Estimated of COVID-19 Sampling Mean in Burkina Faso
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Abstract
Our objective in the development of this document, was to establish an estimate of the average of different variables in particular, the case of daily contamination of covid-19, the case of recovery and finally the case of lethality of COVID-19 in Burkina to give an idea of the real rate of contamination in Burkina Faso. To achieve this objective we used the tools of inferential statistics.
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1. Introduction
The COVID-19 pendulum began in China in December 2019 and since humanity has been fighting against this disease. This emerging disease, little known around the world, has been declared a public health emergency of international concern (USPP) by WHO. In light of the country’s trade with China and the rest of the world, the spread of this pandemic was predictable. Burkina Faso registered its first case of COVID-19 on March 9, 2020. Since that day, it has been registering cases daily.

Coronaviruses, also called crown viruses, are transmitted from human to human by air, by coughing or sneezing and by close contact (touching or shaking hands). They can also be transmitted by contact with an object and/or a surface contaminated by the virus (door handle, stair railing, elevator buttons, etc.).

In view of the extent of COVID’s disease, it is difficult for a scientist to sit around and do nothing. This in this dynamic that our small research team has decided to make our contribution. We offer through certain properties of mathematical statistics an estimate of the average of the following parameters: Number of daily contamination, number of healing and number of cotidient deaths.

This modeling propose in our document is an empirical study. We have observed the evolution of the disease and the reaction of the population to the disease. For 63 days we collected data on the disease through local media. We believe that behind the figures announced lies the behavior of the people of Burkina. Working on 63 days of data is acceptable. We could have waited 90 days to observe again, but the urgency of the situation will not allow it.

The theory of sampling is the study of the links between the reference population called population and the samples from this population. For this to be possible, the sample must be constructed from more or less sophisticated techniques, the study of which constitutes the theory of surveys. In inferential statistics, there is also a common scheme involving probabilities or, a priori, unknown or poorly known and we seek, by means of observations of realizations of the random events governed by these distributions, to reduce to maximum effects of “lack of information” in making certain decisions.

First, we developed a point estimate of the different means. Then we modeled the confidence intervals of the mean with 0.05 of error of the different means. In the last part we modeled a confidence interval for the different variances. By proposing these estimates we hope to approach a certain optimized value for our different parameters (Contamination, Healing and death).

2. Method
The techniques we have used to estimate the different means (Contamination, Healing and death) come from methods of estimating inferential statistics.
2.1 Sample as Creation of a Random Tuple

If we consider the samples as the realization of a random variable with $n$ dimensions $(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$, $(Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n)$ and $(Z_1, Z_2, \ldots, Z_n)$. These multidimensional variables is defined on the set of all possible samples of size $n$ that can be extracted from the mother population (Burkina Faso). They then have all their own probability distributions, linked to that of $X$. We then have all their own probability distributions, linked to that of $X$.

Given a risk $\alpha = 0, 05$, the centered-reduced normal distribution table gives a number $u_{\alpha/2} = 1, 645$ such that:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ -u_{\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_x}{\sigma \sqrt{n}} \leq u_{\alpha/2} \right] = 1 - \alpha$$

We then have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ -u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_x}{\sigma \sqrt{n}} \leq u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \right] = 1 - \alpha$$

Let

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \frac{\bar{X} - u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}}{\sigma \sqrt{n}} \leq \mu_x \leq \bar{X} + u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \right] = 1 - \alpha$$

We found two v.a:

$$T_1 (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) = \frac{\bar{X} - u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}}{\sigma \sqrt{n}} \text{ et } T_2 (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) = \bar{X} + u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}.$$  

2.3 Confidence Interval Estimate of the Variance in the Number of Contamination Cases

$\mu_x$ is unknown. We take $S_{n-1,x}^2$ as an estimator of $\sigma^2$. If $\bar{X} \sim \mathcal{N} (\mu_x, \sigma_x)$ then

$$\frac{(n - 1) S_{n-1,x}^2}{\sigma^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{(n-2)}$$

Given a risk $\alpha = 0, 05$, the chi-square table at 63 degrees of freedom gives $z_1$ and $z_2$ such as:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ z_1 \leq \frac{(n - 1) S_{n-1,x}^2}{\sigma^2} \leq z_2 \right] = 1 - \alpha.$$  

Since the interval $[z_1, z_2]$ is not unique, it depends on the risks $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ admitted outside the interval.
2.4 Estimated Average Contamination

$X$ follows a normal law, $\sigma_X$ is unknown. In this case, we consider the variable

$$T_x = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_x}{s_{n-1} / \sqrt{n}},$$

with $s_{n-1,x} = \frac{63}{62} \times s_{n,x} = 9.95$.

which follows a Student law with 63 degrees of freedom. Given a risk $\alpha = 0.05$, Student’s table at 63 degrees of freedom gives $t_{\alpha/2} = 1.669$ such as :

$$P \left[ -t_{\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\bar{X} - \mu}{s_{n-1} / \sqrt{n}} \leq t_{\alpha/2} \right] = 1 - \alpha$$

let

$$P \left[ \bar{X} - t_{\alpha/2} \frac{s_{n-1}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mu \leq \bar{X} + t_{\alpha/2} \frac{s_{n-1}}{\sqrt{n}} \right] = 0.95$$

3. Results

3.1 Classical Estimation (From a Sample of Size n)

Estimation of the different means : $\theta_x = \mathbb{E}[X] = \mu_x$, $\theta_y = \mathbb{E}[Y] = \mu_y$, $\theta_z = \mathbb{E}[Z] = \mu_z$, $n = 63$.

$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i$, mean of the values observed in the sample, is an estimate of $\mu_x$. $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$, “empirical mean” of random variable, is an estimator of $\mu_x$. $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i$, mean of the values observed in the sample, is an estimate of $\mu_y$. $\bar{Y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$, “empirical mean” random variable, is an estimator of $\mu_y$. $\bar{z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i$, mean of the values observed in the sample, is an estimate of $\mu_z$. $\bar{Z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i$, “empirical mean” of random variable, is an estimator of $\mu_z$.

Figure 1. Histogram : Daily contamination cases in Burkina Faso
Figure 2. A cloud of dots: Daily contamination cases in Burkina Faso

Figure 3. A cloud of dots: Daily contamination cases in Burkina

Figure 4. A cloud of dots: Daily contamination cases in Burkina
It comes that after observation and analysis of the different diagrams: The largest number (49 cases) of gestation was recorded on the 38th day out of the 63 test days with a median of 7. The peak (41 cases) of COVID-19 contamination with Burkina Faso is reached on the 58th day out of the 63 days of testing with a median of 9. On the 30th day the Bukina recorded its largest case of death (4 deaths). We also have a median of 1 case of death over the 63 days of testing.
Table 1. Summary table of certain parameters on COVID-19 in Burkina

|       | X                          | Y                          | Z                          |
|-------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| \(E\) | 12.063,492.063,49          | 9.428,571.428,571         | 0.793,650,793,650.8       |
| \(V\) | 96.092,677.931.39          | 103.732,718.894           | 0.908,346,134,152.6       |
| \(\sigma\) | 9.802,687.281,118         | 10.184,926.062.28        | 0.953,071,945,947.7       |
| \(\max\) | 41                        | 49                        | 04                        |
| \(\min\) | 0                         | 0                         | 0                         |
| \(\Sigma\) | 760                       | 594                       | 50                        |

Figure 7. Number of deaths compared to the number of contamination and healing

The following table summarizes the point values of some characteristic parameters of the random values X, Y and Z.

We observe in the following graph on the X axis we have the number of daily contamination of COVID-19, the Y axis represents the cases of recovery and finally the Z axis represents the daily lethality of COVID-19 in Burkina.

The properties of sampling an average gives:

\[
E[\bar{X}] = E(X) = 12.06 = \mu_x
\]

\[
E[\bar{Y}] = E(Y) = 9.42 = \mu_y
\]

\[
E[\bar{Z}] = E(Z) = 0.79 = \mu_z
\]
3.2 Confidence Interval Estimation

Let \( X, Y \) and are a random variable defined on the mother population, of mean \( \mu_x, \mu_y \) and \( \mu_z \), of variance \( \sigma^2_x, \sigma^2_y \) and \( \sigma^2_z \).

We have 63 days of data, we assume that the different means are the means of another sampling to allow us to use the laws of inferential statistics. We also have different situations that presents itself to us. Either the laws of \( X, Y \) and \( Z \) are known or they are not. Which brings us to the following hypotheses.

3.2.1 Confidence Interval of an Average (so \( \mu \) is Unknown)

Let \( \bar{X} \) be the estimator of \( \mu : \mathbb{E} \left[ \bar{X} \right] = \mathbb{E} [X] = \mu \) et \( \text{var} \left( \bar{X} \right) = \frac{\text{var}(X)}{n} = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \).

3.2.1 First Case: Estimated Average Contamination

3.2.1.1 Estimated Average Contamination

\( X \) follows a normal law, \( \sigma_x \) is known. If \( X \sim N (\mu_x, \sigma_x) \), so \( \forall i \in \{1, ..., n\}, X_i \sim N (\mu_x, \sigma_x) \) and \( \bar{X} \sim N \left( \mu_x, \frac{\sigma_x}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \). Given a risk \( \alpha = 0.05 \), the centered-reduced normal distribution table gives a number \( u_{a/2} = 1.645 \) such that :

\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ -u_{a/2} \leq \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_x}{\sigma \sqrt{n}} \leq u_{a/2} \right] = 1 - \alpha
\]

We then have

\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ -u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \bar{X} - \mu_x \leq u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \right] = 1 - \alpha
\]

Let

\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ \bar{X} - u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mu_x \leq \bar{X} + u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \right] = 1 - \alpha
\]

We found two v.a:

\[
T_1 (X_1, X_2, ..., X_n) = \bar{X} - u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma_x}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{et} \quad T_2 (X_1, X_2, ..., X_n) = \bar{X} + u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma_x}{\sqrt{n}}
\]

\[
T_1 (X_1, X_2, ..., X_n) = 10.02 \\
T_2 (X_1, X_2, ..., X_n) = 14.09
\]

We can therefore say that in Burkina Faso, the average daily contamination is between 10.02 and 14.09 with an error rate of 5%. In short if we consider that \( \sigma_x \) is known and \( X \) follows a normal law; the number of contamination for the 63 days varies between 631.26 and 887.67. The total number of official contamination is from 760 the 63rd day. The 95% confidence interval is well verified.

In the same dynamic if we want to have an idea after 90 days how many cases we can have in the same conditions we will have an interval of [901.8;1,268.1]. The maximum number of cases that can be expected with this method is 1.269.

3.2.1.2 Average Healing Estimate

If \( Y \sim N (\mu_y, \sigma_y) \), so \( \forall i \in \{1, ..., n\}, Y_i \sim N (\mu_y, \sigma_y) \) and \( \bar{Y} \sim N \left( \mu_y, \frac{\sigma_y}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \). Given a risk \( \alpha = 0.05 \), the centered-reduced normal distribution table gives a number \( u_{a/2} = 1.645 \) such that :

\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ -u_{a/2} \leq \frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_y}{\sigma_y \sqrt{n}} \leq u_{a/2} \right] = 1 - \alpha
\]

We found two v.a:

\[
T_1 (Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n) = \bar{Y} - u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma_y}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{et} \quad T_2 (Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n) = \bar{Y} + u_{a/2} \frac{\sigma_y}{\sqrt{n}}
\]

\[
T_1 (Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n) = 7.31 \\
T_2 (Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n) = 11.52
\]

The average of daily healing is between 7.31 and 11.52 with a 95% confidence level.
3.2.1.3 Estimated Lethality Mean

If \( Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma) \), so \( \forall i \in \{1, ..., n\}, Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma) \) and \( \bar{Z} \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \mu, \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \). Given a risk \( \alpha = 0.05 \), the centered-reduced normal distribution table gives a number \( u_{\alpha/2} = 1.645 \) such that:

\[
P \left[ -u_{\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\bar{Z} - \mu}{\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}} \leq u_{\alpha/2} \right] = 1 - \alpha
\]

We found two v.a:

\[
T_1(Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n) = \bar{Z} - u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{et} \quad T_2(Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n) = \bar{Z} + u_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}
\]

\[
T_1(Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n) = 0.59
\]

\[
T_2(Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n) = 0.98
\]

The mortality rate fluctuates between 0 and 1 with an error of 5%.

3.2.2 Second Case

3.2.2.1 Estimated Average Contamination

\( X \) follows a normal law, \( \sigma_x \) is unknown. In this case, we consider the variable

\[
T_x = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_x}{\frac{s_n-1}{\sqrt{n}}}
\]

with \( s_{n-1,x} = \frac{63}{62} \times s_{n,x} = 9.95 \).

which follows a Student law with 63 degrees of freedom. Given a risk \( \alpha = 0.05 \), Student’s table at 63 degrees of freedom gives \( t_{\alpha/2} = 1.669 \) such as:

\[
P \left[ -t_{\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_x}{\frac{s_n-1}{\sqrt{n}}} \leq t_{\alpha/2} \right] = 1 - \alpha
\]

let

\[
P \left[ \bar{X} - t_{\alpha/2} \frac{s_{n-1}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mu_x \leq \bar{X} + t_{\alpha/2} \frac{s_{n-1}}{\sqrt{n}} \right] = 0.95
\]

\[
T_1(X_1, X_2, ..., X_n) = 9.96
\]

\[
T_2(X_1, X_2, ..., X_n) = 14.15
\]

we have \((1 - 0.05) \times 100\) odds out of 100 that the interval [9, 96, 14, 15] covers the average \( \mu_x \).

If we now consider that \( \sigma_x \) is unknown and that \( X \) always follows a normal distribution. We will have a number of cases at the end of 63 days between [627.48;891.45]. For an estimate of 90 days we will have a confidence interval of [896.4;1,264.5]. The maximum number after 3 months of hanging with these different considerations is 1,265.

3.2.2.2 Average Healing Estimate

\( Y \) follows a normal law, \( \sigma_y \) is unknown. In this case, we consider the variable

\[
T_y = \frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_y}{\frac{s_{n-1}}{\sqrt{n}}}
\]

with \( s_{62,y} = \frac{61}{62} \times s_{63,y} = 10.34 \).

which follows a Student law with 63 degrees of freedom. Given a risk \( \alpha = 0.05 \), Student’s table at 44 degrees of freedom gives \( t_{\alpha/2} = 1.669 \) such as:

\[
P \left[ -t_{\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_y}{\frac{s_{n-1}}{\sqrt{n}}} \leq t_{\alpha/2} \right] = 1 - \alpha
\]
let
\[ P \left\{ \bar{Y} - t_{n/2} \frac{S_{n-1,\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mu \leq \bar{Y} + t_{n/2} \frac{S_{n-1,\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} = 0.95 \]

\[ T_1 (Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n) = 7.24 \]

\[ T_2 (Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n) = 11.59 \]

we have \((1 - 0.05) \times 100\) odds out of 100 that the interval \([7.24, 11.59]\) covers the average \(\mu_y\).

3.2.2.3 Estimated Lethality Mean

\(Z\) follows a normal law, \(\sigma_z\) is unknown. In this case, we consider the variable

\[ T_z = \frac{\bar{Z} - \mu_z}{\frac{S_{n-1,\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}} \]

with \(S_{n-1,\sigma} = \frac{63}{62} \times \sigma_{n-z} = 0.96\).

which follows a Student law with 63 degrees of freedom. Given a risk \(\alpha = 0.05\), Student’s table at 44 degrees of freedom gives \(t_{n/2} = 1.669\) such as :

\[ P \left\{ -t_{n/2} \leq \frac{\bar{Z} - \mu_z}{\frac{S_{n-1,\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}} \leq t_{n/2} \right\} = 1 - \alpha \]

let

\[ P \left\{ \bar{Z} - t_{n/2} \frac{S_{n-1,\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mu \leq \bar{Z} + t_{n/2} \frac{S_{n-1,\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} = 0.95 \]

\[ T_1 (Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n) = 0.59 \]

\[ T_2 (Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n) = 1.22 \]

we have \((1 - 0.05) \times 100\) odds out of 100 that the interval \([0.58, 0.99]\) covers the average \(\mu_z\).

3.2.3 Third Case

\(X\) follows an unknown law, \(n\) is large \((n = 63)\).

The hypotheses of the central limit theorem are then satisfied and we deduce that \(\bar{X} \sim N(\mu_x, \frac{\sigma_x}{\sqrt{n}})\).

- If \(\sigma\) is known, we are brought back to the first case.
- If \(\sigma\) is unknown, we should make the normality assumption for the law of \(X\) in order to be able to use the Student variable. However, as \(n\) is large, we would approach the Student law by a reduced centered normal law and the results are identical to those of the first case (where we estimate \(\sigma\) by \(s_{n-1}\)). We will therefore content ourselves with estimating \(\sigma\) by \(s_{n-1}\) without the constraining assumption of normality for \(X\).

3.3 Confidence Interval of a Variance

3.3.1 0.95 Confidence Interval Estimate of the Variance in the Number of Contamination Cases

\(\mu_x\) is unknown. We take \(S_{n-1,\sigma}^2\) as an estimator of \(\sigma^2\). So \(\bar{X} \sim N(\mu_x, \sigma_x)\) then

\[ \frac{(n - 1) S_{n-1,\sigma}^2}{\sigma^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{(n-2)} \]  

Given a risk \(\alpha = 0.05\), the chi-square table at 63 degree of freedom gives \(z_1\) and \(z_2\) such as :

\[ P \left\{ z_1 \leq \frac{(n - 1) S_{n-1,\sigma}^2}{\sigma^2} \leq z_2 \right\} = 1 - \alpha. \]

Since the interval \([z_1, z_2]\) is not unique, it depends on the risks \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\) admitted outside the interval.
In fact $z_1$ is such that

$$P\left( \frac{62 \times S_{62,x}^2}{\sigma^2} < z_1 \right) = \alpha_1;$$

$z_2$ is such that

$$P\left( \frac{62 \times S_{62,x}^2}{\sigma^2} > z_2 \right) = \alpha_2$$

with $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$.

for $n > 30$ the chi-2 law can be approximated by the normal law $N\left( 63, \sqrt{63} \right)$

$$\frac{z_2 - 63}{\sqrt{63}} = 0.68 + 0.69 \times \frac{1}{2}$$

from where $z_2 = 68.43$.

by the same process we get

$$z_1 = 63 - 2.81 \times \sqrt{63}$$

from where $z_2 = 40.69$. If we take symmetrical risks $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{\alpha}{2}$, we have $(1 - 0.05) \times 100$ chance out of 100 that the confidence interval at risk that the confidence interval

$$\left[ \sum_{i=1}^{63} (x_i - \bar{X})^2 / z_2, \sum_{i=1}^{63} (x_i - \bar{X})^2 / z_1 \right]$$

recovered variance $\sigma_x^2$. We take $S_{63,x}^2 = \frac{1}{63} \sum_{i=1}^{63} (X_i - \bar{X})^2$ as an estimator of $\sigma^2$. Si $X \sim N(\mu_x, \sigma_x)$, then

$$\frac{63 \times S_{63,x}^2}{\sigma_x^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{63} (x_i - \bar{X})^2}{z_2} \sim \chi^2_{(62)}$$

because the $X_i$ are independent and of the same law $N(\mu_x, \sigma_x)$. Given a risk $\alpha$, the chi-square table at $n$ degrees of freedom gives 40.69 and 68.43 such as $P\left[ z_1 \leq \frac{63 \times S_{63,x}^2}{\sigma_x^2} \leq z_2 \right] = 0.95$ hence the risk confidence interval 0.05 for $\sigma_x^2 : [9.38; 12.19]$.

3.3.2 0.95 Confidence Interval Estimate of Variance in Number of Healing Cases

$\mu_Y$ is unknown. We take $S_{n-1,y}^2$ as an estimator of $\sigma^2$. Si $\bar{Y} \sim N(\mu_y, \sigma_y)$ then

$$\frac{(n-1) \times S_{n-1,y}^2}{\sigma_y^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}{\sigma_y^2} \sim \chi^2_{(n-1)}.$$ 

Given a risk $\alpha = 0.05$, the chi-square table at 63 degree of freedom gives $z_1$ and $z_2$ such as :

$$P\left[ z_1 \leq \frac{(n-1) \times S_{n-1,y}^2}{\sigma^2} \leq z_2 \right] = 1 - \alpha.$$ 

Since the interval $[z_1, z_2]$ is not unique, it depends on the risks $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ admitted outside the interval. In fact $z_1$ is such that

$$P\left( \frac{62 \times S_{62,y}^2}{\sigma_y^2} < z_1 \right) = \alpha_1;$$

$z_2$ is such that

$$P\left( \frac{62 \times S_{62,y}^2}{\sigma_y^2} > z_2 \right) = \alpha_2$$

with $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$. 
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for $n > 30$ the chi-2 law can be approximated by the normal law $N \left( 63, \sqrt{63} \right)$

$$\frac{z_2 - 63}{\sqrt{63}} = \frac{0.68 + 0.69}{2}$$

from where $z_2 = 68.43$.

by the same process we get

$$z_1 = 63 - 2.81 \times \sqrt{63}$$

from where $z_2 = 40.69$. If we take symmetrical risks $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{4}{z}$, we have $(1 - 0.05) \times 100$ chance out of 100 that the confidence interval at risk that the confidence interval

$$\frac{63 \left( \frac{y_i - \bar{y}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{63} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{63} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}{z_1} = \left[ \frac{63 \times 103.73}{68.43} ; \frac{63 \times 103.73}{40.69} \right] = [95.49; 160.60]$$

recovered variance $\sigma^2$. We take $S^2_{63y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{63} (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2$ as an estimator of $\sigma^2$. Si $Y \sim N(\mu, \sigma)$, then

$$\frac{63 \times S^2_{63y}}{\sigma^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{63} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}{z_2} \sim \chi^2_{(n-1)}$$

because the $Y_i$ are independent and of the same law $N(\mu, \sigma)$.

Given a risk $\alpha$, the chi-square table at 63 degrees of freedom gives 40.69 and 68.43 such as $\mathbb{P}\left[ z_1 \leq \frac{63x^2_{\alpha}}{\sigma^2} \leq z_2 \right] = 0.95$ hence the risk confidence interval 0.05 for $\sigma^2$: $[9.77; 12.67]$.

3.3.3 0.95 Confidence Interval Estimate of Variance in Number of Deaths

$\mu_Y$ is unknown. As resolved in cases of contamination or healing we get: If we take symmetrical risks $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{4}{z}$, we have $(1 - 0.05) \times 100$ chance out of 100 that the confidence interval at risk that the confidence interval

$$\frac{63 \left( \frac{z_i - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{63} (z_i - \bar{z})^2}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{63} (z_i - \bar{z})^2}{u_2} = \left[ \frac{63 \times 0.90}{68.43} ; \frac{63 \times 0.90}{40.69} \right] = [0.82; 1.39]$$

recovered variance $\sigma^2$. We take $S^2_{63z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{63} (Z_i - \bar{Z})^2$ as an estimator of $\sigma^2$. Si $Z \sim N(\mu_z, \sigma_z)$, then

$$\frac{63 \times S^2_{63z}}{\sigma^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{63} (z_i - \bar{z})^2}{u_2} \sim \chi^2_{(62)}$$

because the $X_i$ are independent and of the same law $N(\mu, \sigma)$. Given a risk $\alpha$, the chi-square table at 63 degrees of freedom gives 40.69 and 68.43 such as $\mathbb{P}\left[ 40.69 \leq \frac{63S^2_{\alpha}}{\sigma^2} \leq 68.43 \right] = 0.95$ hence the risk confidence interval 0.05 for $\sigma^2$: $[0.90; 1.17]$.

We observe in the following graph on the $X$ axis we have the number of daily contamination of COVID-19, the $Y$ axis represents the cases of recovery and finally the $Z$ axis represents the daily lethality of COVID-19 in Burkina.
Figure 8. Number of deaths compared to the number of contamination and healing

Table 2. Data summary table 1

|     | E[]  | V[·] | σ(·) | I₁    | I₂    | Iₚᵢ  |
|-----|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| X   | 12.06| 96.09| 9.80 | [10.02; 14.09] | [9.96; 14.15] | [9.38; 12.19] |
| Y   | 9.42 | 103.73| 10.18| [7.31; 11.52] | [7.24; 11.59] | [9.77; 12.67] |
| Z   | 0.79 | 0.90 | 0.95 | [0.59; 0.98]  | [0.58; 0.99]  | [0.90; 1.77]  |

Statistics and Data Analysis

In the following table we offer a summary of the different estimates that we were able to model.

- \( I₁ \) tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that \( X \) follows a normal law and known sigma.
- \( I₂ \) tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that \( X \) follows a normal law and unknown sigma.
- \( Iₖ^{63} \) is the tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that \( X \) follows a normal law and known sigma after 63 days.
- \( Iₖ^{90} \) is the tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that \( X \) follows a normal law and known sigma after 90 days.

Table 3. Data summary table 2

|     | \( P₁^{63} \) | \( P₂^{63} \) | \( P₁^{90} \) | \( P₂^{90} \) | \( P₁^{150} \) | \( P₂^{150} \) |
|-----|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| X   | [631.26; 887.67] | [627.48; 891.45] | [901.8; 1, 268.1] | [896.4; 1, 273.5] | [1, 503; 2, 113.5] | [1, 494; 2, 122.5] |
| Y   | [460.53; 725.96] | [456.12; 730.17] | [657.9; 725.76] | [651.6; 1, 043.1] | [1, 096.5; 1, 728] | [1, 086; 1, 738.5] |
| Z   | [37.17; 91.14] | [36.54; 62.37] | [53.1; 89.1] | [52.2; 89.1] | [88.5; 147] | [87.148.5] |
• $I^{63}_1$ is the tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that $X$ follows a normal law and unknown sigma after 63 days.
• $I^{90}_1$ is the tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that $X$ follows a normal law and unknown sigma after 90 days.
• $I_{short}$ is the variance tolerance interval with a 95% confidence level.
• $I^{150}_1$ is the tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that $X$ follows a normal law and known sigma after 150 days.
• $I^{150}_2$ is the tolerance interval with 95% confidence starting from the fact that $X$ follows a normal law and unknown sigma after 150 days.

3.4 Ancillary Analysis

The second case gives us a much wider interval. In this estimation context we think that it is the most suitable interval. If we consider the information in table 1, the number of cases of contamination will be between [896; 1,274], the number of cases of recovery will be between [651;1,044], the number of deaths will be between [52;90] after three months.

The number of cases of contamination will be between [1,494, 2,123], the number of cases of recovery will be between [1,086;1,739], the number of deaths will be between [87;149] after three months. Report any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, indicating those that were prespecified and those that were exploratory (though not necessarily in the level of detail of primary analyses). Consider putting the detailed results of these analyses on the supplemental online archive. Discuss the implications, if any, of the ancillary analyses for statistical error rates.

4. Discussion

This study is based on a 5% error assumption. In clear terms, we have a 5% chance of being wrong. We also consider that the random variables follow a law. This forecasts is 2123 cases of contamination, 1739 cases of cure and 148 cases of death in 5 months if no palliative measure is taken. This study is an empirical modeling, these figures will remain true as long as the response to COVID-19 from the government and people of Burkina Faso does not evolve.

The maximum number of cures (1728) is lower than the number of new cases (2123). We believe that the Burkinabé State should optimize the system in place, so that the number of cures exceeds the number of new cases. It is in this sense that the disease can be overcome.

The rate of 90 dead over 3 months and 149 deaths after 5 months of covid-19 in Burkina. It is less than that of European countries. But it is not acceptable to let people die. The strategy implemented in Burkina needs to be improved. By popularizing the barrier gesture protocols. Undoubtedly taking a large-scale test. This will make it possible to detect and isolate vulnerable or affected people more quickly.
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Appendix A

The Heading to Appendix A

We have collected ourselves those data as when the epidemic evolves in our country through the press.

Table 4. Covid-19 data base

|   | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Xi | 02 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| ΣXi | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| Yi | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| ΣYi | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Zi | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| ΣZi | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |

Table 5. Covid-19 data base

|   | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Xi | 15 | 21 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| ΣXi | 261 | 282 | 288 | 302 | 318 | 345 | 364 | 384 | 394 | 414 | 434 | 454 | 484 | 514 | 554 | 594 | 634 | 674 | 714 | 754 | 794 |
| Yi | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 | 01 |
| ΣYi | 32 | 46 | 60 | 74 | 88 | 102 | 116 | 130 | 144 | 158 | 172 | 186 | 200 | 214 | 228 | 242 | 256 | 270 | 284 | 298 |
| Zi | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| ΣZi | 14 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |

Table 6. Covid-19 data base

|   | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Xi | 19 | 09 | 07 | 13 | 00 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 03 |
| ΣXi | 600 | 609 | 616 | 623 | 630 | 637 | 644 | 651 | 658 | 665 | 672 | 679 | 686 | 693 | 700 | 707 | 714 | 721 | 728 | 735 |
| Yi | 05 | 27 | 21 | 15 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| ΣYi | 562 | 589 | 616 | 643 | 670 | 677 | 684 | 691 | 698 | 705 | 712 | 719 | 726 | 733 | 740 | 747 | 754 | 761 | 768 | 775 |
| Zi | 00 | 01 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| ΣZi | 38 | 39 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 |
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Appendix B
COVID-19 epidemiological situation in Burkina Faso - Situation N 66

Burkina Faso is a landlocked Sudano-Sahelian country located in the heart of West Africa. It is bordered to the north and west by Mali, to the east by Niger, to the south by Benin, Togo, Ghana and Cote d’Ivoire. It covers an area of 274,200 km². Its climate alternates between two seasons: a dry season from October to April, during which the harmattan blows, and a rainy season from May to September.

According to data from the National Institute of Statistics and Demography (INSD), the population of Burkina Faso in 2020 is estimated at 21,478,529 inhabitants with a growth rate of 3.1% (RGPH 2006).

The epidemiological situation of March 27, 2020 is as follows: Twenty-seven (27) new confirmed cases of COVID-19 were reported on 03/27/2020, bringing the total to 207 confirmed cases.

The state of health alert as declared in Burkina Faso on March 26, 2020. Quarantine became compulsory for a period of two weeks starting on 27 March 2020 in all the cities affected by the COVID-19 epidemic in Burkina Faso.

X represents the number of infected cases, Y the number of cures and Z the number of deaths over a period from March 9 to April 15, 2020. We will also take n the number of days of contamination, in this case n = 63 days for our experience. The following image represents the contamination of covid-19 by city in Burkina Faso. We obtained this card on the website of the Ministry of Health of Burkina Faso (https://reliefweb.int/map/burkina-faso/situation-pid-miologique-du-covid-19-au-burkina-faso-situation-n-66). It was posted on May 4, 2020.

Figure 9. Histogram: Daily contamination cases in Burkina

Copyrights
Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).