the following states: self-isolated ($X$), hospitalized ($H$), and unisolated ($U$) (see Fig. 1(b)). Since we cannot trace the contacts on $W$ due to the random anonymity, the self-isolation for the suspicious contacts can be applied only to $F$.

Depending on the range of the self-isolation, we introduce two intervention protocols, the basic isolation protocol (BIP) and the reinforced isolation protocol (RIP). Under the BIP only the confirmed patients and the one who has direct contact with the confirmed patient are isolated. This is the most popular quarantine protocol adopted by many health authorities [35]. However, the fraction of the household or workplace infection cannot be ignored in some infectious diseases, for example, the household infection is more than 15% for COVID-19 [36]. Such household and workplace infection can be caused by a self-isolated node. Thus controlling such local contacts is another important factor to mitigate the transmission. For the preemptive protection of the susceptible, in the RIP model if a node is hospitalized, then its first and also second nearest neighbors on $F$ are isolated.

In our models, each infected node transmits the disease to the connected susceptible nodes with the probability $\beta_F$ ($\beta_W$) on $F$ ($W$). With the probability $\theta_X$ ($\theta_H$) the nodes are self-isolated (hospitalized) for the isolation (hospitalization) period $t_X$ ($t_H$). The infected nodes are recovered after the recovery time $t_R$ (see ‘Basic Isolation Protocol’ and ‘Reinforced Isolation Protocol’ in Methods). We set the size of each layer as $N = 100,000$. Since we are interested in the control of the severe epidemic outbreak, we use $\beta_F = \beta_W \equiv \beta (\equiv 0.2)$ and $t_F = t_R = 6$ to guarantee that the whole system becomes infected without any intervention. In our model, the strength of the intervention measures is controlled by four parameters, $\theta_H$, $t_H$, $\theta_X$, and $t_X$. For simplicity, we assume that $\theta_H = \theta_X \equiv \theta^*$ and $t_H = t_X \equiv t^*$. Thus, we use only two control parameters $\theta^*$ and $t^*$ in the following simulations.

RESULTS

The fraction of nodes in each state

Let $\rho_m(t)$ ($m \in \{S, I, R\}$) be the fraction of nodes whose disease states is $\sigma_1 = m$ at time $t$, regardless of $\sigma_2$. If $m \in \{U, H, X\}$, then $\rho_m(t)$ represents the fraction of nodes with $\sigma_2 = m$. The peak of $\rho_m(t)$ for each state $m$ is denoted by $\rho_{m\text{peak}}$. In Figs. 2(a)-(d) we show $\{\rho_m(t)\}$’s under the BIP for the various values of parameters $(\theta^*, t^*)$. For small $\theta^*(= 0.3)$, we find that $\rho_{I\text{peak}}^* > 0.9$ followed by $\rho_{H\text{peak}}^* (\gtrsim 0.8)$, regardless of $t^*$ (Figs. 2(a), (b)). $\rho_S(t)$ rapidly decreases and reaches $\rho_S \approx 0$ for $t > 11$. The value of $\rho_{S\text{peak}}^* (< 0.2)$ is relatively small. Thus, $\rho_R(t \to \infty) \approx 1$ when $\theta^*$ is small. On the other hand, as $\theta^*$ increases, $\rho_{I\text{peak}}^*$ is drastically suppressed as well as $\rho_{H\text{peak}}^*$ (Figs. 2(c), (d)). As a result, $\rho_R(t \to \infty)$ is reduced to $\rho_R(t \to \infty) \simeq 0.6 \sim 0.7$ for $\theta^* = 0.9$. For both values of $\theta^*$ displayed in Fig. 2, $t^*$ only affects the behavior of $\rho_H$ and $\rho_X$ (the population of the isolated nodes), i.e., $\rho_{H\text{peak}}^* (t^* = 4) < \rho_{H\text{peak}}^* (t^* = 10)$ and $\rho_{X\text{peak}}^* (t^* = 4) < \rho_{X\text{peak}}^* (t^* = 10)$. Note that $\rho_{I\text{peak}}^*$ is comparable with $\rho_{I\text{peak}}^*$ for all values of $(\theta^*, t^*)$, and $\rho_H(t)$ becomes wider as $t^*$ increases. This means that the hospitalized period becomes longer without any significant change in the final epidemic size, $\rho_R(t \to \infty)$, as $t^*$ increases for all $\theta^*$. Thus, increasing $t^*$ without the improvement of traceability causes an overload on the medical system by making patients be hospitalized for a longer period.

Figs. 2(e)-(h) show $\{\rho_m(t)\}$’s for the RIP model. When $\theta^* \lesssim 0.3$, $\{\rho_m(t)\}$’s for the RIP model show almost the similar behavior with those for the BIP, but $\rho_S(t \to \infty)$ for the RIP is slightly larger than that for the BIP. Since additional nodes are self-isolated under the RIP, $\rho_{X\text{peak}}^*$ increases compared with that for the BIP with the same $(\theta^*, t^*)$. However, we find that $\rho_H$ for the RIP becomes much smaller than that for the BIP. This effect becomes more
drastic for \( \theta^* > 0.3 \). For example, \( \rho_R(t \to \infty) \) and \( \rho^*_{\text{peak}}(t) \) significantly decrease to \( \rho_R(t \to \infty) = 0.5 \sim 0.6 \) and \( \rho^*_{\text{peak}} \approx 0.1 \) for the RIP with \( \theta^* = 0.9 \). \( \{\rho_{\text{m}}(t)\}'s for other values of \((\theta^*, t^*)\) are presented in the Extended Data Fig. 2 and Extended Data Fig. 3. The results indicate that the collapse of the medical systems can be avoided under the RIP if we trace the contacts with sufficiently high accuracy. In addition, we find \( \rho_I \), \( \rho_H \), and \( \rho_X \) oscillate with decreasing amplitude under the RIP as \( \theta^* \) increases. This suggests that even though there is a rapid decrease in \( \rho_I(t) \) after its first peak when \( \theta^* \) is sufficiently large, it is still possible to be followed by successive multiple peaks of \( \rho_I \) (see also Extended Data Fig. 8).

**The effective reproduction number**

To quantify the efficacy of intervention measures, we estimate the instantaneous effective reproduction number, \( R_e(t) \), at \( t \). For a practical purpose, we define \( R_e(t) \) as

\[
R_e(t) = \frac{N_{\text{new}}^e(t)}{N_I(t-1)},
\]

where \( N_{\text{new}}^e(t) \) is the number of new infected nodes at \( t \) and \( N_I(t) \) is the number of infected nodes at \( t \) [37, 38]. Thus \( R_e(t) \) represents a metric to quantify how many new infected nodes are newly infected by the existing infected nodes at each \( t \).

In Figs. 3(a),(b), we show \( R_e(t) \) for the BIP and RIP with \( \theta^* = 0.9 \) and \( t^* = 2 \sim 12 \). The dashed line denotes \( R_e(t) \) without intervention. As shown in Fig. 3(a), \( R_e(t) \) for the BIP rapidly decreases when \( t \leq 4 \) and shows a plateau followed by another rapid drop, regardless of \( t^* \). \( R_e(t) = 1 \) at \( t \approx 11 \) and \( R_e(t) < 1 \) for \( t > 11 \). When \( t > 15 \), \( R_e(t) \) approaches to \( R_e(t) \approx 0 \). On the other hand, \( R_e(t) \) for \( \theta^* = 0.9 \) under the RIP decreases more drastically and \( R_e(t) < 1 \) for \( t \geq 5 \) as shown in Fig. 3(b). When \( t > 20 \), \( R_e(t) \) oscillates with decreasing amplitudes and approaches \( R_e \approx 0 \) under the RIP.

To investigate how \( \theta^* \) affects the epidemic spreading, we also measure \( R_e(t) \)'s for various \( \theta^* \) when \( t^* \) is fixed. In Figs. 3(c),(d), as an example, we display \( R_e(t) \)'s for \( t^* = 10 \). Since \( \theta^* \) denotes traceability, \( R_e(t) \) should decrease as \( \theta^* \) increases for both protocols as shown in Figs. 3(c), (d). Note that when \( \theta^* < 0.3 \), the difference between the BIP and RIP is not noticeable. However, if \( \theta^* > 0.3 \), then \( R_e(t) \) for the RIP becomes much smaller than those for the BIP. From the data in Fig. 3, we find that increasing \( \theta^* \) is more important than increasing \( t^* \) (See also Extended Data Figs. 4 and 5).

The rapid drop of \( R_e(t) \) under both protocols has two different origins depending on \( \theta^* \). For \( \theta^* < 0.3 \) due to the large infection of the early stage, there does not remain a sufficient number of susceptible nodes for \( t > 11 \) (see Figs. 2(a), (b), (e), (f)). On the other hand, if \( \theta^* > 0.3 \) then a significant amount of the susceptible is self-isolated, which protects the susceptible nodes before contact with the patients for \( t > 10 \) (see Figs. 2(c), (d), (g), (h)).

**The final epidemic size and the number of isolated nodes per unit time**

For a direct comparison between the two intervention protocols, we measure the difference, \( \Delta_R \), of the final epidemic sizes between the BIP and RIP (see ‘Final epidemic size’ in Methods). Here, if \( \Delta_R > 0 \) then \( \rho_R \) for the BIP is larger than that for the RIP. The data in Fig. 4(a) clearly shows that \( \Delta_R \) rarely depends on \( t^* \). However, \( \Delta_R \) strongly depends on \( \theta^* \). \( \Delta_R \leq 0.05 \) for all \( t^* \) when \( \theta^* < 0.3 \), while \( \Delta_R > 0.1 \) for \( \theta^* \geq 0.4 \) and \( \Delta_R \) increases as \( \theta^* \) increases. This means that the RIP significantly reduces the final epidemic size compared to the BIP when \( \theta^* \geq 0.3 \). For the maximal traceability, \( \theta^* = 1 \), we find that \( \rho_R(t \to \infty) \) for the RIP is reduced by 67% compared to that for the BIP. This corresponds to the 100% increase of \( \rho_S(t \to \infty) \) under the RIP compared to the BIP (see Extended Data Fig. 6). Thus, isolation of the possible suspicious contacts in advance by applying the RIP significantly reduces the final epidemic size when \( \theta^* \geq 0.3 \).

In epidemic control, reducing the number of isolated individuals at each time step becomes another crucial factor to minimize social and economic recession. For the quantitative analysis, we define the difference in the fractions of the isolated nodes per unit time, \( \Delta_XH \) (see ‘Fraction of isolated nodes per unit time’ in Methods). By definition, if \( \Delta_XH \geq 0 \) then more nodes are isolated under the BIP than the RIP. As shown in Fig. 4(b), for all values of \( \theta^* \), we find that \( \Delta_XH \approx 0 \) for \( t^* \leq 6 \). However, we find that \( \Delta_XH \geq 0 \) when \( t^* > 6 \) and \( \Delta_XH \) increases as \( t^* \) increases. Thus, \( t^* \) affects only \( \rho_X \) and \( \rho_H \) per unit time for both models. Note that, even though \( \Delta_XH \leq 0 \) for \( t^* \leq 6 \), \( \Delta_R \) increases with \( \theta^* \) and \( \Delta_R \geq 0 \) as shown in Fig. 4(a)(see also Fig. 2). Therefore, the RIP more effectively controls the disease spreading through the preemptive isolation of suspicious contacts with fewer isolated nodes per unit time than the BIP.
DISCUSSION

In summary, we model the NPI adopted by many health authorities over the world, and introduce a model for reinforced NPI. In these models the state of each individual is characterized by three disease states with additional isolation states. Two different types of transmission routes observed in real world are implemented by the multiplex networks. By using numerical simulations, we compare the efficacy of the two models, BIP and RIP models, and find that the RIP controls the spreading of disease more efficiently by reducing both the epidemic size and the average number of isolated individuals per unit time, despite its simplicity. Especially, when the traceability is maximal, the final fraction of the susceptible nodes under the RIP increases by almost 100% (almost doubled) compared to that under the BIP. This indicates that the RIP significantly and efficiently protect the susceptible nodes through the preemptive isolation of the possible contacts. Furthermore, since we do not assume any characteristic property of a specific disease, we expect that the suggested models can be used as a general framework for modeling disease control for any real disease outbreak.


Fig. 1 | Schematic diagram for the SIR model with isolation on DLMNs. (a) The schematic diagram for interaction on the DLMN. $W$ and $F$ layers are composed of the same set of nodes, i.e., the nodes at the ends of each dotted line are identical. The yellow infected node chooses random partners on $W$ at each time step (dashed arrows). Thus, if $t_1 \neq t_2$ then it interacts with different nodes on $W$, while its interacting partner does not change on $F$ (black solid lines). (b) The change of states under the BIP or RIP. Red, yellow, and green boxes denote the states for $\sigma_1$, and white boxes represent the states for $\sigma_2$. 
Fig. 2 | The fraction of nodes in each state.

(a)-(d) are \(\{\rho_m(t)\}\)'s \(m \in \{S, I, R, H, X\}\) under the BIP with (a) \(\theta^* = 0.3, t^* = 4\), (b) \(\theta^* = 0.3, t^* = 10\), (c) \(\theta^* = 0.9, t^* = 4\), (d) \(\theta^* = 0.9, t^* = 10\). (e)-(h) shows \(\{\rho_m(t)\}\)'s under the RIP with (e) \(\theta^* = 0.3, t^* = 4\), (f) \(\theta^* = 0.3, t^* = 10\), (g) \(\theta^* = 0.9, t^* = 4\), (h) \(\theta^* = 0.9, t^* = 10\). \(\beta = 0.2\) and \(t_R = 6\) are used in common. Each data is obtained from 500 independent simulations by averaging the surviving samples at time \(t\).
Fig. 3 | The effective reproduction number. Plot of $R_e(t)$ under the (a) BIP and (b) RIP when $t^* = 2 \sim 12$ and $\theta^* = 0.9$ with $\beta = 0.2$, $t_R = 6$. Plot of $R_e(t)$ for the (c) BIP and (d) RIP when $t^* = 10$ and $\theta^* = 0, 0.3 \sim 1.0$ with $\beta = 0.2$, $t_R = 6$. The black dashed curve denotes the case when the isolation protocol is absent. The red dotted horizontal line depicts $R_e(t) = 1$. 
Fig. 4 | Difference in the final epidemic size and the number of isolated nodes per unit time. Plot of (a) $\Delta R$ and (b) $\Delta X_H$ against $\theta^*$ for $t^* = 2 \sim 12$ when $\beta = 0.2$ and $t_R = 6$. The black dashed horizontal line depicts (a) $\Delta R = 0$ and (b) $\Delta X_H = 0$. 
METHODS

UNDERLYING NETWORKS

Let \( N \) be the number of nodes in a network. Each node belongs to the networks defined on both layers, \( F \) and \( W \) at the same time. Thus we investigate the epidemics on multiplex networks. To construct a fixed random network on \( F \), we randomly select two nodes among \( N \) nodes and connect them if they are not linked. This process continues until we have \( L = N \langle k \rangle / 2 \) links on the \( F \) layer. Here \( \langle k \rangle \) is the mean degree of the network on \( F \). The degree distribution of the obtained network on \( F \), \( P_F(k) \), is known to be the Poisson distribution, \( P(k) = (\langle k \rangle)^k e^{-\langle k \rangle}/k! \). The links on \( F \) do not change in time.

On the other hand, the topology of the network on \( W \) changes in time. Therefore, at each time \( t \), a node \( i \) with \( \sigma_{i,1} = I \) randomly chooses \( k'_i \) neighbors on \( W \). \( k'_i \) is drawn from the Poisson distribution, \( P_W(k') = (k')^{k'} e^{-(k')}/k'! \). We use the mean degrees \( \langle k \rangle = \langle k' \rangle = 8 \). The value of the mean degree only affects the epidemic threshold \( \langle k \rangle \), and does not change the main conclusion of our study.
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FINAL EPIDEMIC SIZE

The final epidemic size under each protocol $Y (= BIP$ or $RIP)$ is defined as $\rho_{R,Y}^* \equiv \rho_{R,Y} (t \to \infty)$. The difference in final epidemic size under each protocol is defined as $\Delta_R \equiv \langle \rho_{R,BIP}^* \rangle_s - \langle \rho_{R,RIP}^* \rangle_s$. Here $\langle ... \rangle_s$ denotes the sample average over independent runs. In order to obtain the average final epidemic size, we used 10,000 samples. The average final epidemic sizes, $\langle \rho_{R,BIP}^* \rangle_s$ and $\langle \rho_{R,RIP}^* \rangle_s$ with various parameter sets, $(\theta^*, t^*)$, are plotted in Extended data Fig. 6.

FRACTION OF ISOLATED NODES PER UNIT TIME

To compare the number of isolated nodes we define the fractions of the isolated nodes per unit time (with $\sigma_2 = X$ or $H$) for protocol $Y$ as,

$$\langle \rho_{XH,Y} \rangle_t = \frac{\int_0^{T_{final}} (\rho_X(t) + \rho_H(t)) dt}{T_{final}},$$

where $T_{final}$ represents the time at which $\rho_f(t)$ becomes zero. Then we define the difference between two protocols as $\Delta_{XH} = \langle \rho_{XH,BIP}^* \rangle_s - \langle \rho_{XH,RIP}^* \rangle_s$. Here $\langle ... \rangle_s$ denotes the sample average over independent runs. The fraction of isolated nodes per unit time, $\langle \rho_{XH,BIP}^* \rangle_s$ and $\langle \rho_{XH,RIP}^* \rangle_s$, are obtained from 500 independent trajectories and plotted in Extended data Fig. 7.

CODE AVAILABILITY

All code used in this work is available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.
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Extended Data Fig. 1 | Schematic diagram of the intervention protocol on F layer. (a) On a network with size $N = 8$ the node $A$ is infected while nodes $B \sim H$ are susceptible. (b) Node $A$ is hospitalized with probability $\theta_H$. (c) BIP and RIP: Node $B$ and $C$ are self-isolated with probability $\theta_X$ while node $D$ remains unisolated with probability $1 - \theta_X$. (d) RIP: In addition to (c) node $E$ and $G$ are self-isolated with probability $\theta_X$ while node $F$ remains unisolated with probability $1 - \theta_X$. Node $H$ are not included in the self-isolation candidate since node $D$ is not self-isolated in step (c).
Extended Data Fig. 2 | Plot of \(\rho_m(t)\)'s (\(m \in \{S, I, R, X, H\}\)) under the BIP. \(t^*\) increases from \(t^* = 2\) to \(t^* = 12\) (from left to right). \(\theta^*\) changes from \(\theta^* = 0.1\) to \(\theta^* = 1.0\) (from top to bottom). Each data is obtained from 500 independent simulations by averaging the surviving samples at time \(t\).
Extended Data Fig. 3 | Plot of \( \{\rho_m(t)\} \)’s \((m \in \{S, I, R, X, H\})\) under the RIP. \( t^* \) increases from \( t^* = 2 \) to \( t^* = 12 \) (from left to right). \( \theta^* \) changes from \( \theta^* = 0.1 \) to \( \theta^* = 1.0 \) (from top to bottom). When both \( \theta^* \) and \( t^* \) are large, oscillatory behaviors are observed.
Extended Data Fig. 4 | Effective reproduction number under the BIP. Each plot shows the obtained $R_e(t)$’s for various $t^* (= 2 \sim 12)$ under the BIP when $\theta^*$ is fixed. $\theta^*$ increases by 0.1 from $\theta^* = 0.1$ to $\theta^* = 1.0$ (from top-left to bottom-right). As shown in the data, $t^*$ rarely affect the behavior of $R_e(t)$. However, the increase of $\theta^*$ leads to a drastic drop of $R_e(t)$. 
Extended Data Fig. 5 | Effective reproduction number under the RIP. Plot of $R_e(t)$’s under the RIP for $t^* = 2 \sim 12$ and $\theta^* = 0.1 \sim 1.0$. Like $R_e(t)$’s under the BIP in the Extended Data Fig. 4, $t^*$ does not affect the behavior of $R_e(t)$, while $\theta^*$ significantly changes the behavior of $R_e(t)$. In addition, we find that there are multiple peaks in $R_e(t)$ for $\theta^* > 0.3$ when we the RIP is applied. This implies that, even though the preemptive isolation of the susceptible nodes effectively reduces the infection rate, the instantaneous effective reproduction number can increase again when the isolated susceptible nodes are released to be free.
Extended Data Fig. 6 | Final epidemic size. We plot the average final epidemic size under the (a) BIP and (b) RIP for $t^* = 2 \sim 12$ and $\theta^* = 0.1 \sim 1.0$. The increment of the isolation period ($t^*$) has negligible effect on the final epidemic size while the traceability ($\theta^*$) significantly changes the final epidemic size.
Extended Data Fig. 7 | The fraction of the isolated nodes per unit time. We plot the average fraction of the isolated nodes per unit time under the (a) BIP and (b) RIP for \( t^* = 2 \sim 12 \) and \( \theta^* = 0.1 \sim 1.0 \). Under the BIP, \( \langle \rho_{XH,BIP} \rangle_t \) hardly change as \( \theta^* \) increases for a fixed \( t^* \). However, when the RIP is applied, \( \langle \rho_{XH,RIP} \rangle_t \) drastically decrease when \( \theta^* > 0.3 \) and \( t^* > 6 \). This suggests that with high traceability, the RIP can effectively mitigate the epidemic spreading while minimizing the damage on the social and economic system.
Extended Data Fig. 8 | Oscillatory behaviors under the RIP. Plot of the fractions $\rho_H$, $\rho_I$ and $\rho_f$ under the RIP. $\rho_f(t)$ is defined as the fraction of the susceptible nodes which are just released from self-isolation at time $t$. The epidemic parameters are $\beta = 0.2$ and $t_R = 6$, and the intervention parameters are $\theta^* = 0.9$ and $t^* = 12$. The period of oscillation $\tau$ for each fraction with the given parameters is estimated as $\tau \approx 21$. The peak position of each curve indicates that the increase of the infected causes an increase of the hospitalized individuals. Due to the hospitalization and self-isolation, the number of the infected rapidly decreases. However, after $t^*$ the isolated nodes are set to be free which increases the number of unisolated susceptible nodes. Thus it increases the number of infected individuals again. This pattern is repeated with decreasing amplitude due to the depletion of the susceptible nodes until there is no more infected node left. This oscillatory behavior is observed only for the case of large $\theta^*$ and $t^*$ in the RIP.