MODELING THE SPREAD OF COVID-19 UNDER ACTIVE MANAGEMENT

IVAN CHEREDNIK †

Abstract. Classical approaches to modeling the spread of epidemics are based on two assumptions: the exponential growth of the total number of infections and the saturation due to the herd immunity. With Covid-19, the growth is essentially power-type, especially during the middle stages, and the saturation is currently mostly due to the protective measures. Focusing on these features and the role of epidemic management, we obtain differential equations for the total number of detected cases of Covid-19, which describe the actual curves in many countries almost with the accuracy of physics laws. The two-phase solution we propose worked very well almost for the whole periods of the spread practically in all countries we analyzed that reached the saturation during the first waves. Bessel functions play the key role in our approach. Due to a very small number of parameters, namely, the initial transmission rate and the intensity of the hard and soft measures, we obtain a convincing explanation of the surprising uniformity of the curves of the total numbers of detected infections in many different areas. This theory can serve as a tool for forecasting the epidemic spread and evaluating the efficiency of the protective measures, which is very much needed for epidemics. As its practical application, the computer programs aimed at providing projections for late stages of Covid-19 proved to be remarkably stable in many countries, including Western Europe, the USA and some in Asia.

Introduction. The evidence is strong that the exponential growth of the total number of detected infections of Covid-19, denoted by $u(t)$ in this work, can be detected only during very short periods in any countries, especially during the middle stages. The corresponding curves are in fact of power type: $u(t) \sim Ct^c$ in terms of the time t from the beginning of the spread and for some C, c. Moreover, c, C heavily depend on time; the exponent c approaches 1 near the turning point of

Date: This manuscript was compiled on November 24, 2020.

the spread, and the magnitude C becomes small near the saturation. Since the epidemic is far from over, the saturation here is of technical nature. Generally, it is followed by a period of modest linear-type growth of the total number of infections.

The usage of the basic and current reproduction numbers R_0, R is common for epidemics. The basic one is defined as the initial average number of people infected by one person who contracted the virus; see [CJLP, Co, CD, DHB, He, HL]. However it can be used only qualitatively for Covid-19 and other epidemics of power growth: the formula $u(t) \sim const\, R^t$ for the total number of infections will stop working very quickly and cannot be of real help for forecasting without significant corrections.

Even $R = 1.1$ or so would quickly begin to contradict the actual growth of infections of Covid-19. For instance, Robert Kox Institute periodically provides the R-numbers for Germany frequently reaching 0.7 and 2. However this can be only short-lived.

One of the possibilities to use R for the epidemics with the spread of non-exponential type is to assume that $R \sim 1$ becomes not dominant, i.e. to rely on the theory of resonances. This provides a polynomial growth of the total number of infections, but we follow a different way in this paper.

It was already intensively discussed in the literature that the herd immunity can influence the spread of Covid-19 well before it reaches the levels of $60-70\%$. See e.g. [BBT]. We associate the power growth of the total number of infections with local herd immunity. It starts working almost from the very beginning of the epidemic and really provides the growth of power-type: $u(t) \sim t^c$, as we explain below.

The next step is the key: the time-dependence of the exponent c in terms of Bessel functions. Our theory was posted in the middle of April, when the saturation of the spread was observed only in several countries; they were mostly in phase one, in mode (A) in our terminology. We also provided a variant for the later stages, mode (B), when the hard measures are significantly reduced. The (B)-mode system of ODE appeared really applicable to phase two in many countries, almost anywhere in Western Europe. This phase is the switch to less aggressive management due to relatively low numbers of daily infections.

For the initial growth $\sim t^c$ of the total number of detected positive cases, our phase-two model predicts that the growth will become eventually of type $\sim t^{c/2}\cos(d\log(t))$ for some d. The passage from

the Bessel-type curves for phase 1 to those in phase 2 can be clearly seen in many countries. Though the Bessel-type formulas alone for $u(t)$ worked well almost till the saturation in some countries, for instance, during the first waves in Austria and Israel. These were the countries where the hard measures were continued almost till the saturation.

The spread of Covid-19 in the USA was mathematically quite a challenge for us; the results of our efforts are systematically analyzed in [Ch1]. The first wave in the USA went through several stages, more than with any other countries we considered. Our understanding is that it was so mostly because the hard protective measures were constantly relaxed in the USA on the first signs of improvements, well before the actual saturation. This is in contrast to Europe and several countries in Asia. It was somewhat similar in UK, but it eventually reached phase 2 and the saturation of the first wave.

The costs and consequences of hard measures, especially lockdowns, are huge for any country. Moreover, the saturation due to the hard measures is of unstable nature; the recurrence of the epidemic is quite likely if they are reduced or abandoned. Our theory generally provides the way to control the efficiency of protective measures, but this is quite a challenge even if advanced mathematical means are used.

Prior approaches. There is increasing number of works where the power growth of the total number of infections is considered for modeling Covid-19. Let us mention at least [Ch1, MBS, MH, TKH].

To begin with, in [CD] (well before Covid-19), an ambiguity with the definition and practical calculation of R_0 is mentioned: "It is reassuring to know, however, that the sign of R_0-1 is independent of the decomposition used and that the prediction of exponential growth or decay is therefore correctly made by any of the counting schemes." Mostly assuming the exponential growth in this paper, the "resonances", when R_0 is not a strictly dominant eigenvalue, are mentioned at its end. This regime results in the power growth of the number of infections. Let us quote: "As far as we know, little can be said in general about the exceptional case that R_0 is not strictly dominant".

In [MBS], the authors comment on the power growth: "the nature is full of surprises". In [TKH]: "this new contamination regime is hard to explain by traditional models". In our one: "power law of epidemics must be the starting point of any analysis if we want our mathematical models to be up to date". See also article [Ray] and works mentioned

there concerning a potential usage of small-world interaction network, where individuals are assumed to contact (mostly) local neighbors and have occasional long-range connections.

On the other hand, paper [BBT] and some other works suggest that the levels of herd immunity sufficient to impact the spread of Covid-19 can be significantly lower than the "classical" 60% or so: as low as 40% in some areas due to the population heterogeneity. From this viewpoint, we make the next step in this direction, which seems quite natural. Our starting assumption is that local herd immunity shapes the spread from the very beginning of epidemics and reduces its exponential growth to the power one. This is somewhat related to the small-world.

The main problem with modeling is actually not the power law of epidemics itself, a beginning for us. This law alone is insufficient for forecasting. The exponent c and the corresponding scaling coefficient C heavily depend on the time passed from the beginning of the spread of the infection. An exact mathematical model of this time-dependence is necessary, which was proposed in [Ch1] using the Bessel functions.

We note that the approach of [MBS] to the power growth was of experimental kind. Since the corresponding exponents depend very much on the considered periods, the data in Figure 1 in this paper and in similar papers mainly show that the growth is no greater than polynomial. The exponents c we obtain are different from their exponents. Mathematically, the authors suggested the usage of the SEIR model (Susceptible- Exposed- Infectious- Recovered), which does not result in the power growth, though "small world" is mentioned there as a possibility.

Paper [TKH] is based on the Poissonian small-world network. This approach results in the linear growth ($c \simeq 1$) of the number of infections. The linear growth is clearly present at some stages, but it is far from linear during the first phase and closer to the saturation everywhere. Anyway, the explanation of the linear growth and the saturation in [TKH] is very different from what we proposed in [Ch1].

Among many confirmations of the power growth of the total number of infections of Covid-19, the period 3/20-10/7 in India is very convincing; see Fig. 1. Here $u(t) = const\, t^c$ for $c = 3.65$ is practically exact for the total number of detected cases in India for about 6 months (!).

In this figure, the main parameters were determined on 08/03. This forecast was posted on 10/07; to expire on 11/06 (the maximum of

the u-function). It matched ideally the actual curve of detected cases. As always, a linear growth is expected after the top of the Bessel-type curve $u(t)$, which can be seen in this graph after 11/06. In our theory, we switch to the mode-(B) formula for the second phase.

Saturation due to hard measures. For us, the saturation, including some modest linear growth of the total number of infection after (if) it is reached, is a result of active protective measures, mostly hard ones. They are imposed by authorities in charge, but self-restrictions are equally important. The key is detection-isolation-tracing, which includes closing the places where the spread of infection is the most likely. The societal cost of hard measures is huge, but they proved to reduced the spread efficiently.

It is not disputed that the saturation of the first waves of Covid-19 in many countries (almost all Western Europe) was not due to the herd immunity. The latter probably requires about 40%-60% of all susceptible population to be infected and recovered [BBT], which was far from these levels during the first waves. Thus, the saturation mechanisms of SIR-type models are not applicable here, at least for the first waves.

The timing and the intensity of the second waves clearly confirm the validity of our approach to modeling, based on the prime role of protective measures, mostly the hard ones. Recurrence of epidemics is quite frequent; see e.g. [HL]. However the second waves of Covid-19 begin unusually quickly, sometimes even on the top of the unfinished first waves, as in the USA. The relaxation of hard measures closer to the end of the first waves seems the only logical explanation for this.

The summer vacations (and closed schools) in Western Europe actually were the kind of protection similar to hard measures. At the end of August, the second waves began almost everywhere in Europe, and the number of new detected infections began to grow (again) in the USA from the middle of September.

Mathematically, our exponent "c", which we call the initial transmission rate, appeared increasing from the first to the second waves in many countries. This parameter is one of the main on our theory; it reflects the virus strength and the "initial" number of contacts in the areas. Thus, by reducing the protective measures, especially the hard ones, c is essentially back to that in the beginning of the epidemic, which a tendency to increase. The second key parameter of our theory,

the intensity a of protective measures, dropped very significantly for the second waves.

Qualitatively the duration of the wave is $1/\sqrt{a}$; quantitatively, Bessel functions must be used here. So, mathematically, we essentially repeat the first waves, but now with significantly lower levels of hard measures, longer periods of intensive infections, and higher magnitudes of the total numbers of infections.

Power Law of Epidemics. With such complex processes as epidemics, there can be of course multiple factors contributing to the power growth, biological ones included [CLL]. The "justification" from [Ch1] goes as follows. First, we assume that infected people mostly transmit the disease to their (susceptible) neighbors, and that the population is distributed uniformly. The second assumption is that the wave of the infections expands linearly in a proper graph of contacts. The third one, local herd immunity, is that people "inside the infection zone" do not transmit the disease because they are surrounded by those already infected or recovered, i.e. the border of this zone mostly contributes to the spread of this disease. This readily gives that at least $u(t) \sim t^2$. This is indeed about the lowest c we observed; for instance, it was $c = 2.2$ for the USA.

People from the infected zone do shopping, travel, visit friends. So the higher dimensions are needed to imbed the graph of contacts into some $\mathbb{R}^N$ providing that the geometric distances between points representing people are essentially the numbers of links between them, i.e. reflect the intensity of the contacts.

Upon this embedding, we assume the uniform distribution of the points in $\mathbb{R}^N$ representing people and the linear spread of the disease in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Then, indeed, $u(t) \sim Ct^c$, where c is the "dimension" of the image of this graph, a number from 2 to N.

Next, we represent this $u(t)$ as a solution of the differential equation $du(t)/dt = cu(t)/t$. This is standard when we need to add "external forces". The exponential growth is unsustainable, but the power growth is unsustainable long term too. We "correct" it as follows.

The main ODE. Combining the initial power growth of the total number of detected infections $u(t)$ with the impact of protective measures we obtain the following two systems of differential equations:

$$\left\{\frac{du(t)}{dt} = c\,\frac{u(t)}{t} - p(t),\ \frac{dp(t)}{dt} = a\,u(t)\right\}; \tag{1}$$

$$\left\{\frac{du(t)}{dt} = c\,\frac{u(t)}{t} - \frac{p(t)}{t},\ \frac{dp(t)}{dt} = \frac{b}{t}\,u(t)\right\}. \tag{2}$$

Here t is the time from the beginning of the intensive growth of infections, not always the very beginning of the spread of Covid-19 but sufficiently close to it. System (1) describes the impact of hard measures under the most aggressive response. The second describes the impact of the soft measures: wearing the protective masks and social distancing are the key. We called these modes (A) and (B) in [Ch1, Ch3].

When $a = 0, d = 0$, we obtain the power growth $u(t) \sim Ct^c$; so c can be measured experimentally during the initial stages of Covid-19 and is supposed to be the same for (1) and (2). Mostly it was in the range $2.2 \le c \le 2.8$ (wave 1), but reached $c = 4.5, 5.5$ in Brazil and India.

There is a variant of these systems, when the second equation in (1) is replaced by that from (2), called the transitional (AB)-mode in [Ch1]. It modeled reasonably the spread in the USA, UK, and Brazil, but the usage of (1) and (2) in our two-phase solution appeared sufficient for in many countries.

The protection function $p(t)$ is the key here. Up to proportionality, it is $p(t) =$ (the total number of prevented infections from 0 to t) for system (1), where we assume that each infected individual isolated at $t_\bullet$ will not transmit the disease to $const \cdot (t - t_\bullet)$ people. For (2), $p(t) = const($ the number of infected people who began wearing the masks before t), and similarly for the social distancing and self-restrictions.

Related processes. Both systems are actually from [Ch2], where they were used to describe the dynamic of the (relative) stock prices $p(t)$ under news driven momentum trading. The function $u(t)$ there was the news propagation triggered by some event. It is of power growth in terms of time t passed from the event, but the exponent c is generally smaller than 1, especially when the "positions" are short term.

The arguments there were from behavioral finance. This is actually related; the behavioral aspects of epidemics are of obvious importance [St]. However financial news fades, and this happens quickly; this is very different for the spread of epidemics. System 1 described in [Ch2]

profit taking in stock markets; the second one modeled the "usual" news-driven investing.

As a matter of fact, these two systems are of very general nature. For instance, they are supposed to occur in any momentum risk taking. This concept, MRT for short, is from [Ch2]; it is somewhat similar to Kahneman's "thinking-fast" [Ka]. Managing epidemics on the basis of the current data is very much momentum. As in stock markets, the change of data can be random (and can be ignored as such), or it can be a start of a new tendency. Generally, it is risky not react promptly to each and every piece.

It was expected in [Ch2, Ch1], though without biological evidence, that both systems of equations may describe real neural processes in our brain. Here $u(t)$ is the number of neurons involved in the analysis of a particular event at the moment t, counted from the event, and $p(t)$ is the expected importance of this event vs. other ones and the corresponding expected brain resources needed for its analysis. I.e. $p(t)$ is basically the expected allocation of resources, which are very limited in our brain. We do not know much about the ways our brain work, but the confirmation of the power laws and related saturations are solid in the stock markets and, as we demonstrate, in epidemics.

We note that a significant part of [Ch2] is devoted to the discretization. Decision-making always requires some action potentials, i.e. it is discrete by its nature. With epidemics, this seems not really necessary; the usage of ODE worked very well so far, though potentially the discretization can become important for our approach too.

Two-phase solution. The solutions of (1) and (2) we need are

$$u^{1,2}(t) = t^{(c+1)/2} J_{\pm\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t),$$
$$u_B(t) = t^{c/2}\cos(d\log(Max(1,t))).$$

Here $J_\alpha(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m (x/2)^{2m+\alpha}}{m!\Gamma(m+\alpha+1)}$ are Bessel functions of the first kind; [Wa] (Ch.3, S 3.1). The function u_B is for $d = \sqrt{b - c^2/4} > 0$; it will be used to model later stages of Covid-19.

Our two-phase solution is the usage of a proper linear combination of $u^{1,2}$ for phase 1, till the saturation, and then the usage of u_B for phase 2. It proved to be quite exact for modeling the curves of total numbers of detected infections of Covid-19. For $t \approx 0$: $u^1(t) \approx t^c$ and $u^2(t)$ is approximately $\sim t$. I.e. u^1 dominates; it is the key for forecasting.



FIGURE 1. India: 3/20-10/7, $c=5.75, a=0.035, C=0.55$.

The second fundamental solution of system 2 is with sin instead of cos. When the protective measures are modest, mathematically when $D = c^2/2 - b > 0$, the leading fundamental solution is t^r with $r = c/2 + \sqrt{D}$, i.e. it diminishes from $r = c$ in the beginning of the spread to $r = c/2$ and then remains unchanged. This is of importance, but we will not touch the range $D > 0$ in this work.

India: 3/20-10/07-11/20. The starting number of detected cases was 191, which was subtracted. The power function $0.0125(t + 0.07)^{3.65}$ is a very good approximation for a very long interval. See Fig. 1.

In this graph, the main parameters were determined around 08/03. The forecast posted on 10/07 was that the curve of the total number of detected infections would reach its technical saturation on November 6 with the number 8.25M of the cases. It matched the actual number of cases almost ideally. As always, a linear growth is expected after the top of the Bessel-type curve $u(t)$; this can be seen in the graph. Generally, this period is phase 2, which can described by u_B and our computer programs for this phase.

Here y =cases/$10K$; similarly, y is the total number of cases divided by proper powers of 10 in the other charts we will consider. Say, divided by $100K$ for the USA. The x-axis is always time in days from the beginning of the curve. The red-blue-black dots give the corresponding



FIGURE 2. Italy: $c{=}2.6, a{=}0.2, d{=}0.5$.

actual total numbers of the detected cases. The u-function for India is:

$$u(t) = 0.55\, t^{c/2+0.5}\big(J_{c/2-0.5}(\sqrt{a}t)+0.2J_{0.5-c/2}(\sqrt{a}t)\big),$$

where $c{=}$ 5.75, a = 0.035. There was no clear phase 2 till the middle of November there, so we provide only $u(t)$.

Italy: 2/22-5/22. Figure 2. The starting point was 2/22, when the total number of infections was 17; we subtract this initial value when calculating our dots, the total numbers of detected infections. One has:

$$u_{1,2}(t) = 0.8\, t^{(c+1)/2} J_{\pm\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t), \;\; u(t) = u_1(t) - u_2(t), \quad \text{and}$$
$$u_B(t) = 2.85\, t^{c/2}\cos(d\log(Max(1,t))), \;\; c{=}2.6, a{=}0.2, d{=}0.5.$$

We use here both fundamental solutions $u^{1,2}(t)$ of system (1).

Germany: 3/07-5/22. See Figure 3. We began with the initial number of total infections 684 (subtracted). This was approximately the moment when a systematic management began. One has:

$$u(t) = 1.3\,(t^{(c+1)/2}(J_{+\frac{c-1}{2}} - 0.7J_{-\frac{c-1}{2}})(\sqrt{a}t) \;\; \text{for} \;\; c{=}2.6,$$
$$u_B(t) = 2.95\, t^{c/2}\cos(d\log(Max(1,t))), \; a{=}0.35, d{=}0.56.$$



FIGURE 3. Germany: $c=2.6, a=0.35, d=0.56$.

Japan: 3/20- 5/22. See Figure 4. There was some prior stage; we subtract 950, the total number of infections on March 20. The curve for Japan is not too smooth, which is not unusual. However it is managed well by our 2-phase solution :

$$u(t) = 1.5\, t^{(c+1)/2}(J_{+\frac{c-1}{2}} - 0.4 J_{-\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t),\ c=2.6,$$
$$u_B(t) = 3.15\, t^{c/2}\cos(d\log(Max(1,t))),\ \ a=0.3, d=0.6.$$

The Netherlands: 03/13-5/22. See Figure 5. The number of the total case was 383 on 3/13, the beginning of the intensive spread from our perspective. The usage of the dominant u^1 appeared sufficient:

$$u(t) \ = \ 0.5\, t^{(c+1)/2} J_{\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t), \quad c=2.4,\ a=0.2,$$
$$u_B(t) = 0.86\, t^{c/2}\cos(d\log(Max(1,t))), d=0.54.$$

UK: 03/16-06/13. This country was a challenge for us, though it "eventually" managed to reach phase 2. The u-function here is with the same a, c as for the Netherlands. Actually the red dots are modeled better with the transitional (AB)-mode. However, we prefer to stick



FIGURE 4. Japan: $u = 1.5t^{1.8}(J_{0.8} - 0.4J_{-0.8})(t\sqrt{0.3})$.



FIGURE 5. The Netherlands: $u = 0.5t^{1.7}J_{0.7}(t\sqrt{0.2})$.



FIGURE 6. UK: $u = 2.2t^{1.7}J_{0.7}(t\sqrt{0.2})$.

to the "original" $u(t)$ determined for the period till April 15. The two-phase solution is a combination of two phases separated by a linear period, about 10 days. See Figure 6. The parameter $d = 0.465$ is different from that for the Netherlands (0.54). This can be expected; the process toward the saturation of phase 2 was slower for UK:

$$u(t) \;=\; 2.2\, t^{(c+1)/2}\, J_{\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t), \quad c{=}2.4,\; a{=}0.2,$$
$$u_B(t) = 4\, t^{c/2} \cos(d \log(Max(1,t))), d{=}0.465.$$

Further waves. Their mathematical similarity to the first waves is very remarkable. Our parameters though change, and this is generally in a quite understandable way. We begin with the 2nd wave in the USA, which developed on the top of the unfinished 1st wave there.

The USA: 06/16 - 9/12. The two-phase solution worked well at least till the middle of September (2020) for the second wave in the USA. The accuracy is comparable with what we had above for the first waves in Japan, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands and UK. Upon subtracting



FIGURE 7. 2-phase solution for the 2nd wave in the USA.

$2.1M$, the second phase matched well the following functions:

$$u(t) = 3.4\, t^{(c+1)/2}(J_{+\frac{c-1}{2}} + 0.6 J_{-\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t),\ c = 2.65,$$
$$u_B(t) = 4.1\, t^{c/2} \cos(d \log(Max(1,t))), a = 0.06, d = 0.435.$$

We note that the initial transmission rate was $c = 2.2$ for the USA during the first wave. The parameters c, C and 0.6 in the first formula were determined for the period marked by red dots; the black dots form a control period. The projected saturation for u_B is given by the formula $t_{end} = \exp\big(\frac{1}{d} tan^{-1}(\frac{c}{2d})\big)$. Numerically, $t_{end} = 17.8463$, which is 178 days from 06/16: December 11, 2020. Though this did not materialize since the USA entered the 3rd wave in the middle of September. See Figure 7. The red dots were used to determine c, a.

USA: the 3rd wave. This wave is on the top of unfinished 2nd wave, so we subtract the starting total number of infections, which was about 6.9M on 9/24, when we begin our analysis. The latest date was 11/23, when the 3rd wave in the USA still did not reach the turning point; so any projections were preliminary at that moment. If the Bessel-type formula is used as such, then the end of the first phase can be around March 4, 2021, 162 days from the beginning. The provisional formula



FIGURE 8. The 3rd wave in the USA.

for $u(t)$ is as follows for the 3rd wave:

$$u(t) = 5.5\, t^{(c+1)/2}(J_{+\frac{c-1}{2}} + 0.65 J_{-\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t), \quad \text{for} \quad c{=}2.85, \ a{=}0.02.$$

This is conditional, but the new c clearly increased from $c = 2.65$ for the 2nd wave in a way similar to the passage from the 1st wave to the 2nd. The parameter a significantly dropped from $a = 0.06$ for the 2nd wave: it became almost 3 times smaller. Recall, that $a = 0.06$ was about $1/3rd$ of $a = 0.2$ for the first wave, so the same tendency persists. Recall that the duration of phase 1 is qualitatively proportional to $1/sqrta$ according to our Bessel-type formula.

The Netherlands: the 2nd wave. The second wave were quite uniform in Western Europe. The Netherlands is convenient to demonstrate the evolution of our parameters, because the corresponding u-function does no involve the second, non-dominating, Bessel-type solution. Generally, both are present.

The data indicate the beginning of the second phase of the second wave there, but this is somewhat premature. However the qualitative similarity of Fig. 9 and Fig 5 is obvious. The similarity of the 1st, the 2nd wave, and probably even the 3rd one in the USA is remarkable as well.



FIGURE 9. The 2nd wave in the Netherlands.

Qualitatively, the parameter c significantly increased in the Netherlands: from 2.4 (the 1st wave) to 3.4 (the 2nd). The intensity of the hard measures understandably dropped: from 0.2 to 0.085. Such changes are actually common for the second waves in Europe. The parameter $d = 0.43$ diminished from 0.54, but this was somewhat early to estimate (in the middle of November). One has:

$$u(t) = 0.7\, t^{(c+1)/2}(J_{+\frac{c-1}{2}}(\sqrt{a}t),\ c{=}3.4,$$
$$u_B(t) = 1.65\, t^{c/2}\cos(d\log(Max(1,t))), a{=}0.085, d{=}0.43.$$

In Europe and the USA, there can be of course significant fluctuations during the winter. However, some hard measures were reintroduced: our approach is supposed to work. The self-imposed restrictions are of obvious importance here. Their reduction can be one of the reasons for increasing c during the 2nd waves vs. those for wave 1.

Auto-forecasting. We mostly did this for the USA and Western Europe, but any countries can be "processed" during their second phases (any waves); currently, there is no software for the 1st phases, i.e. that for the Bessel-type modeling.

Auto-forecasting for USA. We will provide the automated forecast for 50 states was based on the period 03/17-05/27; the data were from `https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data`. Every state was processed individually with the interaction; see [Ch1]. The interaction is of independent interest: we allow the curves for individual states to become decreasing as far as the total sum increases, which is motivated by physics.

Our program focuses on the last 20 days; however, the match with the total number of detected infections appeared perfect almost from 03/17 and remained so for further auto-forecasts for a sufficiently long period; see Figure 10.



FIGURE 10. USA, the sum of the curves for individual states.

Such a high level of stability is actually rare in any forecasting, which made the chances good to reach the saturation around 9/19, the projection based on Fig. 10. The saturation does not mean the end of the spread; normally, it is followed by a period of modest linear growth of the total number of infections. No country is isolated and new clusters of infection are always possible.

However, the hard measures were significantly reduced in the USA at the end of May practically in all 50 states. As a result, the number of states that reached phase 2 dropped from about 22 at 5/27 to 8 at 7/12. Then, in the second half of June, the USA entered the second wave.

The program was quite stable for the 2nd phase of the 2nd wave in the USA ... before it entered the 3rd wave in the middle of September.

Auto-forecasting for Europe. The situation was quite stable in Europe in summer. We provide a sample forecast our automated system produced for Western Europe till the end of July, to be exact, for the following 45 countries: Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Faeroe Islands, Finland, France, Germany, Gibraltar, Greece, Guernsey, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Italy, Jersey, Kosovo, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Vatican. See Figure 11.

Here and above the main source of Covid-19 data we used was: `https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus`. The "curve average" is the maximum and the corresponding value of the average of 9 last curves $u_B(t)$ for the sums of the curves of total cases and the forecast curves over the countries above. I.e. it is the moving average. The 9-day average is the simple average of the corresponding maxima.

As of July 8, the following countries had clear second phases: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Greece, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia. Sweden, Poland, Portugal and some other countries did not reach phase 2 at that time. Nevertheless, the forecasts were sufficiently stable. Such stability changed this fall due to the end of the vacation periods and the beginning of the school year.

Conclusion. Modeling of Covid-19 appeared quite a challenge for existing mathematical approaches due to its following features. The growth of the curves of total numbers of detected infections is of power-type, where the initial exponent diminishes over time. The saturation of the first and second waves, when present, is (currently) mostly because of the protective measures, not due to the herd immunity. Both factors and the scope of protective measures makes Covid-19 exceptional. However these factors are not really new; they occurred for the epidemics in the past.

Our theory seems the first one when the active management is considered the leading factor. It results in differential equations depending only on the initial transmission rate and the intensities of the hard and



FIGURE 11. A sample auto-forecast for Europe as of 7/14.

soft measures. The actual curves of the total numbers of detected cases in many countries are described uniformly and with surprisingly high accuracy. Importantly, the saturation due to the active management is of unstable nature; its modeling and forecasting requires sharp mathematical tools. Bessel functions are the key in our approach.

Methods. The key points of our approach to modeling the total number of infections during epidemics are the power growth hypothesis, which has solid confirmations, and attributing the saturation of the spread of Covid-19 mainly to the protective measures, at least during the first wave. The role of protective measures is of course not unique for Covid-19, but their range and intensity reached unprecedented levels with Covid-19. The asymptotic periodicity of Bessel functions, one of the deepest results in their theory, is the main mathematical tool we employ. This is very different from the classical approaches based of SID, SIR, SIER models and their variants.

Due to a very limited number of parameters, actually 3 for our two-phase solution, our model is much more rigid than in any other ones. Nevertheless, we obtain a very good match practically for the whole

periods of the first waves of Covid-19 in many countries; it is actually surprising for such stochastic processes as epidemics. Since our theory was created in the middle of April, we had a unique opportunity to determine our parameters during relatively early stages of Covid-19 and then to test them extensively for sufficiently long control periods.

This is similar to routine testing the quality of the models used for forecasting share-prices in stock markets, where no approach can be accepted without real-time runs and carefully crafted historic experiments that exclude any "usage of future". Testing our system during the control periods, including automated forecasting programs we developed, is an important part of papers [Ch1, Ch3].

Summary. Starting with the power law of epidemics, we demonstrate that Bessel-type functions describe very well long periods of the growth of the total number of detected cases in many countries. Mathematically, they provide the passage from t^c to t and then to the saturation, which appeared exactly what is needed to model Covid-19, where c is the initial transmission rate, which can be captured at relatively early stages of the epidemic. We obtain them via ODE describing the active epidemic management, especially the impact of hard measures.

The saturation due to active protection measures is of unstable nature. To control the efficiency of the management and for forecasting Covid-19 an exact mathematical theory is needed. There will be an endless discussion of the efficiency of different measures and different management approaches until verifiable trustworthy mathematical models and the corresponding software are developed and implemented practically.

The verification does require algorithms that can be used by anyone, not only by their creators, the ultimate test of their validity. This is one of the reasons we wrote our own programs; they are posted in [Ch1, Ch3] and can be used by anyone for any countries and regions, though only for the late stages of Covid-19 so far (mode (B)).

The new theory we suggest seems a solid basis for reaching the next level, which is forecasting. It already describes the curves of total numbers of detected infections with high accuracy and with surprisingly high level of stability of the auto-projections, but forecasting is always a challenge. The small number of the parameter we employ explains very well the uniformity of the curves of total numbers of detected infections

of Covid-19 in many countries, as well as mathematical similarity of the first and the second waves.

These parameters are: (1) the initial transmission rate c, which can be seen at relatively early stages of the spread, (2) the intensity of hard measures a, which become sufficiently stable near the turning point, and (3) the intensity b of the measures (mostly soft) during the second phase, toward the saturation. The scaling coefficient of $u(t)$ is adjusted to match the real numbers of cases. The coefficient of u^2 is actually of importance, but it is mostly used to capture some "effects of the second order" and does not seem critical for forecasting; the dominant Bessel-type solution u^1 is expected to be sufficient for this.

The fact that we were able to describe such complex stochastic processes as epidemics only with 3 parameters seems a real discovery. The confirmations are solid, but it will take time to understand the scope of this new theory and to begin using it practically.

The author thanks very much David Kazhdan for valuable comments and suggestions; a good portion of this paper presents author's attempts to answer his questions. Many thanks to Eric Opdam and Alexei Borodin for their kind interest and ETH-ITS for outstanding hospitality; special thanks are to Giovanni Felder and Rahul Pandharipande. We acknowledge support by NSF grant DMS–1901796 and the Simons Foundation.

Author's Affiliation. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Mathematics Department, Phillips Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3250.

.

References.

[BBT] T. Britton, and F. Ball, and P. Trapman, *A mathematical model reveals the influence of population heterogeneity on herd immunity to SARS-CoV-2*, Science 369: 6505, 846–849. 2, 4, 5

[CJLP] 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. 2

[CLL] M. Castro, and M. López-Garcia, and G. Lythe, and et al, *First passage events in biological systems with non-exponential inter-event times*, Sci Rep 8, 15054 (2018), doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-32961-7. 6

[Ch1] I. Cherednik, *Momentum managing epidemic spread and Bessel functions*, Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 139 (2020); 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 17, 20 doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2020.110234.

[Ch2] I. Cherednik, *Artificial intelligence approach to momentum risk-taking*, Preprint: arxiv 1911.08448v4 (q-fin), 2019. 7, 8

[Ch3] ———, *A surprising formula for the spread of Covid-19 under aggressive management*, Preprint: medRxiv, doi: 10.1101/2020.04.29.2008448 , 2020. 7, 20

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

[CD] J.M. Cushing, and O. Diekmann *The many guises of R_0 (a didactic note)*, J. Theor. Biol. 2016 Sep 7; 404 :295-302. 2, 3

[DHB] O. Diekmann, and H. Heesterbeek, and T. Britton, *Mathematical Tools for Understanding Infectious Disease Dynamics*, Princeton Series in Theoretical and Computational Biology, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 2014. 2

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

[HL] 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, 5

[Ka] D. Kahneman, *Thinking, fast and slow*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011. 8

[MBS] C. Manchein, and E. Brugnago, and R. Silva, and C. Mendes, and M. Beims, *Strong correlations between power-law growth of COVID-19 in four continents and the inefficiency of soft quarantine strategies*, Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 30, 041102 (2020); doi: 10.1063/5.0009454. 3, 4

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

[Ray] T. Ray, *Graph theory suggests COVID-19 might be a "small world" after all*, (2020) 3
`https://www.zdnet.com/article/graph-theory-suggests-covid-19-might-be-a-small-world-after-all/`.

[St] Ph. Strong, *Epidemic psychology: a model*, Sociology of Health & Illness 12:3 (1990), 249–259. 7

[TKH] S. Thurner, and P. Klimek, and R. Hanel, *A network-based explanation of why most COVID-19 infection curves are linear*, PNAS, 117: 37 22684-22689 (2020). 3, 4

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