

1 **Appendix:**

2 We start from the classic SIR epidemic model, $\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta SI$, $\frac{dI}{dt} = \beta SI - \gamma I$, $\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma I$ [eq.
3 (A.1)] with the initial values $S(0) = S_0 \geq 0$, $I(0) = I_0 \geq 0$, and $R(0) = R_0 \geq 0$.

4 Table A.1: Description of Variables and Parameters

Parameters	Description
S	susceptible population
I	infected population
R	recovered population
β	rate at which susceptible become infected (day ⁻¹)
γ	recovery rate (day ⁻¹)

5

6 Table (A.1) displays the definitions of variables and parameters for the equations.

7 Dividing equation (A.1) by the constant total population N yields $\frac{ds}{dt} = -\beta si$,

8 $s(0) = s_0 \geq 0$, $\frac{di}{dt} = \beta si - \gamma i$, $i(0) = i_0 \geq 0$ [eq. (A.2)], with $r(t) = 1 - s(t) - i(t)$, where

9 $s(t)$, $i(t)$, $r(t)$ are the fractions in the classes. The triangle T in the si phase plane given by

10 $T = \{(s, i) | s \geq 0, i \geq 0, s + i \leq 1\}$ [eq. A.3] is positively invariant and unique solutions exist

11 in T for all positive time. Here the contact number $\sigma = \beta/\gamma$ is the contact rate β per unit

12 time multiplied by the average infectious period $1/\gamma$, so it has the proper interpretation as

13 the average number of adequate contacts of a typical infective during the infectious

14 period. Here the replacement number at time zero is $\sigma s(0)$, which is the product of the

15 contact number σ and the initial susceptible fraction $s(0)$. If we let $R_0 = \sigma s(0)$

16 [eq.(A.4)], we shall show that R_0 is actually the basic reproductive number of this S-I-R

17 system.




Figure 1: Phase portrait of S-I-R model

18

19 **Theorem 1.** Let $(s(t), i(t))$ be a solution of (A.2) in T . If $R_0 \leq 1$, then $i(t)$ decreases to zero

20 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. If $R_0 \geq 1$, then $i(t)$ first increases up to a maximum value

21 $i_{\max} = i_0 + s_0 - \frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{[\ln(\sigma s_0)]}{\sigma}$ and then decreases to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The susceptible

22 fraction $s(t)$ is a decreasing function and the limiting value s_∞ is the unique root in

23 $(0, \frac{1}{\sigma})$ of the equation $i_0 + s_0 - s_\infty + \frac{\ln\left(\frac{s_\infty}{s_0}\right)}{\sigma} = 0$ [eq. (A.5)].




Figure 2: Time in days

24

25 Typical paths in T are shown in Figure (A.1), and solutions as a function of time are

26 shown in Figure (A.2). The susceptible fraction $s(t)$ always decreases, but the final

27 susceptible fraction s_∞ is positive. The epidemic dies out because, when the susceptible

28 fraction $s(t)$ goes below $\frac{1}{\sigma}$, the replacement number $\sigma s(t)$ goes below 1. The results in
 29 the theorem are epidemiologically reasonable, since the infectives decrease and there is
 30 no epidemic, if enough people are already immune so that a typical infective initially
 31 replaces itself with no more than one new infective ($R_0 \leq 1$). But if a typical infective
 32 initially replaces itself with more than one new infective ($R_0 \geq 1$), then infectives initially
 33 increase so that an epidemic occurs.

34 To prove the theorem, observe that the solution paths

35 $i(t) + s(t) - \frac{\ln(s(t))}{\sigma} = i_0 + s_0 - \frac{\ln(s_0)}{\sigma}$ in Figure (A.1) are found from the quotient

36 differential equation $\frac{di}{ds} = -1 + 1/(\sigma s)$. The equilibrium points along the s axis are

37 neutrally stable for $s < \frac{1}{\sigma}$.

38 Use the r subscript to denote the real process, and an m subscript to denote the
 39 “observed” or “measured” process. We can safely assume that the recovery rate is the
 40 same in both the observed and real processes. A healthy person is any one who is not
 41 infected with our particular disease of concern, but who could still have symptoms of
 42 illness. Call α the rate at which healthy people get tested for illness, call δ the rate at
 43 which sick people get tested for illness, and call λ the rate at which recovered people get
 44 tested for illness (we could eventually want λ to be unequal from α if memory of recent
 45 symptoms becomes a factor in testing). We do not always expect the same rate of testing
 46 for truly healthy people as for sick people. Call the false positive rate of the test ε_1 and
 47 the false negative rate of the test ε_2 .

48 If this is the case, then (assuming a normal uniform mixing process) we get:

49 $S_m = S_a(1 - \alpha) + S_a\alpha(1 - \varepsilon_1) + I_a(1 - \delta) + I_a\delta\varepsilon_2 + R_a(1 - \lambda) + R_a\lambda(1 - \varepsilon_1)$ [eq. (A.6)]

50 $I_m = S_a\alpha\varepsilon_1 + I_a\delta(1 - \varepsilon_2) + R_a\lambda\varepsilon_1$ [eq. (A.7)] where S_a, I_a, R_a are solutions of system

51 (A.1). So $S_m + I_m = N$ is the constant total population. Dividing equation (A.7) by the N

52 yields $i_m = s_a(\alpha\varepsilon_1 - \lambda\varepsilon_1) + i_a(\delta - \delta\varepsilon_2 - \lambda\varepsilon_1) + \lambda\varepsilon_1$ [eq. (A.8)].

53 If $\alpha = \delta = \lambda = 1$, and $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$, and $R_a = 0$, then $i_m = i_a$ and $s_m = s_a$. That is, when

54 there are no errors and the surveillance is perfect, then the measured quantities equal to

55 the corresponding real quantities.

56

57 To include change in testing rates for the different disease types over time, depending on

58 the observed rates of infection, we assume that $\alpha = \phi_\alpha(i_m)$, $\delta = \phi_\delta(i_m)$, and $\lambda = \phi_\lambda(i_m)$

59 for known ϕ 's (different functions of i_m to reflect our different possible scenarios of

60 human response to observed levels of infection in the population over time).

61

62 We assume that $\alpha = \frac{1}{j(i_m)}\delta = \lambda$ [eq. (A.9)], where $j(i_m)$ as a function of i_m is itself

63 sensitive to the specificity of the signs and symptoms related to diagnosis. Therefore, if

64 $\alpha = \phi(i_m)$ with $0 < \phi(i_m) \leq 1$ for all $i_m \in [0,1]$, equation (A.8) becomes

65 $i_m = \phi(i_m)[(j(i_m) - j(i_m)\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1)i_a + \varepsilon_1]$ [eq. (A.10)].

66 Let $A_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{(1 - \varepsilon_2)j(i_m)}$ [eq. (A.11)].

67 A_ε is the effective ratio of the errors in the tests. Furthermore, $A_\varepsilon = 1$ is equivalent to


68 $j(i_m) - j(i_m)\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1 = 0$. If $A_\varepsilon = 1$, then i_m is a solution of $i_m = \phi(i_m)$ which is

69 independent of the real disease epidemic value i_a . That is, $A_\varepsilon = 1$ implies the
 70 surveillance process cannot accurately predict the actual disease pattern. If $A_\varepsilon \neq 1$, solve

71 i_a from equation (A.10) to obtain $i_a = \frac{i_m - \phi(i_m)\varepsilon_1}{\phi(i_m)[j(i_m) - j(i_m)\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1]}$ [eq. (A.12)].

72 From equation (A.12), using the measured infected population and estimates of the model
 73 parameters we can compute the real disease epidemic process. Next, we use equation
 74 (A.10) to study how changes in the measured infected populations impact the real disease
 75 epidemic processes.

76 Figure (A.3) provides us a glance of two hypothetical ϕ functions that we will use to
 77 study equation (A.10), one constant and one varying with the perceived level of infection
 78 in the population.



79
 80 Figure A.3. The two hypothetical ϕ functions used for demonstration; defined in Table
 81 A.2.

82 Table A.2: hypothetical ϕ functions

Hypothetical Testing Scenario	$\phi(i_m)$	Parameters
1	c	$0 \leq c \leq 1$

2	$k(e^{a-bi_m} + ci_m)$	$0 < k < 1$
---	------------------------	-------------

83

84 Differentiating equation (A.10) with respect to t , we get

85
$$\frac{di_m}{dt} = \frac{(1-\varepsilon_2)(1-A_\varepsilon)j(i_m)(\phi(i_m))^2}{\phi(i_m) - i_m\phi'(i_m) - (\phi(i_m))^2 j(i_m)(1-\varepsilon_2)i_a} \frac{di_a}{dt} \text{ [eq. (A.13)].}$$

86 Let $j(i_m) = \zeta$ [eq. (A.14)], where ζ is a constant and $0 < \zeta \leq 1$.

87 Then equation (A.13) becomes
$$\frac{di_m}{dt} = \frac{(\phi(i_m))^2(1-\varepsilon_2)(1-A_\varepsilon)\zeta}{\phi(i_m) - i_m\phi'(i_m)} \frac{di_a}{dt} \text{ [eq. (A.15)].}$$

88 At the equilibrium points $\frac{di_m}{dt} = 0$. Therefore $\frac{ds_m}{dt} = 0$ since $s_m = 1 - i_m$.

89 Assume $\phi(i_m) - i_m\phi'(i_m) \neq 0$ for all $i_m \in [0,1]$. Then $\phi^2(i_m) = 0$ or

90
$$(1-\varepsilon_2)(1-A_\varepsilon)\zeta \frac{di_a}{dt} = 0 \text{ [eq. (A.16)].}$$

91 Since $0 < \zeta$, $\varepsilon_2 < 1$, and $\phi(i_m) > 0$ for $i_m > 0$, use equation (A.2) and equation (A.16) to

92 obtain $(1-A_\varepsilon)(\beta s_a - \gamma)i_a = 0$ [eq. (A.17)].

93 If $A_\varepsilon = 1$, by equation (A.10) $i_m = \phi(i_m)\varepsilon_1$ [eq. (A.18)]. That is, independent of the real

94 disease epidemics values, i_m is a solution of equation (A.18). If $A_\varepsilon \neq 1$, since at the

95 beginning of the disease epidemics $r_a = 0$ and $s_a + i_a = 1$, equation (A.17) gives

96
$$\begin{cases} (i). & \hat{s}_a(0) = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} = \frac{1}{\sigma}, \quad \hat{i}_a(0) = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta} = 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma}; \\ (ii). & \hat{s}_a(0) = 1, \quad \hat{i}_a(0) = 0 \end{cases} \text{ [eq. (A.19)].}$$

97 Substitute (i) and (ii) of equations (A.19) into equation (A.10) we obtain

98
$$\frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = (1-\varepsilon_2)(1-A_\varepsilon)\zeta\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma}\right) + \varepsilon_1, \quad s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) \text{ [eq. (A.20)], and } \frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = \varepsilon_1,$$

99
$$s_m(0) = 1 - \phi(i_m(0))\varepsilon_1 \text{ [eq. (A.21)].}$$

100 Suppose that (\hat{i}_m, \hat{s}_m) are solutions of equations (A.20) and (A.21), then equation (A.10)

101 can be rewritten as

$$102 \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (i). (\hat{s}_m(0), \hat{i}_m(0)) \in \left\{ (s_m(0), i_m(0)) \mid \frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = (1 - \varepsilon_2)(1 - A_\varepsilon)\zeta\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma}\right) + \varepsilon_1, s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) \right\} \\ (ii). (\hat{s}_m(0), \hat{i}_m(0)) \in \left\{ (s_m(0), i_m(0)) \mid \frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = \varepsilon_1, s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) \right\} \end{array} \right.$$

103 [eq. (A.22)], where $0 \leq \hat{i}_m(0) \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \hat{s}_m(0) \leq 1$.

104 Equation (A.22) shows all the equilibrium points of our measured system with the

105 assumption that $\phi(i_m) - i_m\phi'(i_m) \neq 0$.

106 **Constant Ratio of Diagnosis Test Rates**

107 In this section, we make a simplifying assumption that $j(i_m) = \zeta$, a positive constant.

108 That is, we assume that the rate at which healthy people get tested is directly proportional

109 to the rate at which sick people get tested. With this assumption, let

$$110 \quad \bar{A}_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} A_\varepsilon, & \text{if } \phi(i_m) - i_m\phi'(i_m) > 0; \\ \frac{1}{A_\varepsilon}, & \text{if } \phi(i_m) - i_m\phi'(i_m) < 0 \end{cases} \text{ [eq. (A.24)].}$$

111 We will use \bar{A}_ε , a threshold parameter, to analyze our model with $j(i_m)$ constant. We


112 consider two case studies, hypothetical testing scenario 1 and hypothetical testing

113 scenario 2.

114 **Case Study 1: Hypothetical Testing Scenario 1**

115 Let $\phi(i_m) = c$, where $0 < c \leq 1$. In this case study of surveillance under constant ϕ and j

$$116 \quad , \bar{A}_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{(1 - \varepsilon_2)\zeta}$$



117 Figure 4: $\phi(i_m) = c$, where c is a constant and $0 < c \leq 1$.

118 If $A_\varepsilon = 1$, then as shown in equation (A.18), $i_m(t) = c\varepsilon_1$ for all $t > 0$, which is
 119 independent of the real disease epidemics.

120 If $A_\varepsilon \neq 0$, then equation (A.22) becomes

$$121 \begin{cases} (i). \hat{i}_m(0) = \frac{c(\varepsilon_1 - \zeta + \zeta\varepsilon_2 + \zeta\sigma - \zeta\varepsilon_2\sigma)}{\sigma}, \hat{s}_m(0) = \frac{\sigma - c(\varepsilon_1 - \zeta + \zeta\varepsilon_2 + \zeta\sigma - \zeta\varepsilon_2\sigma)}{\sigma} \\ (ii). \hat{i}_m(0) = c\varepsilon_1, \hat{s}_m(0) = 1 - c\varepsilon_1 \end{cases} \text{ [eq.}$$

122 (A.25)] where $\hat{i}_m(0) = \frac{c(\varepsilon_1 - \zeta + \zeta\varepsilon_2 + \zeta\sigma - \zeta\varepsilon_2\sigma)}{\sigma} \in [0,1]$ [eq. (A.26)].

123 Therefore $0 \leq \hat{s}_m(0) = \frac{\sigma - c(\varepsilon_1 - \zeta + \zeta\varepsilon_2 + \zeta\sigma - \zeta\varepsilon_2\sigma)}{\sigma} \leq 1$ [eq. (A.27)].

124 Let $\sigma_m = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - c(\varepsilon_1 - \zeta + \zeta\varepsilon_2 + \zeta\sigma - \zeta\varepsilon_2\sigma)}$ [eq. (A.28)], then $\hat{s}_m(0)\sigma_m = 1$ [eq. (A.29)].

125 In this particular case, equation (A.15) reduces to $\frac{di_m}{dt} = c(1 - \varepsilon_2)(1 - \bar{A}_\varepsilon)\zeta \frac{di_a}{dt}$ [eq.

126 (A.30)].

127 When $s_m(0) > \frac{1}{\sigma_m}$ and $\phi(i_m) = c$, we obtain $\begin{cases} s_a(0) > 1/\sigma, \text{ if } \bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1; \\ s_a(0) < 1/\sigma, \text{ if } \bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1. \end{cases}$ [eq. (A.31)].

128 Therefore, $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ and $s_m(0) < \frac{1}{\sigma_m}$ implies $\left. \frac{di_a}{dt} \right|_{t=0} < 0$. Similarly, $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ and $s_m(0) > \frac{1}{\sigma_m}$

129 implies $\left. \frac{di_a}{dt} \right|_{t=0} > 0$. We summarize this in the following result.

130 **Theorem 2.** Let $(s_a(t), i_a(t))$ be a solution of a system (A.2) where $\phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m) \neq 0$

131 and $\phi(i_m) > 0$ whenever $i_m > 0$. Then

132 1. If $s_m(0)\sigma_m < 1$ and $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, then $\left. \frac{di_a}{dt} \right|_{t=0} < 0$ and i_a decreases;

133 2. If $s_m(0)\sigma_m < 1$ and $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$, then $\left. \frac{di_a}{dt} \right|_{t=0} > 0$ and i_a increases;

134 3. If $s_m(0)\sigma_m > 1$ and $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, then $\left. \frac{di_a}{dt} \right|_{t=0} > 0$ and i_a increases;

135 4. If $s_m(0)\sigma_m > 1$ and $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$, then $\left. \frac{di_a}{dt} \right|_{t=0} < 0$ and i_a decreases.

136 In Theorem 2, we state how the measured quantities $s_m(0)\sigma_m$ and \bar{A}_ε inform us of the

137 increasing and decreasing nature of the real (unknown) disease epidemics process.

138 To study the relationship between the rates of change of both the measured and real

139 infected populations, we recall that $\left. \frac{di_a}{dt} \right|_{t=0} < 0$ if $s_m(0)\sigma_m < 1$ and $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ (Theorem 2).

140 Since $\frac{di_m}{dt} = \frac{(\phi(i_m))^2 \zeta (1 - \bar{A}_\varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon_2)}{\phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m)} \frac{di_r}{dt}$ and $\phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m) > 0$, we have $\frac{di_m}{dt} < 0$.

141 Similarly, if $s_m(0)\sigma_m > 1$ and $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, we have $\frac{di_a}{dt} > 0$ and $\frac{di_m}{dt} > 0$. That is, when

142 $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ is positive (resp. negative), $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ is positive (resp. negative). Similarly,

143 when $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ is negative (resp. positive), $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ is positive (resp. negative).

144 We summarize this in the following result.

145 **Corollary 3.** *Let $(s_a(t), i_a(t))$ be a solution of a system (A.2) where $i_m > 0$ and*

146 $\phi(i_m) - i_m\phi'(i_m) \neq 0$. *If $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, then $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ have the same sign. However, if*

147 $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$, *then $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ have opposite signs.*

148

149 If $\sigma_{s_a}(0) < 1$, then $\frac{di_a}{dt} < 0$ and $i_a(t)$ decreases (Theorem 1). In addition, if $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, then

150 both $i_m(t)$ and $i_a(t)$ decrease. However, if $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$, then $i_m(t)$ increases while $i_a(t)$

151 decreases. Similarly, if $\sigma_{s_a}(0) > 1$, then $\frac{di_a}{dt} > 0$ and $i_a(t)$ increases. In addition, if

152 $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, then $i_m(t)$ decreases while $i_a(t)$ increases. However, if $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$, then both $i_m(t)$

153 and $i_a(t)$ increase.

154


155 To illustrate Theorem 2 and Corollary 3, we let $\beta = 3$, $\gamma = 1$, $s_a(0) = 0.9$, and $i_a(0) = 0.1$

156 in equation (A.1). With our choice of parameters, $\sigma_{s_a}(0) > 1$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt} > 0$. Suppose

157 $\phi(i_m) = c = 0.65$, Figure A.4 shows the graph of this particular ϕ function.

158

159 First, we assume there are no test errors. That is, $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$. Figure A.5 shows the
160 behaviors of i_m under different value of ζ . With only the effect of constant partial
161 response and no errors in diagnostic tests, Figure A.5 shows that the surveillance process
162 accurately predicts the disease pattern. However, in this case the surveillance process
163 either overestimates or underestimates the real disease epidemics.



164


165 Figure A.5: Real population of infectives versus three
166 different measured values of the infective population in
167 Hypothetical Scenario 1, where $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$.

168

169 In Figure A.6, we illustrate that for $t < t_c$, $\frac{di_a}{dt} > 0$. That is, the proportion of real infected
170 class is increasing whenever $t < t_c$. As predicted by Corollary 3, Figure A.6 shows that
171 for $t < t_c$, the fraction of observed infected class increases whenever $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ (blue graph)
172 and it decreases whenever $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$ (dashed graph). That is, when $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$ the surveillance
173 model reports a decrease in the number of infected where the actual number is increasing.

174 Similarly, for $t > t_c$, $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ implies both i_a and i_m are decreasing, while $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$ implies
 175 i_m is increasing where i_a is decreasing.

176



177

178 Figure A.6: Example of Response to Hypothetical

179 Scenario 1-type Disease

180

181 To illustrate Theorem 2 in this case, we let $\zeta = 1$, $\varepsilon_1 = 0.2$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 0.1$ (blue curve in

182 Figure A.6). Then $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$. By equation (A.28), $\sigma_m = \frac{\beta}{\beta - c[\gamma\varepsilon_1 + \zeta(\beta - \gamma)(1 - \varepsilon_2)]} = 1.765$,

183 and $s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) = 1 - c[(\zeta - \varepsilon_1 - \zeta\varepsilon_2)i_a(0) + \varepsilon_1] = 0.87$. Hence, $s_m(0)\sigma_m = 1.535 > 1$

184 [eq. (A.32)].

185 With our choice of parameters, $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, and the surveillance infected population is

186 increasing (blue curve). As predicted by Theorem 2, Figure A.6 shows that the real

187 infected population (black curve in Figure A.6) is increasing at time $t = 0$.

188

189 To illustrate Theorem 2 with $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$, we let $\varepsilon_1 = 0.6$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 0.7$, where all other

190 parameters remain fixed at their current values. In this case,

191
$$\sigma_m = \frac{\beta}{\beta - \phi(i_m(0))[\gamma\varepsilon_1 + \zeta(\beta - \gamma)(1 - \varepsilon_2)]} = 1.363 \text{ and}$$

192
$$s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) = 1 - c[(\zeta - \varepsilon_1 - \zeta\varepsilon_2)i_a(0) + \varepsilon_1] = 0.6295. \text{ Then } s_m(0)\sigma_m = 0.85854 < 1$$

193 [eq. (A.33)].

194

195 With our choice of parameters $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$ and the surveillance infected population is

196 decreasing (dashed curve). As predicted by Theorem 2, the real infected population is

197 increasing at time $t = 0$.

198

199 Figures A.5 and A.6 show that, when j is constant, then errors in hypothetical scenario 1

200 tests lead to accurate prediction of diseases when $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, while the pattern of predictions

201 are not accurate when $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$.

202

203 **Case Study 2: Hypothetical Scenario 2**

204




Figure 7: $\phi(i_m) = k(e^{-bi_m} + ci_m)$ where $0 < k < 1$.

205

206

207 To study this type of behavioral response curve, we let $\phi(i_m) = k(e^{a-bi_m} + ci_m)$, $0 < k < 1$

208 and $0 < c < b$ (see Figure A.7). The minimum value of $\phi_{\min} = c(k + \ln b/c)/b$ when

209 $i_m = i_{\min} = \frac{1}{b} \ln \frac{b}{c}$. Equation A.10 becomes $i_m = k(e^{-bi_m} + ci_m)((1 - \varepsilon_2)(1 - A_\varepsilon)\zeta i_a + \varepsilon_1)$

210 [eq. (A.34)].

211 Let $\hat{i}_m(0)$ be a solution of $\frac{i_m}{\phi(i_m)} = (1 - \varepsilon_2)(1 - A_\varepsilon)\zeta(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma}) + \varepsilon_1$ [eq. (A.35)]. Then define


212 $\sigma_m = \frac{1}{1 - \hat{i}_m(0)}$ [eq. (A.36)], and similarly as in the previous case,

213 $\bar{A}_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} A_\varepsilon, & \text{if } \phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m) > 0; \\ \frac{1}{A_\varepsilon}, & \text{if } \phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m) < 0 \end{cases}$ [eq. (A.37)].

214 Then both Theorem 2 and Corollary 3 hold for this particular case.

215 For $i_m > 0$ and $b > 0$, we have $\phi(i_m) - i_m \phi'(i_m) = ke^{-bi_m}(1 + bi_m) > 0$ [eq. (A.38)].

216 This suggests that $\bar{A}_\varepsilon = A_\varepsilon$ with our choice of ϕ (see Figure a.7).



217

218 Figure A.8: Real population of infectives versus three

219 different measured values of the infective population

220 in a hypothetical scenario 2-type disease

221

222 In both Figures A.8 and A.9 we let $k = 0.5$, $b = 2$ and $c = 1.5$. As in the scenario 1
 223 study, with only the effects of constant partial response where $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$, we illustrate in
 224 Figure A.8 that depending on the values of ζ the surveillance process either
 225 underestimates or overestimates the real infective population during an epidemic event
 226 while correctly predicting the increasing and decreasing nature of the real disease
 227 process. To illustrate this with specific examples, we let $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$ in equation (A.10)
 228 and obtain $i_m = \phi(i_m)\zeta i_a$ [eq. (A.39)]. Thus, if $\phi(i_m)\zeta > 1$ for all i_m , the measured
 229 population of infectives overestimates the real value of population of infectives for all
 230 $t > 0$ (purple curve in Figure A.8). Conversely, if $\phi(i_m)\zeta < 1$ for all i_m , the measured
 231 population of infectives underestimates the real process for all $t > 0$ (blue curve in Figure
 232 A.8). In the case that the value of $\phi(i_m)\zeta$ varies from below 1 to above 1, the
 233 surveillance underestimates the real infected population at first and overestimates it later
 234 on (red curve in Figure A.8).
 235
 236 Figure A.9 shows the cases when $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq 1$, and $0 < \varepsilon_2 \leq 1$. As in the case of scenario 1,
 237 for $t < t_c$, $\frac{di_a}{dt} > 0$. As predicted by Corollary 3, Figure 9 shows that for $t < t_c$, the
 238 fraction of observed infected class increases whenever $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ (blue graph) and it
 239 decreases whenever $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$ (dashed graph). When $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$, the surveillance results are not
 240 reliable. That is, our detecting patterns for both scenario 1- and scenario 2-type diseases
 241 are similar.

242 Furthermore, Figure A.9 shows $i_a(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 10$ whereas $i_m(t) > 0$. That is, the
 243 surveillance system can wrongly report positive numbers of infected individuals whereas
 244 none existed.

245 To illustrate how the measured disease process can inform us of the real (unknown)
 246 disease process, we let $\zeta = 1$, $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1$, and $\varepsilon_2 = 0.1$ in Equation (A.34) (blue curve in
 247 Figure A.9). With these choice of parameters, $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$. By equation (A.28),

248
$$\sigma_m = \frac{1}{1 - \hat{i}_m(0)} = 1.46802, \text{ and}$$

249
$$s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) = 1 - \phi(i_m(0))[(\zeta - \varepsilon_1 - \zeta\varepsilon_2)i_a(0) + \varepsilon_1] = 0.912635.$$

250 Hence $s_m(0)\sigma_m = 1.33976 > 1$ [eq.(A.40)]. With our choice of parameters, $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$ and the
 251 surveillance infected population is increasing (blue curve). As predicted by Theorem 2,
 252 Figure A.9 shows that the real infected population (black curve in Figure A.9) is
 253 increasing at time $t = 0$.

254 Next, we let $\varepsilon_1 = 0.7$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 0.6$ where all other parameters remain fixed at their

255 current values. In this case $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$, $\sigma_m = \frac{1}{1 - \hat{i}_m(0)} = 1.32456$, and

256
$$s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) = 1 - \phi(i_m(0))[(\zeta - \varepsilon_1 - \zeta\varepsilon_2)i_a(0) + \varepsilon_1] = 0.659323.$$
 Then

257
$$s_m(0)\sigma_m = 0.873314 < 1$$
 [eq. (A.41)], and the surveillance infected population is

258 decreasing (dashed curve). As predicted by Theorem 2, the real infected population is
 259 increasing at time $t = 0$.

260 In both Figures A.6 (Scenario 1) and A.9 (Scenario 2) the surveillance process under
 261 constant partial respond and constant ratio of diagnosis test rates correctly predicts the

262 increasing or decreasing nature of the real disease when $\bar{A}_\varepsilon < 1$. However, the predictions
 263 are not reliable when $\bar{A}_\varepsilon > 1$.

264

265 **Non-Constant Ratio of Diagnosis Test Rates**

266 Our model is set up to look at when human behavior causes an observed process to not
 267 follow a real process in time. To address the full scope of possibilities for these processes
 268 to be disconnected, we now assume that $j(i_m)$ is non-constant.

269 For simplicity, we assume the non-constant form

270 $j(i_m) = \frac{pi_m}{1+qi_m}$ where $p > 0$ and $q > 0$ [eq. (A.42)]. Then equations (A.10) and (A.13)

271 become $i_m = \phi(i_m) \left(\varepsilon_1 - \frac{i_a(\varepsilon_1 + i_m(q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)))}{1 + i_m q} \right)$ [eq. (A.43)], and

272 $\frac{di_m}{dt} = \frac{(qi_m + 1)((1 - \varepsilon_2)p - q\varepsilon_1)i_m - \varepsilon_1)(\phi(i_m))^2}{(1 + qi_m)^2 \phi(i_m) - p(1 - \varepsilon_2)i_a(\phi(i_m))^2 - i_m(1 + qi_m)^2 \phi'(i_m)} \frac{di_a}{dt}$ [eq.(A.44)].

273 At the equilibrium points, $\frac{di_m}{dt} = 0$.

274 Assume $(1 + qi_m)^2 \phi(i_m) - p(1 - \varepsilon_2)i_a(\phi(i_m))^2 - i_m(1 + qi_m)^2 \phi'(i_m) \neq 0$. Since $i_m \geq 0$ and
 275 $q > 0$ imply $qi_m + 1 > 0$, we have $[(1 - \varepsilon_2)p - b\varepsilon_1]i_m - \varepsilon_1](\beta s_a - \gamma)i_a = 0$ [eq. (A.45)] at
 276 the equilibrium points. At the beginning of the epidemic $r_a = 0$ and $s_a + i_a = 1$.

277 Consequently, equation (A.45) gives

$$\begin{cases}
(i). & \hat{s}_a(0) = \gamma/\beta = 1/\sigma, & \hat{i}_a(0) = 1 - \gamma/\beta = 1 - 1/\sigma; \\
(ii). & \hat{s}_a(0) = 1, & \hat{i}_a(0) = 0; \\
(iii). & \hat{s}_m(0) = 1 - \varepsilon_1/(1 - \varepsilon_2)a - b\varepsilon_1, \hat{i}_m(0) = \varepsilon_1/(1 - \varepsilon_2)a - b\varepsilon_1 \text{ if } (1 - \varepsilon_2)a - b\varepsilon_1 \neq 0
\end{cases} \quad [\text{eq.}$$

279 (A.46)].

280 Substitute (i) and (ii) of equations (A.46) into equation (A.10) we obtain

$$281 \quad \frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = \left[\frac{pi_m(0)}{1 + qi_m(0)}(1 - \varepsilon_2) - \varepsilon_1 \right] \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma} \right) + \varepsilon_1, s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) \quad [\text{eq. (A.47)}] \text{ and}$$

$$282 \quad \frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = \varepsilon_1, s_m(0) = 1 - \phi(i_m(0))\varepsilon_1 \quad [\text{eq. (A.48)}].$$

283

284 Suppose that (\hat{i}_m, \hat{s}_m) are solutions of equations (A.47) and (A.48), then equation (A.46)

285 can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases}
(i). & (\hat{s}_m(0), \hat{i}_m(0)) \in \left\{ (s_m(0), i_m(0)) \left| \frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = \left[\frac{pi_m(0)}{1 + qi_m(0)}(1 - \varepsilon_2) - \varepsilon_1 \right] \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma} \right) + \varepsilon_1, s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) \right\}, \\
(ii). & (\hat{s}_m(0), \hat{i}_m(0)) \in \left\{ (s_m(0), i_m(0)) \left| \frac{i_m(0)}{\phi(i_m(0))} = \varepsilon_1, s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0) \right. \right\} \\
(iii). & \hat{s}_m(0) = 1 - \varepsilon_1/(1 - \varepsilon_2)p - q\varepsilon_1, i_m(0) = \varepsilon_1/(1 - \varepsilon_2)p - q\varepsilon_1 \text{ if } (1 - \varepsilon_2)p - q\varepsilon_1 \neq 0
\end{cases}$$

287 [eq. (A.49)].

288

289 Equation (A.49) shows all the equilibrium points of our measured system with the

290 assumption that $(1 + bi_m)^2 \phi(i_m) - p(1 - \varepsilon_2)i_a(\phi(i_m))^2 - i_m(1 - qi_m)^2 \phi'(i_m) \neq 0$ [eq.

291 (A.50)].

292

293 **Constant Human Response with Non-constant Ratio of Diagnosis Test Rates**

294 (Hypothetical Scenario 1).

295 Here, we study the impact of non-constant ratio of diagnosis tests during a scenario 1-
 296 type epidemic. Thus, we let $\phi(i_m) = c$ and $0 \leq c \leq 1$. Then equations (A.47) and (A.48)
 297 respectively reduce to

298 $i_m^2 q \sigma + i_m (c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) + \sigma) - c\varepsilon_1 = 0, s_m(0) = 1 - i_m(0)$ [eq. (A.51)] and

299 $\frac{i_m(0)}{c} = \varepsilon_1, s_m(0) = 1 - \phi(i_m(0))\varepsilon_1$ [eq. (A.52)].

300 Therefore, the equilibrium points of our measured system are

301
$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(i).} \quad \hat{i}_m(0) = \frac{-c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) - \sigma + \sqrt{4cq\varepsilon_1\sigma + (c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) + \sigma)^2}}{2q\sigma}, \\ \hat{s}_m(0) = \frac{2q\sigma + c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) - \sigma - \sqrt{4cq\varepsilon_1\sigma + (c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) + \sigma)^2}}{2q\sigma} \\ \text{(ii).} \quad \hat{i}_m(0) = c\varepsilon_1, \hat{s}_m(0) = 1 - c\varepsilon_1; \\ \text{(iii).} \quad \hat{s}_m(0) = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{(1 - \varepsilon_2)p - q\varepsilon_1}, \hat{i}_m(0) = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{(1 - \varepsilon_2)p - q\varepsilon_1} \text{ if } (1 - \varepsilon_2)p - q\varepsilon_1 \neq 0 \end{array} \right.$$

302 [eq. (A.53)].

303 If

304 $0 < \frac{2q\sigma + c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) + \sigma + \sqrt{4cq\varepsilon_1\sigma + (c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) + \sigma)^2}}{2q\sigma} < 1$

305 , [eq. (A.54)] define

306
$$\sigma_m = \frac{2q\sigma}{2q\sigma + c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) + \sigma + \sqrt{4cq\varepsilon_1\sigma + (c(-q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)(-1 + \sigma)) + \sigma)^2}}$$

307 [eq. (A.55)]. Then $\hat{s}_m(0)\sigma_m = 1$ [eq. (A.56)]. For $\phi(i_m) = c$, equations (A.43) and (A.44)

308 become $i_a = \frac{(1 + i_m q)(i_m - c\varepsilon_1)}{c(-i_m p + \varepsilon_1 + i_m p \varepsilon_2)}$ [eq. (A.57)] and

309 $\frac{di_a}{dt} = \frac{\varepsilon_1(cp(1 - \varepsilon_2) - 1) - 2q\varepsilon_1 i_m(t) + q(p(1 - \varepsilon_2) - q\varepsilon_1) i_m(t)^2}{c(\varepsilon_1 + (q\varepsilon_1 + p(-1 + \varepsilon_2)) i_m(t))^2} \frac{di_m}{dt}$ [eq. (A.58)].

310 By equation (58), the relation between $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ is determined by the sign of

311 $F(i_m) = \varepsilon_1(cp(1-\varepsilon_2)-1) - 2q\varepsilon_1i_m(t) + q(p(1-\varepsilon_2) - q\varepsilon_1)i_m(t)^2$ [eq. (A.59)].

312 When $j(i_m)$ is given by equation (A.42), the function F that describes the relation

313 between $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ is a complicated function which depends on the model parameters.

314

315 To illustrate their effects on i_a , as in the previous section, we first assume there are no


316 errors in diagnosis tests and let $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$. With our choice of parameters, Figure A.10

317 shows that the surveillance system underestimates the real epidemics. Furthermore,

318 without diagnosis test errors, it is possible for the surveillance processes to report no

319 disease epidemics where there is an increasing or decreasing disease epidemic (see Figure

320 A.10).



321

322 Figure A.10: Examples of a scenario 1-type disease with j


323 non-constant and no testing errors: Graphs of i_m for

324 different j 's with $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$.

325 Next, we choose the following parameter values: $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1$, $\varepsilon_2 = 0.05$, $c = 0.85$, $p = 10$,

326 $q = 10$ [eq. (A.60)]. Then $F(i_m) = 1.515 - 4i_m(t) + 340i_m(t)^2$ [eq. (A.61)]. With this

327 choice of parameters, $F(i_m) > 0$ for all $i_m \in [0,1]$. Hence both $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ have the
328 same sign (see the red curve in Figure A.11).
329 Let $\varepsilon_1 = 0.7$, $\varepsilon_2 = 0.85$ where the other parameters are kept fixed at their current values.
330 Then $F(i_m) = 0.1925 - 14i_m + 55i_m^2 < 0$ for $i_m \in (0.013,1]$ [eq. (A.62)]. With our choice
331 of parameters $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ have opposite signs for $i_m \in (0.013,1]$ (see the dashed curve
332 in Figure A.11). That is, initially i_m decreases while i_a increasing. However, this trend is
333 later reversed.
334 Similarly, let $\varepsilon_1 = 0.6$, $\varepsilon_2 = 0.4$ with the other parameters are kept fixed at their current
335 values. Then $F(i_m) = 2.46 - 12i_m$ [eq. (A.63)].



336
337 Figure A.11: Examples of Scenario 1-type disease with j
338 non-constant: Graphs of i_m for different ε 's with
339 $p=q=10$
340

341 Since $F(i_m) > 0 \in (0.205,1]$ and $F(i_m) < 0 \in [0,0.205)$, then $\frac{di_m}{dt}$ and $\frac{di_a}{dt}$ have the same
342 sign if i_m lies in $(0.205,1]$. They have opposite signs if i_m lies in $[0,0.205)$ (see blue

343 curve in Figure A.11). That is, since $i_m \in (0.205, 1]$, both i_m and i_a increase or decrease at
 344 the same time.

345


346 Now, let $p = q = 1$ while all the other parameters are kept fixed at their current values.

347 Figure A.12 shows that, with the same testing errors ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 , the behaviors of i_m may

348 differ at different values of p and q . In particular, in the case that $\epsilon_1 = 0.1$, $\epsilon_2 = 0.05$, i_a

349 and i_m both increase or decrease at the same time in Figure A.11. However, in Figure

350 A.12 i_a and i_m do not always increase (or decrease) at the same time.



351

Figure A.12: Examples of Scenario 1-type disease with j

352

non-constant: Graphs for i_m with different ϵ 's with

353

$$p=q=1$$

354

355

356 With non-constant ratio test rates and small testing errors, it is possible for the

357 surveillance data to report a decreasing disease epidemics where the real disease is

358 increasing in the population (see Figure A.12).

359 Figure A.10 shows that, when the ratio of diagnosis test rates is not constant then it is

360 possible for the surveillance data to fatally indicate no disease while the real disease

361 epidemics is either increasing or decreasing. We have not observed this fatal error when
362 the ratio of diagnosis test rates is constant (see Figures A.5, A.8 and A.10).