

Rational social distancing policy during epidemics with limited healthcare capacity

Simon K. Schnyder,^{1,2,*} John J. Molina,¹ Ryoichi Yamamoto,¹ and Matthew S. Turner^{3,4,†}

¹*Department of Chemical Engineering, Kyoto University, Kyoto 615-8510, Japan*

²*Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 153-8455, Japan*

³*Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK*

⁴*Institute for Global Pandemic Planning, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK*

(Dated: May 3, 2022)

Epidemics of infectious diseases posing a serious risk to human health have occurred throughout history. During the ongoing SARS-CoV-2 epidemic there has been much debate about policy, including how and when to impose restrictions on behavior. Under such circumstances policymakers must balance a complex spectrum of objectives, suggesting a need for quantitative tools. Whether health services might be ‘overwhelmed’ has emerged as a key consideration yet formal modelling of optimal policy has so far largely ignored this. Here we show how costly interventions, such as taxes or subsidies on behaviour, can be used to exactly align individuals’ decision making with government preferences even when these are not aligned. We assume that choices made by individuals give rise to Nash equilibrium behavior. We focus on a situation in which the capacity of the healthcare system to treat patients is limited and identify conditions under which the disease dynamics respect the capacity limit. In particular we find an extremely sharp drop in peak infections as the maximum infection cost in the government’s objective function is increased. This is in marked contrast to the gradual reduction without government intervention. The infection costs at which this switch occurs depend on how costly the intervention is to the government. We find optimal interventions that are quite different to the case when interventions are cost-free. Finally, we identify a novel analytic solution for the Nash equilibrium behavior for constant infection cost.

Policymakers can manage epidemics using a variety of non-clinical interventions that target behavior and hence the rate at which the disease is passed on. At one extreme this can involve merely providing accurate information and/or conceptual tools to enable rational individuals to identify their optimum behavior. More interventionist strategies available to policymakers include subsidising preferred behavior and/or penalising behavior that they wish to discourage. The SARS-CoV-2 epidemic has generated much debate about policy, including how and when to impose restrictions on behaviour. Policy is likely to fall sharply into focus as the epidemic is analysed in a historical context, informing our planning for future epidemics. The primary goal of this work is to establish a proof-of-principle that fully quantitative approaches can be used to help design optimal intervention strategies, first in a stylised model but without obvious conceptual limits to incorporating more faithful descriptions of population composition and behavior.

Dealing with an epidemic as a policymaker requires a number of objectives to be prioritised and balanced. The goal of limiting infections may justify restrictions on the day-to-day social and economic activities of citizens or subjects. A *rational* policy design process involves policymakers who are aware of the strategies that provide the most beneficial outcomes, these being evaluated using quantitative metrics. Such an approach allows proper assessment of the validity and parameterisation of these metrics in advance, whether or not that debate takes

place in the public domain. Less quantitative approaches to policy-making risk incorporating further uncertainty and may compromise the engagement of a public that does not understand how and why particular outcomes are being targeted. Our motivation here is to further the development of such quantitative tools. Ultimately we would see this as an aid to policy making but here we are concerned with establishing a point of principle - that it is possible to target outcomes that are optimal in the sense that they maximise an objective function that balances costs against benefits in the specific cases when (i) these interventions can carry costs and (ii) when the healthcare system has limited capacity.

This study is concerned with rational policymaking in and for a society of rational individuals. There already exists a literature that explores the behaviour of rational *individuals*, in the absence of policy interventions. These individuals are typically assumed to be able to adjust their behaviour in the face of an epidemic [1–7]. Broadly speaking, individuals may choose to limit their social activity when infections are high, to avoid the risk of becoming infected themselves, provided that the health risks outweigh the social and economic costs. In the opposite limit, little or no behavioural changes are made and the epidemic is assumed to run its natural course much as if the agents were unreasoning. These studies are highly stylised in several respects, including the use of population-wide mean-field compartmentalised model and little or no analysis of the role of uncertainties. While they have not yet been developed into the more sophisticated variants needed to reorientate towards real data they nonetheless lay down an important milestone in demonstrating that such analysis is possible, at least

* skschnyder@gmail.com

† m.s.turner@warwick.ac.uk

in principle. It is generally straightforward to see how such approaches can be extended to incorporate the complexities of real data, mirroring the sophistication of epidemiological approaches that incorporate more realistic household-level descriptions. This might include multiple agent types with different risk and behavior profiles [2, 8], spatial [9] and temporal networks [10, 11], seasonal effects [12], transmission heterogeneity [13] or agent-based models [14–16]. It is also possible to include noise, for instance in the control [17].

Perhaps the most fundamental common assumption is that individual agents act rationally, i.e. to maximise an economic utility. Although the limitations of such approaches have been widely acknowledged, e.g. within behavioural economics generally [18], this remains one of the fundamental assumptions of modern economic theory and will be adopted in the present work, noting that conceptual tools could be provided to assist individuals in identifying rational decisions. Recent methodological advances have allowed the extension of these approaches to establish the behaviour of individuals that target a Nash equilibrium, rather than a global utility maximum that requires coordination [1, 2, 7, 19, 20].

Different from such *decentralised* decision-making, governments present an instance of *centralised* decision-making. These will typically not aim for Nash equilibria but for policy that is more socially optimal or better aligned with political or national priorities. Recent investigations include [21] for SIS and [5, 22] for SIR models. We note also the study by Li et al. [23] of population behavior in response to public investments in the SIS model. Subsidy and tax schemes can be used by a social planner to decentralize optimal policy, i.e. to bring the Nash equilibrium of individuals into alignment with the global optimum [21, 24, 25].

Some recent studies have also focussed on the role of healthcare threshold, e.g. in an SEIR model [20, 26, 27], but not in combination with Nash equilibrium behavior and costly government interventions.

SIR being a compartmental model with continuous values, it is impossible to eradicate the disease before reaching herd immunity by infection or vaccination. This can in principle be incorporated, e.g. by defining a critical value of the infectious compartment below which the disease is said to have been eradicated [26], although eradication is quite complicated in a global pandemic. We neglect the possibility of complete eradication in what follows.

Waves of infections are predicted to occur under certain circumstances, e.g. when fresh variants occur that (partially) escape immunity or when social distancing is a more *ad hoc* response to recent changes in the infection and fatality numbers [28].

We focus on calculating the self-organised social distancing of individuals and the government incentives that enable such behavior. We do not investigate other possible policy interventions such as vaccination and treatment strategies, [22, 29], or isolation, testing, and active




Figure 1. **Causal hierarchy of the model.** Epidemic dynamics are modelled using a simple Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered compartmental model. This informs all decision making (black arrows). The progress of the disease depends only on the behaviour of individuals, who adopt a behaviour consistent with an infectiousness $k(t)$ at time t (gold arrow). Individuals may receive government incentives $\varepsilon(t)$ (brown arrow) to modify their behaviour. They then adopt a rational strategy $k(t)$, corresponding to a Nash equilibrium, based on some utility functional. The government maximises its own value functional and intervenes with incentives for individuals to realise this. This intervention process will, in general, itself carry costs.

case-tracing strategies [26, 30], noting that these can be included in future variants of models like the one we analyse here.

In what follows policymakers are also assumed to be acting rationally. They decide how to intervene so as to maximise a government-level objective function. In the spirit of a proof of principle we limit policy priorities to three of the most obvious factors: reducing direct health risks, avoiding excessive stress on the health care system and mitigating the social and financial impact associated with placing limits on individual behaviour. The primary variables are: (1) the individual infectiousness $k(t)$, parameterising the mean number of additional cases a single infected individual would cause in a previously unexposed population. This is assumed to have a background, or natural, level $\kappa^* > 1$ adopted by society in the absence of any behavioral changes, also known as the basic reproduction number R_0 . (2) A time-dependent government intervention $\varepsilon(t)$ that can be deployed to incentivise behavioural changes in individuals. For simplicity we neglect the possibility of reinfection, although the present framework can be modified to incorporate this. This is probably the main point at which our formalism differs from one that would be fine-tuned for SARS-CoV-2 but we note that SARS-CoV-2 reinfection was not established early in the epidemic, when policies were initially formulated.




Figure 2. **Comparison of social distancing behaviour.** (a) Population behavior $k(t)$, (b) government intervention $\varepsilon(t)$ and (c, d) dynamics of the disease s , i for a range of scenarios with $i_0 = 3 \cdot 10^{-8}$ and $\kappa^* = 4$ throughout: a baseline where there is no cost to getting infected, $\alpha = 0$; the Nash equilibrium for $\alpha = 400$, calculated numerically via forward-backward sweep and analytic solution; the utilitarian maximum for $\alpha = 400$; population behavior for two optimal government policies, one being without cost to the government, $\gamma_g = 0$, and one being costly, $\gamma_g = 0.5$, with $\alpha = 400$.

EPIDEMIC DYNAMICS

The epidemic dynamics represent the lowest hierarchy in our problem, see fig. 1, and inform all rational decisions made by the population and policy makers. We assume that the epidemic follows a standard SIR compartmentalised model [31] in which the fraction of the population in the susceptible, infected and recovered categories, the latter including any fatalities, obey the rescaled equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s} &= -k s i \\ \dot{i} &= k s i - i \\ \dot{r} &= i \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with initial values $s(0) = 1 - i_0$ and $i(0) = i_0$ at a time $t = 0$. Here a dot denotes a time derivative and we have assumed a single timescale for recovery and the duration of infectiousness, for simplicity, measuring time t in these




Figure 3. **The rational behavior in the presence of a healthcare threshold depends on the maximum cost of infection.** (a) The infection cost $\alpha(i)$ for a range of healthcare thresholds i_{hc} , see eq. (19) with steepness $\sigma = 300$. For comparison, two scenarios where $\alpha(i) = \alpha_0$ (grey line) and $\alpha(i) = \alpha_1$ (black) are considered as well. (b1) Nash equilibrium behavior of population $k(t)$ and (b2) infectious cases i over time for $\alpha(i) = 100$ (grey), for $\alpha(i) = 200$ (black) and for $\alpha_0 = 100$, $\alpha_1 = 200$ with $i_{hc} = 0.1$ (yellow). (c) The peak of the epidemic $\max(i)$ as a function of the maximum cost of being infectious α_1 corresponding to the infection cost scenarios shown in (a), with $\alpha_0 = 100$. (d) total number of cases after the epidemic has run its course. (e) Duration of the epidemic as defined by the time interval for which $i > 10^{-4}$.

units. Since the following results do not depend on the recovered fraction of the population, we omit it in what

follows. The solution of these equations is shown for constant $k = \kappa^* = 4$ in fig. 2 as a baseline for comparison to various scenarios with behavioral modification of k .

NASH EQUILIBRIUM BEHAVIOR

We imagine a small population of individuals, employing a different strategy $\kappa(t)$, introduced into a large population reservoir employing strategy $k(t)$. The probability that an individual is in compartment j at time t is written $\psi_j(t)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\psi}_s &= -\kappa\psi_s i \\ \dot{\psi}_i &= \kappa\psi_s i - \psi_i\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

with initial values $\psi_s(0) = s(0)$ and $\psi_i(0) = i(0)$. These equations are similar to eqs. 1 but involve the infected fraction of the population reservoir i , itself a solution to those equations.

The individuals will seek to maximise a utility functional which depends on both their own and the population behaviour, $U(\kappa(t), k(t))$. A Nash equilibrium for a population of identical individuals is found when one identifies a strategy $\kappa(t)$ for which, when adopted by the general population, individuals cannot find an alternative strategy $\tilde{\kappa}(t)$ that improves their utility

$$U(\tilde{\kappa}(t), \kappa(t)) \leq U(\kappa(t), \kappa(t)), \text{ for any } \tilde{\kappa}(t). \quad (3)$$

The strategy to obtain explicit solutions, as described in [7], is to maximise $U(\kappa, k)$ over κ , treating k as exogenous. Having identified this extremum, one sets $k = \kappa$ to obtain the Nash equilibrium strategy adopted by the entire population.

We analyse a simple stylised form for the individual utility with discounted utility per time u

$$U = \int_0^\infty u(t) dt \quad (4)$$

$$u = f^{-t} [-\alpha(i) \psi_i - \beta (\kappa - \kappa^*)^2 + (\kappa - \kappa^*)\varepsilon(t)] \quad (5)$$

Here $f \geq 1$ is the individual's discount factor (equivalent to discount time $1/\log f$). The cost associated with infection, including the risk of death, is written $\alpha(i)$. This can reflect escalating costs when a healthcare threshold is exceeded, e.g. as hospitals become full. The constant β parameterises the financial and social costs associated with an individual modifying their behaviour from the baseline infectivity κ^* . Our choice of a quadratic form here ensures a natural equilibrium at $\kappa = \kappa^*$ in the absence of disease and/or intervention. In what follows we choose units for all utilities in which $\beta = 1$ without loss of generality. Government incentives (if any), are written $\varepsilon(t)$. These represent state level incentives (or penalties) designed to modify behaviour. For example, if $\varepsilon < 0$, the government is incentivising cautious behaviour $\kappa < \kappa^*$ and taxing risky behaviour $\kappa > \kappa^*$.

We have assumed that all individuals have to pay the cost of social distancing equally in contrast to other work, e.g. [1, 22] where the cost of social distancing is paid mostly by the s -compartment. Their choice is motivated by the fact that only susceptibles can influence their fate with their own behavior. Our choice is motivated by the observation that no individual, regardless of compartment, can socially distance without incurring a cost.

It is numerically convenient to truncate the utility integral at a final time t_f . Indeed this can be realistic if associated, e.g. with the rollout of mass vaccination. The contribution to the utility from the course of the epidemic after t_f is written U_f . Assuming the arrival of a perfect vaccine at t_f , which reduces the fraction of susceptibles immediately to 0, the utility then reads

$$\begin{aligned}U &= \int_0^{t_f} u(t) dt + U_f \\ U_f &= -f^{-t_f} \alpha(0) \frac{\psi_{i,f}}{1 + \log f}\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

see SI for a short derivation. In this work we always choose t_f large enough so that i_f is extremely small (typically $\lesssim 10^{-8}$) and U_f is negligible, although it is always included in the solutions we show here, for completeness. We note that the arrival of a vaccine or treatment earlier during the course of the epidemic can have consequences for the optimal behaviour [5]. However, in this work, t_f is assumed to always be sufficiently late for vaccination to have no behavioral or policy consequences.

The Nash equilibrium behavior of the population can be calculated within a Hamiltonian/Lagrangian approach, see [7, 32]. The Hamiltonian for the individual behavior is given by

$$\begin{aligned}H &= u + v_s(-\kappa\psi_s i) + v_i(\kappa\psi_s i - \psi_i) \\ &= -f^{-t} [\alpha(i)\psi_i + (\kappa - \kappa^*)^2 - \varepsilon(\kappa - \kappa^*)] \\ &\quad - (v_s - v_i)\kappa\psi_s i - v_i\psi_i\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

The Lagrange fields $v_s(t)$ and $v_i(t)$ constrain the dynamics to obey eqs. (2). Furthermore, they can be seen as expressing the (economic) value of being in state s and i , respectively, at any given time. At this stage, the government incentives $\varepsilon(t)$ are treated as exogenous. The Hamiltonian equations for the values (also called costate equations in the control theory literature) are

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{v}_s &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \psi_s} = (v_s - v_i)\kappa i \\ \dot{v}_i &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \psi_i} = f^{-t}\alpha(i) + v_i\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

with boundary conditions

$$v_s(t_f) = \frac{\partial U_f}{\partial \psi_{s,f}} = 0, \quad v_i(t_f) = \frac{\partial U_f}{\partial \psi_{i,f}} = \frac{-f^{-t_f}\alpha(0)}{1 + \log f}. \quad (9)$$

The Nash equilibrium strategy for an individual follows from $0 = \partial H / \partial \kappa$ and reads

$$\kappa = \kappa^* - \frac{f^t}{2}(v_s - v_i)\psi_s i + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon. \quad (10)$$

Assuming that all individuals are identical and would all independently choose the Nash equilibrium strategy, we can then conclude that the average behavior of the whole population is identical with the Nash equilibrium strategy, $k(t) = \kappa(t)$. Therefore $s = \psi_s$ and $i = \psi_i$, as well as

$$k = \kappa = \kappa^* - \frac{f^t}{2}(v_s - v_i)si + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon. \quad (11)$$

The optimal outcome of the epidemic can easily be calculated for an exogenous government intervention field ε . This is achieved by numerically solving eq. (1) with boundary conditions $s(0) = 1 - i_0$ and $i(0) = i_0$, eq. (8) with boundary conditions eq. (9), in conjunction with eq. (11). We use a typical numerical approach, a forward-backward sweep [32] and choose $i_0 = 3 \cdot 10^{-8}$ and $\kappa^* = 4$.

This Nash solution is shown on fig. 2 for $\alpha = 400$. The Nash behavior leads to social distancing and therefore a longer duration for the epidemic with correspondingly lower infection rates and a smaller number of cases overall.

Analytic solution for constant infection cost

Fully analytic solutions for problems in epidemiological control theory are very rare. This is because these problems are intrinsically nonlinear both at the level of the epidemiological dynamics and the utility functional, leading to nonlinear control equations. However, we derive below an analytic solution for the Nash equilibrium strategy and resulting disease dynamics.

From eqs. (8) and (9), the value $v_i(t)$ can be obtained analytically, if $\alpha(i) = \alpha$ is assumed constant

$$v_i(t) = -\frac{f^{-t}\alpha}{1 + \log f}. \quad (12)$$

In addition, we obtain an analytic solution for the Nash equilibrium strategy with $f = 1$ and constant α in the absence of government intervention $\varepsilon = 0$ with $t_f \rightarrow \infty$ (see Supplementary Information for further details). We obtain the fraction of those susceptible parametrised by the fraction of those recovered (which increase monotonically with time)

$$s(r) = \frac{\exp[-ar - \frac{1}{2}br^2]}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{\pi b}{2}} \exp\left[\frac{a^2}{2b}\right] \left(\text{Erf}\left[\frac{a}{\sqrt{2b}}\right] - \text{Erf}\left[\frac{a+br}{\sqrt{2b}}\right]\right)} \quad (13)$$

with $a = \kappa^* - \alpha s_f/2$, $b = \alpha s_f/2$ and $s_f = s(t_f)$. Since we also know that $r_f = 1 - s_f(r_f)$, we can self-consistently determine r_f and thus the solution. In this approach, time is parametrised as

$$t(r) = \int_0^r \frac{dr'}{1 - r' - s(r')} \quad (14)$$

These analytic results are shown in fig. 2 where they can be seen to be in excellent agreement with the corresponding numerical results.

UTILITARIAN MAXIMUM

For comparison with the Nash equilibrium, we calculate the best possible population behavior, corresponding to the limit of full cooperation on the level of individuals. This corresponds to directly optimising the population level utility

$$\begin{aligned} U_p &= \int_0^{t_f} u_p(t)dt + U_{p,f} \\ u_p &= f^{-t} [-\alpha(i)i - (k - \kappa^*)^2 + \varepsilon(k - \kappa^*)] \\ U_{p,f} &= -\frac{f^{-t_f}\alpha(0)i_f}{1 + \log f} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

to find the optimal k , using eq. (1). If adopted by the entire society this would yield the best possible outcome for all. For convenience, we use the same variable names for the economic values, even though their values will be different from the Nash case. Then

$$\begin{aligned} H_p &= -f^{-t} [\alpha(i)i + (k - \kappa^*)^2 - \varepsilon(k - \kappa^*)] \\ &\quad - (v_s - v_i)ksi - v_i i \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_s &= -\frac{\partial H_p}{\partial s} = (v_s - v_i)ki \\ \dot{v}_i &= -\frac{\partial H_p}{\partial i} = f^{-t}[\alpha(i) + \alpha'(i)i] + (v_s - v_i)ks + v_i \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with boundary conditions

$$v_s(t_f) = 0, \quad v_i(t_f) = -\frac{f^{-t_f}\alpha(0)}{1 + \log f} \quad (18)$$

The optimal strategy again follows from $0 = \partial H_p / \partial k$ and yields the same decision rule as given by eq. (11) for the Nash equilibrium. In general, the utilitarian optimum yields a higher utility than the Nash equilibrium, but is susceptible to defection by individuals who can gain at a personal level by adopting different strategies, up to the Nash equilibrium, see fig. 2.

RESULTS WITHOUT GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

At first, we concentrate on the case where the cost of infection is constant $\alpha(i) = \alpha$ and where the government takes no role in the response to the epidemic, $\varepsilon = 0$. This situation has been already discussed for slightly different utilities [1]. To appreciate the impact of optimal decision making, it is helpful to first establish a baseline: the course of an epidemic without any behavioral modification, $k = \kappa^*$, see fig. 2 (grey curves). This corresponds to a situation where there is no perceived risk associated with an infection, $\alpha = 0$. In contrast, for a moderate risk, $\alpha = 400$, the population chooses a Nash




Figure 4. **Optimal government policy assuming a healthcare threshold.** (a) Peak of the epidemic as a function of the maximum cost of infection for a range of scenarios where the (maximum) infection cost for either population or government is varied: Nash equilibrium behavior of the population, without government intervention for a constant infection cost (black line, replotted from fig. 3) and with a healthcare threshold at $i_{hc} = 0.01$ (red, replotted from fig. 3); with government intervention for a constant infection cost (cost free $\gamma_g = 0$: green, costly $\gamma_g = 0.5$: purple) and with a healthcare threshold at $i_{hc} = 0.01$ (cost free $\gamma_g = 0$: gold, costly $\gamma_g = 0.5$: blue). The circles mark the scenarios shown in fig. 5. (b) Total number of cases for the scenarios shown in (a). (c) Duration of the epidemic for the scenarios shown in (a).

equilibrium with considerable reduction in their activity k , which reduces peak infection levels and the total number of cases $1 - s_\infty$, with s_∞ shorthand for $s(t \rightarrow \infty)$, at the expense of prolonging the epidemic. The utilitarian optimum can target a scenario where the duration of the epidemic is almost the same as for the baseline scenario, with a smaller total of cases than for the Nash equilibrium. The higher the cost of infection α , the stronger is the behavioral modification, see black lines in fig. 3. As a consequence, the peak height of infections, fig. 3c, and the total number of cases, fig. 3d, are reduced and the longer the epidemic takes to run its course, fig. 3e. The duration on which the behavior deviates from the pre-epidemic value κ^* is comparable to the duration of

the epidemic.

We express the fact that healthcare systems have limited capacity by having the infection cost rise near a healthcare threshold i_{hc}

$$\alpha(i) = \alpha_0 + \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_0}{2} (\tanh[(i - i_{hc})\sigma] + 1) \quad (19)$$

with minimum cost α_0 , maximum cost α_1 and a steepness σ , see fig. 3a. If, during the course of the epidemic, the fraction of infectious i approaches the threshold, the cost to being infectious increases. This reflects the greater risk of becoming infected when healthcare resources are saturated. Here we choose a healthcare threshold $i_{hc} = 0.01$, see eq. (19). In the following we set $\alpha_0 = 100$ and $\sigma = 300$.

The rational response to a health care threshold can be to invest in stronger social distancing than in the scenario where the cost of infection is always high, i.e. $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1$, see fig. 3b, even though the average infection cost is lower. We find in general two Nash equilibrium strategies in the presence of a health care threshold, see fig. 3. (1) For low α_1 it is rational to enact stronger social distancing than for the case of a constant high cost of infection, $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1$, as just described above. Still, the peak of infection exceeds the health care threshold, see fig. 3c. This scenario is also characterised by slightly lowered case numbers, fig. 3d and slightly longer epidemic durations, fig. 3e. (2) If α_1 exceeds a critical value which depends on i_{hc} (and to a lesser extent on α_0 and σ), the rational strategy is not to exceed the health care threshold but to remain close to it. This yields less severe social distancing than the constant $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1$ case, fig. 3c, with a higher total of cases, fig. 3d, and shorter duration of the epidemic, fig. 3e.

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION STRATEGY

The government's objectives are encoded in a similar objective function

$$V = \int_0^{t_f} v(t)dt + V_f \quad (20)$$

$$v = f_g^{-t} [-\alpha_g(i)i - \beta_g (k - \kappa^*)^2 - \gamma_g \varepsilon (k - \kappa^*)]$$

$$V_f = -\frac{f_g^{-t_f} \alpha_g(0) i_f}{1 + \log f_g}.$$

with f_g a governmental discount factor and where α_g , β_g and γ_g account for the different costs assigned to outcomes, and interventions, at the government level. The sign change in the intervention term means that incentivizing the population can be costly to the government. The pre-factor γ_g can account for how the cost of interventions can influence the government objective function. We measure the government objective function in units where $\beta_g = 1$ without loss of generality and denote the lower and upper limits of $\alpha_g(i)$ as α_{g0} and α_{g1} , using the




Figure 5. **Course of the epidemic with government intervention.** Government intervention ε assuming (a) constant infection cost α_g and cost-free intervention $\gamma_g = 0$, (b) a healthcare threshold (HT) and cost-free intervention $\gamma_g = 0$, and (c) a healthcare threshold and costly intervention $\gamma_g = 0.5$; all for a range of a_g or a_{1g} , respectively, as marked by circles in fig. 4(a) and listed in the legends of (g-i), with individuals assuming that $\alpha_0 = 100$. (d-f) Equilibrium population behavior k in response to ε of (a-c), respectively. (g-i) Infectious i over time, corresponding to the behavior shown in (d-f), respectively. Here the y -axis has linear scale between 0 and 10^{-2} and logarithmic scale above that.

same sharpness σ as for individuals, see eq. (19). The small term V_f again models vaccination at t_f .

An important aspect of our work is that we investigate the situation in which the cost of an infection can be quite different for the government than for an individual, $\alpha/\beta < \alpha_g/\beta_g$. This situation is highly plausible. For instance, it is likely to be more difficult for an individual to negotiate the right to work remotely than if the government imposes these arrangements.

The equilibrium behavior expressed by eq. (11) uniquely determines the outcome of the epidemic in the presence of an imposed government policy $\varepsilon(t)$. We can therefore rewrite the SIR model as a function not of k , but of ε

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s} &= -k(\varepsilon) s i \\ \dot{i} &= k(\varepsilon) s i - i \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

In this spirit, it is the government determining the outcome of the epidemic with its choice of ε . The government objective function then reads

$$v = f_g^{-t} [-\alpha_g(i)i - (k(\varepsilon) - \kappa^*)^2 - \gamma_g \varepsilon (k(\varepsilon) - \kappa^*)] \quad (22)$$

In analogy to individual decision making, we now have an objective function and equations for the course of the epidemic that depend on a single control variable, but instead of optimising for κ , we optimise for ε . The Hamiltonian for the government policy requires the introduction

of two new values, λ_s and λ_i , (dropping most functional dependencies for brevity)

$$\begin{aligned} H_g &= -f_g^{-t} [\alpha_g i + (k(\varepsilon) - \kappa^*)^2 + \gamma_g \varepsilon (k(\varepsilon) - \kappa^*)] \\ &\quad - (\lambda_s - \lambda_i) k(\varepsilon) s i - \lambda_i i \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Then the differential equations for the values are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\lambda}_s &= -\frac{\partial H_g}{\partial s} = i\Lambda \\ \dot{\lambda}_i &= -\frac{\partial H_g}{\partial i} = s\Lambda + f_g^{-t} [\alpha_g(i) + \alpha'_g(i)i] + \lambda_i \\ \Lambda &= -(\lambda_i - \lambda_s) \left(\kappa^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) + \frac{f_g^{-t} f^t}{2} (v_i - v_s) \times \\ &\quad (i s [f^t (v_i - v_s) - 2f_g^t (\lambda_i - \lambda_s)] + \varepsilon(\gamma_g + 1)) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\lambda_s(t_f) = 0, \quad \lambda_i(t_f) = -\frac{f_g^{-t_f} \alpha_g(0)}{1 + \log f_g} \quad (25)$$

The optimal government strategy obeys $0 = \partial H_g / \partial \varepsilon$ which yields

$$\varepsilon = i s \frac{f^t (1 + \gamma_g) (v_s - v_i) - f_g^t (\lambda_s - \lambda_i)}{1 + 2\gamma_g} \quad (26)$$

RESULTS WITH GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

We obtain the government strategy with a nested application of a forward-backward sweep of eqs. (21) and (24) to (26). At each iteration of the government strategy ε , we calculate the Nash equilibrium $k(\varepsilon)$, also with a forward-backward sweep, treating government intervention as exogenous.

If government and individuals share the same preferences, $\alpha_g(i) = \alpha(i)$, and government intervention is free of cost for the government, $\gamma_g = 0$, the optimal government strategy $\varepsilon(t)$ gives rise to the utilitarian maximum for the population, see fig. 2 for an example where the infection cost is constant. To achieve the utilitarian maximum, the ε field is used to bias the individuals' equilibrium strategy in the presence of government intervention away from the unperturbed Nash equilibrium to coincide with the utilitarian maximum. If intervention is costly for the government, e.g. $\gamma_g = 0.5$, then we find that the government intervenes less, see fig. 2. For constant infection cost, the government strategy only weakly depends on the infection cost, regardless of whether of whether the intervention is costly or not. The peak of infection is relatively insensitive to α in all scenarios studied here, see fig. 4a, but the relaxation of the social distancing after the pandemic peak becomes longer with rising cost, see fig. 5, with the total number of cases approaching the herd immunity threshold ever more closely, see fig. 4b.

If the capacity of the healthcare system is limited according to eq. (19) (fig. 3a) government intervention leads to a markedly different course of the epidemic as compared to the Nash equilibrium without government intervention, see fig. 4, noting the very different variation in peak infection levels shown in panel (a) with/without government intervention: Note the extremely sharp switch between policies that favour high peak infection and those that track the health care threshold as the maximum infection cost α_{1g} increases. At low α_{1g} the government targets a solution with a higher peak of infections, see panel (a), without necessarily increasing the total number of cases, (b), at the expense of a longer duration of the epidemic, (c). When the maximum infection cost is high the government targets the healthcare threshold, albeit at a lower peak of infections than the population would be able to reach on its own. The crossover between the regimes depends on the direct cost for the interventions, controlled by the parameter γ_g . When the intervention is cost-free $\gamma_g = 0$, the crossover occurs at a markedly smaller maximum infection cost than for the case without government intervention. For reference, we show the government intervention, the behavior of the population in response to it, and the course of the epidemic for a range of maximum infection costs α_{1g} in fig. 5. These results also markedly differ from the government strategy that is optimal for a constant infection cost.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Healthcare systems in general, and intensive care facilities in particular, have limited capacity. Assuming a threshold above which costs rise as a result of the rationing of scarce (intensive) care resources among patients, we find that it can be rational to adjust behavior so that infections remain close to this threshold. This is a generic response when *either* the above-threshold costs α_1 or α_{1g} , for the individuals or government respectively, are high enough. However, the disease dynamics can be very different under government intervention than without it, see e.g. fig. 4a. We find that optimal government intervention strategies undergo a sharp “switch”

from high peak infection numbers to a lower level, around the healthcare threshold. Furthermore, we find that both the maximum infection cost at which this switch occurs and the form of the intervention adopted are sensitive to how costly the intervention is to the government. For diseases that have infection costs around the value at which this policy switch occurs we anticipate that it would be very difficult for policymakers to know whether to adopt a high- or low-peak infection approach, particularly in the face of uncertainties. It further seems quite plausible that the risks associated with COVID19 correspond to parameters that are rather close to this switch. This observation might help to explain why government policies to tackle COVID19 differed so markedly.

Future work could include expanding our formalism to noisy dynamics, noisy control, imperfect information or to study the robustness of the control, similar to [27, 33, 34]. There is also the intriguing possibility of allowing individuals to directly influence government in the same way that ε allows the government to influence individuals. One approach might be to invoke a field that is a proxy for political contentment, controlled by individuals, that would appear in the government objective function. This could give rise to a formalism with significant game theoretic complexity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to dedicate this work to the memory of Prof. George Rowlands, who passed away in early 2021 and who was involved in many of the early discussions leading to this work. We would like to thank Andrew J. Oswald, Steven Satchell, Michael Tildesley, Giorgos Galanis and Patrick Mellacher for careful reading of the manuscript and helpful comments. M.S.T. acknowledges the generous support of visiting fellowships from JSPS and the Leverhulme Trust and the kind hospitality of the Yamamoto group. This work is supported by the Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (JSPS KAKENHI) under Grants No. 17K17825, 20H00129, 20K03786, 20H05619, and 22H04841 and the SPIRITS 2020 of Kyoto University”.

-
- [1] T. C. Reluga, Game Theory of Social Distancing in Response to an Epidemic, *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **6**, e1000793 (2010).
 - [2] E. P. Fenichel, C. Castillo-Chavez, M. G. Ceddia, G. Chowell, P. A. G. Parra, G. J. Hickling, G. Holloway, R. Horan, B. Morin, C. Perrings, M. Springborn, L. Velazquez, and C. Villalobos, Adaptive human behavior in epidemiological models, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 6306 (2011).
 - [3] Z. Wang, C. T. Bauch, S. Bhattacharyya, A. D’Onofrio, P. Manfredi, M. Perc, N. Perra, M. Salathé, and D. Zhao, Statistical physics of vaccination, *Physics Reports* **664**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1608.09010.
 - [4] S. Bhattacharyya and T. Reluga, Game dynamic model of social distancing while cost of infection varies with epidemic burden, *IMA J. Appl. Math. (Institute Math. Its Appl.)* **84**, 23 (2019).
 - [5] M. Makris and F. Toxvaerd, *Cambridge Working Papers in Economics*, Cambridge Working Papers in Economics 2097 (2020).
 - [6] Y. Yan, A. A. Malik, J. Bayham, E. P. Fenichel, C. Couzens, and S. B. Omer, Measuring voluntary

- and policy-induced social distancing behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **118**, 1 (2021).
- [7] T. C. Reluga and A. P. Galvani, A general approach for population games with application to vaccination, *Math. Biosci.* **230**, 67 (2011).
- [8] D. Acemoglu, V. Chernozhukov, I. Werning, and M. D. Whinston, *Optimal targeted lockdowns in a multi-group SIR model*, Working Paper 27102 (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020).
- [9] A. G. Chandrasekhar, P. Goldsmith-Pinkham, M. O. Jackson, and S. Thau, Interacting regional policies in containing a disease, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **118**, 1 (2021), arXiv:2008.10745.
- [10] P. Holme and J. Saramäki, Temporal networks, *Physics Reports* **519**, 97 (2012), arXiv:1108.1780.
- [11] P. Holme and N. Masuda, The basic reproduction number as a predictor for epidemic outbreaks in temporal networks, *PLoS ONE* **10**, 1 (2015), arXiv:1407.6598.
- [12] D. He, J. Dushoff, T. Day, J. Ma, and D. J. Earn, Inferring the causes of the three waves of the 1918 influenza pandemic in England and Wales, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **280**, 10.1098/rspb.2013.1345 (2013).
- [13] K. Sun, W. Wang, L. Gao, Y. Wang, K. Luo, L. Ren, Z. Zhan, X. Chen, S. Zhao, Y. Huang, Q. Sun, Z. Liu, M. Litvinova, A. Vespignani, M. Ajelli, C. Viboud, and H. Yu, Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of SARS-CoV-2, *Science* **371**, eabe2424 (2021).
- [14] N. M. Ferguson, D. A. T. Cummings, C. Fraser, J. C. Cajka, P. C. Cooley, and D. S. Burke, Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic, *Nature* **442**, 448 (2006).
- [15] J. Tanimoto, *Social Dilemma Analysis of the Spread of Infectious Disease* (2018) pp. 155–216.
- [16] P. Mellacher, *COVID-Town: An Integrated Economic-Epidemiological Agent-Based Model*, GSC discussion papers 23 (Graz Schumpeter Centre, 2020).
- [17] J. Yong and X. Y. Zhou, *Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*, Vol. 43 (Springer Science & Business Media, 1999).
- [18] D. Kahneman, Maps of bounded rationality: Psychology for behavioral economics, *American economic review* **93**, 1449 (2003).
- [19] D. McAdams, Nash SIR: An Economic-Epidemiological Model of Strategic Behavior During a Viral Epidemic, *Covid Economics* **10.2139/ssrn.3593272** (2020).
- [20] M. S. Eichenbaum, S. Rebelo, and M. Trabandt, The Macroeconomics of Epidemics, *Review of Financial Studies* **34**, 5149 (2021).
- [21] R. Rowthorn and F. Toxvaerd, *The optimal control of infectious diseases via prevention and treatment*, Cambridge Working Papers in Economics 2027 (University of Cambridge, 2020).
- [22] F. Toxvaerd and R. Rowthorn, *On the management of population immunity*, Cambridge Working Papers in Economics 2080 (University of Cambridge, 2020).
- [23] J. Li, D. V. Lindberg, R. A. Smith, and T. C. Reluga, Provisioning of Public Health Can Be Designed to Anticipate Public Policy Responses, *Bull. Math. Biol.* **79**, 163 (2017).
- [24] F. Toxvaerd, Rational Disinhibition and Externalities in Prevention, *International Economic Review* **60**, 1737 (2019).
- [25] Z. A. Bethune and A. Korinek, *COVID-19 infection externalities: trading off lives vs. livelihoods*, Working Paper 27009 (National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA, 2020).
- [26] F. Piguillem and L. Shi, *Optimal COVID-19 Quarantine and Testing Policies*, EIEF Working Paper 20/04 (2020).
- [27] M. Kantner and T. Koprucki, Beyond just “flattening the curve”: Optimal control of epidemics with purely non-pharmaceutical interventions, *Journal of Mathematics in Industry* **10**, 10.1186/s13362-020-00091-3 (2020), arXiv:2004.09471.
- [28] T. Lux, The social dynamics of COVID-19, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **567**, 125710 (2021).
- [29] F. Chen and F. Toxvaerd, The economics of vaccination, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **363**, 105 (2014).
- [30] A. J. Kucharski, P. Klepac, A. J. Conlan, S. M. Kissler, M. L. Tang, H. Fry, J. R. Gog, W. J. Edmunds, J. C. Emery, G. Medley, J. D. Munday, T. W. Russell, Q. J. Leclerc, C. Diamond, S. R. Procter, A. Gimma, F. Y. Sun, H. P. Gibbs, A. Rosello, K. van Zandvoort, S. Hué, S. R. Meakin, A. K. Deol, G. Knight, T. Jombart, A. M. Foss, N. I. Bosse, K. E. Atkins, B. J. Quilty, R. Lowe, K. Prem, S. Flasche, C. A. Pearson, R. M. Houben, E. S. Nightingale, A. Endo, D. C. Tully, Y. Liu, J. Villabona-Arenas, K. O’Reilly, S. Funk, R. M. Eggo, M. Jit, E. M. Rees, J. Hellewell, S. Clifford, C. I. Jarvis, S. Abbott, M. Auzenbergs, N. G. Davies, and D. Simons, Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study, *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **20**, 1151 (2020).
- [31] W. O. Kermack and A. McKendrick, A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character* **115**, 700 (1927).
- [32] S. Lenhart and J. Workman, *Optimal Control Applied to Biological Models* (Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2007).
- [33] J. Köhler, L. Schwenkel, A. Koch, J. Berberich, P. Pauli, and F. Allgöwer, Robust and optimal predictive control of the COVID-19 outbreak, *Annual Reviews in Control* **51**, 525 (2021), arXiv:2005.03580.
- [34] D. H. Morris, F. W. Rossine, J. B. Plotkin, and S. A. Levin, Optimal, near-optimal, and robust epidemic control, *Communications Physics* **4**, 1 (2021), arXiv:2004.02209.
- [35] J. C. Miller, A Note on the Derivation of Epidemic Final Sizes, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **74**, 2125 (2012).
- [36] J. C. Miller, Mathematical models of SIR disease spread with combined non-sexual and sexual transmission routes, *Infectious Disease Modelling* **2**, 35 (2017), 1609.08108.

Supplementary Information

UTILITY SALVAGE TERM FOR VACCINATION AT t_f

Assume that a perfect vaccine becomes available at t_f , which immediately protects every susceptible individual, $s(t > t_f) = 0$ and $\psi_s(t > t_f) = 0$. The SIR dynamics of eq. (1) then reduce to

$$\dot{i} = -i \quad (27)$$

Therefore, the population of infectious $i(t_f) = i_f$ recover as

$$i(t > t_f) = i_f \exp[-(t - t_f)] \quad (28)$$

and likewise for the individual dynamics

$$\psi_i(t > t_f) = \psi_{i,f} \exp[-(t - t_f)] \quad (29)$$

Since there is no danger of becoming newly infected after t_f , there is no reason to modify one's behavior, $\kappa(t) = \kappa^*$. Taking the utility defined by eq. (5)

$$U = \int_0^\infty u(t) dt \text{ with} \\ u = f^{-t} [-\alpha \psi_i(t) - (\kappa(t) - \kappa^*)^2 + \varepsilon(t)(\kappa(t) - \kappa^*)]$$

we identify the late time utility coming from $t > t_f$ as

$$U_f = - \int_{t_f}^\infty f^{-t} \alpha(i) \psi_i dt \quad (30)$$

For $t > t_f$, we assume $\alpha(i) = \alpha(0)$ constant (strictly speaking, in the case where we apply a tanh-form for $\alpha(i)$, this is only an approximation but is accurate to leading order in $i_f \ll i_{hc} \ll 1$). This can immediately be integrated to yield

$$U_f = -f^{-t_f} \alpha(0) \frac{\psi_{i,f}}{1 + \log f} \quad (31)$$

The boundary conditions are therefore

$$v_s(t_f) = \frac{\partial U_f}{\psi_{s,f}} = 0 \\ v_i(t_f) = \frac{\partial U_f}{\psi_{i,f}} = -f^{-t_f} \alpha(0) \frac{1}{1 + \log f} \quad (32)$$

Assuming Nash equilibrium, the salvage term reads

$$U_f = -f^{-t_f} \alpha(0) \frac{i_f}{1 + \log f} \quad (33)$$

ANALYTIC SOLUTION

In the following we calculate an analytic solution for Nash equilibrium behavior for an SIR model and a utility with constant cost of infection and a quadratic cost of social distancing, noting the a preexisting analytic solution for constant infectivity κ , [31, 35, 36].

The Nash equilibrium $k(t)$ optimising the utility eq. (5) is given by the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s} &= -k s i \\ \dot{i} &= k s i - i \\ \dot{v}_s &= (v_s - v_i) k i \\ \dot{v}_i &= \alpha + v_i \\ k &= \kappa^* - \frac{1}{2} (v_s - v_i) s i \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

i.e. eqs. (1), (8) and (11) in the main text, with boundary conditions $s(0) = 1 - i_0$, $i(0) = i_0$, $v_s(t_f) = 0$, $v_i(t_f) = -\alpha$. We have assumed that $f = 1$, $\alpha(i) = \alpha$ constant and $\varepsilon = 0$.

Firstly, we work with the integrated fraction of infected cases up to time t , i.e. the fraction of recovered cases r , defined as

$$r = \int_{-\infty}^t i(t') dt' \quad (35)$$

noting that $i = \dot{r}$. In what follows it is convenient to consider an implicit form for the variation $k(r)$. Because $r(t)$ is monotonic we can rely on a one-to-one mapping between $k(t)$ and $k(r)$. The second transformation involves defining $\dot{K} = k i$, hence K obeys

$$K(r) = \int_0^r k(r') dr' \quad (36)$$

Equations (1) then lead to $\dot{s} = -s \dot{K}$ and $\dot{i} = -\dot{s} - i$. The first of these can be integrated to $s = s_0 e^{-K(r)}$. The constant of integration is the population fraction of susceptibles prior to the outbreak, here set to $s_0 = 1$ for simplicity. Hence

$$s = e^{-K(r)} \quad (37)$$

The equation for i can be rewritten as $\frac{d^2 r}{dt^2} = -\frac{ds}{dt} - \frac{dr}{dt}$ and integrated once to $\dot{r} = c_0 - r - e^{-K(r)}$, with c_0 a constant of integration. The state prior to the emergence of any infected cases has $i \equiv \dot{r} = r = K = 0$ and so $c_0 = 1$. Hence

$$i = 1 - r - e^{-K(r)} \quad (38)$$

Integrating again we find

$$F(r) \equiv \int_0^r \frac{dr'}{1 - r' - e^{-K(r')}} = t \quad \text{hence} \quad r = F^{-1}(t) \quad (39)$$

with the origin of time chosen so that $r(0) = 0$. Note that eqs. (37) to (39) (and the sum rule $r = 1 - s - i$) represent an exact analytical solution to the SIR dynamics under arbitrary dynamical variation of the infectivity k , through K . In the late time limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ the cumulative total of infections reaches its final value given by the non-zero root of

$$r_f + e^{-K(r_f)} = 1 \quad (40)$$

Concerning the values, we can see directly that $v_i(t) = -\alpha$. For the value v_s we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_s &= (v_s + \alpha) \frac{\partial K}{\partial r} \frac{\partial r}{\partial t} \\ \Rightarrow \int \frac{dv_s}{v_s + \alpha} &= \int dt \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} \\ \Rightarrow \log(v_s + \alpha) &= K + \text{const} \\ \Rightarrow v_s + \alpha &= \mu e^K \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

with a constant μ . From the boundary condition $v_s(t_f) = 0$ we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha e^{-K(t_f)} = \mu &\Rightarrow \mu = \alpha s(t_f) \\ \Rightarrow v_s &= \alpha s_f e^K - \alpha \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Now we can restate the equation for the optimal behavior k as follows

$$\begin{aligned} k &= \kappa^* - \frac{1}{2}(v_s - v_i)si \\ \Rightarrow \partial_r K &= \kappa^* - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha s_f e^K - \alpha + \alpha)e^{-K} \dot{r} \\ &= \kappa^* - \frac{\alpha s_f}{2} \dot{r} \\ &= \kappa^* - \frac{\alpha s_f}{2}(1 - r - e^{-K}) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

With $s = e^{-K}$ and therefore $\partial_r s = -s \partial_r K$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} -e^{-K} \partial_r K &= -e^{-K} \left[\kappa^* - \frac{\alpha s_f}{2}(1 - r - e^{-K}) \right] \\ \Rightarrow \partial_r s &= -s \left[\kappa^* - \frac{\alpha s_f}{2}(1 - r - s) \right] \\ &= -s[a + br + bs] \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

with $a = \kappa^* - \alpha s_f/2$ and $b = \alpha s_f/2$. This has an analytic solution. The one satisfying $s(r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 1$, consistent with our earlier choice of initial conditions, is

$$s(r) = \frac{\exp[-ar - \frac{1}{2}br^2]}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{\pi b}{2}} \exp\left[\frac{a^2}{2b}\right] \left(\text{Erf}\left[\frac{a}{\sqrt{2b}}\right] - \text{Erf}\left[\frac{a+br}{\sqrt{2b}}\right] \right)} \quad (45)$$

Since we also know that $r_f = 1 - s_f(r_f)$, we can self-consistently (numerically) determine r_f and thus obtain the solution. In this approach, time is parametrised as eq. (39),

$$t(r) = \int_0^r \frac{dr'}{1 - r' - s(r')} \quad (46)$$

which can easily be calculated numerically.