4/14/2020

Erratum to "Responding to COVID-19: A Note"

Lukasz A. Drozd and Marina M .Tavares

The model used to generate Figure 1 assumes δ=1/3 instead of δ=1/2 (baseline calibration in the paper). This information is erroneously omitted. A higher value of δ=1/3 is reasonable for the early stages of the pandemic when infected and symptomatic individuals do not yet self-isolate. Below we provide both versions of the Figure.

This figure appears in the paper and it assume δ=1/3 (R0=2.5):



The same figure but for the baseline calibration assuming δ=1/2 (R0=2.5):