The impact of demographic factors on numbers of COVID-19 cases and deaths in Europe and the regions of Ukraine

Igor Nesteruk

Institute of Hydromechanics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Kyiv, Ukraine.
inesteruk@yahoo.com

Oleksii Rodionov

Private consulting office, Kyiv, Ukraine

ABSTRACT

The accumulated numbers of COVID-19 cases and deaths per capita are important characteristics of the pandemic dynamics that may also indicate the effectiveness of quarantine, testing, vaccination, and treatment. The statistical analysis based on the number of cases per capita accumulated to the end of June 2021 showed no correlations with the volume of population, its density, and the urbanization level both in European countries and regions of Ukraine. The same result was obtained with the use of fresher datasets (as of December 23, 2021). The number of deaths per capita and per case may depend on the urbanization level. For European countries these relative characteristics decrease with the increase of the urbanization level. Opposite trend was revealed for the number of deaths per capita in Ukrainian regions.

Keywords: COVID-19 pandemic, epidemic dynamics in Europe, epidemic dynamics in Ukraine, mathematical modeling of infectious diseases, statistical methods.

Introduction

The accumulated number of COVID-19 cases per capita (CC) and deaths per capita (DC) may indicate the effectiveness of quarantine, testing, vaccination, treatment, and also characterizes the virulence of coronavirus strains which circulated in a particular region. An important characteristic of the strain virulence and treatment efficiencies can be the number of deaths per case DC/CC. The CC and DC numbers are regularly reported by World Health Organization, [1] and COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU), [2].

The impact of some eco-demographic factors on the COVID-19 pandemic dynamics was studied in [3-20]. In particular, in [20] the influences of the volume of population, its density, and the urbanization level on the CC numbers accumulated at the end of June 2021 were investigated for European countries and the regions of Ukraine. Since no statistically significant correlations were revealed, in this paper we will study the influence of the volume of population N_{pop} , its density, and the level of urbanization N_{ubr}/N_{pop} (N_{ubr} is the number of people living in cities) on the CC, DC and DC/CC values with the use of fresher figures (as of December 23, 2021) for European countries and regions of Ukraine.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Data

For this statistical analysis we will use the data set regarding the numbers of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases in the regions of Ukraine accumulated at the time December 23, 2021 and compare it with the results based on the figures accumulated at June 27, 2021. As in paper [20], we will use the CC numbers (per 100 persons of population) registered by national statistics [21] and demographic data sets for Ukrainian regions [22] (see Table 1). The accumulated numbers of deaths registered by national statistics [21] in Ukrainian regions at December 23, 2021 are shown in the last column of Table 1. As the information from the regions of Ukraine fully or partially occupied by the Russian Federation is inaccurate, we excluded from consideration Donetsk and Luhansk regions, Crimea and Sevastopol. The CC figures (per 1,000,000 persons of population) registered by JHU [2] at two moments of time: June 28, 2021 and December 23, 2021 are shown in Table 2, which contains also the accumulated number of deaths per million (DC) as of December 23, 2021, [2] and the demographic data sets for European countries taken from [23-25].

Table 1. Demographic characteristics and the accumulated number of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases and deaths in the regions of Ukraine as of June 27, 2021 and December 23, 2021

Oblast (region)	Population N_{pop} , [22]	Urban popu- lation, N_{ubr} , [22]	Popula- tion density (number of people per square km), [22]	Accumu- lated number of laboratory- confirmed cases per hundred as of June 27, 2021, [21]	Accumu- lated number of laboratory- confirmed cases per hundred as of Decem- ber 23, 2021, [21]	Accumu- lated number of deaths as of Decem- ber 23, 2021, [21]
Vinnytsia	1 545 416	799 385	58.29	4.67	8.8	3029
Volyn	1 031 421	539 179	51.2	6.06	10.03	2148
Dnipropetrovsk	3 176 648	2 668 744	99.54	4.33	7.75	8707
Zhytomyr	1 208 212	716 457	40.5	7.43	11.79	3204
Zakarpattia	1 253 791	465 904	98.13	4.98	6.96	2283
Zaporizhzhia	1 687 401	1 306 231	62.08	6.30	10.99	5105
Ivano-Frankivsk	1 368 097	606 764	98.23	6.38	9.32	3052
Kyiv (oblast)	1 781 044	1 105 383	63.31	7.12	10.21	4588
Kirovohrad	933 109	591 944	37.95	2.25	3.59	1458
Lviv	2 512 084	1 534 040	115.06	5.52	8.78	5900
Mykolaiv	1 119 862	768 022	45.53	6.34	10.45	3231
Odesa	2 377 230	1 597 062	71.37	5.95	10.1	5488
Poltava	1 386 978	867 201	48.25	5.70	10.16	3619
Rivne	1 152 961	548 088	57.51	6.93	11.07	2231
Sumy	1 068 247	741 430	44.82	7.43	12.5	2781
Ternopil	1 038 695	473 727	75.14	6.82	10.4	2075
Kharkiv	2 658 461	2 158 121	84.62	5.66	9.27	6231
Kherson	1 027 913	631 317	36.12	3.53	7.81	2656
Khmelnitskyi	1 254 702	720 752	60.82	7.18	11.78	3262
Cherkasy	1 192 137	678 682	57.04	6.97	10.92	2526
Chernivtsi	901 632	390 551	111.35	8.94	13.3	2976
Chernihiv	991 294	649 063	31.11	5.92	9.74	2353
Kyiv (city)	2 967 360	2 967 360	3536.78	7.22	11.01	8069

Table 2. Demographic characteristics and the accumulated number of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases and deaths in European countries as of June 28, 2021 and December 23, 2021

Country	Population, [23]	Urbanization level N_{urb}/N_{pop} %, [24]	Population density (per square km), [25]	Total cases per million CC as of June 28, 2021, [2]	Total cases per million CC as of December 23, 2021, [2]	Total deaths per million DC as of December 23, 2021, [2]
Monaco	38682	100	1,547	65615.126	116548.6	961.538
Vatican City	801	100	2,273	33374.536	33251.23	no data
Malta	514564	95	1,447	69330.229	84878.9	916.489
San Marino	33785	97	561	150008.84	218965	2852.102
Netherlands	17059560	91	416	99886.646	176606.8	1205.141
Belgium	11482178	98	384	93486.963	174589	2416.54
United Kingdom	67141684	83	270	70284.988	172901.5	2167.399
Liechtenstein	37910	14	245	79555.288	154127.7	1803.733
Luxembourg	604245	91	243	112850.972	155069	1428.765
Germany	83124418	77	225	44576.917	83172	1312.555
Italy	60627291	70	207	70432.141	91391.17	2256.927
Switzerland	8525611	74	204	81198.962	140829.1	1383.398
Andorra	77006	88	183	179667.379	278860.8	1796.934
Denmark	5752126	88	136	50743.387	115907.8	545.817
Czech Republic	10665677	74	136	155658.773	224437.2	3290.394
Poland	37921592	60	122	76088.436	106289.4	2472.286
Portugal	10256193	65	112	85856.051	123239.9	1852.886
Slovakia	5453014	54	111	71720.074	245814.2	2973.78
Albania	2882740	60	107	46046.633	72029.15	1107.23
Austria	8891388	66	106	72206.875	139153.7	1503.361
France	64990511	80	105	86325.089	132236.8	1810.972
Hungary	9707499	71	105	83645.21	128431.5	3976.163
Turkey	82340088	75	105	64196.94	108763.9	953.932
Slovenia	2077837	55	104	123742.383	217967	2659.325
Moldova	4051944	43	99	63613.375	92880.14	2379.458
Spain	46692858	80	99	81117.733	122322.8	1904.345
Serbia	8802754	56	91	105279.579	187323.5	1821.715
Romania	19506114	54	89	56174.491	94160.52	3056.446
North Macedonia	2082957	58	83	74722.806	106754.3	3777.859
Greece	10522246	79	80	40416.745	101881.1	1947.594
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3323925	48	75	62481.731	87879.76	4057.964
Croatia	4156405	57	75	87610.845	168213.5	2983.837
Ireland	4818690	63	74	55002.07	136541.9	1182.042
Ukraine	44246156	69	73	52556.15	87621.13	2304.263
Bulgaria	7051608	75	63	60682.066	106153.8	4413.154
Belarus	9452617	78	46	44001.045	72981.12	577.049
Montenegro	627809	67	44	159544.758	257851.7	3802.239
Lithuania	2801264	68	42	102372.965	188826	2685.268
Latvia	1928459	68	29	72759.97	144706.8	2404.477
Estonia	1322920	69	27	98740.406	177301.6	1433.004
Sweden	9971638	87	23	107819.278	125324.1	1502.437
Norway	5337962	82	17	24116.983	67305.34	229.983
Finland	5522576	85	16	17176.113	40943.44	271.071
Iceland	336713	94	3	19208.791	64326.07	107.759

Linear regression and Fisher tests

The linear regression will be used to calculate the regression coefficient r and the coefficients a and b of corresponding straight lines, [26]:

$$y = a + bx \quad (1)$$

where x is the volume of population N_{pop} , its density per square km, or the urbanization level N_{urb}/N_{pop} ; y is the numbers of cases per capita CC, numbers of deaths per capita DC and deaths per case ratio DC/CC.

We will also use the F-test for the null hypothesis that says that the proposed linear relationship (1) fits the data sets. The experimental values of the Fisher function can be calculated with the use of the formula:

$$F = \frac{r^2(n-m)}{(1-r^2)(m-1)} \quad (2)$$

where $m=2$ is the number of parameters in the regression equation, [26]. The experimental values F must be compared with the critical values $F_C(k_1, k_2)$ of the Fisher function at a desired significance or confidence level ($k_1 = m-1$, $k_2 = n-m$, see, e.g., [27]). If $F_C(k_1, k_2) > F$, the corresponding hypothesis is supported by observations.

Results

Within six months, the numbers of cases per hundred in the regions of Ukraine increased from 1.4 to 2.2 times (see Table 1 and Fig. 1). The minimum values remained in the Kirovohrad region 3.59 (2.25), and the maximum ones - in the Chernivtsi region 13.3 (8.94). The variation (the difference between maximum and minimum values) increased 1.45 times. Rather high CC values still remained in Zhytomyr, Khmelnytskyi, Kyiv (city), and Sumy regions. As of December 23, 2021 the maximum values of deaths per 100,000 persons were registered in Chernivtsi (330.1) and Zaporizhzhia (302.5) regions. The minimum values corresponding to Kirovohrad (156.3) and Zakarpattia (182.1) regions are approximately twice smaller (see Table 1). The numbers of deaths per 100 registered cases vary much more: from 11.23 (Dnipropetrovsk) and 7.33 (Kyiv city) to 2.00 (Ternopil) and 2.02 (Rivne).

As of June 28, 2021, the highest CC levels were registered in Andorra - 18%, Montenegro - 16%, Czech Republic - 15.5%, San Marino - 15%, Slovenia - 12.4%. In six months, the list of the most infected countries has changed as follows: Andorra (27.9%), Montenegro (25.8%), Slovakia (24.6 %). The lowest CC values were in the Vatican (3.3% no new cases were registered last 6 month), Finland (4.1%) and Iceland (6.4%), see Table 2. As of December 23, 2021 the maximum values of deaths per 100,000 persons were registered in Bulgaria (441.3), Bosnia and Herzegovina (405.8) and Hungary (397.6). The minimum values (corresponding to Iceland (10.8), Norway (23.0) and Finland (27.1)) were much smaller, see Table 2. The calculated numbers of deaths per 100 registered cases vary from 4.6 (Bosnia and Herzegovina), 4.2 (Bulgaria) and 3.5 (North Macedonia) to 0.47 (Denmark), 0.34 (Norway) and 0.17 (Iceland).

Such huge differences raise questions about their cause. As in [20], we have investigated possible correlations with the volume of population, its density and the level of urbanization. The results are presented in Tables 3 and 4 and in Figs. 1-4. The linear regression (1) was used to calculate the regression coefficient r , the coefficients a and b of corresponding straight lines, and the experimental values of the

Fisher function. The results are shown in Table 3 for CC values and in Table 4 for DC and $100000 \cdot DC/CC$ values.

The regression analysis demonstrates that there are no correlations between CC values and demographic factors, since $F_C(k_1, k_2) > F$ for all cases presented in Table 3 (compare figures in two last columns). This fact is valid both in the case of Ukrainian regions and European countries for datasets corresponding December 23, 2021 and previous study with the use of CC values accumulated at the end of June 2021 (results are published in [20] and shown in brackets). Numbers of cases per 100 persons and corresponding best fitting lines are shown in Fig. 1 for Ukrainian regions and in Fig. 2 for Europe. Small markers and dashed lines correspond to the situation at the end of June 2021, large markers and solid lines – on December 23, 2021. It can be seen that CC data are very scattered. Some visible trends occurred only for dependence CC versus density of population in Europe at the end of 2021 (see the blue solid line in Fig. 2), but even in this case no significant correlation was revealed.

Table 3. Optimal values of parameters in eq. (1), correlation coefficients and the results of Fisher test applications. The results of calculations performed in [20] with the use of data sets corresponding to the end of June 2021 are shown in brackets.

Number of Figure, relationship, region	n	Correlation coefficient, r	Optimal values of parameters a in eq. (1)	Optimal values of parameters b in eq. (1)	Experimental value of the Fisher function F , eq. (2), $m=2$	Critical value of Fisher function $F_c(1, n-2)$ for the confidence level 0.1, [27]
1, CC versus volume of population, Ukraine	23	-0.1078 (-0.1082)	10.3503 (6.4203)	-3.1785e-007 (-2.2551e-007)	0.2467 (0.2486)	2.96
2, CC versus volume of population, Europe	44	-0.1778 (-0.1607)	14.1528 (8.2330)	-4.4192e-008 (-2.5094e-008)	1.3706 (1.1132)	2.84
1, CC versus density of population, Ukraine	23	0.1232 (0.1792)	9.7826 (5.9935)	3.4716e-004 (3.6060e-004)	0.3235 (0.6967)	2.96
2, CC versus density of population, Europe	44	-0.2026 (-0.0953)	14.1058 (8.0331)	-0.0026 (-7.7955e-004)	1.7984 (0.3848)	2.84
1, CC versus urbanization level, Ukraine	23	0.0028 (-0.1024)	9.8339 (6.6956)	0.0388 (-1.0123)	1.6121e-004 (0.2224)	2.96
2, CC versus urbanization level, Europe	44	-0.1017 (-0.0019)	15.9213 (7.8739)	-3.3644 (-0.0394)	0.4387 (1.5088e-04)	2.84

Figure 1. Numbers of COVID-19 cases per 100 persons (CC) in the regions of Ukraine accumulated as of June 27, 2021 versus the volume of population $N_{pop}/1000$ (red), its density per square km (blue), and the urbanization level $1000*N_{urb}/N_{pop}$ (black). Markers represent values from Table 1. Best fitting lines (1) correspond to values shown in Table 3.

Figure 2. Numbers of COVID-19 cases per 100 persons (CC) in European countries accumulated as of June 28, 2021 versus the volume of population $N_{pop}/100000$ (red), its density per square km (blue), and the urbanization level $1000*N_{urb}/N_{pop}$ (black). Markers represent values from Table 2. Best fitting lines (1) correspond to values shown in Table 3

The regression analysis of DC values showed that there are correlations with the urbanization levels both for Ukrainian regions and European countries, since $F_C(k_1, k_2) < F$ for these cases (see Table 4). The signs of correlation coefficients and parameters b are opposite for Ukrainian regions and European countries. In Ukrainian regions the number of deaths increases with the increase of urbanization level (see the black solid line in Fig. 3). The same line in Fig.4 illustrates the opposite trend for European countries. The mortality rate (DC/CC ratio) diminishes with the increase of the urbanization level in Europe (see last row in Table 4 and the dashed black line in Fig. 4). Opposite trend is visible in Fig. 3 for Ukrainian regions, but no

statistically significant relationship was revealed ($F_C(k_1, k_2) > F$). The volume of population and its density do not affect the DC and DC/CC values (see Table 4 and Figs. 3 and 4).

Table 4. Correlations for ratios of deaths per million (DC) and deaths per 100,000 cases (100000*DC/CC). Optimal values of parameters in eq. (5), correlation coefficients and the results of Fisher test applications. Results for Ukraine are shown before slash, for Europe- after slash. Number of countries in Europe taken for calculations $n=43$ (without Vatican, see Table 2). Number of Ukrainian regions taken for calculations $n=23$ (see Table 1).

Relationship	Correlation coefficient, R	Optimal values of parameters a in eq. (1)	Optimal values of parameters b in eq. (1)	Experimental value of the Fisher function F , eq. (2), $m=2$	Critical value of Fisher function $F_c(I, n-2)$ for the confidence level 0.1, [27]
DC density of population	0.1685 / -0.1896	2.3870e+03 / 2.1385e+03	0.0959 / -0.6561	0.6137 / 1.5289	2.96 / 2.85
DC volume of population	0.1867 / -0.0854	2.2354e+03 / 2.0743e+03	1.1123e-004 / -3.9774e-006	0.7584 / 0.3010	2.96 / 2.85
DC urbanization level	0.3971 / -0.3930	1.7152e+03 / 3.8161e+03	1.1223e+003 / -2.4985e+003	3.9314 / 7.4911	2.96 / 2.85
100000*DC/CC versus density of population	-0.0230 / -0.1699	2.5318e+03 / 1.6578e+03	-0.0182 / -0.5373	0.0111 / 1.2190	2.96 / 2.85
100000*DC/CC versus volume of population	0.1656 / 0.0665	2.3162e+03 / 1.5089e+03	1.3664e-04 / 2.8323e-006	0.5918 / 0.1823	2.96 / 2.85
100000*DC/CC versus urbanization level	0.3117 / -0.4094	1.2203e+03 / 3.2717e+03	1.2203e+003 / -2.3785e+003	2.2595 / 8.2580	2.96 / 2.85

Figure 3. Deaths caused by coronavirus in Ukrainian regions accumulated as of December 23, 2021. Numbers of deaths per million DC (large markers and solid lines) and per 100,000 cases $100000 \cdot DC/CC$ (small markers and dashed lines) versus the volume of population $N_{pop}/1000$ (red), its density per square km (blue), and the urbanization level $1000 \cdot N_{urb}/N_{pop}$ (black). Markers represent values from Table 1. Best fitting lines (1) correspond to values shown in Table 4.

Figure 4. Deaths caused by coronavirus in European countries accumulated as of December 23, 2021. Numbers of deaths per million DC (large markers and solid lines) and per 100,000 cases $100000 \cdot DC/CC$ (small markers and dashed lines) versus the volume of population $N_{pop}/100000$ (red), its density per square km (blue), and the urbanization level $1000 \cdot N_{urb}/N_{pop}$ (black). Markers represent values from Table 2. Best fitting lines (1) correspond to values shown in Table 4.

Discussion

Very different CC, DC and DC/CC values registered in the regions of Ukraine and European countries do not depend on the volume of population and its density. The deaths per capita and death per case values decrease with the increase of the urbanization level of European countries. Opposite trend was revealed for Ukrainian regions. These facts motivate us to focus on the analysis of quarantine measures, testing, tracing and isolating patients.

We also have to take into account the large number of unregistered cases observed in many countries [28-33]. Estimates for Ukraine made in [28, 33] showed that the real number of cases could be 4-20 times higher than registered and reflected in the official statistics. Probably, in Ukrainian villages many deaths caused by coronavirus were not registered. That is why the DC values increase with the urbanization level in Ukrainian regions. The decrease of DC and DC/CC values in European cities probably are connected with better testing, isolation, and treating the COVID-19 patients.

The results of this study motivate us to pay attention to the pollution effects. The smallest CC, DC, and DC/CC values were registered in the cleanest North European countries (Iceland, Norway, Denmark, and Finland). Higher figures for Sweden are probably connected with the absence of lockdown in 2020. The increase of DC values in the most urbanized Ukrainian regions may be also connected with the atmospheric pollution.

References

1. World Health Organization. "Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports". <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/>. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2020.
2. COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU). <https://github.com/owid/covid-19-data/tree/master/public/data>
3. Byass, P. Eco-epidemiological assessment of the COVID-19 epidemic in China, January-February 2020. medRxiv 2020, doi:10.1101/2020.03.29.20046565.
4. Dehning J. et al. Inferring COVID-19 spreading rates and potential change points for case number forecasts. Preprint, ArXiv:2004.01105(2020).
5. Distante, C.; Gadelha Pereira, I.; Garcia Goncalves, L.M.; Piscitelli, P.; Miani, A. Forecasting Covid-19 Outbreak Progression in Italian Regions: A model based on neural network training from Chinese data. medRxiv 2020.
6. Hamzah, F.; Binti, A.; Lau, C.; Nazri, H.; Ligot, D.V.; Lee, G.; Tan, C.L. CoronaTracker: Worldwide COVID-19 Outbreak Data Analysis and Prediction. Bull. World Health Organ. 2020, 1, 32.
7. Fanelli, D.; Piazza, F. Analysis and forecast of COVID-19 spreading in China, Italy and France. Chaos Solitons Fractals 2020, 134, 109761.
8. Webb, G.F.; Magal, P.; Liu, Z.; Seydi, O. A model to predict COVID-19 epidemics with applications to South Korea, Italy, and Spain. medRxiv 2020.
9. Distante, C.; Piscitelli, P.; Miani, A. Covid-19 Outbreak Progression in Italian Regions: Approaching the Peak by the End of March in Northern Italy and First Week of April in Southern Italy. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2020, 17, 3025.
10. KY Ng, MM Gui. COVID-19: Development of a robust mathematical model and simulation package with consideration for ageing population and time delay for control action and resusceptibility. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena. Volume 411, October 2020, 132599
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physd.2020.132599>
11. Diego Carvalho, Rafael Barbastefano, Dayse Pastore, Maria Clara Lippi. A novel predictive mathematical model for COVID-19 pandemic with quarantine, contagion dynamics, and environmentally mediated transmission. medRxiv 2020.07.27.20163063; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.27.20163063>
12. Piotr T. Chruściel, Sebastian J. Szybka. Universal properties of the dynamics of the Covid-19 pandemics. medRxiv 2020.08.24.20181214; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20181214>

13. Gyan Bhanot, Charles DeLisi. Analysis of Covid-19 Data for Eight European Countries and the United Kingdom Using a Simplified SIR Model. medRxiv 2020.05.26.20114058; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.26.20114058>
14. Lia Humphrey et al. TESTING, TRACING AND SOCIAL DISTANCING: ASSESSING OPTIONS FOR THE CONTROL OF COVID_19 . medRxiv 2020.04.23.20077503; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077503>
15. Md. Haider Ali Biswas, M. S. Khatun, A. K. Paul, M. R. Khatun, M. A. Islam, S. A. Samad, U. Ghosh. Modeling the Effective Control Strategy for Transmission Dynamics of Global Pandemic COVID-19. medRxiv 2020.04.22.20076158; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.22.20076158>
16. Elinor Aviv-Sharon, Asaph Aharoni. Forecasting COVID-19 pandemic Severity in Asia. medRxiv. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.15.20102640>
17. Ashok Krishnamurthy. Spatiotemporal Transmission Dynamics of COVID-19 in Spain. Conference: Advancing knowledge about spatial modeling, infectious diseases, environment and health (June 8-12, 2020). Presentation. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342247591_Spatiotemporal_Transmission_Dynamics_of_COVID-19_in_Spain
18. Nesteruk I. *COVID19 pandemic dynamics*. Springer Nature, 2021, <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-981-33-6416-5>
19. Nesteruk I. Comparison of the First Waves of the COVID-19 Pandemic in Different Countries and Regions. In book: *COVID19 pandemic dynamics*. Springer Nature, 2021, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-33-6416-5_7
20. Nesteruk I, Rodionov O, Nikitin A.V, and Walczak S. Influences of seasonal and demographic factors on the COVID-19 pandemic dynamics. EAI Endorsed Transactions on Bioengineering and Bioinformatics. Published online Dec 8, 2021, DOI: 10.4108/eai.8-12-2021.172364
21. <https://index.minfin.com.ua/reference/coronavirus/ukraine/>
22. https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A1%D0%BF%D0%B8%D1%81%D0%BE%D0%BA_%D0%BE%D0%B1%D0%BB%D0%B0%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B5%D0%B9_%D0%A3%D0%BA%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%97%D0%BD%D0%B8_%D0%B7%D0%B0_%D1%87%D0%B8%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D1%96%D1%81%D1%82%D1%8E_%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%BB%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%BD%D1%8F
23. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_European_countries_by_population
24. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_countries_by_percentage_of_urban_population
25. <https://www.indexmundi.com/map/?v=21000&r=eu&l=en>
26. Draper NR, Smith H. Applied regression analysis. 3rd ed. John Wiley; 1998.
27. <https://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/cd-22/manual/v2appendixc.pdf>
28. Nesteruk I. Visible and real sizes of new COVID-19 pandemic waves in Ukraine Innov Biosyst Bioeng, 2021, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 85–96. DOI: 10.20535/ibb.2021.5.2.230487 <http://ibb.kpi.ua/article/view/230487>
29. <https://podillyanews.com/2020/12/17/u-shkolah-hmelnytskogo-provely-eksperyment-z-testuvannyam-na-covid-19/>
30. <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/11/02/europe/slovakia-mass-coronavirus-test-intl/index.html>
31. <https://www.voanews.com/covid-19-pandemic/slovakias-second-round-coronavirus-tests-draws-large-crowds>

32. Nesteruk I. The real COVID-19 pandemic dynamics in Qatar in 2021: simulations, predictions and verifications of the SIR model. September 2021. Semina Ciências Exatas e Tecnológicas 42(1Suppl(2021)):55-62. DOI: 10.5433/1679-0375.2021v42n1Suplp55
33. Nesteruk I. Influence of Possible Natural and Artificial Collective Immunity on New COVID-19 Pandemic Waves in Ukraine and Israel. Explor Res Hypothesis Med 2021; Published online: Nov 11, 2021. doi: 10.14218/ERHM.2021.00044. <https://www.xiahepublishing.com/2472-0712/ERHM-2021-00044>