

# Modeling the dynamics of COVID-19 using Q-SEIR model with age-stratified infection probability

Joshua Frankie Rayo<sup>1\*</sup>, Romulo de Castro<sup>2</sup>, Jesus Emmanuel Sevilleja<sup>3</sup>, Vena Pearl Boñgolan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science, College of Engineering, University of the Philippines Diliman

<sup>2</sup> Center for Informatics, University of San Agustin, Iloilo City, Philippines

<sup>3</sup> National Center for Mental Health, Mandaluyong City, Philippines

\*Corresponding author: [jbrayo@up.edu.ph](mailto:jbrayo@up.edu.ph)

## Abstract

We explore the advantage of age-stratifying the population as an improvement on the quarantine-modified SEIR model. We hypothesize that this would project lower cases of infection for the Philippines because of our country's low median age. We introduce the variable  $U$  that is multiplied to the incubation rate  $\sigma$  when exposed individuals become infected.  $U$  is the dot product of the proxy infection probabilities stratified per age group ( $F$ ) and the population stratified per age group ( $P$ ) divided by the total population, similar to calculating mathematical expectation. Proxies were taken from two data sets: Hubei, China with a calculated value of  $U_{CHN} = 0.4447$  and Quezon City, Philippines with  $U_{QC} = 0.5074$ . When the majority age group, represented by the median age, is far from the age group with the highest number of infections the number of infected individuals decreases and produces a delayed peaking effect. This new method gives a much lower estimate on peak number of infected cases by 65.2% compared with age-stratification alone; and by 75.2% compared with Q-SEIR alone.

*Keywords: COVID-19; SEIR model; quarantine policy; age stratification; Philippines*

## 24 Introduction

25 As COVID-19 rages around the world, modeling of the epidemic must be continuously validated against the  
26 actual number of cases to help decision makers plan healthcare resource allocations. This scenario underscores  
27 the importance of massive, inclusive diagnostic testing to get to the real number of cases in a locality.

28 The Q-SEIR model [1] is a compartmental model that estimates the number of susceptible ( $S$ ), exposed ( $E$ ),  
29 infectious ( $I$ ) and removed ( $R$ ) individuals during an epidemic in a community ( $N$ ) with quarantine factor ( $Q$ ).

30 The dynamics of this epidemic can be described by a system of differential equations

$$31 \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle S, E, I, R \rangle = \left\langle \frac{-\beta QSI}{N}, \frac{\beta QSI}{N} - \sigma E, \sigma E - \gamma R, \gamma R \right\rangle$$

$$32 \quad N = S + E + I + R$$

33 Parameters needed to run the model include:  $t$  as unit of time, usually in days and starts at  $t = 0$ ,  $\beta$  is the  
34 transmission rate (number of individuals who contract the disease per unit time),  $\sigma$  is incubation rate for the  
35 symptoms of the disease to manifest on an individual (expressed as 1 person per units of time) and  $\gamma$  is removal  
36 rate (expressed as 1 person per units of time). This model does not consider vaccination and ignores the  
37 population's vital statistics since the epidemic may not linger long enough for natural births and deaths to be  
38 influential. It also assumes removed as either recovery with permanent immunity or death.

39  $Q(t)$  is a parameter that represents the effectiveness of quarantine, which can change over time. A value of 1  
40 means that there is no quarantine and we regain the original SEIR model, while a value of 0.4 means that it is  
41 60% effective. Implementing quarantine effectively reduces disease transmission: less people will be exposed  
42 consequently lowering the number of infected individuals, delaying the peak, and flattening the epidemic curve  
43 as expected. Using the Age Stratification method, for Quezon City, the projected peak number of infected cases  
44 is 9.95% of the total population, while Q-SEIR projected 13.99% with  $Q(t) = 0.4$  [1].

45 The Q-SEIR model assumes a homogeneous population where all individuals have the same probability of  
46 becoming infected. However, in Hubei, China, the report [5] indicates that number of infected individuals  
47 disproportionately occurs in higher age groups. We treat the age-stratified occurrences in Hubei as good proxies  
48 for the infection probabilities per age group in Quezon City, Philippines. Thus, we now combine the Q-SEIR

49 model and the presumed age-stratified infection probability. We hypothesize that this would project a lower  
50 number of infections for Quezon City because of the Philippines' younger population. The number of infected  
51 cases at the peak and the time of peaking using this model (Age-Stratified Q-SEIR, ASQ) will be compared with  
52 Q-SEIR.

## 53 **Materials and Methods**


54 We assumed that  $\beta, \sigma$  and  $\gamma$  parameters are immutable properties of the virus-host interaction therefore they  
55 remain constant throughout the simulation. Two variables ( $Q$  and  $U$ ) were introduced to incorporate the  
56 quarantine policy and age-stratification of infection probability, respectively. The system is globally stable, so it  
57 was solved using first-order forward Euler method.  $N$  is conserved on each iteration,  $\frac{dN}{dt} = 0$ . A Microsoft Excel  
58 worksheet was used in entering the necessary parameters, implementing the numerical solution, and displaying  
59 the simulation results. The following parameter values were assigned for the base configuration:

$$\begin{array}{lll} S(t_0) = 99.9996497 & R(t_0) = 0.0000031 & \beta = 3.2 \\ E(t_0) = 0.000325 & N = 100.00 & \sigma = 1/7 \\ I(t_0) = 0.0000222 & t_0 = 0 \text{ (March 03, 2020)} & \gamma = 0.3 \end{array}$$

60 Simulation results on different scenarios are compared from this base configuration.

## 61 **Results and Discussion**

62 Fig 1 and Table 1 show simulation results on Q-SEIR for Quezon City where  $Q(t) = 1$  from day 0 to 13 and  
63  $Q(t) = 0.2$  (80% successful quarantine) from day 14 onwards – the initial confirmed cases appeared on March  
64 03 and the quarantine was imposed on March 16. This long-term scenario seems to have recreated *herd*  
65 *immunity*, protecting 16.44% of the susceptible population after 83.56% of the population was removed.  
66 Quarantine policy  $Q(t) = 0.2$  decreased the peak number of infected individuals, from 13.99% [1] to 5.79%.



67

68 **Fig 1. Q-SEIR model simulation displaying a herd immunity effect after 161 days of continuous**  
 69 **quarantine.  $Q(t) = 1$  from day 0 to 13 and  $Q(t) = 0.2$  from day 14 onwards.**

70 **Table 1. Peak times and values from Q-SEIR model with stricter quarantine.**

Findings	Time (days)	Date	Percentage
Peak exposed	100	28/06/2020	12.3241
Peak infected	103	01/07/2020	5.7914

71 An early report [5] showed that COVID-19 has a higher infection occurrence among the older age groups and  
 72 those with comorbidities. As an improvement to the Q-SEIR, an age-stratification component was added (we  
 73 now call as ASQ) where the relative proportion of infected cases per age group proxies the infection probability.  
 74 We only modified the term involving the transition from  $E$  to  $I$ . The probability of infection was represented by  
 75 parameter  $U$ , such that  $0 < U(t) \leq 1$ , which is multiplied to  $\sigma$ . The effect is that the incubation time, averaged  
 76 across the population over all age stratifications, increases. When  $U\sigma < \gamma$ , patients are being discharged from  
 77 hospitals faster than being admitted.


78 Without loss of generality, we use nine bins to group individuals by 10-year age intervals (0-9 years old, 10-19  
 79 years old, ..., 70-79 years old to 80 years old and above). Let  $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_9\}$  be the number of individuals per  
 80 age group. Similarly, we define  $F = \{F_1, \dots, F_9\}$  as the number of infected individuals per age group (proxy for  
 81 infection probability).

$$U = \frac{\sum_n \left( P_n \frac{F_n}{\max_j(F_j)} \right)}{\sum_n P_n} = \frac{P \cdot F}{N}$$

83 The quantity  $F/\max(F)$  represents relative infection probability per age group, with computed values on Table  
 84 2. This is the age groups' presumed infection probability relative to the most vulnerable age group. We define  
 85 the most vulnerable age group as the age group with the greatest number of infected individuals. In our  
 86 simulation, exposed individuals from the most vulnerable age group ( $F/\max(F) = 1$ ), become infected after  
 87 the specified incubation time while individuals in other age groups ( $F/\max(F) < 1$ ) effectively extend their  
 88 incubation time. Table 2 shows values for  $P$ ,  $F$  and  $F/\max(F)$  for Quezon City [2] and Hubei [5]. Quezon City  
 89 reported 1,294 cases as of May 5, 2020 and Hubei reported 44,672 cases as of February 11, 2020. Fig 2 shows  
 90 that they tend to have a normal distribution, a consequence of the Central Limit Theorem. It is observed that the  
 91 most vulnerable age group in Quezon City (30-39 years old) is younger than Hubei (50-59 years old). We posit  
 92 that this is a direct effect related to the Philippines' young age [1, see also Kenya vs. Japan comparison].

93 **Table 2. Relevant values for calculating the value of  $U$ .** The second column contains the population of  
 94 Quezon City by age group. The third and fourth columns contain the reported number of infected cases from  
 95 Quezon City and Hubei by age group. The fifth and sixth columns are the normalized age-stratified infection  
 96 probability proxies used to determine  $U$ .

Age group (years)	$P_{QC}$	$F_{QC}$	$F_{Hubei}$	$F/\max(F)_{QC}$	$F/\max(F)_{Hubei}$
0-9	573,845	12	416	0.0439	0.0415
10-19	612,165	20	549	0.0732	0.0548
20-29	659,804	166	3,619	0.6080	0.3616
30-39	512,688	273	7,600	1.0000	0.7594
40-49	390,696	192	8,571	0.7033	0.8564
50-59	275,683	231	10,008	0.8461	1.0000
60-69	142,813	243	8,583	0.8901	0.8576
70-79	52,146	120	3,918	0.4396	0.3914
≥80	21,870	37	1,408	0.1355	0.1407



97

98 **Fig 2. Distribution of relative infection probabilities from Hubei (as of February 11, 2020), Quezon City**  
 99 **(as of May 05, 2020) and the National Capital Region (NCR), Philippines (as of May 14, 2020).** Quezon  
 100 City is a district of NCR. The most vulnerable age group (30-39 years old for both QC and NCR) is assigned a  
 101 score of 1.

102 The Philippines has a very young population with a median age of 25.2 years, lower than the world median age  
 103 of 30.9 years and China's 38.4 years [3]. The vulnerable age range of the Quezon City is 30-39 years old, while  
 104 Hubei is 50-59 years old. The value of  $U$  is close to 1 if  $P$  and  $F$  has similar spread. Normalization relative to the  
 105 age group with most infected cases show:  $U_{Hubei} = 0.4447$  and  $U_{QC} = 0.5074$ .  $U_{QC}$  may still change as the  
 106 confirmed cases of the epidemic continue to be tallied.

107 Fig 3 and Table 3 shows a simulation on Age-stratified Q-SEIR (ASQ) model for Quezon City where  $Q(t) =$   
 108 1 from day 0 to 13 and  $Q(t) = 0.2$  from day 14 onwards with age-stratified infection probability from Quezon City  
 109 as well.




110

111 **Fig 3. Age-stratified Q-SEIR (ASQ) model simulation.**  $Q(t) = 1$  from day 0 to 13 and  $Q(t) = 0.2$  from day 14  
 112 onwards and  $U(t) = 0.5130$ .

113 **Table 3. Peak times and values from Age-stratified Q-SEIR (ASQ) model simulation.**


Findings	Time (days)	Date	Percentage
Peak exposed	174	10/09/2020	14.4199
Peak infected	178	14/09/2020	3.4673

114 Compared to Q-SEIR, the peak number of infected cases decreased from 5.79% to 3.47%. However, the peak  
 115 number of exposed cases increased from 12.31% to 14.42%. Younger age seems to be protective (lowers  
 116 infection) yet the higher proportion of younger individuals in a population increases exposure. This is the age-  
 117 stratification effect on a young population if the older age groups are more vulnerable. This principle is well-  
 118 illustrated by COVID-19 tests (Fig 4) and confirmed cases (Fig 5) from Hospital X, a government hospital from  
 119 the Philippines, undisclosed for privacy concerns. A young population effectively prolongs the incubation period,  
 120 very likely because of their better immune status and fewer risk factors such as diabetes and cardiovascular  
 121 diseases.



122

123 **Fig 4. Results of COVID-19 testing implemented at Hospital X on May 05, 2020.** There is a higher number  
124 of young individuals in this population which increases exposure.



125

126 **Fig 5. Percentage of positive tests by age group, obtained from Hospital X on May 05, 2020.** Younger  
127 age groups have lower infection probability than older age groups.

## 128 Conclusion

129 The ASQ model gives a much lower estimate on peak number of infected cases by 65.2% (3.46% vs 9.95%)  
130 compared with age-stratification alone; and by 75.2% (3.46% vs 13.99%) compared with Q-SEIR alone. We  
131 think this is because the median age of the Quezon City population is at a distance younger from the most  
132 vulnerable age group.

133 This method is part of a toolkit that forecasts demand on healthcare resources. More information on this toolkit  
134 can be found on <https://sites.google.com/a/dcs.upd.edu.ph/sms/simulating-the-dynamics-of-covid-19>. Local  
135 government units and public officials may contact the corresponding author to request a demonstration.  
136 Improvements on this model may include nonlinear incidence and treatment rates [4] to incorporate social  
137 awareness, physical distancing and quality of patient treatment.

## 138 Acknowledgements

139 We would like to thank the College of Engineering, University of the Philippines Diliman for supporting us in this  
140 research.

## 141 References

- 142 1. Bongolan V, Minoza J, de Castro R, Sevilleja J. Age-stratified Infection Probabilities Combined with  
143 Quarantine-Modified SEIR Model in the Needs Assessments for COVID-19. MedRxiv [Preprint]. 2020  
144 medRxiv 20057851 [posted 11 April 2020; cited 2020 May 04]: [5 p.]. Available from:  
145 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.08.20057851v1> doi:10.1101/2020.04.08.20057851
- 146 2. Department of Health, Philippines. Philippines COVID-19 Tracker; 2020 Apr 15 [cited 2020 May 05]. In:  
147 Department of Health [Internet]. Available from: <https://ncovtracker.doh.gov.ph>
- 148 3. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations. (2019, August 28). World Population  
149 Prospects 2019; 2019 Aug 28 [cited 2020 May 04]. In: United Nations [Internet]. Available from:  
150 <https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Standard/Population>
- 151 4. Upadhyay R, Pal A, Kumari, S. Dynamics of an SEIR epidemic model with nonlinear incidence and  
152 treatment rates. Nonlinear Dynamics. 2019 Apr 4. doi:10.1007/s11071-019-04926-6
- 153 5. Verity, R, Okell, L, Dorigatti, I. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based  
154 analysis. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020 Mar 20. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7