

Article

Estimating Time-Dependent Disease Transmission Intensity using Reported Data: An Application to Ebola and Selected Public Health Problems

Anuj Mubayi^{1,2,3,4} , Abhishek Pandey⁵ , Christine Brasic⁶ , Anamika Mubayi⁷, Parijat Ghosh⁸ and Aditi Ghosh^{6,*} 

¹ PRECISIONheor, Los Angeles, CA, USA; anujmubayi@yahoo.com

² Department of Mathematics, Illinois State University, Normal, IL

³ Center for Collaborative Studies in Mathematical Biology, Illinois State University, Normal, IL

⁴ College of Health Solutions, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

⁵ Yale School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven, CT; abhishek.pandey@yale.edu

⁶ University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, Whitewater, WI; brasiccs23@uww.edu (C.B.); ghosha@uww.edu (A.G.)

⁷ University of Allahabad, Allahabad, India; anamikamubayi@yahoo.co.in

⁸ University of Missouri, Columbia; phool.ghosh@gmail.com

* Correspondence: ghosha@uww.edu

Abstract: Obtaining reasonable estimates for transmission rates from observed data is a challenge when using mathematical models to study the dynamics of “infectious” diseases, like Ebola. Most models assume the transmission rate of a contagion does not vary over time. However, these rates do vary during an epidemic due to environmental conditions, social behaviors, and public-health interventions deployed to control the disease. Therefore, obtaining time-dependent rates can aid in understanding the progression of disease through a population. We derive an analytical expression using a standard SIR-type mathematical model to compute time-dependent transmission rate estimates for an epidemic in terms of either incidence or prevalence type available data. We illustrate applicability of our method by applying data on various public health problems, including infectious diseases (Ebola, SARS, and Leishmaniasis) and social issues (obesity and alcohol drinking) to compute transmission rates over time. We show that transmission rate estimates can have a large variation over time, depending on the type of available data and other epidemiological parameters. Time-dependent estimation of transmission rates captures the dynamics of the problem and can be utilized to understand disease progression through population accurately. Alternatively, constant estimations may provide unacceptable results that could have major public health consequences.

Citation: Mubayi, A.; Abhishek, P.; Brasic, C.; Mubayi, A.; Ghosh, P.; Ghosh, A. Title. *Journal Not Specified* 2021, 1, 0. <https://doi.org/>

Received:

Accepted:

Published:

Keywords: Transmission coefficient; Infectious disease dynamics; Compartmental model; Parameter estimation

Publisher’s Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Submitted to *Journal Not Specified* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

An epidemic is a function of environmental factors and a contact structure that varies over time, which in turn leads to varying transmission potential of an “infection”. We also refer the word “infection” to describe social influences exerted by a typical influential individual with a particular social problem that results in a naive (to the social problem) individual getting involved in the problem. For example, an alcoholic might influence an abstainer into initiating drinking. Many authors have studied outbreaks of social problems and infectious diseases using compartmental transmission model. Qualitative aspects of homogeneous mixing models with constant transmission potential of an infection are well understood for various applications. These models are relatively easy to analyze and can answer questions, at the population level, with good precision.

30 Homogeneous mixing compartmental models have a long history, however, quantifica-
31 tion of temporal transmission potential of an infectious agent, an input variable for this
32 type of model, has been a challenge.

33 William Hamer first published a paper in 1906 containing an epidemic model for
34 the transmission of measles where his observation included the incidence of new cases,
35 in a time interval, is proportional to the product, SI , of the density of susceptibles
36 (S) and the density I of infectives (I) in the population. The formulation of incidence
37 can be explained by considering some epidemiological quantity. Consider a single
38 susceptible individual in a homogeneously mixing population of size N . This individual
39 contacts other members of the population at the rate c , per unit time, and a proportion
40 I/N of these contacts are with individuals who are "infectious". If the probability
41 of transmission of infection given contact is ρ , then the rate at which the *infection is*
42 *transmitted to a susceptible* is $\rho c I/N$, per unit time, and the rate at which the susceptible
43 population *becomes infected* is $\rho c SI/N$.

44 The *contact rate* is often a function of population density, reflecting the fact that
45 contacts take time and saturation occurs. If c is assumed approximately proportional to
46 N or equal to constant, incidence can be represented by terms like βSI (referred as *mass*
47 *action incidence*) or $\beta SI/N$ (referred as *standard incidence*), respectively. The parameter β ,
48 which includes the contact rate c , is called as a "transmission coefficient" (or "effective
49 contact rate" or "transmission potential") with units as time^{-1} . At low population
50 densities mass action is a reasonable approximation of a much more complex contact
51 structure, however, in general, standard incidence is more appropriate for modeling
52 transmission for human diseases or influences for social problems. The term $\beta I/N$ is
53 sometimes referred as the force of infection, i.e., per capita rate at which susceptible
54 members of the host population are getting infected. On the other hand, the transmission
55 rate, represents the number of new infections per unit of time generated by an infected
56 individual. The transmission rate is calculated by dividing incidence for a given time
57 period by a disease prevalence for the same time interval.

58 Most infectious disease data is collected in form of incidence and/or prevalence.
59 *Prevalence* of a "disease" in a population is defined as the total number of cases of the
60 disease in the population at a given time, whereas *prevalence proportion* is computed by
61 dividing the total number of cases in the population by the number of individuals in the
62 population. It is used as an estimate of how common a condition is within a population
63 over a certain period of time. *Incidence* is a measure of the risk of developing some
64 new condition within a specified period of time. Incidence proportion (also known as
65 cumulative incidence) is the number of new cases within a specified time period divided
66 by the size of the population initially at risk. When the denominator is the sum of the
67 person-time of the at-risk population, it is also known as the incidence density rate or
68 person-time incidence rate. Using person-time rather than just time handles situations
69 where the amount of observation time differs between people, or when the population
70 at-risk varies with time. Prevalence is a measurement of all individuals affected by
71 the disease within a particular period of time, whereas incidence is a measurement of
72 the number of new individuals who contract a disease during a particular period of
73 time. So prevalence and incidence proportion at the time t is given by $I(t)/N(t)$ and
74 $\beta * (S(t)/N(t)) * (I(t)/N(t))$, respectively.

75 In compartmental mathematical models, varied assumptions are made based on
76 characteristics of a modeling disease which lead modelers to focus on more important
77 aspects of the epidemic. For example, an epidemic that occurs on a timescale that is
78 much shorter than that of the population replenishment (that is, epidemic occurs at a
79 much faster rate than births and deaths in the population), constant population size can
80 be assumed. Additional common features of these models might include temporary or
81 permanent recovery of infected individuals and a birth rate into infective class. Whether
82 establishment or a major outbreak of an infectious disease or a social problem will
83 occur in a population, requires extensive experience or a mathematical model of disease

84 dynamics and estimates of the parameters of the disease model. Here, we provide a
85 method for estimating the transmission coefficient. A suitable set of data for estimation
86 of β includes prevalence and incidence of the outbreak in question. There are many
87 different methods for estimating β but most of them results in an aggregate value over
88 time. The methods in literature include estimation using regression of prevalence and
89 time since start of an epidemic [1], estimating from equation for basic reproductive
90 rate when threshold density is known [2], estimating from equilibrium prevalence [3,4],
91 using age prevalence curves [5], inferring from behavior or contact data [6], and iterative
92 comparison of field prevalence data with model predictions [7].

93 Some researchers have modeled time varying transmission coefficients for diseases
94 that follow seasonal patterns but using a predefined functional form [8]. On the other
95 hand, a study by Finkenstadt and Grenfell [9] uses a discrete time model that allows
96 for a temporally varying transmission parameter with a period of one year with no
97 assumption on functional form. However, their estimation is computationally intensive
98 and assumes that reporting interval of the available data must be an integer fraction of
99 the serial interval of the disease. Here, we provide an analytical formula for estimating
100 transmission coefficient over time. Examples of social problems like alcohol drinking
101 and obesity and infectious diseases like Ebola, Visceral Leishmaniasis (or Kala-azar),
102 and SARS are used to show relevance of the analytical work. The available data of
103 US college alcohol drinking and obesity outbreak in US include prevalence trends,
104 whereas incidence data of Ebola outbreak in West Africa (Guinea, Sierra Leone, and
105 Liberia), Kala-azar outbreak in Bihar, and SARS epidemic in Hong Kong are used for the
106 estimation.

107 In this paper, we compute time dependent and independent transmission coefficient
108 of Ebola virus disease along with other health care problems like college alcohol
109 drinking, the obesity epidemic in United States, the spread of Visceral Leshmaniasis, and
110 the spread of the 2003 SARS Outbreak in Hong Kong. The remaining paper is stratified
111 as follows: Section 2 provides a compartmental SIR model and two analytical expressions
112 of transmission coefficients based on prevalence and incidence data; examples for
113 computing coefficient over time using each of the two expressions and field data are
114 shown in Section 3; and finally, the results are discussed in Section 4. Fig.(1) represents
115 the overview of this paper.




Figure 1. Overview of the paper.

116 **2. Materials and Methods**

117 **2.1. Formulation for Time Dependent Estimation**

118 Consider a "disease" outbreak in a population that follow the following system of
119 differential equations:

$$S' = pb(t) - \beta(t)SI + \gamma(t)R - \mu(t)S \quad (1)$$

$$I' = \bar{p}b(t) + \beta(t)SI - \alpha(t)I - \mu(t)I \quad (2)$$

120 where $R(t) = 1 - S(t) - I(t)$ and parameters are defined in Table 1 and Table 2.

121 Following steps carried out in Haderler [10] and using Equations (1) and (2), we
122 derive two explicit expressions for $\beta(t)$: one based on prevalence data and other on the
123 incidence of the disease. The main derivation steps for are mentioned below.

Table 1. Definition of variables and parameters in the model given by equations (1) and (2).

Variables	Definitions
S	Proportion of susceptibles
I	Proportion of "infectives"
R	Proportion of recovered individuals
Parameters	Definitions
b(t)	Rate of recruitment in the population
p	Proportion of new recruits that are susceptibles
$\bar{p} = 1 - p$	Proportion of new recruits that are infected
$\beta(t)$	Transmission or influence coefficient
$\alpha(t)$	Per-capita recovery rate
$\gamma(t)$	Per-capita rate of losing immunity or relapse rate
$\mu(t)$	Per-capita mortality or departure rate

Table 2. Definition of variables and parameters in the model given by equations (1) and (2).

Parameters	Estimates				
	Ebola	Alcohol	Obesity	Kala-azar	SARS
p	1.0 (per month)	0.35 [11,12] (per year)	0.94 [13] (per year)	1.0 (per month)	1.0 (per day)
b	0.0	0.29 [14]	0.01	0.003 [15]	0.0
α	0.003 [16]	0.17 [4]	0.22 [17]	0.211 [7]	0.04 [18]
γ	0.008 [19]	0.0	0.14 [17]	0.0	0.0
μ	0.0	0.27 [4]	0.013	0.001 [7]	0.0

124 **2.1.1. $\beta(t)$ as a function of prevalence**

125 Suppose prevalence data are available. Derivation of $\beta(t)$ as a function of prevalence
126 is carried out as follows. Adding Equations (1) and (2) we get

$$(S + I)' = (b(t) + \gamma(t)) - (\gamma(t) + \mu(t))(S + I) - \alpha(t)I \quad (3)$$

Setting $c(t) = b(t) + \gamma(t)$ and $d(t) = \gamma(t) + \mu(t)$ in Equation (3) and solving it we obtain

$$S(t) = (S(0) + I(0))Z(0, t) + \int_0^t Z(s, t)[c(s) - \alpha(s)I(s)]ds - I(t) \quad (4)$$

127 where $Z(a, b) = \exp\left(-\int_a^b d(s)ds\right)$.

Isolating $\beta(t)$ from Equation (2) we obtain $\beta(t)$ as function of prevalence (I)

$$\beta(t) = \frac{I' + (\alpha(t) + \mu(t))I - \bar{p}b(t)}{SI} \quad (5)$$

128 where $S(t)$ is given by Equation (4).

129 Note, beside prevalence (I), we also need I' to compute $\beta(t)$ using formula 5.
130 However, I' can be approximated using prevalence data.

131 2.1.2. $\beta(t)$ as a function of incidence

132 On the other hand, suppose incidence data are available. In order to calculate
133 expression of $\beta(t)$ as a function of incidence ($w(t) = \beta(t)SI$) we first solve Equation
134 (2) for I with initial condition $I(T)$ (where $T \in [0, L]$ is a time at which the prevalence
135 proportion, $I(T)$, is available) and get

$$I(t) = I(T)H(T, t) - \int_t^T H(s, t)[w(s) + \bar{p}b(s)]ds \quad (6)$$

136 where $H(a, b) = \exp\left(-\int_a^b (\alpha(s) + \mu(s))ds\right)$.

137 Using this expression of $I(t)$ in Equation (1) and solving the resultant equation for
138 S with initial condition $S(0)$ we get

$$S(t) = Z(0, t)S(0) + \int_0^t Z(u, t)[pb(u) - w(u)]du \quad (7)$$

$$+ \int_0^t Z(u, t)\gamma(u)\left[1 - I(T)H(T, u) + \int_u^T H(s, u)[w(s) + \bar{p}b(s)]ds\right]du$$

139

Thus,

$$\beta(t) = \frac{w(t)}{SI} \quad (8)$$

140 where $S(t)$ and $I(t)$ are given by Equations (7) and (6), respectively.

141 Note, we need prevalence at time point T , $I(T)$, to compute $\beta(t)$ using formula (7).
142 The time point T can be appropriately chosen, close to maximum of prevalence and not
143 towards starting or end of epidemic.

144 2.2. Time-Independent Estimation: Bayesian Analysis

145 The Bayesian Monte Carlo Markov Chains (MCMC) approach can be used to
146 quantify uncertainty around the transmission rates and compare our analytical estimates
147 with it.

Let θ represents vector of our transmission parameters and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_T)^T$ is the available data set. We can take likelihood function in our bayesian approach as

$$L(\mathbf{y}|\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}\right) \times \exp\left(-\frac{[\text{logit}(y_i) - \text{logit}(f_i(\theta))]^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (9)$$

148 where T is the total number of data points in the data set, σ is the appropriately chosen
149 variance and $f(\theta)$ is the model output function for which data are used. If there are more
150 than one data sets are used then the likelihood can be modified as follows:

$$L(\mathbf{y}|\theta) = \prod_k L(\mathbf{y}_k|\theta)$$

151 While Bayesian approach can provide uncertainty around time-independent average
152 transmission rate, it doesn't inform how the transmission rate varied over time
153 and uncertainty itself is constant over time. Therefore, this approach, while assists in
154 understanding uncertainty in disease progression, it does not address the challenge of

155 capturing changing transmission rates over the progression of an epidemic with respect
156 to time.

157 3. Results

We use four examples to show how to estimate β over time from the available epidemiological data. The examples provide a method to study social and public health issues. To compute estimates of $\beta(t)$, we use first order discretization for derivatives and composite trapezoidal rule for integration as given below

$$f'(t) \approx \frac{f(t+h) - f(t)}{h}$$

$$\int_0^t f(x)dx \approx h \left(\frac{f(0) + f(t)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f(kh) \right).$$

158 These discretization are used in the formulas given in Equations (5) and (8).

159 We can avoid this discretization by choosing a function, for example, a polynomial,
160 that can be fitted to the prevalence and incidence temporal data. This fitted function can
161 then be used directly in the Equations (5) and (8).

162 3.1. Using Incidence Data

163 In this section, we apply available incidence data to three past epidemics: the
164 2014-2016 Ebola outbreak in West Africa, the 2005 outbreak Visceral Leishmaniasis in
165 the Indian state of Bihar, and the 2003 SARS outbreak in Hong Kong.

166 3.1.1. 2014-2016 Ebola Outbreak in West Africa

167 In this section, we estimate the transmission coefficient, $\beta(t)$ for the 2014-2016 Ebola
168 epidemic in West Africa using available incidence data. The number of reported cases
169 per month were retrieved from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
170 and are shown totaled as West Africa (Figure 3a), and individually for Guinea (Figure
171 3c), Sierra Leone (Figure 3e), and Liberia (Figure 3g) [20]. For these estimates, prevalence
172 is taken as May 31, 2015, as this point is close to the maximum prevalence and not
173 towards the start of the epidemic (see Section 2.1.2). Incidence is calculated by dividing
174 these case counts by the 2016 population for each country, as reported by the United
175 Nations (UN) [21]. We assume a constant recovery rate of 10 days ($\alpha(t) = \alpha$), a constant
176 relapse rate of 10 years ($\gamma(t) = \gamma$), no vertical transmission ($p = 1$), and a constant
177 population ($b(t) = \mu(t) = u = 0$); since the CDC data provides monthly case counts,
178 these parameters are adjusted to per month rates. We estimate $\beta(t)$ by simplifying
179 Equation (6) as follows:

$$\beta(t) = \frac{w(t)}{\left(S(0) - \int_0^t w(u)du \right) \left(I(T)e^{\alpha(T-t)} - \int_t^T e^{\alpha(s-t)}w(s)ds \right)} \quad (10)$$

On discretizing Equation (10) we get following expressions. If $t \leq T$,

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{w(t)}{a_1 b_1} \tag{11}$$

where

$$a_1 = S(0) - h \left[\frac{w(0) + w(t)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} w(kh) \right]$$

and

$$b_1 = I(T)e^{\alpha(T-t)} - he^{-t\alpha} \left[\frac{g_1(t) + g_1(T)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_1(kh) \right]$$

If $t > T$,

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{w(t)}{a_1 b_2} \tag{12}$$

where

$$b_2 = I(T)e^{\alpha(T-t)} + he^{-t\alpha} \left[\frac{g_1(t) + g_1(T)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_1(kh) \right]$$

180 where $g_1(x) = e^{m_1 x} w(x)$ and $m_1 = \alpha$.

181

182 For the estimation of $\beta(t)$ with regards to available incidence data, the estimates
 183 are found in Table 2 (see Appendix A.2) and are shown for West Africa (Figure 3b),
 184 Guinea (Figure 3d), Sierra Leone (Figure 3f), and Liberia (Figure 3h). Comparing the
 185 results for each region, we find the largest temporal estimate for both the mean and
 186 median $\beta(t)$ to be that of Guinea (see Table 3 and Figure 2). Analysing the estimates for
 187 transmission rate temporally, we observe that transmission rate follows the incidence
 188 pattern reflecting the effects of exponential incline in the beginning of epidemic as well
 189 as impacts of disease-acquired immunity as well as non-pharmaceutical interventions
 190 implemented over the course of epidemic (Figure 3).






Figure 2. Plot for estimates of $\beta(t)$ using available incidence data for the 2014-2015 Ebola epidemic of West Africa, where Q_i represent i^{th} quartile.

Table 3. Summary statistics of Ebola results for $\beta(t)$.


	Minimum	<i>mean</i> \pm <i>SD</i>	Q1	Median	Q4	Maximum
West Africa	0.00	1.57 \pm 2.36	0.14	0.43	2.01	10.38
Guinea	0.00	2.73 \pm 3.34	0.10	1.36	3.50	11.74
Sierra Leone	0.00	1.51 \pm 2.30	0.02	0.68	1.65	6.23
Liberia	0.00	1.40 \pm 2.52	0.00	0.03	1.71	10.50




(a)




(c)




(b)




(d)




(e)



(g)



(f)



(h)

Figure 3. $\beta(t)$ estimates for the 2014-2016 Ebola outbreak: **3a** Cases per month for West Africa; **3b** $\beta(t)$ estimates for West Africa; **3c** Cases per month for Guinea; **3d** $\beta(t)$ estimates for Guinea; **3e** Cases per month for Sierra Leone; **3f** $\beta(t)$ estimates for Sierra Leone; **3g** Cases per month for Liberia; **3h** $\beta(t)$ estimates for Liberia.

191 3.1.2. 2005 Occurrence of Visceral Leishmaniasis in Bihar, India

192 Visceral Leishmaniasis (VL) is a vector borne infectious disease that is spread from
 193 person to person by a bite of the tiny insect, sandfly. Large population suffers from VL
 194 in some tropical and subtropical countries of the world. The highest burden of the VL is
 195 found in Indian state of Bihar. We obtained underreporting adjusted 2005 incidence data
 196 of Bihar from [7]. The data contain number of new cases during past month adjusted for
 197 underreporting. The Expression (13) is used to estimate $\beta(t)$ via two different models.
 198 The first model was for a single outbreak and hence demography was not considered
 199 whereas the second model assumed birth and death though with a same per-capita rate.

If $t \leq T$ then

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{w(t)}{a_2 b_3} \quad (13)$$

where

$$a_2 = 1 - e^{-\mu t}(1 - S(0)) - h e^{-tm_2} \left[\frac{g_2(0) + g_2(t)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_2(kh) \right]$$

and

$$b_3 = I(T)e^{(\alpha+\mu)(T-t)} - h e^{-tm_3} \left[\frac{g_3(t) + g_3(T)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_3(kh) \right]$$

If $t > T$

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{w(t)}{a_2 b_4} \quad (14)$$

where

$$a_3 = 1 - e^{-\mu t}(1 - S(0)) - h e^{-tm_2} \left[\frac{g_2(0) + g_2(t)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_2(kh) \right]$$


and

$$b_4 = I(T)e^{(\alpha+\mu)(T-t)} + h e^{-tm_3} \left[\frac{g_3(t) + g_3(T)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_3(kh) \right]$$

200 where $g_i(x) = e^{m_i x} w(x)$ (for $i = 1, 2$), $m_2 = \mu$ and $m_3 = \alpha + \mu$.

201 Since annual epidemic during 2005 started showing clear trend of decaying in
 202 the month of October, we took this time to compute the prevalence of VL in Bihar.
 203 Prevalence during October 2005 was computed under assumption that 25% of worldwide
 204 leishmaniasis prevalence is from VL cases whereas remaining is from other forms of
 205 Leishmaniasis. It also assumed 20% of global burden is in Bihar. Since some proportion
 206 of a population are naturally immune to the disease, we carried out estimation for three
 207 different values of initial proportion of susceptibles, namely, 0.1, 0.5 and 0.8. Recovery
 208 rate of 0.21 per month and influx/outflux rate of the population of 0.00138 was computed
 209 using data from Mubayi et al. (2010) [7]. The other assumptions of the model include
 210 constant recovery (i.e., $\alpha(t) = \alpha$), no vertical transmission (i.e., $p = 1$), permanent
 211 recovery (i.e., $\gamma(t) = 0$) and same constant per-capita incoming and outgoing rates (i.e.,
 212 $b(t) = \mu(t) = \mu$). We only model human population and do not take into account vector
 213 population explicitly. Thus, $\beta(t)$ could be interpreted as vectorial capacity of sandfly
 214 population transmitting infection between humans.

215 The obtained estimates of $\beta(t)$ are given in Table 3 (see Appendix A.2) and Fig-
 216 ures 4a, 4b and ?. The β estimates that we have computed here are comparable to
 217 corresponding estimates in [7] (in this reference the mean estimates are $\beta_h = 0.13$ (with
 218 Median=0.11, Std=0.08, Q1=0.07, Q3=0.17) and $\beta_v = 0.12$ (with Median=0.11, Std=0.08,
 219 Q1=0.07, Q3=0.16) where around 75% of the population was susceptible).



(b) **Figure 4.** Estimates of $\beta(t)$ for the 2005 outbreak of Visceral Leishmaniasis in the Indian state of Bihar, using available incidence data: **4a** Estimates of $\beta(t)$ related to an outbreak of Visceral Leishmaniasis, when $S(0) = 0.1$; **4b** Estimates of $\beta(t)$ for two initial proportion of susceptibles in a population affected with Visceral Leishmaniasis. Estimates of $\beta(t)$ obtained for two different values of μ (0.0 and 0.00138) are almost same.




Figure 6. Box-and-Whiskers plot for estimates of $\beta(t)$ for two different values of μ in a Visceral Leishmaniasis outbreak, where q_i represent i^{th} quartile: q_1 Estimates for $\mu = 0.0$; q_2 Estimates for $\mu = 0.00138$.

220 3.1.3. 2003 SARS Outbreak in Hong Kong

221 Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) is a viral respiratory illness caused by
 222 a coronavirus. SARS epidemic in Hong Kong is shown in Figure 7a. We estimated
 223 transmission coefficient using a single outbreak model with parameters values given in
 224 Table 7. The formula used for estimating $\beta(t)$ is

$$\beta(t) = \frac{w(t)}{\left(S(0) - \int_0^t w(u)du\right) \left(I(T)e^{\alpha(T-t)} - \int_t^T e^{\alpha(s-t)}w(s)ds\right)} \quad (15)$$

225 On discretizing Equation (15) we get following expressions. If $t \leq T$,

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{w(t)}{a_4 b_5} \quad (16)$$

where

$$a_4 = S(0) - h \left[\frac{w(0) + w(t)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} w(kh) \right]$$

and

$$b_5 = I(T)e^{\alpha(T-t)} - he^{-t\alpha} \left[\frac{g_4(t) + g_4(T)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_4(kh) \right] \quad (17)$$

If $t > T$,

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{w(t)}{a_4 b_6} \quad (18)$$


where

$$b_6 = I(T)e^{\alpha(T-t)} + he^{-t\alpha} \left[\frac{g_4(t) + g_4(T)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} g_4(kh) \right] \quad (19)$$

226 where $g_4(x) = e^{m_4 x} w(x)$ and $m_4 = \alpha$.

227 The temporal estimates of $\beta(t)$ are shown in Table 4 (see Appendix A.2) and Figure

228 7b.



(b)
Figure 7. The 2002-2003 SARS outbreak in Hong Kong: **7a** Daily reported cases; **7b** Estimation of $\beta(t)$ using available incidence data. Prevalence for April 16, 2003 was taken in the calculation when number of symptomatic cases started declining [22].

229 3.2. Using Prevalence Data

230 We use US national college alcohol drinking and obesity data as examples in
 231 this section. In Appendix A, We also present a hypothetical example with synthetic
 232 prevalence data and known time varying transmission rate to illustrate the ability of our
 233 analytical expression to accurately capture the time-dependent transmission rate

234 3.2.1. College Alcohol Drinking




Figure 8. Estimates of $\beta(t)$ related to alcohol drinking college population, when $\mu = 0$.

235 The available alcohol drinking data represent prevalence (proportion of cases at a
 236 certain time) and not incidence (new cases over time period). This is because the data
 237 is based on the survey where the drinking pattern estimates are obtained by asking
 238 individuals their drinking behavior during past one year. Hence, data can be interpreted
 239 as the number of individuals in certain drinking category at a particular time. Therefore,
 240 we use formula given in Equation (5) to estimate $\beta(t)$. We assume that drinking is a
 241 result of social influences exerted by drinkers (I) on susceptibles (S) or social drinkers.
 242 Individuals recovered from drinking at a constant rate α (i.e., $\alpha(t) = \alpha$). The recovery is
 243 assumed to be permanent (i.e., $\gamma(t) = 0$). The incoming and departure rates are same
 244 (i.e. $\mu(t) = b(t) = \mu$) and $p = 1$. These assumption are reasonable in context of the type
 245 of data (college population) used here.

246 Alcohol drinking data, obtained from Engs et al., 1997 and 1999, is given in the
 247 Table 5 [11,12] that represent the trend observed in national college drinking surveys.
 248 The recovery rate, α is taken to be 0.17 [4]. We estimate $\beta(t)$ using simplified Equation
 249 (5) and above assumptions as follows

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{\frac{I(t)-I(t-h)}{hI(t)} + \alpha + \mu - \frac{\bar{p}\mu}{I(t)}}{(S(0) + I(0))e^{-\mu t} - I(t) + e^{-\mu t}hc_1} \quad (20)$$

where

$$c_1 = \frac{f_2(0) + f_2(t)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_1(kh), \text{ and}$$

$$f_2(x) = e^{\mu x}[\mu - \alpha I(x)].$$

250 If $\mu = 0$, this equation can be reduced, where f_2 is $-\alpha I(x)$.

251 We found that mean estimate of β is 1.04 (std=0.3; Table 5 see Appendix A.2
 252 and Figure 8) during 1982-94 for the national college drinkers. The estimates of β are
 253 comparable to the estimates obtained in the [4]. These estimates of $\beta(t)$ are all contained

254 in 95% CI of the estimates in the [4], which are $\beta_0 = 1.69$ (95% CI[0.63, 2.75]) and
 255 $\beta_2 = 0.75$ (95% CI[0.29, 1.21]).

256 Engs et al., 1994 and 1997 suggest that 65% of freshman are drinkers during the
 257 start of Fall semester. Hence, we assumed that 0.65 proportion of incoming students are
 258 drinkers, i.e., $p = 0.35$. We assumed negligible change in size of a college population
 259 and consider rate of enrollments equal to combined rate of graduation and drop out
 260 rates (i.e., $b(t) = \mu(t) = \mu$).

261 3.2.2. Obesity Epidemic in US




Figure 9. $\beta(t)$ estimates of Obesity with initial (1997) prevalence of 19.5%.

262 We use model to see whether weight gain in one person is associated with weight
 263 gain in his or her family members and friends. Obese persons is an individual whose
 264 body-mass index (the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters)
 265 is greater than or equal to 30. It is found that there has been increasing number of
 266 obese persons in a community and a person's chances of becoming obese increases
 267 dramatically if he or she had a parent, sibling, friend or spouse who became obese in a
 268 given interval [23]. The most reasonable explanations for the obesity epidemic, include
 269 changes in which luxuries and food consumption are being promoted in the society and
 270 has not spared any socioeconomic class. An obesity is a result of individual's choice and
 271 behavior which is influenced by appearance and behavior of others in the community.
 272 Hence, it suggests that just like the spread of drug-use or infectious diseases, weight gain
 273 in one person might influence weight gain in other person. That is, it's not that obese
 274 or non-obese people simply find other similar people to hang out with. This influence
 275 could be direct or indirect, which can vary continuously over time and may depend on
 276 demographic and social factors of the community as well.

277 We used annual CDC data from references [17] and [13] to estimate parameters
 278 for our obese epidemic model. The data obtained from [24] include a age-adjusted
 279 prevalence of obesity in US using the projected 2000 U.S. population.

280 The model assumes constant population and hence $b(t) = \mu(t) = \mu$. It is assumed
 281 that 6% of children are born obese [13]. The vale of recovery rate is assumed to be equal
 282 to an average of rate at which an overweight individuals move on diet (4.068×10^{-3} per
 283 week [17]) and rate at which an obese individual stops or reduces bakery, fried meals
 284 and soft drinks consumption (4.4379×10^{-3} per week [17]). We assume obesity reduces
 285 life span by 6 to 7 years. Hence if average life span in US is 78.4 years than average
 286 life span of at-risk population for obese is (78.4 - 6.5) years. The estimated β from [17]
 287 ranges from 0.02 to 0.04. These estimates are much lower than our estimated values
 288 in Table 6 (see Appendix A.2) with range of (0.36, 3.02). This is because the region of
 289 our study differ from the region modeled by [17]. Our results suggest that estimates

290 of transmission coefficient increases with increase in μ and decrease in initial size of
291 susceptible population, $S(0)$.

$$\beta(t) \approx \frac{\frac{I(t)-I(t-h)}{hI(t)} + \alpha + \mu - \frac{\bar{p}\mu}{I(t)}}{(S(0) + I(0))e^{-(\gamma+\mu)t} - I(t) + e^{-(\gamma+\mu)t}hc_2} \quad (21)$$

where

$$c_2 = \frac{f_3(0) + f_3(t)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_3(kh)$$

and

$$f_3(x) = e^{(\gamma+\mu)x}[\gamma + \mu - \alpha I(x)].$$

292 4. Discussion

293 Compartmental models have provided valuable insights into the epidemiology
294 of many infectious diseases. Transmission coefficient, a product of contact rate and
295 probability of transmission given a contact, is a parameter in the compartmental model
296 which naturally varies over time. This coefficient had the greatest effect on predictions
297 of dynamics of disease or social problem and difficult to estimate. However, due to lack
298 of detailed data as well as complexities involved in numerical estimating this parameter,
299 most studies estimate it as a time-independent parameter averaging it over the course of
300 epidemic. In this study, we present a method to estimate time-dependent transmission
301 rate using two types of data commonly reported during infectious disease outbreaks:
302 the time series of the number of infectives (or prevalence) and the number of new cases
303 generated during a period of time (or incidence). By deriving an analytical method
304 that uses a standard deterministic model and these data sets to directly estimate $\beta(t)$,
305 this new approach resolves the computational challenges often involved with more
306 complex model. By applying our approach to a number of infectious diseases, we
307 illustrate applicability of our methods in various contexts. Moreover, similar approaches
308 can be applied with any appropriate mathematical model to derive time-dependent
309 transmission rate for diseases whose dynamics may need to incorporate other factors
310 such as environment (for.e.g., Cholera) or vector-dynamics (for. e.g. dengue).

311 Utility of approach presented in this manuscript is demonstrated using several
312 public health problems including Ebola, Visceral Leishmaniasis, US college alcohol
313 drinking and obesity outbreak in the US. In particular, we estimated the temporal
314 estimates of transmission rate for Ebola during 2014–2016 outbreak in West Africa
315 (aggregated) as well as for individual countries of Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone. Our
316 results though limited by the accuracy of data, demonstrated the wide-variability in
317 transmission risks across the three countries. Moreover, we found that our temporal
318 estimates of transmission risk followed the pattern of incidence closely reflecting the
319 substantial contribution of transmission risk towards the nature of disease progression.

320 During the times of public health emergencies due to an infectious disease out-
321 breaks such as Ebola outbreak in West Africa or ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, effective
322 reproductive numbers are often estimated using incidence data to understand the pro-
323 gression of disease and inform strategies to curb the transmission. While estimates of
324 effective reproductive numbers are useful, combining it with estimation of time-varying
325 transmission risk through our approach can be more informative to inform public health
326 decision making. Transmission risk at a particular time is a product of contacts and
327 probability of transmission. Thus it can be used to make short term predictions about
328 new infections as well as it can inform how much reduction in contact patterns or
329 risk of transmission (through mask/vaccination/hygiene) can reduce the transmission
330 parameter sufficiently to reverse the trend of an epidemic.

331 In the current study, we used simple deterministic model along with simple in-
332 tegration numerical techniques to show how commonly reported data (incidence and
333 prevalence) can be utilized in informing temporal transmission risk, and thus manage
334 public health challenges more effectively. Practical application of our approach would
335 improve with use of more complex models (appropriate) as well more sophisticated
336 integration techniques. Moreover, analytical derivation can be used to understand the
337 impact of changes in any other input parameter (such as smaller/longer quarantine
338 periods) on transmission risk in a straight-forward way. Similarly, an area of future
339 research can expand presented framework to understand how incomplete data may
340 alter the quality of parameter estimation. Therefore, value of analysis reported here is
341 as a beginning point for future research that will build on current approach to develop
342 computational models that can inform policies in swift manner during public health
343 emergencies.

344 We believe using our methods can provide good approximation of time dependent
345 transmission coefficients and goodness of approximation should increase with use of
346 more sophisticated numerical integration techniques.

347 **Author Contributions:** The contribution of different authors are “Conceptualization, Anuj Mubayi,
348 Aditi Ghosh and Abhishek Pandey.; methodology, Anuj Mubayi, Abhishek Pandey, Aditi Ghosh,
349 Christine Brasic; software, Abhishek Pandey, Christine Brasic, Anamika Mubayi, Parijat Ghosh;
350 validation, Anuj Mubayi, Abhishek Pandey, Christine Brasic and Aditi Ghosh; formal analysis,
351 Anuj Mubayi, Abhishek Pandey, Christine Brasic and Aditi Ghosh; investigation, Anuj Mubayi,
352 Abhishek Pandey, Christine Brasic, Aditi Ghosh, Anamika Mubayi, Parijat Ghosh; resources, Chris-
353 tine Brasic, Parijat Ghosh, Anamika Mubayi; data curation, Anuj Mubayi, Christine Brasic, Parijat
354 Ghosh, Anamika Mubayi; writing—original draft preparation, XAnuj Mubayi, Abhishek Pandey,
355 Christine Brasic and Aditi Ghosh; writing—review and editing, Anuj Mubayi, Abhishek Pandey,
356 Christine Brasic, Aditi Ghosh, Anamika Mubayi, Parijat Ghosh; visualization, Anuj Mubayi.;
357 supervision, Anuj Mubayi; project administration, Anuj Mubayi; funding acquisition, none.

358 **Funding:** “This research received no external funding”

359 **Institutional Review Board Statement:** “Not applicable”.

360 **Informed Consent Statement:** “Not applicable”

361 **Data Availability Statement:** In this section, the data is collected from public domain and is
362 included in the Tables in Appendix.

363 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the
364 design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the
365 manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

366 Abbreviations

367 The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

368	CDC	Center for Disease Control
	MCMC	Monte Carlo Markov Chains
	SIR	Susceptible–Infectious–Recovered
369	SARS	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
	USA	United States of America
	US	United States
	VL	Visceral Leishmaniasis

370 References

- 371 1. Anderson, R.; May, R. Population biology of infectious diseases. Part I. *Nature* **1979**,
372 *280*, 361–367.
- 373 2. Coyne, M.; Smith, G.; McAllister, F. Mathematic model for the population biology of rabies
374 in raccoons in the mid-Atlantic states. *Amer J Vet Res* **1989**, *50*, 2148–2154.

- 375 3. C, K.Z. Estimating Contact Process Saturation in Sylvatic Transmission of *Trypanosoma*
376 *cruzi* in the United States. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **2010**, *4*. doi:doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0000656.
- 377 4. Mubayi, A.; Greenwood, P.; Wang, X.; Castillo-Chavez, C.; Gorman, D.; Gruenewald, P.;
378 Saltz, R. Types of Drinkers and Drinking Settings: An Application of a Mathematical Model.
379 *Addiction (in review)* **2021**.
- 380 5. Cohen, J. *Schistosomiasis: a human host-parasite system*, 1 ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1981; pp.
381 237–56.
- 382 6. Johnson, L. The interaction between HIV and other sexually transmitted infections in South
383 Africa: a model-based evaluation. PhD thesis, Department of Actuarial Science, University
384 of Cape Town, South Africa, 2008.
- 385 7. Mubayi, A.; Castillo-Chavez, C.; Chowell, G.; Kribs-Zaleta, C.; Kumar, N.; Siddiqui, N.; Das,
386 P. Transmission dynamics and underreporting of Kala-azar in Indian state of Bihar. *Journal*
387 *of Theoretical Biology* **2010**, *262*, 177–185.
- 388 8. Fine, P.; Clarkson, J. Measles in England and Wales I: An Analysis of Factors Underlying
389 Seasonal Patterns. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **1982**, *11*, 5–14.
- 390 9. Finkenstadt, B.; Grenfell, B. Time series modelling of childhood diseases: a dynamical
391 systems approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **2000**, *49*, 187–205.
- 392 10. Hadelor, K. Parameter Identification in Epidemic Models. Notes, April 6, 2010.
- 393 11. Engs, R.; Hanson, D.; Diebold, B. The Drinking Patterns and Problems of a National Sample
394 of College Students, 1994: Implications for Education. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*
395 **Spring 1997**.
- 396 12. Engs, R.; Hanson, D. Reduction of Consumption Theory: A Test Using the Drinking Patterns
397 and Problems of Collegians in the United States, 1983-1994. *College Student Journal* **1999**,
398 *33*, 333–345.
- 399 13. Kim, J.; Peterson, K.E.; Scanlon, K.S.; Fitzmaurice, G.M.; Must, A.; Oken, E.; Rifas-Shiman,
400 S.L.; Rich-Edwards, J.W.; Gillman, M.W. Trends in overweight from 1980 through 2001
401 among preschool-aged children enrolled in a health maintenance organization. *Obesity*
402 *(Silver Spring)* **2006**, *14*, 1107–1112.
- 403 14. of the President University of California, S.A.S.O. UC Information Digest. A Reference Guide
404 on Student Access & Performance at the University of California. [http://www.ucop.edu/](http://www.ucop.edu/sas/infodigest03/)
405 [sas/infodigest03/](http://www.ucop.edu/sas/infodigest03/), 2003. Accessed: 2010, Sep. 4.
- 406 15. Rahman, M.; Daniel, E. A Reproductive Health Communication Model That Helps Improve
407 Young Women’s Reproductive Life and Reduce Population Growth: The Case of PRACHAR
408 from Bihar, India. *Pathfinder International Research and Evaluation Working Paper Series* **2010**.
- 409 16. Velásquez, G.E.; Aibana, O.; Ling, E.J.; Diakite, I.; Mooring, E.Q.; Murray, M.B. Time from
410 Infection to Disease and Infectiousness for Ebola Virus Disease, a Systematic Review. *Clinical*
411 *Infectious Diseases* **2015**, *61*, 1135–1140. doi:10.1093/cid/civ531.
- 412 17. Jodara, L.; Santonjaa, F.J.; Gonzalez-Parrab, G. Modeling dynamics of infant obesity in the
413 region of Valencia, Spain. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications* **2008**, *56*, 679–689.
- 414 18. Mubayi, A.; Kribs-Zaleta, C.; Martcheva, M.; Castillo-Chavez, C. A cost-based comparison
415 of quarantine strategies for new emerging diseases. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*
416 **2010**, *7*.
- 417 19. for Disease Control, C.; Prevention. Ebola Virus Disease-Survivors. [https://www.cdc.gov/](https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/treatment/survivors.html)
418 [vhf/ebola/treatment/survivors.html](https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/treatment/survivors.html), 2019, Nov. 5. Accessed: 2021, Jan. 1.
- 419 20. for Disease Control, C.; Prevention. 2014 Ebola Outbreak in West Africa Epidemic Curves.
420 [https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/2014-2016-outbreak/cumulative-cases-graphs.](https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/2014-2016-outbreak/cumulative-cases-graphs.html)
421 [html](https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/2014-2016-outbreak/cumulative-cases-graphs.html), 2019, Apr. 3. Accessed: 2021, Jan. 1.
- 422 21. of Economic, U.N.D.; Affairs, S. 2019 Revision of World Population Prospects. [https:](https://population.un.org/wpp/)
423 [/population.un.org/wpp/](https://population.un.org/wpp/), 2019, Aug. 28. Accessed: 2021, Jan. 1.
- 424 22. Riley, S.; Fraser, C.; Donnelly, C.A.; Ghani, A.C.; Abu-Raddad, L.J.; Hedley, A.J.; Leung, G.M.;
425 Ho, L.M.; Lam, T.H.; Thach, T.Q.; Chau, P.; Chan, K.P.; Lo, S.V.; Leung, P.Y.; Tsang, T.; Ho,
426 W.; Lee, K.H.; Lau, E.M.C.; Ferguson, N.M.; Anderson, R.M. Transmission dynamics of the
427 etiological agent of SARS in Hong Kong: impact of public health interventions. *Science* **2003**,
428 *300*, 1961–1966. doi:10.1126/science.1086478.
- 429 23. Christakis, N.; Fowler, J. The Spread of Obesity in a Large Social Network over 32 Years. *N*
430 *Engl J Med* **2007**, *357*, 370–9.
- 431 24. for Disease Control, C.; Prevention. A Program for Early Release of selected estimates from
432 the National Health Interview Survey. (CDC) *National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS)*
433 **2008**.

434 **Appendix A.**

435 *Appendix A.1. Estimation of Time Dependent Transmission Coefficient using Synthetic*
 436 *Prevalence data*

437 We demonstrate our method of using prevalence data to estimate time dependent
 438 transmission coefficient using synthetic prevalence data generated with two particular
 439 choices of transmission coefficients (constant and seasonal with respect to time) and the
 440 model ((1) and (2)) with rest of parameters given by Table A1.

Table A1. Parameters for generating synthetic prevalence data.

Parameters	p	$b(t)$	$\gamma(t)$	$\mu(t)$	$\alpha(t)$
Values	1	33/1000	0	33/1000	0

441 We used two particular choice of transmission coefficients,

- 442 1. $\beta(t) = 200$,
- 443 2. $\beta(t) = 200(1 - \epsilon \cos 2\pi t)$, with $\epsilon = 0.1$

444 to generate daily prevalence data for five years and estimated monthly transmission
 445 coefficient using (5). The monthly estimates for time dependent transmission coefficient
 446 were reasonably accurate and close to the true values of the transmission coefficients
 447 used to generate prevalence data in both the cases when transmission coefficient was
 448 constant and when it was periodic (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Monthly estimates of transmission coefficients and their true values used to generate synthetic prevalence data for a) constant transmission coefficient and b) periodic transmission coefficient.

449 *Appendix A.2. Tables*

Table 2. 2014-2016 Ebola outbreak in West Africa. Estimates of $\beta(t)$ for incidence data.

	West Africa		Guinea		Sierra Leone		Liberia			
	Date	Incidence: $\omega(t)$	$\beta(t)$	Incidence: $\omega(t)$	$\beta(t)$	Incidence: $\omega(t)$	$\beta(t)$	Incidence: $\omega(t)$	$\beta(t)$	
2014	31-Mar	5.1E-06	0.20	9.5E-06	2.93	0	0	1.7E-06	0.03	
	30-Apr	4.8E-06	0.19	9.3E-06	2.78	0	0	1.1E-06	0.02	
	28-May	3.2E-06	0.13	5.1E-06	1.50	2.2E-06	0.05	0	0	
	24-Jun	1.2E-05	0.49	9.3E-06	2.68	1.9E-05	0.47	8.5E-06	0.16	
	31-Jul	3.1E-05	1.23	6.0E-06	1.69	5.1E-05	1.24	6.1E-05	1.12	
	28-Aug	7.3E-05	2.89	1.6E-05	4.41	6.7E-05	1.62	2.3E-04	4.14	
	26-Sep	1.5E-04	5.62	3.6E-05	9.35	1.4E-04	3.20	4.5E-04	7.75	
	31-Oct	3.0E-04	10.38	5.1E-05	11.74	4.5E-04	10.01	6.7E-04	10.50	
	28-Nov	1.5E-04	4.92	4.2E-05	8.75	2.4E-04	4.98	2.4E-04	3.51	
	31-Dec	1.4E-04	4.33	4.7E-05	9.08	3.2E-04	6.23	8.4E-05	1.20	
	2015	28-Jan	8.0E-05	2.42	1.8E-05	3.26	1.5E-04	2.74	1.3E-04	1.87
		25-Feb	6.9E-05	2.06	2.0E-05	3.58	1.1E-04	1.96	1.3E-04	1.88
31-Mar		6.3E-05	1.84	2.9E-05	4.88	9.2E-05	1.66	1.0E-04	1.43	
29-Apr		4.7E-05	1.37	7.3E-06	1.21	5.8E-05	1.04	1.3E-04	1.81	
31-May		3.6E-05	1.03	6.3E-06	1.03	5.9E-05	1.04	7.5E-05	1.01	
30-Jun		1.7E-05	0.48	7.9E-06	1.29	4.1E-05	0.73	0	0	
31-Jul		1.3E-05	0.36	3.1E-06	0.50	3.5E-05	0.62	1.3E-06	0.02	
31-Aug		9.5E-06	0.27	7.7E-07	0.12	2.9E-05	0.52	0	0	
29-Sep		1.4E-05	0.39	1.3E-06	0.21	4.2E-05	0.74	0	0	
30-Oct		6.7E-06	0.19	2.6E-07	0.04	2.1E-05	0.37	0	0	
30-Nov		2.3E-06	0.07	0	0	7.5E-06	0.13	6.6E-07	0.01	
30-Dec		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2016	27-Jan	8.5E-08	2.44E-03	0	0	2.7E-07	4.81E-03	0	0	
	17-Feb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	30-Mar	3.0E-07	0.01	6.0E-07	0.10	0	0	0	0	
	13-Apr	2.5E-07	0.01	2.6E-07	0.04	0	0	6.6E-07	0.01	

Table 3. 2005 Visceral Leishmaniasis incidence data from Bihar, India. Estimates of $\beta(t)$ of models with and without demography.

Month	Incidence ($\omega(t)$)	S(0):	0.1	0.5	0.8	0.1	0.5	0.8
		$\beta(t) : \mu = 0$			$\beta(t) : \mu = 0.00138$			
Jan	3.4E-05	0.44	0.09	0.05	0.42	0.08	0.05	
Feb	6.2E-05	0.92	0.18	0.11	0.88	0.18	0.11	
Mar	1.0E-04	1.65	0.33	0.21	1.57	0.32	0.20	
Apr	1.2E-04	1.97	0.39	0.25	1.87	0.39	0.24	
May	1.3E-04	2.10	0.42	0.26	1.98	0.41	0.26	
June	1.0E-04	1.76	0.35	0.22	1.64	0.35	0.22	
July	1.1E-04	1.98	0.39	0.25	1.83	0.39	0.24	
Aug	9.5E-05	1.71	0.34	0.21	1.57	0.34	0.21	
Sept	9.2E-05	1.73	0.34	0.22	1.58	0.34	0.17	
Oct	6.8E-05	1.36	0.27	0.17	1.23	0.27	0.17	
Nov	6.5E-05	1.41	0.28	0.17	1.25	0.28	0.17	
Dec	9.2E-05	2.06	0.41	0.26	1.82	0.40	0.26	

Table 4. Estimates of $\beta(t)$ using incidence data from the 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) epidemic in Hong Kong.

Date	Incidence	$\beta(t)$	Date	Incidence	$\beta(t)$	Date	Incidence	$\beta(t)$
	$\omega(t)$			$\omega(t)$			$\omega(t)$	
14-Feb	1.5E-07	8.11E-04	23-Mar	1.6E-05	1.49E-01	29-Apr	1.5E-06	1.33E-02
15-Feb	0	0	24-Mar	1.6E-05	1.31E-01	30-Apr	2.9E-07	2.73E-03
16-Feb	0	0	25-Mar	1.2E-05	8.84E-02	1-May	7.3E-07	7.06E-03
17-Feb	1.5E-07	9.07E-04	26-Mar	9.1E-06	6.34E-02	2-May	1.0E-06	1.02E-02
18-Feb	0	0	27-Mar	7.8E-06	5.25E-02	3-May	7.3E-07	7.45E-03
19-Feb	1.5E-07	9.78E-04	28-Mar	5.9E-06	3.90E-02	4-May	4.4E-07	4.61E-03
20-Feb	1.5E-07	1.01E-03	29-Mar	4.7E-06	3.10E-02	5-May	7.3E-07	7.92E-03
21-Feb	1.5E-07	1.05E-03	30-Mar	7.8E-06	5.08E-02	6-May	7.3E-07	8.15E-03
22-Feb	1.5E-07	1.09E-03	31-Mar	5.9E-06	3.78E-02	7-May	1.3E-06	1.50E-02
23-Feb	1.5E-07	1.13E-03	1-Apr	3.8E-06	2.46E-02	8-May	4.4E-07	5.14E-03
24-Feb	4.4E-07	3.51E-03	2-Apr	5.1E-06	3.32E-02	9-May	5.9E-07	7.06E-03
25-Feb	1.5E-07	1.21E-03	3-Apr	5.0E-06	3.22E-02	10-May	2.9E-07	3.64E-03
26-Feb	1.5E-07	1.26E-03	4-Apr	6.2E-06	3.95E-02	11-May	7.3E-07	9.38E-03
27-Feb	1.5E-07	1.30E-03	5-Apr	6.5E-06	4.10E-02	12-May	4.4E-07	5.79E-03
28-Feb	2.9E-07	2.70E-03	6-Apr	5.9E-06	3.69E-02	13-May	4.4E-07	5.97E-03
1-Mar	5.9E-07	5.58E-03	7-Apr	4.1E-06	2.58E-02	14-May	4.4E-07	6.16E-03
2-Mar	7.3E-07	7.19E-03	8-Apr	3.5E-06	2.24E-02	15-May	4.4E-07	6.35E-03
3-Mar	2.9E-07	2.97E-03	9-Apr	3.1E-06	1.98E-02	16-May	1.5E-07	2.19E-03
4-Mar	4.4E-07	4.60E-03	10-Apr	4.7E-06	3.04E-02	17-May	2.9E-07	4.52E-03
5-Mar	4.4E-07	4.76E-03	11-Apr	3.4E-06	2.20E-02	18-May	0	0
6-Mar	2.5E-06	2.74E-02	12-Apr	3.1E-06	2.03E-02	19-May	1.5E-07	2.43E-03
7-Mar	4.1E-06	4.49E-02	13-Apr	2.6E-06	1.77E-02	20-May	2.9E-07	5.02E-03
8-Mar	5.0E-06	5.34E-02	14-Apr	4.1E-06	2.78E-02	21-May	7.3E-07	1.29E-02
9-Mar	5.0E-06	5.21E-02	15-Apr	3.4E-06	2.30E-02	22-May	1.5E-07	2.65E-03
10-Mar	1.8E-06	1.83E-02	16-Apr	2.6E-06	1.82E-02	23-May	0	0
11-Mar	3.1E-06	3.23E-02	17-Apr	3.4E-06	2.36E-02	24-May	1.5E-07	2.85E-03
12-Mar	2.9E-06	3.07E-02	18-Apr	2.5E-06	1.77E-02	25-May	1.5E-07	2.95E-03
13-Mar	2.4E-06	2.47E-02	19-Apr	1.9E-06	1.38E-02	26-May	1.5E-07	3.05E-03
14-Mar	3.8E-06	4.01E-02	20-Apr	1.0E-06	7.60E-03	27-May	1.5E-07	3.16E-03
15-Mar	3.7E-06	3.82E-02	21-Apr	1.8E-06	1.34E-02	28-May	1.5E-07	3.27E-03
16-Mar	5.0E-06	5.11E-02	22-Apr	2.2E-06	1.70E-02	29-May	0	0
17-Mar	4.0E-06	3.99E-02	23-Apr	1.6E-06	1.27E-02	30-May	2.9E-07	7.00E-03
18-Mar	1.9E-06	1.93E-02	24-Apr	1.9E-06	1.54E-02	31-May	0	0
19-Mar	3.7E-06	3.72E-02	25-Apr	1.9E-06	1.57E-02	1-Jun	0	0
20-Mar	2.8E-06	2.82E-02	26-Apr	1.2E-06	9.87E-03	2-Jun	0	0
21-Mar	3.8E-06	3.85E-02	27-Apr	1.9E-06	1.64E-02	3-Jun	0	0
22-Mar	4.6E-06	4.53E-02	28-Apr	4.4E-07	3.88E-03			

Table 5. Alcohol drinking data and estimates of $\beta(t)$.

Years	1982	1985	1988	1991	1994
Drinkers ($I(t)$)	52%	51%	49%	46%	47%
$\beta(t)$ when $\mu = 0$	—	0.85	0.84	0.90	1.54

Table 6. Age-adjusted Prevalence of Obesity in US using the projected 2000 U.S. population [24].

Year	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Prev. (%)	19.5	20.6	21.5	21.8	22.9	23.8
Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Prev (%)	23.5	24.3	25.3	26.2	26.6	27.5