The Impact on Well-Being of Cognitive Bias about Infectious Diseases

Radomir Pestow[1],

Mathematical Institute, University of Koblenz

April 16, 2024

Abstract

We investigate the relationship between bias about infectious disease and well-being. First, we empirically establish the existence and the causes of bias, specifically during the COVID-19 pandemic. After that we investigate theoretically the effects of bias on well-being. In order to do this, we present a behavioral-epidemiological differential equation model derived from an agent-based model that combines rational choice behavior with infectious disease dynamics. In addition the model is evaluated normatively by an axiomatically characterized model of an ethical, impartial, eudaimonistic and individualist observer. These assumptions imply a new proof for the utilitarian principle. The result is that while increased fear improves purely epidemiological outcomes, the social welfare outcome shows mixed results; which shows that it is not enough to take only epidemiological measures into account when generating policy recommendations. Finally, we draw some practical consequences from the model, and point to some ethical considerations in modeling the interaction of policy making and public perception.

classification:

Keywords:

Funding/Competing Interests

This research has been conducted as part of the Covid&AI project, which is funded by Ministry of Science and Health of Rhineland-Palatinate, Germany.

Acknowledgments I acknowledge the fruitful discussions along the presentations of the work in our joint workshops of the four research groups at the University of Koblenz. Additionally,

[1]e-mail: pestow@uni-koblenz.de, corresponding author

I would to thank Prof. Thomas Götz, of the University of Koblenz, and Prof. Tyll Krüger, of the Technical University of Warsaw, and Prof. em. Thomas Kuhn, of the Technical University Chemnitz, for the fruitful discussions and suggestions.

1 Introduction

1.1 Existence of Bias

Before we ask what the consequences of bias are for well-being, let us first ask whether there exists bias about infectious disease at all, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. In general, the very fact that there is political polarisation on factual issues (as opposed to value issues) is evidence of the existence and persistence of bias among large groups of the populations in various polities. For, mutually exclusive positions cannot be all true at the same time; at least one of them has to be false. It is likely that, most readers, whatever their political persuasions, considered some of their political opponents (in private or public life) to be (heavily) biased or misinformed about the particular matter on which there is a disagreement; and the feeling is just as likely mutual.

But let's be more concrete. Early on, the WHO reported a fatality rate of 3.4% (WHO, 2020) for COVID-19 and contrasted this with a fatality rate of "far below" 1% for the seasonal flu; asserting that only 1% of corona virus infections are asymptomatic. But subsequent sero-prevalence studies found infection-fatality rates ranging from 0.00% to 1.63% with median 0.27%, as, incidentally, summarized in another WHO publication (Ioannidis, 2020a).[2]. A later reconciliation of six systematic evaluations of pre-vaccine, sero-prevalence studies settled on an infection fatality rate of around 0.15% (Ioannidis, 2021). In any case, this early pronouncement can be seen as a very prominent and influential example of bias[3].

Given that there was already bias in the expert community, it is not surprising that there was also bias in the population at large, as it is influenced by the expert community. For example, the well-executed COSMO-study (Betsch et. al., 2020) shows a wide divergence of views in the population on how many belong to the risk group, ranging from 0% to 100% with pronounced local peaks at decimal "round" number like 5, 10,15,20,30,40,50,60 (COSMO, 2022). A Gallup survey (Rothwell et al., 2021) came to the conclusion that 92% of US adults and 62% overstate the hospitalization risks for the unvaccinated and vaccinated respectively. Another online questionnaire at the end of February 2020 found that "US and UK participants' median estimate for the probability of a fatal disease course among those infected with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was 5.0% (IQR 2.0%-15.0%) and 3.0% (IQR 2.0%-10.0%), respectively." (Geldsetzer, 2020).

[2]Taking the available evidence into account, that was available at that time, one could have come early on to the conclusion that these estimates were exaggerated (Ioannidis, 2020b).

[3]Alternatively, in the spirit of the argument above, if a person were to still believe the early announcement, then the later estimates would demonstrate to this person the existence of wide ranging bias in the expert community.

1.2 Causes of Bias about COVID-19

Having established the existence of bias about infectious disease, we will briefly at some of its causes.

1.2.1 Immediate Causes of Bias

Obviously, information beyond our immediate sense experience, our memory thereof and conclusions therefrom has to reach us through social channels, of which organized media forms a part. Since a virus is beyond immediate sense experience, the vast majority forms their beliefs about virii in general, and Coronavirii in particular, based on socially transmitted ideas, many of them through organized media. It is therefore clear that these opinions are a reflection of the social milieu (real and virtual).

Now, a content analysis of the UK media coverage between January and May 2020 found that "journalists relied heavily on fear-inducing messages by emphasizing threats related to COVID-19 and, though to a lesser degree, measures against these threats" (Hase et al., 2022). Another content analysis of a global media sample came to a similar conclusion that "Human Interest and fear/scaremongering frames dominated the global media coverage of the pandemic." (Ogbodo et al., 2020). Finally, COSMO reported that around 40-50% feared the Coronavirus, and that 40-60% thought more or less often about the disease throughout 2020 (COSMO, 2022); which, as argued above, mostly reflects social milieu and, in light of the previous argument, the type and prevalence of media content. We will not go into further details as these findings of predominantly negative media messaging at the beginning of the pandemic are probably in line with the personal experiences of most of our contemporaries in western societies.

1.2.2 Mediate Causes of Bias

Pursuing this causal threat leads us to the role of governments in the pandemics. There are indications that exaggerated fear was actually intended[4] [5] and promoted[6] by some governments in

[4] "The perceived level of personal threat needs to be increased among those who are complacent, using hard-hitting emotional messaging." UK Government (2020).

[5] "Emphasize the Worst Case!" Federal Government of Germany (2020); incidentally, COSMO initiated because "Journalists need timely knowledge about developing audience behaviour and habits to rapidly tailor information sharing and to develop narrative tools that encourage behaviour changes according to evidence from risk communication research." (Bertsch et al., 2020, coauthored by head of the RKI at that time, the department that was central in the German pandemic management.)

[6] The UK health minister at that time wanted to "[...] frighten the pants off everyone with the new strain." The Cabinet Secretary at that time was of the opinion that in "ramping up messaging - the fear/guilt factor [is] vital" (Lockdown Files, 2023). Scientists involved with the behavioral change effort later questioned the ethicality of the psychological operations employed (Rayner, 2021).

order to increase compliance with pandemic measures and thereby reduce the spread of infections. Some influential publishers in German speaking countries followed the government lead (with well intentions) [7][8] in order to spread the Government message.

Other prominent state of the art recommendations of behavioral change tactics aimed to increase socially induced conformism[9] and mental rigidity[10] (Bavel, 2020)[11].

This artificially reinforced a narrow focus on mortality and morbidity of one disease and lead to a loss of focus on other societal problems (among which are not only diseases), as well as to a disregard of collateral damages (Schippers, 2020). The narrow focus on deaths and infections was also reflected in influential modeling that disregarded all consequences beyond infections and deaths (Joffe, 2021).

1.3 Consequences of Bias

Having understood that bias existed during the pandemic, the direction of the bias and what its main drivers were, the natural question is, does bias actually increase well-being or not? For, all human action is motivated by a desire for (subjective) well being, in sense of seeking pleasures and avoiding pain be they more of a corporeal or mental nature ("pleasure minus pain"). All sciences and arts, including the medical as well as the political, are therefore subservient to increasing human well-being (infections or deaths from infections are only one among many determinant parts of well-being). This raises our main question, what is the impact of bias-inducing fear based

[7] Julian Reichelt reported the expectations her publisher had of him as (former) Editor-in-Chief of a widely circulating German tabloid: "Friede Springer had the idea - and made this very clear to me - that Bild should immediately report in support of the German government and the Chancellor in the early stages of the coronavirus crisis. And that was not my idea of journalism." (Reichelt, 2022)

[8] An influential Swiss publisher said in a leaked record that "In all the countries where we are active - and I would be happy if it stays in this circle - we said on my initiative that we want to support the government through our media coverage so that we all get through the crisis well." (von Matt, 2022)

[9] "[...] messages that provide in-group models for norms (for example, members of your community) may therefore be most effective.";
Effecting messaging approaches suggested include "focusing on protecting others (for example, 'wash your hands to protect your parents and grandparents'), aligning with the recipient's moral values, appealing to social consensus or scientific norms and/or highlighting social group approval.";
"For instance, a message with compelling social norms might say, 'the overwhelming majority of people in your community believe that everyone should stay home'.";
"Methods to increase certainty include helping people feel knowledgeable about their new attitude and making them feel that their new attitude is the 'moral' one to have.";
"People are also more likely to cooperate when they believe that others are cooperating. [...] This suggests that leaders and the media can promote cooperation by making [...] [cooperative] behaviours more observable.";
"Leaders can do this, for instance, by being a source of 'moral elevation'. Visibly displaying prosocial and selfless acts can prompt observers to also act with kindness and generosity themselves."

[10] "[Psychological] Inoculation follows the biomedical analogy: people are exposed to a severely weakened dose of a persuasive argument, strong enough to trigger the immune system but not so strong as to overwhelm it. A meta-analysis has found inoculation effective in protecting attitudes from persuasion.";
"thus, focusing on worst-case scenarios, even if they are uncertain, may encourage people to make sacrifices for others."

[11] Incidentally, the paper could be useful in the research of sects, like the Peoples Temple, and possibly sudden civilizational collapses as it provides many examples of mind closing mechanisms that were demonstrated to be applicable to larger groups.

messaging the general well-being? Considering the central importance of well-being, the scarcity of modeling that takes well-being explicitly into account is surprising.

Trying to answer this question raises another problem. Namely, how to judge or evaluate different resultant distributions of well-being? Given several distributions of well-being, which one is to be considered to be better? This a question of social welfare. To show how a principled, normative model can be constructed, we included a new set of axioms for utilitarian principle[12]. Making value assumptions explicit is especially important when models are used to give policy recommendations as these can impose values on the population at large. It also encourages to the the whole of well-being into account and not just parts of it.

Our modelling rests on three main strands of literature SIR Models (Kermack/McKendrick, 1927, or Martcheva, 2010 for a modern exposition), Economic Decision Models (von Neumann, 1947), and Social Welfare Analysis (d'Aspermont in Arrow et al., 2002). Related to our model are models that take fear into account (Mandal et al., 2020, Juga et al., 2021, Mpeshe/Nyerere, 2021, Epstein et al., 2021, Jain et al., 2022, Retzlaff et al., 2022), which in our model can be quantified as the expectation of a decrease in well being. A helpful pedagogical example in designing the model was (Tuckwell/Williams, 2007).

The ethical model we build is based on the axiomatically characterized social value judgement of an ethical, impartial, eudaimonistic and individualist observer. This already presupposes that the agents in question have a sense of their own well-being and act accordingly, which we model by rational choice behavior, in the sense made precise below.

2 Model Assumptions

2.1 Epidemiological Assumptions

We consider a population of homogeneous agents, N, that is subdivided into three distinct classes: susceptibles $S(t)$, infected $I(t)$, and recovered $R(t)$. At each time step, susceptibles choose the level of effort $a \in [0, 1]$ they will make in order to avoid an infection (measured in terms of a reduction in transmission probability). After that, each susceptible makes one random contact uniformly distributed over the whole population. If agents make contact with an infected individual, they get infected with probability $\beta(1 - a)$. Infected agents recover with probability γ, and recovered

[12] Just to be clear, the author himself does not consider himself to be a utilitarian, but rather considers himself to be more at home in the "moral sense" tradition of ethics; still as the our axioms show again, utilitarianism is not to be disregarded.

agents stay recovered.

Since the agents are homogeneous, they all have the same information and react in the same way to this information. Therefore all susceptibles will choose the same action a.

What are the expected changes in the numbers of the compartments? Let $S(t), I(t), R(t)$ and the action a be given, then

$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta S) = -\beta(1-a)\frac{I}{N}S$$
$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta I) = \beta(1-a)\frac{I}{N}S - \gamma I$$
$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta R) = \gamma I$$

Here the fraction of infected $\frac{I}{N}$ is equal to the probability that a susceptible agent will meet an infected (due to the uniform distribution of contacts). Further, $\beta(1-a)$ is the transmission probability, β, reduced by the avoidance effort. Each susceptible agent has therefore a chance of $\beta(1-a)\frac{I}{N}$ to get infected (getting infected is a Bernoulli variable). Therefore, in sum, $\beta(1-a)\frac{I}{N}S$ agents are expected to get infected on average.

Similarly, recovering is a Bernoulli random variable with probability γ. Therefore, as many as γI are expected to recover.

2.2 Behavioral Assumptions

We additionally assume that the agents have a sense of their own well-being and act accordingly with myopic von-Neumann-Morgenstern rationality (von Neumann, 1947, Marschak, 1950, Harsyani, 1955)[13] [14]. That is, the agents choose that action which *maximizes their present expected value* (in contrast to agents with a finite time horizon, that would maximize the expected, and possibly discounted, present value in their time horizon).

Effort to avoid an infection bears a cost $c(a)$, which is zero if no effort is exerted, $c(0) = 0$, has constantly increasing marginal costs $c''(a) = \kappa > 0$ (for some constant κ), and is evaluated in terms of the agents well-being. We further assume that the first additional unit of protection has no additional cost in terms of well-being, $c'(0) = 0$. Getting an infection on the other hand bears

[13] An *intra*-personal well-being scale requires comparability of levels and of differences in well-being; an *inter*-personal scale requires comparability of units (like just noticable differences); measuring well-being extended in time is enabled by inter-temporal comparability of present and future well-being.

[14] Empirical methods to evaluate well-being include empathic evaluation, quality of life indicators, neuroscience (monitoring of reward centers in the brain), income, questionnaire methods: pairwise comparison tests, willingness to pay (cf. Ng, 2000)

a probabilistic health cost, with distribution Θ and mean $\bar{\theta}$, for the agents well-being.

The agents observe these health outcomes in the population, possibly with biased exposure or selective attention, so that some outcomes are over-/undersampled, resulting in the actually observed distribution $\tilde{\Theta}$ with the shifted perceived mean $\tilde{\theta}$.

The agents have then the following information available: effort costs c, health costs $\tilde{\Theta}$, effective transmission probability $\beta(1-a)$ and the probability of meeting an infected $\frac{I}{N}$. We also assume that the costs are additive.

Taken all of the above together, the agents thus try to choose the least worst expected outcome in the following decision problem

$$\max_{a\in[0,1]} v(I,a) := -\kappa a^2 - \tilde{\theta}\beta(1-a)\frac{I}{N}$$

where κa^2 are the protection costs and $\tilde{\theta}\beta(1-a)$ is the expected health cost for that protection level both evaluated in terms of well-being. Since the value function is homogeneous in the cost parameters, we can set $\kappa = 1$ without loss of generality ($\tilde{\theta}$ reads then as the health cost in proportion to the protection cost). The optimal effort level is therefore $a(I) = \min\{\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}\frac{I}{N}, 1\}$.

2.3 Value Assumptions

For the purpose of making a value judgement on the state of the society of agents (i.e. a judgement of the form "societal state x is better than societal state y"), we will characterize how an ethical, impartial, eudaimonistic, and individualist observer forms a judgement on the comparative value of two societal states (cf. d'Aspermont in Arrow et al., 2002, Ng, 2000). The following axioms (esp. Eudaimonism and Individualism) are formally related to those of pure utilitarianism as described in (d'Aspermont in Arrow et al., 2002). One reason why we choose utilitarianism here as our normative model is that the other prominent alternative, Rawlsian or egalitarian social justice, is uninteresting in our case simply from a formal viewpoint, as the welfare level of the least-well off is always the same (the worst disease outcome is always realized in an infinite population). Secondly, the average well-being is in itself already an interesting measure.

Let then $x, y \in C$ be social states in the set of comparable states C, and let P be the social ordering relation of the impartial observer, were xPy means that x is considered to be a strictly better social state than y. Analogously I is the indifference relation of the observer between two social states, where I and P are compatible with each other. Furthermore let $w_i(x)$ denote the

well-being of agent i in social state x and $w(x)$ the vector of well-being. Then the observer is assumed to be guided by the following principles:

Unanimity (or Pareto Principle) If *all* agents are better off in one social state than in another with one individual being at least strictly better off, then the former state is strictly preferred by the ethical observer: [if $[w(x) \geq w(y)$ (compared componentwise) and one i with $w_i(x) > w_i(y)]$ then xPy].

Impartiality All agents are treated equal. The well-being of one agent is not considered more important than that of others: [let $w_{\pi(i)}(x) = w_i(y)$ with permutation, π then xIy].
If the observer *were* to prefer individual i to individual j, he would prefer a given state x to a given state y, if $w_i(x) = a, w_j(x) = b, w_i(y) = b, w_j(y) = a$, and $a > b$; i.e. he prefers the state were individual i gets the higher level of two possible levels of well-being rather than individual j.

Eudaimonism The observer is indifferent between two states, if the well-being of individuals is exactly the same in both states, i.e.: if $w(x) = w(y)$, then xIy.
Thus, the observer does not care about anything extraneous to well-being, such as the type or color of clothes one wears, only insofar it affects well-being.[15]

Individualism When comparing two social states, the judgement depends only on the difference in well-being between these two states: let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be social states with $w(x_1) - w(y_1) = w(x_2) - w(y_2)$ then $u(x_1)Pu(y_1) \iff u(x_2)Pu(y_2)$ and $u(x_1)Iu(y_1) \iff u(x_2)Iu(y_2)$
Here each individual is considered as to be a world in itself, as if the individuals are living on different planets, since relative welfare levels are not considered. However, consider that empathy (were the well-being of one agent somehow depends or is related to the well-being of others) and Weber-Fechner like properties of well-being, lead to more egalitarian conclusions even in this individualistic setting.

Maximum Domain The set of societal states S which the observer can compare includes all possible variations in well-being, i.e. $\mathbb{R}^n = w(S)$. This means that for every well-being distribution, there is a state that realizes it.

[15] This axiom is actually consequence of the previous principle, considering the identity function as a trivial permutation, $\pi = id$.

The social welfare ordering of the impartial observer is then given by $\sum_i w_i(x)$ in the following sense (see the appendix for the proof) [16]:

$$\sum_i w_i(x) > \sum_i w_i(y) \quad \text{iff } x \text{ is judged to be better than } y$$

$$\sum_i w_i(x) = \sum_i w_i(y) \quad \text{iff } x \text{ is judged to be equivalent to } y$$

Also, observe that the strict preference relation defined by $P := \{(x, y) \in S | \sum_i w_i(x) > \sum_i w_i(y)\}$, and the indifference relation defined by $I := \{(x, y) \in S | \sum_i w_i(x) = \sum_i w_i(y)\}$, both fulfill the axioms, thus proving their consistency.

In our case we consider the total well-being w_i of an agent i to be the episodic or cumulative reward, i.e. $w_i(t) = \sum_{s=1}^{t} r_i(s)$ (cf. Kahneman, 1997).

The expected change in per-capita welfare, $W(t) := \frac{\sum_{i \in S(t)} w_i(t)}{N}$, is thus given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Delta W(t)) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\sum_i r_i(t)}{N}\right) && (1)\\
&= \frac{\sum_i \mathbb{E}(r_i(t))}{N} && (2)\\
&= \frac{\sum_i v(I(t), a(I(t)))}{N} && (3)\\
&= \frac{v(I(t), a(I(t)))S(t)}{N} && (4)\\
&= \left(-a(I)^2 - \bar{\theta}\beta(1 - a(I))\frac{I}{N}\right)\frac{S}{N} && (5)
\end{aligned}$$

here the index i ranges over the susceptible agents.

Here v is the expected value of action a, given the number of infected I. In the last line, $-a(I)^2$ is effort cost (which is the same for all susceptible agents since all take the same action). Further, a $\bar{\theta}\beta(1 - a(I))\frac{I}{N}S$ is the total health cost, $\beta(1 - a(I))\frac{I}{N}S$, which the newly infected experience, as $\bar{\theta}$ is the true mean of the health costs.

[16] An alternative argument for evaluating the social state by the sum of well-being or rather the average well-being comes from the contractarian tradition (Harsyani (1955), Sen (1970), Sugden (1979)). We repeat it here for its simplicity. In the thought experiment, as in (Sen (1970)), society is placed behind a "veil-of-ignorance", which establishes a kind of impersonality. A concept closely related to impartiality. Behind the veil no one knows which position in society he will take or actually has. And since all the characteristics of the individuals behind the veil are hidden, all will take the same decision (as there is nothing to differentiate them) and will therefore agree with each other on one social contract.

By Laplaces' principle of indifference, the probabilities for taking a given position are all the same. Thus, under rational choice in the sense above, individuals will decide on a society where the expected well-being or average well-being is maximized.

3 Results

3.1 Limit Model

If we normalize the population, and assume that the time steps were sufficiently small, we obtain the following differential equation system in the infinite population limit by the Law of Large Numbers.

$$
\begin{aligned}
a(I) &= \min\{\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I, 1\} \\
\frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta(1-a(I))IS \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= \beta(1-a(I))IS - \gamma I \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma I \\
\frac{dW}{dt} &= (-a(I)^2 - \bar{\theta}\beta(1-a(I))I)S
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\tilde{\theta} = 0$ gives us the standard SIR-Model.

Some observations are in order. First note, if $I(0)$ is such that $\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I(0) < 1$, then $a(I) = \frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I$ throughout the whole pandemic, which simplifies the model further. This is the case, because $a(I)$ cannot grow above 1. As $a(I)$ is continuous (in I and therefore in t) it would need to be equal to 1 at some point, if it were to grow above one. But then $\beta(1-a(I))IS$ would be equal to 0 in the first and second equation and the number of infected would fall, pushing $a(I)$ under 1 again.

The system will then have the following form for appropriate starting values

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta(1-\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I)IS \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \beta(1-\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I)IS - \gamma I \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma I \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{dW}{dt} = \left(-\left(\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I\right)^2 - \bar{\theta}\beta\left(1-\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I\right)I\right)S \tag{9}$$

Another special case is where $\frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2} < 1$, then we will also have $a(I) < 1$ through out and $a(I) = \frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}I$.

3.2 Qualitative Analysis

We can also see that if $I(0) \approx 0$, then $a(I) \approx 0$, and the dynamics are nearly the same as in the basic SIR-model. Thus, we can say that right at the start both models give nearly the same results.

Further, S' is negative throughout, S therefore is monotonically decreasing and bounded from below (since S is stationary in $S = 0$ which implies that $S' = 0$ at that point, i.e. it will stay there and cannot cross it). Thus S has a lower limit.

Now assume that $I(0)$ is small at the start and consider the growth rates of S and I (with $c := \frac{\tilde{\theta}\beta}{2}$):

$$s(t) := \frac{\frac{dS}{dt}}{S} = -\beta(1 - cI)I$$
$$g(t) := \frac{\frac{dI}{dt}}{I} = \beta(1 - cI)S - \gamma$$

Here we note that g can cross 0 only from above but not from below. For assume, $g(t_0) = 0$, then $I' = 0$. Now if we take the derivative of g, we see that $g' = -\beta c I' S + \beta(1 - cI)S' = \beta(1 - cI)S' < 0$. Therefore once g is below zero, it will stay below zero and the number of infected will be continuously falling.

Also if g is positive, then also $I' > 0$. Taking again the derivative we see that g' will be negative, since both $-\beta c I' S$ and $\beta(1 - cI)S'$ will negative. Therefore, the growth rate will be continuously falling and correspondingly the growth of I will be continuously slowing down.

We get the following picture. If $I(0)$ is small enough, the model will behave in the beginning as the SIR model. The growth of I will continuously level off until I reaches, presumably, its peak, after which I will be continuously falling, until I and S level off to their limits.

3.3 Simulation Results

To get a more clearer picture, lets take look at some simulation results; first at the epidemiological outcomes, then at the welfare outcomes.

3.3.1 Epidemiological Outcomes

Note that the epidemiological outcomes depend only on the perception of the disease, while welfare depends on both the perception and the actual severity. For the epidemiological outcomes we will therefore take a look at how disease perception, $\tilde{\theta}$, affects the course of the epidemic, especially

the peak of infections, $I_m := \max_t I(t)$, time of peak, $t_m := \arg\max_t I(t)$, final incidence, $f := \lim_{t\to\infty} R(t)$, and duration (when the number of infected is first below the initial value), $d := \inf\{t | I(t) < I(0)\}$.

The figure 1 depicts how the epidemic as a whole is affected by the disease perception in the short term.

These figures suggest that the peak of infections is increasing with disease severity, while the final incidence as well as welfare decreasing are decreasing in severeness of the disease, while at the same time the duration is increasing. Let us then take a look at the long term outcomes.

Here we took a long enough time frame (here $T = 5000$) so that the epidemics with the differing severity finish (in the sense that $I(T) < I(0)$). Final incidence is then simply, $R(T)$.

Figure 2 shows us the peak of infections and the time of their occurring. Figure 3 depicts the final incidence and duration of the epidemic.

The figures confirm what we suspected from the short term depictions: peak of infections, final incidence are monotonically decreasing in severity while the duration is monotonically increasing.

Now, lets see whether monotonicity holds for all parameters values. For this purpose we evaluate the model on a parameter grid of $N \cdot M$ points with $(\beta_n, \gamma_m) = (\beta_l + (\beta_u - \beta_l)\frac{n}{N}, \beta_l + (\beta_u - \beta_l)\frac{m}{M}) \in [\beta_l, \beta_u] \times [\beta_l, \beta_u]$. On each grid point we sampled perceived severity on P points with $\tilde{\theta}_p = \theta_l + (\tilde{\theta}_u - \tilde{\theta}_l)\frac{p}{P}$ and check whether the outcomes, $I_m(\beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}), t_m(\beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}), d(\beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}), f(\beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ are monotonous or convex in $\tilde{\theta}$. Here $(\beta_l, \gamma_l, \tilde{\theta}_l)$ are the lower bounds and $(\beta_u, \gamma_u, \tilde{\theta}_u)$ are the upper bounds, which we take to be $(0.1, 0.1, 0)$ and $(1, 0.9, 100)$ respectively with $N = M = 10$ and $P = 20$

Figure 4 show the monotonicity and convexity regions of the epidemiological parameter region for the various outcomes $\Omega \in \{I_m, t_m, d, f\}$ with the following color coding:

$$M_\Omega(\beta, \gamma) := \begin{cases} \bullet & \text{if } (\Delta_{\tilde{\theta}}\Omega) > 0, \\ \bullet & \text{if } (\Delta_{\tilde{\theta}}\Omega) = 0, \\ \bullet & \text{if } (\Delta_{\tilde{\theta}}\Omega) < 0, \\ \bullet & \text{else} \quad . \end{cases}$$



Figure 1: The epidemic in the short term with $\beta = 0.2$, $\gamma = 0.125$, $b = 1$, $I(0) = 0.0001$



Figure 2: Peak of infections and time of peak for $\beta = 0.2$, $\gamma = 0.125$, $b = 1$, $I(0) = 0.0001$

$$C_\Omega(\beta,\gamma) := \begin{cases} \bullet & \text{if } \ (\Delta^2_{\tilde\theta}\Omega) > 0, \\ \bullet & \text{if } \ (\Delta^2_{\tilde\theta}\Omega) \ = 0, \\ \bullet & \text{if } \ (\Delta^2_{\tilde\theta}\Omega) < 0, \\ \bullet & \text{else } \ . \end{cases}$$

where the inequalities mean that the differences have to be strictly greater than zero for at least one value of $\tilde\theta$. For the numerical evaluation we first checked whether the differences are nearly zero and then checked for the inequalities.

Here we see that the effect of threat perception is unequivocal with respect to peak of infections (constant or monotonically decreasing with increasing threat perception), final incidence (same), while the duration of the pandemic is either linear or increasing with threat perception. In addition the peak of infections are linear or convex in threat perception.



Figure 3: Final incidence and duration for $\beta = 0.2$, $\gamma = 0.125$, $b = 1$, $I(0) = 0.0001$

3.3.2 Welfare Outcomes

For the simulation, we first solved the epidemiological model for given level of perceived disease severity and then integrated the welfare equation with various real disease severities. The real severity ranged here from $\bar{\theta}_l = 0.1$ to $\bar{\theta}_l = 100$ on Q points with $\bar{\theta}_q = \bar{\theta}_l + (\bar{\theta}_u - \bar{\theta}_l)\frac{q}{Q}$. From that we calculated similar to above how final welfare $W_\infty := \lim_{t\to\infty} W(t)$ is affected by varying the perceived threat levels for a given real threat level. Thus $N \cdot M \cdot Q$ points were sampled and the first and second differences in Welfare (as above) were evaluated by varying the perceived threat levels. Table 1 depicts the aggregated results.

	> 0	$= 0$	< 0	other
ΔW_∞	30.3%	0.0%	21.5%	48.2%
$\Delta^2 W_\infty$	21.5%	30.3%	0.0%	48.2%

Table 1: Percentages of the monotonicity and convexity regions in the parameter region for $\beta, \gamma, \bar{\theta}$

We see that the effects of bias on final welfare are ambiguous.



Figure 4: Monotonicity and Convexity results

4 Discussion

Our model confirms that fear can indeed "improve" common epidemiological outcomes (like peak of infections and total recovered), however the effect on social welfare is not that unambiguous. Higher perceived threat levels lead to more cautious behaviors that reduce the effective transmission rate thereby lead an improvement of the purely epidemiological outcomes. However the prolongation of the epidemic means that the efforts to contain the epidemic are also prolonged which themselves can create a burden that gets over time larger than the disease itself.

5 Conclusions

Our main conclusion is that it necessary to take well-being holistically into account and that is is not enough to focus only on epidemiological outcomes. Further, in disease prevention it is necessary to balance the costs of protection with the improvements in health, which requires which in turn requires corresponding data, on perceived and real threat levels, as well as costs; supposing that the controlling agency aims to increase the well-being of the population.

This also points to a further research question, namely, how do public perception and political decision making actually interact and what is the impact on well-being of this interaction; and related to this how *should* public perception be "optimally controlled" (in a mathematical sense) or rather influenced in order to serve well-being.

The last question however raises some fundamental issues which future modeling should be aware of as it restricts the (ethical) applicability of optimal control to public perception.

First, it questionable whether the "state-manufactured consent of the governed" can bestow democratic legitimacy on those who govern. For it sounds absurd to say that a population that is psychologically ruled by the government is actually ruling the government. It rather seems that the more a population is ruled by a government, rather than the other way round, the less it is actually a democracy, because psychological control by the government shifts the objective locus of control from the population to those in power (cf. Thomson/Ip, 2000, Christian/Bajaj, 2022).

Secondly, parts of the population that perceive this shift in the locus of control, will be inclined to reverse this shift, and to regain their sense of control by doing the opposite of what they are mandated, whether the threat is real or not. We have to say, in light of the above, that they are, purely democratically speaking (disregarding other outcomes), not completely unjustified.

Third, a "doom loop" (to borrow a phrase by Laura Dodsworth, Rayner (2021)) can lead to

sub-optimal and overly risky decision making procedures on the individual and societal level.

Fourth, if a government has the power to psychologically influence the population (which the Covid-19 crisis demonstrated that it has), there is a non-negligible chance that this power will be abused if the population is unprotected from it. On a long enough timeline this chance will be realized.

Fifth, closing the minds of the population to other opinions or steering them to specific opinions presupposes that one is in possession of the true opinion. This is however in a strict philosophical sense impossible pertaining to matters empirical. For, as Descartes argued, we cannot distinguish, as seen from an interior perspective, whether we are perceiving a realistic dream or actual reality. Thus, to believe in our sense experience requires already a leap of faith. To believe in the experiences of others requires many more leaps of faith. Philosophically speaking, all empirical science is doubtful; or in other words: empirical science cannot reach absolute certainty on the level of Mathematics.[17]

But more practically speaking, there is always the possibility of error. As we have shown at the beginning of the article, there are factual disagreements between large parts of the population, which proves that large parts of the population can be in error; and there is nothing that prevents the majority or the ruling class to be in error.

The points above seem to make the introduction of protective rights against psychological control by the state very desirable, otherwise the consequences of not introducing them have to be suffered in terms of damages to democratic legitimacy, polarization, and malgovernment (see also (Schippers, 2021, 2022) for other practical implications). The fith point in particular leads us to emphasize the importance of *methodic doubt*, especially in science, as this provides a remedy against individual and social errors ("group think") and, taken constructively, is a powerful stimulant in the search for truth.

Regarding future research, the rational choice and social welfare approach presented here are very flexible and allow to extent the modelling in many directions (possibly somewhere along the lines outlined above) as the vastness of the economic literature building on these concepts shows. Thus, it is possible to add various social dynamics (opinion dynamics, political mechanisms) to the epidemiological modelling. Furthermore, the model predicts some functional relationships between fear and various epidemiological and welfare outcomes. Proper operationalization of the independent and dependent variables in these relationships would enable one to test these

[17] There is one exception which Leibniz noted, namely the empirical fact of the existence of ones consciousness and one might add the existence of the contents of consciousness.

empirically.

We hope to have shown the importance of an holistic approach to epidemiology.

A Proof of the Utilitarian Principle

We now want to proof from the axioms that

$$\sum_i w_i(x) > \sum_i w_i(y) \quad \text{iff } x \text{ is judged to be better than } y$$

and

$$\sum_i w_i(x) = \sum_i w_i(y) \quad \text{iff } x \text{ is judged to be equivalent to } y$$

The proof for that borrows ideas from (d'Aspermont in Arrow et al., 2002).

We will first show the " $\Longrightarrow$ "-part for both statements as this also implies the other direction.

Let $J \in \{I, P\}$ denote the comparative judgment of the observer.

1. The following construction $C : S \times S \mapsto S \times S$ will create another pair of states, u, v so that uJv for given x, y with xJy, i.e.: if C(x,y) = (u,v), and xJy, then uJv, for $J \in \{I, P\}$. Furthermore, if $\sum_i w_i(x) = \sum_i w_i(y)$, then $\sum_i w_i(u) = \sum_i w_i(v)$, i.e. C preserves the comparative judgement of the observer. Finally, the total number of zero-components in both $w(u), w(v)$ is larger than the number of zero-components in $w(x), w(y)$.

1.2. Construction Let xJy. First, rearrange the components of $w(x)$, $w(y)$ in decreasing order resulting in well-being vectors w'_x, w'_y, with permutations π_x, π_y. By (Maximum Domain) we can choose two states x', y' so that $w(x') = w'_x$, and $w(y') = w'_y$.

By (Impartiality), we have xIx' and yIy'. Therefore by the compatability of P and I, the observer makes the same judgment on x', y' as on x, y, i.e. $x'Jy'$.

Now construct a new vector s, so that s_i is equal to the smaller value of $w_i(x'), w_i(y')$. Choose with (Maximum Domain) two new states u, v, so that $w(u) = w(x') - s$ and $w(v) = w(y') - s$.

1.3. Observation By (Non-Egalitarianism/Utilitarianism) we have uJv, as the difference in well-being between u, v is the same as in between x', y', i.e. $w(u) - w(v) = w(x') - w(y')$.

At the same time, the total number of components equal to zero in $w(u), w(v)$ is larger or equal to the number of zero components in $w(x), w(y)$, if there are non-zero components in $w(x), w(y)$.

For, if both $w_i(x'), w(y')$ are different from zero, then either $w_i(u) = w_i(x') - s_i$ will be zero or $w_i(v) = w_i(y') - s_i$, depending on the value of s_i (one zero is added to the total number of zeros). If on the other hand one of $w_i(x'), w_i(y')$ is zero, then $w_i(u)$ will be zero or $w_i(v)$, again depending on the value of s_i (no zero is added or omitted).

2. " $\Longrightarrow$ "

2.1 First to the " $\Longrightarrow$ "-part of the first statement: Let x, y be two states with $\sum_i w_i(x) = \sum_i w_i(y)$. We will show that the observer is indifferent between x, y. For this apply C a number of times, n, to itself until we arrive at two zero vectors u, v, i.e. $C^n(x, y) = (u, v)$ with $w(u) = w(v) = 0$. Note that after the re-arrangement step of C it is impossible that one of the first components is zero and the other is not, otherwise both vectors would not sum up to the same value. By (Eudaimonism), the observer is indifferent between u, v, i.e. $J = I$.

2.2 Now to the " $\Longrightarrow$ "-part of the second statement: Assume that $\sum_i w_i(x) > \sum_i w_i(y)$. Take the difference between the bigger and the smaller sum and divide it by the number of agents,n, yielding $d := \frac{1}{n}(\sum_i w_i(x) - \sum_i w_i(y)) > 0$.
Choose with (Maximum Domain), a new state v with $w_i(v) = w_i(x) - d$. Observe that $\sum_i w_i(v) = \sum_i w_i(y)$. By the preceding paragraph we know that v is indifferent to y, i.e. vIy. But by (Unanimity) v is strictly preferred to y, i.e. vPy, since every component in $w(x)$ is equal or bigger than $w(v)$ by construction. Therefore, by the compatibility of I and P we have xPy.

3. " $\Longleftarrow$ " From the preceding we know that a state is preferred to another if the sum of well-being in one state is bigger than in the second; indifferent, if the sums are equal; and less preferred, if the sum of the first state is smaller than that of the second. That is, the judgement respects the ordering of the sums. This implies the " $\Longleftarrow$ "-part of both statements.

References

WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 3 March 2020, `https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---3-march-2020`, accessed 24. February 2024

Ioannidis, 2020, Infection fatality rate of COVID-19 inferred from seroprevalence data. Bull World Health Organ. 2021 Jan 1;99(1):19-33F. doi: 10.2471/BLT.20.265892. Epub 2020 Oct 14. PMID: 33716331; PMCID: PMC7947934.

Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2020). Coronavirus disease 2019: the harms of exaggerated information and non-evidence-based measures. European Journal of Clinical Investigation, e13222. doi:10.1111/eci.13222

Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2021). Reconciling estimates of global spread and infection fatality rates of COVID-19: An overview of systematic evaluations. European Journal of Clinical Investigation, 51(5). doi:10.1111/eci.13554

Betsch, C., Wieler, L., Bosnjak, M., Ramharter, M., Stollorz, V., Omer, S., Korn, L., Sprengholz, P., Felgendreff, L., Eitze, S., Schmid, P. (2020). Germany COVID-19 Snapshot Monitoring (COSMO Germany): Monitoring knowledge, risk perceptions, preventive behaviours, and public trust in the current coronavirus outbreak in Germany, http://dx.doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.2776

COVID-19 Snapshot Monitoring, Risikowahrnehmung ("Risk Perception"), 2022 https://projekte.uni-erfurt.de/cosmo2020/web/topic/risiko-emotionen-sorgen/10-risikowahrnehmung/, acccessed 24. February 2024

Rothwell J, Witters D, 2021, U.S. Adults' Estimates of COVID-19 Hospitalization Risk, https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/354938/adults-estimates-covid-hospitalization-risk.aspx, accessed 24. February 2024

Geldsetzer P, 2020, Use of Rapid Online Surveys to Assess People's Perceptions During Infectious Disease Outbreaks: A Cross-sectional Survey on COVID-19, J Med Internet Res 2020;22(4):e18790, doi: 10.2196/18790 PMID: 32240094 PMCID: 7124956

Hase, Valerie, and Katherine M. Engelke. 2022. Emotions in Crisis Coverage: How UK News Media Used Fear Appeals to Report on the Coronavirus Crisis. Journalism and Media 3: 633–649. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia3040042

Ogbodo, J. N., Onwe, E. C., Chukwu, J., Nwasum, C. J., Nwakpu, E. S., Nwankwo, S. U., ... & Ogbaeja, N. I. (2020). Communicating health crisis: a content analysis of global media framing of COVID-19. Health promotion perspectives, 10(3), 257.

UKGovernment, The Scientific Pandemic Insights Group on Behaviours. (2020, March 23). 25 Options for increasing adherance to social distancing. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/887467/25-options-for-increasing-adherence-to-social-distancing-measures-22032020.pdf

Interior Ministry of the Federal Republic of Germany, 2020, Das interne Strategiepapier des Innenministeriums zur Corona-Pandemie, https://www.abgeordnetenwatch.de/recherchen/informationsfreiheit/das-interne-strategiepapier-des-innenministeriums-zur-corona-pandemie, accessed 24. February 2024

Betsch, C., Wieler, L. H., & Habersaat, K. (2020). Monitoring behavioural insights related to COVID-19. The Lancet, 395(10232), 1255-1256.

The Telegraph, 2023, 'Project Fear' authors discussed when to 'deploy' new Covid variant, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/03/04/project-fear-covid-variant-lockdown-matt-hancock-whatsapp/

Rayner, 2021, Use of fear to control behaviour in Covid crisis was 'totalitarian', admit scientists, The Telegraph.

Rayner, 2021, State of fear: how ministers 'used covert tactics' to keep scared public at home, The Telegraph.

rbb, 2022, Chez Krömer - Zu Gast: Ex-Bild-Chefredakteur Julian Reichelt (S07/E03), at around minute 12:00 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lfLQX_WNtQU, accessed 24th February 2024

von Matt R, 2022, Die «unjournalistische» Aussage von Ringier-CEO Marc Walder, https://www.srf.ch/news/schweiz/rolle-der-medien-in-krisen-die-unjournalistische-aussage-von-ringier-ceo-marc-walder

Bavel, J. J. V., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., ... & Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. Nature human behaviour, 4(5), 460-471.

Schippers, M. C. (2020). For the greater good? The devastating ripple effects of the Covid-19 crisis. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 2626.

Joffe, A. R. (2021). COVID-19: rethinking the lockdown groupthink. Frontiers in public health, 98.

Kermack, McKendrick: A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. Proc. Roy. Soc. A, Band 115, 1927, S. 700–721.

Martcheva, M. (2015). An introduction to mathematical epidemiology (Vol. 61, pp. 9-31). New York: Springer.

Mandal, M., Jana, S., Nandi, S. K., & Kar, T. K. (2020). Modelling and control of a fractional-order epidemic model with fear effect. Energy, Ecology and Environment, 5(6), 421-432.

Juga, M. L., Nyabadza, F., & Chirove, F. (2021). An Ebola virus disease model with fear and environmental transmission dynamics. Infectious Disease Modelling, 6, 545.

Mpeshe, S. C., & Nyerere, N. (2021). Modeling the dynamics of coronavirus disease pandemic coupled with fear epidemics. Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine, 2021.

Epstein, J. M., Hatna, E., & Crodelle, J. (2021). Triple contagion: a two-fears epidemic model. Journal of the Royal Society Interface, 18(181), 20210186.

Jain, K., Bhatnagar, V., Prasad, S., & Kaur, S. (2022). Coupling fear and contagion for modeling epidemic dynamics. IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering, 10(1), 20-34.

Retzlaff, C. O., Burbach, L., Kojan, L., Halbach, P., Nakayama, J., Ziefle, M., & Calero Valdez, A. (2022). Fear, behaviour, and the COVID-19 pandemic: a city-scale agent-based model using socio-demographic and spatial map data. Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation, 25(1).

Reicher S, Drury J, Michie S, West R. The UK government's attempt to frighten people into covid protective behaviours was at odds with its scientific advice BMJ 2023; 380 :p652 doi:10.1136/bmj.p652

Tuckwell, H. C., & Williams, R. J. (2007). Some properties of a simple stochastic epidemic model of SIR type. Mathematical biosciences, 208(1), 76-97.

von Neumann, Morgenstern, 1947, Theory of Games and Economic Behavior.

Marschak, J. (1950). Rational Behavior, Uncertain Prospects, and Measurable Utility. Econometrica, 18(2), 111. doi:10.2307/1907264

Harsanyi, J. C. (1955). Cardinal welfare, individualistic ethics, and interpersonal comparisons of utility. Journal of political economy, 63(4), 309-321.

Arrow, et al., 2002, Handbook of Social Choice and Welfare; d'Aspermont, Chapter 10.

Van den Broucke, S. (2020). Why health promotion matters to the COVID-19 pandemic, and vice versa. Health promotion international, 35(2), 181-186. https:doi.org10.1093heaprodaaa042

Stolow, J. A., Moses, L. M., Lederer, A. M., & Carter, R. (2020). How fear appeal approaches in COVID-19 health communication may be harming the global community. Health Education & Behavior, 47(4), 531-535.

Sugden, Robert, and Albert Weale. (1979) "A contractual reformulation of certain aspects of welfare economics." Economica 46.182 : 111-123. https://doi.org/10.2307/2553184

Sen, Amartya (1970). Collective Choice and Social Welfare, Holden-Day, Inc.

Kahneman, Daniel, Peter P. Wakker, and Rakesh Sarin. (1997). "Back to Bentham? Explorations of experienced utility." The quarterly journal of economics 112.2: 375-406. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555235

Ng, Yew-Kwang. 2000. Efficiency, equality and public policy: With a case for higher public spending. Springer, . https://doi.org/10.1057/9780333992777

Thomson, S., & Ip, E. C. (2020). COVID-19 emergency measures and the impending authoritarian pandemic. Journal of Law and the Biosciences, 7(1), lsaa064.

Schippers, M. C., & Rus, D. C. (2021). Optimizing decision-making processes in times of COVID-19: using reflexivity to counteract information-processing failures. Frontiers in psychology, 12, 650525.

Schippers, M. C., Ioannidis, J., & Joffe, A. R. (2022). Aggressive measures, rising inequalities, and mass formation during the COVID-19 crisis: An overview and proposed way forward. Frontiers in public health, 2715.

Christiano, Tom and Sameer Bajaj, "Democracy", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/democracy/>.