


Heterogeneity in Contacts

Behaviour & Age

Realism Vs Transparency



Sources of Heterogeneity in Contacts

Individual exposure and infection hazard may be heterogeneous for a number reasons:

I. Risk structure

- Determined by behavioural patterns
- Or related to occupation

2. Age-determined contacts


- Childhood diseases

3. Seasonality


- Time-dependent contact rates result in sustained oscillations

Simple contact heterogeneities

- * Contact tracing to examine HIV transmission network in Colorado Springs:



More Generally



High risk group

Low risk group

Modeling Risk Structure

Introduce a model consisting of individuals whose behaviour/work places them in one of two *kinds* of groups: Low risk and High risk


Use an extension of simple SIS model

$$\frac{dS_L}{dt} = \gamma_L I_L - \beta_{LL} S_L I_L - \beta_{LH} S_L I_H$$

$$\frac{dI_L}{dt} = -\gamma_L I_L + \beta_{LL} S_L I_L + \beta_{LH} S_L I_H$$

$$\frac{dS_H}{dt} = \gamma_H I_H - \beta_{HH} S_H I_H - \beta_{HL} S_H I_L$$

$$\frac{dI_H}{dt} = -\gamma_H I_H + \beta_{HH} S_H I_H + \beta_{HL} S_H I_L$$



What's R_0 ?

- Instead of a single transmission rate (β), we now have a matrix of transmission parameters (β)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \beta_{HH} & \beta_{HL} \\ \beta_{LH} & \beta_{LL} \end{pmatrix}$$

- This is called WAIFW (Who Acquires Infection From Whom) matrix
- Typically, it's assumed $\beta_{LH} = \beta_{HL}$
- And high assortativity, such that $\beta_{HH} > \beta_{LL} > \beta_{HL}$

What's R_0 ?

✿ At disease-free equilibrium

$$(S_H^*, I_H^*, S_L^*, I_L^*) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$$

- \mathcal{F} = new infections
- $\mathcal{F}_H = \beta_{HH} S_H I_H + \beta_{HL} S_H I_L$
- $\mathcal{F}_L = \beta_{LL} S_L I_L + \beta_{LH} S_L I_H$
- \mathcal{V} = pathogen progression
- $\mathcal{V}_H = \gamma_H I_H$
- $\mathcal{V}_L = \gamma_L I_L$

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{HH} S_1^* & \beta_{HL} S_1^* \\ \beta_{HL} S_2^* & \beta_{LL} S_2^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{HH} & \beta_{HL} \\ \beta_{HL} & \beta_{LL} \end{pmatrix} \quad V = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_H & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_L \end{pmatrix}$$

What's R_0 ?

- ✿ Next generation operator, K , given by

$$FV^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{HH} & \beta_{HL} \\ \beta_{HL} & \beta_{LL} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\gamma_H} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\gamma_L} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$K = FV^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\beta_{HH}}{\gamma_H} & \frac{\beta_{HL}}{\gamma_L} \\ \frac{\beta_{LH}}{\gamma_H} & \frac{\beta_{LL}}{\gamma_L} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\det(K - \Lambda I) = \begin{vmatrix} \frac{\beta_{HH}}{\gamma_H} - \Lambda & \frac{\beta_{HL}}{\gamma_L} \\ \frac{\beta_{LH}}{\gamma_H} & \frac{\beta_{LL}}{\gamma_L} - \Lambda \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

- ✿ Solve for largest Λ

Worked example

- Let $\gamma_H = \gamma_L = 50$,
- with WAIFW matrix give by $\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 45 & 20 \\ 20 & 35 \end{pmatrix}$


$$\begin{aligned} K = FV^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 45 & 20 \\ 20 & 35 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{50} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{50} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} .9 & .4 \\ .4 & .7 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\det(K - \Lambda I) = \begin{vmatrix} .9 - \Lambda & .4 \\ .4 & .7 - \Lambda \end{vmatrix} = \Lambda^2 - 1.6\Lambda + 0.47$$

- So $\Lambda = 1.21$ or $.39 \Rightarrow R_0 = 1.21$

Limitations

- R_0 quantifies overall transmission — useful for control measures that ignore epidemiological “type”
- Not target specific
- What if interested in focusing on high risk group?



- Control measures could be aimed at, for example, paths leading to High risk group

Type Reproduction Number

- If a control strategy is aimed at particular host types only, (vectors, wildlife reservoir, vaccination of domestic animals), then so-called “type reproduction number”, T , takes over role of R_0
- Its value determines control effort needed

Type Reproduction Number

- **Type reproduction Number, T_i**

- All paths leading to i targeted

- $l \rightarrow i, 2 \rightarrow i, \dots, p \rightarrow i.$

- ❖ Then

- ❖ $x_1 = \{i\}, x_2 = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $T_i = T_{1 \rightarrow i, 2 \rightarrow i, \dots, n \rightarrow i}.$

Basic reproduction Number, R_0 : all possible paths are targeted

- ❖ $x_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, x_2 = \{1, \dots, n\}$

Target Reproduction Number

- Suppose we target q paths of transmission

$$j_1 \rightarrow i_1, j_2 \rightarrow i_2, \dots, j_q \rightarrow i_q$$

- Let X be set of all targeted paths

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{'recipient'} & \longrightarrow & x_1 = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_q\}, \\ \text{classes} & & x_2 = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_q\} \\ & \longleftarrow & \text{'donour'} \\ & & \text{classes} \end{array}$$

- The Target Reproduction Number is

$$\mathcal{T}_X = \rho(P_{x_1} K P_{x_2} (1 - K + P_{x_1} K P_{x_2})^{-1})) \text{ if } \rho(K - P_{x_1} K P_{x_2}) < 1$$


- where P_{xi} is a projection matrix ($P_{k,k} = 1$ if $k \in x_i$, zero otherwise).

Target Reproduction Number

if $\rho(K - P_{x_1} K P_{x_2}) > 1$

then T_X is not defined since disease cannot be eradicated by targeting only X

Targeting S_H



- ❖ Target paths: H → H, L → H.
- ❖ $x_1 = \{H\}$, $x_2 = \{H, L\}$
- ❖ Target reproduction number:

$$\begin{aligned} T_H &= \mathcal{T}_{H \rightarrow H, L \rightarrow H} \\ &= \rho(P_{x_1} K P_{x_2} (1 - K + P_{x_1} K P_{x_2})^{-1})), \text{ if } \rho(K - P_{x_1} K P_{x_2}) < 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix} \quad P_{x_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad P_{x_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Targeting S_H

$$P_{x_1} K P_{x_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$


❖ Check: $\rho(K - P_{x_1} K P_{x_2}) = 0.7$

$$\begin{aligned} & (P_{x_1} K P_{x_2}) \left(I - K + (P_{x_1} K P_{x_2}) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1.43 & 1.33 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

❖ Hence, $T_H = T_{H \rightarrow H, L \rightarrow H} = 1.43$

❖ Need to vaccinate H susceptibles: $1 - 1/T_H = 1 - 1/1.43 = 0.3$

Lowering H \rightarrow H transmission





- ❖ Target paths: H \rightarrow H.
- ❖ $x_1 = \{H\}$, $x_2 = \{H\}$
- ❖ Target reproduction number: $T_H = \mathcal{T}_{H \rightarrow H}$
 $= \rho(P_{x_1} K P_{x_2} (1 - K + P_{x_1} K P_{x_2})^{-1}))$, if $\rho(K - P_{x_1} K P_{x_2}) < 1$
 $K = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix} \quad P_{x_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad P_{x_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
- ❖ Hence, $T_H = \mathcal{T}_{H \rightarrow H} = 1.93$
- ❖ Need to reduce contact by $1 - 1/T_H = 1 - 1/1.93 = 0.48$





More Generally

Target Paths	x_1	x_2	Target Reproduction	Reduction	Vaccination
All	H, L	H, L	$R_0 = 1.21$	0.17	17% H 17% L
$H \rightarrow H$ $L \rightarrow H$	H	H, L	$T_H = 1.43$	0.3	30% H 0% L
$H \rightarrow L$ $L \rightarrow L$	L	H, L	$T_L = 2.30$	0.57	0% H 57% L
$H \rightarrow H$	H	H	1.93	0.48	-
$L \rightarrow L$	L	L	Not Defined	-	-
$L \rightarrow H$	H	L	5.33	0.81	-
$H \rightarrow L$	L	H	5.33	0.81	-

Reduce targeted transmission by 40%



Reduce targeted transmission by 60%



Summary

- Target reproduction number informative for heterogeneous populations
- Behavioural risk (core groups)
- Vectors & Hosts
- Age structure
- Spatial structure

Modeling Age Structure

- So far, looked at heterogeneity arising in contacts, due to behavioural differences (risk structure)
- Now, we consider changing risk due to age structure, motivated by childhood diseases (ie SIR)
- Initially, assume only two age groups: Low risk (Adults) and High risk (**C**hildren)
- Differences from previous model: (i) SIR not SIS, (ii) individuals eventually move from class *C* to class *A* in SIR model


Modeling Risk Structure

$$\frac{dX_C}{dt} = \nu - (\beta_{CC}Y_C + \beta_{CA}Y_A)X_C - \mu_C X_C - \tau_C X_C$$

$$\frac{dY_C}{dt} = (\beta_{CC}Y_C + \beta_{CA}Y_A)X_C - \gamma Y_C - \mu_C Y_C - \tau_C Y_C$$

$$\frac{dX_A}{dt} = \tau_C X_C - (\beta_{AC}Y_C + \beta_{AA}Y_A)X_A - \mu_A X_A$$

$$\frac{dY_A}{dt} = \tau_C Y_C + (\beta_{AC}Y_C + \beta_{AA}Y_A)X_A - \gamma Y_A - \mu_A Y_A$$



$$N = N_C + N_A = (X_C + Y_C + Z_C) + (X_A + Y_A + Z_A)$$

Initial Dynamics



- Again, key thing is WAIFW matrix, which we'll assume to take following form

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 100 & 10 \\ 10 & 20 \end{pmatrix}$$

- Let's assume $1/\tau_C = 15$ years & $1/\tau_A = 60$ years
- So, $N_C/N = 0.2$ and $N_A/N = 0.8$
- Using same spectral radius approach as before, we get $R_0 \sim 2.2$

Paediatric Vaccination

$$P_c \sim 0.55$$



- Prevalence much higher in C class than A class
- Vaccination threshold same as in unstructured model (!!)
- Low levels of immunization *increase* fraction of population

Which WAIFW?

- So far, we have used hypothetical WAIFW matrices
- In reality, we may have data on disease prevalence in C and A classes, but our matrix β has 4 entries we need to estimate!
- Pragmatic assumption has been to simplify WAIFW along intuitive/sensible lines, eg
- Often, reasonably obvious what's not a plausible WAIFW matrix


$$\beta_{\text{unlikely}} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 & \beta_2 \\ \beta_2 & \beta_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 & 0 \\ \beta_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \dots$$

Application to Childhood Diseases

- Some of earliest discrete age-class (RAS) models developed for measles (Schenzle 1984)
- Make pragmatic assumption: transmission, especially in pre-vaccine era, primarily driven by school dynamics
- Need four age groups
 - Pre-school (0-4 years)
 - Primary school (5-10 years)
 - Secondary school (11-16 years)
 - Adults (16+)
- We're now faced with old problem of which WAIFW?

Typical age-specific data

Given n age classes, age-specific transmission matrix has n^2 elements ... correcting for reciprocity, we still have $n(n-1)/2$ term



Often, only have information on age-specific prevalence or serology


Which WAIFW?

- Two seemingly sensible WAIFW matrices are


$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_2 & \beta_2 & \beta_3 & \beta_4 \\ \beta_2 & \beta_1 & \beta_3 & \beta_4 \\ \beta_3 & \beta_3 & \beta_3 & \beta_4 \\ \beta_4 & \beta_4 & \beta_4 & \beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_2 & \beta_4 & \beta_4 & \beta_4 \\ \beta_4 & \beta_1 & \beta_4 & \beta_4 \\ \beta_4 & \beta_4 & \beta_3 & \beta_4 \\ \beta_4 & \beta_4 & \beta_4 & \beta_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

With $\beta_1 > \beta_2 > \beta_3 > \beta_4$


Mossong et al. (2008)



Age-specific contacts




Contacts at home




Contacts at work


BE




DE




FI




GB




IT




LU




NL





PL




Read et al. (2014)




Social mixing data from urban & rural China



Age Structured Dynamics



Age-structured SEIR model




Model, simulated as time varying Markov Chain
Updating of age-classes occurs annually
0-19 one-year classes, and 20+

Age-specific transmission rate

Force of infection determine by:

- > Contact structure (c_{ij}) -- from Mossong study
- > Probability that contact is with infectious -- I_j/N_j
- > Transmission probability, given contact -- q_i

$$\lambda_i = q_i \sum_j c_{ij} \frac{I_j}{N_j}$$



Age-Structured transmission: from data

- From age-specific incidence data, calculate age-specific force of infection
- That is, probability of infection while in age class i
- $P(\text{infection in age } i) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda_i \Delta a_i)$

$$\lambda_i^d = -\frac{1}{\Delta a_i} \log \left(\frac{\sum_{j=i+1}^n D_j}{\sum_{j=i}^n D_j} \right)$$


Δa_i is width of class i

D_j is incidence data in class j

Age-Structured transmission: from model

- If we know c_{ij} –rate of contacts between class i and class j – then
- K_i is risky contacts of class i = $\sum_j c_{ij} I_j / N_j$
- Thus, force of infection is
 - $\lambda_i = q K_i$
- q is probability of infection given contact
- So, $q = K_i / \lambda^d_i$

Estimating q



Fluctuations likely due to age-specific biases in contact data and age-specific variation in detectability, susceptibility, and nature of contacts as related to transmission

Assume q constant to assay role of age-specific contacts in transmission

Age-specific transmission rate

Force of infection determine by:


- > Contact structure (c_{ij}) -- from Mossong study
- > Probability that contact is with infectious -- I_j/N_j
- > Transmission probability, given contact -- q_i

$$\lambda_i = q_i \sum_j c_{ij} \frac{I_j}{N_j}$$

Can use data to

- > determine transmission probability, given contact -- q_i
- > validate model

Model-data comparison



Does the Contact Matrix Matter?

