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Abstract—In this paper, the population dynamics of a novel coronavirus are studied. An extended SEIR model with quarantine, hospitalization, and the environment compartment is proposed to simulate the novel coronavirus epidemic. The model considers eight distinct epidemiological classes: susceptible, exposed, asymptomatic, symptomatic, quarantined, hospitalized, recovered, and viruses in the environment. The basic reproduction numbers are determined by using a method called the next-generation matrix. The model has two equilibria: a disease-free equilibrium and an endemic equilibrium. The Lyapunov function and the LaSalle invariance principle are used to analyze the global asymptotical stability of the equilibria of the proposed model. The disease-free equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable if the basic reproduction number is less than unity, and the endemic equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable if the basic reproduction number is greater than unity. To study cost-effectiveness assessments for the four optimum control strategies, we ran numerical simulations. When the four control strategies were compared, it was discovered that Strategy A (public health education and intensive medical treatment) was the most economical and efficient control intervention in the absence of vaccination. However, we observe that strategies A, B, and D are similarly effective at containing COVID-19 in terms of infection prevention.

Index Terms—COVID-19 model, global stability, quarantine, hospitalization, optimal control.

I. INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) designated the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) as a public health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) on January 30, 2020. On February 12, 2020, a brand-new coronavirus disease in humans was given the name “Coronavirus Disease” by the World Health Organization. In March 2020, WHO proclaimed COVID-19 a global pandemic [1]. The spread of the COVID-19 virus can occur due to direct or indirect physical contact with the sufferer. Indirect transmission can occur when viruses in patient droplets are inhaled by humans [2]. The virus can survive for up to three days on plastic and stainless steel, or it can survive in aerosols for up to three hours [3]. The spread of COVID-19 is difficult to detect because it can be transmitted by people without symptoms. The outbreak and spread of COVID-19 have prompted governments and health authorities in various countries to take the necessary actions to stop the spread of COVID-19. Pharmaceutical or non-medical interventions that can be carried out by all parties under the coordination of the local government, for example, public health education campaigns, implementing clean and healthy behavior through health protocols (washing hands with soap, wearing a mask, not smoking, consuming balanced nutrition, staying at home, avoiding crowds, keeping the environment clean, etc.), and ensuring the availability of support (PCR tests). The growth of the COVID-19 epidemic is extremely serious and constitutes a significant threat to public health security and the global economy, so COVID-19 must be controlled.

Until now, the mechanism of the spread of COVID-19 has been studied for prevention and control purposes. One approach to understanding the dynamics of the spread of infectious diseases is through mathematical modelling. Mathematical models can help us understand the transmission and control mechanisms of new infectious diseases like COVID-19. In the absence of vaccines or pharmaceutical interventions, mathematical modelling can be used to evaluate non-medical preventative strategies or non-pharmaceutical interventions ([4]-[8]). Many new epidemic model are based on the classic SEIR (Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered). Several COVID-19 epidemic models based on the classic SEIR compartment model are now being utilized to simulate COVID-19 disease dynamics ([9]-[12]). Zhao et al. [13] investigated an adapted SEIR model to forecast COVID-19 spread in South Africa, Egypt, Algeria, Nigeria, Senegal, and Kenya. Similarly, [14] investigated the expansion of the SEIR model using model parameters derived from epidemiological data and estimates based on data from West Java Province, Indonesia. Obsu and Balcha [15] used a COVID-19 mathematical model that included three time-dependent control functions: preventive control measures (quarantine, isolation, and social distancing), disinfection of contaminated surfaces, and
infected individuals at home. Rapid testing, medical masks, increased medical care in hospitals, and public awareness are among the interventions investigated by the authors. Furthermore, [16] conducted a mathematical study on the spread of COVID-19 while taking social distancing and rapid assessment into account in the case of Jakarta, Indonesia. Luo et al. [17] studied the contribution of non-pharmaceutical interventions to the control of COVID-19 in China based on a pairwise model. Asamoah et al. [18] use data from Ghana to investigate the global stability and cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 in terms of environmental impact. They then used cost-effectiveness analysis to look at optimal control and economic outcomes. Following that, Asamoah et al. [19] look into the sensitivity and an economic evaluation of a new model to study the COVID-19 epidemic and its control measures to find the best solution. Their main discovery was that it is better to have two ways to control a situation (reducing transmission and isolating cases) instead of just one way, even though it may be more expensive.

According to the facts and descriptions above, COVID-19 is currently a health problem in all countries. If vaccine availability is limited, public health education campaign interventions, quarantine, self-isolation, early diagnosis and treatment, and surface disinfection are the top priority programs for preventing the spread of COVID-19. This is where the significance of this study lies: examining the impact of nonpharmaceutical and medical interventions using mathematical models. In this study, the model framework refers to the model from [18], which was expanded by adding quarantine and hospital compartments.

The aim of this research is to analyze optimal control and Analyzing the best way to control the transmission of COVID-2019 and the cost-effectiveness of implementing public health education (awareness the medical mask, stay at home, and washing their hands), intense medical treatment, and surface disinfection. It is recommended to use a bigger SEIR model: Susceptible, Exposed, Asymptomatic Infectious, Symptomatic Infectious, Quarantined, Hospitalized, and Recovered.

The organization of this paper is as follows: In the next section, the epidemic model, positivity, and boundedness of the solutions are shown in Section 2. In Section 3, the model analysis is described, comprising the equilibrium point, the basic reproduction number, and an examination of the global stability of the equilibrium point. The sensitivity analysis of the basic reproduction number is presented in Section 4. Section 5 defines the optimal control problem, characterizes the optimal control, and presents numerical simulations. Section 6 contains the cost-effectiveness analysis. In Section 7, several conclusions are offered as a conclusion.

II. MODEL FORMULATION

We assumed that the total population is divided into eight distinct epidemiological classes: susceptible class or individuals who are susceptible to the COVID-19 virus (\(S(t)\)), exposed class or individuals who have been infected, but are not infectious (\(E(t)\)), asymptomatic class or individuals who are infectious yet do not exhibit symptoms (\(A(t)\)), symptomatic class or someone who has COVID-19 symptoms and can transfer the illness (\(I(t)\)), quarantined asymptomatic class or individuals with infectious diseases yet show no symptoms are quarantined (\(Q(t)\)), hospitalized or isolated symptoms class or individuals with infectious diseases who are admitted to a medical facility (\(H(t)\)), recovered class or those who have recovered from the illness (\(R(t)\)), and the concentration of the SARS-CoV-2 in the environment (\(B(t)\)). The total population of humans at time \(t\) is \(N(t) = S(t) + E(t) + A(t) + I(t) + Q(t) + H(t) + R(t)\). A flow diagram of each compartment’s dynamics in model (1) is shown in Fig. 1.

The corresponding systems of differential equations and the description of the parameters are, respectively, given in (1) and Table I.

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= \Lambda - [\beta(\eta A + I + \eta H) + \beta B]S - \mu S, \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta(\eta A + I + \eta H) + \beta B]S - (\kappa + \mu)E, \\
\frac{dA}{dt} &= (1 - p)\kappa E - (\gamma_1 + \mu)A, \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= p\kappa E - (\gamma_1 + \alpha_1 + \mu)I, \\
\frac{dQ}{dt} &= \gamma_2 A - (\delta + \mu)Q, \\
\frac{dH}{dt} &= \gamma_2 I + \theta Q - (\delta + \alpha_2 + \mu)H, \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \delta Q + \delta_2 H - \mu R, \\
\frac{dB}{dt} &= m_A + m_I - \sigma B.
\end{align*}
\]

The non-negative initial conditions of the system of model (1) are denoted by \(S(0) > 0, E(0) \geq 0, A(0) \geq 0, I(0) \geq 0, Q(0) \geq 0, H(0) \geq 0, R(0) \geq 0, B(0) \geq 0\).

We simplify the equation of system (1) to get the total differential equation as

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dN}{dt} &= \Lambda - \mu N - \alpha_1 I - \alpha_2 H, \\
\frac{dB}{dt} &= m_A + m_I - \alpha B.
\end{align*}
\]
The model developed assumed that susceptible individuals are continuously recruited (by birth or immigration) into the population at a constant rate \( \lambda \). The susceptible individuals acquire the COVID-19 infection when they interact with the infected individuals in classes \( A, I, H, \) and \( B \) compartments. According to the assumption that the frequency of human-pathogen interactions is bilinear with the intensity of infection, \( \lambda = \beta (\eta A + I + \eta H) + \beta B \), where the parameter \( \beta \) shows the effective contact rates from asymptomatic, symptomatic, and hospitalized classes and \( \beta_i \) shows the effective contact rates of the virus in the environment class. The parameter \( \eta_i \) \((0 \leq \eta_i \leq 1)\) accounts for the expected reduction in disease transmissibility of asymptomatic infected individuals versus symptomatic infected individuals. The parameter \( \eta_e \) is used for the infectiousness rate among COVID-19 hospitalized patients. Following the completion of the incubation period, the latent individuals develop an infection and become infected at the rate \( \kappa \) and proportion denoted by \( p \) enters the symptomatic infected class after exhibiting disease symptoms, while the remainder with no symptoms join the asymptomatic infected compartment. Asymptomatic individuals who have contact with COVID-19-infected patients are discovered (by contact-tracing) and placed in quarantine at a rate of \( \gamma_1 \), progression rate from quarantined to the hospitalized class at a rate \( \gamma_2 \). Symptomatic infected individuals have been confirmed (after testing) and placed in hospitals at a rate of \( \gamma_2 \). The parameters \( \delta_1 \) and \( \delta_2 \) represent the recovery rates of quarantined and hospitalized classes, respectively. Last but not least, \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) indicate, respectively, the COVID-19-induced death rate for people in the \( I \) and \( H \) classes. The natural death rate in all classes is denoted by \( \mu \). Here every state variables and parameters are considered to be positive for every \( t > 0 \).

In order for the system (1) to be biologically valid, the model’s solution must be both positive and bounded for every time \( t > 0 \). The following lemmas provide the proof:

**Lemma 1.** If \( D(t) = \{ S(t), E(t), A(t), I(t), Q(t), H(t), R(t), B(t) \} \) with the initial condition, then the solution \( D(t) \) of system (1) is nonnegative for every \( t > 0 \). Also, \( \lim_{t \to \infty} N(t) = \Lambda / \mu \) and \( \limsup B(t) = \Lambda (m_1 + m_2) / \sigma \mu \).

**Proof.** Let \( t_0 = \sup \{ t > 0 : D(t) > 0 \text{ in } [0, t] \} \). Thus, \( t_0 > 0 \). From the first equation of the system (1), we have

\[
\frac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - (\lambda + \mu)S, \tag{3}
\]

With \( \lambda = \beta (\eta A + I + \eta H) + \beta B \). Using the integrating factor and the technique of variable separation, (3) can be expressed as

\[
\frac{dS}{dt} \left[ S(t) \exp \{ \mu v + \lambda(v)dv \} \right] = \Lambda \exp \{ \mu v + \lambda(v)dv \}. \tag{4}
\]

Integrating (4) in the range \( [0, t] \) we get,

\[
S(t) \exp \left\{ \mu t + \int_0^t (\lambda(v)dv) \right\} - S(0) = \int_0^t \Lambda \exp \left\{ \mu v + \int_v^t \lambda(v)dv \right\} dv.
\]

So,

\[
S(t) = \left[ S(0) + \int_0^t \Lambda \exp \{ \mu v + \lambda(v)dv \} dv \right] \exp \left\{ -\left( \mu t + \int_0^t \lambda(v)dv \right) \right\}. \tag{5}
\]

For the remaining equations, we follow the same procedures as in the equation for system (1) above to show \( D(t) > 0 \) for all \( t > 0 \). As a result, the first portion of the lemma is established.

As for the second portion of the lemma, it should be emphasized that

\[
0 < S(t), E(t), A(t), I(t), Q(t), H(t), R(t), N(t) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\mu}, \quad 0 < B(t) \leq \frac{\Lambda (m_1 + m_2)}{\sigma \mu}. \tag{6}
\]

If the first seven equations of system (1) are added, we get

\[
\frac{dN}{dt} = \Lambda - \mu N - (\alpha_1 H + \alpha_2 H) \leq \Lambda - \mu N. \tag{6}
\]

From the last equation of system (1), we have

\[
\frac{dB}{dt} = m_1 A + m_2 J - \sigma B. \tag{7}
\]

When we combine and subtract \( \limsup \) for \( t \to \infty \) in (6) and (7), we get

\[
\frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \leq \liminf_{t \to \infty} N(t) \leq \limsup_{t \to \infty} N(t) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\mu}
\]

and

\[
\Lambda (m_1 + m_2) / \sigma \mu \leq \liminf_{t \to \infty} B(t) \leq \limsup_{t \to \infty} B(t) \leq \Lambda (m_1 + m_2) / \sigma \mu.
\]
Thus, \( \limsup_{t \to \infty} N(t) = \Lambda / \mu \) and \( \limsup_{t \to \infty} B(t) = \Lambda (m_1 + m_2) / \sigma \mu \).

The proof of Lemma 2 is completed. \( \square \)

The closed region will be defined as a positively invariant set in the following lemma. Using our COVID-19 model, the area shown below will be analyzed. Consider the area that is feasible

\[
\Omega = \Omega_b \times \Omega_m \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}_+ ,
\]

where

\[
\Omega_b = \{ (S, E, A, I, Q, H, R) \in \mathbb{R}^7 : N \leq \Lambda / \mu \}
\]

and

\[
\Omega_m = \{ B \in \mathbb{R}_+ : B \leq \Lambda (m_1 + m_2) / \mu \sigma \} .
\]

**Lemma 2.** The closed region \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^8 \) given below is a positively invariant set with a non-negative initial condition for the system (1) in \( \mathbb{R}^8 \).

\[
\Omega = \{ (S, E, A, I, Q, H, R, B) \in \mathbb{R}^8 : N \leq \Lambda / \mu , B \leq \Lambda (m_1 + m_2) / \mu \sigma \} .
\]

**Proof.** From (6) and (7), we have

\[
\frac{dN(t)}{dt} \leq \Lambda - \mu N \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dB(t)}{dt} \leq \frac{\Lambda m}{\mu} - \sigma B .
\]

where \( m = m_1 + m_2 \).

Integrating both sides of the above two inequality equations and applying the comparison [20] when \( t \to \infty \), we obtain

\[
N(t) \leq N(0) e^{-\mu t} + \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} (1 - e^{-\mu t})
\]

and

\[
B(t) \leq \frac{m \Lambda}{\mu \sigma} + \left( B(0) - \frac{m \Lambda}{\mu \sigma} \right) e^{-\mu t} .
\]

Clearly, \( 0 < N(t) \leq N(0) e^{-\mu t} \) and \( 0 < B(t) \leq m \Lambda / \mu \sigma \), as \( t \to \infty \).

In particular, \( N(t) \leq N(0) \mu / \mu \) if \( N(0) \leq N(0) \mu / \mu \) and \( B(t) \leq m \Lambda / \mu \sigma \) if \( B(0) \leq m \Lambda / \mu \sigma \). Thus, the region \( \Omega \) is positively invariant and attracts all possible solutions of the system (1). Thus, \( S(t), E(t), A(t), I(t), Q(t), H(t), R(t), \) and \( B(t) \) are bounded.

The proof of Lemma 2 is completed. \( \square \)

**III. MODEL ANALYSIS**

We will perform a qualitative analysis of the system (1) in this part.

A. The Equilibrium Points

In this section, the equilibrium points of system (1) will be calculated. For convenience, we note \( k_1 = k + \mu , k_2 = \gamma_1 + \mu , k_3 = \gamma_2 + \alpha_1 + \mu , k_4 = \theta + \delta_1 + \mu , \) and \( k_5 = \delta_2 + \alpha_2 + \mu . \)

The equilibrium points of system (1) is obtained by solving the following system

\[
\begin{align*}
A - \beta \left[ \eta (\alpha_1 + \gamma_1 ) + \eta_1 (\alpha_1 + \gamma_2 ) + \eta_2 (\gamma_2 + \alpha_1 + \mu ) + k_2 \right] & = 0 \\
\left[ \beta (\eta_1 A + \eta_2 I + \gamma_2 (\gamma_1 + \mu ) + k_1 \right] & = 0 \\
(1 - \mu ) & = 0 \\
\mu k_1 - k_2 & = 0 \\
(1 - \mu ) & = 0 \\
\gamma_1 & = 0 \\
\gamma_2 & = 0 \\
\delta_2 & = 0 \\
\mu & = 0 \\
m & = m_1 + m_2 .
\end{align*}
\]

From the system (9) and some algebraic manipulations, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
A & = \frac{(1 - \mu ) k}{k_1} S , \\
I & = \frac{\mu k}{k_1} E , \\
Q & = \frac{\gamma_1 (1 - \mu ) k}{k_1} E , \\
B & = \frac{\mu k}{k_1} E , \\
H & = \frac{\mu k_2}{k_1} E , \\
R & = \frac{\mu k_3}{k_1} E .
\end{align*}
\]

Substituting (10) in the second equation of system (1) gives

\[
\begin{align*}
& \left[ \beta \left[ \eta k_2 k_3 k_4 (1 - \mu ) + \eta_1 k_2 k_3 k_4 (1 - \mu ) + \eta_2 k_2 k_3 k_4 + k_2 k_3 k_4 \right] \right] k_2 k_3 k_4 \\
& - \beta \left[ k_1 \eta_1 (1 - \mu ) + k_2 m_2 \right] S - k_1 \right] E = 0 .
\end{align*}
\]

B. Disease-Free Equilibrium and Basic Reproduction Number

The first case in (11) if \( E = 0 . \) results in the disease-free equilibrium point, given by

\[
X_0 = \left( \frac{\mu}{\mu} , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 \right) .
\]

The expected value of the infection rate per time unit is the basic reproduction number, denoted as \( \mathcal{R}_0 . \) An infected person is the source of the infection, which affects a susceptible population. In the following, we will find that the basic reproduction number \( \mathcal{R}_0 \) of system (1) is computed using the next-generation matrix method formulated in [21].

Let

\[
X = (E , A , I , Q , H , B ) .
\]

\[
X = \left( k_1 = \kappa + \mu , k_2 = \gamma_1 + \mu , k_3 = \gamma_2 + \alpha_1 + \mu , k_4 = \theta + \delta_1 + \mu , \right.
\]

\[
\text{and } k_5 = \delta_2 + \alpha_2 + \mu . \right.
\]

Without loss of generality, system (1) can be written as

\[
\frac{dX}{dt} = F(X) - V(X)
\]

where

\[
\lambda = \frac{\mu}{\mu} , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 , 0 .
\]
\[ F(X) = \begin{pmatrix} \beta(\eta A + \eta_2 H)S + \beta_1 BS \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V(X) = \begin{pmatrix} k_1E \\ -\gamma_2I - \theta Q + k_2H \\ 0 \\ -\gamma_1A + k_3I \\ -\gamma_1A + k_3Q \\ -p\kappa E + k_3I \end{pmatrix}. \]

By calculating, we obtain the Jacobian matrices of \( F(X) \) and \( V(X) \) at the disease-free equilibrium \( X_0 \) are respectively,

\[
F = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\beta_0}{\mu k_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{pmatrix} k_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -p\kappa & 0 & k_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\gamma_2 & 0 & -\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\gamma_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\gamma_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{14}
\]

Now, \( FV^{-1} \) is the generation matrix of system (1) and the basic reproduction number of system (1) is obtained as the spectral radius \( \rho(FV^{-1}) \) that is the dominant eigenvalue of the matrix \( FV^{-1} \), denoted by \( R_0 \), is thus given by

\[
R_0 = \frac{\beta_0 \lambda(1-p)}{\mu k_1 k_2} + \frac{\beta_0 \lambda p}{\mu k_1 k_2} + \frac{\beta_0 \lambda}{\mu k_2 k_k} \tag{16}
\]

where \( R_{h1}, R_{a1}, R_{h0}, \) and \( R_{a0} \) are the proportions of the basic reproduction number contributed by the asymptomatic infected class, the symptomatic infected class, the hospitalized infected class, and the virus in the environment class, respectively. The basic reproduction number represents the number of new infected individuals caused by a primary infected individual during the infection period in totally susceptible individuals.

**C. Endemic Equilibrium**

Let us suppose that \( X_i = (S', E', A', I', Q', H', R', B') \) represents an endemic equilibrium of system (1). The second case in (11) if \( E = 0 \) implies that

\[
S' = \frac{\lambda}{\mu R_0}. \tag{17}
\]

By adding the first two equations of system (9), we substitute \( S' \) from (17) and simplify \( E' \) we get

\[
E' = \frac{\lambda - \mu S'}{k_1} = \frac{\lambda}{k_1} \left( R_0 - 1 \right). \tag{18}
\]

Hence, \( E' > 0 \) whenever \( R_0 > 1 \). Thus, the other components of the endemic equilibrium \( X_i \) can then be obtained by substituting the unique value of \( E' \) give in (18) into the steady-state expressions in (10), we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
A' = & \frac{(1-p)\kappa E'}{k_2}, \\
I' = & \frac{p\kappa E'}{k_1}, \\
Q' = & \frac{\gamma_1(1-p)\kappa E'}{k_k}.
\end{align*}
\]

**D. Global Stability of the Disease-free Equilibrium**

We shall demonstrate the global stability of the disease-free equilibrium \( X_0 \) in this subsection to confirm that the COVID-19 disease has been eradicated. For this purpose, we consider the feasible region

\[
\Omega = \{(S, E, A, I, Q, H, R, B) \in \mathbb{R}^7 : S \leq S^0 \}.
\]

**Lemma 3.** For the system (1), the region \( \Omega \) is positively invariant.

**Proof.** From the first equation of system (1), we have

\[
\frac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - \left[ \beta(\eta A + \eta_2 H) + \beta_1 B \right]S - \mu S \\
\leq \Lambda - \mu S = \mu \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} - S \right) \tag{20}
\]

In order to solve the differential equations (20), we use the comparison theorem [33].

\[
S(t) \leq S^0 - (S^0 - S(0))e^{-\mu t}.
\]

So, if \( S(0) \leq S^0 \) is true for all \( t \geq 0 \), then \( S(t) \leq S^0 \) is true for all \( t \geq 0 \). Hence, we have the region \( \Omega \) is positively invariant and attracts all solutions of system (1).

The proof of Lemma 3 is completed.

The global asymptotic stability for the disease-free equilibrium of system (1) will be examined in the following theorem. We applied the approach suggested by [22] to look into the global stability of \( X_0 \).

**Theorem 1.** If \( R_0 \leq 1 \), then the disease-free equilibrium \( X_0 \) of system (1) is globally asymptotically stable in \( \Omega \).

**Proof.** Let \( Y_i = (S, R) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) represents the uninfected compartments, \( Y'_i = (E, A, I, Q, H, B) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \) represents the infected compartments, and the disease-free equilibrium of system (1), \( X_0 = (\Lambda/\mu, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) = (Y'_0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) \) where \( Y'_0 = (S^0, R^0) = (\Lambda/\mu, 0) \). System (1) can be written as
\[
\frac{dY_1}{dt} = F(Y_1,0), \\
\frac{dY_2}{dt} = G(Y_1,Y_2), \quad G(Y_1,0) = 0,
\]

where
\[
F(Y_1,Y_2) = \left( \Lambda - \beta (\eta A + I + \eta_2H) + \beta_0 B \right) S - \mu S + \delta_2 Q - \mu R \]
\[
G(Y_1,Y_2) = \begin{pmatrix}
\beta (\eta E + I + \eta_2 H) + \beta_0 B S - k_1 E \\
(1-p)kE - k_2 A \\
\rho k E - k_1 l \\
\gamma_1 A - k_3 Q \\
\gamma_2 I + \theta Q - k_4 H \\
m_1 A + m_2 I - \sigma B
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The disease-free equilibrium of system (1) is globally asymptotically stable if the two following conditions (H1) and (H2) are satisfied.

(H1) For \( \frac{dY_1}{dt} = F(Y_1,0) \), \( Y_1^0 \) is globally asymptotically stable where \( F(Y_1^0,0) = 0 \).

(H2) \( G(Y_1,0) = 0 \) and \( G(Y_1,Y_2) = CY_2 - G(Y_1,Y_2) \), \( G(Y_1,Y_2) \geq 0 \) for \( (Y_1,Y_2) \in \Omega \) and \( C = D_2 G(Y_1^0,0) \) is a Metzler-matrix.

From the first equation of system (21),
\[
\frac{dY_1}{dt} = F(Y_1,0) = \begin{pmatrix}
\Lambda - \mu S \\
- \mu R
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The solution of system (22) is
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
S(t) \\
R(t)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
\Lambda t + (S^0 - \Lambda t)e^{-\mu t} \\
R^0 e^{-\mu t}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

It can be shown \( S \rightarrow S^0 = \Lambda / \mu \) and \( R \rightarrow R^0 = 0 \) as \( t \rightarrow \infty \), indicating that the solution of (22) has global convergence. As a result, condition (H1) is satisfied, and \( Y_1^0 = (S^0,R^0) \) is globally asymptotically stable.

Furthermore, we show that \( G(Y_1,Y_2) \) satisfies the two conditions in (H2). It is clear that \( G(Y_1,0) = 0 \). From the system (21), we obtain
\[
C = D_2 G(Y_1^0,0) = \begin{pmatrix}
-k_1 & \beta_0 \Lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-p(1-p)k & -k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
pk & -k_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \rho_2 & -k_4 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \theta & -k_5 & 0 \\
0 & m_1 & m_2 & 0 & -\sigma
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The matrix \( C \) is a Metzler-matrix because none of its off-diagonal entries are nonnegative. In the region \( \Omega_1 \), \( S \leq S^0 \) and hence we have \( S^0 - S \geq 0 \). The boundaries of the total population are \( N \leq N/ \mu \) and \( B \leq mN/ \sigma \mu \). We have \( S^0 - S \leq 0 \) and \( \beta_0 B \) and \( G(Y_1,Y_2) \geq 0 \). As a result, \( G(Y_1,Y_2) \) meets the two criteria, which suggests that condition (H2) is met.

The proof of Theorem 1 is completed.

**E. Global Stability of Endemic Equilibrium**

The Lyapunov asymptotic theorem is used to describe the global asymptotic stability of the endemic equilibrium. By referencing the research of Yi and Wu [31, 32], we will design a Lyapunov function from system (1).

**Theorem 2** If \( R_0 > 1 \), then the endemic equilibrium \( X_1 \) of the system (1) is globally asymptotically stable in \( \Omega \).

**Proof.** Let \( R_0 > 1 \), such that the endemic equilibrium of system (1) \( X_1 \) exists. We consider the candidate Lyapunov function \( \mathcal{L} \) as follows:
\[
\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left( S - S^r \right) E + A A^\top + (I - I^r) (Q - Q^r) + \left( H - H^r \right) (R - R^r) + \left( B - B^r \right)^2.
\]

The statement below gives the derivative of \( \mathcal{L} \) along the solutions of system (1). The statement below gives the derivative along the solutions of system (1).

\[
\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dt} = \begin{pmatrix}
-S^r & -E^{r} & A^{r} & -I^{r} & -Q^{r} \\
H^{r} & -R^{r} & ((B - B^{r}) dB \ dt)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

From (6) and (7), all solutions of system (1) satisfy \( N^r = N/ \mu \), \( B^r = mN/ \sigma \mu \), \( dN/ dt \leq \Lambda - \mu N \), \( dB/ dt \leq mN/ \mu - \sigma B \).

Thus, \( d\mathcal{L}/ dt \geq 0 \) and
\[
\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dt} = \begin{pmatrix}
-S^r & -E^{r} & A^{r} & -I^{r} & -Q^{r} \\
H^{r} & -R^{r} & ((B - B^{r}) dB \ dt)
\end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix}
-N^r (\Lambda - \mu N) + (B - B^{r}) dB \ dt \\
-N^r (\Lambda - \mu N) + (B - B^{r}) dB \ dt
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
Additionally, \( d\mathcal{L}/dt = 0 \) if and only if \( N = \Lambda/\mu \) and \( B = m\Lambda/\sigma \mu \) (or \( S = S^*, E = E^*, A = A^*, I = I^*, Q = Q^*, H = H^*, R = R^*, \) and \( B = B^* \)). Hence, \( \mathcal{L} \) is a Lyapunov function on \( \Omega \). The biggest compact invariant set of system (1) in the set \( \{S,E,A,I,Q,H,R,B\} \subseteq \Omega : \frac{dX}{dt} = 0 \) is a singleton \( \{X_1\} \). Then by LaSalle’s Invariance Principle [23], the endemic equilibrium \( X_1 \) is globally asymptotically stable in \( \Omega \) for \( R_0 > 1 \).

The proof of Theorem 2 is completed. \( \square \)

### F. Sensitivity Analysis for \( R_0 \)

The effect of model parameter values on the output value of \( R_0 \). Sensitivity analysis is used to measure how sensitive the basic reproduction number with respect to the model parameters. We perform the analysis by calculating the basic reproduction number is with respect to the model parameters.

We perform the analysis by calculating the sensitivity indices of \( R_0 \) to the parameters in the model using the approach of [24]. The sensitivity index is used to measure the spread of the initial disease and the relative change in \( R_0 \) if one parameter changes while other parameters remain. A sensitivity index on parameters with a high influence on \( R_0 \) can be used to target intervention in order to control disease transmission. The sensitivity index can also be computed using partial derivatives when a variable is differentiable function of a model parameter.

**Definition 1.** The normalized forward sensitivity index of a variable, \( R_0 \), that depends differentiably on index on parameter, \( c \) is defined as

\[
y_c = \frac{\partial R_0}{\partial c} \frac{c}{R_0}
\]

Using parameter values from Table I, we calculate the sensitivity indices of \( R_0 \) for all 18 parameters (\( \mu, \Lambda, \beta, \gamma, \eta, \rho, \gamma_1, \eta_2, \delta_1, \sigma, \beta_1, m_1, m_2, \theta, \delta_1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \kappa \) related to \( R_0 \). We performed a sensitivity analysis using (28) with these parameters. The parameters are ordered from most sensitive to least sensitive. In practice, the natural death rate, disease death rate, and recruitment rate are not easy to control, so from Table III, it is concluded that the most sensitive parameter is \( \beta \), followed by \( \gamma_1 \), and \( \eta_2 \). Fig. 2 depicts the sensitivity index values for all parameters in bar chart which corresponds to Table III.

In general, Table III indicates that by increasing one of the sensitivity indices with a positive sign (\( \Lambda, \beta, \eta, \rho, \gamma, \delta_1, \sigma, \beta_1, m_1, m_2, \theta, \delta_1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \kappa \)) the other parameters constant, the value of \( R_0 \) increases. This implies that they increase the endemicity of the disease. The value of \( R_0 \) decreases when one of the sensitivity indices with a negative sign (\( \mu, \gamma_1, \delta_1, \sigma, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \kappa \)) is increased while the other parameters remain constant. This means that they reduce the endemicity of the disease.

Table III shows that \( \beta \) represent the rate of transmission from the infected \( (A, I, H) \) to the susceptible and has a positive sensitivity index (+0.9218). This shows that an increase (or decrease) in \( \beta \) by 10% will be followed by an increase (or decrease) in \( R_0 \) by 9.218%.

On the other hand, \( \gamma_1 \) represents the rate of quarantine and has a negative sensitivity index (-0.7166). This shows that a change of 10% in \( \gamma_1 \) will be immediately followed by a change of 7.166% in the basic reproduction number \( R_0 \). The natural mortality rate \( (\mu) \) and the recruitment rate of susceptibles \( (\Lambda) \), respectively, are linked to and the highest sensitivity index, respectively. We cannot utilize these factors as control parameters since they are uncontrollable. The sensitivity index of the hospitalized rate
is -0.1870, which indicate that to reduce $R_0$ we need to increase the hospitalized rate. The sensitivity index of recovery from hospitalized class ($\gamma_2$) is -0.0799, which indicate that to reduce $R_0$ we need to increase the recovery from hospitalized class. The sensitivity index of the natural decay rate of viruses from the environment surfaces ($\sigma$) is +0.0782, which indicates that to reduce $R_0$ we need to decrease the natural decay rate of virus from the environment (surface). The sensitivity indices for $\gamma_2$ and $\sigma$ are relatively small, which indicate that they have no effect on $R_0$. The relationship between the basic reproduction number $R_0$, the transmission rate $\beta$, and the quarantined rate $\gamma_1$ is depicted in Fig. 3. According to Fig. 3, even if $\gamma_1$ is large, the basic reproduction number $R_0$ can be less than unit by decreasing the transmission rate $\beta$.

IV. OPTIMAL CONTROL

A. The Formulation of Optimal Control Problem

Previously, we analyzed the impact of control interventions at a constant rate. In this section, we formulate the optimal control problem for COVID-19 by including five time-dependent controls in system (1). The first control variable is the awareness of wearing a medical mask, staying at home, and washing their hands to prevent the spread of COVID-19, as denoted by $u_1$. The control variable $u_2$ is a control variable used to improve hospitalized patient care in terms of intense medical treatment to increase the recovery rate of hospitalized individuals. The control variable $u_3$ is surface disinfection, which is used to reduce the number of viruses on environmental surfaces. The controls are bounded between 0 and 1 in the intervention time interval $[0, T]$, where $T$ stands for the last time the controls were utilized. Thus, system (1) became

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= \Lambda - (1-u_1)\beta(\eta_A + I + \eta_H) + \beta BR - \mu S, \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= (1-u_1)\beta(\eta_A + I + \eta_H) + \beta BS - (\kappa + \mu)E, \\
\frac{dA}{dt} &= (1-p)\kappa E - (\gamma_1 + \mu)A, \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= p\kappa E - (\gamma_2 + \alpha_1 + \mu)I, \\
\frac{dQ}{dt} &= \gamma_1 A - (\theta + \delta_1 + \mu)Q, \\
\frac{dH}{dt} &= \gamma_2 E + \theta Q - (\delta_2 + u_2 + \alpha_2 + \mu)H, \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \delta_2 Q + (\delta_2 + u_3)H - \mu R, \\
\frac{dB}{dt} &= m_A + m_I - (\sigma + u_3)B.
\end{align*}
$$

Furthermore, it is also stated that there are bounds on the maximum rate of control measures in a given period.

B. Characterization of Optimal Control

Our goal is to minimize the number of infected humans (asymptomatic infected, symptomatic infected, hospitalized individuals), the pathogen population $B$ (the concentration of coronavirus in the environmental reservoir), and the costs required to control COVID-19 by applying these five measures. The Pontryagin maximal principle [25] provides the necessary conditions for optimal control. According to PMP, the optimal control problem with the objective function is given by

$$
J(u) = \int_0^T \left[ \int b_A A + b_B B + b_I I + b_H H + b_I I + (c_1 \mu_1 + c_2 \mu_2 + c_3 \mu_3) \right] dt
$$

where $b_j$, $j=1, 2, 3, 4$ are the balance of the cost size of reducing the disease transmission and $c_i, i=1, 2, 3$ are weights of the relative costs of the controls associated with the measures $u_1, u_2,$ and $u_3$ respectively. The goal is to create an optimal control, $u_1^*, u_2^*$, and $u_3^*$ such that

$$
J(u_1^*, u_2^*, u_3^*) = \min_{u_i} J(u_1(t), u_2(t), u_3(t)).
$$

where the control set is given by $U = \{u_i(t): 0 \leq u_i(t) \leq 1, i=1, 2, 3 \} \in [0, T]$.

We will also use system (1) to determine the existence of an optimal control with the necessary conditions that satisfy Pontryagin’s Maximum Principle [41]. The Pontryagin’s Maximum Principle converts (1)-(3) into a problem of minimizing a pointwise Hamiltonian function $H$ with respect to $u_i$ ($i=1, 2, 3$). The Lagrangian $L$ for the above optimal control system is defined as

$$
L = b_A I + b_B H + b_I I + b_H H + \frac{1}{2}(c_1 \mu_1 + c_2 \mu_2 + c_3 \mu_3)
$$

The Hamiltonian function $H$ is defined for all $t \in [0, T]$, as follows.

$$
H = b_A A + b_B B + b_I I + b_H H + \frac{1}{2}(c_1 \mu_1 + c_2 \mu_2 + c_3 \mu_3) + \lambda_\gamma (\Lambda - (1-u_1)\beta(\eta_A + I + \eta_H) + \beta BS - \mu S) + \lambda_\epsilon (1-u_1)\beta(\eta_A + I + \eta_H) + \beta BS - (\kappa + \mu)E + \lambda_\Delta (1-p)\kappa E - (\gamma_1 + \mu)A + \lambda_\delta p\kappa E - (\gamma_2 + \alpha_1 + \mu)I) + \lambda_\theta \gamma_1 A - (\theta + \delta_1 + \mu)Q + \lambda_\mu \gamma_2 E + \theta Q - (\delta_2 + u_2 + \alpha_2 + \mu)H) + \lambda_\kappa \delta_2 Q + (\delta_2 + u_3)H - \mu R + \lambda_\sigma (m_A + m_I - (\sigma + u_3)B)
$$

where $\lambda_\gamma, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_\Delta, \lambda_\delta, \lambda_\theta, \lambda_\mu, \lambda_\kappa, \lambda_\sigma,$ and $\lambda_\tau$ are the adjoint variables.

Next, we examine the preconditions that must be met in order for a solution to the optimal control problem for system (1) to exist.

**Theorem 3.** If $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*, u_3^*)$ is an optimal control and

$$
\left\{ S^*, E^*, A^*, I^*, Q^*, H^*, R^*, B^* \right\}
$$

are the solutions of the corresponding control system (1) that minimize the objective functional $J(u, u, u)$ over the control set $U$, then there exists an adjoint variable $\lambda_j$ for $j=S, E, A, I, Q, H, R, B$.
which satisfying
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)(1 - u_1)\beta(\eta_s A + I + \eta_r H) + \beta B + \lambda_e u,
\]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)(1 - u_1)\beta(\eta_s A + I + \eta_r H) + \beta B + \lambda_e u,
\]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = -b_1 + (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)(1 - u_1)\beta S + (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)\gamma_1
\]
\[+ \lambda_e (\sigma + u), \]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = \lambda_s u,
\]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = \lambda_s u,
\]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = -b_2 + (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)(1 - u_1)\beta S + (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)\gamma_2
\]
\[+ \lambda_e (\sigma + u), \]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)(1 - u_1)\beta S + (\lambda_s - \lambda_e)(\delta_2 + u_1)
\]
\[+ \lambda_e (\sigma + u), \]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = \lambda_s u,
\]
\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = \lambda_s u,
\]

with transversality condition
\[
\lambda_j(T) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j = S, E, A, I, Q, H, R, B
\] (35)

Furthermore, the associated optimal controls \(u_1^*, u_2^*, \) and \(u_3^*\) are given by
\[
u_1^* = \min \left\{1, \max \left\{ \left( \lambda_s - \lambda_e \right)\beta(\eta_s A + I + \eta_r H) + \beta B \right\} \right\}
\]
\[
\nu_2^* = \min \left\{1, \max \left\{ \left( \lambda_s - \lambda_e \right)^2 \right\} \right\}
\]
\[
\nu_3^* = \min \left\{1, \max \left\{ \frac{\lambda_s B}{c_3} \right\} \right\}
\] (36)

Proof. To determine whether optimal control exists, utilize the result from [26]. By differentiating the Hamiltonian function \(H\) in (33) with respect to the state variables \(S, E, A, I, Q, H, R, B\), we can obtain the adjoint equations (7.9) as follows:
\[
\frac{d\lambda_s}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dS}, \quad \lambda_s(T) = 0; \quad \frac{d\lambda_e}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dE}, \quad \lambda_e(T) = 0;
\]
\[
\frac{d\lambda_s}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dA}, \quad \lambda_s(T) = 0; \quad \frac{d\lambda_e}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dI}, \quad \lambda_e(T) = 0;
\]
\[
\frac{d\lambda_s}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dQ}, \quad \lambda_s(T) = 0; \quad \frac{d\lambda_e}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dH}, \quad \lambda_e(T) = 0;
\]
\[
\frac{d\lambda_s}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dR}, \quad \lambda_s(T) = 0; \quad \frac{d\lambda_e}{dt} = -\frac{dH}{dB}, \quad \lambda_e(T) = 0.
\] (37)

Finally, from common control arguments requiring bounds on the control, it follows that
\[
u_i^* = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
0 & \text{if } \tilde{u}_i < 0 \\
\tilde{u}_i & \text{if } 0 \leq \tilde{u}_i \leq 1 \\
1 & \text{if } \tilde{u}_i > 1
\end{array} \right.
\] (40)
where \(i = 1, 2, 3\). As a result, the characterization in (36) can be derived.

The proof of Theorem 3 is completed. \(\square\)

V. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

A. Optimal Control Simulation

Using the parameter values in Table II, we can directly calculate the basic reproduction number \(R_0 = 1.433105\), indicating that the system has a globally asymptotically stable \(E_1 = (5.131228 \times 10^6, 1466.7, 797.5, 95.3, 1651.1, 104.5, 8.9562 \times 10^6, 327.4)\) equilibrium point. In this section, we perform only four numerical simulations of seven possible combinations of three intervention strategies \((u_1, u_2, \text{ and } u_3)\) to explore the most effective intervention strategies.

With appropriate lower and upper bounds for the control and initial conditions for the state variables, the constraint system (29) and adjoint system (34) are solved forward in time and backward in time, respectively.

This simulation known as fourth-order Runge-Kutta forward-backward sweep simulation. For simulation purposes, we used the initial conditions \(S(0) = 30,416,000, E(0) = 15, A(0) = 15, I(0) = 12, Q(0) = 5, H(0) = 0, R(0) = 0, \) and \(B(0) = 0\), together with the parameter values listed in Table I. The weight and cost associated with the objective function (5.2) are assumed to be \(c_1 = 20, c_2 = 100, c_3 = 20\). The lower and upper bounds for the controls \((u_1, u_2, \text{ and } u_3)\) are assumed to be 0 and 1.

We consider and compare three control intervention schemes: a double control implementation and three control implementations combined. Thus, the simulations of optimal control are divided into four strategies: the use of a combination of \(u_1, u_2\) (Strategy A), the use of a control combination of \(u_1, u_3\) (Strategy B), the use of a
combination of \( u_2 \) and \( u_3 \) (Strategy C), and the use of a combination of \( u_5 \), \( u_5 \), and \( u_3 \) (Strategy D).

The following four scenarios were considered for numerical simulations:

**Strategy A. The Use of a Combination of \( u_2 \) and \( u_3 \)**

Fig. 4 presents the numerical simulation with the implementation of the combination of two controls \( u_2 \) (the awareness about medical masks, staying at home, and hand washing) and \( u_3 \) (the intense medical treatment). Fig. 4 (a-b) demonstrates that the optimal control Strategy A can reduce the total number of infections averted \((A + I + H)\) and the number of viruses on environmental surfaces \((B)\) compared to not using the optimal control Strategy A. Figure 4 (c) depicts the control profile for this strategy. It can be seen that the usage of the awareness about medical mask, stay at home, and hand washing (\( u_2 \)) measures needs to be optimally practiced (100%) for about the first 61 days and then gradually decrease to zero (lower bound). The usage of control \( u_3 \) (the intense medical treatment) was 0.16 at the start of the control period and then gradually decreased to the lower bound.

**Strategy B. The Use of a Combination of \( u_2 \) and \( u_3 \)**

Fig. 5 shows the numerical simulation with the implementation of the combination of two controls, namely, the awareness about medical mask, stay at home, and hand washing (\( u_2 \)) and the surface disinfection (\( u_3 \)). According to Fig. 5(a-b), the use of Strategy B is the same as the simulation results by strategy A. The control profile for Strategy B is shown in Figure 5(c). It is observed that the controls \( u_2 \) and \( u_3 \) are kept 100% for the first 61 and 3 days of COVID-19 pandemic, respectively.

**Strategy C. The Use of a Combination of \( u_2 \) and \( u_3 \)**

Fig. 6 presents the numerical simulation with the implementation of the combination of two controls \( u_2 \) (the intense medical treatment) and \( u_3 \) (the surface disinfection). Figs. 6(a) and 6(b) demonstrate that the optimal control Strategy A can reduce the total number of infections averted and the number of viruses on environmental surfaces \((B)\) compared to not using the optimal control Strategy A. Figure 6(c) depicts the control profile for this strategy. It can be seen that the usage of awareness about medical masks, staying at home, and hand washing (\( u_2 \)).

**Strategy D. The Use of a Combination of \( u_5 \), \( u_2 \), and \( u_3 \)**

Fig. 7 shows the implementation of the combination of three controls: public health education or awareness about medical masks, staying at home, and hand washing (\( u_5 \)), intense medical treatment (\( u_3 \)), and surface disinfection (\( u_3 \)). Figures 7(a-b) show that the total number of infections averted and the number of viruses on environmental surfaces removed by Strategy D are the same as the simulation results for strategy A or B. The control profile for Strategy D is shown in Figure 7 (c). It can be seen that the usage of this strategy should be maintained at optimally practiced levels for controls \( u_2 \) and \( u_3 \), respectively, at 61 and 3.3 days. After which, at the end of the control period, it progressively declined to zero. Comparatively, control \( u_2 \) was 0.15 at the start of the control period before gradually dropping to the lower bound.

**B. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis**

In this session, cost-effectiveness analysis is used to evaluate and determine the most effective and cost-effective strategy from four competing strategies (A, B, C, and D). To examine the variations in health costs and results of alternative solutions for the same finite resources, we employ two methods of implementation: ICER, or incremental cost-effectiveness ratio and ACER, or average cost-effectiveness ratio.

The definitions of ICER for the two strategies \( i \) and \( j \) and ACER for strategy \( k \) are given as follows [19]:

\[
\text{ICER} = \frac{\text{Difference in total costs of strategies } i \text{ and } j}{\text{Difference in total number of infectious averted of strategies } i \text{ and } j} \tag{41}
\]

\[
\text{ACER} = \frac{\text{Total costs invested on the intervention}}{\text{Total number of infections averted using the intervention}} \tag{42}
\]

The numerator of ICER in (41) consists of the differences in intervention cost, cost of disease averted, and cost of prevented cases. While the ICER denominator in (41) evaluates the difference in health outcomes, including the total number of infectious diseases averted (the differences between infectious disease individuals without and with control measures), the total number of infectious diseases averted (TA) and viral loads eliminated (TV) with the strategy \( i \) used over a specified time period were calculated using the formula

\[
TA(i) = \int_0^T (X - X) \, dt \quad \text{and} \quad TV(i) = \int_0^T (B - B) \, dt
\]

Variable \( X \) is the number of the infectious individuals \((A, I, H)\) without controls and \( X \) is the number of the infectious individuals \((A', I', H')\) with

**Table II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value (day(^{-1}))</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Lambda )</td>
<td>271.23</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( 6.038 \times 10^8 )</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_i )</td>
<td>( 1.03 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu )</td>
<td>( 3.01 \times 10^{-1} )</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta )</td>
<td>0.6323</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_2 )</td>
<td>0.5642</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>0.0268</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>0.1849</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_1 )</td>
<td>0.3309</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_2 )</td>
<td>0.0714</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_1 )</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_2 )</td>
<td>0.3219</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>0.3117</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>0.0169</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_1 )</td>
<td>0.0178</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_2 )</td>
<td>0.9215</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
controls. $B$ and $B^*$ are the viral load on surfaces in the environment without and with controls, respectively.

Furthermore, the formula that defines the total cost (TC) for implementing optimal control for a strategy $i$ is

$$ TC(i) = \int_0^T \left( c \mu^2_1 + c \mu^2_2 + c \mu^3_1 \right) dt. $$

Table III shows the total number of infectious diseases averted, the total number of viruses on the surface, the total cost, and the objective values of the various strategies. This table shows the total number of infections averted after implementing different control strategies in ascending order, ordered in terms of the mean total number of diseases prevented and the total viral load removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>TA (infections)</th>
<th>TV (viruses)</th>
<th>TC (cost)</th>
<th>$J$ (value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.072E+07</td>
<td>1.409E+07</td>
<td>4199.400</td>
<td>8.135E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.764E+07</td>
<td>1.856E+07</td>
<td>635.124</td>
<td>1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.764E+07</td>
<td>1.856E+07</td>
<td>747.778</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.764E+07</td>
<td>1.856E+07</td>
<td>752.126</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Numerical simulation with the implementation of controls $u_1$ and $u_2$.

Fig. 5. Numerical simulation with the implementation of controls $u_1$ and $u_2$.  

The overall number of infectious diseases avoided, the total number of viruses on the surface, the total cost, and the objective values of the various techniques are all displayed. The lowest cost value is associated with the control implementation utilizing strategy C, which is followed by strategy A in Table III. On the other hand, the control application using strategy D (or B) has the highest cost value and the lowest objective value.

To incrementally compare the two competing strategies, the ICER for strategies C and A is calculated using the ICER formula (41) as follows:

\[
\text{ICER}(C) = \frac{4.199 \times 10^3 + 3.92 \times 10^4}{1.072 \times 10^7} = 3.92 \times 10^4 \\
\text{ICER}(A) = \frac{635.1245 - 4199.4}{8.764 \times 10^7 - 1.072 \times 10^7} = -4.63 \times 10^{-5}.
\]

From Table IV, it can be seen that ICER (C) has a higher value than ICER (A). This means that using the combination of two controls \(u_2\) (the intense medical treatment) and \(u_3\) (the surface disinfection). Thus, strategy C is excluded from the list of potential control interventions competing for the same limited resources, and then we compare control intervention strategies A and B using a similar procedure, as shown in Table V.

Note that, because the total number of infections averted by the three competing strategies A, B, and D is the same, the ICER for those methods does not need to be recalculated. This cost analysis method states that the most cost-effective option is the one with the lowest ACER value. Table V shows that implementing Strategy A is the most economically advantageous option, followed by Strategy B and lastly Strategy D. The outcome is inconsistent with strategy B’s (or D’s) objective function value, which is the lowest of the four strategies.

Therefore, in this study, strategy A, which combines of two controls \(u_1\) (awareness about medical masks, staying at home, and hand washing) and \(u_2\) (the intense medical treatment), is considered to be the most economically sound option. From numerical simulation and the cost-effectiveness analysis for the four optimum control strategies, it was discovered that when the four control strategies were compared. In the absence of immunization, Strategy A (using physical or social distancing protocols) was the most cost-effective and effective control intervention. However, we observe that techniques A, B, and D are similarly effective at containing COVID-19 in terms of infection prevention.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

In this study, we create and examine a mathematical model of COVID-19 transmission that incorporates public health education (awareness about medical masks, staying at home, and hand washing), intense medical treatment, and surface disinfection interventions is created and examined.
In the first part, we perform a theoretical analysis of the model, including the positivity and boundedness of the solution using differential equation theory, establishing two equilibrium points (disease-free and endemic), determining the basic reproduction number via the generation matrix approach, demonstrating the disease-free equilibrium point and endemic equilibrium point are global stable by building the Lyapunov function, and using the Lasalle invariant principle. Then the model was developed by adding three control variables: public health education ($u_1$), intense medical treatment ($u_2$), and surface disinfectant ($u_3$). Three control expressions are produced using Pontryagin’s maximal principle.

In the second part, we run numerical simulations. Through sensitivity analysis, the sensitivity index for each parameter to the basic reproduction number is obtained. Next, employing the fourth-order Runge-Kutta numerical scheme and the forward-backwards sweep method. We tried out the four different strategies and checked what happened and obtained the four optimal strategies, which were visually demonstrated in the form of plots of total infected cases, virus on the surface, and control profiles for each strategy. The four optimal strategies were then analyzed using average cost-effectiveness ratio (ACER) and cost-effectiveness analysis (ICER), yielding three final strategies, namely, Strategy A (a combination of the public health education and the intense medical treatment), Strategy B (a combination of the public health education and the surface disinfectant), and Strategy D (a combination of three controls) with the same number of averted infections. As a result, the total cost value and the objective function value of the strategy are utilized to determine which is most effective, with strategy A being the most effective. However, we found that, in terms of preventing infection, Strategies A, B, and D were similarly successful in containing COVID-19.

This study suggests that future research should consider extending the model to account for the impact of vaccination on reducing the number of COVID-19 cases and develop strategies that are cost-effective and low-impact. Further studies using appropriate factual data sets are encouraged to have a better understanding of the dynamics of disease transmission.
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