

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

3
4 *Slavoljub STANOJEVIC^a, Mirza PONJAVIC^b, Slobodan STANOJEVIC^c, Aleksandar
5 STEVANOVIC^d, Sonja RADOJICIC^e

6
7 ^aDirectorate of National Reference Laboratories, Batajnicki drum 10, 11080 Zemun, Serbia

8 ^bInternational Burch University, Francuske revolucije bb, Ilidza 71210, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina,
9 e-mail: mirza.ponjavic@gis.ba

10 ^cVeterinary Scientific Institute of Serbia, Janisa Janulisa 14, 11107 Belgrade, Serbia, e-mail:
11 slobodan.vet@gmail.com

12 ^dUniversity of Pittsburgh, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, 3700 O'Hara
13 Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15261, USA, e-mail: stevanovic@pitt.edu

14 ^eBelgrade University, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine – Department of Infectious Diseases and
15 Epidemiology, Bulevar Oslobođenja 18, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, e-mail: sonjar@vet.bg.ac.rs

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

17
18 **Abstract**

19 As a response to the pandemic caused by SARS-Cov-2 virus, on 15 March, 2020, the Republic of
20 Serbia introduced comprehensive anti-epidemic measures to curb COVID-19. After a slowdown in the
21 epidemic, on 6 May, 2020, the regulatory authorities decided to relax the implemented measures.
22 However, the epidemiological situation soon worsened again. As of 7 February, 2021, a total of 406,352
23 cases of SARSCov-2 infection have been reported in Serbia, 4,112 deaths caused by COVID-19. In order
24 to better understand the epidemic dynamics and predict possible outcomes, we have developed an
25 adaptive mathematical model SEAIHRDS (S-susceptible, E-exposed, A-asymptomatic, I-infected, H-
26 hospitalized, R-recovered, D-dead due to COVID-19 infection, S-susceptible). The model can be used to
27 simulate various scenarios of the implemented intervention measures and calculate possible epidemic
28 outcomes, including the necessary hospital capacities. Considering promising results regarding the

29 development of a vaccine against COVID-19, the model is extended to simulate vaccination among
30 different population strata. The findings from various simulation scenarios have shown that,
31 with implementation of strict measures of contact reduction, it is possible to control COVID-19 and
32 reduce number of deaths. The findings also show that limiting effective contacts within the most
33 susceptible population strata merits a special attention. However, the findings also show that the
34 disease has a potential to remain in the population for a long time, likely with a seasonal pattern. If
35 a vaccine, with efficacy equal or higher than 65%, becomes available it could help to significantly slow
36 down or completely stop circulation of the virus in human population.

37 The effects of vaccination depend primarily on: 1. Efficacy of available vaccine(s), 2. Prioritization
38 of the population categories for vaccination, and 3. Overall vaccination coverage of the population,
39 assuming that the vaccine(s) develop solid immunity in vaccinated individuals. With expected basic
40 reproduction number of $R_0=2.46$ and vaccine efficacy of 68%, an 87% coverage would be sufficient to
41 stop the virus circulation.

42 Keywords: COVID-19, SEAIHRDS mathematical model, prediction, vaccination

43

44 **1. Introduction**

45 On 11 March, 2020, the World Health Organization characterised the disease caused by the
46 novel SARS-Cov-2 virus as a pandemic [1]. The Initial epidemic outbreak in China spread outside the
47 Wuhan area, and subsequently on a global scale. On 6 March, 2020, the first case of the novel
48 coronavirus infection was reported in the Republic of Serbia. Taking into consideration the escalation of
49 the disease and limited effects of the initially implemented measures, the state of emergency was
50 declared throughout the country on 15 March, 2020. Comprehensive anti-epidemic measures (e.g.
51 lockdown of entire country) were introduced in the entire country [2].

52 Due to the absence of specific pharmaceutical intervention, Serbia, like other countries,
53 implemented an anti-epidemic strategy based on physical distancing, school and university closures,
54 reduced number of workers present in the workplaces, closure of places of worship for public religious
55 services, reduced working hours of cafés and restaurants, avoiding mass gatherings, events, sports
56 games, tracing and identification of infected people's contacts, etc. After a slowdown in the epidemic, as

57 shown in the relevant officially published data, the regulatory authorities decided to relax the introduced
58 measures on 6 May, 2020. However, the epidemiological situation soon worsened again, resulting in the
59 reinstatement of some measures, as well as the introduction of new measures [2]. Although the return of
60 extensive measures has yielded favourable results, the further development of the epidemic is not clear.

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

70 Since the outbreak of COVID-19, many published papers have dealt with the implementation of
71 mathematical modelling and prediction of possible outcomes of COVID-19 epidemics. Most of these
72 research efforts have been based on the implementation of the SIR (susceptible-infected-removed)
73 model. Many of the other models provide a clear picture of dynamics of COVID-19 spreading, including
74 the overloading of the relevant health systems. For example, Ferguson et al., developed one of the first
75 models for COVID19 simulation, which was, among other things, used to plan the health care resources
76 [8]. Wu et al., developed the SEIR model to examine the dynamics of SARS-Cov-2 transmission from
77 person to person. This model was also used to calculate the basic reproduction number R_0 , which we use
78 in this paper as one of the key parameters [9]. The classical SIR model assumes that there is
79 homogenous mixing of infected and susceptible populations and that the total population is constant and
80 does not change over time. Moreover, according to the classical SIR model, there is a monotonous
81 decline in susceptible population towards zero [10]. However, such assumptions are not objective in the
82 case of COVID-19 spreading and they are the basic problem in the modelling of this pandemic. In reality,
83 the human population fluctuates constantly [11]. In order to account for such fluctuation, and better
84 understand the COVID-19 epidemic in the Republic of Serbia, we have employed mathematical modelling

85 of the epidemic using the available data on the characteristics of the disease, such as incubation period,
86 latent period, recovery period, severity of clinical signs, and mortality rate caused by COVID-19.

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

101

102 **2. Methodology**

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

106

107 **2.1. SEAIHRDS mathematical model**

108 Classical SEIRDS model divides the population into compartments, i.e. groups, and follows the
109 disease dynamics at all times. The population is divided into the following compartments: the portion of
110 the population susceptible to the infection is denoted by S, those latently infected with SARSCov-2
111 (exposed to) are denoted by E, the infected individuals who are able to spread the disease are denoted
112 by I, the ones recovered from the infection are denoted by R, and those who died due to disease with D.

113 Assuming that individuals mix homogenously, the force of infection λ (the rate at which susceptible
114 persons are infected) is related to *per capita* contact rate β . Also, the risk of infection is closely related to
115 the number of infectious individuals in the population I_t . It depends on the number of infectious individuals
116 (I_t) and how frequently they make contacts with other persons. In a situation of homogenous mixing
117 among the population, the force of infection λ can be express as follows:

$$118 \quad \lambda(t) = \beta I(t) \quad (1)$$

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

$$121 \quad S_{t+1} = bN_t - \beta S_t I_t - mS_t + \omega R_t \quad (2)$$

$$122 \quad E_{t+1} = \beta S_t I_t - fE - mE_t \quad (3)$$

$$123 \quad I_{t+1} = fE_t - (r+m)I_t - \delta I_t \quad (4)$$

$$124 \quad R_{t+1} = rI_t - (m+\omega)R_t \quad (5)$$

$$125 \quad D_{t+1} = \delta I_t \quad (6)$$

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

$$130 \quad N_t = S_t + E_t + I_t + R_t + D_t + bN_{t-1} - mS_{t-1} \quad (7)$$

131 where parameters b and m are *per capita* daily birth rate and death rate unrelated to COVID-19.

132 However, considering that implemented anti-epidemic measures against COVID-19 do not have
133 an identical impact on the population's age subgroups and that COVID-19 pathogenesis varies in different
134 age subgroups, we propose the use of multi-compartment version of standard SEIRDS model. The
135 model, named SEAIHRDS, monitors the dynamics of following compartments: susceptible individuals (S),
136 latently infected with SARSCov-2 (E) (exposed to/presymptomatic), asymptomatic infectious individuals
137 (A), infectious individuals with symptoms/clinically ill (I), hospitalized patients (H), recovered individuals
138 (R), and those who died due to disease (D). In this model the susceptible population was further stratified
139 within the compartment S according to age and occupations. Grouping into various strata was done
140 according to the real age structure of the Republic of Serbia population as follows: pre-school children

141 (S_{ps}), elementary school children (S_{es}), high school children (S_{hs}), college students (S_{cs}), unemployed
 142 population (S_{ua}), employed population (S_{ea}), and elderly/retired (S_r) (Table 1). To simulate the epidemic
 143 progression through different population strata-subgroups, we used appropriate, stratum-specific, model
 144 parameters and factors of effective contact reduction (anti-epidemic intervention measures - ρ), which
 145 were adapted to the relevant population groups: lockdown of the entire country, closures of pre-school,
 146 school and college sessions closures, reduced number of workers allowed in the workplaces, work from
 147 home, restrictions of mobility of elderly people, etc. During the simulation, we monitored the effects of
 148 various levels of contact reduction, ranging from 20% to 75%, taking into account the realistic possibilities
 149 of maintaining a minimum work process, functioning of the society and feasibility of such measures.

150 Given that intervention measures, applied in response to the emergence of COVID-19, are not
 151 the same for all population strata, homogeneous mixing can be expected only within same population
 152 stratum. The rate of effective contacts β , after the application of intervention measures, is no longer
 153 identical at the level of all strata of the population. Effective contacts are limited by the intensity and types
 154 of measures applied and are identical only when it comes to individuals within the same population strata.
 155 Furthermore, persons in different population strata become infected at different rates depending on how
 156 frequently they interact with other persons in their own subgroup and other subgroups. If we assume that
 157 force of infection differs between different strata of population, the equation for the force of infection would
 158 be as follows: $\lambda_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} I_j(t)$ (8)
 159 where $\lambda_i(t)$ is force of infection in the i^{th} population strata, β_{ij} is the rate at which susceptible persons in the
 160 j^{th} population strata and infectious persons in j^{th} population strata come into effective contact per unit of
 161 time, and $I_j(t)$ is the number of infectious persons in j^{th} population strata. Also, in this model the number of
 162 recovered and dead is conditioned with different ages and genders.

163 Now our model will be expressed as follows:

$$164 \frac{dS_i(t)}{dt} = bN(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} I_j(t) S_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} \eta A_j(t) S_i(t) + \omega R_i(t) - m S_i(t) \quad (9)$$

$$165 \frac{dE_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} I_j(t) S_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} \eta A_j(t) S_i(t) - (m + f) E_i(t) \quad (10)$$

$$166 \frac{dA_i(t)}{dt} = f \alpha E_i(t) - (\gamma + m) A_i(t) \quad (11)$$

$$167 \frac{dI_i(t)}{dt} = f(1 - \alpha) E_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_{ij} I_j(t) - (r + m) I_i(t) \quad (12)$$

168
$$\frac{dH_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_{ij} I_j(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{ij} H_i(t) - (\varepsilon + m) H_i(t) \quad (13)$$

169
$$\frac{dR_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n r_{ij} I_j(t) + \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{ij} A_j(t) + \varepsilon H_i(t) - (m + \omega) R_i(t) \quad (14)$$

170
$$\frac{dD_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{ij} I_i(t) \quad (15)$$

171 where α is the proportion of asymptomatic cases, η accounts for the relative infectiousness of
172 asymptomatic carriers (in comparison to symptomatic carriers), r is the rate at which infectious individuals
173 whit symptoms are recovered, γ is the rate at which asymptomatic infectious individuals are recovered, σ
174 is rate at which infectious individuals are hospitalized, ε is the rate at which hospitalized patients are
175 recovered, δ is the rate at which infected individuals die from COVID-19 infection and ω is rate of waning
176 of immunity ([Supplementary material](#)).

177

178 **2.2. Determining the herd immunity threshold and control of COVID-19 by vaccination policy**

179 Considering the undergoing worldwide efforts to develop a vaccine against COVID-19 and
180 promising results, we extended the model to simulate and analysed the effects of a hypothetical
181 vaccination on the epidemic dynamics, and to estimate the extent of coverage of vaccination which can
182 interrupt the chain of infection. The control of COVID-19 by vaccination means targeting the entire
183 susceptible population with mass vaccination until critical herd immunity achieved. In such situation there
184 is a “race” between the exponential growth of epidemic and mass vaccination. The level of herd immunity
185 threshold (HIT) can be calculated by the following formula: $HIT = 1 - 1/R_o = (R_o - 1)/R_o$ (16)
186 and the critical vaccination coverage required to achieve herd immunity can be obtained by multiplying
187 herd immunity threshold with reciprocal value of vaccine efficacy, v_e :

188
$$V_c = \frac{1}{v_e} \left(1 - \frac{1}{R_o}\right) \quad (17)$$

189 Most people infected with SARS-CoV-2 develop an immune response followed by the
190 development of specific antibodies between 10 and 21 days after getting infected [12]. Specific IgM and
191 IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 develop 6 to 15 days after the onset of the disease [13-17].
192 According to some studies, the presence of antibodies has been confirmed in less than 40% of the
193 patients within 1 week after the onset of the disease, whereas percentage reaches 100% of subjects 15
194 days after the onset of disease [18]. Although duration of the immune response against CVOVID 19 is still

195 unknown, comparing with other coronaviruses, where immunity wane within 12 to 52 weeks after the first
196 symptoms appear [19, 20], while in the case of SARS-CoV-1 infection the presence of IgG antibodies was
197 confirmed in 90% and 50% of infected patients, respectively, over two and three years, respectively [29],
198 we assumed that durable immunity against COVID-19 is possible [20, 21]. Immunity to HCoVOC43 and
199 HCoV-HKU1 appears to wane appreciably within 1 year [21, 22], whereas SARS-CoV-1 infection can
200 induce longer-lasting immunity [23]. S. F. Lumley et. in a study conducted on 1,246 persons recovered
201 from COVID-19 found no symptomatic re-infections over 6 months [24].

202 Based on these findings, and fact that SARS-Cov-2 virus is also beta coronavirus, we assumed
203 that in the event of the development of a successful vaccine, immunity against the SARS-Cov-2 virus
204 could last for a year, as well as after recovery after a natural infection. In a study conducted to determine
205 the dynamics of SARS-Cov-2 transmission in the post pandemic period, Kissler et al. applied a similar
206 approach in defining the possible length of the immunity period [20].

207 For the purpose of modelling a control strategy based on vaccination, additional compartment to
208 the model was added denoted with $V(t)$, in which there are vaccinated persons who have successfully
209 developed protective immunity after vaccination. The vaccination parameter, u , is the daily rate of
210 vaccination of susceptible population and it represents the proportion of susceptible population
211 immunized per unite time. The critical daily rate of vaccination, \bar{u}_c is $\bar{u}_c = (b+\omega)(R_o - 1)$, required to
212 interrupt the infection [5]. The basic reproduction number under the vaccination is $R_{op} = (1-p)R_o$. The
213 proportion of effectively protected persons, p , is conditioned by parameter the vaccine efficacy, v_e . This
214 parameter represents a proportion of person who successfully developed protective immunity after
215 vaccination, whereas total number of actively protected individuals in time t is $V(t) =$ number of vaccinated
216 $\times v_e$ [5]. In this compartment the daily rate of waning of immunity at which immunity of vaccinated
217 population fades out is ω , and it is reciprocal to the period of lasting of immunity. Vaccinated persons,
218 after losing their immunity, become sensitive again and removed to the compartment S. The change of
219 rate in this compartment per unit time is as follows:

$$220 \frac{dV_i(t)}{dt} = v_e S_i(t) - mV_i - \omega V_i. \quad (18)$$

221 The compartment S(t) is slightly modified as follows:

$$222 \frac{dS_i(t)}{dt} = bN(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} I_j(t) S_i(t) + \omega R_i(t) - mS_i(t) - v_e S_i(t) + \omega V_i. \quad (19)$$

223 The other of compartments of SERIDS model remain unchanged.

224

225 **2.3. Model parametrisation**

226 In proposed model, β is *per capita* effective contact rate at which specific persons come into
227 effective contact per unit of time. An effective contact is defined as a contact sufficient to cause disease
228 transmission [10, 24, 26]. We calculated the parameter β by using the formula:

$$229 \quad \beta = R_0 / NT_R \quad (20)$$

230 where R_0 is a basic reproduction number of the disease, i.e. the average number of newly infected people
231 with COVID-19 (secondary infection cases), infected by one infectious individual in a totally susceptible
232 population, N is total population, and T_R is the average duration of infectious period [10, 25, 26]. The R_0
233 values of 2.46 and 3.1 are adopted from the relevant literature. The R_0 values were based on the data
234 obtained during the initial phase of the epidemic in Italy [27]. Since the implemented measures and
235 disease transmission were simulated through various population strata, we corrected the β parameter
236 with a relevant, stratum-specific contact reduction factor ρ_i . In this way, we obtained the *per capita* contact
237 rate specific for each separate stratum based on following formula

$$238 \quad \beta_i = \beta(1 - \rho_i). \quad (21)$$

239 The values of the ρ_i factor in different population strata ranged from 0.25 to 0.75 (effective contact
240 reduction ranged from 25% to 75%).

241 Parameters such as daily birth and death rates were calculated based on the data published by
242 the Office of Statistics of the Republic of Serbia, and data published by the World Bank regarding the life
243 expectancy in the Republic of Serbia [28, 29]. The latter study reported that the life expectancy in Serbia
244 was 79.06 years in 2017 [29]. By using this figure, we expressed the daily death rate as a value reciprocal
245 to life expectancy $m = 0.000036$. We calculated the daily *per capita* birth rate of $b = 0.000025$ based on
246 the figure of 9.2 births in the Republic of Serbia per 1000 people in a year. These estimates were needed
247 to realistically simulate fluctuations of the total population. To simplify the calculations, we assumed that
248 the general morality rate m is applicable for all population strata.

249 The infectivity rate, i.e. the rate of transfer from compartment E to I, was derived as a value
250 reciprocal to the COVID-19's average latent period. The data on the average duration of latent infection
251 (f^{-1}) and the average period during which an infected person is shedding the SARS-Cov-2 virus (T_R) were
252 adopted from the relevant literature as $f^{-1} = 3.5$ days [30, 31] and $T_R = 9.3$ days, respectively [30]. Also
253 the data on the percentage of hospitalized patients and those whose therapy requires intensive care,
254 used for prediction of required hospital capacities, as shown in Table 1, were taken from literature [30, 8].

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

$$258 \quad \delta = IFR_{stratum} / T_D \quad \text{and} \quad (22)$$

$$259 \quad r = (1 - IFR_{stratum}) / T_R \quad (23)$$

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

265

266 **2.4. Setting disease control scenarios**

267 Five different scenarios were developed for simulating the COVID-19 epidemic control based on
268 non-pharmaceutical interventions. SC1 implies a base-case scenario where the epidemic spreads in
269 susceptible population without any anti-epidemic measures being implemented. In the other scenarios,
270 the extent of contacts was reduced, for each population stratum separately, according to objective
271 possibilities and measures which were implemented during the actual epidemic in the Republic of Serbia.
272 Scenarios are presented in Table 4.

273 The timing of the simulation of anti-epidemic measures, i.e. the reduction of individual contacts
274 corresponds to the actual date when the implementation of measures in the real epidemic in Serbia
275 began (March 15, 2020). Considering that it is not realistic to expect the desired level of reduction of
276 physical contacts to be achieved in one day, in each scenario, a period of gradual introduction of

277 measures was simulated (lag period of 7 days). Since each individual scenario was simulated at R_0 of
278 2.46 and 3.10, different contact reduction rates were applied accordingly.

279 Additional four scenarios of control of COVID-19 were simulated based on vaccination policy. We
280 assumed that vaccine efficacy was 50%, 68%, 80%, and 85%. The initial conditions assumed that all
281 other anti-epidemic measures are excluded from the model and replaced with mass vaccination.
282 Indicators of epidemic dynamics were monitored, such as: CI, hospitalized patients, patient in intensive
283 care units and deaths.

284

285 **2.5. Model sensitivity analysis and calibration**

286 Considering the world experience with detection of COVID-19 cases, as well as the unreliable
287 data on COVID-19 infections which are currently available worldwide, model calibration is very
288 challenging, and can result in obtaining inaccurate values for the parameters [40]. This is especially due
289 to the facts that a significant percentage of the infected individuals do not exhibit any symptoms. The
290 other issue is small percentage of tested population [40].

291 As part of the national seroepidemiological study, 1,006 subjects were tested in Serbia from May
292 11th to June 25th, 2020, for the purpose of estimating the extent of COVID-19 infection. According to the
293 published data, seroconversion was confirmed in 6,4% of the subjects. On the other hand, a total of
294 13,372 cases of the infection were reported, which means that those who were infected constitute around
295 0.19% of the overall population. However, it is our opinion that the data on reported deaths caused by
296 COVID-19 infection is more reliable for use in model calibration, e.g. infection fatality rate. Alex et al.
297 reached a similar conclusion when simulating COVID-19 by using the SEIRD model with heterogeneous
298 diffusion [40]. When we compared the data recorded during the beginning of the epidemic in Serbia with
299 the results obtained during the simulation, such as the initial doubling time, the two data series matched
300 well. However, later, the obtained results did not match well the officially registered data on the number of
301 infected, especially after the beginning of the implementation of measures in Serbia. We attribute these
302 differences to the methodology by which official authorities register cases of infection, and collect the
303 data.

304 The parameter that determines the number of deaths is the IFR. It is the number of persons who
305 die of the COVID-19 among all infected individuals regardless of whether the infected show symptoms of
306 the disease or not. As with many diseases, IFR is not always equivalent to the number of reported deaths
307 caused by COVID-19. This is because a significant number of deaths, although caused by COVID-19, will
308 not be recognized as deaths caused by COVID-19 [41]. Also, there are many asymptomatic cases of
309 infection which are never detected [42, 43, 44, 45].

310 However, according to new findings, the overall estimate of the proportion of people who become
311 infected with SARS-CoV-2 and remain asymptomatic throughout infection was 20% (95% confidence
312 interval) with a prediction interval of 3%–67% in 79 studies that addressed this question [46, 47]. Michael
313 A. Johansson et al. reported that 30% of individuals with infection never develop symptoms and are 75%
314 as infectious as those who do develop symptoms, and concluded that persons with infection who never
315 develop symptoms may account for approximately 24% of all transmission [39].

316 Due the fact that there is a lag in time between when people are infected and when they die,
317 patients who die on any given day were infected much earlier, and thus the denominator of the mortality
318 rate should be the total number of patients infected at the same time as those who died [41]. David et al.
319 estimated mortality rate by dividing of deaths on a given date by the total number of persons confirmed as
320 COVID 19 cases 14 days before [29, 41]. It is based on the assumption that maximum incubation period
321 is 14 days [34]. However, if we take into account that the number of registered cases of COVID-19
322 infection is usually significantly lower than the actual number, assuming that the data on deaths are
323 accurate, the real IFR value is significantly lower than the calculated value [40]. If we apply this to the
324 situation in Serbia, the daily value of IFR on July 10th, 2020, when the largest number of deaths was
325 registered in one day, was 9.33%, considering that 18 deaths were registered on July 10th and 14 days
326 earlier 193 confirmed cases of COVID-19 infection. The raw values of IFR for the period between March
327 6th and August 10th were as follows: median of IFR = 2.11%, and average value of IFR = 7.15% bounded
328 in interval 4.17%-10.13%. When we compared these values with those published by the WHO, CDC and
329 other authors [43, 44, 48] we concluded that they differ significantly. Considering these findings, the IFR
330 values adopted in the model (for various population groups and genders) were primarily taken from the
331 literature, with a remark that the selection of IFR values was based on preliminary comparison of the

332 overall Serbian IFR with similar IFRs found in the literature, taking into account the registered deaths and
333 most probable number of infected individuals [33]. To make this possible, the first step was to correct the
334 local raw IFR value mentioned above. Based on real data we first calculated the population at risk of
335 dying from COVID-19 infection for each individual day since the outbreak, ending on August 10th, 2020.
336 The number at risk on a given day should correspond to the number of deaths from COVID-19 infection,
337 considering the lag period from infection to death. For this calculation, we used the data on the number of
338 deaths D_t in Serbia registered on daily bases [2]. We hypothesized that the distribution of time periods t_n
339 from the moment of COVID19 infection to death follows the lognormal distribution defined by the
340 parameters $m = 26.8$ and $\sigma = 12.4$ days [48, 49].

341 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
342 dying from COVID-19 infection for each individual day, where m_t is the probability that the time between
343 infection and death is t days and follows the lognormal distribution ($m = 26.8$, $\sigma = 12.4$) [48, 49]. After that,
344 the daily IFR values were calculated according to the formula $IFR_{(t)} = D_t / I_{r(t)}$ [50]. Based on IFR values
345 calculated in this way, we made descriptive statistics and obtained the mean value of $IFR = 0.70\%$,
346 bounded in the interval 0.46-0.94% and a median of 0.19%. It is important to note here that this value
347 corresponds with the COVID-19 IFR values found in Eastern European countries and Spain [50, 33].
348 Taking these findings into account, we decided to take the IFR values specific to certain population strata
349 recorded in Spain as the most appropriate for our case [33]. The adopted IFR values are listed in Table 3.

350 In this section, we used sensitivity analysis to estimate the amount of change on outcomes when
351 varying the input values used in the model. Sensitivity analysis is one of the methods most frequently
352 used for the evaluation of disease spread models [51, 52]. A sensitivity analysis is carried out to
353 characterise the impact of uncertainty of input parameters on model outputs. Sensitivity analysis consists
354 of assessing the impact that changes in input parameters have on model outcomes. We evaluate two
355 aspects of the model: the global behavior of the model when perturbing a group of key parameters
356 together, and the impact of changes when perturbing the key parameters used in the model individually.

357 The model sensitivity analysis was conducted by changing the most sensitive model parameters:
358 R_0 , β , $f-1$, r , b , m , γ , ε , η , ω , $\bar{\tau}_d$. The values of these parameters were increased by 5%, 10% and 25%
359 relative to the base scenario and changes in output indicators were observed.

360 Finally, validation of the model was performed by comparing the historical data of the real
361 epidemic in Serbia with the data obtained with the SEAIHRDS model. For validation purposes, the current
362 epidemic of COVID-19 was simulated, along with actual anti-epidemic measures. Taking into account the
363 risks described above related to the accuracy of historical data from the COVID-19 epidemic in Serbia
364 and significantly higher confidence in the accuracy of data related to the number of deaths from COVID-
365 19 compared to data on the number of infected, for the purpose of model validation, only data on the
366 cumulative number of deaths were used. The reason for this assumption is that there is still uncertainty
367 about the proportion of the infected population that is not reported due to a mild form of the disease or
368 the patients are asymptomatic.

369 In statistical analysis the coefficient of determination, R^2 , was used to check goodness of fit of
370 SEAIHRD model with COVID-19 data recorded during the real epidemic. The regression coefficient
371 compares predicted values (y) against actual data (x). To address model uncertainties, bias, mean
372 absolute error (MAE), mean square error (MSE), the root mean square error (RMSE), maximum deviation
373 (MaxDev) and normalized root mean square error (NRMSE) were also estimated (*Supplementary*
374 *material*).

375

376 **3. Results**

377 **3.1. Predicting the number of sick, hospitalized patients and deaths caused by COVID-19 in the** 378 **absence of any intervention measures**

379 After the simulation, the model predicted that with $R_0 = 2.46$, and without the implementation of
380 any anti-epidemic measures, the initial doubling time of the infection could be five days. The epidemic
381 wave could peak 219 days after the outbreak, and it could yield 99,819 infected individuals in a day.
382 Afterwards, the infection rate could decline for 215 days, eventually reaching the daily incidence of 492
383 newly infected, after which the next epidemic wave could start. The second wave could peak 706 days
384 after the onset of epidemic and yielding 25,232 infected individuals in a day. The third epidemic wave
385 could peak 429 days later, with 13,709 infected individuals in a day. The true cumulative incidence in the
386 first year of the epidemic could be 6,229,144 infected people with SARS-Cov-2 virus, while the apparent

387 cumulative incidence could be 4,360,401 infected. A total of 20,894 patients could die due to COVID-19
388 consequences.

389 With $R_0 = 3.1$, the following results were obtained: the initial doubling time of the infection was five
390 days, true cumulative incidence 7,133,221, apparent cumulative incidence 4,993,254, and the total
391 deaths of 23,951. Fig. 1, panels a) and b) show daily variations in the number of susceptible, latently
392 infected, infected and recovered patients, at basic reproduction numbers of $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3$,
393 respectively. Panels c) and d) of the same figure show daily fluctuations in susceptible, recovered and net
394 reproduction rates R_n for $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3$, respectively. Panels e) and f) of Fig. 1 show daily variations
395 in R_n , true and apparent disease incidences at basic reproduction numbers of $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3$. The
396 shaded area corresponds to the period when the daily number of new COVID-19 infected individuals
397 increasing, and therefore all of the following hold: $R_n > 1$, proportion susceptible $> 1/R_0$ and the proportion
398 of population that is recovered (immune) is below the herd immunity threshold. Fig. 2 panels a) and b)
399 show a prediction of necessary hospital capacities. Panels c) and d) of Fig. 2 show predicted numbers of
400 sick and dead due to COVID-19 at $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3$ and age structure of hospitalized patients and
401 deaths.

402

403 **3.2. Predicting the number of sick, hospitalized patients and deaths caused by COVID-19 in the** 404 **conditions of application of restrictive anti-epidemic measures**

405 When the spread of COVID-19 epidemic through totally susceptible population in the Republic of
406 Serbia is simulated, under an assumption of only incidental movement among the population, basic
407 reproduction number of $R_0 = 2.46$, and with lock-down of entire country, a significant slowdown of the
408 epidemic was observed. Initial infection doubling time was 6 days. The peak of the epidemic wave could
409 occur 702 days after the epidemic onset, when there could be 2,848 infected in one day. In the first year
410 of the epidemic 308,581 people could be infected and 1,031 people could die.

411 When the basic reproductive number was increased to $R_0 = 3.1$, and for certain segments of the
412 population the contact reduction factor ρ_i increased compared to the values from the scenario with $R_0 =$
413 2.46 (reduction of contacts in public places and contacts of persons over 65 years by 55% and 65%,
414 respectively), the results changed significantly. The model predicted that with $R_0 = 3.10$, the initial

415 infection doubling time could be 5 days, the peak of epidemic wave could occur after 246 days and it yield
416 8,110 infected people in one day. In the first year of the epidemic 2,219,251 people could be infected and
417 7,194 could die.

418 Table 5 provides the overview of epidemic indicators obtained from the simulations of all five
419 scenarios with $R_0 = 2.46$ and $R_0 = 3.1$. Figures 3. and 4 provide a comparative overview of results of all
420 five simulated scenarios. Panels a) and b) of Fig. 3 show the values of cumulative incidences on a daily
421 basis for $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3.1$, respectively. Panels b) and c) of Fig. 3 show the expected total number of
422 hospitalized patients and patients in intensive care units (ICU) for $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3.1$, respectively. Fig.
423 4 provides overview of required hospital capacities e.g. hospital bed occupancy and the occupancy of
424 beds in ICU on daily bases for $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3.1$, respectively. The results show that after applying
425 various measures to slow down the circulation of SARS-Cov-2, the number of newly infected people,
426 hospitalized patients and the occupancy of hospital capacities are the lowest in the situations where
427 rigorous anti-epidemic measures are applied to all population strata (Scenario 2 in Table 5 and in Fig. 3
428 and Fig. 4). Openings of pre-school and elementary school's facilities leads to a visible jump in the
429 number of infected and hospitalized in all strata. This finding clearly shows that children, although least
430 susceptible to developing more severe clinical pictures, are important when transmitting SARS-Cov-2
431 (Scenario 3 in Table 5 and Fig. 3). Opening of the high schools and colleges also leads to a visible
432 increase in the number of newly infected and hospitalized patients, including an increase in the number of
433 deaths (Scenario 5 in Table 5 and Fig. 3). Without the application of any intervention measures, the
434 greatest burden on the health system could be expected 228 days from the beginning of the epidemic at
435 $R_0=2.46$ or 168 days at $R_0=3.1$.

436 Depending on the R_0 value used in simulation, it could be necessary to provide 42,351 (61,739)
437 hospital beds and an additional 20,173 (28,740) in intensive care units. In the case of Scenario 2, there is
438 a significant slowdown in the epidemic. According to the predictions obtained by the simulation of
439 Scenario 2, after 713 (259) days at the moment of maximum occupancy of hospital capacities, it might be
440 necessary to provide 1,387 (3,940) beds in COVID-19 hospitals and 784 (2,162) beds in intensive care
441 units (Fig. 4).

442 **3.3. COVID-19 simulation and disease control by implementing a hypothetical vaccine**

443 Assuming that the disease is spreading at the basic reproduction number of $R_0=2.46$, the herd
444 immunity threshold (when the disease can be expected to slow down and the chain of infection is
445 expected to be broken) would be 59.35%, while at $R_0=3.1$, it would be 67.74%. Depending on the efficacy
446 of the potential vaccine, the required vaccination coverage should be 87% ($v_e=68\%$), 74.19% ($v_e=80\%$),
447 69.82% ($v_e=85\%$), 65.94% ($v_e=90\%$) and 95.41% ($v_e=71\%$), 84.68% ($v_e=80\%$), 79.70% ($v_e=85\%$), 75.27%
448 ($v_e=90\%$) for $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3.1$, respectively. The different ways of including vaccination in the
449 SEAIHRD model are detailed in the [supplementary material](#). Fig. 5 shows different scenarios of COVID-
450 19 control strategies based solely on vaccination.

451

452 **3.4. Results of the model sensitivity analysis**

453 The results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in tables 6 and 7. The tables show increased
454 values of input parameters and the percentage of the parameter increase relative to the basic scenario,
455 as well as the values of output results obtained after the simulation of the changed scenario.

456 **3.5. Results of the model validation**

457 The model was validated on the most recent historical data (from January 1, 2021 to February 1,
458 2021). As shown in Table 8. all measures of the prediction quality of deceased due to COVID-19 are low.
459 The average difference between the actual number of people who died of COVID-19 and predicted one is
460 only 2.05% and the maximum deviation between the predicted and actual number will not exceed 4.82%
461 with a probability of 95%.

462 Based on Fig. 6 and Table 9, we can conclude that the SEAIHRD model fits historical data quite
463 well. Pearson's r and coefficient of determination (R^2) have shown strong the linear relationship between
464 real deceased and the number of deaths predicted by SEAIHRD model.

465 More information on validation results are detailed in the [supplementary material](#).

466

467

468 4. Conclusions and discussion

469 For the needs of this research, we augmented the classic deterministic model by adding the
470 compartments of vaccinated, asymptomatic, hospitalized and latently infected subjects. By adding birth
471 and death rates, we enabled daily fluctuations of the overall simulated population, which brought us
472 closer to the real conditions in which the disease is transmitted. When we assumed that the recovered
473 lose immunity over time, we obtained dynamic oscillations of epidemic waves through susceptible
474 population.

475 The input values for the parameters used to simulate the COVID-19 were obtained either from
476 literature review or were calculated on the basis of data have taken from the literature and other official
477 sources. Whereas some of these inputs are well documented; other input values are either not so well
478 documented or based on potential subjective opinions (i.e., expert opinion, historical data from epidemic
479 etc.). In any case, well documented or not input values have potential to impact results and, therefore,
480 should be carefully evaluated. The results of conducted sensitivity analysis show that the sources of
481 uncertainty are different for each output considered and it is necessary to consider multiple output
482 variables for a proper assessment of the model. The most influential parameter is r than R_0 and f^{-1} .

483 The model was tested on Serbian COVID-19 statistic data and obtained validation results allow
484 us to conclude that the proposed model has good prediction ability and performance. However, although
485 we obtained satisfactory results during the validation of the model, worth noticing also that some of the
486 model parameters were estimated based on available data that might be less precise due to the difficulty
487 of being measured. That could be the reason why the values of some parameters e.g. recovery rate,
488 contact rate, daily infection rate, that are estimated in hospitals may differ from those acquired by this
489 study. For that reasons SEAIHRD model can be used for the long-term rough predictions of the epidemic.
490 Obtained long-term predictions reflect the general dynamic of the outbreak and are especially useful for
491 the healthcare system workers and governmental officials.

492 When we simulated different disease control scenarios of the COVID-19 epidemic based on non-
493 pharmaceutical intervention measures, scenario number 2 proved to be the most effective approach to
494 the disease control, because it implemented the most comprehensive anti-epidemic measures (entire

495 country lock down). However, the basic problem of this approach is the feasibility and practicability to
496 maintain the measures in the long term.

497 The model predicted that students, children and younger school-age generations have an
498 important role in transmitting COVID-19, especially if they come into contact with a more vulnerable
499 population. The model showed that, in the case of returning school children of all ages to schools, an
500 increase of 10.48% in the estimated deaths and 12.16% of the number of infected is possible, when
501 compared to the conditions before opening of the schools (Scenarios 2 and 4). However, most dead and
502 seriously diseased people are found in the older population. This is particularly important when planning
503 intervention measures, especially when deciding on which restrictions to be lifted and how (opening
504 schools, students' return to faculties etc.). The model predicted that COVID-19 has a potential to spread
505 rapidly and linger in population. Due to a large number of the infected persons and duration of the
506 disease, there are significant needs for hospital capacities, especially in the conditions when the disease
507 is suppressed by implementing partly relaxed anti-epidemic measures, or in the case of absence of any
508 measures. According to the prediction, without the application of any intervention measures, at the
509 moment of the greatest load, depending of actual R_0 , the health system should provide 42,351 ($R_0=2.46$)
510 hospital beds for the care of the patients and an additional 20,733 in intensive care units. On the other
511 hand, in the case of the application of the strictest anti-epidemic measures, the needs decrease to only
512 1,387 beds in COVID-19 hospitals and additional 784 beds in intensive care units. In the case of
513 continued implementation of current measures, which are significantly less intense than the measures
514 applied at the beginning of the epidemic, it is necessary to provide 3,537 beds in COVID-19 hospitals and
515 1,945 beds in intensive care units in the entire country. The model also shows that the needs for hospital
516 capacities decline with the ending of the first epidemic wave, since daily incidence decreases and during
517 the second and third waves it never reaches the initial peaks, but these needs still remain substantial. For
518 example, in the case of Scenario 1, at the top of the second epidemic wave, it is necessary to provide
519 11,845 beds in COVID-19 hospitals and 6,378 in intensive care units, which makes 27.96% and 30,76%
520 of the required capacities of the first wave of the epidemic.

521 Based on the cyclical patterns of the epidemic waves and duration of simulated epidemics, the
522 model predicted that the disease has a potential to linger in population and that it will most probably have
523 a seasonal pattern. Therefore, potential vaccines can have an enormous potential and significance for
524 COVID-19 control. Depending on the efficacy of future vaccines, the disease can be stopped and curbed
525 almost solely by implementing the measure of vaccination. However, the necessary conditions for these
526 predictions and expectations are the efficacy of potential vaccines and the ability of a health systems to
527 implement vaccination to a satisfactory extent and rapidly, especially with regards to the most sensitive
528 categories of population. Depending on the R_0 , a vaccine that would have an efficacy ≥ 68 -71% could
529 stop the pandemic and break the chain of infection. However, even vaccines with lower efficacy could be
530 useful as they would significantly reduce the number of cases and deaths, especially if used in
531 combination with the other disease control measures. The effects of vaccination depend primarily on: 1.
532 Efficacy of available vaccine(s), 2. Prioritization of the population categories for vaccination, and 3.
533 Overall vaccination coverage of the population, assuming that the vaccine(s) develop solid immunity in
534 vaccinated individuals. With expected basic reproduction number of $R_0=2.46$ and vaccine efficacy of
535 68%, an 87%- coverage would be sufficient to stop the virus circulation. The required minimal vaccination
536 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%
537 ($v_e=80\%$), 79.70% ($v_e=85\%$) for $R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3.1$, respectively. The minimum daily vaccination rate
538 should be 0.47% for vaccines with an efficiency of 85%, and 0.59% for vaccines with an efficiency of
539 68%.

540 Based on the obtained results, we can conclude that at this point, without the application of
541 specific pharmaceutical products, COVID-19 suppression is highly dependent on the basic reproduction
542 number (R_0), and that more intensive contacts and relaxed measures can result in a dramatic spread of
543 the virus. The choice of intervention measures depends on the feasibility of their implementation and their
544 efficacy in different social contexts. COVID-19 will likely have to be suppressed in this way for a certain
545 period of time. This will most probably last until sufficient quantities of a reliable and effective vaccine are
546 available, and thereafter until optimal vaccination coverage is achieved.

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

549 **References**

550 [1] World Health Organization (WHO), Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak situation. 2020.
551 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>, [accessed 18 August 2020].

552 [2] <https://covid19.rs>, 2020, [accessed 18 August 2020].

553 [3] Wangping J, Ke H, Yang S, Wenzhe C, Shengshu W, Shanshan Y, Miao L. Extended SIR prediction
554 of the epidemics trend of COVID-19 in Italy and compared with Hunan, China. *Frontiers in Medicine* 2020;
555 7:169.

556 [4] Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, Davies N. Early dynamics of
557 transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet infectious diseases*
558 2020. Doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20) 30144-4.

559 [5] Matt J. Keeling, Pejman Rohani. *Modelling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals*, Princeton
560 University Press, 3 Market Place, Woodstock, Oxfordshire OX20 1SY, p. 8-10.

561 [6] Kermack, W. and A. McKendrick (1927). A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics.
562 *Proceedings of the Royal Society. A* 115, p. 700–721.

563 [7] Barnes B. and G. R. Fulford. *Mathematical modelling with case studies Using Maple™ and MATLAB*,
564 CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group 6000 Broken Sound Parkway NW, Suite 300, Boca Raton, FL 33487-
565 2742, p. 100-102.

566 [8] Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions
567 (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand; 2020.

568 [https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf)
569 [COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf).

570 [9] Wu Z, Googan JMM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019
571 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases from the Chinese Center for
572 Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*. 2020;323(13):1239-1242. Doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2648.

573 [10] Emilia Vynnycky, Richard G. White with an introduction by Paul E.M. Fine. *An Introduction to*
574 *Infectious Disease Modelling*. Oxford University Press Inc., New York © Oxford University Press; 2010.

- 575 [12] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Immune responses and immunity to SARS-
576 CoV-2; 2020. <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/latest-evidence/immune-responses>; [accessed 18
577 August 2020].
- 578 [13] Woelfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Mueller MA, et al. Clinical presentation
579 and virological assessment of hospitalized cases of coronavirus disease 2019 in a travel-associated
580 transmission cluster. medRxiv. 2020; <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502>.
- 581 [14] Liu W, Liu L, Kou G, Zheng Y, Ding Y, Ni W, et al. Evaluation of Nucleocapsid and Spike Protein-
582 based ELISAs for detecting antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv. 2020.
583 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.16.20035014>.
- 584 [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
585 COVID-19 patients: the perspective application of serological tests in clinical practice. medRxiv.
586 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038018>.
- 587 [16] Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients
588 of novel coronavirus disease 2019. medRxiv. 2020; <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.02.20030189>.
- 589 [17] Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, Wang C, Geurtsvan Kessel CH, Corman VM, et al. SARS-CoV-2
590 specific antibody responses in COVID-19 patients. medRxiv. 2020;
591 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038059>.
- 592 [18] Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients
593 of novel coronavirus disease 2019. medRxiv. 2020; <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.02.20030189>.
- 594 [19] Kellam P, Barclay W. The dynamics of humoral immune responses following SARS-CoV-2 infection
595 and the potential for reinfection. *The Journal of general virology*. 2020 May 20.
- 596 [20] Kissler et al. Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period,
597 *Science* 10.1126/science.abb5793 (2020).
- 598 [21] K. A. Callow et al. The time course of the immune response to experimental coronavirus infection of
599 man. *Epidemiol. Infect.* 105, 435–446 (1990)
- 600 [22] J. M. Dan et al. Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection
601 *Science* 371, eabf4063 (2021). DOI: 10.1126/science.abf4063.

602 [23] K.-H. Chan et al. Cross-reactive antibodies in convalescent SARS patients' sera against the
603 emerging novel human coronavirus EMC (2012) by both immunofluorescent and neutralizing antibody tests
604 J. Infect. 67, 130–140 (2013).

605 [24] Sheila F Lumley et al. Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 are associated with protection against reinfection.
606 medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.18.20234369>.

607 [25] Gerardo Chowell, James M. Hyman, Lu'is M. A. Bettencourt, Carlos Castillo-Chavez. Mathematical
608 and Statistical Estimation Approaches in Epidemiology, ISBN 978-90-481-2312-4, Doi 10.1007/978-90-
609 481-2313-1, Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York; 2009.

610 [26] Michael Thrusfield. Veterinary epidemiology. Third edition. Blackwell Science Ltd, a Blackwell
611 Publishing company; 2007.

612 [27] Marco D'Arienzo, Angela Coniglio. Assessment of the SARS-CoV-2 basic reproduction number, R_0 ,
613 based on the early phase of COVID-19 outbreak in Italy. Biosafety and Health 2(2020) 57-59.

614 [28] Demografski pregled 2017. Broj: 68/2018, [https://www.minrzs.gov.rs/sites/default/files/2019-
615 01/demografski_pregled_68.pdf](https://www.minrzs.gov.rs/sites/default/files/2019-01/demografski_pregled_68.pdf); [accessed 15 July 2020].

616 [29] The World Bank. World Developments Indicators;
617 https://www.google.com/publicdata/explore?ds=d5bncppjof8f9_&met_y=sp_dyn_le00_in&idim=country:SRB:HRV:BIH&hl=en&dl=en#!ctype=l&strail=false&bcs=d&nselm=h&met_y=sp_dyn_le00_in&scale_y=lin&ind_y=false&rdim=world&idim=country:SRB&ifdim=world&hl=en_US&dl=en&ind=false;
618
619 [accessed 25
620 August 2020].

621 [30] Byrne AW et al. Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping review and
622 analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19 cases. BMJ Open
623 2020;10:e039856. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039856].

624 [31] Shujuan Ma et al., Epidemiological parameters of coronavirus disease 2019: a pooled analysis of
625 publicly reported individual data of 1155 cases from seven countries. medRxiv 2020;preprint doi:
626 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.21.20040329>].

627 [32] Robert Verity et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis.
628 Lancet Infect Dis 2020; 20: 669–77, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30243-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7)

- 629 [33] Roberto Pastor-Barriuso et al. Infection fatality risk for SARS-CoV-2: a nationwide
630 seroepidemiological study in the noninstitutionalized population of Spain. medRxiv. 2020; preprint doi:
631 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.06.20169722>.
- 632 [34] Marco D'Arienzo, Angela Coniglio. Assessment of the SARS-CoV-2 basic reproduction number, R_0 ,
633 based on the early phase of COVID-19 outbreak in Italy. Biosafety and Health 2(2020) 57-59.
- 634 [35] McAloon C. et al. Incubation period of COVID-19: a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of
635 observational research. BMJ Open 2020;10:e039652. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039652.
- 636 [36] Pierre-Yves Boëlle et al. Trajectories of Hospitalization in COVID-19 Patients: An Observational
637 Study in France. J. Clin. Med. 2020, 9, 3148; doi:10.3390/jcm9103148.
- 638 [37] Natalie M. Linton et al. Incubation Period and Other Epidemiological Characteristics of 2019 Novel
639 Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A Statistical Analysis of Publicly Available Case Data. J.
640 Clin. Med. 2020, 9(2), 538; <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9020538>.
- 641 [38] Ma S, Zhang J, Zeng M, et al. Epidemiological parameters of coronavirus disease 2019: a pooled
642 analysis of publicly reported individual data of 1155 cases from seven countries. medRxiv 2020.
- 643 [39] Michael A. Johansson et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People Without COVID-19 Symptoms.
644 JAMA Network Open. 2021;4(1):e2035057. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.35057.
- 645 [40] Alex Viguerie, Guillermo Lorenzo, Ferdinando Auricchio, Davide Baroli, Thomas J.R. Hughes, Alessia
646 Patton, Alessandro Reali, Thomas E. Yankeelov, Alessandro Veneziani. Simulating the spread of COVID-
647 19 via a spatially-resolved susceptible–exposed–infected–recovered–deceased (SEIRD) model with
648 heterogeneous diffusion. Applied Mathematics Letters 111 (2021) 106617.
- 649 [41] David Baud, Xiaolong Qi, Karin Nielsen-Saines, Didier Musso, Léo Pomar, Guillaume Favre. Real
650 estimates of mortality following COVID-19 infection. The Lancet. 2020 Jul; 20(7): 773.
651 Doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30195-X.
- 652 [42] Charles F. Manski, Francesca Molinari. Estimating the COVID-19 infection rate: Anatomy of an
653 inference problem. Journal of Econometrics. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.04.041>.
- 654 [43] WHO. Q&A: Influenza and COVID-19 - similarities and differences.
655 [https://www.who.int/westernpacific/news/q-a-detail/q-a-similarities-and-differences-covid-19-and-](https://www.who.int/westernpacific/news/q-a-detail/q-a-similarities-and-differences-covid-19-and-influenza)
656 influenza. [accessed 18 August 2020].

- 657 [44] CDC. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html>; [accessed 18 August
658 2020].
- 659 [45] BMJ 2020; 368. Covid-19: identifying and isolating asymptomatic people helped eliminate virus in
660 Italian village. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1165>.
- 661 [46] Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Ipekci AM, et al. (2020)
662 Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A
663 living systematic review and metaanalysis. PLoS Med 17(9): e1003346. [https://doi.
664 org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003346](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003346).
- 665 [47] Eric A Meyerowitz et al. Towards an accurate and systematic characterisation of persistently
666 asymptomatic infection with SARS-CoV-2. Lancet Infect Dis 2020. [https://doi.org/10.1016/
667 S1473-3099\(20\)30837-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30837-9).
- 668 [48] CEBM- The Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine develops, promotes and disseminates better
669 evidence for healthcare. Estimating the infection fatality ratio in England. [https://www.cebm.net/covid-
670 19/estimating-the-infection-fatality-ratio-in-england/](https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/estimating-the-infection-fatality-ratio-in-england/); [accessed 9 October 2020].
- 671 [49] Wood, S. N. Did COVID-19 infections decline before UK lockdown? ArXiv:2005.02090 [q-Bio, Stat].
672 <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.02090>.
- 673 [50] Selene Ghisolfi, Ingvild Almås, Justin Sandefur, Tillmann von Carnap, Jesse Heitner, Tessa Bold.
674 Predicted COVID-19 Fatality Rates Based on Age, Sex, Comorbidities, and Health System Capacity.
675 2020Jun.[https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/predicted-covid-19-fatality-rates-based-age-sex-
676 comorbidities-and-health-system-capacity.pdf](https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/predicted-covid-19-fatality-rates-based-age-sex-comorbidities-and-health-system-capacity.pdf).
- 677 [51] B. Martinez-Lo´pez et al. A novel spatial and stochastic model to evaluate the within and between
678 farm transmission of classical swine fever virus: II Validation of the model. / Veterinary Microbiology 155
679 (2012) 21–32 doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.08.008.
- 680 [52] Karsten et al. Monte Carlo simulation of classical swine fever epidemics and control II. Validation of
681 the model. Veterinary Microbiology 108 (2005) 199–205. doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2005.04.008.
682
683
684

685 **Tables**

686 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%

687

688

689 Table 2. Age structure of the population of the Republic of Serbia and expected percentage of
690 hospitalized patients, patients in intensive care, and death rate caused by COVID-19.

Population age groups	*Population	Percentage of total population	**Expected % of hospitalized patients (σ)	***Expected % of patients whose treatment requires intensive care	****Infection fatality rate IFR (male/female)
0-9	458,199	6.56%	0.00%	5.00%	0.04%;0.01%
10-19	445,481	6.38%	0.04%	5.00%	0.00%;0.02%
20-29	1,028,226	14.73%	1.04%	5.00%	0.00%;0.01%
30-39	951,615	13.63%	3.43%	5.00%	0.00%;0.05%
40-49	968,854	13.88%	4.25%	6.30%	0.08%;0.04%
50-59	963,229	13.79%	8.16%	12.20%	0.33%;0.20%
60-69	815,244	11.68%	11.80%	27.40%	1.62%;0.62%
70-79	696,045	9.97%	16.60%	43.20%	6.11%;2.68%
80-	655,711	9.39%	18.40%	70.90%	16.40%;6.49%

691 *[28], **[32], ***[8], ****[33]

692

693 Table 3. SEAIHRD model parameters

Input parameters	Mark	Value	Source
Population	N_{t_0}	6,982,604	[28]
Initial number of cases	I_{t_0}	1	Assumed
Initially immune	I_{mm0}	0	Assumed
Basic reproduction number	R_0	2.46 (3.1)	[34]
Effective contact rate	C_e	0.38	Estimated
<i>Per capita</i> contact rate	β	0.0000000378	Estimated
Daily infection rate (transfer E→I)	f	0.294118	Estimated
Recovery rate of symptomatic cases	r	0.107527	Estimated
Daily rate of waning of immunity	ω	0.002739726	Estimated
<i>Per capita</i> birth rate	b	0.000025205	[28]
<i>Per capita</i> death rate unrelated to COVID-19	m	0.000036006	Estimated
Life expectancy in years	L	76.09	[29]
Duration of latent infection in days	f^{-1}	3.5	[30]
Duration of infectious period in days (clinical cases)	T_R	9.3	[30]
Duration of immunity in days	I_{mm}	365.00	Assumed
Incubation period in days	Inc	5.8	[35]
Time period (day)	dt	1.00	-
Average treatment duration in hospital	<i>days</i>	15,9	[36]
Average time spent in intensive care	<i>days</i>	27	[36]
Recovery rate of hospitalized cases	ε	0.062893	Estimated
Average times taken from onset of symptoms to death	<i>days</i>	17	[37]
Infectious period for asymptomatic cases	<i>days</i>	7.25	[30, 38]
Recovery rate of asymptomatic cases	γ	0.137931	Estimated
Expected percentage of asymptomatic cases	-	30%	[39]
Infectiousness of asymptomatic cases in relation to symptomatic cases	η	75%	[39]

694 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 50% at $R_0 = 2.46$ or by 65% at $R_0 = 3.10$; physical distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 45% at $R_0 = 2.46$) or by 55% at $R_0 = 3.10$.
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 60% at $R_0 = 2.46$ or by 65% at $R_0 = 3.10$; social distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 40% at $R_0 = 2.46$ or by 55% at $R_0 = 3.10$.
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 60% at $R_0 = 2.46$ or by 65% at $R_0 = 3.10$; social distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 40% at $R_0 = 2.46$ or by 55% at $R_0 = 3.10$.
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 60% at $R_0 = 2.46$ or by 65% at $R_0 = 3.10$; social distancing of the unemployed population and in public places – reduction in contacts by 40% at $R_0 = 2.46$ or by 55% at $R_0 = 3.10$.

695

696

697 Table 5. Results of different simulated scenarios ($R_0 = 2.46$ and $R_0 = 3.1$). The data refers to the period of 365 days from epidemic onset.

Scenario mark	SC1		SC2		SC3		SC4		SC5	
Basic reproductive number	$R_0=2.64$	$R_0=3.1$	$R_0=2.64$	$R_0=3.1$	$R_0=2.64$	$R_0=3.1$	$R_0=2.64$	$R_0=3.1$	$R_0=2.64$	$R_0=3.1$
Cumulative incidence (CI)	6,229,144	7,133,221	308,581	2,219,251	1,286,227	2,419,079	1,375,416	2,489,197	1,408,262	2,514,936
Apparent CI	4,360,401	4,993,254	216,007	1,553,476	900,359	1,693,355	962,791	1,742,438	985,783	1,760,456
Overall hospitalized	278,781	320,567	13,970	98,337	56,631	105,930	60,319	108,554	61,685	109,538
Overall in intensive care	85,633	98,333	4,260	29,753	17,085	32,058	18,202	32,855	18,612	33,147
Overall deaths	20,894	23,951	1,031	7,194	4,113	7,754	4,383	7,948	4,483	8,018

698

699 Table 6. Results of the model sensitivity analysis of individual parameters used in the model

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
R_0	5%	6,398,486	21,470	2.72%	2.75%
R_0	10%	6,553,978	21,998	5.21%	5.28%
R_0	25%	6,982,604	23,782	12.10%	13.82%
f^1	5%	6,224,056	19,885	0.08%	4.83%
f^1	10%	6,219,502	18,968	0.15%	9.22%
f^1	25%	6,208,481	16,666	0.33%	20.24%
r	5%	6,068,299	20,351	2.58%	2.60%
r	10%	5,908,223	19,811	5.15%	5.18%
r	25%	5,425,721	18,182	12.90%	12.98%

700

701

702 Table 7. Results of the model sensitivity analysis of group of parameters using a perturbation up to 25%

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
R_0, f^{-1}, r	5%	6,242,433	19,948	-0.21%	4.53%
R_0, f^1, r	10%	6,257,685	19,093	-0.46%	8.62%
R_0, f^1, r	25%	6,321,339	16,984	-1.48%	18.71%
$R_0, \beta, f^1, r, b, m, \gamma, \varepsilon, \eta, \omega, \bar{\tau}_d$	25%	6,147,725	13,203	1.31%	36.81%

703

704 Table 8. Measures of the prediction quality

	MAE	%Error	MSE	RMSE	Normalized MAE	Normalized MSE	Max Deviation
Deceased	73	2.04%	7,212.20	84.92	2.05%	0.06%	4.82%

705

706 Table 9. Regression statistics

Multiple R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error	Observations
0.981678289	0.963692263	0.963124954	86.24143528	66

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716


717

718

719



720

721 **Figures**





a) Distribution of the total number of the susceptible, latently infected, asymptomatic infectious individuals, infected and recovered on a daily basis since the epidemic onset ($R_0=2.46$)

b) Distribution of the total number of the susceptible, latently infected, asymptomatic infectious individuals, infected and recovered on a daily basis since the epidemic onset ($R_0=3.1$)



c) Daily fluctuations of the susceptible, recovered and net disease transmission rates ($R_0=2.46$)


d) Daily fluctuations of the susceptible, recovered and net disease transmission rates ($R_0=3.1$)



e) Daily fluctuations of apparent incidence, true incidence and net disease transmission rates ($R_0=2.46$)

f) Daily fluctuations of apparent incidence, true incidence and net disease transmission rates ($R_0=2.46$)


722 Fig.1 Model prediction of latently infected, asymptomatic infectious individuals, infected, recovered and
723 daily fluctuations of R_n .



724


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

727



728

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




730

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



732

733





a) Comparative overview of daily incidences ($R_0=2.46$).

b) Comparative overview of daily incidences ($R_0=3.1$).



c) Comparative overview of hospitalized patients ($R_0=2.46$).

d) Comparative overview of hospitalized patients ($R_0=3.1$).



e) Comparative overview of deaths ($R_0=2.46$)

f) Comparative overview of deaths ($R_0=3.1$)


734 *NV-without vaccination and any non-pharmaceutical intervention*

735

736

737

Fig. 5 Results of simulated COVID-19 control based solely on vaccination, scenarios 6-9 ($R_0=2.46$ and $R_0=3.1$).




738

739 Fig. 6. The observed number of deceased individuals (blue), number of deaths modeled with SEAIHRD

740 model (yellow) and predicted number of deaths (green).

741 * **Figures 1 to 6 should be printed in color.**



$$\frac{dS_i(t)}{dt} = bN(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} I_j(t) S_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} \eta A_j(t) S_i(t) + \omega R_i(t) - m S_i(t)$$

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

$$\frac{dA_i(t)}{dt} = f\alpha E_i(t) - (\gamma + m) A_i(t)$$


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

$$\frac{dH_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_{ij} I_j(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{ij} H_i(t) - (\varepsilon + m) H_i(t)$$

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

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

Fig. 1. SEAIHRDS model with demography



$$\frac{dS_i(t)}{dt} = bN(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} I_j(t) S_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} \eta A_j(t) S_i(t) + \omega R_i(t) - m S_i(t)$$

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

$$\frac{dA_i(t)}{dt} = f\alpha E_i(t) - (\gamma + m) A_i(t)$$

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


$$\frac{dH_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_{ij} I_j(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{ij} H_i(t) - (\varepsilon + m) H_i(t)$$

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


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

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


Fig. 2. SEAIHRDVS model with demography and vaccination




a) Prediction of the total number of the susceptible, latently infected, asymptomatic infectious individuals, infected and recovered on a daily basis since the epidemic onset. No intervention measures applied ($R_0=2.46$)




b) Prediction of the total number of the susceptible, latently infected, asymptomatic infectious individuals, infected and recovered on a daily basis since the epidemic onset. No intervention measures applied ($R_0=3.1$)




c) The results obtained during the simulation of the application of various contact reduction measures (scenarios 1-5, $R_0=2.46$)



d) The results obtained during the simulation of the application of various contact reduction measures (scenarios 1-5, $R_0=3.1$)



e) Results of simulated COVID19 control based solely on vaccination, scenarios 6-9 ($R_0=2.46$).



f) Results of simulated COVID19 control based solely on vaccination, scenarios 6-9 ($R_0=3.1$).