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## Background and objectives

In spring of 2009 it is detected in Mexico a new strain of type $A$ influenza virus that it expands quickly. We think about to predict the number of cases, of hospital complications and deaths in Spain.

## Methods

We design a dynamic (compartmental) model with six groups: susceptible; people in the state of latency; people that will develop the illness in a symptomatic and asymptomatic way; those that die for complications and those recovered. The pattern was validated with the last ten years of the Spanish Influenza Sentinel Surveillance Systems (SISSS) We developed two scenarios: of low transmission (S1), similar to the seasonal influenza ( $\mathrm{Ro}=1$,8) and (S2) of high transmission ( $\mathrm{Ro}=3$ )

> Figure 1. Dynamic model


Table 1. Parameters of the model


## Results

In July of 2009 the model was validated and it allowed us to predict that the epidemic wave could produce 3,400,000 (S1*) and 10,900,000 (S2*) cases in Spain. SISSS has registered about $1,450,000$ during the whole season. They were considered 100,000 (S1) and 327,000 (S2) hospital complications. The real data are ignored. They were considered 6,700 (E1) and 21,700 (E2) deaths supposing that the case fatality would be of 2 for thousand, when in fact it has been observed that it was of 0.2 for thousand. Table 2 and Figure 2 show the predictions made before the appearance of cases. Figure 3 shows the predictions made from data from the SISSS of 20-39 weeks with the final result of the epidemic.

|  | Scenatio_ ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | Scenaio. $\mathrm{I}_{1} 1$ | Scenaio 1_2 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Scenaio-1.3 | Scenatio.2* | Scenaio. $\mathrm{L}^{1 / 1}$ | Scenaio_2.2 | Scenaio 2 2 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Realdata |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sux |  | $\begin{gathered} 30 \text { percent ( } 50 \% \\ \text { develop } \\ \text { symptoms) } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | x |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Kearaata } \\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Spanish } \\ \text { Influnnal } \\ \text { Sentinel } \\ \text { Survilace } \\ \text { Systemms } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Wer beieming oftre | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Cases per 100,000 in the week beginning of the epidemic curve | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,56 | 0,56 | 0,56 | 0,56 | 4,63 |
| Week with more asses | 37 | 38 | 39 | 39 | 26 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 46 |
|  | 1.060,74 | 1.617,83 | 2.127,85 | 2.699,32 | 3.981,87 | 5.518,20 | 6.772,19 | 9.169,40 | 371,68 |
| Total accumulated at the end of the curve. Cases per 100,000 | 7.315,43 | 10.970,65 | 14.624,36 | 18.276,61 | 9.43,34 | 14.148,81 | 18.863,15 | 23.585,98 | 2.994,27 |
| werkothe eridemix | 51 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 36 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 51 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Cases per } 100,000 \text { in the } \\ \text { last week of the epidemic } \\ \text { curve } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2,74 | 5,81 | 9,91 | 15,00 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 40,80 |
| Oticese | 7,32 | 10,97 | 14,62 | 18,28 | 9,44 | 14,15 | 18,86 | 23,59 | 2,99 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Real attack rate (including } \\ \text { symptomatic and } \\ \text { asymptomatic) (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 14,63 | 21,94 | 29,25 | 36,55 | 18,88 | 28,30 | 37,73 | 47,17 | 5,99 |
|  | 19,05 | 19,74 | 20,23 | 20,61 | 10,42 | 10,79 | 11,05 | 11,26 |  |
| (enenemion otreal | 20,23 | 20,92 | 21,41 | 21,79 | 11,05 | 11,42 | 11,68 | 11,89 |  |

Figure 2. Scenarios versus real data


Figure 3. Final result of the epidemic versus predictions


## Conclusions and <br> recommendations

The discrepancies among the estimated and observed values can be due to: 1. Different information is compared; the models predict total number of cases, SISSS estimates through a sampling the number of cases. 2. Lack in the knowledge of the natural history (red circle in figure 1): Which is the proportion of asymptomatic cases? Which is the pattern of contacts among the susceptible ones? Which is the probability of effective contact? Which is susceptible population's percentage? Which is the proportion of complications among the sick persons? Which is the case fatality? (According to the source it can oscillate among 2 for a hundred, 2 for thousand or 0,2 for thousand)

[^0]
[^0]:    3.- The model didn't consider any type of measure of primary, secondary or tertiary prevention, what forces us to wonder. 4. - The infectious period of the virus has not been as high as it was considered at the beginning of the pandemic. 5.- Other aspects to consider: vaccination, immune population's bag and the role of the mass media. Recommendations: 1) to Pay special attention to the contacts of the cases to be able to estimate the percentage of asymptomatic cases. b) to Extend the use of the clinical electronic history to diagnose the cases and this way to avoid possible errors of sampling of SISSS. c) to Make pursuit study in a sample of cases to estimate case fatality values and hospital complications.

