Simulation and prediction of further spread of COVID-19 in The Republic of Serbia by SEIRDS model of disease transmission

*Slavoljub STANOJEVIC[a] , Mirza PONJAVIC[b] , Slobodan STANOJEVIC[c] , Aleksandar STEVANOVIC[d], Sonja RADOJICIC[e]

[a]Directorate of National Reference Laboratories, Batajnicki drum 10, 11080 Zemun, Serbia

[b]International Burch University, Francuske revolucije bb, Ilidza 71210, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, e-mail: mirza.ponjavic@gis.ba

[c]Veterinary Scientific Institute of Serbia, Janisa Janulisa 14, 11107 Belgrade, Serbia, e-mail: slobodan.vet@gmail.com

[d]University of Pittsburgh, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, 3700 O'Hara Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15261, USA, e-mail: stevanovic@pitt.edu

[e]Belgrade University, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine – Department of Infectious Diseases and Epidemiology, Bulevar Oslobodenja 18, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, e-mail: sonjar@vet.bg.ac.rs

*Corresponding author: Slavoljub Stanojevic, e mail: slavoljub.stanojevic@minpolj.gov.rs

Abstract

As a response to the pandemic caused by SARSCov-2 virus, on 15 March, 2020, the Republic of Serbia introduced comprehensive anti-epidemic measures to curb COVID 19. After a slowdown in the epidemic, on 6 May, 2020, the regulatory authorities decided to relax the implemented measures. However, the epidemiological situation soon worsened again. As of 15 October, 2020, a total of 35,454 cases of SARSCov-2 infection have been reported in Serbia, including 770 deaths caused by COVID19. In order to better understand the epidemic dynamics and predict possible outcomes, we have developed a mathematical model SEIRDS (S-susceptible, E-exposed, I-infected, R-recovered, D-dead due to COVID19 infection, S-susceptible). When developing the model, we took into account the differences between different population strata, which can impact the disease dynamics and outcome. The model can be used to simulate various scenarios of the implemented intervention measures and calculate possible epidemic

outcomes, including the necessary hospital capacities. Considering promising results regarding the development of a vaccine against COVID19, the model is enabled to simulate vaccination among different population strata. The findings from various simulation scenarios have shown that, with implementation of strict measures of contact reduction, it is possible to control COVID19 and reduce number of deaths. The findings also show that limiting effective contacts within the most susceptible population strata merits a special attention. However, the findings also show that the disease has a potential to remain in the population for a long time, likely with a seasonal pattern. If a vaccine, with efficacy equal or higher than 65%, becomes available it could help to significantly slow down or completely stop circulation of the virus in human population. The effects of vaccination depend primarily on: 1. Efficacy of available vaccine(s), 2. Prioritization of the population categories for vaccination, and 3. Overall vaccination coverage of the population, assuming that the vaccine(s) develop solid immunity in vaccinated individuals. With expected basic reproduction number of R_o=2.46 and vaccine efficacy of 68%, an 87%–coverage would be sufficient to stop the virus circulation.

Keywords: COVID19, SEIRDS mathematical model differential equation, prediction, vaccination

1. Introduction

On 11 March, 2020, the World Health Organization characterised the disease caused by the novel SARS Cov-2 virus as a pandemic [1]. Initial epidemic outbreak in China spread outside the Wuhan area, and subsequently on a global scale. On 6 March, 2020, the first case of the novel corona virus infection was reported in the Republic of Serbia. Taking into consideration the escalation of the disease and limited effects of the initially implemented measures, the state of emergency was declared throughout the country on 15 March, 2020. Comprehensive anti-epidemic measures (e.g. lockdown of entire country) were introduced in the entire country [2]. Due to the absence of specific pharmaceutical intervention, Serbia, like other countries, implemented an anti-epidemic strategy based on social distancing, school and university closures, reduced number of workers present in the workplaces, closure of places of worship for public religious services, reduced working hours of cafés and restaurants, avoiding mass gatherings, events, sports games, tracing and identification of infected people's contacts, etc. After a slowdown in the epidemic, as shown in the relevant officially published data, the regulatory authorities decided to relax the introduced

measures on 6 May, 2020. However, the epidemiological situation soon worsened again, resulting in the reinstatement of some measures, as well as the introduction of new measures [2]. Although the return of extensive measures has yielded favourable results, the further development of the epidemic is not clear.

For these reasons, mathematical modelling has a crucial role in understanding the epidemic and predicting possible outcomes. Modelling is a particularly useful tool for devising strategies for combating the epidemic, capacity planning, and selection of efficient measures, especially in the absence of specific pharmaceutical treatments [3, 4, 5]. Mathematical modelling based on differential equations dates back to the first half of 20th century. In 1927, Kermack and McKendrick developed the basic model of disease transmission consisting of three compartments: susceptible (S), infected (I) and removed (R). The model was based on a connected system of nonlinear differential equations as a special case of the general epidemiological model [6, 7]. Subsequent models, became more complex and adapted to the needs of research [5].

Since the outbreak of COVID19, many published papers have dealt with the implementation of mathematical modelling and prediction of possible outcomes of COVID19 epidemics. Most of these research efforts have been based on the implementation of the SIR (susceptible-infected-removed) model. Many of the other models provide a clear picture of dynamics of COVID19 spreading, including the overloading of the relevant health systems. For example, Ferguson et al., developed one of the first models for COVID19 simulation, which was, among other things, used to plan the health care resources [8]. Wu et al., developed the SEIR model to examine the dynamics of SARS-Cov-2 transmission from person to person. This model was also used to calculate the basic reproduction number R_o, which we use in this paper as one of the key parameters [9]. The classical SIR model assumes that there is homogenous mixing of infected and susceptible populations and that the total population is constant and does not change over time. Moreover, according to the classical SIR model, there is a monotonous decline in susceptible population towards zero [10]. However, such assumptions are not objective in the case of COVID-19 spreading and they are the basic problem in the modelling of this pandemic. In reality, human population fluctuates constantly [11]. In order to account for such fluctuation, and better understand the COVID 19 epidemic in the Republic of Serbia, we have employed mathematical modelling of the epidemic using the available data on the characteristics of the disease, such as incubation period, latent period, recovery

period, severity of clinical signs, and mortality rate caused by COVID19. Unlike the classic SIR model, SEIRDS (S-susceptible, E-exposed, I-infected, R-recovered, D-dead due to COVID19 infection, S-susceptible) epidemic model, developed for this research, simulates the spreading of COVID 19 in an open population. Taking into account that the population is constantly changing and that various measures are applied for different strata or subgroups of the population (such as preschool children, children attending primary school, high school students, students, employees, the unemployed and retirees), as well as changes in the intensity of applied measures, we have proposed the use of a model that takes these circumstances into account. Based on input disease parameters taken from scientific literature and specific data related to Serbia, this model simulates daily disease occurrence, including the number of hospitalised patients and cases which require intensive care. The model also predicts the expected number of deaths, as well as hospital capacities necessary to accommodate the patients. It provides a possibility to simulate different scenarios of disease control and intervention measures. Considering the expectations of successful development of the vaccine against COVID 19 in the near future, we added an option to model vaccination of different strata of the population as a set of disease control strategies.

2. Methodology

This section presents the research methodology and the proposed model, which was used to predict the further dynamics of the epidemic in Serbia. We also presented the data that were used to model the epidemic, a simulated strategy to combat COVID 19, and a sensitivity analysis.

2.1. SEIRDS mathematical model

Classical SEIRDS model divides the population into compartments, i.e. groups, and follows the disease dynamics at all times. The population is divided into the following compartments: the portion of the population susceptible to the infection is denoted by S, those latently infected with SARSCov-2 (exposed to) are denoted by E, the infected individuals who are able to spread the disease are denoted by I, the ones recovered from the infection are denoted by R, and those who died due to disease with D. Assuming that individuals mix homogenously, the force of infection λ (the rate at which susceptible persons are infected) is related to *per capita* contact rate β. Also, the risk of infection is closely related to the number of infectious

individuals in the population I_t. It depends on the number of infectious individuals (I_t) and how frequently they make contacts with other persons. In a situation of homogenous mixing among the population, the force of infection λ can be express ae follows:

$$\lambda(t) = \beta I(t) \quad (1)$$

The change of rates in every compartment per unit time in SEIRDS model is presented in the following series of differential equations:

$$S_{t+1}=bN_t - \beta S_t I_t - mS_t + \omega R_t \quad (2)$$

$$E_{t+1}=\beta S_t I_t - fE - mE_t \quad (3)$$

$$I_{t+1}=fE_t - (r+m)I_t \quad (4)$$

$$R_{t+1}=rI_t - (m+\omega)R_t \quad (5)$$

$$D_{t+1}= \delta I_t \quad (6)$$

where f is rate of onset of infections expressed as the reciprocal of the latent infection period, r is the rate at which infectious individuals are recovered, δ is the rate at which infectious individuals die from COVID 19 infection and ω is rate of waning of immunity. The total population at any particular interval of time t is:

$$N_t = S_t + E_t + I_t + R_t + D_t + bN_{t-1} - mS_{t-1} \quad (7)$$

where parameters b and m are *per capita* daily birth and death rates unrelated to COVID19.

However, considering that implemented anti-epidemic measures against COVID 19 do not have an identical impact on population's age subgroups and that COVID19 pathogenesis varies in different age subgroups, we propose the use of multi-compartment version of standard SEIRDS model. In this model susceptible population was further stratified within the compartment S according to age and occupations. Grouping into various strata was done according to the real age structure of the Republic of Serbia population as follows: pre-school children (S_{ps}), elementary school children (S_{es}), high school children (S_{hs}), college students (S_{cs}), unemployed population (S_{ua}), employed population (S_{ea}), and elderly/retired (S_r) (Table 1). To simulate the epidemic progression through different population strata-subgroups, we used appropriate, stratum-specific, model parameters and factors of effective contact reduction (anti-epidemic intervention measures - ρ), which were adapted to the relevant population groups: lockdown of the entire country, closures of pre-school, school and college sessions closures, reduced number of workers allowed in the workplaces, work from home, restrictions of mobility of elderly people, etc. During the simulation, we monitored the effects of

various levels of contact reduction, ranging from 25% to 75%, taking into account the realistic possibilities of maintaining a minimum work process, functioning of the society and feasibility of such measures.

Given that intervention measures, applied in response to the emergence of COVID19, are not the same for all population strata, homogeneous mixing can be expected only within same population stratum. The rate of effective contacts β, after the application of intervention measures, is no longer identical at the level of all strata of the population. Effective contacts are limited by the intensity and types of measures applied and are identical only when it comes to individuals within the same population strata. Furthermore, persons in different population strata become infected at different rates depending on how frequently they interact with other persons in their own subgroup and other subgroups. If we assume that force of infection differs between different strata of population, the equation for the force of infection would be as follows:

$$\lambda_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij}\, I_j(t) \tag{8}$$

where $\lambda_i(t)$ is force of infection in the ith population strata, β_{ij} is the rate at which susceptible persons in the ith population strata and infectious persons in j^{th} population strata come into effective contact per unite of time, *and* $I_j(t)$ is the number of infectious persons in j^{th} population strata. Also, in this model the number of recovered and dead is conditioned with different ages and genders.

Now our model will be expressed as follows:

$$\frac{dS_i(t)}{dt} = bN(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} I_j(t) S_i\,(t) - mS_i(t) \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{dE_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} I_j(t) S_i\,(t) - (m + \mathrm{f}) E_i(t) \tag{10}$$

$$\frac{dI_i(t)}{dt} = \mathrm{f} E_i(t) - (r + m) I_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_{ij} I_j(t) \tag{11}$$

$$\frac{dR_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} r_{ij} I_j(t) - (m + \omega) R_i(t) \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{dD_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_{ij} I_i(t) \tag{13}$$

In this model susceptible, exposed, infectious, recovered, deaths and total population are:

$$S(t)=S_{ps}(t)+S_{es}(t)+S_{hs}(t)+S_{cs}(t)+S_{ua}(t)+S_{ea}(t)+S_p(t) \tag{14}$$

$$E(t)=E_{ps}(t)+E_{es}(t)+E_{hs}(t)+E_{cs}(t)+E_{ua}(t)+E_{ea}(t)+E_p(t) \tag{15}$$

$$I(t)=I_{ps}(t)+I_{es}(t)+I_{hs}(t)+I_{cs}(t)+I_{ua}(t)+I_{ea}(t)+I_p(t) \tag{16}$$

$$R(t)=R_{ps}(t)+R_{es}(t)+R_{hs}(t)+R_{cs}(t)+R_{ua}(t)+R_{ea}(t)+R_p(t) \tag{17}$$

$$D(t)=D_{ps}(t)+D_{es}(t)+D_{hs}(t)+D_{cs}(t)+D_{ua}(t)+D_{ea}(t)+D_p(t) \tag{18}$$

168 $N(t)=S(t)+E(t)+I(t)+R(t)-D(t)$ (19)

169 **2.2. Determining the herd immunity threshold and control of CIVID 19 by vaccination policy**

170 Considering the undergoing worldwide efforts to develop a vaccine against COVID 19 and promising
171 results, we extended the model to simulate and analysed the effects of a hypothetical vaccination on the
172 epidemic dynamics, and to estimate the extent of coverage of vaccination which can interrupt the chain of
173 infection. The control of COVID 19 by vaccination means targeting the entire susceptible population with
174 mass vaccination until critical herd immunity achieved. In such situation there is a "race" between the
175 exponential growth of epidemic and mass vaccination. The level of herd immunity threshold (HIT) can be
176 calculated by the following formula:

177 $HIT = 1- 1/R_o = (R_o-1)/R_o$ (20)

178 and the critical vaccination coverage required to achieved herd immunity can be obtained by multiplying
179 herd immunity threshold with reciprocal value of vaccine efficacy, v_e:

180 $V_c = \frac{1}{v_e}(1 - \frac{1}{R_o})$ (21)

181 Most people infected with SARS-CoV-2 develop an immune response followed by the development
182 of specific antibodies between 10 and 21 days after getting infected [12]. Specific IgM and IgG antibodies
183 against SARS-CoV-2 develop 6 to 15 days after the onset of the disease [13-17]. According to some
184 studies, the presence of antibodies has been confirmed in less than 40% of the patients within 1 week after
185 the onset of the disease, whereas percentage reaches 100% of subjects 15 days after the onset of disease
186 [18]. Although duration of the immune response against CVOVID 19 is still unknown, comparing with other
187 coronaviruses, immunity wane within 12 to 52 weeks after the first symptoms appear [19], while in the case
188 of SARS-CoV-1 infection, the presence of IgG antibodies was confirmed in 90% and 50% of infected
189 patients, respectively, over two and three years, respectively [29]. Based on these findings, we assumed
190 that in the event of the development of a successful vaccine, immunity against the SARRSCov-2 virus could
191 last for a year, as well as after recovery after a natural infection.

192 For the purpose of modelling, additional compartment to the model was added denoted with V(t),
193 in which there are vaccinated persons who have successfully developed protective immunity after
194 vaccination. The vaccination parameter, u, is the daily rate of vaccination of susceptible population and it
195 represents the proportion of susceptible population immunized per unite time. The critical daily rate of

vaccination, u_c, is $\psi_c = (b+\omega)(R_o - 1)$, required to interrupt the infection [5]. The basic reproduction number under the vaccination is $R_{op} = (1-p)R_o$. The proportion of effectively protected persons, p, is conditioned by parameters the vaccine efficacy, v_e. This parameter represents a proportion of person who successfully developed protective immunity after vaccination, whereas total number of actively protected individuals in time t is V(t) = number of vaccinated x v_e [5]. In this compartment the daily rate of waning of immunity at which immunity of vaccinated population fades out is ω, and it is reciprocal to the period of lasting of immunity. Vaccinated persons, after losing their immunity, become sensitive again and removed to the compartment S. The change of rate in this compartment per unit time is as follow:

$$\frac{dV_i(t)}{dt} = v_e \psi S_i(t) - mV_i - \omega V_i. \quad (22)$$

The compartment S(t) is slightly modified as follow:

$$\frac{dS_i(t)}{dt} = bN(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} I_j(t)\, S_i(t) - mS_i(t) - v_e \psi S_i(t). \quad (23)$$

The other of compartments of SERIDS model remain unchanged.

2.3. Model parametrisation

In proposed model, β is *per capita* effective contact rate at which specific persons come into effective contact per unit of time. An effective contact is defined as a contact sufficient to cause disease transmission **[10, 20, 21]**. We calculated the parameter β by using the formula:

$$\beta = R_o/NT_R \quad (24)$$

where R_o is a basic reproduction number of the disease, i.e. the average number of newly infected people with COVID 19 (secondary infection cases), infected by one infectious individual in a totally susceptible population, N is total population, and T_R is the average duration of infectious period [10, 20, 21]. The R values of 2.46 and 3.1 are adopted from the relevant literature. The R_o values were based on the data obtained during the initial phase of the epidemic in Italy [22]. Since the implemented measures and disease transmission were simulated through various population strata, we corrected the β parameter with a relevant, stratum-specific contact reduction factor ρ_i. In this way, we obtained the *per capita* contact rate specific for each separate stratum based on following formula. $\beta_i = \beta(1-\rho_i)$. The values of the ρ_i factor in different population strata ranged from 0.25 to 0.75 (effective contact reduction ranged from 25% to 75%).

Parameters such as daily birth and death rates were calculated based on the data published by the Office of Statistics of the Republic of Serbia, and data published by the World Bank regarding the life expectancy in the Republic of Serbia [23, 24]. The latter study reported that the life expectancy in Serbia was 79.06 years in 2017 [23]. By using this figure, we expressed the daily death rate as a value reciprocal to life expectancy m = 0.000036. We calculated the daily *per capita* birth rate of $b = 0.000025$ based on the figure of 9.2 births in the Republic of Serbia per 1000 people in a year. These estimates were needed to realistically simulate fluctuations of the total population. To simplify the calculations, we assumed that the general morality rate m is applicable for all population strata.

The infectivity rate, i.e. the rate of transfer from compartment E to I, was derived as a value reciprocal to the COVID 19's average latent period. The data on the average duration of latent infection (f^{-1}) and the average period during which an infected person is shading the SARSCov-2 virus (T_R) were adopted from the relevant literature as f^{-1} = 4.6 days and T_R = 6.5 days, respectively [8]. The same study is used as a source of the data: on the percentage of hospitalised patients and those whose therapy requires intensive care, used for prediction of required hospital capacities, as shown in Table 1 [8].

Parameters such as δ and r are related to the infectious fatality rate (IFR) for COVID 19 and average times taken from infection to death (T_D) or recovery (T_R). These parameters were calculated using the following formulas:

$$\delta = IFR_{stratum}/T_D \text{ and} \tag{25}$$

$$r = (1-IFR_{stratum})/T_R \tag{26}$$

The IFRs, shown in Table 3, were taken from literature and compared with local IFR value which was calculated based on officially registered deaths published by the health system of the Republic of Serbia [2]. The Calculation of local IFR is presented in section 2.4. Population data, (e.g. total population, age structure, and stratification) are presented in Tables 1 and 2. A summary of all model parameters is given in Table 3.

Table 1. Structure of different population strata in the Republic of Serbia [23]

Stratum	Population	Percentage of total population
Younger than 7 years	356,377	5.10%
Elementary school	550,527	7.88%
Secondary school	249,455	3.57%
Students	241,698	3.46%
Employed	2,197,065	31.46%
Pensioners	1,715,152	24.56%
Others	1,672,330	23.95%

Table 2. Age structure of the population of the Republic of Serbia and expected percentage of hospitalised patients, patients in intensive care, and death rate caused by COVID19.

Population age groups	*Population	Percentage of total population	**Excepted % of hospitalised patients	**Expected % of patients whose treatment requires intensive care	***Infection fatality rate IFR (male/female)
0-9	458,199	6.56%	0.10%	5.00%	0.04%;0.01%
10-19	445,481	6.38%	0.30%	5.00%	0.00%;0.02%
20-29	1,028,226	14.73%	1.20%	5.00%	0.00%;0.01%
30-39	951,615	13.63%	3.20%	5.00%	0.00%;0.05%
40-49	968,854	13.88%	4.90%	6.30%	0.08%;0.04%
50-59	963,229	13.79%	10.20%	12.20%	0.33%;0.20%
60-69	815,244	11.68%	16.60%	27.40%	1.62%;0.62%
70-79	696,045	9.97%	24.30%	43.20%	6.11%;2.68%
80-	655,711	9.39%	27.30%	70.90%	16.40%;6.49%

*[23], **[8], ***[25]

Table 3. SEIRD model parameters

Input parameters	Mark	Value	Source
Population	N_{t0}	6,982,604	[23]
Initial number of cases	It_0	1	
Initially immune	I_{mm0}	0	
Basic reproduction number	R_0	2.46 (3.1)	[22]
Effective contact rate	C_e	0.38	
Per capita contact rate	β	0.000000054	
Daily infection rate (transfer E→I)	f	0.217391304	
Recovery rate	r	0.153846154	
Daily rate of waning of immunity	ω	0.002739726	
Per capita birth rate	b	0.000025205	[23]
Per capita death rate unrelated to COVID19	m	0.000036006	
Waning immunity rate	v	0.002777778	
Life expectancy in years	L	76.09	[24]
Duration of latent infection in days	f^{-1}	4.60	[8]
Duration of infectious period in days (clinical cases)	T_R	6.50	[8]
Duration of immunity in days	I_{mm}	365.00	
Incubation period in days	Inc	5.10	[8]
Time period (day)	dt	1.00	
Average treatment duration in hospital	*days*	10,4	[8]
Average time spent in intensive care	*days*	16	[8]

2.4. Setting disease control scenarios

Five different scenarios were developed for simulating the COVID19 epidemic control based on non-pharmaceutical interventions. SC1 implies a base-case scenario where the epidemic spreads in susceptible population without any anti-epidemic measures being implemented. In the other scenarios, the extent of contacts was reduced, for each population stratum separately, according to objective possibilities and

266 measures which were implemented during the actual epidemic in the Republic of Serbia. Scenarios are
267 presented in table 4.

268 Table 4. Description of different simulated non-pharmaceutical intervention scenarios

Mark	Scenario	Scenario description
SC1	Base-case scenario	The population relies on development of herd immunity. No anti-epidemic measures are implemented.
SC2	Lock down of the entire country	Pre-schools, schools, and colleges are fully closed – reduction in contacts at educational institutions by 75%; reduction in contacts in workplaces by 50%; reduction in contacts of the elderly (older than 65) by 25%; social distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 25%.
SC3	Partial lockdown of the country - I	Elementary and pre-school educational institutions are open. High schools and colleges are closed. Reduction in contacts by 75% at colleges and high-schools; reduction in contacts in workplaces by 50%; reduction in contacts of the elderly (older than 65) by 25%; social distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 25%.
SC4	Partial lockdown of the country - II	Colleges are closed – reduction in contacts by 75%; reduction in contacts in the workplace by 50%; reduction in contacts of the elderly (older than 65) by 25%; social distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 25%.
SC5	Partial lockdown of the country - III	Reduction in contacts in the workplace by 50%; reduction in contacts of the elderly (older than 65) by 25%; social distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 25 %

269

270 Additional four scenarios of control of COVID 19 were simulated based on vaccination policy. We assumed
271 that vaccine efficacy was 50%, 68%, 80%, and 85%. The initial conditions assumed that all other anti-
272 epidemic measures are excluded from the model and replaced with mass vaccination. Indicators of

273 epidemic dynamics were monitored, such as: CI, hospitalized patients, patient in intensive care units and
274 deaths.

275 **2.5. Model sensitivity analysis and calibration**

276 Considering the world experience with detection of COVID19 cases, as well as the unreliable data on
277 COVID19 infections which are currently available worldwide, model calibration is very challenging, and can
278 result in obtaining inaccurate values for the parameters [26]. This is especially due to the facts that a
279 significant percentage of the infected individuals do not exhibit any symptoms. The other issue is small
280 percentage of tested population [26].

281 As part of the national seroepidemiological study, 1,006 subjects were tested in Serbia from May
282 11th to June 25th, 2020, for the purpose of estimating the extent of COVID-19 infection. According to the
283 published data, seroconversion was confirmed in 6,4% of the subjects. On the other hand, a total of 13,372
284 cases of the infection were reported, which means that those who were infected constitute around 0.19%
285 of the overall population. However, it is our opinion that the data on reported deaths caused by COVID19
286 infection is more reliable for use in model calibration, e.g. infection fatality rate. Alex et al. reached a similar
287 conclusion when simulating COVID19 by using the SEIRD model with heterogeneous diffusion [26]. When
288 we compared the data recorded during the beginning of the epidemic in Serbia with the results obtained
289 during the simulation, such as the initial doubling time, the two data series matched well. However, later,
290 the obtained results did not match well the officially registered data on the number of infected, especially
291 after the beginning of the implementation of measures in Serbia. We attribute these differences to the
292 methodology by which official authorities register cases of infection, and collect the data. However, on
293 October 15th, 2020 official authorities have published new epidemiological estimates of COVID19
294 population infection, which is 20% of the total population, which approximately coincides with the results
295 obtained from our simulation, (e.g. 1,396,521 infected cases obtained from simulation compared to
296 1,120,460 cases estimated by the Serbian official authorities).

297 The parameter that determines the number of deaths is the IFR. It is the number of persons who
298 die of the COVID 19 among all infected individuals regardless of whether the infected show symptoms of
299 the disease or not. As with many diseases, IFR is not always equivalent to the number of reported deaths
300 caused by COVID 19. This is because a significant number of deaths, although caused by COVID 19, will

not be recognized as deaths caused by COVID 19 [27]. Also, there are many asymptomatic cases of infection which are never detected [28, 29, 30].

Due the fact that there is a lag in time between when people are infected and when they die, patients who die on any given day were infected much earlier, and thus the denominator of the mortality rate should be the total number of patients infected at the same time as those who died [27]. David et al. estimated mortality rate by dividing of deaths on a given date by the total number of persons confirmed as COVID 19 cases 14 days before [27]. It is based on the assumption that maximum incubation period is14 days [34]. However, if we take into account that the number of registered cases of COVID 19 infection is usually significantly lower than the actual number, assuming that the data on deaths are accurate, the real IFR value is significantly lower than the calculated value [26]. If we apply this to the situation in Serbia, the daily value of IFR on July 10th, 2020, when the largest number of deaths was registered in one day, was 9.33%, considering that 18 deaths were registered on July 10th and 14 days earlier 193 confirmed cases of COVID 19 infection. The raw values of IFR for the period between March 6th and August 10th were as follows: median of IFR = 2.11%, and average value of IFR = 7.15% bounded in interval 4.17%-10.13%. When we compared these values with those published by the WHO, CDC and other authors [29, 30, 31] we concluded that they differ significantly. Considering these findings, the IFR values adopted in the model (for various population groups and genders) were primarily taken from the literature, with a remark that the selection of IFR values was based on preliminary comparison of the overall Serbian IFR with similar IFRs found in the literature, taking into account the registered deaths and most probable number of infected individuals [8]. To make this possible, the first step was to correct the local raw IFR value mentioned above. Based on real data we first calculated the population at risk of dying from COVID 19 infection for each individual day since the outbreak, ending on August 10th, 2020. The number at risk on a given day should correspond to the number of deaths from COVID 19 infection, considering the lag period from infection to death. For this calculation, we used the data on the number of deaths D_t in Serbia registered on daily bases [2]. We hypothesized that the distribution of time periods t_n from the moment of COVID 19 infection to death follows the lognormal distribution defined by the parameters m = 26.8 and σ = 12.4 days [32]. Taking into account the published data on the expected percentages of asymptomatic cases in the population, we assumed that the registered number of cases of infection is 20% of the total number of actually infected

[29, 33, 34]. Based on the formula: $I_{r(t)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} I_{(t-n)} * m_{(t-n)}$ by reverse, we calculated the population at risk of dying from COVID 19 infection for each individual day, where m_t is the probability that the time between infection and death is t days and follows the lognormal distribution (m = 26.8, σ = 12.4) [35]. After that, the daily IFR values were calculated according to the formula $IFR_{(t)} = D_t / I_{r(t)}$ [35]. Based on IFR values calculated in this way, we made descriptive statistics and obtained the mean value of IFR = 0.70%, bounded in the interval 0.46-0.94% and a median of 0.19%. It is important to note here that this value corresponds with the COVID 19 IFR values found in Eastern European countries and Spain [35, 36]. Taking these findings into account, we decided to take the IFR values specific to certain population strata recorded in Spain as the most appropriate for our case [36]. The adopted IFR values are listed in Table 3.

The model sensitivity analysis was conducted by changing the most sensitive model parameters: β, f, r. The values of these parameters were increased by 5%, 10% and 25% relative to the base scenario and changes in output indicators were observed.

3. Results

3.1. Predicting the number of sick, hospitalized patients and deaths caused by COVID 19 in the absence of any intervention measures

After the simulation, the model demonstrated that with R_o = 2.46, and without the implementation of any anti-epidemic measures, the initial doubling time of the infection was five days. The epidemic wave would peak 158 days after the outbreak, and it would yield 157,424 infected individuals in a day. Afterwards, the infection rate would decline for 180 days, eventually reaching the daily incidence of 225 newly infected, after which the next epidemic wave would start. The second wave would peak 569 days after the onset of epidemic and yielding 36,922 infected individuals in a day. The third epidemic wave would peak 914 days later, with 18,791 infected individuals in a day. The true cumulative incidence in the first year of the epidemic would be 6,633,834 infected people with SARSCov-2 virus, while the apparent cumulative incidence would be 1,326,767 infected. A total of 5,525 patients would die due to COVID19 consequences. With R_o = 3.1, the following results were obtained: the initial doubling time of the infection was five days, true cumulative incidence 7,035,433, apparent cumulative incidence 1,407,089, and the total deaths of 5,868. Fig. 1, panels a) and b) show daily variations in the number of susceptible, latently infected, infected and recovered

patients, at basic reproduction numbers of R_o=2.46 and R_o=3, respectively. Panels c) and d) of the same figure show daily fluctuations in susceptible, recovered and net reproduction rates R_n for R_o=2.46 and R_o=3, respectively. Panels e) and f) of Fig. 1 show daily variations in R_n, true and apparent disease incidences at basic reproduction numbers of R_o=2.46 and R_o=3. The shaded area corresponds to the period when the daily number of new COVID19 infected individuals increasing, and therefore all of the following hold: R_n>1, proportion susceptible >1/R_o and the proportion of population that is recovered (immune) is below the herd immunity threshold. Fig. 2 panels a) and b) show a prediction of necessary hospital capacities. Panels c) and d) of Fig. 2 show predicted numbers of sick and dead due to COVID19 at R_o=2.46 and R_o=3 and age structure of hospitalized patients and deaths.



a) Distribution of the total number of the susceptible, latently infected, infected and recovered on a daily basis since the epidemic onset (R_o=2.46)



b) Distribution of the total number of the susceptible, latently infected, infected and recovered on a daily basis since the epidemic onset (R_o=3.1)



c) Daily fluctuations of the susceptible, recovered and net disease transmission rates (R_o=2.46)



d) Daily fluctuations of the susceptible, recovered and net disease transmission rates (R_o=3.1)



e) Daily fluctuations of apparent incidence, true incidence and net disease transmission rates (R_o=2.46)



f) Daily fluctuations of apparent incidence, true incidence and net disease transmission rates (R_o=2.46)

Fig.1 Model prediction of latently infected, diseased, recovered and daily fluctuations of R_n.



a) Necessary hospital capacities (R_o=2.46)

b) Necessary hospital capacities (R_o=3.1)

c) Age structure of hospitalised patients (R_o=2.46)

d) Age structure of hospitalised patients (R_o=3.1)

e) Expected age structure of the dead (R_o=2.46)

f) Expected age structure of the dead (Ro=3.1)

Fig.2 Model prediction of required hospital capacities under the assumption of different intervention measures.

3.2. Predicting the number of sick, hospitalized patients and deaths caused by COVID 19 in the conditions of application of restrictive anti-epidemic measures

When the spread of COVID19 epidemic through totally susceptible population in the Republic of Serbia is simulated, under an assumption of only incidental movement among the population, basic reproduction number of R_o = 2.46, and with lock-down of entire country, a significant slowdown of the epidemic was

observed. Initial infection doubling time was 11 days. The peak of the epidemic wave was reached 269 days after the epidemic onset and it was 25,754 infected in one day. In the first year of the epidemic 3,283,691 people would get infected and 3,391 people would die. When the basic reproduction number was increased to R_o=3.1, while keeping the same conditions of locking down the entire country, results changed significantly. The initial infection doubling time was 9 days, the epidemic wave peak was reached after 164 days and it yield 65,327 infected people in one day. In the first year of the epidemic 5,021,561 people would get infected and 4,923 would die. Table 6 provides the overview of epidemic indicators obtained from the simulations of all five scenarios with R_o = 2.46 and R_o = 3.1. Figures 3. and 4 provide a comparative overview of results of all five simulated scenarios. Panels a) and b) of Fig. 3 show the values of cumulative incidences on a daily basis for R_o=2.46 and R_o=3.1, respectively. Panels b) and c) of Fig. 3 show the expected total number of hospitalised patients and patients in intensive care units (ICU) for R_o=2.46 and R_o=3.1, respectively. Fig. 4 provides overview of required hospital capacities e.g. hospital bed occupancy and the occupancy of beds in ICU on daily bases for R_o=2.46 and R_o=3.1, respectively. The results show that after applying various measures to slow down the circulation of SARSCov-2, the number of newly infected people, hospitalized patients and the occupancy of hospital capacities are the lowest in the situations where rigorous anti-epidemic measures are applied to all population strata (Scenario 2 in Table 6 and in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). Openings of pre-school and elementary school's facilities leads to a visible jump in the number of infected and hospitalized in all strata. This finding clearly shows that children, although least susceptible to developing more severe clinical pictures, are important when transmitting SARSCov-2 (Scenario 3 in Table 6 and Fig. 3). Opening of the high schools and colleges also leads to a visible increase in the number of newly infected and hospitalized patients, including an increase in the number of deaths (Scenario 5 in Table 6 and Fig. 3). Without the application of any intervention measures, the greatest burden on the health system could be expected 196 days from the beginning of the epidemic at R_o=2.46 or 144 days at R_o=3.1. Depending on the R_o value used in simulation, it would be necessary to provide 12,740 (19,380) hospital beds and an additional 8,486 (12,355) in intensive care units. In the case of Scenario 2, there is a significant slowdown in the epidemic, so that after 621 (238) days at the moment the highest occupancy of hospital facilities would be to provide 461 (4,181) beds in COVID hospitals and 358 (3,120) beds in intensive care units (Fig. 4).

Table 6. Results of different simulated scenarios (R_o = 2.46 and R_o = 3.1). The data refers to the period of 365 days from epidemic onset.

Scenario mark	SC1		SC2		SC3		SC4		SC5	
Basic reproductive number	R_o=2.64	R_o=3.1	R_o=2.64	R_o=3.1	R_o=2.64	R_o=3.1	R_o=2.64	R_o=3.1	R_o=2.64	R_o=3.1
Cumulative incidence (CI)	6,633,834	7,035,443	3,283,691	5,021,561	4,969,942	5,990,015	5,171,901	6,087,288	5,408,422	6,257,345
Apparent CI	1,326,767	1,407,089	656,738	1,004,312	993,988	1,198,003	1,034,380	1,217,458	1,081,684	1,251,469
Overall hospitalized	115,612	122,782	67,142	98,973	88,529	106,442	90,361	106,945	92,727	108,242
Overall in intensive care	37,212	39,512	22,353	32,690	29,288	34,975	29,865	35,121	30,545	35,452
Overall deaths	5,525	5,868	3,391	4,923	4,424	5,260	4,510	5,281	4,609	5,328



a) Comparative overview of cumulative incidences (CI). Results obtained from simulated scenarios 1-5 (R_o=2.46)



b) Comparative overview of cumulative incidences (CI). Results obtained from simulated scenarios 1-5 (R_o=3.1)



c) Comparative overview of hospitalised patients on a daily basis. Results obtained from simulated scenarios 1-5 (R_o=2.46)



d) Comparative overview of hospitalised patients on a daily basis. Results obtained from simulated scenarios 1-5 (R_o=3.1)



e) Comparative overview of expected number of patients in intensive care on a daily basis. Results obtained from simulated scenarios 1-5 with R_o=2.46



f) Comparative overview of expected number of patients in intensive care on a daily basis. Results obtained from simulated scenarios 1-5 with R_o=3.1

Fig.3 Model prediction of expected number of hospitalised patient and patient in intensive care.



a) Comparative overview of hospital bed occupancy (R_o=2.46)

b Comparative overview of hospital bed occupancy (R_o=3.1)

c) Comparative overview of ICU bed occupancy (Ro=2.46)

d) Comparative overview of ICU bed occupancy (Ro=3.1)

Fig. 4 Model prediction of required hospital capacities needed to treat patients with COVID 19.

3.3. COVID19 simulation and disease control by implementing a hypothetical vaccine

Assuming that the disease is spreading at the basic reproduction number of R_o=2.46, the herd immunity threshold (when the disease can be expected to slow down and the chain of infection is expected to be broken) would be 59.35%, while at R_o=3.1, it would be 67.74%. Depending on the efficacy of the potential vaccine, the required vaccination coverage should be 87% (v_e =68%), 74.19% (v_e =80%), 69.82% (v_e=85%) and 95.41% (v_e=71%), 84.68% (v_e=80%), 79.70% (v_e=85%) for R_o=2.46 and R_o=3.1, respectively. Fig. 5 shows different scenarios of COVID19 control strategies based solely on vaccination.



a) Comparative overview of daily incidences (R_o=2.46).



b) Comparative overview of daily incidences (R_o=3.1).



c) Comparative overview of hospitalised patients (R_o=2.46).



d) c) Comparative overview of hospitalised patients (R_o=3.1).



e) Comparative overview of deaths (Ro=2.46)



f) Comparative overview of deaths (Ro=3.1)

NV-without vaccination and any non-pharmaceutical intervention

Fig. 5 Results of simulated COVID19 control based solely on vaccination, scenarios 6-9 (R_o=2.46 and R_o=3.1).

3.4. Results of the model sensitivity analysis

The results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in table 9. The table shows increased values of input parameters and the percentage of the parameter increase relative to the basic scenario, as well as the values of output results obtained after the simulation of the changed scenario.

Table 9. Results of model sensitivity analysis.

Model parameter mark	Change relative to the basic scenario	CI	Deaths (D_{th})	Change in CI relative to the basic scenario	Change in D_{th} relative to the basic scenario
β	5%	6,733,914	5,610	1.51%	1.54%
β	10%	6,819,454	5,683	2.80%	2.86%
β	25%	7,022,923	5,857	5.87%	6.01%
f^{-1}	5%	6,642,443	5,532	0.13%	0.13%
f^{-1}	10%	6,651,063	5,539	0.26%	0.25%
f^{-1}	25%	6,676,747	5,560	0.65%	0.63%
r	5%	6,508,468	5,420	-1.89%	-1.90%
r	10%	6,376,497	5,309	-3.88%	-3.90%
r	25%	5,938,474	4,943	-10.48%	-10.54%

4. Conclusions and discussion

For the needs of this research, we augmented the classic deterministic model by adding the compartments of vaccinated and latently infected subjects. By adding birth and death rates, we enabled daily fluctuations of the overall simulated population, which brought us closer to the real conditions in which the disease is transmitted. When we assumed that the recovered lose immunity over time, we obtained dynamic oscillations of epidemic waves through susceptible population. When we simulated different disease control scenarios of COVID19 epidemic based on non-pharmaceutical intervention measures, scenario number 2 proved to be the most effective approach to the disease control, because it implemented the most comprehensive anti-epidemic measures (entire country lock down). However, the basic problem of this approach is feasibility and possibility to maintain the measures in the long term.

The model demonstrated that students, children and younger school-age generations have an important role in transmitting COVID19, especially if they come into contact with a more vulnerable

454 population. The model showed that, in the case of returning school children of all ages to schools, an
455 increase of 32.98% of the estimated deaths and 57.50% of the number of infected is possible, when
456 compared to the conditions before opening of the schools (Scenarios 2 and 4). However, most dead and
457 seriously diseased people are found in the older population. This is particularly important when planning
458 intervention measures, especially when deciding on which restrictions to be lifted and how (opening
459 schools, students' return to faculties etc.). The model demonstrated that COVID19 has a potential to spread
460 rapidly and linger in population. Due to a large number of the infected and duration of the disease, there
461 are significant needs for hospital capacities, especially in the conditions when the disease is suppressed
462 by implementing partly relaxed anti-epidemic measures, or in the case of absence of any measures. Without
463 the application of any intervention measures, at the moment of the greatest load, depending of actual R_o,
464 the health system would have to provide 12,740 (R_o=2.46) hospital beds for the care of the patients and an
465 additional 8,486 in intensive care units. On the other hand, in the case of the application of the strictest anti-
466 epidemic measures, the needs decrease to only 461 beds in COVID hospitals and additional 358 beds in
467 intensive care units. In the case of continued implementation of current measures, which are significantly
468 less intense than the measures applied at the beginning of the epidemic (Scenario 4), it is necessary to
469 provide 3,508 beds in COVID hospitals and 2,617 beds in intensive care units in the entire country. The
470 model also shows that the needs for hospital capacities decline with the ending of the first epidemic wave,
471 since daily incidence decreases and during the second and third waves it never reaches the initial peaks,
472 but these needs still remain substantial. For example, in the case of Scenario 1, at the top of the second
473 epidemic wave, it is necessary to provide 3,643 beds in COVID hospitals and 2,575 in intensive care units,
474 which makes 30% and 25% of the required capacities of the first wave of the epidemic.

475 Based on the cyclical patterns of the epidemic waves and duration of simulated epidemics, the
476 model demonstrated that the disease has a potential to linger in population and that it will most probably
477 have a seasonal pattern. Therefore, potential vaccines can have an enormous potential and significance
478 for COVID19 control. Depending on the efficacy of future vaccines, the disease can be stopped and curbed
479 almost solely by implementing the measure of vaccination. However, the necessary conditions for these
480 predictions and expectations are the efficacy of potential vaccines and the ability of a health systems to
481 implement vaccination to a satisfactory extent and rapidly, especially with regards to the most sensitive

categories of population. Depending on the R_o, a vaccine that would have an efficacy ≥ 68-71% could stop the pandemic and break the chain of infection. However, even vaccines with lower efficacy could be useful as they would significantly reduce the number of cases and deaths, especially if used in combination with the other disease control measures. The required minimal vaccination coverage should be 87% (v_e =68%), 74.19% (v_e =80%), 69.82% (v_e=85%) and 95.41% (v_e=71%), 84.68% (v_e=80%), 79.70% (v_e=85%) for R_o=2.46 and R_o=3.1, respectively. The minimum daily vaccination rate should be 0.47% for vaccines with an efficiency of 85%, and 0.59% for vaccines with an efficiency of 68%.

Based on the obtained results, we can conclude that at this point, without the application of specific pharmaceutical products, COVID19 suppression is highly dependent on the basic reproduction number (R_o), and that more intensive contacts and relaxed measures can result in a dramatic spread of the virus. The choice of intervention measures depends on the feasibility of their implementation and their efficacy in different social contexts. COVID19 will likely have to be suppressed in this way for a certain period of time. This will most probably last until sufficient quantities of a reliable and effective vaccine are available, and thereafter until optimal vaccination coverage is achieved.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

[1] World Health Organization (WHO), Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak situation. 2020. https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/ novel-coronavirus-2019, [accessed 18 August 2020].

[2] https://covid19.rs, 2020, [accessed 18 August 2020].

[3] Wangping J, Ke H, Yang S, Wenzhe C, Shengshu W, Shanshan Y, Miao L. Extended SIR prediction of the epidemics trend of COVID-19 in Italy and compared with Hunan, China. Frontiers in Medicine 2020; 7:169.

[4] Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, Davies N. Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. The Lancet infectious diseases 2020. Doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20) 30144-4.

509 [5] Matt J. Keeling, Pejman Rohani. Modelling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals, Princeton
510 University Press, 3 Market Place, Woodstock, Oxfordshire OX20 1SY, p. 8-10.
511 [6] Kermack, W. and A. McKendrick (1927). A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics.
512 Proceedings of the Royal Society. A 115, p. 700–721.
513 [7] Barnes B. and G. R. Fulford. Mathematical modelling with case studies Using Maple™ and MATLAB,
514 CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group 6000 Broken Sound Parkway NW, Suite 300, Boca Raton, FL 33487-
515 2742, p. 100-102.
516 [8] Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions
517 (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand; 2020.
518 https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-
519 COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf.
520 [9] Wu Z, Googan JMM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019
521 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases from the Chinese Center for Disease
522 Control and Prevention. JAMA. 2020;323(13):1239-1242. Doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2648.
523 [10] Emilia Vynnycky, Richard G. White with an introduction by Paul E.M. Fine. An Introduction to Infectious
524 Disease Modelling. Oxford University Press Inc., New York © Oxford University Press; 2010.
525 [12] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Immune responses and immunity to SARS-CoV-
526 2; 2020. https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/latest-evidence/immune-responses; [accessed 18
527 August 2020].
528 [13] Woelfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Mueller MA, et al. Clinical presentation
529 and virological assessment of hospitalized cases of coronavirus disease 2019 in a travel-associated
530 transmission cluster. medRxiv. 2020; https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502.
531 [14] Liu W, Liu L, Kou G, Zheng Y, Ding Y, Ni W, et al. Evaluation of Nucleocapsid and Spike Protein-based
532 ELISAs for detecting antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv. 2020.
533 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.16.20035014.
534 [15] Long Q-x, Deng H-j, Chen J, Hu J, Liu B-z, Liao P, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-
535 19 patients: the perspective application of serological tests in clinical practice. medRxiv.
536 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038018.

537 [16] Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients
538 of novel coronavirus disease 2019. medRxiv. 2020; https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.02.20030189.
539 [17] Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, Wang C, Geurtsvan Kessel CH, Corman VM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 specific
540 antibody responses in COVID-19 patients. medRxiv. 2020; https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038059.
541 [18] Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients
542 of novel coronavirus disease 2019. medRxiv. 2020; https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.02.20030189.
543 [19] Kellam P, Barclay W. The dynamics of humoral immune responses following SARS-CoV-2 infection
544 and the potential for reinfection. The Journal of general virology. 2020 May 20;
545 [20] Gerardo Chowell, James M. Hyman, Lu´ıs M. A. Bettencourt, Carlos Castillo-Chavez. Mathematical
546 and Statistical Estimation Approaches in Epidemiology, ISBN 978-90-481-2312-4, Doi 10.1007/978-90-
547 481-2313-1, Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York; 2009.
548 [21] Michael Thrusfield. Veterinary epidemiology. Third edition. Blackwell Science Ltd, a Blackwell
549 Publishing company; 2007.
550 [22] Marco D'Arienzo, Angela Coniglio. Assessment of the SARS-CoV-2 basic reproduction number, R0,
551 based on the early phase of COVID-19 outbreak in Italy. Biosafety and Health 2(2020) 57-59.
552 [23] The World Bank. World Developments Indicators;
553 https://www.google.com/publicdata/explore?ds=d5bncppjof8f9_&met_y=sp_dyn_le00_in&idim=country:S
554 RB:HRV:BIH&hl=en&dl=en#!ctype=l&strail=false&bcs=d&nselm=h&met_y=sp_dyn_le00_in&scale_y=lin&
555 ind_y=false&rdim=world&idim=country:SRB&ifdim=world&hl=en_US&dl=en&ind=false; [accessed 25
556 August 2020].
557 [24] Demografski pregled 2017. Broj: 68/2018, https://www.minrzs.gov.rs/sites/default/files/2019-
558 01/demografski_pregled_68.pdf; [accessed 15 July 2020].
559 [25] Roberto Pastor-Barriuso et al. Infection fatality risk for SARS-CoV-2: a nationwide seroepidemiological
560 study in the noninstitutionalized population of Spain. medRxiv. 2020; preprint doi:
561 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.06.20169722.
562 [26] Alex Viguerie, Guillermo Lorenzo, Ferdinando Auricchio, Davide Baroli, Thomas J.R. Hughes, Alessia
563 Patton, Alessandro Reali, Thomas E. Yankeelov, Alessandro Veneziani. Simulating the spread of COVID-

564 19 via a spatially-resolved susceptible–exposed–infected–recovered–deceased (SEIRD) model with
565 heterogeneous diffusion. Applied Mathematics Letters 111 (2021) 106617.
566 [27] David Baud, Xiaolong Qi, Karin Nielsen-Saines, Didier Musso, Léo Pomar, Guillaume Favre. Real
567 estimates of mortality following COVID-19 infection. The Lancet. 2020 Jul; 20(7): 773. Doi: 10.1016/S1473-
568 3099(20)30195-X.
569 [28] Charles F. Manski, Francesca Molinari. Estimating the COVID-19 infection rate: Anatomy of an
570 inference problem. Journal of Econometrics. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.04.041.
571 [29] WHO. Q&A: Influenza and COVID-19 - similarities and differences.
572 https://www.who.int/westernpacific/news/q-a-detail/q-a-similarities-and-differences-covid-19-and-
573 influenza. [accessed 18 August 2020].
574 [30] CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html; [accessed 18 August
575 2020].
576 [31] CEBM- The Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine develops, promotes and disseminates better
577 evidence for healthcare. Estimating the infection fatality ratio in England. https://www.cebm.net/covid-
578 19/estimating-the-infection-fatality-ratio-in-england/; [accessed 9 October 2020].
579 [32] Wood, S. N. Did COVID-19 infections decline before UK lockdown? ArXiv:2005.02090 [q-Bio, Stat].
580 http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.02090.
581 [33] CEBM- The Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine develops, promotes and disseminates better
582 evidence for healthcare. COVID-19: What proportion are asymptomatic? https://www.cebm.net/covid-
583 19/covid-19-what-proportion-are-asymptomatic/; [accessed 18 August 2020].
584 [34] BMJ 2020; 368 doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1165. https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m1165
585 [35] Selene Ghisolfi, Ingvild Almås, Justin Sandefur, Tillmann von Carnap, Jesse Heitner, Tessa Bold.
586 Predicted COVID-19 Fatality Rates Based on Age, Sex, Comorbidities, and Health System Capacity. 2020
587 Jun.https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/predicted-covid-19-fatality-rates-based-age-sex-
588 comorbidities-and-health-system-capacity.pdf.
589 [36] Roberto Pastor-Barriuso et al. Infection fatality risk for SARS-CoV-2: a nationwide seroepidemiological
590 study in the noninstitutionalized population of Spain. medRxiv. 2020; preprint doi:
591 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.06.20169722.