A SURPRISING FORMULA FOR THE SPREAD OF COVID-19 UNDER AGGRESSIVE MANAGEMENT

IVAN CHEREDNIK †

Abstract. We propose an algebraic-type formula that describes with high accuracy the spread of Covid-19 pandemic under aggressive management for the periods of the intensive growth of the total number of infections. The formula can be used as a powerful forecasting tool. The parameters of the theory are the transmission rate, reflecting the viral fitness and "normal" frequency of contacts in the infected areas, and the intensity of prevention measures. The duration of the period of intensive growth is essentially inversely proportional to the square root of the intensity of hard measures for the most aggressive mode. A more precise formula is based on the Bessel functions. The data for the USA, UK, Sweden, Israel are provided, including the "forecast cones".

1. Our approach and main findings. A formula describing very well the spread of Covid-19 during the periods of intensive growth is the main result. We model the effects of *momentum management of epidemics*, which can be defined as a system of measures of any nature aimed at reducing the epidemic spread by regulating the intensity of these measures on the basis of the latest total detected numbers of infections. The "hard measures", such as detection and prompt isolation of infected people and closing the places where the spread is the most likely, combined with the most aggressive response ensure a relatively fast saturation. When the intensity weakens at the later stages and hard measures are reduced, the saturation is delayed, but not too much according to a complete theory. Generally, we obtain some "forecast cone" depending on how quickly the hard measures are reduced, which is some domain between two Bessel-type graphs. After the "technical saturation" the growth of the total number of detected infections becomes essentially linear and mild assuming that the measures are still in place. Our approach is of behavioral and sociological

† Department of Mathematics, UNC Chapel Hill, NC, USA.
Email: chered@email.unc.edu .

nature; the fact that it provides such a surprising accuracy seems a real discovery.

Power law of epidemics. The simplest equation for the spread of communicable diseases results in exponential growth of the number of infections, which is mostly applicable to the initial stages of epidemics. See e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4] here and below and [5] about some perspectives with *Covid-19*. We focus on the middle stages, where the growth is no greater than some power functions in time, which requires a different approach and different equations.

The equally classical *logistic* models of the spread, as well as the SIR, SID generalizations, assume that the number of infections is comparable with the whole population, which we do not impose. Many epidemics were not really of this kind during the last 100 years, mostly due to better disease control worldwide and general life improvements.

The reality now is the power-type growth of *total* number of infections $U(t)$ after a possible short period of exponential growth, *Covid-19* included. Our approach is based on this assumption.

Generally, $dU(t)/dt$, the rate of change of the total number of infections $U(t)$ is proportional to $U(t)-U(t-p)$, where p is the period when the infected people spread the virus in the most intensive way. Assuming that $U(t) = t^\alpha$, one has: $dU(t)/dt = \alpha t^{\alpha-1}$ and the leading term of $U(t) - U(t-p)$ is $p\,\alpha t^{\alpha-1} = p\,\alpha\,U(t)/t$, i.e. essentially proportional to $dU(t)/dt$. However, if $\alpha > 1$, there will be other terms in the expansion of $U(t)-U(t-p)$ and the proportionality with $U(t)/t$ can be only if either the virus transmission strength diminishes or we reduce our contacts over time. We stick to the latter reason in this work.

Let us try to clarify this. If the total number of cases growths linearly, i.e. when the number of new daily infections is constant, which is not really a "trigger" for us psychologically. However, we react strongly if the growth is parabolic or so. With *Covid-19*, *sociological* factors alone seem quite sufficient to result in the power growth. This is different from other power laws for infectious diseases; compare e.g. with [3].

Practically speaking, if someone wants to "see" the current *trend* of the epidemic using *only* the total number of infections to date, then $U(t)/t$ is the best way of course. Anyway, the corresponding differential equation $dU(t)/dt = c\,U(t)/t$ immediately gives that $U(t) = Ct^c$ for some constant C, i.e. results in the power growth. Such "sociological approach" to the epidemic spread is quite natural in our work: the active managements of epidemics is clearly of sociological nature.

This is what we do even *before* any protection measures; the initial c is about 2 in many countries for *Covid-19*. When the management begins, $U(t)$ is not $\sim t^c$ anymore; Bessel functions come into play till the "technical saturation" provided that the measures are as "hard"

as possible. The measures can soften after the turning point (or what looks like a turning point). We can model this too; the corresponding equations can be solved in terms of Bessel functions as well.

Some details. The full theory is presented in [6]. If the number of new infections is proportional to the current number of those infected, then the exponential growth of the spread is granted. By analogy with *news impact over time* from [7], it is quite likely that the number of such contacts is proportional to the current *total* number of the detected infections to date *divided by the time to date*. The coefficient of proportionality is the intensity of the spread. The "news impact" is absolutely relevant here: the discussion of the epidemic by the authorities in charge and everywhere is one of the key factors influencing our understanding the situation and the reduction of our contacts. The active prevention measures are the main factor, but they begin later.

Starting with the equation $dU(t)/dt = c\,U(t)/t$ for the total number of infections $U(t)$, the coefficient of proportionality, the *basic transmission rate* c, is therefore a combination of the transmission strength of the virus and the "normal" frequency of the contacts in the infected place. There can be other mechanisms for the "power law", including the biological ones. Self-isolation of infected species is common ... unless for *rabies*; it can grow over time and can depend on the intensity of the spread. The replication processes for viruses is another reduction mechanism, but this is well beyond this article.

The coefficient c is one of the two main mathematical parameters of our theory. It can be qualitatively seen as follows.

Before the prevention measures are implemented, approximately it reveals itself in the growth $\sim t^c$ of the total number of detected infections, where t is time. Mostly, $c \approx 2.2 \dot{-} 2.6$ for *Covid-19*. This is after a short period of the exponential growth. Upon the active management, the growth quickly drops to $t^{c/2}$, i.e. becomes essentially linear, which is part of our theory in [6]. Importantly our $u(t)$ and $w(t)$ behave as $\sim t^c$ for relatively small t, so Bessel functions can be used very well to model the initial stages; this is the key for forecasting.

Ending epidemics. The "power law" is only a starting point of our analysis. The main problem is of course to "add" here some mechanisms ending epidemics and those preventing their possible recurrence. These are major challenges, biologically, psychologically, sociologically and mathematically. One can expect this *megaproblem* to be well beyond the power law itself, but we demonstrate that mathematically there is a path based on Bessel functions. The power growth alone does not lead to any saturation, the Bessel functions are needed.

We are of course fully aware of the statistical nature of the problem, but the formula for the growth of the total number of infections we

propose works almost with an accuracy of physics laws. This is very surprising for such stochastic processes as epidemics.

An important outcome of our modeling is that the measures of "hard type", like detecting and isolating infected people and closing the places where the spread is almost inevitable, are the key for ending an epidemic. The most aggressive "hard way" is to employ such measures strictly proportionally to the current total numbers of detected infections, not to its derivative of any kind.

For instance, if the number of infections doubles during some period, then *testing-detection* must be increased 4–fold. Similarly, when we approach the saturation, where the number of new detected infections becomes close to zero, the "hard response" is to continue testing *linearly* for some time, i.e. performing the same number of tests every day in spite of almost zero number of new infections.

By contrast, the "soft response" is as follows. We react to the *average* number instead of the *absolute* number of infections. For instance, testing and other measures will practically stop when there are no new "cases". If this is coupled with "soft" measures (see below), then mathematically the epidemic will never reach the saturation. However coupling the "soft response" with "hard" measures does result in the saturation, though it will take longer.

The u, w–formulas. Upon composing the corresponding differential equations and integrating them we obtain the following. The function $u(t) = C\, t^{(c+1)/2} J_{c/2-1/2}(\sqrt{a}t)$ for the Bessel function $J_\alpha(x)$ of the first kind models the growth of the *total* number of infections, where C is the scaling parameter. Here and below time t is normalized $days/10$ for the number of days from the beginning of the period of the intense growth of the epidemic. Under "soft response" it is $w(t) = D\, t^{(c+1)/2} J_{c-1}(2\sqrt{bt})$ for the same c but different D, b. We will mostly discuss $u(t)$, which work with high accuracy till the late stages. Both are $\sim t^c$ for small t. Thus both cover well the period of initial, essentially quadratic, growth of the number of detected infections. The parameters a, b give the *intensity* of "hard" measures correspondingly for $u(t)$ and $w(t)$.

The parameter a is 0.2 for the USA and UK; it can be about 0.3 for countries with somewhat more proactive approach, like Austria and Israel, and it becomes 0.15 and 0.1 for "the world" and Sweden. The basic transmission rates c are currently: 2.2 for the USA, 2.4 for UK, Sweden, 2.6 for Israel, 2.8 for "the world". Recall that c qualitatively corresponds to the growth $\sim t^c$ of total infections in the beginning of the epidemic, when no protection measures are in place.

Limitations. Of course there can be other reasons for $u(t), w(t)$ to "serve epidemics", not only due to the aggressive management. It is

not impossible that there are connections with the replication process of viruses, but this we do not touch upon. As in any models, there are limitations, which we will address now.

First and foremost, the available infection numbers are for the *detected* cases, which are mostly *symptomatic*. However this is not of much concern to us. We understand managing epidemics from the viewpoint of the management. Infected people who are detected mostly have symptoms, but the change of the number of detected cases generally reflects well the "trend", which is sufficient to properly adjust the intensity of the measures. So *de facto* focusing on symptomatic cases is basically sufficient for the management (and for our approach). No assumptions on asymptomatic cases are necessary to obtain the u, w–formulas. We of course understand that when the number of new *reported* infections drops to zero, there can be many non-detected asymptomatic cases, which can potentially lead to the recurrence of the epidemic. Such a saturation is only a *technical* end of the epidemic.

The second reservation concerns *newly emerged clusters of infections*, testing in new areas, and the countries where the spread is on the rise. The u–formula can be used, but significant fluctuations can be expected. The best is to use it then together with the w–formula, which provides some "cone" of expectations. Obviously, if the new clusters persist the predictions must be constantly updated.

The third reservation is related to the management of the epidemic. Not all countries employ the protection measures in similar ways, but this is not a problem to us. The problem is if the intensity of the measures and the criteria are changed in some irregular ways. Diminishing the "hard" measures too early or even dropping them completely at later stages is of this kind; this is where $w(t)$ comes into play.

Last but not the least is the *data quality*. Changing frequently the ways they are collected and the criteria makes such data useless for us. Though, if the number of detected infections is underreported in some regular ways, whatever the reasons, such data can be generally used. Thus, this is sufficiently relaxed, but the data for several countries, not too many, are not suitable for the usage of our "forecasting tool".

Forecasting the spread. With these reservations, the first point of maximum t_{top} of $u(t)$ is a good estimate for the duration of the epidemic when the "hard" measures are used and the response is "hard". If the response to total number of infections is "soft", the w–function is supposed to be used. This is assuming that the measures are systematic and the focus is on the detection and isolation of infected people.

We note that the approximate reflection symmetry of $du(t)/dt$ for the $u(t)$ in the range from $t = 0$ to t_{top} can be interpreted as *Farr's law of epidemics under aggressive management*. Generally, the portions of the corresponding graph before and after the *turning point* are supposed

to be essentially symmetric to each other. This is not exactly true for $du(t)/dt$, the first half is a bit shorter than the second. See Figure 2 and the others; the turning point is at $\max\{du(t)/dt\}$. For $w(t)$, the period after the turning point is somewhat longer than that before.

As any model, our one is based on various simplifications. We assume that the number of people perceptive to the virus is unlimited, i.e. we do not consider epidemics with the number infections comparable with the whole population. Also, we do not take into consideration the average durations of the disease the quarantine periods in our model. The *total* number of *detected* infections is what we are going to model, which is commonly used and systematically reported. In spite of all these simplifications, the u–formula works unexpectedly well.

We mention here a strong connections with *behavioral finance*: *momentum risk-taking* from [7]. Practically the same $u(t)$ as above serves "profit taking" in stock markets. The initial polynomial growth of $u(t)$ is parallel to the "power law" for share prices; $w(t)$ occurred there too.

2. Two kinds of management. There is a long history and many aspects of mathematical modeling epidemic spread; see e.g. [1] for a review. We restrict ourselves only with the dynamic of *momentum managing epidemics*, naturally mostly focusing on the middle stages, when our actions must be as precise as possible. The two basic modes we consider are essentially as follows:

(A) aggressive enforcement of the measures of immediate impact, where testing-detection-isolation is the key, reacting to the current *absolute* numbers of detected infections, i.e. in the hardest possible way;

(B) a more balanced and more defensive approach when mathematically we react to the *average* numbers of infections to date and the employed measures are of more indirect and palliative nature.

Hard and soft measures. The main examples of (A)–type measures are prompt detection and isolation of infected people and those of high risk to be infected, and closing places where the spread is the most likely. Actually the primary measure here is *testing*; the number of tests is what we can really implement and control. The *detection* of infected people is its main purpose, but the number of tests is obviously not directly related to the number of detections, i.e. to the number of *positive tests*. The efficiency of testing requires solid priorities, focus on the groups with main risks, and solving quite a few problems.

Even simple mentioning problems with testing, detection and isolation is well beyond our article. However, numerically we can use the following. During the epidemics, essentially during the stages of linear growth, which are the key for us, the number of positive tests can be mostly assumed a stable fraction of the total number of tests.

This is demonstrated in Figure 1. Such proportionality can be seen approximately from March 16 in this figure.



FIGURE 1. Daily testing vs. new daily cases for USA

The measures like wearing protective masks, social distancing, recommended self-isolation, restricting the size of events are typical for (B). They are aimed at reducing c, which heavily impacted the differential equations we obtained in [6]. However the main difference between the modes, (A) vs. (B), is the way the number of infections is treated: the *absolute* number of infections is the trigger for (A), whereas the *average* number of infections to date is what we monitor under (B). The mode (AB) from [6], a combination of "hard" measures with "soft response", is important at later stages of *Covid-19*.

Hard measures are the key. Generally, the (A)–type approach provides the fastest and hardest response to the changes with the number of infections. We somewhat postpone with our actions until the averages reach proper levels under (B), and the measures we implement are "softer". Mathematically, the (B)-mode is better protected against stochastic fluctuations, but it is slower and generally cannot alone lead to the termination of the epidemic, which we justify within our approach.

The main objective of any managing epidemics is to end them quickly. However the excessive usage of hard measures can lead to the recurrence of the epidemic, some kind of "cost" of our aggressive interference in a natural process. Unless *herd immunity* is a possibility, this can be avoided only if we stick to the prevention measures as much as possible even when the number of new infections goes down significantly. Reducing them too much on the first signs of improvement is a way to the recurrence of the epidemic, which we can see mathematically.

Some biological aspects. The *viral fitness* is an obvious component of the transmission rate c. Its diminishing over time can be expected, but this is involved. This can happen because of the virus replication

errors. The *RNA* viruses, *Covid-19* included, replicate with fidelity that is close to error catastrophe. See e.g. [8] for some review and predictions. Such matters are well beyond this paper, but one biological aspect must be mentioned, concerning the *asymptomatic cases*.

The viruses mutate at very high rates. They can "soften" over time to better coexist with the hosts, though fast and efficient spread is of course the "prime objective" of any virus. Such softening can result in an increase of asymptomatic cases, difficult to detect. So this can contribute to diminishing c we observe, though not because of the actual decrease of the spread of the disease. We model the available (posted) numbers of total infections, which mostly reflect the symptomatic cases.

To summarize, it is not impossible that the replication errors and "softening the virus" may result in diminishing c at later stages of the epidemic, but we think that the reduction of the contacts of infected people with the others dominates here, which is directly linked to behavioral science, sociology and psychology.

3. The formula for the growth.. We will need the definition of the *Bessel functions* of the first kind:

$$J_\alpha(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m (x/2)^{2m+\alpha}}{m!\Gamma(m+\alpha+1)}.$$

See [9] (Ch.3, S 3.1). Practically, use `BesselJ`$[\alpha, \mathtt{x}]$ in Mathematica.

The key point is that measures of type (A) have "ramified" consequences, in some contrast to (B). Namely, isolated infected individuals will *not* transmit the virus to many people, they will not infect many others and so on; thus the number of those protected due to a single isolation grows over time. Combining this with our approach to the power law of epidemics, we arrive at the differential equation for the total number of detected infections $u(t), w(t)$:

$$\frac{du(t)}{dt} = c\,\frac{u(t)}{t} - \frac{1}{a}\int_0^t u(s)ds, \quad \frac{dw(t)}{dt} = c\,\frac{w(t)}{t} - \frac{1}{b}\int_0^t \frac{w(s)}{s}ds,$$

which can be solved in terms of Bessel functions. The dominant solutions are $u(t) = Ct^{(c+1)/2} J_{c/2-1/2}(\sqrt{a}t)$, $w(t) = Dt^{(c+1)/2} J_{c-1}(2\sqrt{bt})$ for some constants C, D. Note that both are $\sim t^c$ for small t.

There is a surprisingly perfect match of the *total* number of infections for *Covid-19* during the initial and middle stages with our $u(t)$, from the moment when these numbers begin to grow "significantly" and during some time after the "turning point". In the USA and UK,

at least from March 15 till April 15 at least. Epidemics are very stochastic processes, so such a precision is unexpected. If not $u(t)$, then presumably $w(t)$ can be employed for the later stages.

Let us mention that `https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus` is mostly used for the data, updated at 11:30 London time. *We always set $x = days/10$ in this article.*

The USA data. The scaling coefficient 1.7 in Figure 2 is adjusted to match the real numbers. For the USA, we set $y = \text{infections}/100K$, and take March 17 the beginning of the period of "significant growth". The parameters are $c = 2.2$, $a = 0.2$.

The *red dots* show the corresponding actual *total* numbers of infections. They *perfectly* match $u(t) = 1.7t^{1.1}J_{0.6}(t\sqrt{0.2})$ in Figure 2, which results in the following: the number of cases in the USA was expected to reach its preliminary saturation at $t_{top} = 4.85$ (48.5 days from 03/17 to May 5) with $u_{top} = 10.3482$, i.e. with 1034820 infections (it was 609516 at 04/15). This is of course a *lower bond*: about $1M$ of total cases at the u–saturation point t_{top} near May 5.

The *black dots* show the test period, till May 5. The "prediction", a lower bound for the "saturation" to be exact, was based on the assumption that *the intensity of hard measures continues to be proportional to the total number of detected infections to date*. It was clearly the case for the *red dots*, but there were several significant jumps and even periods of significant growth during the test period (black dots). This could be due to new clusters of infections or diminishing the intensity of hard measures. Such fluctuations are not unusual and do not influence too much the match with $u(t)$ if they readily trigger additional protection measures, which is not always the case. If $u(t)$ (upon some shifts) seems not applicable at the later stages, as happened for the USA and UK, $w(t)$ is supposed to be used according to [6].

Obviously $t = t_{top}$ cannot be the end of the epidemic. The data from South Korea and those from other countries that went through the "saturation", demonstrate that *a linear growth of the total number of cases can be expected around and after t_{top}, with possible fluctuations*. The obvious reasons are: *(a)* reducing the "hard" and "soft" measures, *(b)* no country is isolated from infections from other places, *(c)* continued testing can result in finding more asymptomatic cases, *(d)* new clusters of disease are always possible. Anyway, fluctuations closer to the "u–saturation" and after it are quite likely. Reacting to them "hard way" is not always the case. The u–formula is mostly applicable to the period when the protection measures, especially "hard" ones, are applied in a hard and regular manner.



FIGURE 2. $u(t)=1.7\,t^{(c+1)/2}J_{(c-1)/2}(\sqrt{a}t)$ for $c=2.2, a=0.2$

Covid-19 in UK. The data will be from 03/16 till 04/15; add 18 to our "red dots", the initial number at 03/16, to match the actual total numbers. The *black dots* constitute the control period: 04/16-05/05.



FIGURE 3. $u(t)=2.2\,t^{(c+1)/2}J_{(c-1)/2}(\sqrt{a}t)$ for $c=2.4, a=0.2$

Now $c=2.4, a=0.2$ work fine, and the scaling coefficient is 2.2. The total number of cases is divided by $10K$, not by $100K$ as for the USA. The "u–saturation moment" was 5.17, i.e about 51 days after March 16, somewhere around May 6. The estimate for corresponding number of infections was about 170000, with all ifs. It was assuming that the

"hard" measures would be employed at the same pace as before April 15, i.e. following mode (A), which is the most aggressive approach.

Sweden 03/07-04/23. This is an example of the country that remains essentially "open". Actually, they actively do testing of infected people, the key "hard" measure from our perspective. Also, the strength of the health-care in this country must be taken into consideration, and that Sweden is surrounded by the countries that fight *Covid-17* aggressively. The growth of the total number of cases was essentially quadratic for a relatively long period, which is what "power law" states for the epidemics with minimal "intervention". By now, the growth is linear; a reduction from t^c to $t^{c/2}$ follows from the theory. Mathematically, our $u-$ formula is applicable, but for the record low $a = 0.1$; it is $a = 0.15$ for "the world". Here y is the total number of cases divided by 1000 ; add 137, the initial value, to our "dots". The projected $u-$ saturation was around May 17, with standard reservations; see Figure 4. We think $w(t)$ can do better, but with the countries that do not employ real hard measures, the usage of u, w is questionable.



FIGURE 4. $u(t) = 1.7\, t^{(c+1)/2} J_{(c-1)/2}(\sqrt{a}t)$ for $c = 2.4, a = 0.1$

Israel: "saturation". The last example we provide is what can be expected when the country went through the "saturation". Israeli population is diverse, which has a potential of significant fluctuations of the number of cases and various clusters of infection. However its solid response to *Covid-19* and good overall health-system, made the growth of the spread sufficiently predictable. We divide the total number of cases by 1000, as for Sweden; see Figure 5.

The *red dots* began March 13, when the *total* number of detected infections was 96, and stopped April 17; the remaining period till May 5,

shown by the black dots, was the "control one". The saturation forecast went through almost perfectly, but there were significant fluctuations in process. After April 26, the predicted moment of the saturation, the growth of the total number of (known) infections is supposed to be mild linear. The parameters are: $a = 0.3$, i.e. the intensity of hard measures is better than with the USA, UK, and $c = 2.6$. The latter means that the initial transmission coefficient was somewhat worse than $c = 2.4$ in the USA, UK, possibly due to the greater number of "normal" contacts. Recall that a, c are parameters of our theory, related to but not immediately connected with the real factors.



FIGURE 5. $u(t) = 2.2\, t^{(c+1)/2} J_{(c-1)/2}(\sqrt{a}t)$ for $c = 2.6, a = 0.3$

4. Toward forecasting. Our function $u(t)$ models well the period of intensive growth when the hard measures are coupled with the most aggressive respond to the current number of total cases. It seems essentially sufficient for forecasting if the (A)–mode is used all the way until the number of new detected infections drop almost to zero. Then t_{top}, the first zero of $du(t)/dt$ is a reasonable estimate for the "technical end of epidemics". South Korea, Austria, Israel and quite a few others did exactly this. Some linear growth can be expected after t_{top}, but this moment is really a saturation.

However growing number of countries begin reducing hard measures (if any) almost after the turning point, or after what looks like a turning point. The growth can be expected linear then, but the number of daily new infections can be very high. From our perspective, this means a switch from mode (A) to mode (B). We need to be more exact here. The hard measures are still obviously present, but the response becomes softer, of type B.

For instance, if the number of new cases is essentially a constant, even uncomfortably high, the (B)–response is to keep the testing-detection constant too. Furthermore, counting on the improvements with testing and better capacities for isolation and treatment, many places with potentially high risks of the spread of *Covid-19* can be allowed to reopen. An argument in favor of such an approach is that people who suspect that they are infected begin more actively request help at this stage. This works in the same direction as any "hard" measures; some countries, like Sweden, count on this.

Possibly no further modeling is needed for the countries that reached stable relatively small numbers of new daily infections. This is with usual reservations concerning new clusters of infections and similar developments. However if the new daily cases are constant but high, a different kind of modeling is required, which is (AB).

Our theory provides this. The assumption is that the hard measures are still in place, but the response to the current total number of detected infections is via $U(t)/t$ instead of $U(t)$; see Section 2. The saturation will occur significantly later.

This model, called (AB)–mode here and in [6], is governed by $w(t)$. The point t^w_{top} where the (first) maximum of $w(t)$ occurs seems a reasonable upper bound for the "technical saturation". The prior $t^u_{top} = t_{top}$ then is a lower bound; we obtain some *forecast cone*.

Actually even relatively minor deviations with a, c can lead to significant changes of $u(t)$ over time, so we have some "cones". However, we have something more fundamental here. The switch to $w(t)$ is due to a different kind of management.

When the daily numbers of new cases are high, there are significant chances of new clusters and fluctuations of the data of all kinds. So we need to model a process with many uncertainties. However, we think that this is basically no different from what we did for the middle stages, where $u(t)$ was surprisingly efficient.

Recall that $u(t) = Ct^{\frac{c+1}{2}} J_{(c-1)/2}(t\sqrt{a})$, $\quad w(t) = Dt^{\frac{c+1}{2}} J_{c-1}(2\sqrt{tb})$. Accordingly, their match $u(t) \approx w(t)$ near $t = 0$ gives:

$$\frac{C}{D} \approx \Big(\frac{2b}{\sqrt{a}}\Big)^{\frac{c-1}{2}} \frac{\Gamma((c+1)/2)}{\Gamma(c)} \quad \text{for the } \Gamma\text{-function.}$$

The cone for the USA. The prior $t_{top} = t^u_{top}$ for $u(t)$ was May 5, with a, c, C calculated on the bases of the data till April 16. It was under the expectations that the "hard" measures would applied as in (A) (as before April 16). However the presence of 3 major spikes in the daily cases and other factors like *de facto* relaxing hard measures obviously



FIGURE 6. USA: $c=2.2, a=0.2, C=1.7$; $b=0.35, D=1.9$.

delayed the saturation. Whatever the reasons, the switch to the (AB)-mode and $w(t)$ appeared necessary.

The current trend seems toward $w(t)$. Generally, the black dots can be expected to stay within the *forecast cone*, subject to all standard warnings. The cone is defined as the area between $u(t)$ extended by a constant $u(t_{top})$ for $t > t^u_{top}$ and the graph of $w(u)$ till t^w_{top}, which is approximately May 30, 2020. The parameters b, D of $w(t)$ are calculated to ensure good match with *red dots*; c, the initial transmission rate, is the same for $u(t)$ and $w(t)$. The graphs of $u(t)$ and $w(t)$ are very close to each other in the range of *red dots*. The above relation for C/D holds with the accuracy about 20%.

The w–saturation value is around 1.6M, but mostly we monitor the *trend*, the "derivative" of the graph of black dots, which is supposed to be close to the derivative of $w(t)$ or $u(t)$. See Figure 6. Some spikes with number of cases are inevitable; it is acceptable if the dots continue to be parallel to $u(t)$ or $w(t)$ (or in between).

UK: June 10? The graphs of $u(t), w(t)$ with all red-black dots available by now are in Figure 7. The expected t^w_{top} is around June 9. The total number of detected infections is expected 330K. These "predictions" will of course depend on many developments. However, there is an important argument in favor of the stability of our model: any spikes with the numbers of infections are supposed to trigger actions of authorities in charge and influence of own protection measures. This is a rationale for relatively uniform patterns of the spread of *Covid-19*.

Sweden: 100 days?. The case of Sweden is actually to set a limit to our approach, because this country does not follow hard ways with



FIGURE 7. UK: $c=2.4, a=0.2, C=2.2$; $b=0.35, D=2.5$.

fighting *Covid-19*. However it appeared that $w(t)$ works well here so far; the data follow it closely. See Figure 8. Accordingly, the forecast is that approximately after 100 days, there can be some saturation, i.e. at about June 15. Here we have of course more reservation than with other examples. However, if people readily contact the authorities with any symptoms of *Covid-19*, this is a "hard measure".



FIGURE 8. $w(t)=2.1t^{(c+1)/2}J_{c-1}(2\sqrt{bt})$; $b=0.3, c=2.4$.

Some discussion. Recall that we consider only "total cases", the numbers of all detected infections, and begin at the moment when the "significant" growth begins, which is essentially when the active measures start. According to our theory, the match with $u(t)$ can be

expected in some interval around the turning point. Practically it holds better than this, including the beginning of the period of intensive growth. It seems that $u(t)$ gives a reasonable forecast as far as the authorities in charge follow mode (A), i.e. aggressively employ "hard" measures, even when the numbers of new cases become steady.

If the reductions of hard measures start before the new cases diminish significantly, the *forecast cone* between $u(t)$ and $w(t)$ can be used. Generally, $w(t)$ seems closer to "reality", especially if the reduction of hard measures on the first signs of improvements is likely.

Our restriction to the period till April 15, 2020 with fixing a, c, except for Sweden, is not accidental. It was sufficient for the practical confirmations of the theory of the "middle period" of the spread presented in Figures 2,3, and with other countries. The latest data, *the black dots*, provide the "real-time checks"; they were obtained *after* the parameters were fixed. The pandemic is far from over, but within the scope of this paper, the data we needed to claim that Bessel functions can be used for forecasting were essentially present by 04/15.

When the epidemic approaches the u–saturation, which is the first maximum of $u(t)$ in our model, reducing and abandoning "hard" measures can be expected. If this saturation results in relatively small daily numbers of new detected infections, we would expect a further growth like $At^{c/2}$ with some "mild" A and $c/2 \approx 1$. Though fluctuations can and will happen. Such growth is generally covered by our theory; it is not connected with Bessel functions. This is fully applicable to $w(t)$, but in many cases $u(t)$ can be sufficient.

If the daily numbers remain high, "spikes" of infections, new clusters and so on can be expected, as we can see for the USA. Then the transitional mode (AB) seems more relevant for the later stages; at least it is the most logical mathematical suggestion within our theory. Combining the corresponding w–curve with the u–curve, we arrive at the *forecast cone*, which seems the best we can propose by now.

Thus, generally $w(t)$ and $u(t)$ seems realistic upper and lower bounds for the total number of detected infections. The $u(t)$ alone can be sufficient in countries that fight *Covid-19* in aggressive ways.

On the basis of what we see, the best ways to use our curves seem as follows: *(1):* determine a, c when the period of linear growth seems steady, *(2):* update them constantly till the turning point and somewhat beyond, *(3):* try to adjust the intensity of the measures to stay close to $u(t)$, *(4):* after the turning point determine b, D and $w(t)$ for the "upper bound", *(5):* "testing-detecting" must be intensively continued well after the "saturation". The latter is needed to prevent the recurrence of the epidemic. With *(3)*, the applicability of our models requires fast responses to new clusters of the disease, spikes with the

new cases due to the reductions of the measures and so on. This is assuming that *herd immunity,* is not a significant factor.

Generally, our forecasting tool can serve the best if the data and the measures are as uniform and "stable" as possible. Then underreporting the number of infections, focusing on symptomatic cases, and inevitable fluctuations with the data may not influence too much the applicability of the u, w–curves.

Acknowledgements. I'd like to thank ETH-ITS for outstanding hospitality. My special thanks are to Giovanni Felder, Rahul Pandharipande. I also thank very much David Kazhdan for his valuable comments and suggestions. Funding: partially supported by NSF grant DMS–1901796 and the Simons Foundation.

References.

[1] H. Hethcote, *The mathematics of infectious diseases*, SIAM Review, 42:4. (2000), 599–653. 2, 6

[2] H. Hethcote, and S. Levin, *Periodicity in Epidemiological Models*, In: Applied Mathematical Ecology. Biomathematics, 18, 193–211, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, S. Levin, T. Hallam, L. Gross (eds), 1989. 2

[3] S. Meyer, and L. Held, *Power-Law models for infectious disease spread*, The Annals of Applied Statistics 8:3 (2014), 1612–1639. 2

[4] Ph. Strong, *Epidemic psychology: a model*, Sociology of Health & Illness 12:3 (1990), 249–259. 2

[5] S. Cobey, *Modeling infectious disease dynamics*, Science, 24 Apr 2020; DOI: 10.1126/science.abb5659. 2

[6] I. Cherednik, *Momentum managing epidemic spread and Bessel functions*, Preprint: arxiv 2004.06021v3 (q-bio), 2020. 3, 7, 9, 13

[7] I. Cherednik, *Artificial intelligence approach to momentum risk-taking*, Preprint: arxiv 1911.08448v4 (q-fin), 2019. 3, 6

[8] R. Carrasco-Hernandez, and R. Jácome, and Y. López Vidal, and S. Ponce de León, *Are RNA viruses candidate agents for the next global pandemic? A review*, ILAR Journal, 58:3 (2017), 343–358. 8

[9] G.N. Watson, *A Treatise on the Theory of Bessel Functions*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1944. 8