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Abstract

We present two different approaches for modeling the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic. Both approaches are based on the population classes susceptible, exposed, infectious, quarantined, and recovered and allow for an arbitrary number of subgroups with different infection rates and different levels of testing. The first model is derived from a set of ordinary differential equations that incorporate the rates at which population transitions take place among classes. The other is a particle model, which is a specific case of crowd simulation model, in which the disease is transmitted through particle collisions and infection rates are varied by adjusting the particle velocities. The parameters of these two models are tuned using information on COVID-19 from the literature and country-specific data, including the effect of restrictions as they were imposed and lifted. We demonstrate the applicability of both models using data from Cyprus, for which we find that both models yield very similar results, giving confidence in the predictions.

1 Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic is a new disease and there is as yet not enough understanding on its future evolution. Since medical interventions, such as vaccines or antiviral treatments, are not available yet, non-medical interventions are being implemented to contain the disease. In a number of countries, including Cyprus, the imposed restrictions have helped slow down the spread of the disease. Cyprus, being an island country, managed to limit the spread of the disease, by imposing restrictions on air travel and shutting down large parts of the economy, ultimately achieving 2.2 deaths per 100,000 population, a death rate comparable to that of Greece and Malta\cite{1,2}. However, as restrictions are being lifted, it is important to know how the disease in each country will evolve. Reliable predictions will help policy-makers to formulate appropriate intervention strategies, while taking into account also economic and social factors. Mathematical models and numerical simulation can be used as a decision support tool to assist policy-makers, by forecasting the spread of the disease as a function of the lifting of restrictions as well as on the level of testing and contact tracing\cite{3,12}. Since the epidemic spreading is a complex process depending to a large
extent both on the behavior of the virus \cite{4,5} and human interactions \cite{6,7}, the purpose of this work is to provide such predictions for a number of scenarios using two models. While these models are applicable to any country, they are calibrated for the specific case of Cyprus for which such forecasting is not available.

Since the outbreak of COVID-19, a number of mathematical epidemiological models have been used to predict the spread of the disease in a number of countries (e.g. Refs. \cite{3,7–10}) and regions (e.g., Refs. \cite{11,12}). Typically, the predictions are made within a single type of model. In this work, we use two models, each relying on different methodologies, to cross-check predictions.

1. **Compartmental models based on ordinary differential equations (ODEs).** These models describe how portions of the population transition among classes or compartments via ODEs. For example, the classical SIR model describes the evolution of three compartments, the susceptible, infected, and removed \cite{13}, with two parameters that model the rates at which the population transfers from one compartment to the other. In the present study, our objective is to derive a model that is suitable for countries like Cyprus, where data typically used for modeling COVID-19, such as of hospitalizations, intubation, and deaths, are too small for a meaningful data-driven analysis. We therefore use a time-dependent infection rate and detection rate, with which we are able to capture the reported cases in Cyprus without needing to revert to models with a large number of parameters relying on data that are scarce or not available.

2. **Particle model.** Such models belong to the broader class of crowd simulation/agent-based models, which track the evolution of the interactions of agents in time and space. Here, particle dynamics and interactions are used as a proxy of human social interactions, allowing the transmission of the disease through particle collisions, naturally introducing an element of randomness in the system. This approach is reminiscent of the equivalent of network models and stochastic-branching processes, which is often used to model disease outbreaks. Such models are computationally demanding and an efficient code will be employed in order to simulate the whole population of Cyprus residing in cities, where most of the COVID-19 cases are registered.

The main goal of the study is to examine the predictive power of the above models for the COVID-19 case. We demonstrate that both models describe quite accurately the existing data and yield very similar predictions for the evolution of the disease as measures are imposed and lifted once these are calibrated to the same data. More importantly, we examine whether such models predict the future evolution of COVID-19 for countries like Cyprus for a number of different scenarios as the economy reopens and in relation to the ability of the health care services to detect and isolate future cases through contact tracing and aggressive testing. One of the key highlights of this study is that, although these models are based on different approaches, they both yield consistent predictions.

The structure of the paper is as follows: In Sec. 2 we introduce the two models and describe how we tune the parameters, adjusting them to the specific case of Cyprus. In Sec. 3 we discuss the results of the models and in Sec. 4 we give our conclusions and future plans.

## 2 Description of the models

We describe here the two models and how their parameters are tuned. There is presently a plethora of models of varying degrees of complexity and sophistication, depending on
the wealth of data available. For example, for larger populations, where naturally the death toll is higher, modeling approaches may be effectively used to capture the evolution of the number of deceased. For smaller countries, however, like Cyprus with a small number of deaths, the applicability of e.g. statistical models that focus on extracting multitude of parameters from the recorded deaths may be questionable.

Here we propose an approach that uses a minimal set of fitting parameters. To model COVID-19 evolution one needs to make certain assumptions. In our modeling we use some common features that are also being applied in a number of other studies that are currently being applied to COVID-19. Namely, we consider that

i The disease consists of two phases: (a) an exposed phase during which an individual contracts the disease but has no symptoms and does not transmit the disease to others; (b) an infectious phase, during which individuals transmit the disease to susceptible members of the population.

ii A portion of the exposed individuals who ultimately become infectious is detected. We take this portion to be a function of time depending on the level of screening and testing being performed.

iii The detected cases are assumed to be immediately quarantined, so that the spread of the virus is attributed solely to the undetected cases.

iv The population is divided in five classes; the susceptible, exposed, quarantined, infectious, and removed; i.e. an SEIQR type of model.

v The removed class includes individuals who (a) recover or (b) die due to the disease and we do not differentiate among these subclasses. In addition, the quarantined class is modeled in the same way as the removed class, but tracked independently as a function of time.

vi The average duration of the exposed latent period is constant.

vii The average duration of the infectious period is constant.

viii A key feature of our modeling is that we take the rate of infection/transmission to be a function of time, reflecting the measures implemented by the government in regards to social distancing, limitations of travel, and suspending parts of the economy.

For the infectious period, we rely on recent data that estimate it to be 7-12 days. We therefore fix the infectious period ($\tau_i$) to 10 days and the exposed period ($\tau_e$) to 2 days.

These modeling features are kept the same for both our models. Further extensions of the models could include, for example, assigning a probability of the quarantined population to infect, a delay between the time an infectious individual is quarantined, or defining additional groups within the classes which would however introduce more parameters. While such extensions of the models may be considered in the future as more data become available, we opt to evaluate here our models with the least possible parameters, which as will be seen in Sec. 3 are sufficient to describe the current data.

2.1 Compartmental model

Extending the original SIR model of Kermack and McKendrick \[13\] to include an Exposed and a Quarantined class, the following coupled system of ODEs arises, which is in alignment with the assumptions introduced earlier:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta \frac{SI}{N}, \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta \frac{SI}{N} - \frac{E}{\tau_e}, \quad (1a) \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= \frac{rE}{\tau_e} - \frac{I}{\tau_i}, \quad (1b) \\
\frac{dQ}{dt} &= (1 - r) \frac{E}{\tau_e} - \frac{Q}{\tau_i}, \quad (1c) \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \frac{I + Q}{\tau_i}, \quad (1d)
\end{align*}
\]

where \(S(t), E(t), I(t), Q(t),\) and \(R(t)\) capture, respectively, the evolution of the susceptible, exposed, infected, quarantined, and removed classes of the population as a function of time \(t\). We will refer to this extended model as the SEIQR model. The parameter \(\beta > 0\) corresponds to the infection rate in inverse time units, which is a measure of the average number of contacts an infective individual makes in a wholly susceptible population that may lead to an infection per unit time, \(\tau_i > 0\) and \(\tau_e > 0\) are the average times an individual remains in the infective and exposed classes respectively. The portion of undetected cases who later infect others is given by \(r\) and \(N\) is the total population (assuming no vital dynamics, namely births or deaths due to other causes).

Central to the standard SIR and SEIQR models is the modeling of the rates at which individuals transition between population classes. Both the SIR and SEIQR models assume that the times for which individuals remain in the exposed and infectious states are exponentially distributed random variables \[17\], which implies that the chance of an individual moving out of the exposed and recovered classes is independent of the time they entered the particular class. This leads to dispersed timescales, which manifests itself, for example, in unrealistically long recovery times for the number of individuals that got infected towards the end of an epidemic and in overoptimistic predictions of the levels of control required to contain the epidemic \[18\].

A more general approach assigns arbitrary probability distributions for the recovery and latent times. This yields a system of integral–differential equations of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
E(t) &= E(0)P_E(t) + \int_0^t \beta \frac{S(x)I(x)}{N} P_E(t - x) \, dx, \quad (2a) \\
I(t) &= I(0)P_I(t) + r \int_0^t \left( \beta \frac{S(x)I(x)}{N} - \frac{dE(x)}{dx} \right) P_I(t - x) \, dx, \quad (2b) \\
Q(t) &= Q(0)P_I(t) + (1 - r) \int_0^t \left( \beta \frac{S(x)I(x)}{N} - \frac{dE(x)}{dx} \right) P_I(t - x) \, dx, \quad (2c) \\
R(t) &= (Q(0) + I(0))(1 - P_I(t)) - \int_0^t \left( \beta \frac{S(x)I(x)}{N} - \frac{dE(x)}{dx} \right)(1 - P_I(t - x)) \, dx, \quad (2d) \\
S(t) + E(t) + I(t) + R(t) &= N, \quad (2e)
\end{align*}
\]

where \(P_I(t)\) and \(P_E(t)\) are non-increasing functions that correspond to the probabilities of remaining infectious or quarantined and exposed \(t\) units after becoming infectious or quarantined and exposed, respectively with \(P_I(0) = P_E(0) = 1\) (see \[17\] for a related model). In each of Eqs. \((2a-c)\), the first terms correspond to the respective initial
populations in a class that remain in the same class after $t$ time units, whereas the second terms correspond to the sum of individuals who become members of a class within the time interval $[0,t]$. Eq. (3) captures the transfer of the infectious and quarantined classes to the removed classes, whereas combining Eqs. (2a–e) yields Eq. (1).

As noted in earlier works (e.g. Ref. [17]), letting $P_E(t) = e^{-t/\tau_e}$ and $P_I(t) = e^{-t/\tau_i}$ reduces Eqs. (2) to Eqs. (1). Although it has been argued that more general multi-stage gamma-distributed latent and infectious periods may be more appropriate, see e.g. [18–20], here we chose the latent and infectious periods to be of fixed length [21]. By doing so we preserve the simplicity of the final model, while alleviating the aforementioned issues with exponentially distributed latent and recovery periods. Hence $P_E(t)$ and $P_I(t)$ are assumed to be of the form

$$P_E(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq t < \tau_e \\ 0, & t \geq \tau_e \end{cases}, \quad P_I(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq t < \tau_i \\ 0, & t \geq \tau_i \end{cases}. \quad (3a,b)$$

Considering this time-dependence, we are able to deduce the following system of delay differential equations

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -X(t),$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = X(t) - X(t - \tau_e),$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = rX(t - \tau_e) - rX(t - \tau_i - \tau_e) - I_0\delta(t - \tau_i),$$

$$\frac{dQ}{dt} = (1-r)X(t - \tau_e) - (1-r)X(t - \tau_i - \tau_e) - Q_0\delta(t - \tau_i),$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = X(t - \tau_i - \tau_e) + I_0\delta(t - \tau_i),$$

where, for $t > 0$,

$$X(t) = \beta S(t) I(t) \frac{N}{N} \quad (4f)$$

when $t > 0$ and $\delta(t)$ being the Dirac delta function.

The system of Eqs. (4) is further extended in the present study by incorporating the features given by items ii), iii) and vi) above, which is achieved by introducing a time-dependent function $r(t)$ which corresponds to the portion of undetected cases. Furthermore, rather than solving the delay differential equations that may require specialized techniques, we opt to convert the system of Eqs. (4) to a discrete difference equation so that they become:

$$S(t+1) = S(t) - X(t),$$

$$E(t+1) = E(t) + X(t) - X(t - \tau_e),$$

$$I(t+1) = I(t) + r(t - \tau_i) X(t - \tau_e) - r(t - \tau_i - \tau_e) X(t - \tau_i - \tau_e) - I_0\delta_{t,\tau_i}, \quad (5a)$$

$$Q(t+1) = Q(t) + (1-r(t - \tau_e)) X(t - \tau_e) - (1-r(t - \tau_i - \tau_e)) X(t - \tau_i - \tau_e) - Q_0\delta_{t,\tau_i}, \quad (5c)$$

$$R(t+1) = R(t) + X(t - \tau_i - \tau_e) + (Q_0 + I_0)\delta_{t,\tau_i}, \quad (5e)$$

where $t$ represents discrete time in days and $\delta$ is the Kronecker delta. Eqs. (5) are to be solved with the appropriate initial conditions. We have confirmed numerically that such an approach does not compromise the overall quantitative agreement with the solutions to the original system of delay differential equations. Note that the equations for $E(t)$,
Q(t) and R(t) may be decoupled from the system, as they can be fully specified independently once the evolution of X(t), I(t), and S(t) is determined. Hence, it suffices to keep track of the movement of individuals across the susceptible and infective classes as well as the number of exposed individuals at each day. Initially, we take I(0) = r(0)c_0/(1 − r(0)), the actual undetected cases who are assumed to be responsible for initiating the epidemic outbreak as derived from the initial confirmed cases c_0. The exposed individuals at t = 0 are those who become infectious at t = τ_e and hence X(0) = (c_2 − c_1)/(1 − r(0)), where c_{1,2} are the confirmed cases on days 1 and 2, respectively. Likewise, the exposed individuals one day before the first cases are confirmed at t = 2020 (March 24), the actual announcements by the government, with measures enforced on March 24, 2020. The exposed individuals at t = 0 are those who become infectious at t = τ_e and hence X(0) = (c_2 − c_1)/(1 − r(0)), where c_{1,2} are the confirmed cases on days 1 and 2, respectively. Likewise, the exposed individuals one day before the first cases are confirmed at t = 0, will be those who will become infected when t = 1, so that we may take X(−1) = (c_1 − c_0)/(1 − r(0)), assuming for simplicity that r(0) = r(−1). This allows us to determine the susceptibles at t = 0 as S(0) = N − c_2/(1 − r(0)).

Summarizing, we consider X(t) of the form

\[
X(t) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{c_1 - c_0}{1 - r(0)}, & t = -1 \\
\frac{c_2 - c_1}{1 - r(0)}, & t = 0 \\
\beta(t)S(t)I(t)N, & t > 0 
\end{cases}
\]

(6)

with \(\beta(t)\) being time-dependent to reflect governmental measures imposed or lifted. The fitting process is facilitated by the fact that the government imposes or relaxes measures in \(M\) stages and at given times \(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_M\). In order to use the fewest possible parameters, we take \(\beta(t)\) to be of the form

\[
\beta(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ b_M + b_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{M} (b_j - b_{j-1}) \tanh(m_j(t - t_j)) \right],
\]

(7)

where \(b_0\) and \(b_M\) being, respectively, the initial and final transmission rates \(\lim_{t \to \infty} \beta(t) = b_M\) and \(b_j, j = 1, \ldots, M - 1\) correspond to intermediate transmission rates. This choice for \(\beta(t)\) allows us to have some flexibility on the form of \(\beta(t)\), capturing both smooth transitions across the \(b_j\) and abrupt step-like behaviors (when \(m_j \to \infty\)). To fit the Cyprus case, we consider a two-stage process \((M = 2)\) based on the actual announcements by the government, with measures enforced on March 24\textsuperscript{th}, 2020 (\(t_1 = 15\)) and almost fully lifted on May 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2020 (\(t_2 = 73\)). Hence, the required model parameters are obtained based on the data for confirmed cases, which for our model are given by

\[
C(t) = c_0 + \sum_{\tau = \tau_e - 1}^{t} (1 - r(\tau - \tau_e))X(\tau - \tau_e),
\]

(8)

by performing a least-squares fit for five parameters \(b_{0,1,2}\) and \(m_{1,2}\) while all the rest are kept fixed. The number of deaths due to COVID-19 are too few in Cyprus in order to reliably perform any fitting. The reported as recovered would require the introduction of yet another timescale, since according to the protocols followed, individuals are considered to have recovered after they test negative twice within a period of 24 hours and only after all symptoms are resolved, which leads to a median recovery time of 23 days \(\textsuperscript{22}\). The portion of undetected \(r(t)\) evolves in a prescribed manner that captures how aggressively testing is performed, and is elaborated in Sec.\textsuperscript{3}.
Forecasting for various scenaria

Beyond the available data, which are fitted to determine the five parameters of the model, we forecast the evolution of the epidemic based on different scenaria. In one scenario, we choose to divide the three major classes \(X(t), S(t)\) and \(I(t)\) into two groups each, namely \(X_{1,2}(t), S_{1,2}(t)\) and \(I_{1,2}(t)\) that can be used to model situations where a portion of the population, e.g. people above 65 years old and/or with preexisting conditions, is considered vulnerable to the disease and continues to observe strict social distancing measures compared to the rest who return to work. Hence, initially and up to some time \(t = t_\ast\) the population is assumed to behave uniformly to reflect the lockdown imposed to the whole population. For \(t > t_\ast\), we differentiate into subclasses as follows. We prescribe the \(2 \times 2\) contact matrix with constant entries \(\beta_{j,k}\), which denotes the average number of infectious contacts made per day by an individual in group \(j\) with an individual in group \(k\). Since the total number of contacts between group \(j\) to \(k\) must equal the number of contacts from group \(k\) to group \(j\), we must have \(N_1 \beta_{j,k} = N_2 \beta_{k,j}\), where \(N_{1,2}\) are the corresponding populations of each group with \(N = N_1 + N_2\).

Therefore, the exposed, infectious and susceptible for groups 1 and 2 evolve according to

\[
X_k(t) = \left( \frac{\beta_{1,k} I_1(t)}{N_1} + \frac{\beta_{2,k} I_2(t)}{N_2} \right) S_k(t) \tag{9a}
\]

\[
S_k(t + 1) = S_k(t) - X_k(t), \tag{9b}
\]

\[
I_k(t + 1) = I_k(t) + r_k(t - \tau_e) X_k(t - \tau_e) - r_k(t - \tau) X_k(t - \tau), \tag{9c}
\]

for \(t > t_\ast\) and \(k = 1\) and 2. For \(t \leq t_\ast\) the time histories of \(X_k, S_k, \) and \(I_k\) correspond to scalings of \(X(t), S(t)\) and \(I(t)\) by \(N_k/N\), and we also let \(r_k(t) = r(t)\). Hence, the confirmed cases for each of the two groups, \(C_k\) \((k = 1\) and 2\), is given at time \(t > t_\ast\) by

\[
C_k(t) = C(t_\ast) N_k/N + \sum_{\tau = \tau_\ast + \tau_e - 1}^{t} \left(1 - r_k(\tau - \tau_e)\right) X_k(\tau - \tau_e). \tag{10}
\]

Whether the two groups evolve differently depends crucially on \(r_{1,2}(t)\) and the contact matrix \(\beta_{j,k}\). For instance, if we set \(r_k(t) = r(t)\) and \(\beta_{k,j} = \beta N_j/N\), the collective evolution of the two groups is not distinguishable from a simulation using Eqs. \((9)\) with the two groups mixed in a single group.

### 2.2 Particle model

Within the particle model, disease transmission is modeled by elastic collisions of two-dimensional hard discs. The number of particles per unit time scattered in any direction from a given disc is

\[
N_{\text{coll.}} = Dn v_0, \tag{11}
\]

where \(n\) is the number of discs per unit area with radius \(D/2\) and \(v_0\) is their velocity. We take \(D = 4\) m so that individuals with distance greater than 2 m can not infect others. This fixes the length unit of the system. Then the basic reproduction number is given by

\[
R_0 = N_{\text{coll.}} p \tau_i, \tag{12}
\]

where \(p\) is the probability that an infectious individual transmits the disease upon collision with another individual. We take \(\tau_i\) to be the same average time a single individual is infectious as for the extended SEIQR model.

The work-flow implemented includes using the DynamO \([23]\) particle simulator within our own post-processing scripts to generate a list of elastic particle collisions.
This list is then parsed with a given set of parameters, namely initial number of infected, exposed, and quarantined, infection probability for each population subgroup, detection rate as a function of time, and velocities as a function of time. At regular time-steps the total number of susceptible, exposed, infectious, quarantined, and recovered are registered. As in the case of the extended SEIQR model, an exposed individual transitions either to infectious or quarantined based on a time-dependent undetected ratio \( r(t) \). Quarantined individuals do not infect and their time evolution is taken to model the reported numbers by the government. Our work-flow, which includes post-processing of the output from DynamO, analyzing the collisions list, and processing and visualizing the data is available online.  

The particle simulation time units are in a scale that can only be expressed in physical time units \textit{a posteriori}. To determine the time scale \( a \), we initialize with one randomly chosen exposed individual and measure the average number of transmissions per individual \( R \) as a function of time, for multiple values of \( \tau_i/a \). By convention, we only measure this quantity for individuals that have recovered, which means \( R(t) = 0 \) for \( t < \tau_i + \tau_e \). In the left panel of Fig. 1 we show \( R(t) \) measured for representative values of \( \tau_i \). The measurement is repeated 256 times, randomly varying the initial individual exposed each time, which yields the statistical error in \( R(t) \). \( \tau_e \) is kept fixed to one fifth of \( \tau_i \). From this analysis we see that \( R(\tau_i + \tau_e) \) is constant for a time period after \( t = \tau_i + \tau_e \) long enough to obtain a reliable measurement of \( R_0 \) for each choice of \( \tau_i \). In the right panel of Fig. 1 we show the measured \( R_0 \) as a function of \( \tau_i \) and confirm the linear behavior as expected from Eq. (12). Demanding that initially \( R_0 = 3.5 \) and \( \tau_i = 10 \) days we fix \( a \) via a linear fit, which yields \( a \approx 2.763 \) days per simulation time unit.

\[ R_0 = R(\tau_i + \tau_e) \]

After fixing the time scale \( a \) we further tune the particle model in order to determine the dependence of \( R_0 \) on the probability of infection \( p \) and velocity scaling factor \( u/v_0 \). This is shown in Fig. 2 for representative values of \( p \). This tuning allows us to determine the combination of \( u/v_0 \) and \( p \) to achieve a desired value of \( R_0 \). Namely, we
use 10 values of $p$ within $[0, 1)$ and fit to the form:

$$\alpha_0 \frac{u}{v_0}p + \alpha_1 \frac{u}{v_0} + \alpha_2 p + \alpha_3$$

obtaining $\vec{\alpha} = (3.68(4), 0.01(2), -0.37(2), -0.012(8))$.

Fig 2. Particle model tuning. $R_0$ obtained as a function of the particle velocities $u/v_0$ for representative values of the probability of infection $p$.

2.3 Determination and comparison of $R_0$ between models

In the results that follow, we will quote values of $R_0$ obtained from both the extended SEIQR model and the particle model. To facilitate comparison, we define the following:

- With $R_0^{\text{model}}$ we will quote the value of $R_0$ as obtained from the model parameters. For the extended SEIQR model we have

$$R_0^{\text{model}}(t) = \beta(t)(1 - r(t))\tau_i,$$

where $\beta(t)$ is of the form of Eq. (7) and its parameters will be determined from fits as will be discussed in the next section. For the particle model, $R_0^{\text{model}}(t)$ is a function of the velocities $u(t)/v_0$ and probabilities $p(t)$ as determined from the analysis of Fig. 2. In particular, for the particle model it is given by

$$R_0^{\text{model}}(t) = \alpha_0 \frac{u(t)}{v_0}p(t) + \alpha_1 \frac{u(t)}{v_0} + \alpha_2 p(t) + \alpha_3,$$

with $\vec{\alpha}$ as determined in Sec. 2.2.

- With $R_0^{\text{integral}}$ we will quote, for both models, an integral definition of $R_0$ as defined in Ref. [24]. Namely, in this case we take

$$R_0^{\text{integral}}(t) = \tau_i \frac{\rho(t + 1)}{\sum_{i=-\infty}^{t-(\tau_i+\tau_r)+1} \rho(i)}$$

where $\rho(t)$ are the reported cases at time $t$ as determined from each model.
3 Results

The two aforementioned models can now be implemented in a country-specific case. In this study we consider the case of Cyprus for which such modeling and forecasting is lacking. Our analysis strategy is to adjust the parameters of the two models to reproduce the available data of Cyprus up to the writing of this manuscript, namely July 31st, 2020 and then predict the evolution of the pandemic until the end of 2020. Four different scenarios will be considered as explained below.

In Fig. 3 we show the result of fitting Eq. 8 of our model to reported COVID-19 positive cases in Cyprus 22 to obtain the parameters of $\beta(t)$ for the SEIQR model. We validate the model by using data up to date July 31, 2020, being April 9th, 2020. A study in the US, analyzing data obtained from 23rd March to 12th May, estimated this number to be between six to 24 times 27.

Given the intensification of testing and tracing in Cyprus since May 22 and the low death rate 2, which indicates low prevalence of the virus, we take the portion of undetected cases $r(t)$, to gradually decrease from one detected in 10 infected to one in three by using the functional form for the portion of undetected cases $r(t)$ to be

$$ r(t) = \frac{r_1 + r_0}{2} + \frac{r_1 - r_0}{2} \tanh(m_r(t - t_r)), $$

with $r_0 = 0.9$, $r_1 = 0.7$, $m_r = 0.05$, and $t_r = 73$ or May 21st, 2020.

As can be seen, we obtain consistent results and good prediction of the available data when fitting until June 1st i.e. when omitting up to two months of the most recent data from the fits. From the central panel, we see that the estimates for $R_0$ overlap when varying $t_f$, which confirms that our fits yield consistent parameters for the choices considered. The parameters obtained for each fit range are tabulated in Table 1.

Table 1. Fit parameters obtained for $\beta(t)$ for three choices of the final day $t_f$ used in the fit, namely for day 84 (June 1st), 114 (July 1st), and 128 (July 15th), with $t = 0$ being April 9th. Errors are quoted with the superscript and subscript for the upper and lower bounds respectively, obtained via a Markov chain Monte Carlo as explained in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$t_f$ [days]</th>
<th>$b_0$ [days$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>$b_1$ [days$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>$b_2$ [days$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>$m_1$ [days$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>$m_2$ [days$^{-1}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.550$^{+0.006}_{-0.001}$</td>
<td>0.019$^{+0.009}_{-0.005}$</td>
<td>0.143$^{+0.009}_{-0.009}$</td>
<td>0.082$^{+0.001}_{-0.002}$</td>
<td>0.019$^{+0.002}_{-0.001}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.553$^{+0.004}_{-0.001}$</td>
<td>0.015$^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$</td>
<td>0.155$^{+0.005}_{-0.011}$</td>
<td>0.080$^{+0.001}_{-0.002}$</td>
<td>0.020$^{+0.002}_{-0.003}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.553$^{+0.005}_{-0.001}$</td>
<td>0.014$^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$</td>
<td>0.157$^{+0.005}_{-0.001}$</td>
<td>0.080$^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$</td>
<td>0.020$^{+0.002}_{-0.004}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 3. Fitting the SEIQR model. In the top panel, we show the reported cases in Cyprus (circles) as a function of time and the result of fitting our SEIQR model. We consider three periods taking $t_f = 84$ (blue curve), 114 (orange curve), and 128 (green curve) that overlap with the data. The blue shaded region shows the interval between March 25th and May 21st, used as $t_1$ and $t_2$ in Eq. (7). The dashed curves and bands show the predicted mean value and 90% confidence level as the time range being fitted varies by changing $t_f$. The central panel shows $R_{\text{model}}$ with the solid curves and $R_{\text{integral}}$ with the dashed curves. The bottom panel shows the ratio of undetected $r(t)$.

Having validated our extended SEIQR model by predicting the reported cases over the known period by varying $t_f$, we make forecasting using four plausible scenarios:

A) In scenario A, we take $\beta(t)$ and $r(t)$ to be constant and produce a forecast of the new detected cases to be reported by the government until the end of 2020.

B) In scenario B, we gradually change $r(t)$ to asymptotically reach 50% by mid August. This reflects a scenario in which more aggressive testing and contact tracing is performed.

C) In scenario C, we decrease $\beta(t)$ such that $R_{\text{model}}$ approximately reaches 1 by mid August. Thus we model the case in which measures are tightened in order to preempt a second wave.

D) In scenario D, we use Eq. (10) to model the effect of splitting the population into two groups. Namely, for 80% of the population we take $\beta(t)$ to remain unchanged as in scenario A, with the remaining 20% having a $\beta(t)$ that reproduces $R_{\text{model}} \simeq 0.5$. This scenario models a situation in which, for example, restrictions are imposed on vulnerable groups.
Fig 4. Forecasting using the SEIQR model. Predicting the evolution of COVID-19 for scenarios A and B (upper panel) and C and D (lower panel) obtained using our extended SEIQR model. In the upper part of each plot we show the reported cases in Cyprus (circles) as a function of time. The gray band shows the period used to fit the parameters, namely we use data on the reported cases up to \(t_f=128\) or July 15th. The blue curve and band shows our prediction for each scenario. In the central part of each plot, we show with the solid blue curve \(R_0^{\text{model}}\), and with the dashed yellow curve \(R_0^{\text{integral}}\). For the case of scenario D, the solid blue curve corresponds to \(R_0^{\text{model}}(t)\) evaluated using \(\beta(t)\) used for 80% of the population, while the dash-dotted line shows \(R_0^{\text{model}}(t)\) evaluated using \(\beta(t)\) used for 20%. In the bottom part we show \(r(t)\).

The forecasting for the four scenarios using the SEIQR model are shown in Fig. 4 when using the parameters as determined by fitting the Cyprus reported cases taking \(t_f=128\) or July 15th. As can be seen, for scenario A, the mean value of infected steadily increases. In scenarios B, C, and D on the other hand, within the uncertainty bands, we observe a flattening of the daily cases until end of the year.
confirmed cases ($\times 10^3$)

**Scenario A**
Continue with fitted $R_{0}(t)$ to end of year

**Scenario B**
Increase detection rate to $\sim 50$

**Scenario C**
Reduce $R_{0}(t)$ model to $\sim 1$ on August 1st

**Scenario D**
Impose strict lockdown on 20% of population

![Fig 5. Forecasting using the particle model. Predictions for the same four scenarios as in Fig. 4 but using the particle model. In the top part of the plots, the blue curve and associated band is obtained as the average and 90% confidence interval when seeding the model 32 times. In the central part of the plots, we show with the blue curve $R_{0}^{\text{model}}$ and with the orange dashed curve $R_{0}^{\text{integral}}$. The rest of the notation is the same as that used in Fig. 4.]

Our predictions based on the time evolution of the particle model for the four different scenarios are shown in Fig. 5. We use the same $r(t)$ as used in the extended SEIQR model. For the functional form of $u(t)$, we use $\beta(t)$, where now instead of $b_j$ of Eq. (7) we adjust the particle velocities $u_j$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$ to minimize $\chi^2$ defined in the same way as in the SEIQR model given in Eq. (17). The error bands in the upper part of the plots are statistical, obtained as the 90% confidence level from independently seeding the particle model 32 times. Requiring an increase of the minimum $\chi^2$ yields errors in the parameters that are smaller than 0.5% and are therefore negligible compared to the statistical errors shown in Fig. 5.
As can be seen from comparing the forecasts shown in Figs. 4 and 5, the two models are qualitatively in agreement in their predictions for all four scenarios. In particular, they both predict that within scenario A and within the uncertainty one cannot exclude either a steady future increase in daily cases that can turn into an epidemic or a flattening. For other three scenarios, both models show a flattening or complete suppression of daily cases by the end of the year. It should be noted that the large fluctuations observed in $R_0^{\text{integral}}$ in Fig. 5 arise from the discrete nature of the particle model when multiple consecutive days yield zero new cases.

4 Conclusions

In this work we developed two different approaches to model the evolution of COVID-19. The two approaches can be used in any country and do not require large numbers of data. In particular they can be applied in countries like Cyprus, where the most consistent and reliable data are for the daily reported cases since data on e.g. deaths, intubations, and hospitalizations are too few for a meaningful statistical analysis. The models are highly complementary; the SEIQR model is an ODE-based compartmental approach and is computationally fast allowing sampling of parameters over long Monte Carlo Markov chains; the particle simulation approach, while computationally demanding, allows for tagging and tracing individuals and changing infection probabilities for arbitrary subsets of the population.

We calibrate and validate the models using the Cyprus reported positive COVID-19 data. For both models, we are able to fit the daily reported cases using five parameters that describe either the change of infection rate over time for the case of the SEIQR model or the velocities of the particles for the case of the particle model. In addition, we are able to obtain consistent results when using the two models to predict the evolution of COVID-19 for four scenarios that can be applied to control the epidemic.

The four scenarios are chosen as appropriate examples to demonstrate the range of parameters that can be adjusted using our two models, such as future lockdowns or easing of restrictions for subsets of the population and changes in the number of tests performed that in turn change the ratio of infected reported. Richer scenarios can be forecasted by combining these measures and by selectively applying them to multiple subsets of the population.

Although the robustness of the model fits we have undertaken pertains to datasets from other countries, we have chosen to limit the discussion to the case for Cyprus for the sake of brevity. Furthermore, future work to enhance the models will include allowing for non-uniform spatial distributions to model different population densities and data-driven modeling of the detection rate as more data become available.
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