

Intermittent non-pharmaceutical strategies to mitigate the COVID-19 epidemic in a network model of Italy via constrained optimization

Marco Coraggio^{*, 1}, Shihao Xie^{*, 2}, Francesco De Lellis¹, Giovanni Russo^{#, 3}, Mario di Bernardo^{#, 1}

Abstract—This paper is concerned with the design of intermittent non-pharmaceutical strategies to mitigate the spread of the COVID-19 epidemic exploiting network epidemiological models. Specifically, by studying a variational equation for the dynamics of the infected in a network model of the epidemic spread, we derive, using contractivity arguments, a condition that can be used to guarantee that, in epidemiological terms, the effective reproduction number is less than unity. This condition has three advantages: (i) it is easily computable; (ii) it is directly related to the model parameters; (iii) it can be used to enforce a scalability condition that prohibits the amplification of disturbances within the network system. We then include satisfaction of such a condition as a constraint in a Model Predictive Control problem so as to mitigate (or suppress) the spread of the epidemic while minimizing the economic impact of the interventions. A data-driven model of Italy as a network of three macro-regions (North, Center, and South), whose parameters are identified from real data, is used to illustrate and evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed control strategy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Because of recent events, the design of control strategies aimed at mitigating the spread of epidemic processes has suddenly become a major pressing research problem with clear societal and economic impacts [1], [2]. Among these strategies, non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) are essential measures to contain the transmission of the virus for both mitigating or suppressing the epidemic (see [3] [4] for further details on the definition and difference between mitigation and suppression strategies).

In this context, two key challenges are: (i) devising proxies to detect the onset of the epidemic spreading; (ii) synthesize control strategies that balance the need of containing the epidemic with the need of reducing its economic impact.

In this paper, we consider network epidemic models. For these models we give a sufficient condition, which directly depends on the model parameters, ensuring that the epidemiological effective reproduction number \mathcal{R}_t is less than unity and that the infected population decreases to zero. Then, we consider a network model of Italy parameterized on real data and obtain a set of intermittent non-pharmaceutical intervention strategies at the regional level by formulating a constrained optimization problem that is solved via Model

Predictive Control (MPC). The formulation embeds our condition as a constraint and is based on the minimization of an economic cost function. The resulting strategy is able to mitigate (or even suppress) the spread of the disease while minimizing its overall impact on the economy.

Related work: A fast intermittent lockdown strategy was proposed in [1] with the goal of using periodic interventions to alleviate the effects of measurement uncertainty. Following a similar argument, a cyclic periodic lockdown strategy was studied in [5], while a stepping down policy was presented in [6]. The use of feedback to dynamically adapt the intervention strategies as a function of the epidemic state was suggested in several papers in the recent literature. For example, in [7], several feedback intervention strategies are presented, while in [8] the benefits were shown of adopting feedback intermittent regional control strategies triggered by occupancy levels of the intensive care units (ICUs) in each region. Also, several epidemic control strategies were recently proposed which are based on using an MPC approach. These include [9], where MPC is used to decide whether to enforce social distancing in a region/country of interest. Therein, the model used to synthesize the control strategy is a SIRASDC model (S : susceptible, I : infected, R : recovered, A : asymptomatic, S : symptomatic, D : dead, C : with control) and hard constraints on ICUs occupancy and minimal dwell time of the control window were explicitly included in the formulation. MPC was also implemented on a number of different models, e.g. a SIDARTHE model (S : susceptible, I : infected, D : diagnosed, A : ailing, R : recognized, T : threatened, H : healed, E : extinct) in [10], a SEAIR model (S : susceptible, E : exposed, A : asymptomatic infected, I : confirmed infections, R : recovered) in [11], or a multi-region SIRQTHE network model (S : susceptible, I : infected, R : recovered, Q : quarantined, T : threatened, H : healed, E : extinct) in [12].

MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

In the rest of this paper, we denote by \mathbf{I} the identity matrix of appropriate dimensions, by $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ column vectors of appropriate dimensions consisting of all zeros and ones, respectively; $\|\cdot\|_q$ denotes the vector q -norm and its induced matrix norm, and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ is the positive orthant in \mathbb{R}^n (including the axes). We also let $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ be the sets of semipositive and positive natural numbers, respectively. Also, we use $\mathbf{A} \geq \mathbf{0}$ to indicate that all elements A_{ij} of a given matrix are such that $A_{ij} \geq 0, \forall i, j$ (analogous element-wise definitions hold for $>, \leq, <$). Finally, we recall the following lemma.

*. #These authors contributed equally.

¹Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, University of Naples Federico II, Italy (email: {marco.coraggio, francesco.delellis, mario.dibernardo}@unina.it).

²School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University College Dublin (email: shihao.xie1@ucdconnect.ie).

³Department of Information and Electric Engineering and Applied Mathematics, University of Salerno (email: giovarusso@unisa.it).

Lemma 1 ([13], p. 368). *Let $\mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. If $\mathbf{B}_1 \geq 0$, $\mathbf{B}_2 \geq 0$, and $\mathbf{B}_1 \leq \mathbf{B}_2$, then $\|\mathbf{B}_1\| \leq \|\mathbf{B}_2\|$.*

II. MODEL DESCRIPTION

To model the dynamics of the epidemic, we adapted and updated a network model that was originally presented and validated in [8]. We re-parameterized and updated the model with real data related to the spread of the epidemic in Italy collected by the National Civil Protection Authority [14], between February 24, 2020 and February 25, 2021. The model comprises $M = 3$ macro-regions corresponding to the North (including the regions Piedmont, Lombardy, Liguria, Veneto, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Trentino-Alto Adige, Emilia Romagna), the Center (Tuscany, Umbria, Marche, Lazio, Abruzzo), and the South (Molise, Campania, Basilicata, Apulia, Calabria, Sicily, Sardinia) of the Italian peninsula.

The dynamics of the disease in each region $i = 1, \dots, M$, $M = 3$, is captured by a SIQHDR model, describing the time evolution of the number of susceptible (S_i), (undetected) infected (I_i), quarantined (Q_i), hospitalized (H_i), deceased (D_i), and recovered (R_i) as a function of time t . We also define $\mathbf{S} := [S_1 \dots S_M]^\top$, $\mathbf{I} := [I_1 \dots I_M]^\top$, $\mathbf{Q} := [Q_1 \dots Q_M]^\top$, $\mathbf{H} := [H_1 \dots H_M]^\top$, $\mathbf{D} := [D_1 \dots D_M]^\top$, $\mathbf{R} := [R_1 \dots R_M]^\top$, and let $\mathbf{x} := [\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{I}^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{R}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{18}$ be the state vector of the model. Moreover, for each pair (i, j) of macro-regions, the quantity $\phi_{ij}(t) \in [0, 1]$ describes the fraction of people in region i that commute and interact with people in region j returning to their region of origin at the end of each day t (see also [15]).

The resulting network model we consider is

$$S_i(t+1) = S_i(t) - \beta S_i(t) \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\rho_j(t) \phi_{ij}(t)}{N_j^p(t)} \sum_{k=1}^M \phi_{kj}(t) I_k(t), \quad (1a)$$

$$I_i(t+1) = I_i(t) + \beta S_i(t) \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\rho_j(t) \phi_{ij}(t)}{N_j^p(t)} \sum_{k=1}^M \phi_{kj}(t) I_k(t) - (\gamma + \alpha_i + \psi_i) I_i(t), \quad (1b)$$

$$Q_i(t+1) = Q_i(t) + \alpha_i I_i(t) - (\kappa_i^H + \eta_i^Q) Q_i(t) + \kappa_i^Q H_i(t), \quad (1c)$$

$$H_i(t+1) = H_i(t) + \kappa_i^H Q_i(t) + \psi_i I_i(t) - (\eta_i^H + \kappa_i^Q + \zeta(H_i(t))) H_i(t), \quad (1d)$$

$$D_i(t+1) = D_i(t) + \zeta(H_i(t)) H_i(t), \quad (1e)$$

$$R_i(t+1) = R_i(t) + \gamma I_i(t) + \eta_i^Q Q_i(t) + \eta_i^H H_i(t), \quad (1f)$$

where

$$N_i^p(t) = \sum_{k=1}^M \phi_{ki}(t) (S_k(t) + I_k(t) + R_k(t)), \quad (2)$$

and the initial conditions are given at time $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ as $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{18}$.

Following [8], in (1) the infection rate β and the recovery rate γ are taken to be equal for all the macro-regions, as they have not been shown to strongly depend on regional factors. The other parameters vary among different macro-regions

Parameter	Global	North	Center	South
β	0.4	-	-	-
γ	0.07	-	-	-
ζ^0	0.0168	-	-	-
ζ^b	0.0068	-	-	-
ψ_i	-	0.0327	0.0922	0.1042
η_i^H	-	0.6086	0.4439	0.7565
η_i^Q	-	0.0141	0.0063	0.0075
κ_i^H	-	0.0375	0.0200	0.0429
κ_i^Q	-	0.0344	0.0202	0.0179
ϕ_{1j}^0	-	0.9979	0.0013	0.0008
ϕ_{2j}^0	-	0.0030	0.9949	0.0021
ϕ_{3j}^0	-	0.0011	0.0024	0.9965
T_i^H	-	4660	2775	3170

TABLE I

MODEL PARAMETER VALUES; FOR A DESCRIPTION OF ALL PARAMETERS SEE [8], PAGE 6. THE VALUES OF T_i^H ARE REPORTED FROM [18]

and capture factors such as the heterogeneity of effects of the strategies used to mitigate the disease in each region, different capacities of the regional health care systems, etc. In particular, let us note that

$$\gamma + \alpha_i + \psi_i \leq 1, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, M\}, \quad (3)$$

as in (1b) the number of people leaving compartment I_i can never be greater than I_i . All parameters' values we identified from data reported in [14] are contained in Table I. Additionally, N_i^p is the population in region i that is currently free-to-move, while N_i is the total population in region i . As in [8], we also estimate the number of patients requiring treatment in intensive care as 10% of the those who are hospitalized. Moreover, letting T_i^H be the maximum number of beds in the ICUs of region i [16], [17], following [8] we express the mortality rate ζ as a function of the hospitalized estimated as

$$\zeta(H_i(t)) = \zeta^0 + \zeta^b \min\left(\frac{0.1H_i(t)}{T_i^H}, 1\right). \quad (4)$$

Social distancing: The parameter $\rho_i(t) \in [0, 1]$ models the effect of social distancing (including the use of personal protective equipment such as face masks) in region i and is assumed to be time-varying. Namely, $\rho_i = 1$ corresponds to the absence of social distancing measures, whereas $\rho_i = 0$ means that contact between people is forbidden. Intermediate values indicate different levels of social distancing.

Travel restrictions: In what follows we assume

$$\phi_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} \varphi_i(t) \varphi_j(t) \phi_{ij}^0, & i \neq j, \\ 1 - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^M \phi_{ij}(t), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi_i(t) \in [0, 1]$ is a parameter modelling the strength of travel restrictions to/from region i on day t while ϕ_{ij}^0




Fig. 1. Linear regression of the values of α_i in each region (see (1)) over the fraction p of population tested daily between April 22, 2020 and February 25, 2021, taken from [14].

is the influx from region i to region j in the absence of travel restrictions. In particular, $\varphi_i = 1$ means that travel to/from region i is possible, whereas $\varphi_i = 0$ implies that it is forbidden.

Testing: The effect of testing-and-tracing is captured by the parameter α_i in (1), which models the rate at which undetected infected I_i are moved to the quarantined compartment Q_i . To describe the ability of a region to modulate the amount of testing carried out within its territory, we set $\alpha_i(t) = \alpha^0 + \sigma_i(t)\tilde{\alpha}$, where $\sigma_i(t) \in [0, 1]$ is a parameter denoting the testing capacity of region i on day t so that testing is set to the minimal level, $\alpha^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, when $\sigma_i = 0$, or to its maximal value, $\alpha^0 + \tilde{\alpha}$, when $\sigma_i = 1$.

The values α^0 and $\tilde{\alpha}$ were identified as $\alpha^0 = 0.0671$ and $\tilde{\alpha} = 0.0806$ by performing a linear regression of the data collected by each Italian region in the time window April 22, 2020–February 25, 2021 as reported in Figure 1.

Reproduction number

A crucial quantity to assess the rate of propagation of an epidemic disease is the *reproduction number*, defined in epidemiology as “the number of secondary infections generated by one infected person” [19]. Typically, the *basic* reproduction number \mathcal{R}_0 is computed when the entire population is assumed to be susceptible [20], [21], while the *effective* reproduction number \mathcal{R}_t is estimated from data [19], [22]. Specifically, the effective reproduction number of region i , denoted by $\mathcal{R}_{t,i}$, can be estimated via the method described in [23, §8]. That is, by computing

$$\mathcal{R}_{t,i} = \frac{\sum_{k=t-3}^t [(N_i - S_i(k)) - (N_i - S_i(k-1))]}{\sum_{k=t-7}^{t-4} [(N_i - S_i(k)) - (N_i - S_i(k-1))]} \quad (5)$$

Note that while an analytical expression of \mathcal{R}_0 for network epidemic models can be found in the existing literature, e.g. [15], [24], an algebraic expression for \mathcal{R}_t does not exist in a closed form at the moment for this kind of models. Later in Section III, we derive a sufficient condition to ensure that \mathcal{R}_t (for the network) is below the critical unitary threshold.

III. ANALYSIS

We let $\boldsymbol{\rho} := [\rho_1 \cdots \rho_M]^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\varphi} := [\varphi_1 \cdots \varphi_M]^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := [\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_M]^\top$, and define the vector of time-varying

parameters $\mathbf{u} := [\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\varphi}^\top \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top]^\top \in [0, 1]^9$, which will be used later in Sections IV and V as the vector of control inputs to mitigate the epidemic.

A. Dynamics and variation of the infected around a trajectory

We focus on the dynamics of the infected recasting (1b) in a more compact form as

$$\mathbf{I}(t+1) = (\mathcal{I} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t))) \mathbf{I}(t), \quad (6)$$

where we stressed the dependency of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ on the state vector and the parameters, and where

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \begin{cases} \beta S_i \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{\rho_k \phi_{ik} \phi_{jk}}{N_k^p} - (\alpha_i + \psi_i + \gamma), & i = j, \\ \beta S_i \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{\rho_k \phi_{ik} \phi_{jk}}{N_k^p}, & i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

In what follows, say $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t) := [\bar{\mathbf{S}}^\top(t) \bar{\mathbf{I}}^\top(t) \bar{\mathbf{Q}}^\top(t) \bar{\mathbf{H}}^\top(t) \bar{\mathbf{D}}^\top(t) \bar{\mathbf{R}}^\top(t)]^\top$ the state evolution of (1) starting from some initial condition $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{18}$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$, when $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is equal to $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)$.

Additionally, denote by $\delta \mathbf{I}(t)$ the variation around $\bar{\mathbf{I}}(t)$ due to perturbations of the infected only (in the terminology of contraction theory this is a “virtual displacement”, as defined in [25], obtained by considering only variations of the infected). After some algebraic manipulations, the dynamics of the virtual displacement $\delta \mathbf{I}(t)$ can be given as

$$\delta \mathbf{I}(t+1) = (\mathcal{I} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)) + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t))) \delta \mathbf{I}(t), \quad (8)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \sum_{q=1}^M \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{iq}}{\partial I_j} I_q = -\beta S_i \sum_{k=1}^M \left(\frac{\rho_k \phi_{ik} \phi_{jk}}{N_k^p} \sum_{q=1}^M \frac{\phi_{qk}}{N_k^p} I_q \right). \quad (9)$$

B. A sufficient condition for epidemic containment

Next, we use (6) and (8) to give a simple yet effective condition to (i) enforce suppression of the epidemic and (ii) to ensure that the number of secondary infections generated by perturbing the number of infected along a trajectory decays exponentially to zero.

Proposition 1. *Assume that there exists some matrix norm, say $\|\cdot\|_q$, and some constant $c < 1$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{I} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t))\|_q \leq c < 1, \quad \forall t \geq t_0, t_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}. \quad (10)$$

Then, (i) $\|\bar{\mathbf{I}}(t)\|_q \leq c^{t-t_0} \|\bar{\mathbf{I}}(t_0)\|_q$ for all $t \geq t_0$, and (ii) $\|\delta \mathbf{I}(t)\|_q \leq c^{t-t_0} \|\delta \mathbf{I}(t_0)\|_q$ for all $t \geq t_0$.

Proof. We start by proving (i), which is obvious for $t = t_0$. For $t > t_0$ we notice that, from (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathbf{I}}(t)\|_q &= \left\| \prod_{\tau=t_0}^{t-1} (\mathcal{I} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\tau), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\tau))) \bar{\mathbf{I}}(t_0) \right\|_q \\ &\leq \prod_{\tau=t_0}^{t-1} \|\mathcal{I} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\tau), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\tau))\|_q \|\bar{\mathbf{I}}(t_0)\|_q, \end{aligned}$$

and hence (i) follows.

To prove (ii), it suffices to show that (10) implies

$$\|\mathcal{I} + \Psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)) + \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t))\|_q \leq c < 1, \quad \forall t \geq t_0, t_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}, \quad (11)$$

and repeat the steps used to prove (i), considering (8). To show this, let

$$\mathbf{B}_1(t) := \mathcal{I} + \Psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)) + \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)), \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_2(t) := \mathcal{I} + \Psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)). \quad (13)$$

Recalling (3), (7) and (13), we have $\mathbf{B}_2(t) \geq 0$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$. Additionally, we have

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{18}, \forall \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^9, \quad (14)$$

and, from (9), it holds that

$$\sum_{q=1}^M \frac{\phi_{qk}}{N_k^p} I_q = \frac{\sum_{q=1}^M \phi_{qk} I_q}{\sum_{q=1}^M \phi_{qk} (S_q + I_q + R_q)} \leq 1, \quad \forall k.$$

Hence, recalling (12), we get from (3) that $\mathbf{B}_1(t) \geq 0$, $\forall t \geq t_0$. Moreover, (14) also implies that $\mathbf{B}_1(t) \leq \mathbf{B}_2(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$. Hence, exploiting Lemma 1 and (10), we have $\|\mathbf{B}_1(t)\| \leq \|\mathbf{B}_2(t)\| \leq c$, $\forall t \geq t_0$, which is used to get (11) and thus (ii) is proved. \square

We now give an interpretation of Proposition 1 in terms of \mathcal{R}_t . We start with noticing that \mathcal{R}_t is typically defined in qualitative terms in epidemiology as the variation in the number of infected due to the perturbation in the number of infected (see Section II). From this definition it stems that if

$$\sum_{i=1}^M \delta I_i(t+1) < \sum_{i=1}^M \delta I_i(t), \quad (15)$$

and therefore the total variation of infected along a trajectory goes to zero, than it must be that $\mathcal{R}_t < 1$. Note that condition (15) is satisfied by fulfilling condition (10) in Proposition 1 with $\|\cdot\|_1$. Additionally, note that using the ∞ -norm, $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, condition (10) yields

$$\max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \delta I_i(t+1) < \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \delta I_i(t), \quad (16)$$

and this in turn implies that the maximum variation of infected across all regions in the model decreases over time. We argue that condition (10) as expressed in (16) might be effectively used to assess quantitatively the trend of an epidemic spread. Note that the use of the infinity norm also prohibits the amplification of (bounded deterministic) disturbance on the infected dynamics within the network system as recently noted in [26, Remark 6].

As proven in the Appendix, Proposition 1 can also be related to a condition independently obtained in [27] when specialized to a SIS network model (see the Appendix for the formal statement and further details).

IV. CONTROL PROBLEM FORMULATION

We now formulate our control problems, aimed at either mitigating or suppressing an epidemic, using a combination of different control actions, while minimizing the economic impact of the measures.

Suppression of the epidemic: First, we consider the problem of finding the cheapest strategies in terms of social distancing (ρ) and travel restrictions (φ) that enforce suppression of the epidemic, assuming testing (σ) is not increased beyond its nominal value. To this aim, we define—omitting time dependence for the sake of brevity,

$$A_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := |1 + \Psi_{ii}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^M |\Psi_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})|. \quad (17)$$

Clearly, if $A_i \leq c < 1$, $\forall i, \forall t \geq t_0$, then (10) in Proposition 1 holds, with the infinity norm, and the infected population decreases to zero. Thus, the control goal can be formulated as that of solving the following constrained optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathcal{U}_{[1, T-1]}} J_{[1, T]}, \quad (18a)$$

$$\text{s.t. (1), } \forall t,$$

$$A_i(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \leq c < 1, \quad \forall i, \forall t, \quad (18b)$$

$$\rho_i \in \mathcal{S}_\rho, \varphi_i \in \mathcal{S}_\varphi, \sigma_i = 0, \quad \forall i, \forall t,$$

$$w_{\mathbf{u}} \geq \tau^*, \quad (18c)$$

where $J_{[1, T]}$ is the economic cost function over the time window $[1, T]$, and will be presented in Section IV-A, $\mathcal{U}_{[1, T-1]} := (\mathbf{u}(1), \mathbf{u}(2), \dots, \mathbf{u}(T-1))$ is the set of all decision variables, $\mathcal{S}_\rho, \mathcal{S}_\varphi$ are sets of possible values of ρ_i and φ_i which will be selected in Section V, and $w_{\mathbf{u}}(t)$ is the *dwell time* on \mathbf{u} (i.e. (18c) means that the value of \mathbf{u} cannot change before at least $\tau^* \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ days have passed since the last change).

Mitigation of the epidemic: To better preserve the economy, and as currently done in many countries affected by the epidemic, we also study a different approach, where the goal is to control the epidemic spread allowing some of the restrictions to be lifted when certain conditions are met and enforced otherwise.

To this aim, we obtain a relaxation of condition (10), by considering the condition

$$\forall i, \quad \text{if } \pi_i(t) \implies A_i(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \leq c < 1. \quad (19)$$

where $\pi_i(t)$ is a Boolean condition associated to the ‘‘criticality’’ of the epidemic situation in region i , that we choose as

$$\pi_i(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0.1H_i(t) \geq \epsilon_H T_i^H \vee \mathcal{R}_{t,i} \geq \epsilon_{\mathcal{R}}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

linking it to the level of saturation of the ICUs in each region and the value of $\mathcal{R}_{t,i}$ in each region estimated using (5), with $\epsilon_H \in (0, 1]$, $\epsilon_{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. The resulting control problem can be then be formulated as (18) with (18b) substituted by (19).

The effect of testing: Finally, we explore if and how increasing the amount of testing beyond the nominal value in each region can further reduce costs by formulating the problem as (18) where the constraint on σ_i is chosen as $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma$, \mathcal{S}_σ being a set of possible values of σ_i selected later in Section V.

A. Cost function

As a cost function for the optimization problems above, we consider the total economic cost of the measures undertaken by each region, computed accounting for the cost of people not being able to work and the cost of testing.

Let $P_{\text{active},i}(t) := S_i(t) + I_i(t) + R_i(t)$; $c_m = \text{€}83.992$ be the mean daily GDP pro-capita in Italy as reported in [28], $c_w = 0.617$ be the fraction of people that are *not* able to work when social distancing is in place [29], and c_α be the daily cost of carrying out maximal testing, normalized over the population.

Then, the economic cost at time t in region i is given by

$$J_i(t) = J_{i,1}(t) + J_{i,2}(t) + J_{i,3}(t) + J_{i,4}(t) + J_{i,5}(t), \quad (21)$$

where the addends in (21) are defined as follows:

- $J_{i,1}(t)$ is the loss due to people that live and work in region i , but cannot work because of social distancing:

$$J_{i,1}(t) := c_m c_w \left(1 - \sqrt{\rho_i(t)}\right) \phi_{ii}^0 P_{\text{active},i}(t); \quad (22)$$

- $J_{i,2}(t)$ is the loss due to people that live in other regions and work in i , can travel but cannot work because of social distancing:

$$J_{i,2}(t) := c_m c_w \left(1 - \sqrt{\rho_i(t)}\right) \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \phi_{ji}(t) P_{\text{active},j}(t); \quad (23)$$

- $J_{i,3}(t)$ is the cost of travel restrictions computed in terms of people that live in other regions and work in i , but cannot travel:

$$J_{i,3}(t) := c_m c_w \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^M \left(\phi_{ij}^0 - \phi_{ij}(t)\right) P_{\text{active},j}(t); \quad (24)$$

- $J_{i,4}(t)$ is the loss due to people that live in i but cannot work because becoming incapacitated:

$$J_{i,4}(t) := c_m [c_w Q_i(t) + H_i(t) + D_i(t)]; \quad (25)$$

- $J_{i,5}(t)$ is related to the cost of carrying out increased testing in region i and is computed as

$$J_{i,5}(t) := c_\alpha N_i \sigma_i(t). \quad (26)$$

The expressions in (22) and (23), were obtained by noticing that in (1)—omitting subscripts for notational easiness—the amount of new infected at each time step is proportional to $\rho SI = (\sqrt{\rho}S)(\sqrt{\rho}I)$. Therefore, the portion of people that is *not* restrained is proportional to $\sqrt{\rho}$, and consequently the fraction of population that *is* restrained is proportional to $(1 - \sqrt{\rho})$. In (26), $c_\alpha = \tilde{p} c_{\text{test}} k_p = 0.2125$, where $c_{\text{test}} = \text{€}59$ is the economic cost of a single test as reported in [30], $k_p = 1.74$ is a correction factor that takes into account that the number of tests per person is on average greater than 1 [14], and \tilde{p} was defined earlier in Section II.

Letting the regional terminal cost be $\bar{J}_i(T) = 0$, and assuming the presence of a discount factor $0 < d \leq 1$, the

Variable	Value
T	365
τ^*	14
T_p	29
l_{MPC}	5
\mathcal{S}_ρ	{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7}
\mathcal{S}_φ	{ $\sqrt{0.3}$, 1}
\mathcal{S}_σ	{0, 0.5, 1}
ϵ_H	0.3
ϵ_R	1.3
d	0.9
c	0.99

TABLE II
PARAMETER VALUES FOR CONTROL DESIGN

total cost J over the time window $[t_0, T]$ which is used in the control formulations can then be given as

$$J_{[t_0, T]} = \sum_{t=t_0}^{T-1} d^{(t-t_0)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^M J_i(t) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^M \bar{J}_i(T). \quad (27)$$

V. MPC IMPLEMENTATION AND VALIDATION

We solved the control problems described in the previous section by using a Model Predictive Control approach [31].

As reported in Table II, we chose the set of possible values of the control inputs ρ_i , φ_i and σ_i to represent different levels of social distancing, travel restrictions and testing levels, respectively. For ρ_i we approximated the values of this parameters estimated in [8] for each of the Italian regions when different levels of social distancing were enforced, while for φ_i we replicated the decrease of 70% in mobility fluxes among regions as registered in [32] during the first months of the Italian national lockdown (February–May 2020). As for the level of testing in each region, we chose three representative values of $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma$, to represent low, medium, and intense testing levels (see Table II).

We also enforced the constraint that the control input cannot change before τ^* days have passed since its last change, similarly to what done in [9], [33]. Formally, the control strategy on day t can be changed only if $\tau(t) = \tau^*$, where $\tau(t)$ is the number of days (up to τ^*), counting back from t (excluding t), such that the control variables stayed equal to the value they had in $t - 1$. To compute $\tau(t)$, we initialize $\tau(1) = 0$, and update τ according to the law

$$\tau(t+1) = \begin{cases} \min\{\tau(t) + 1, \tau^*\}, & \text{if } \mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{u}(t-1), \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

A. Numerical results

Using a prediction horizon T_p , as reported in Table II, and $d = 0.9$ in (27), the optimization problem is solved using a genetic algorithm implemented in MATLAB 2020 [34], with the parameters reported in Table III. To simplify computations, when $\tau(t) = \tau^*$, if the MPC finds that $\mathbf{u}(t)$ can be applied continuously for m days, and that $\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{u}(t-1)$,

Variable	Value
population size	4000
elite percentage	20% of population size
crossover fraction	40% of population size
stall generations	50

TABLE III
PARAMETERS FOR THE GENETIC ALGORITHM




Fig. 2. Evolution of the model states in each region (top panels), the control inputs (middle panels) and the value of $\mathcal{R}_{t,i}$ estimated using (5) (bottom panels) when MPC is used to solve problem (18) (with constraint (18b)). In the top panels, the scale on the left vertical axis refers to the state variables I_i (blue) and Q_i (black) while the scale in red on the right vertical axis refers to $0.1H_i$ (solid red line), T_i^H (dashed red line), and $\epsilon_H T_i^H$ (dash-dotted red line). Plots are shaded in red when condition (10) is applied. In the middle panels, the control variables ρ_i (blue), φ_i (orange), and σ_i (yellow) are depicted, with the plots being shaded in grey when $\tau(t) < \tau^*$ (and the control values cannot be changed). In the bottom panels, the current estimate of $\mathcal{R}_{t,i}$ (solid line) is plotted.

we apply $\mathbf{u}(t)$ for $\min(m, l_{\text{MPC}})$ days (rather than just one day).

1) *Epidemic suppression*: We can observe the solution to (18) (with constraint (18b)) in Figure 2. As expected, the epidemic is effectively eradicated by the control strategy, as the number of infected people asymptotically goes to zero. However, this strategy is particularly expensive with a total cost of $\text{€}421.989 \cdot 10^9$ (computed with $d = 1$).

2) *Mitigation*: The results of the control strategy when applied to solve (18) with constraint (19) is reported in Figure 3. In this case, the total cost was found to be equal to $\text{€}337.172 \cdot 10^9$, that is significantly lower than the previous scenario. This is a consequence of the fact that, in each region, NPIs interventions are taken only when some safety thresholds are met and only in that specific region. At the same time, the number of people in ICUs remains within capacity, and all regional effective reproduction numbers remain within acceptable values.

3) *Effect of additional testing*: Finally, we report the solution to the problem when $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma$ in Figure 4, with the total cost found to be equal to $\text{€}262.379 \cdot 10^9$, that is even




Fig. 3. Evolution of the model states in each region (top panels), the control inputs (middle panels) and the value of $\mathcal{R}_{t,i}$ estimated using (5) (bottom panels) when MPC is used to solve (18) with constraint (19). Top panels are shaded in red when $A_i(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \leq c$ (see (17)), while green is used when $A_i(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) > c$. In the bottom panels, the threshold value $\epsilon_{\mathcal{R}}$ for $\mathcal{R}_{t,i}$ is plotted in a dash-dotted line.




Fig. 4. Evolution of the model states in each region (top panels), the control inputs (middle panels) and the value of $\mathcal{R}_{t,i}$ estimated using (5) (bottom panels) when MPC is used to solve the problem when $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma$.

lower than the previous case. Clearly, the use of additional testing as a further measure allows the control to further reduce costs by relying less on increasing social distancing to mitigate the epidemic, avoiding saturation of the regional health systems. Indeed, in Figure 4, it is possible to note that travel restrictions are never used in this case, and social distancing is significantly less severe when compared to that in Figures 2 and 3.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We considered the problem of designing localized intermittent non-pharmaceutical intervention strategies to mitigate the COVID-19 epidemic in a regional model of the Italian epidemic. We first gave a sufficient condition to determine the stability of the infected population, in a network epidemic

model. We then exploited this stability condition, or a relaxed version of it, as a constraint to formulate the control problem as an optimization problem in which the levels of social distancing, travel restrictions and additional testing must be selected to avoid saturation of the regional health systems and containment (or suppression) of the epidemic spread while minimizing the overall cost to the economy. Our results show the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

CODE AND DATA AVAILABILITY

The code and the data to run the model identification (to find the parameters in Table I), the linear regression reported in Figure 1, and all the simulations in Section V-A are available at <https://github.com/diBernardoGroup/MPC-mitigate-COVID-19>.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bin *et al.*, “Post-lockdown abatement of COVID-19 by fast periodic switching,” *PLOS Computational Biology*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–34, 2021.
- [2] S. M. Kissler *et al.*, “Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period,” *Science*, vol. 368, no. 6493, pp. 860–868, 2020.
- [3] N. Ferguson *et al.*, “Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand,” Imperial College London, Tech. Rep., 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/mrc-gida/2020-03-16-COVID19-Report-9.pdf>
- [4] J. M. Brauner *et al.*, “Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19,” *Science*, vol. 371, no. 6531, 2021.
- [5] O. Karin *et al.*, “Cyclic exit strategies to suppress COVID-19 and allow economic activity,” 2020, medRxiv:2020.04.04.20053579.
- [6] D. M. Kennedy *et al.*, “Modeling the effects of intervention strategies on COVID-19 transmission dynamics,” *Journal of Clinical Virology*, vol. 128, p. 104440, 2020.
- [7] G. Stewart, K. Heusden, and G. A. Dumont, “How control theory can help us control COVID-19,” *IEEE Spectrum*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 22–29, 2020.
- [8] F. Della Rossa *et al.*, “A network model of Italy shows that intermittent regional strategies can alleviate the COVID-19 epidemic,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 5106, 2020.
- [9] M. M. Morato *et al.*, “An optimal predictive control strategy for COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) social distancing policies in Brazil,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 50, pp. 417–431, 2020.
- [10] J. Köhler *et al.*, “Robust and optimal predictive control of the COVID-19 outbreak,” *Annual reviews in Control*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2020.11.002>
- [11] C. Tsay *et al.*, “Modeling, state estimation, and optimal control for the US COVID-19 outbreak,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 10, p. 10711, 2020.
- [12] R. Carli *et al.*, “Model predictive control to mitigate the COVID-19 outbreak in a multi-region scenario,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 50, pp. 373–393, 2020.
- [13] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [14] Dipartimento della Protezione Civile. (2020) Dipartimento della protezione civile–presidenza del consiglio dei ministri official covid-19 data repository. [Online]. Available: <http://github.com/pcm-dpc/COVID-19/tree/master/dati-andamento-nazionale>
- [15] L. M. Stolerman, D. Coombs, and S. Boatto, “SIR-network model and its application to dengue fever,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 75, no. 6, pp. 2581–2609, 2015.
- [16] Ministero della Salute. (2020) Posti letto per regione e disciplina. [Online]. Available: <http://www.dati.salute.gov.it/dati/dettaglioDataset.jsp?menu=dati&idPag=17>
- [17] M. della Salute. (2020) Linee di indirizzo organizzative per il potenziamento della rete ospedaliera per emergenza covid-19. [Online]. Available: <https://www.trovanorme.salute.gov.it/norme/renderNormsanPdf?anno=2020&codLeg=74348&parte=1%20&serie=null>

- [18] Agenzia Nazionale per i Servizi Sanitari Regionali. (2021) Ricoverati e posti letto in area non critica e terapia intensiva. [Online]. Available: <https://www.agenas.gov.it/covid19/web/index.php?r=site%2Ftab2>
- [19] K. Rothman, S. Greenland, and T. Lash, *Modern epidemiology*, 3rd ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2011.
- [20] J. Heesterbeek, “A brief history of R_0 and a recipe for its calculation,” *Acta Biotheoretica*, vol. 50, pp. 189–204, 2002.
- [21] J. Heffernan, R. Smith, and L. Wahl, “Perspectives on the basic reproductive ratio,” *Journal of the Royal Society, Interface / the Royal Society*, vol. 2, pp. 281–93, 2005.
- [22] H. Nishiura and G. Chowell, *The Effective Reproduction Number as a Prelude to Statistical Estimation of Time-Dependent Epidemic Trends*. Springer Netherlands, 2009, pp. 103–121.
- [23] E. Kohlberg and A. Neyman, “Demystifying the math of the coronavirus,” Harvard Business School, Tech. Rep., 2020.
- [24] O. Diekmann, J. Heesterbeek, and J. Metz, “On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio R_0 in models for infectious-diseases in heterogeneous populations,” *Journal of mathematical biology*, vol. 28, pp. 365–382, 1990.
- [25] W. Lohmiller and J.-J. E. Slotine, “On contraction analysis for non-linear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 683–696, 1998.
- [26] S. Xie, G. Russo, and R. Middleton, “Scalability in nonlinear network systems affected by delays and disturbances,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCNS.2021.3058934>
- [27] Q. Ma, Y.-Y. Liu, and A. Olshevsky, “Optimal lockdown for pandemic control,” 2021, arXiv:2010.12923.
- [28] International Monetary Fund, “World Economic Outlook Database, October 2020,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2020/October>
- [29] H. Holgersen, Z. Jia, and S. Svenkerud, “Who and how many can work from home? evidence from task descriptions,” *Journal for Labour Market Research*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2021.
- [30] A. Cicchetti *et al.*, “Analisi dei modelli organizzativi di risposta al Covid-19,” ALTEMS, Tech. Rep., 2020. [Online]. Available: https://altems.unicatt.it/altems-INSTANT%20REPORT%20ALTEMS%20ANNUALE%20-%202020_finale.pdf
- [31] M. Morari and J. H. Lee, “Model predictive control: past, present and future,” *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 667–682, 1999.
- [32] Google LLC. (2020) Google mobility data. [Online]. Available: <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility>
- [33] R. Carli, G. Cavone, N. Epicoco, P. Scarabaggio, and M. Dotoli, “Model predictive control to mitigate the COVID-19 outbreak in a multi-region scenario,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, p. S1367578820300626, 2020.
- [34] Mathworks. (2021) Global Optimization Toolbox. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mathworks.com/products/global-optimization.html>

APPENDIX

For the sake of completeness, we explore here the relationship between the stability condition in Proposition 1 and a recent condition derived independently in [27], when both are applied to a discrete-time SIS model (adapted from the continuous-time model adopted in [27]).

Namely, the dynamics of the infected we consider is given by

$$\mathbf{I}(t+1) = \left[(1-\gamma)\mathbf{I} + \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}-\mathbf{I}(t))\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} \right] \mathbf{I}(t), \quad (29)$$

where $I_i \in [0, 1]$ is the portion of infected in region i , with $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, $\mathbf{I} := [I_1 \ \dots \ I_M]^T$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ is the infection rate, $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ is the recovery rate, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ captures the rate at which infection flows between regions (also accounting for social distancing), with $\mathbf{A} \geq 0$, and $\text{diag}(\mathbf{v})$ is a diagonal matrix having on its main diagonal the vector \mathbf{v} .

Next, we derive and compare two different upper bounds on the maximum eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} , that guarantee the stability of the infected dynamics in the origin. The first bound, say

(B1), is derived following the arguments in Proposition 1, whereas the second, say (B2), is computed following the steps in [27].

Bound derived from Proposition 1: By using similar arguments as those used in Proposition 1, it can be shown that, if there exists some matrix norm and some $c < 1$ such that

$$\|(1 - \gamma)\mathcal{I} + \text{diag}(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{I}(t))\beta\mathbf{A}\| \leq c, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}, \quad (30)$$

then $\|\mathbf{I}(t)\| \leq c^{t-t_0} \|\mathbf{I}(t_0)\|$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Letting $I^m(t) := \min_i I_i(t)$, and applying the triangle inequality and Lemma 1, we find that (30) is satisfied if

$$\|\mathbf{A}\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - I^m(t)} \frac{\gamma + c - 1}{\beta}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}, \quad (31)$$

where we used the fact that the variables $I_i(t)$ are bounded between 0 and 1. As $\|\mathbf{A}\| \geq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$, then there exists $p \in (0, 1]$ such that $p \|\mathbf{A}\| = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$. Thus, we rewrite (31) and obtain the first bound as

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) \leq g_1 := \frac{p}{1 - I^m(t)} \frac{\gamma + c - 1}{\beta}. \quad (B1)$$

Bound derived from [27]: Following the arguments in [27], we let $\mathbf{P} := (1 - \gamma)\mathcal{I} + \beta\mathbf{A}$, noting that $\mathbf{P} \geq 0$. Applying the Perron-Frobenius theorem [13, Theorem 8.3.1] to \mathbf{P}^\top yields the existence of an eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$, with associated left eigenvector $\mathbf{v}_{\max} \geq 0$. Moreover, $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P})$ is such that $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}) \geq |\lambda_i(\mathbf{P})|$, for all other eigenvalues λ_i of \mathbf{P} . Now, if

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) \leq g_2 := \frac{\gamma + c - 1}{\beta}, \quad (B2)$$

(which constitutes the second bound), we consequently get $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}) \leq c < 1$, and it is then immediate to show that this implies that $\mathbf{0}$ is a stable equilibrium for the dynamics $\mathbf{I}(t)$ given in (29). Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{\max}^\top \mathbf{I}(t+1) &= \mathbf{v}_{\max}^\top ((1 - \gamma)\mathcal{I} + \text{diag}(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{I}(t))\beta\mathbf{A})\mathbf{I}(t) \\ &\leq \mathbf{v}_{\max}^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{I}(t) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{v}_{\max}^\top \mathbf{I}(t) \leq c \mathbf{v}_{\max}^\top \mathbf{I}(t), \end{aligned}$$

which means stability of $\mathbf{I}(t)$ in $\mathbf{0}$ recalling that $\mathbf{I}(t) \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\max} \geq 0$. Note that (B2) is equivalent to the stability condition in Proposition 3.1 in [27] when applied to a discrete-time SIS network model.

Comparison: Finally, we relate the two stability conditions (B1) and (B2). Clearly, when $I^m(t) \in (1 - p, 1)$, $g_1 > g_2$ and our condition (B1) is less conservative than (B2), while it is more conservative ($g_1 < g_2$) when $I^m(t) \in [0, 1 - p)$.