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ABSTRACT – Covid-19 is an ongoing pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2. Some interventions are implemented to control the spread of the disease. In Indonesia, there is a campaign related to non-pharmaceutical approach called 3M. This campaign is carried out so that people use masks, wash their hands, and keep their distance. In this paper, we propose a mathematical model considering non-pharmaceutical interventions and indirect transmission. The non-pharmaceutical interventions studied are the implementation of mask-wearing, handwashing, and social distancing. The model is presented as a system of first-order differential equations. The basic reproduction number is determined. The system has two equilibrium points, namely the disease-free equilibrium point and the endemic equilibrium point. The local stability condition of the disease-free equilibrium point is proved using the Lienard-Chipart criterion. Center manifold theory is used to prove the local stability condition of the endemic equilibrium point. We also study the optimal control strategy related to mask-wearing, handwashing, and social distancing. Furthermore, cost-effectiveness analysis of intervention strategies is also conducted by studying the average cost-effectiveness ratio of each intervention strategy. Our results show that the most effective strategy to control covid-19 spread is the combination of mask-wearing, handwashing, and social distancing. Moreover, the most cost-effective strategy is mask-wearing intervention. Global sensitivity analysis is performed by studying the partial rank correlation coefficient. The results show that mask-wearing intervention is the most influential intervention on basic reproduction number compared to social distancing and handwashing.

INTRODUCTION

Covid-19 is an ongoing pandemic which is caused by SARS-CoV-2 infection [1]. At the end of December 2019, Wuhan Health Commission reported the outbreak of unknown pneumonia [2]. However, the cases occur since December 8, 2019 in Wuhan, China [1]. It is stated that this disease is the third coronavirus crisis since 2002 [2]. SARS-CoV-2 belongs to the Coronaviridae family [3]. It is well known that coronavirus primarily targets human respiratory system [4]. SARS-CoV-2 is highly infectious and has spread to no less than 200 countries. This is the reason why WHO stated that covid-19 is a global threat (pandemic) [5].

In the beginning of the outbreak, it is believed that the transmission occurs from infected animal to human. However, it is now clear that the transmission occurs due to close contact or exposure to virus [3]. The transmission caused by sneezing, coughing, and sometimes talking is classified as direct transmission [6]. To reduce covid-19 spread, social distancing should be practiced [1], [5]. Ong et al. [7] and Wu et al. [8] stated that contaminated environment with infected person’s droplet potentially becomes a medium of transmission. Based on this information, the transmission may occur even though there is no direct interaction between infected person and uninfected person. Therefore, we can say that this transmission mechanism is indirect transmission. To reduce covid-19 transmission, some researchers have recommended that we should not touch our eyes, mouth, and nose with unwashed hand [5]. In addition, the infected individuals should cover their mouth and nose by using tissue or mask [3].

One of the covid-19 mathematical models proposed in the beginning of the outbreak is discussed in [9]. The authors investigate the impact of mask use in reducing covid-19 burden. Mathematical model related covid-19 are also discussed in [10]–[18]. Several models proposed in these papers do not take into account the indirect transmission. The impact of non-pharmaceutical aproach on the spread of covid-19 is discussed in [11], [12], [15], [18]. Some of these papers also present optimal control problem [11-14], [16], [18].

In this paper, we propose covid-19 model considering mask-wearing, handwashing, social distancing, direct and indirect transmission. The main objectives of this work are to investigate the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on the spread of covid-19 when direct and indirect transmission are considered. To further explore the impact of indirect transmission of covid-19 and the effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions, in this article, we discuss a cost-effectiveness analysis and global sensitivity analysis. Cost-effectiveness analysis is carried out by calculating the average cost-effectiveness ratio (ACER) of each intervention. The method given in [19] is used in performing the global sensitivity analysis.
analysis. The paper is established as follows. The model construction is discussed in section 2. In section 3 and section 4, we present the basic properties of our proposed model and the basic reproduction number obtained, respectively. Stability analysis is discussed in section 5. In section 6, we study the optimal control problem of proposed model. Numerical simulation results for optimal control problem, cost-effectiveness analysis, and global sensitivity analysis are presented in section 7.

MODEL CONSTRUCTION

In this section, we describe the model construction process. Firstly, we divide the human population into four compartments, namely susceptible human \((S)\), latent human \((L)\), infectious human \((I)\), and recovered human \((R)\). \(V\) represents SARS-CoV-2 on the surface of objects. The schematic diagram can be seen in Figure 1.
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The reduction in the number of susceptible humans happens due to direct and indirect transmission. We assume that direct transmission is affected by social distancing and indirect transmission is affected by handwashing. The dynamic of susceptible human compartment is represented by the following ordinary differential equation.

\[
\frac{dS}{dt} = \Omega - (1-u_1)\beta_1 SI - (1-u_2)\beta_2 SV - \mu_h S,
\]

where \(\Omega\) is recruitment rate of susceptible humans, \(u_1\) is proportion of susceptible humans who implement social distancing, \(u_2\) is proportion of susceptible humans who implement handwashing, \(\beta_1\) is transmission rate from infectious humans to susceptible humans, \(\beta_2\) is infection rate of viruses, and \(\mu_h\) is the natural death rate of human. Susceptible humans who are infected through direct transmission or indirect transmission become latent humans. After completing the latent period, the latent humans leave latent human compartment and move to infectious human compartment. Further, latent humans are also reduced due to natural death. The dynamics of latent human compartment is described by the following differential equation.

\[
\frac{dL}{dt} = (1-u_1)\beta_1 SI + (1-u_2)\beta_2 SV - \gamma L - \mu_h L,
\]

where \(\gamma = \frac{1}{\text{Latent period}}\). Infectious humans who have recovered leave the infectious human compartment and move to the recovered human compartment. Thus, the dynamic of infectious human compartment is represented by the following equation.

\[
\frac{dI}{dt} = \gamma L - \sigma I - \mu_h I,
\]

where \(\sigma\) is recovery rate. The recovered human compartment dynamics is described by

\[
\frac{dR}{dt} = \sigma I - \mu_h R.
\]

The increase in the number of SARS-CoV-2 in the environment occurs due to droplets released by infectious humans. Therefore, the amount of virus released by infectious humans is affected by the use of masks. Further, the amount of virus on the surface of the object is reduced due to the natural death of the virus \((\mu_v)\). Therefore, the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 on the surface of objects is represented by equation

\[
\frac{dV}{dt} = \beta_3 SI - \mu_v V,
\]
where \( u_i \) is the proportion of infectious human who use mask and \( \alpha \) is the average amount of SARS-CoV-2 released by one infectious person per day. Therefore, the model obtained from the model construction process above is expressed as

\[
\frac{dV}{dt} = (1-u_3)\alpha I - \mu V,
\]

where \( u_3, u_2, u_1 \in [0,1) \), \( \Omega > 0 \), and the other parameters are positive. We assume that the control parameter never reaches 1 because there are always groups of people who are ignorant of the appeal to use masks, wash hands, and keep a distance.

**BASIC PROPERTIES AND EQUILIBRIUM POINTS**

In this section, we present the basic properties and equilibrium points of system (1).

**Theorem 1.** If initial values given are non-negative, then the solutions of system (1) are non-negative and bounded.

**Proof.** Firstly, we show that the invariant region of system (1) is \( \mathbb{R}^5_+ \). From system (1), we get

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dS}{dt} & = \Omega - (1-u_1)\beta_1 SI - (1-u_2)\beta_2 SV - \mu S, \\
\frac{dL}{dt} & = (1-u_1)\beta_1 SI + (1-u_2)\beta_2 SV - \gamma L - \mu L, \\
\frac{dI}{dt} & = \gamma L - \sigma I - \mu I, \\
\frac{dR}{dt} & = \sigma I - \mu R, \\
\frac{dV}{dt} & = (1-u_3)\alpha I - \mu V,
\end{align*}
\]

(1)

where \( u_1, u_2, u_3 \in [0,1) \), \( \Omega > 0 \), and the other parameters are positive. We assume that the control parameter never reaches 1 because there are always groups of people who are ignorant of the appeal to use masks, wash hands, and keep a distance.

Since \( \frac{dx_i}{dt} \geq 0 \) for \( x_i = 0 \) and \( x_{j \neq i} \geq 0 \) where \( i, j = 1,2,3,4,5 \), \( x_1 = S, x_2 = L, x_3 = I, x_4 = R, x_5 = V \), based on Lemma 2 in [20], we conclude that \( \mathbb{R}^5_+ \) is invariant set of system (1). It is indicated that the solutions of system (1) are in \( \mathbb{R}^5_+ \) if initial conditions given are in \( \mathbb{R}^5_+ \). Hence, if initial values given are non-negative, then the solutions of system (1) are non-negative.

Now we prove that the solutions of system (1) are bounded if initial values given are non-negative. We already stated that human population is divided into four disjoint compartments, i.e. \( S, L, I, R \). Hence, we get \( N = S + L + I + R \), where \( N \) is the total number of human. From the first four equations of system (1), we have

\[
\frac{dN}{dt} = \Omega - \mu h N.
\]

(2)

It clear that (2) is the first-order linear differential equation. After solving (2), we have \( N(t) \leq \frac{\Omega}{\mu h} \). This result implies that \( I(t) \leq \frac{\Omega}{\mu h} \). From the last equation of system (1), we have
\[ \frac{dV}{dt} = (1-u_3)\alpha I - \mu_h V \]

\[ \leq (1-u_3)\frac{\Omega}{\mu_h} - \mu_h V. \]

Based on Gronwall inequality, it is proved that \( V \) is bounded, i.e., \( V(t) \leq \frac{(1-u_3)\alpha \Omega}{\mu_h \mu_h V} \). The proof is completed. \( \Box \)

To determine the equilibrium points, we set the left hand side of system (1) equal to zero and determine the resulted system solutions. There are two equilibrium points of the system, i.e., disease-free equilibrium point \( \Gamma_0 = (S^*, L^*, I^*, R^*, V^*) = \left( \Omega \gamma/\mu_h, 0, 0, 0, 0 \right) \) and endemic equilibrium point \( \Gamma_1 = (S^{**}, L^{**}, I^{**}, R^{**}, V^{**}) \), where

\[ S^{**} = \frac{\Omega \gamma - (y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)I^{**}}{\mu_h \gamma}, \]

\[ L^{**} = \frac{(\sigma + \mu_h)I^{**}}{\gamma}, \]

\[ I^{**} = \frac{(R_e - 1)\mu_h \mu_h (y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)}{(1-u_1)\beta_1(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h) + (1-u_2)\beta_2(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)}, \]

\[ R^{**} = \frac{\sigma I^{**}}{\mu_h}, \]

\[ V^{**} = \frac{(1-u_1)\alpha I^{**}}{\mu_v}, \]

\[ R_e = \frac{(1-u_1)\beta_1\Omega \gamma}{\mu_h(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)} + \frac{(1-u_2)\beta_2(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)}{\mu_h \mu_v(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)}. \]

It is easy to see that \( \Gamma_0 \) always exists in \( R_{S0}^3 \). Furthermore, \( \Gamma_1 \) exists in \( R_{S0}^5 \) if \( R_e > 1 \). In the next section we show that the existence condition of \( \Gamma_1 \) is totally dependent on the basic reproduction number.

**BASIC REPRODUCTION NUMBER**

The reproduction number is obtained using next generation matrix described in [21]. The infected compartments are \( L, I, V \). Hence, we get the following next-generation matrix

\[
FV^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}
(1-u_1)\beta_1\Omega \\
\mu_h(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h) + (1-u_2)\beta_2(1-u_3)\alpha \Omega \gamma \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The characteristic polynomial of \( FV^{-1} \) is

\[ P(\lambda) = \lambda^5 \left( \lambda - \left( \frac{(1-u_1)\beta_1\Omega \gamma}{\mu_h(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)} + \frac{(1-u_2)\beta_2(1-u_3)\alpha \Omega \gamma}{\mu_h \mu_v(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)} \right) \right). \]

Following [21], the reproduction number is given by

\[ R_0 = R_0^a + R_0^b, \]

where

\[ R_0^a = \frac{(1-u_1)\beta_1\Omega \gamma}{\mu_h(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)}, \quad R_0^b = \frac{(1-u_2)\beta_2(1-u_3)\alpha \Omega \gamma}{\mu_h \mu_v(y + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)}. \]
Notice that the basic reproduction number consists of two terms. The first term \( R_0^c \) relates to direct transmission by infectious humans while the second term \( R_0^d \) relates to indirect transmission that occurs due to the presence of viruses on the surface of objects. The first term denotes the secondary case produced by an infectious human during his infectious period. Meanwhile, the second term represents the secondary case produced by the virus during its lifetime on the surface of the object. It is clear that \( R_c = R_0^c \). Hence, \( \Gamma_1 \) exists in \( R_0^c > 0 \) if \( R_0 > 1 \).

**STABILITY ANALYSIS**

**Theorem 2.** If \( R_0 < 1 \) then \( \Gamma_0 \) is locally asymptotically stable. If \( R_0 = 1 \) then one eigenvalue of Jacobian matrix of system (1) at \( \Gamma_0 \) is zero. If \( R_0 > 1 \) then \( \Gamma_0 \) is unstable.

**Proof.** The Jacobian matrix of system (1) at \( \Gamma_0 \) is given by

\[
J(\Gamma_0) = \begin{pmatrix}
-\mu_h & 0 & -(1-u_1)\beta_1 S^* & 0 & -(1-u_2)\beta_2 S^* \\
0 & -\gamma + \mu_h & -(1-u_1)\beta_1 S^* & 0 & -(1-u_2)\beta_2 S^* \\
0 & \gamma & -(\sigma + \mu_h) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \sigma & -\mu_h & 0 \\
0 & 0 & (1-u_1)\alpha & 0 & -\mu_v \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The characteristic equation of \( J(\Gamma_0) \) is

\[
H(\lambda) = (\lambda + \mu_h)^2 H_1(\lambda),
\]

where

\[
H_1(\lambda) = \lambda^3 + h_1\lambda^2 + h_2\lambda + h_3,
\]

\[
h_1 = (\gamma + \mu_h) + (\sigma + \mu_h) + \mu_v,
\]

\[
h_2 = (\gamma + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)\left(\mu_v + 1 - R_0^d\right),
\]

\[
h_3 = (1 - R_0^d)\mu_v(\gamma + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h).
\]

Notice that \( J(\Gamma_0) \) has two negative eigenvalues i.e. \( \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = -\mu_h \). Since \( u_1,u_2,u_3 \in (0,1) \) and the other parameters are positive, it is clear that \( R_0^c,R_0^d > 0 \). Hence, \( R_0 < 1 \) implies \( R_0^c,R_0^d < 1 \). Thus, if \( R_0 < 1 \) then \( h_1,h_2,h_3 > 0 \). Obviously, if \( R_0 > 1 \) then there is a sign change in the sequence of \( H_1(\lambda) \) coefficient. Hence, based on Descartes’ sign rule [22], there is a positive eigenvalue if \( R_0 > 1 \). Thus, \( \Gamma_0 \) is unstable if \( R_0 > 1 \).

We observe that if \( R_0 = 1 \) then \( h_3 = 0 \). This result suggests that \( J(\Gamma_0) \) has simple zero eigenvalue if \( R_0 = 1 \). Now, we use Lienard-Chipart criterion to prove the local stability condition of \( \Gamma_0 \). Based on Lienard-Chipart criterion [23], \( \Gamma_0 \) is locally asymptotically stable if \( h_1 > 0,h_2 - h_3 > 0,h_3 > 0 \). Clearly, \( h_1 > 0 \). Moreover, if \( R_0 < 1 \) then \( h_3 > 0 \). We can show that \( h_1h_2 - h_3 > 0 \) that is

\[
h_1h_2 - h_3 = ((\gamma + \mu_h) + (\sigma + \mu_h))\left((\mu_v + 1 - R_0^d)\right)(\gamma + \mu_h)(\sigma + \mu_h)
\]

\[
+ \mu_v^2((\gamma + \mu_h) + (\sigma + \mu_h) + (1-u_3)\alpha\gamma(1-u_2))\beta_2 S^*.
\]

Certainly, if \( R_0 < 1 \) then \( h_1h_2 - h_3 > 0 \). Therefore, based on Lienard-Chipart criterion [23], if \( R_0 < 1 \) then \( \Gamma_0 \) is locally asymptotically stable. \( \square \)

**Theorem 3.** The endemic equilibrium point \( \Gamma_1 \) is locally asymptotically stable if \( R_0 > 1 \).

**Proof.** It has been shown that \( J(\Gamma_0) \) has simple zero eigenvalue if \( R_0 = 1 \). Therefore, we can use the method proposed in [24] to prove that there is a positive equilibrium point which is locally asymptotically stable when \( R_0 > 1 \). Based on Theorem 2, \( R_0 = 1 \) is a critical point of stability of the disease-free equilibrium point because one of the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of the system at \( \Gamma_0 \) is 0. Firstly, we choose \( \beta \) as bifurcation parameter. It is easy to show that critical point of \( \beta \) that is equivalent to \( R_0 = 1 \) is
\[
\beta^*_i = (1 - R^*_0) \left( \frac{\gamma + \mu_h}{\sigma + \mu_h} \mu_h \mu_i \right) \left( \frac{\gamma + \mu_h}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right) \Omega.
\]

It is easy to check that \( J(\Gamma_0, \beta^*_i) \) has simple zero eigenvalue. Next, we determine the left eigenvector \( v \) and right eigenvector \( w \) of \( J(\Gamma_0, \beta^*_i) \) corresponding to zero eigenvalue. We get

\[
v_1 = 0, \quad \quad w_1 = -\left( \frac{(1-u_1) \beta^*_i S^* \mu_i + (1-u_2) \beta^*_i S^* (1-u_3) \alpha}{\mu_h \mu_i (\sigma + \mu_h)} \right) \gamma w_2,
\]

\[
v_2 = \frac{\gamma v_3}{\gamma + \mu_h}, \quad \quad w_2 = w_2,
\]

\[
v_3 = v_3, \quad \quad w_3 = \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h},
\]

\[
v_4 = 0, \quad \quad w_4 = \frac{\sigma \gamma w_2}{\mu_h (\sigma + \mu_h)},
\]

\[
v_5 = \frac{(1-u_2) \beta^*_i S^* \gamma v_3}{\mu_i (\gamma + \mu_h)}, \quad \quad w_5 = \frac{(1-u_2) \gamma \sigma w_2}{\mu_i (\sigma + \mu_h)},
\]

where \( v_3 \) is arbitrarily positive and \( w_2 \) is determined when \( \bar{v} \bar{w} = 1 \). It is straightforward to show that \( w_2 > 0 \). Before applying theorem 4.1 in [24], we set \( x_1 = S, x_2 = L, x_3 = I, x_4 = R, x_5 = V \) and \( \frac{dx_i}{dt} = f_i \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \). Hence, we get

\[
v_2 w_1 w_3 \frac{\partial^2 f_2 (\Gamma_0, \beta^*_i)}{\partial \Gamma \partial x_3} = -\left( \frac{\gamma v_3}{\gamma + \mu_h} \right) \left( \frac{(1-u_1) \beta^*_i S^* \mu_i + (1-u_2) \beta^*_i S^* (1-u_3) \alpha}{\mu_h \mu_i (\sigma + \mu_h)} \right) \gamma w_2 \left\langle \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right\rangle \beta^*_i < 0,
\]

\[
v_2 w_1 w_2 \frac{\partial^2 f_2 (\Gamma_0, \beta^*_i)}{\partial \Gamma \partial x_1} = -\left( \frac{\gamma v_3}{\gamma + \mu_h} \right) \left( \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right) \left( \frac{(1-u_1) \beta^*_i S^* \mu_i + (1-u_2) \beta^*_i S^* (1-u_3) \alpha}{\mu_h \mu_i (\sigma + \mu_h)} \right) \gamma w_2 \left\langle \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right\rangle \beta^*_i < 0,
\]

\[
v_2 w_3 \frac{\partial^2 f_2 (\Gamma_0, \beta^*_i)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta} = \left( \frac{\gamma v_3}{\gamma + \mu_h} \right) \left( \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right) \Omega \mu_h > 0.
\]

These results imply

\[
a = \sum_{i,j=1}^{5} v_i w_i \frac{\partial^2 f_1 (\Gamma_0, \beta^*_i)}{\partial \Gamma \partial x_j} = \left( \frac{\gamma v_3}{\gamma + \mu_h} \right) \left( \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right) \Omega \mu_h \left\langle \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right\rangle \beta^*_i < 0,
\]

\[
a = \sum_{i,j=1}^{5} v_i w_i \frac{\partial^2 f_1 (\Gamma_0, \beta^*_i)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta} = \left( \frac{\gamma v_3}{\gamma + \mu_h} \right) \left( \frac{\gamma w_2}{\sigma + \mu_h} \right) \Omega \mu_h > 0.
\]

Based on Theorem 4.1 in [24], forward bifurcation occurs at \( \beta^*_1 \) which is equivalent to \( R_0 = 1 \). Therefore, it is proved that \( \Gamma_1 \) is locally asymptotically stable if \( R_0 > 1 \). □

**OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS**

In this section, we study optimal control strategy with \( u_1, u_2, u_3 \) as the control parameters. Our optimal control model is system (1). Our objective is to minimize the number of linfected humans (latent human + infectious human) and the number of SARS-CoV-2 on the surface of objects. Furthermore, we also want to minimize the intervention cost related to mask-wearing, handwashing, and social distancing. Therefore, we choose the following objective function.
\[ F(L, I, V, u_1, u_2, u_3) = \int_0^T G \, dt, \]

where \( G = D_1 L + D_2 I + D_3 V + D_4 u_1^2 + D_5 u_2^2 + D_6 u_3^2 \). \( D_1, D_2, \) and \( D_3 \) are balancing cost factor for handling latent human, infectious human, and SARS-CoV-2 on the surface of objects, respectively. Meanwhile, \( D_4, D_5, D_6 \) are costs of implementing control \( u_1, u_2, \) and \( u_3 \), respectively.

The hamiltonian function is given by

\[
H(L, I, R, V, u_1, u_2, u_3) = G + k_1 \frac{dS}{dt} + k_2 \frac{dL}{dt} + k_3 \frac{dH}{dt} + k_4 \frac{dR}{dt} + k_5 \frac{dV}{dt} \\
= D_1 L + D_2 I + D_3 V + D_4 u_1^2 + D_5 u_2^2 + D_6 u_3^2 \\
+ k_1 (\Omega - (1 - u_1) \beta IS - (1 - u_2) \beta IS - \mu L) \\
+ k_2 ((1 - u_1) \beta SI + (1 - u_2) \beta SI - \gamma L - \mu I) \\
+ k_3 (\beta I - \mu I) \\
+ k_4 (\sigma I - \mu R) \\
+ k_5 ((1 - u_3) \alpha I - \mu V),
\]

Thus, the control system is given by (1), while the adjoint system is as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dk_1}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial S} = (k_1 - k_2)(1 - u_1) \beta I + (k_1 - k_2)(1 - u_2) \beta I + k_1 \mu, \\
\frac{dk_2}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial L} = -D_1 + k_2 (\gamma + \mu) - k_3 \gamma, \\
\frac{dk_3}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial I} = -D_2 + k_1 (1 - u_1) \beta SI - k_2 (1 - u_1) \beta SI + k_3 (\sigma + \mu) - k_5 (1 - u_3) \alpha, \\
\frac{dk_4}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial R} = k_4 \mu, \\
\frac{dk_5}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial V} = -D_3 + k_1 (1 - u_2) \beta SI - k_2 (1 - u_2) \beta SI + k_5 \mu, 
\end{align*}
\]

where \( k_i(T) = 0 \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \). Suppose \( u_j \in [0, u_j^{\max}] \) for \( j = 1, 2, 3 \). Solving \( \frac{\partial H}{\partial u_j} = 0 \) gives the optimal value of control parameters as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
u_1^* &= \min \left\{ \max \left\{ 0, \frac{(k_2 - k_1) \beta SI}{2D_4} \right\}, u_1^{\max} \right\}, \\
u_2^* &= \min \left\{ \max \left\{ 0, \frac{(k_2 - k_1) \beta SI}{2D_5} \right\}, u_2^{\max} \right\}, \\
u_3^* &= \min \left\{ \max \left\{ 0, \frac{k_5 \alpha I}{2D_6} \right\}, u_3^{\max} \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Following [25], in this article, we use \( E \) to measure the effectiveness of each intervention strategy.

\[
E = 1 - \int_0^T \frac{(\hat{L}(t) + \hat{I}(t))}{(L(t) + I(t))} \, dt,
\]

where \( \hat{L}(t) \) and \( \hat{I}(t) \) represent the number of latent humans and the number of infectious humans at time \( t \), respectively, when the intervention strategy is applied. On the other hand, \( L(t) \) and \( I(t) \) denote the number of latent humans and the number of infectious humans at time \( t \), respectively, when no intervention is involved. Therefore,

\[
(L(t) + I(t)) \left( \frac{\hat{E}(t)}{E} \right) \]

is the number of infected humans that have been avoided because of the intervention. From
the objective function to be minimized, \( D_1 u_1^2 + D_2 u_2^2 + + D_0 u_5^2 \) is the cost of the intervention. According to [26], average cost-effectiveness ratio of intervention can be determined using the following formula.

\[
\text{ACER} = \frac{\text{Cost of intervention}}{\text{The number of infected human averted}}
\]  

(4)

Therefore, following [27], we use the following equation to measure the ACER of intervention.

\[
\text{ACER} = \frac{\int_0^T \left( D_1 u_1^2 + D_2 u_2^2 + + D_0 u_5^2 \right) dt}{\int_0^T \left( L(t) + I(t) \right) - \left( \tilde{L}(t) + \tilde{I}(t) \right) dt}
\]  

(5)

NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

We perform some numerical simulations using the parameter values given in the Table 1. The initial conditions used are \( S(0) = 10000, L(0) = 1000, I(0) = 500, R(0) = 0, V(0) = 100000 \).

Table 1. Parameter values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Omega )</td>
<td>( \frac{10^5}{70 \times 365} )</td>
<td>person ( \times \text{day}^{-1} )</td>
<td>Estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_1 )</td>
<td>( 2.79 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>person ( ^{-1} \times \text{day}^{-1} )</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_2 )</td>
<td>( 4.3 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>virus ( ^{-1} \times \text{day}^{-1} )</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu_h )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{70 \times 365} )</td>
<td>\text{day}^{-1}</td>
<td>Estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2 \times 7} )</td>
<td>\text{day}^{-1}</td>
<td>Estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2 \times 7} )</td>
<td>\text{day}^{-1}</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>( 10000 )</td>
<td>virus ( \times \text{human}^{-1} \times \text{day}^{-1} )</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu_r )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{5} )</td>
<td>\text{day}^{-1}</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first simulation is performed using \( u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = 0.2 \). The reproduction number obtained is \( 2.2364 > 1 \). Further we get \( L^* = 19.4297 \) and \( I^* = 19.4191 \). Based on Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, the disease-free equilibrium point is unstable and the endemic equilibrium point is locally asymptotically stable. This result suggests that \((L, I)\) tend to \((19.4297, 19.4191)\). The numerical simulation result is given in Figure 2(a). Notice that the solution curve of \( L + I \) tend to positive value, i.e., 38.8487. Therefore, our theoretical and numerical simulation result are alike.

For the second simulation, we perform the simulation using \( u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = 0.8 \). The reproduction number obtained is \( 0.1983 < 1 \). Based on Theorem 2, the disease-free equilibrium point is locally asymptotically stable. This result implies that \((L, I)\) tend to \((0, 0)\). Notice that the solution curve \( L + I \) shown in Figure 2(b) tend to zero. Therefore, our theoretical and numerical simulation result are alike. These results imply that non pharmaceutical approach can be used to control the spread of covid-19. We should use medical mask, keep our distance and wash our hands regularly.
We now illustrate the forward bifurcation that occurs at $\beta^*_1$. By using the set of parameter value used in the second simulation, we obtain $\beta^*_1 = 3.1453 \times 10^{-6}$. We set $\beta_1 \in [1.5726 \times 10^{-6}, 4.7180 \times 10^{-6}]$. The result can be seen in Figure 3. Clearly, when $\beta_1 < \beta^*_1$, $I_h$ tend to zero which implies that $\Gamma_0$ is asymptotically stable. On the other hand, $I_h$ converge to positive equilibrium which suggests that $\Gamma_1$ is asymptotically stable if $\beta_1 > \beta^*_1$. Furthermore, $\Gamma_0$ becomes unstable when $\beta_1 > \beta^*_1$.

Global sensitivity analysis

A global sensitivity analysis is conducted using the method described in [19]. We generate latin hypercube sampling (LHS) matrix and determine partial rank correlation coefficient (PRCC) of each parameter. The number of simulations used is 20000. Figure 4 shows that parameter $\mu$, $\sigma$, $\mu_v$, $u_1$, $u_2$, $u_5$ have negative relationship with basic reproduction number, while $\Omega, \beta_1, \beta_2, \alpha$ have positive relationship. Notice that $\sigma$ is the parameter that has the most influence on $R_0$ among the parameters that have negative relationship. Furthermore, it is clear that among the control parameters, $u_3$ is the parameter that has the most influence on $R_0$ followed by $u_2$. 

![Figure 2. Dynamics of infected human when $R_0 > 1$ and $R_0 < 1$.](image)

![Figure 3. Forward bifurcation diagram of system (1) at $\beta^*_1$.](image)
Optimal control and cost-effectiveness analysis

In this subsection, we present the numerical solution of optimal control problem and cost effectiveness analysis. We investigate seven intervention schemes as follows:

- Strategy 1: social distancing intervention only. In this strategy, we set $u_1 \geq 0, u_2 = 0, u_3 = 0$.
- Strategy 2: handwashing intervention only. In this strategy, we set $u_1 = 0, u_2 \geq 0, u_3 = 0$.
- Strategy 3: mask-wearing intervention only. In this strategy, we set $u_1 = 0, u_2 = 0, u_3 \geq 0$.
- Strategy 4: social distancing and handwashing intervention. In this strategy, we set $u_1 \geq 0, u_2 \geq 0, u_3 = 0$.
- Strategy 5: social distancing and mask-wearing intervention. In this strategy, we set $u_1 \geq 0, u_2 = 0, u_3 \geq 0$.
- Strategy 6: handwashing and mask-wearing intervention. In this strategy, we set $u_1 = 0, u_2 \geq 0, u_3 \geq 0$.
- Strategy 7: social distancing, handwashing, and mask-wearing intervention. In this strategy, we set $u_1 \geq 0, u_2 \geq 0, u_3 \geq 0$.

For the numerical simulations of optimal control problem, we choose $D_1 = 1, D_2 = 3, D_3 = 1, D_4 = 5, D_5 = 1, D_6 = 1$.

**Strategy 1**

The first simulation of the optimal control problem is performed to investigate the dynamics of the spread of covid-19 when there is an intervention, namely social distancing. Figures 5(a) and 5(b) show the dynamics of infected human and virus on the surface of object, respectively. As we can see, the difference between the solution curves of the model involving control and the model not involving control is not meaningful even though $u_1$ is at its maximum value as shown in Figure 5(c). When strategy 1 is applied, the number of infectious and latent humans on day 100 is 31 and 52, respectively. Meanwhile, the number of viruses is 3094869. It is smaller than the number of infectious humans, latent humans, and viruses when no intervention is practiced.
Strategy 2

To study the dynamics of the spread of covid-19 when only handwashing intervention is applied, we conduct numerical simulations. The dynamic of infected human and viruses can be seen in Figure 6(a) and 6(b). If strategy 2 is used with \( u_2 \) at its highest value during the simulation period as seen in Figure 6(c), the number of latent humans, infectious humans, and viruses at the end of the simulation are 5, 14, and 954453, respectively. It is clear that there is a significant decrease in the number of infected humans and viruses when strategy 2 is implemented. This is different from the results when strategy 1 is applied.

![Graphs](a). \( L(t) + I(t) \) (b). \( V(t) \) (c). \( u_2(t) \)

**Figure 6.** Dynamics of infected humans, viruses, and control profile when strategy 2 is applied.

Strategy 3

The third simulation of optimal control problem is carried out to study the impact of implementing strategy 3 on the spread of covid-19. As we can observe in Figure 7(a), the dynamics of infected humans are similar to Figure 6(a). However, a significant difference is seen in the dynamics of the viruses as can be seen in Figure 7(b). The numerical simulation results show that the number of latent humans, infectious humans, and viruses on day 100 are 5, 14, 191095, respectively. It is clear that there is a very extreme decline in the number of viruses when compared to the number of viruses when strategy 1 or strategy 2 is involved. This happens because 80% of infected humans use masks during the simulation period as shown in figure 7(c).

![Graphs](a). \( L(t) + I(t) \) (b). \( V(t) \) (c). \( u_3(t) \)

**Figure 7.** Dynamics of infected humans, viruses, and control profile when strategy 3 is applied.

Strategy 4

Now we discuss the results of the numerical simulation of the optimal control problem when implementing strategy 4. It seems that the dynamics of infected humans and viruses as shown in Figures 8(a) and 8(b) are very similar to those of Figures 6(a) and 6(b). Nevertheless, the numerical solution shows the number of latent humans, infectious humans, and viruses at the end of the simulation course is 3, 11, and 782673, respectively. It is clear that the difference in the outcomes of implementing strategy 2 and strategy 4 is not significant even though \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) are at their maximum values during the simulation period as seen in Figure 8(c).
Strategy 5

Figure 9 shows the results of the numerical simulation of the optimal control problem when the intervention employed is social distancing and handwashing. Notice that the dynamics of infected humans (Figure 9a) and viruses (Figure 9b) are very similar to the results of the third numerical simulation as shown in Figure 7. However, if strategy 5 is applied, the number of latent humans, infectious humans, and viruses on day 100 are 3, 11, and 156712, respectively. Obviously, the prevalence of covid-19 is smaller than when strategy 3 is applied. Figure 9(c) shows that we have to keep control $u_3$ at its maximum bound longer than $u_1$.

Strategy 6

The sixth simulation is performed to see the impact of implementing strategy 6. As shown in Figures 10(a) and 10(b), the dynamics of the spread of covid-19 are very similar to those shown in Figures 9(a) and 9(b). If strategy 6 is applied, the number of latent humans, infectious humans, and virus at day 100 are 2, 9, and 130252, respectively. It is clear that the number of infected humans and viruses when strategy 6 is applied is the smallest compared to the previous simulations. Figure 10(c) tells us that we should lower the control $u_2$ first than $u_3$.

Strategy 7

The last simulation of the optimal control problem is carried out to examine the dynamics of the spread of covid-19 when strategy 7 is implemented. The dynamic of infected human and virus can be seen in Figure 11(a) and Figure 11(b),
respectively. The number of latent human, infectious human, and virus are 1, 7, and 102878, respectively. Figure 11(c) shows that we should keep control \( u_3 \) at its maximum bound longer than \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \). Clearly, strategy 7 provides the best results compared to other strategies when viewed from the prevalence of covid-19.

![Graphs of infected humans, viruses, and control profile](image)

**Figure 11.** Dynamics of infected humans, viruses, and control profile when strategy 7 is practiced.

### Cost-effectiveness analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>ACER</th>
<th>( \bar{E} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( 6.9972 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>0.0314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( 2.1241 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>0.2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( 5.2684 \times 10^{-8} )</td>
<td>0.8397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( 1.1438 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>0.2312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( 3.1291 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>0.8444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>( 1.0423 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>0.8468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>( 3.6212 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>0.8512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost-effectiveness analysis is carried out by determining the ACER of each strategy using (5). In addition, we also determine the effectiveness of each strategy in reducing the infected humans by using (3). The results are given in the Table 2. Obviously, strategy 7 has the highest effectiveness, which is 0.8512. Based on Table 2, the most effective strategy in reducing the number of infected humans is strategy 7 followed by strategy 6. According to [25], the most cost-effective strategy is the strategy that has the smallest ACER. Therefore, we conclude that strategy 3 is the most cost-effective strategy followed by strategy 6.

### CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose covid-19 model considering non-pharmaceutical intervention and indirect transmission. The model has two equilibrium points. The existence and local stability condition of all equilibrium points are given and proved. Our results show that non-pharmaceutical approach can be used to control the covid-19 spread. Our results show that combination of social distancing, handwashing, and mask-wearing is the most effective strategy to control covid-19 spread. Based on the ACER values, the most cost-effective strategy is mask-wearing. Furthermore, global sensitivity analysis result shows that parameter related to mask-wearing is the most influential parameter on basic reproduction number compared to parameter related to social distancing and handwashing.
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