

# Fear, Access, and the Real-Time Estimation of Etiological Parameters for Outbreaks of Novel Pathogens

**Authors:** Nina H. Fefferman<sup>\*1,2</sup>, Eric T. Lofgren<sup>3</sup>, Nianpeng Li<sup>4</sup>, Pieter Blue<sup>5</sup>, David J. Weber<sup>6</sup> and Abdul-Aziz Yakubu<sup>4</sup>.

\* Corresponding Author: N.H. Fefferman, 447 Hesler Biology Building, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, 37996, email: nfefferm@utk.edu

<sup>1</sup> Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA

<sup>3</sup> Paul G. Allen School for Global Animal Health, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

<sup>4</sup> Department of Mathematics, Howard University, Washington, DC 20059, USA

<sup>5</sup> School of Mathematics, The University of Edinburgh, James Clerk Maxwell Building, The King's Buildings, Mayfield Road, Edinburgh, Scotland

<sup>6</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases, UNC School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

## Abstract:

Early analysis of outbreaks of novel pathogens to evaluate their likely public health impact depends on fitting predictive models to data gathered and updated in real-time. Both transmission rates and the critical  $R_0$  threshold (i.e. the pathogen's 'reproductive number') are inferred by finding the values that provide the best model fit to reported case incidence. These models and inferred results are then the basic tools used for public health planning: how many people expected to be infected, at what scales of time and space, and whether potential intervention strategies impact disease transmission and spread. An underlying assumption, however, is that the ability to observe new cases is either constant, or at least constant relative to diagnostic test availability. We present a demonstration, discussion, and mathematical analysis of how this assumption of predictable observability in disease incidence can drastically impact model accuracy. We also demonstrate how to tailor estimations of these parameters to a few examples of different types of shifting influences acting on detection, depending on the likely sensitivity of surveillance systems to errors from sources such as clinical testing rates and differences in healthcare-seeking behavior from the public over time. Finally, we discuss the implications of these corrections for both historical and current outbreaks.

**Keywords:** Mathematical Epidemiology, Observer Effects, Biosurveillance, Outbreak Modeling, H1N1 2009, COVID-19

49 **Introduction:**

50

51 Mathematical models of the progression of the spread of infectious disease provide the  
52 tools used for real-time decision making in public health planning and outbreak  
53 management. They allow us to predict the time course of spread within a  
54 population(Chowell et al. 2017; Perkins et al. 2016; van den Driessche and Watmough  
55 2002) , provide critical cost-benefit estimates (Dasbach et al. 2006; Hayman et al. 2017;  
56 Keeling et al. 2017; Purdy et al. 2004), and evaluate best practices for particular  
57 interventions (Andrews and Basu 2011; Andrews and Bauch 2016; Ferguson et al. 2003;  
58 Kretzschmar et al. 2004). When confronted with a novel, potentially virulent pathogen,  
59 there is a rush to parameterize models appropriately (Capaldi et al. 2012; Farah et al.  
60 2014; Sebrango-Rodríguez et al. 2017; Tizzoni et al. 2012), getting real-time case  
61 incidence data from surveillance sources and fitting the models to it to determine the  
62 likeliest estimates for probabilities of transmission (i.e. infectiousness) and the basic  
63 reproductive number,  $R_0$ , which provides a metric of epidemic potential (Anderson 1991;  
64 Chowell et al. 2006; Chowell et al. 2004). As a new outbreak unfolds, updated incidence  
65 data helps refine the parameter estimates, shifting our understanding of the nature of the  
66 threat in real time (Moore 2004; Sebrango-Rodríguez et al. 2017; Tizzoni et al. 2012).  
67 However, many of these models make an explicit assumption that detection of new  
68 disease incidence is a function of well-understood confounders that remain mostly  
69 invariant over the course of an outbreak, such as the probability of an infected person  
70 developing symptoms. There are known corrections for instances that violate this  
71 assumption of constant detectability, such as when clinical case definition criteria are

72 revised (Green 1998; Santermans et al. 2016; Thursky et al. 2003) or when new more  
73 sensitive and/or specific diagnostic tests become available (Nouvellet et al. 2015; Villela  
74 2017). These confounders, however, are features of the surveillance process itself, and  
75 may therefore be understood so long as there is sufficient incorporation of medical and  
76 public health practice in the interpretation of the models (Villela 2017). Critically, these  
77 surveillance-based step-function changes may not be the only meaningful factors  
78 confounding our ability to accurately estimate incidence data over time, and therefore  
79 accurately model the progression of an outbreak.

80

81 The importance of incorporating human behaviors into predictive epidemiological  
82 models has gained attention over the past decade (e.g. (Bansal et al. 2007; Del Valle et al.  
83 2005; Fenichel et al. 2011; Funk et al. 2010; Perra et al. 2011)). Many models have now  
84 explored the potential impact of behaviors that directly impact transmission (e.g. school  
85 closures (Earn et al. 2012; Ferguson et al. 2006; Gemmetto et al. 2014; Lofgren et al.  
86 2008), social distancing (Glass et al. 2006; Maharaj and Kleczkowski 2012; Reluga 2010;  
87 Valdez et al. 2012), use of personal protective equipment (PPE) (Anderson and Garnett  
88 2000; Duerr et al. 2007)), etc.). However, the impact of human behavior within the  
89 context of epidemic outbreaks is not limited only to those that affect the transmission  
90 patterns of the pathogen. Our functioning societies enter into an epidemiological observer  
91 effect (cf. (Dirac 1947)) in which various behaviors are likely to confound both the  
92 sensitivity and specificity of surveillance detection of disease incidence.

93

94 Media-fanned public apprehension can create an over-demand for clinical testing  
95 (Sharma et al. 2003), even in the absence of clinical signs or symptoms and when  
96 transmission from asymptomatic persons does not occur (Baxter 2010). Social  
97 stigmatization associated with illness can conversely cause many with symptoms to avoid  
98 healthcare providers, and hence diagnosis, for as long as possible in order to avoid social  
99 repercussions (e.g. as with HIV/AIDS patients (Chesney and Smith 1999; Kalichman and  
100 Simbayi 2003). Even with fully rational and cooperative behavior on the part of the  
101 general public, public health directives and media attention will affect physicians  
102 themselves, potentially drastically altering rates at which physicians order tests to provide  
103 clinical diagnosis rather than relying on palliative treatment without the need for  
104 diagnosis (Barras 2020; Cowie et al.). This effect has already been shown to scale  
105 disproportionately with the actual rate of incidence (though not the focus of the study,  
106 this can be inferred from Fig 2 in (Iowa 1998 Annual Report)).

107

108 Further compounding the potential for these behavioral effects to mislead our models, the  
109 behaviors themselves are likely to depend on perceived epidemic status of the population.  
110 Individuals may shift their behaviors as reported prevalence rises and falls out of fear, or  
111 lack thereof, whether warranted by epidemiological truths or not. Case fatality rates are  
112 calculated based both on reported deaths and estimated case incidence, potentially  
113 amplifying the feedback since death may be considered an even greater motivator to  
114 action than illness. This implies that, not only do we may need to correct our predictive  
115 models for the pattern of surveillance sensitivity over time, but also to have sensitivity  
116 itself depend on the current perceived prevalence of the disease. This may be even more

117 critical in instances where estimated case incidence does not accurately reflect numbers  
118 of infections (i.e. when case fatality rates and infection fatality rates differ significantly).  
119 In effect, modeling efforts should be split into separate endeavors: one of curve fitting for  
120 observed incidence, and one of inferring from those curves the likely underlying, actual  
121 disease process.

122

123 To capture this coupled process of disease dynamics and disease detection, we consider a  
124 standard, simple epidemiological model, but incorporate the potential for errors derived  
125 from a variety of sources that confound our estimates of case incidence. We use these  
126 models to demonstrate how these corrections would alter our understanding of historical  
127 outbreaks, and then discuss some evidence that modern outbreaks are affected by the  
128 types of behavioral shifts that we consider.

129

130

### 131 **Methods/ Model**

132 We begin with a standard Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) system, however, we  
133 will examine both “real” process of actual pathogen spread (denoted by the subscript  $a$ ),  
134 and a “perceived” or “measured” process (denoted by the subscript  $m$ ). For simplicity  
135 sake, we will assume that correct diagnosis and treatment has no bearing on the duration  
136 of illness/ recovery time, nor on the rates of transmission from infected to susceptible  
137 individuals. Although both of these are obviously false for most outbreaks, they allow us  
138 to highlight the processes and methods most relevant to our purpose here and are easily  
139 corrected in specific application to particular outbreaks in the future. We therefore

140 assume that the recovery rate,  $\gamma$ , is the same in both the perceived and real processes (i.e.

141  $\gamma_a = \gamma_m = \gamma$ ).

142 This therefore yields a “real” process of  $\frac{ds_a}{dt} = -\beta_a s_a i_a$ ,  $\frac{di_a}{dt} = \beta_a s_a i_a - \gamma i_a$ , and

143  $r_a(t) = 1 - s_a(t) - i_a(t)$ , where  $s_a(t)$ ,  $i_a(t)$ , and  $r_a(t)$  are the fractions of the populations

144 in the respective health categories at time  $t$ . To build the perceived disease process from

145 this model, we then incorporate rates of testing for each fraction of the population, and

146 the sensitivity and specificity of the test as follows.

147

148 Importantly, we will define as susceptible any person one who is not infected with our the

149 pathogen of concern, despite possible infection with another illness. It is therefore not

150 only reasonable but probable that “susceptible people” will seek out health care services

151 and be tested for infection under our surveillance process, especially if the symptoms of

152 their infection closely match those of the pathogen causing our focal outbreak. We

153 therefore define  $\alpha$  to be the rate at which susceptible people are tested for illness, call  $\delta$

154 the rate at which infected people are tested for illness, and call  $\lambda$  the rate at which

155 recovered people are tested for illness. (For purposes of this paper, we will assume

156  $\alpha = \lambda$ , however this assumption may be relaxed in future work if memory of recently

157 resolved symptoms affects health care seeking behavior). We define the false positive

158 rate of the diagnostic test  $\varepsilon_1$  and the false negative rate of the test  $\varepsilon_2$  (these may apply

159 either to clinical diagnostic sensitivity and specificity, or else to error rates stemming

160 from differences in physician opinion during syndromic surveillance).

161

162 Assuming that, at least initially, our surveillance cannot determine whether an uninfected  
163 person is susceptible or recovered, and therefore  $s_m(t) + i_m(t) = 1$ , we can define  
164  $s_m = s_a(1 - \alpha) + s_a\alpha(1 - \varepsilon_1) + i_a(1 - \delta) + i_a\delta\varepsilon_2 + r_a(1 - \lambda) + r_a\lambda(1 - \varepsilon_1)$  and  
165  $i_m = s_a(\alpha\varepsilon_1 - \lambda\varepsilon_1) + i_a(\delta - \delta\varepsilon_2 - \lambda\varepsilon_1) + \lambda\varepsilon_1$ . Defined in this way, if  $\alpha = \delta = \lambda = 1$ , and  
166  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$ , and  $r_a = 0$ , then  $i_m = i_a$  and  $s_m = s_a$  (i.e. when there are no errors and the  
167 surveillance is perfect, then the measured case incidence will be equal to the  
168 corresponding real case incidence, as we would hope).

169

170 Using this definition, we then correct our understanding of any disease incidence curve  
171 once we have either measured or assumed appropriate functions/values for  $\alpha$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $\varepsilon_1$ ,  
172 and  $\varepsilon_2$ . While this might at first seem straightforward, there arises the complication that  
173 our health care seeking behavior functions are likely to be problematic in at least three  
174 separate ways: (1) they are likely to be functions of the current perceived prevalence of  
175 infection in the population (i.e. some function of  $i_m$ ), (2) they are likely to be functions of  
176 time since the beginning of the perception of the current outbreak, (3) they are likely to  
177 be non-linear and, in some cases, not even continuous. We therefore propose the  
178 following algorithm to produce a system of SIR curves which reflect the underlying  
179 disease dynamics without the influence of behavioral shifts and/or testing inaccuracy; we  
180 will denote this system as “Testing Neutral”, TN.

181

182 We start from the most conservative assumption: that only the epidemiological rates of  
183  $\beta_m$  and  $\gamma$  for the outbreak curve of interest are known (i.e. that the raw data to which an

184 SIR model was fit to obtain those parameters is currently unavailable). We make this  
185 assumption to provide a method by which analysis of previously published rates for  
186 historical outbreaks could be analyzed without having to reanalyze the original outbreak  
187 data (should that data in fact be accessible, the correction can naturally be applied  
188 directly to the  $i_m$  data directly rather than to  $i^*$  curve described below). We, therefore,  
189 begin with an initially reconstructed SIR system (denoted by  $*$ ) using only our measured  
190  $\beta_m$  and  $\gamma$ :  $\frac{ds^*}{dt} = -\beta_m s^* i^*$  and  $\frac{di^*}{dt} = \beta_m s^* i^* - \gamma i^*$ . We then compute the corrected curve  
191 for the infected population (which is no longer necessarily continuous) using the  
192 definition of  $i_m$  above and applying it to the  $i^*$  and  $i_{cor}$  instead of  $i_m$  and  $i_a$   
193 (respectively), we obtain  $i_{cor} = \frac{i^* - \varepsilon_1 \alpha}{\delta(1 - \varepsilon_2) - \varepsilon_1 \alpha}$  so long as  $\frac{\varepsilon_1 \alpha}{(1 - \varepsilon_2)} \neq 1$  (note: if it is equal  
194 to 1, then  $i^* = \alpha$ , which implies that the surveillance process cannot accurately capture  
195 the underlying real disease dynamics; derivation of this equality can be found in ESM  
196 Appendix 1). We are then able to generate the TN system by finding a new value of  $\beta$   
197 which minimizes the square of the distance between the  $i_{cor}(t)$  curve and a new,  
198 hypothetical, standard continuous SIR system's infected curve, using the known value of  
199  $\gamma$ . We call this new, corrected value the "Testing Neutral  $\beta$ " which we denote  $\beta_{TN}$ . So  
200 long as our assumed rates and behavior adjustment functions are reasonable  
201 approximations of the associated real-world values and behaviors,  $\beta_{TN} = \beta_a$ , and the TN  
202 system may reasonably approximate the real disease dynamics (i.e.  $s_{TN} = s_a$ ,  $i_{TN} = i_a$ ,  
203 using the rates  $\beta_{TN}$  and  $\gamma$ ). These values of  $\beta_a$  and  $\gamma$  (and by extension, the  $R_0$   
204 computed either by fitting  $i_{TN} = i_a$ , or else computed as the ratio of these corrected



205 etiological rates) may then be compared to similarly corrected values for other outbreaks  
206 without worry that differences in sensitivity or health-care seeking behavior will  
207 influence the comparison.

208

## 209 **Results**

210

### 211 *Demonstration of Impact of Healthcare-Seeking Behavior, Clinical Testing Rates, and* 212 *Diagnostic Error Rates on Estimation of Outbreak Dynamics and Severity*

213

214 To demonstrate the potential of these types of confounding factors in incidence  
215 estimation to influence our understanding of ongoing disease dynamics, we present the  
216  $i_m$  and  $i_a$  curves under a variety of values for  $\varepsilon_1$ , and  $\varepsilon_2$ , and function choices for  $\alpha$   
217 and  $\delta$ . Even under the simplest exploratory case, in which there are no ongoing  
218 dynamics affecting the ability to estimate incidence over time and where also the rates of  
219 testing for susceptible, infected, and recovered individuals are all held constant and  
220 identical, we see that asymmetry in error type rates alone can drastically alter our  
221 understanding of an ongoing outbreak (Fig. 1a). Extending this simple case to also  
222 include behavioral responses that shift over the course of an outbreak (i.e. non-constant  
223 testing rates), while still keeping all else the same, we see also that there can be drastic  
224 errors, even in the understood shape of the incidence curve to match the cases observed  
225 (Fig. 1b). (Again, for derivation of predictions for agreement/disagreement with real  
226 disease process based on the direction of the inequality between  $A_\varepsilon$  and 1, and the  
227 derivation of this example, see ESM Appendix 1).

228 Note that these calculations presented in Figure 1 are meant to be extremes to highlight  
229 the potential for confusion – we show a full range of values for  $\varepsilon_1$ , and  $\varepsilon_2$  ranging from  
230 potentially realistic ( $A_e = 1$ ) to dramatically inflated (both  $\varepsilon_1$ , and  $\varepsilon_2$  are greater than 0.5,  
231 which would result in a more accurate test by simply negating the result). This is done to  
232 highlight the problem, though of course, real-world values are expected to be within a  
233 much narrower, more conservative range.

234

### 235 *Data-Driven Case Studies*

236

#### 237 **Historical Outbreaks of Pandemic Influenza**

238 Employing this now demonstrated potential for mismatch in understood dynamics to  
239 more realistic outbreak scenarios, we see that when health-care seeking behavior is  
240 dependent on the perceived prevalence of disease, shifting at a set threshold, there is also  
241 the potential for drastic misunderstanding of the disease dynamics, even if the error rates  
242 in testing are realistically low (Ai et al. 2020; Chu et al. 2012) (Fig 2a). Further departing  
243 from an idealized instructional case, when we incorporate both testing rate dependence  
244 on perceived prevalence and the amount of time since surpassing the threshold for  
245 increased behavioral demand for testing (e.g. gradual relaxation in public risk perception  
246 over time), the differences between the reality of the disease dynamics and the  
247 understanding that would be provided by fitting a model to case incidence data is even  
248 greater (Fig 2b).

249

250 To demonstrate how these effects might impact current understanding of modern  
251 analyses, we construct a hypothetical scenario using results from an excellent paper  
252 comparing the severity of pandemic and epidemic outbreaks of influenza: Viboud et al.  
253 2006 (Viboud et al. 2006). In this paper, the authors concluded (among other things) that  
254 the  $R_0$  values for three pandemic years (1918, 1957, and 1968) were 2.1, 1.5 and 1.8  
255 (respectively). However, while all three pandemic years of data were analyzed using  
256 transmission estimates inferred from influenza-attributed mortality data, the data for the  
257 1957 and 1968 years were based upon WHO laboratory surveillance. For this reason, we  
258 can assume that the reported influenza attributed mortality was more accurate in  
259 representing only deaths from influenza (or associated pneumonia) than would have been  
260 possible for 1918. Entirely hypothetically, even if we assume that health care seeking  
261 behavior did not change at all between 1918 and 1957 (purely for demonstration, we  
262 assume  $\alpha = \begin{cases} 0.01 & \text{if } i_m \leq 0.05 \\ 0.8 & \text{if } i_m > 0.05 \end{cases}$  and  $\delta = \begin{cases} 0.5 & \text{if } i_m \leq 0.01 \\ 1.0 & \text{if } i_m > 0.01 \end{cases}$  for all of these analyses), if we posit  
263 that the syndromic surveillance of 1918 led to error rates of  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1$  and  $\varepsilon_2 = 0.005$ ,  
264 whereas the laboratory based testing was able to increase the specificity of the diagnosis  
265 (leaving the sensitivity the same) to  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.01$ , we already see a drop in the perceived vs  
266 TN estimates of  $R_0$  for 1918 from 2.1 to 1.9, but no change (after rounding to the same  
267 number of digits) in the  $R_0$  estimates for either 1957 or 1968. This leads to a substantial  
268 mismatch in the observed incidence curve for the 1918 pandemic and an understanding of  
269 the same outbreak under a Testing Neutral assumption (Fig 3a) while both the 1957 and  
270 1958 outbreaks would already have been accurately understood (Fig 3b and 3c).  
271

272 While we have no reason to suspect that our hypothetical error rates and assumed health  
273 care seeking behavioral functions reflect the reality of any of these three pandemics, they  
274 are clearly within realistic ranges and therefore demonstrate how dramatic the impact of  
275 even small differences in diagnostic sensitivity (whether due to changes in laboratory  
276 practice or to patient- or physician-driven behavior) can be on epidemiological estimates  
277 on which we base our public health strategies and policies.

278

### 279 **Outbreak of Influenza H1N1-09**

280

281 Whereas case studies of historical outbreaks of pandemic influenza allowed us to  
282 demonstrate the potential misestimate for  $R_0$  and resulting disease dynamics in the  
283 absence of direct understanding of behavioral shifts in testing practices, the more recent  
284 “novel” (H1N1-09) provides instead real-world data on the shifting demand for clinical  
285 diagnostic testing. This pandemic was first brought to light by global media attention *in*  
286 *advance* of clinical diagnosis in many areas. This is made clear by considering a time-  
287 series of both ordered clinical tests and confirmed cases of H1N1 in the UNC healthcare  
288 system in 2009 in which testing started immediately after media attention to the virus, but  
289 significantly before any actual circulation was detected (Fig. 4a).

290

291 Using the actual sensitivity and specificity known for the H1N1 tests in use at the time  
292 (Ginocchio et al. 2009), and the UNC testing curve to parameterize demand, we see that  
293 the reported estimate of  $R_0 = 1.58$  (Fraser et al. 2009), under correction, instead becomes  
294 and  $R_0 = 1.64$  (Fig. 4b). Of potential note, if we restrict the window for curve fitting to

295 just the first weeks' worth of data, we instead get an estimated  $R_0 = 1.66$  (Fig. 4c),  
296 meaning that, for this scenario, earlier estimates and projections were likely to  
297 overestimate the progression of the outbreak slightly. Depending on whether or not the  
298 UNC data is actually representative of broader patterns of test-seeking or test-ordering  
299 behavior this provides evidence that our understanding of the global dynamics of novel  
300 H1N1 in 2009 may be flawed.

301

### 302 **Outbreak of COVID-19**

303 While we have no way of currently estimating the rate of susceptible individuals seeking  
304 testing, we can make some generalizations given that the demand for testing in the United  
305 States as of 17 March well outstripped the supply of tests, and access to these tests was  
306 decidedly non-uniform (e.g. supplemental test availability from the Seattle Flu Study).

307

### 308 Analytic Condition for Accuracy in Estimated Case Incidence from Surveillance

309

310 In addition to these numerical examples, we provide a theoretical threshold condition,  
311  $\bar{A}_\varepsilon$ , for the ability of a surveillance system to reflect actual disease incidence based on  
312 assumed relationships among the behavioral functions and error rates (much as  $R_0$   
313 provides a threshold condition for epidemics). Assuming that the behavioral health care  
314 seeking functions are independent of time, the effective ratio of error rates in the

315 diagnostic tests, defined as  $A_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{(1 - \varepsilon_2)j(i_m)}$ , where  $j(i_m) = \delta/\alpha$ , can be used to define

316 
$$\bar{A}_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} A_\varepsilon, & \text{if } \phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m) > 0; \\ \frac{1}{A_\varepsilon}, & \text{if } \phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m) < 0 \end{cases}$$
 where  $\phi(i_m) = \alpha$ . This  $\bar{A}_\varepsilon$  then provides a way to

317 determine whether the perceived or measured disease process may accurately reflect the  
318 real, underlying disease process. In this case, when the ratio of the diagnosis test rates is  
319 constant, if there are no errors in the diagnosis tests then the surveillance accurately  
320 reflects the real disease process though it may overestimate or underestimate actual  
321 incidence. If there are errors, the surveillance system accurately reflects the increasing or  
322 decreasing nature of the real disease if  $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ , but can indicate increasing (resp.  
323 decreasing) incidence while the actual incidence is decreasing (resp. increasing) when  
324  $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$ . When the ratio of the diagnosis tests is non-constant the results are more  
325 complicated, but some results are still accessible: without errors in diagnostic tests, a  
326 surveillance system can wrongly report no disease incidence while actual case incidence  
327 is either increasing or decreasing. Further, with small errors in the diagnostic tests it is  
328 possible for a surveillance system to report decreasing incidence while the actual  
329 incidence is increasing. (Proofs and characterizations of these relationships are provided  
330 in ESM Appendix 1.)

331

## 332 **Discussion**

333

334 The ability to accurately infer epidemiological rates from outbreak data is critical to a  
335 majority of our public health planning efforts. As our models demonstrate, the accuracy  
336 of our estimates may be significantly compromised by our implicit assumption that  
337 diagnostic error rates and health care seeking behavior remain constant over the course of

338 single, and even multiple, outbreaks, even as we know this assumption to be untrue.  
339 Regardless of the particular mechanism through which we attempt to characterize the  
340 changes in diagnostic sensitivity and specificity, our results demonstrate (in both theory  
341 and practice) how these dynamics may be incorporated into epidemiological modeling  
342 efforts and how the results may translate into a more accurate understanding of infectious  
343 disease dynamics.

344

345 Some studies have been able to assess the impact of public health announcement- or  
346 media-driven behavioral change with regard to disease risk and diagnosis (e.g. (Sharma et  
347 al. 2003)). It is clear that we will need to develop better models that explicitly capture the  
348 major factors that can effect change in public behavior regarding health care and  
349 diagnosis. While it may be impossible to accurately assess the impact of behavioral  
350 changes in health care seeking behavior for past epidemics, one possible course of action  
351 going forwards would be to ask physicians, hospitals and laboratories to record and report  
352 the number of tests performed in addition to merely the number of cases positively  
353 diagnosed, regardless of acknowledge threat of outbreaks.

354

355 These models and insights may also be of critical use our collective ongoing efforts to  
356 understand and predict the progression of COVID-19. Not only do we provide the  
357 obvious alternations to the standard epidemic predictions for error rates in testing, we  
358 also provide a mechanism by which to correct our understanding of  $R_0$  based on changes  
359 in access to tests of various sensitivities and specificities over time. This is especially  
360 important given both the formulation of governmental responses to the pandemic (i.e.

361 “flattening the curve” or relying on community protection, *i.e.* ‘herd immunity’) and their  
362 subsequent evaluation hinge on accurate estimations of  $R_0$ . While presented here with  
363 constant rates to enable the analytic calculations, real-time estimations of  $R_0$  are  
364 frequently based on numerical solutions, rather than analytic calculations. In this case, the  
365 expansion of precisely these equations to allow for  $\alpha$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\lambda$  to themselves be  
366 dynamic functions of public perception and disease prevalence will enable vastly more  
367 accurate understanding of real-time case incidence data. Work currently underway to try  
368 and capture the functional forms of these responses in observed behaviors in the US will  
369 hopefully allow us to extend these results very soon to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic  
370 itself, but we provide this model in the meanwhile to allow others to work in parallel and  
371 improve our real-time decision-support capabilities.

372



## 373 Literature Cited

- 374 Ai, T., Z. Yang, H. Hou, C. Zhan, C. Chen, W. Lv, Q. Tao et al. 2020. Correlation of  
375 chest CT and RT-PCR testing in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China:  
376 a report of 1014 cases. *Radiology*:200642.
- 377 Anderson, R., May, R.M. 1991, *Infectious disease of humans*. Oxford, UK, Oxford  
378 University Press.
- 379 Anderson, R. M., and G. P. Garnett. 2000. Mathematical models of the transmission and  
380 control of sexually transmitted diseases. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 27:636-  
381 643.
- 382 Andrews, J. R., and S. Basu. 2011. Transmission dynamics and control of cholera in  
383 Haiti: an epidemic model. *The Lancet* 377:1248-1255.
- 384 Andrews, M. A., and C. T. Bauch. 2016. The impacts of simultaneous disease  
385 intervention decisions on epidemic outcomes. *Journal of theoretical biology*  
386 395:1-10.
- 387 Bansal, S., B. T. Grenfell, and L. A. Meyers. 2007. When individual behaviour matters:  
388 homogeneous and network models in epidemiology. *Journal of the Royal Society*  
389 *Interface* 4:879-891.
- 390 Barras, C. 2020. Major testing issues in US, Pages 8, *New Scientist*, Elsevier.
- 391 Baxter, R. 2010. Surveillance lessons from first-wave pandemic (H1N1) 2009, Northern  
392 California, USA. *Emerging infectious diseases* 16:504.
- 393 Capaldi, A., S. Behrend, B. Berman, J. Smith, J. Wright, and A. L. Lloyd. 2012.  
394 Parameter estimation and uncertainty quantification for an epidemic model.  
395 *Mathematical biosciences and engineering*:553.
- 396 Chesney, M. A., and A. W. Smith. 1999. Critical delays in HIV testing and care - The  
397 potential role of stigma. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42:1162-1174.
- 398 Chowell, G., C. E. Ammon, N. W. Hengartner, and J. M. Hyman. 2006. Estimation of the  
399 reproductive number of the Spanish flu epidemic in Geneva, Switzerland. *Vaccine*  
400 24:6747-6750.
- 401 Chowell, G., N. W. Hengartner, C. Castillo-Chavez, P. W. Fenimore, and J. M. Hyman.  
402 2004. The basic reproductive number of Ebola and the effects of public health  
403 measures: the cases of Congo and Uganda. *Journal of theoretical biology*  
404 229:119-126.
- 405 Chowell, G., C. Viboud, L. Simonsen, S. Merler, and A. Vespignani. 2017. Perspectives  
406 on model forecasts of the 2014–2015 Ebola epidemic in West Africa: lessons and  
407 the way forward. *BMC medicine* 15:42.
- 408 Chu, H., E. T. Lofgren, M. E. Halloran, P. F. Kuan, M. Hudgens, and S. R. Cole. 2012.  
409 Performance of rapid influenza H1N1 diagnostic tests: a meta-analysis. *Influenza*  
410 *and other respiratory viruses* 6:80-86.
- 411 Cowie, G. A., B. C. Cowie, and J. E. Fielding. Influenza testing trends in sentinel  
412 surveillance general practices in Victoria 2007 to 2014 The Victorian Sentinel  
413 Practice Influenza Network (VicSPIN) conducts surveillance for syndromic and  
414 laboratory confirmed influenza in approximately 100 general practices in Victoria  
415 each influenza season. Participating general practitioners test for influenza at their  
416 own discretion—the percentage of patients swabbed within and between seasons is  
417 evaluated. Page last updated: 30 March 2017.

- 418 Dasbach, E. J., E. H. Elbasha, and R. P. Insinga. 2006. Mathematical models for  
419 predicting the epidemiologic and economic impact of vaccination against human  
420 papillomavirus infection and disease. *Epidemiologic Reviews* 28:88-100.
- 421 Del Valle, S., H. Hethcote, J. M. Hyman, and C. Castillo-Chavez. 2005. Effects of  
422 behavioral changes in a smallpox attack model. *Mathematical Biosciences*  
423 195:228-251.
- 424 Dirac, P. A. M. 1947, *The principles of quantum mechanics*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- 425 Duerr, H. P., S. O. Brockmann, I. Piechotowski, M. Schwehm, and M. Eichner. 2007.  
426 Influenza pandemic intervention planning using InfluSim: pharmaceutical and  
427 non-pharmaceutical interventions. *Bmc Infectious Diseases* 7:13.
- 428 Earn, D. J. D., D. He, M. B. Loeb, K. Fonseca, B. E. Lee, and J. Dushoff. 2012. Effects  
429 of school closure on incidence of pandemic influenza in Alberta, Canada. *Annals*  
430 *of internal medicine* 156:173-181.
- 431 Farah, M., P. Birrell, S. Conti, and D. D. Angelis. 2014. Bayesian emulation and  
432 calibration of a dynamic epidemic model for A/H1N1 influenza. *Journal of the*  
433 *American Statistical Association* 109:1398-1411.
- 434 Fenichel, E. P., C. Castillo-Chavez, M. G. Ceddia, G. Chowell, P. A. G. Parra, G. J.  
435 Hickling, G. Holloway et al. 2011. Adaptive human behavior in epidemiological  
436 models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:6306-6311.
- 437 Ferguson, N. M., D. A. T. Cummings, C. Fraser, J. C. Cajka, P. C. Cooley, and D. S.  
438 Burke. 2006. Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *Nature* 442:448-  
439 452.
- 440 Ferguson, N. M., M. J. Keeling, W. J. Edmunds, R. Gant, B. T. Grenfell, R. M.  
441 Anderson, and S. Leach. 2003. Planning for smallpox outbreaks. *Nature* 425:681-  
442 685.
- 443 Fraser, C., C. A. Donnelly, S. Cauchemez, W. P. Hanage, M. D. Van Kerkhove, T. D.  
444 Hollingsworth, J. Griffin et al. 2009. Pandemic potential of a strain of influenza A  
445 (H1N1): early findings. *Science* 324:1557-1561.
- 446 Funk, S., M. Salathé, and V. A. Jansen. 2010. Modelling the influence of human  
447 behaviour on the spread of infectious diseases: a review. *Journal of The Royal*  
448 *Society Interface* 7:1247-1256.
- 449 Gemmetto, V., A. Barrat, and C. Cattuto. 2014. Mitigation of infectious disease at school:  
450 targeted class closure vs school closure. *BMC infectious diseases* 14:695.
- 451 Ginocchio, C. C., F. Zhang, R. Manji, S. Arora, M. Bornfreund, L. Falk, M. Lotlikar et al.  
452 2009. Evaluation of multiple test methods for the detection of the novel 2009  
453 influenza A (H1N1) during the New York City outbreak. *Journal of Clinical*  
454 *Virology* 45:191-195.
- 455 Glass, R. J., L. M. Glass, W. E. Beyeler, and H. J. Min. 2006. Targeted Social Distancing  
456 Design for Pandemic Influenza. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 12:11.
- 457 Green, T. A. 1998. Using surveillance data to monitor trends in the AIDS epidemic.  
458 *Statistics in medicine* 17:143-154.
- 459 Hayman, D., J. Marshall, N. French, T. Carpenter, M. Roberts, and T. Kiedrzyński. 2017.  
460 Cost-benefit analyses of supplementary measles immunisation in the highly  
461 immunized population of New Zealand. *Vaccine* 35:4913-4922.
- 462 Iowa, S. H. L. a. U. o. 1998 Annual Report. Eastern Iowa Whooping Cough Outbreak.

- 463 Kalichman, S. C., and L. C. Simbayi. 2003. HIV testing attitudes, AIDS stigma, and  
464 voluntary HIV counselling and testing in a black township in Cape Town, South  
465 Africa. *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 79:442-447.
- 466 Keeling, M. J., K. A. Broadfoot, and S. Datta. 2017. The impact of current infection  
467 levels on the cost-benefit of vaccination. *Epidemics* 21:56-62.
- 468 Kretzschmar, M., S. van den Hof, J. Wallinga, and J. van Wijngaarden. 2004. Ring  
469 vaccination and smallpox control. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 10:832-841.
- 470 Lofgren, E. T., J. Rogers, M. Senese, and N. H. Fefferman. 2008. Pandemic preparedness  
471 strategies for school systems: is closure really the only way? *Annales Zoologici*  
472 *Fennici* 45:449-458.
- 473 Maharaj, S., and A. Kleczkowski. 2012. Controlling epidemic spread by social  
474 distancing: Do it well or not at all. *BMC Public Health* 12:679.
- 475 Moore, K. 2004. Real-time syndrome surveillance in Ontario, Canada: the potential use  
476 of emergency departments and Telehealth. *European Journal of Emergency*  
477 *Medicine* 11:3-11.
- 478 Nouvellet, P., T. Garske, H. L. Mills, G. Nedjati-Gilani, W. Hinsley, I. M. Blake, M. D.  
479 Van Kerkhove et al. 2015. The role of rapid diagnostics in managing Ebola  
480 epidemics. *Nature* 528:S109.
- 481 Perkins, T. A., A. S. Siraj, C. W. Ruktanonchai, M. U. G. Kraemer, and A. J. Tatem.  
482 2016. Model-based projections of Zika virus infections in childbearing women in  
483 the Americas. *Nature microbiology* 1:16126.
- 484 Perra, N., D. Balcan, B. Gonçalves, and A. Vespignani. 2011. Towards a characterization  
485 of behavior-disease models. *PloS one* 6.
- 486 Purdy, K. W., J. W. Hay, M. F. Botteman, and J. I. Ward. 2004. Evaluation of strategies  
487 for use of acellular pertussis vaccine in adolescents and adults: A cost-benefit  
488 analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 39:20-28.
- 489 Reluga, T. C. 2010. Game theory of social distancing in response to an epidemic.
- 490 Santermans, E., E. Robesyn, T. Ganyani, B. Sudre, C. Faes, C. Quinten, W. Van Bortel et  
491 al. 2016. Spatiotemporal evolution of Ebola virus disease at sub-national level  
492 during the 2014 West Africa epidemic: model scrutiny and data meagreness. *PloS*  
493 *one* 11.
- 494 Sebrango-Rodríguez, C. R., D. A. MartíÑez-Bello, L. SÁNchez-ValdÉS, P. J.  
495 Thilakarathne, E. Del Fava, P. Van Der Stuyft, A. LÓPez-QuÍlez et al. 2017.  
496 Real-time parameter estimation of Zika outbreaks using model averaging.  
497 *Epidemiology & Infection* 145:2313-2323.
- 498 Sharma, V., M. D. Dowd, D. S. Swanson, A. J. Slaughter, and S. D. Simon. 2003.  
499 Influence of the news media on diagnostic testing in the emergency department.  
500 *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine* 157:257-260.
- 501 Thursky, K., S. P. Cordova, D. Smith, and H. Kelly. 2003. Working towards a simple  
502 case definition for influenza surveillance. *Journal of Clinical Virology* 27:170-  
503 179.
- 504 Tizzoni, M., P. Bajardi, C. Poletto, J. J. Ramasco, D. Balcan, B. Gonçalves, N. Perra et  
505 al. 2012. Real-time numerical forecast of global epidemic spreading: case study of  
506 2009 A/H1N1pdm. *BMC medicine* 10:165.
- 507 Valdez, L. D., P. A. Macri, and L. A. Braunstein. 2012. Intermittent social distancing  
508 strategy for epidemic control. *Physical Review E* 85:036108.

- 509 van den Driessche, P., and J. Watmough. 2002. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold  
510 endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission.  
511 *Mathematical Biosciences* 180:29-48.
- 512 Viboud, C., T. Tam, D. Fleming, A. Handel, M. A. Miller, and L. Simonsen. 2006.  
513 Transmissibility and mortality impact of epidemic and pandemic influenza, with  
514 emphasis on the unusually deadly 1951 epidemic. *Vaccine* 24:6701-6707.
- 515 Villela, D. A. M. 2017. Imperfect testing of individuals for infectious diseases:  
516 Mathematical model and analysis. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and*  
517 *Numerical Simulation* 46:153-160.
- 518  
519  
520

521 **Figure Legends**

522 **Figure 1: Example Perceived and Infected Curves Representing the Same Outbreak**  
 523 **Under Different Testing Rates/Functions.** All curves:  $\beta_a = 3$ ,  $\gamma = 1$ ,

524  $s_a(0) = 0.9$ ,  $i_a(0) = 0.1$ . (a) Constant Behavioral Responses. Black solid curve:  
 525 real disease dynamics; Black ■:  $\alpha = 0.65$ ,  $\delta = 0.65$ ,  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.2$ , and  $\varepsilon_2 = 0.1$ ;  
 526 Dashed curve:  $\alpha = 0.65$ ,  $\delta = 0.65$ ,  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.6$ , and  $\varepsilon_2 = 0.7$ ; Black ✕: when the  
 527 effective ratio of errors in testing,  $A_\varepsilon = 1$  (for calculations, see Appendix 1). (b)  
 528 Non-Constant Behavioral Responses: All curves:  $\beta_a = 3$ ,  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $s_a(0) = 0.9$ ,  
 529  $i_a(0) = 0.1$ . Black curve: real disease dynamics; All other curves  $\alpha = 0.65$ ,  
 530  $\delta = \frac{0.65(1 + qi_m)}{pi_m}$ ,  $p = q = 1$ , ( $\varepsilon_1$  and  $\varepsilon_2$  for each curve as labeled).

531

532 **Figure 2: Example Perceived and TN Infected Curves Representing the Same**

533 **Outbreak.** (a) Non-Constant Health Care Seeking Behavior Functions. All  
 534 curves:  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $s_a(0) = 0.999$ ,  $i_a(0) = 0.001$ . Solid curve – Perceived Outbreak:

535 
$$\beta_m = 1.15, \alpha = \begin{cases} 0.01 & \text{if } i_m \leq 0.003 \\ 0.8 & \text{if } i_m > 0.003 \end{cases}, \delta = \begin{cases} 0.5 & \text{if } i_m \leq 0.001 \\ 1.0 & \text{if } i_m > 0.001 \end{cases}, \varepsilon_1 = 0.002, \text{ and}$$

536  $\varepsilon_2 = 0.005$ ; Dotted curve – Testing Neutral Outbreak:  $\beta_{TN} = 1.13$

537 (b) Healthcare Seeking Behavior Functions that Depend on Perceived Epidemic  
 538 Severity and Time from first Outbreak Identification. All curves:  $\gamma = 1$ ,

539  $s_a(0) = 0.999$ ,  $i_a(0) = 0.001$ . Solid curve – Perceived Outbreak:  $\beta_m = 1.15$ ,  
 540  $\alpha = \{0.01 \text{ if } i_m \text{ has never exceeded } 0.003, \text{ and } 0.7 \text{ when } i_m \text{ first exceeds } 0.003,$   
 541  $\text{decreasing exponentially (by a factor of } e^{(x-t)}) \text{ over time to } 0.3\}$ ,

542  $\delta = \begin{cases} 0.5 & \text{if } i_m \leq 0.001 \\ 1.0 & \text{if } i_m > 0.001 \end{cases}, \varepsilon_1 = 0.01, \text{ and } \varepsilon_2 = 0.005$ ; Dotted curve – Testing Neutral

543 Outbreak:  $\beta_{TN} = 1.10$

544

545 **Figure 3: Differences in Estimates of  $R_0$  for Three Pandemic Years Using**

546 **Hypothetical Correction Rates.** (a) Analysis of Influenza Pandemic of 1918,

547 (b) Analysis of Influenza Pandemic of 1957, (c) Analysis of Influenza

548 Pandemic of 1968.

549 For all panels – Solid line: Perceived/Reported pandemic incidence curve,

550 reconstructed from reported  $R_0$ . Dotted line: TN pandemic incidence curves

551 (1918 TN  $R_0 = 1.9$ ; TN 1957  $R_0 = 1.5$ ; 1968 TN  $R_0 = 1.8$ ).

552

553 **Figure 4: Testing Rates and Resulting Estimates of  $R_0$  for Novel H1N1 2009.** (a)

554 Counts of influenza tests ordered and H1N1 positive tests from UNC, (b)

555 Estimated epidemic curves from reported (solid line) and TN (dotted line)

556 epidemic incidence curves using the full time series, (c) Estimated epidemic

557 curves from reported (solid line) and TN (dotted line) epidemic incidence using

558                    only the first 7 days of data after the first reported case to approximate real-  
559                    time parameter estimation and resulting prediction.  
560





Figure 1





Figure 2








Figure 3






Figure 4