

Real-time use of a dynamic model to measure the impact of public health interventions on measles outbreak size and duration — Chicago, Illinois, 2024

Scott Olesen US CDC Center for Forecasting & Outbreak Analytics



In 2024, a measles outbreak was possible among new arrivals in Chicago

- Around this time, there were 12,000 people in 27 temporary migrant shelters in Chicago
- ~90% were from Venezuela
- Venezuela has had declining measles immunization coverage among children





In March 2024, a measles case was reported at a new arrivals shelter in Chicago



Shelter conditions were crowded and well-mixed





Shelter conditions were crowded and well-mixed





The resulting measles outbreak had 57 total cases



Public health interventions reduced the size of the outbreak





A modeling task force was assembled early in the outbreak





Rash onset date

Modelers were tasked with multiple types of questions

CDC

Real-time situational awareness about the shelter outbreak:

- Is the case series data consistent with the single, known introduction?
- What is the final expected **outbreak size**?
- When is the outbreak expected to **end**?

Post hoc evaluation of the interventions in the shelter outbreak:

- To what degree did **mass vaccination** reduce the outbreak size?
- To what degree did **active case-finding** reduce transmission?

Other questions, not about the shelter itself:

- What is the chance of an outbreak in shelters with similar conditions?
- What is the probability of spillover into the larger community?
- How does this outbreak relate to nationwide trends in measles cases?

The task force had access to, and expertise with, an existing modeling framework



In Focus

How Do I? V

Home » News » Press Releases » Operation Allies Welcome Completes Vaccination Campaign for Measles and Varicella for Afghan Evacuees

Get Involved

News All DHS News

Topics

Homeland Security

THE LANCET Public Health

This journal Journals Publish Clinical Global health Multimedia Events About

ARTICLES - Volume 8, Issue 8, E618-E628, August 2023 - Open Access

Measles virus transmission patterns and public health responses during Operation Allies Welcome: a descriptive epidemiological study

Nina B Masters, PhD A^{a,b} Andrew S Beck, PhD^a Adria D Mathis, MSPH^a Jessica Leung, MPH^a Kelley Raines, MPH^a - Prabasaj Paul, PhD^c et al. Show more

Affiliations & Notes ➤ Article Info ➤

Operation Allies Welcome Completes Vaccination Campaign for Measles and Varicella for Afghan Evacuees

About DHS V

Release Date: October 4, 2021

OAW flights from abroad will resume this week

WASHINGTON – Operation Allies Welcome (OAW) has completed a historic and nationwide vaccination campaign for measles, mumps, rubella (MMR), and varicella (chickenpox) to Afghan evacuees who are temporarily staying at eight military installations in the United States. As a result of this effort, more than 49,000 Afghan evacuees nationwide are now vaccinated. Evacuees are also receiving vaccinations at staging areas in Europe and the Middle East. OAW flights from staging areas will resume this week. Arriving eligible Afghans receive the MMR, varicella, polio, COVID-19, and other age appropriate vaccinations, as well as medical exams and health screenings, as a condition of their humanitarian parole.

Compartmental, stochastic model



Age group: <6 months



Other age groups: 6-11 months 1-11 years >11 years, not pregnant >11 years, pregnant

- Assume well-mixed population
- Use age-structured estimates of measles immunity among Venezuelans for starting *S* and *R* compartment sizes
- Account for *R* individuals who do not have vaccination records
- Move individuals from S to R or S_V based on empirical vaccination effort
- Move individuals between other compartments using Gillespie algorithm and typical mass action ODEs
- Change recovery (I→R) rate constant after active case finding begins

Calibrated forecasts were used to estimate outbreak duration and size



Calibrated forecasts, by forecast date 80 -60 40 20 0-80 -60 24-03-20 Seses reported 0 00 00 0 00 024-03-40 20 20 Cumulative I 024-04 20 0 80 -2024-04-60 40 20 Mar 01 Mar 15 Apr 01 Apr 15

- As expected, forecast accuracy improved with time
- Outbreaks are highly stochastic, but stochasticity in this model formulation likely did not capture true variability in reproductive number across individuals
- First-pass compartmental model did not reproduce observed generations of infections, because of overdispersion of latent (*E*) and infectious (*I*) periods.

Calibrated forecasts were used to estimate outbreak duration and size



| Forecast date | No. of observed measles cases among shelter residents | Median model-predicted final outbreak size (IQR) | Median model-predicted final rash onset date Apr 16 | | |
|------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Mar 11 | 7 | 29 (20-39) | | | |
| Mar 18 | 18 | 38 (31-41) | Apr 18 | | |
| Mar 25 | 47 | 60 (57–65) | Apr 20 | | |
| Apr 1 | 51 | 60 (58-63) | Apr 20 | | |
| Apr 8 | 52 | 58 (56-60) | Apr 18 | | |

Model stabilized to a $\sim 10\%$ overestimate of final outbreak size (52)

Estimates of the outbreak duration were consistent, ~10-day overestimates



Counterfactual simulations gave *post hoc* **estimates of interventions' effects**



Intervention scenarios

Counterfactual simulations gave *post hoc* **estimates of interventions' effects**



| Intervention start dates | | Chance of additional measles cases among shelter residents,* % | | | | Duration | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Mass vaccination | Active case-finding | Zero cases | 1–9 cases | 10-49 cases | 50–99 cases | ≥100 cases | Last rash o | onset in outbreak (median |
| Never | Never | 24 | 7 | _ | - | 69 | | May 26 |
| Mar 15 | Never | 24 | 10 | 23 | 28 | 15 | | Apr 21 |
| | Mar 8 | 23 | 13 | 28 | 27 | 8 | | Apr 17 |
| Mar 8 | Never | 24 | 15 | 40 | 21 | 1 | | Apr 14 |
| | Mar 8 | 23 | 17 | 43 | 17 | 1 | | Apr 9 |
| Mar 1 | Never | 24 | 24 | 49 | 3 | | | Apr 3 |
| | Mar 8 | 23 | 26 | 49 | 2 | | | Mar 30 |
| - | | | | | | | | |
| | Best case | | | | Actual | | | |
| | | | | | | condit | ions | |

Reflections on the modeling experience



- **Real-time support**, both forecasts and counterfactuals, were very useful to on-the-ground team.
- We benefited from having a **tool on the shelf**, with plausible parameters already specified.
- We benefited from a **strong team**:
 - The task force lead was a highly experienced measles modeler.
 - We had ~5 modelers with some modeling and software development experience.
- The compartmental model was useful, up to a point.
 - Compartmental models make **implicit assumptions** about compartmental dwell time distributions.
 - Incremental increases in conceptual model complexity (e.g., explicitly tracking vaccination documentation status) led to exponential increases in **implementation complexity**.
- We would have benefited from **standardized tooling**:
 - Turn-key calibration and inference methods
 - High-performance individual-level simulations

The team, disclaimer, links to products

Nina B. Masters (task force lead) Inga Holmdahl Paige B. Miller Chirag K. Kumar **Catherine M. Herzog** Peter M. DeJonge Stephanie Gretsch Sara E. Oliver Manisha Patel David E. Sugerman Beau B. Bruce Brian F. Borah Scott W. Olesen <ULP7@CDC.GOV>

National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases Chicago Department of Public Health Illinois Department of Public Health

https://github.com/CDCgov/measles-model-chicago-2024

DOI: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7319a2

Dr. Borah's NIC presentation on this outbreak: <u>https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jPJppKjGu_qtkIDZ6d49-</u> <u>UJghA7K_eK5/view?pli=1</u>

The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.



CFA is hiring!





Contact Scott Olesen <**ULP7@CDC.GOV**> for guidance on navigating federal hiring system