

# The effect of competition between health opinions on epidemic dynamics

Alexandra Teslya, PhD<sup>a,1</sup>, Hendrik Nunner<sup>b</sup>, Vincent Buskens, PhD<sup>b</sup>, and Mirjam E Kretzschmar, PhD<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>Department of Sociology / ICS, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

This manuscript was compiled on December 16, 2021

**Past major epidemic events showed that when an infectious disease is perceived to cause severe health outcomes, individuals modify health behavior affecting epidemic dynamics. To investigate the effect of this feedback relationship on epidemic dynamics, we developed a compartmental model that couples a disease spread framework with competition of two mutually exclusive health opinions (health-positive and health-neutral) associated with different health behaviors. The model is based on the assumption that individuals switch health opinions as a result of exposure to opinions of others through interpersonal communications. To model opinion switch rates, we considered a family of functions and identified the ones that allow health opinions to co-exist. In the disease-free population, either the opinions cannot co-exist and one of them is always dominating (monobelt equilibrium) or there is at least one stable co-existence of opinions equilibrium. In the latter case, there is multistability between the co-existence equilibrium and the two monobelt equilibria. When two opinions co-exist, it depends on their distribution whether the infection can invade. If presence of the infection leads to increased switching to a health-positive opinion, the epidemic burden becomes smaller than indicated by the basic reproduction number. Additionally, a feedback between epidemic dynamics and health opinion dynamics may result in (sustained) oscillatory dynamics and a switch to a different stable opinion distribution. Our model captures feedback between spread of awareness through social networks and infection dynamics and can serve as a basis for more elaborate individual-based models.**

Health behavior | Socio-epidemiological model | Behavioral response | Opinion dynamics | Prophylactic behavior

The notion that the relationship between epidemic dynamics and reactive collective behavior plays an important role in the course of an outbreak of an infectious disease has been recognized in theoretical epidemiology (1–5). This notion is supported by data collected during various outbreaks of infectious diseases, dating back as far as the Spanish flu pandemic of 1918 (1, 3, 5) to SARS pandemic (6, 7) and swine flu pandemic (8), and ending with the ongoing SARS-CoV2 pandemic (9). Two types of societal reactions to an infectious disease outbreak can be distinguished, namely centralized top-down and individual-based bottom-up reactions. First, governing authorities may impose public health interventions aiming at protecting the most vulnerable groups, and mitigating the spread of infection. Typical measures are school closures, limitation of the number of persons in indoor spaces, and travel restrictions. Second, individuals may change their behavior by self-imposing protective measures such as hygiene measures or mask wearing in an effort to defend themselves from infection and its consequences (10). It has been observed that practicing of self-protective measures increased during outbreaks of infectious diseases and declined when the disease

was eliminated (6–8). Thus, there is an indication for a feedback relationship between epidemic dynamics and uptake of self-protective measures.

It was not until the 2000s that the importance of this type of reaction for epidemic dynamics was recognized and investigated using mathematical modeling (2, 4, 11). Accounting for the behavior-infection feedback relationships in epidemic models has helped to explain patterns observed in real world data. Multiple epidemic peaks and relatively small outbreaks, where much larger ones were expected, were convincingly shown to be the result of changes in individual human behavior during an epidemic (4, 5).

Health behaviors are a subject to (health) opinion held. The dynamics of circulation of ideas and beliefs in a population is studied in the field known as sociophysics. Even the simplest sociophysics models can have rich dynamics where a number of distinct opinion distributions is possible with a potential for bistability between them (12–14). To understand the effect of the feedback loop between disease spread and health opinion circulation on epidemic dynamics, it is important to understand the role of assumptions about the propagation of opinions on their distribution in the population. In this work we consider the effect of interpersonal communications on the dynamics of health opinion competition using different functional representations for opinion switch rates. We show that depending on the shape of the functional response qualitatively different opinion distributions appear, which in turn

## Significance Statement

Disease epidemics often co-evolve with opinions on health-related behavior. Most existing models have difficulties understanding co-existence of different opinions in a population when the disease is not present, while we do observe this. We modeled opinion switching process by using an innovative way to capture the dependence of opinion switching rate on the population state. We combined this with network interaction patterns and were able to derive conditions under which a stable co-existence of opinions can occur. We used this insight to explain appearance of epidemic cycles and the population switching between different distributions of opinions. Our work demonstrates that for information interventions accurate understanding of opinion propagation processes is crucial.

MEK and VB conceived the study and developed the model. MEK and AT performed stability and bifurcation analysis of the model dynamics. AT implemented the model, carried out all numerical model analyses. AT prepared figures with input from VB, HN, and MEK. All authors participated in the discussion and interpretation of the outputs of the model. AT performed relevant literature overview. AT and MEK wrote the manuscript. All authors contributed to editing of the final version of the manuscript, and gave the final approval for publication.

The authors declare no competing interests.

<sup>1</sup>To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: [a.i.teslya@umcutrecht.nl](mailto:a.i.teslya@umcutrecht.nl)

49 affects outlook of an epidemic.  
50 In the context of health-related opinions and the associated  
51 self-imposed preventive behaviors, pro- and anti-vaccination  
52 sentiments garnered a lot of attention (11, 15–17), while other  
53 investigations focused on non-pharmaceutical interventions  
54 such as mask wearing and social distancing (2, 4, 9, 18). While  
55 ideally vaccination is a nearly instantaneous event that pro-  
56 tects an individual for a long time, the latter measures only  
57 confer protection while they are being practiced. For emerg-  
58 ing infectious diseases for which pharmaceutical interventions  
59 are not available, as was the case with COVID-19 in 2020,  
60 the extent of the outbreak depends on the uptake rate of  
61 non-pharmaceutical measures by the population (19).

62 Health opinions can fall on a spectrum ranging from health-  
63 promoting, adaptors of which practice self-protective measures,  
64 to health-indifferent, whereupon individuals having such opin-  
65 ions do not modify their behavior with the aim of protect-  
66 ing their health. The health belief model (10) posits that  
67 adopting health promoting measures is motivated by several  
68 constructs: (i) perceived susceptibility (risk of contracting a  
69 specific health problem), (ii) perceived severity (estimation  
70 of the consequences of this problem), (iii) perceived barriers  
71 (impediments for adopting a relevant health behavior),  
72 (iv) perceived benefits (assessment of effectiveness in avoiding  
73 the health problem if the health behavior is adopted), and  
74 (v) cues to action (events that bring on adoption of a specific  
75 behavior). If an individual believes the disease to be a threat,  
76 they may modify their health behavior in a number of ways  
77 that affect their susceptibility, the probability of encountering  
78 an infectious individual, and duration of infection. In contrast  
79 to beliefs, which support adoption of health protective behav-  
80 iors, individuals may also be indifferent to health-related risks.  
81 Indifferent individuals may make little to no effort to protect  
82 their health or limit the disease spread. For example, during  
83 the AH1N1/09 (“swine flu”) outbreak in 2009, people who  
84 were uncertain about the disease and felt that the extent and  
85 danger of the outbreak were exaggerated were less likely to  
86 change their behavior (20).

87 Individuals may form and change their opinions when being  
88 exposed to communications by a.o. health officials, newscasts,  
89 social media, and interpersonal interactions. Ideally, communi-  
90 cations by health officials provide accurate information about  
91 an epidemic outbreak and possible self-protective measures  
92 that individuals can adopt. On the other hand, social media  
93 and interpersonal communications can be carriers of misinforma-  
94 tion and opinions that may downplay or exaggerate the  
95 risks of acquiring infection. Individuals may feel a pressure  
96 to conform to their social environment and may adopt an  
97 opinion even if it contradicts available evidence or information  
98 distributed by health authorities (13). Moreover, by means of  
99 digital social media interpersonal communications can spread  
100 more widely and rapidly than through the physical contact  
101 network, such that the propagation may be stimulated by  
102 ongoing communication in media (21).

103 Here we focus on a health opinion switching process that  
104 arises due to interpersonal communication. To investigate  
105 the effect of interpersonal communication on the competi-  
106 tion of health opinions in the population, we developed a  
107 deterministic compartmental model that stratifies the popu-  
108 lation by opinions. To improve the analytic tractability of  
109 the mathematical model, we restrict ourselves to the case of

two mutually exclusive opinions, namely health-positive and  
health-neutral. While health opinions in reality can range on  
a continuous scale between health awareness and indifference  
(22), our choice can also be justified by the argument that  
health related behavior is either practiced or not. So, we as-  
sume that holding the health-positive opinion invariably leads  
to adoption of health protective measures in the face of an out-  
break (e.g., mask wearing, increased hands washing, keeping a  
distance of 1.5 meters from others), while individuals holding  
the health-neutral opinion will not take these measures.

In earlier modelling work, sustained circulation of the health  
opinions from both sides of the spectrum required the presence  
of an outbreak (2, 4, 23). However, frequently, the opinions  
persist without the disease being present. In this case, the  
opinion switching rates depend on the number/density of the  
carriers of these opinions. Another important consideration is  
the functional definition of the opinion switching rate. Often  
it is captured by a mass action term (2, 4, 14, 18) that may  
not necessarily reflect the reality. We address both of these  
considerations. In our model, individuals switch between  
opinions as a result of communication with individuals of  
the opposing opinion, with a switch rate that is a positive  
non-decreasing function of the density of individuals holding  
the opposing opinion. Here we consider a broader family of  
functions to describe the rate of switching, which includes  
linear, saturating, and sigmoidal functions. We couple opinion  
dynamics with an epidemic model by allowing the rate of  
switching to the health-positive opinion to depend on the  
disease prevalence. With respiratory diseases as influenza  
or COVID-19 in mind, we consider a population that mixes  
assortatively by opinions.

Using bifurcation and stability analysis, we investigate the  
opinion distribution landscape in the absence of disease. The  
dynamics in a disease-free state both highlight the key con-  
siderations for the design of information intervention prior to  
the outbreak, as well as set the stage for epidemic dynamics  
in case an infectious disease enters the population. We ana-  
lyze for which distributions of opinions in the population an  
outbreak of an infectious disease can occur, i.e. how the distri-  
bution of opinions impacts the basic reproduction number of  
the infection. We then explore the coupled opinion-epidemic  
dynamics using numerical bifurcation analysis. Finally, we  
describe parameter regions, for which damped/sustained oscil-  
latory dynamics may appear, and give conditions under which  
a disease can be eradicated even when the basic reproduction  
number is above 1.

## Results

**A model for competing opinions.** In the context of an infec-  
tious disease, we consider a scenario where two relevant mutu-  
ally exclusive health opinions,  $a$  and  $b$ , circulate in a population.  
We denote with  $a$  a health-positive opinion whereupon an indi-  
vidual holding it adapts measures that reduce the probability  
of contracting the disease, and  $b$  denotes a health-neutral opin-  
ion such that its holder does not modify their behavior. Thus,  
the population is split into individuals who believe  $a$ ,  $N_a$  and  
those who believe  $b$ ,  $N_b$ . In this work we use word “density” to  
denote a proportion of total population. Thus, the proportion  
of population (density) that holds opinion  $a$  is denoted by  $n_a$ ,  
while the density of population  $N_b$  is  $n_b$ .

We assume that individuals regardless of their opinion have

on average  $c$  social contacts per week. We use the term “social contacts” to denote interactions that may lead to switching of opinions. Additionally, we consider the possibility of assortative preference to mix with individuals of the same opinion. The degree of assortative mixing is denoted by  $\omega$ ,  $0 \leq \omega \leq 1$ , with  $\omega$  equal to 0 describing the situation where individuals interact without regard about the opinion held (fully proportionate mixing) and  $\omega$  equal to 1 denotes fully assortative mixing where individuals only mix with individuals which share their opinion. For  $0 \leq \omega \leq 1$ ,  $\omega$  indicates the proportion of contacts that occur only with individuals sharing the same opinion, while  $1 - \omega$  fraction of contacts occur with holders of each opinion, proportionate to the density of respective population. Individuals  $N_{\bar{l}}$ ,  $\bar{l} \in \{a, b\}$  may change their opinion upon contact with individuals with the opposing opinion,  $N_l$ ,  $l \in \{a, b\}$ ,  $l \neq \bar{l}$ . The rate of switching is described by a density-dependent function  $f_l(n_l)$ , multiplied by social contact rate  $c$ , and the likelihood of mixing with individuals regardless of their opinion,  $1 - \omega$ . We assume the switch rate functions  $f_l(n_l)$  to be positive, continuous and increasing, and define

$$f_l(n_l) = \frac{p_l n_l^k}{1 + \theta_l n_l^k}, \quad l \in \{a, b\}, \quad [1]$$

where  $p_l$ ,  $0 \leq p_l \leq 1$  is the per contact probability of switching from opinion  $l$  to opinion  $l$ . Parameters  $\theta_{\bar{l}}$ ,  $\theta_l \geq 0$ , and  $k$ ,  $k \geq 1$  specify the shape of the response function. Observe that the switch rate to an opinion is zero, if there are no individuals with that opinion in the population.

Three types of response functions can be distinguished depending on parameters  $k$  and  $\theta$  (Figure 1a): (1) for  $k = 1$  and  $\theta_a = \theta_b = 0$  the switch rate function is linear; (2) for  $k = 1$  and  $\theta_a, \theta_b > 0$  the switch rate function is saturating for large densities; (3) for  $k > 1$  and  $\theta_a, \theta_b > 0$  the switch rate function is sigmoidal. In ecology, very similar functions have been derived from first principles to describe the functional response of predator population density to the density of available prey, and are known as Holling type I, II, III functional response (24).

In this work we investigate long term opinion dynamics for each one of these response functions. However, note that, to describe the diffusion of innovations or opinions in a population, sigmoidal functions have been used (25). These functions capture the trend whereupon the spread of an opinion  $l$  is very slow as long as only a small proportion of the population holds this opinion, and slows down again when the proportion of the population  $N_l$  is large, with fast growth in between. The saturation for high density of  $N_l$  mimics the saturation of information effect, whereupon the information loses its impact once it has been received several times. In our model, both opinions spread according to a sigmoidal response function, possibly with different shapes. This leads to a system in which opinions compete and may either co-exist or drive each other to extinction.

We assume that opinion dynamics are fast compared to the natural demographic processes, and therefore do not include demographic processes in the model.

**A model coupling opinion dynamics and epidemic dynamics.** We consider a disease that follows a Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) or a Susceptible-Infected-Susceptible (SIS)

model. To investigate the effect of feedback between disease dynamics and opinion dynamics on the course of an epidemic, we couple the above described framework of opinion competition with a SIR or SIS infection transmission model (Figure 1c). For both types of disease dynamics, individuals become infected and infectious at rate  $\lambda$ , which depends on the prevalence of infection,  $i$ . Infectious individuals recover with rate  $\gamma$ , either becoming susceptible again (SIS model) or becoming immune (SIR model).

Each individual has an opinion and an infection status. We denote the density of susceptible individuals holding opinion  $a$  with  $s_a$ , the density of infectious individuals holding the same opinion with  $i_a$ , and the density of recovered individuals with  $r_a$ . Similarly,  $s_b$ ,  $i_b$ , and  $r_b$  denote the densities of individuals who hold opinion  $b$  in the respective epidemiological states. Individuals  $N_a$  have a lower probability of acquiring infection than individuals  $N_b$ , i.e.  $\beta_a \leq \beta_b$ . We assume that the measures taken by  $N_a$  only reduce their susceptibility, and that infectivity and the recovery rate are the same for the two types of individuals. Note that the parameters  $\beta_a, \beta_b$  implicitly include the transmission-relevant contact rate, which may differ from the social contact rate  $c$ . Finally, we consider the case where assortativity also applies to infection-relevant contacts, such that in terms of physical contacts, the individuals can prefer to mix with individuals who have the same health opinion. Therefore the rates with which individuals  $s_a$  and  $s_b$  are specified by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_a(t) &= \beta_a \left( \omega \frac{i_a(t)}{n_a(t)} + (1 - \omega)(i_a(t) + i_b(t)) \right), \\ \lambda_b(t) &= \beta_b \left( \omega \frac{i_b(t)}{n_b(t)} + (1 - \omega)(i_a(t) + i_b(t)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad [2]$$


The infection status of individuals does not modify the rate with which they switch their opinion. However, infection spread in the population can affect opinion dynamics. Here, we consider the case of individuals obtaining information about disease spread that is available publicly via media and health authorities. In our model, with increasing prevalence of infection  $i = i_a + i_b$ , opinion  $a$  gains in popularity, which is represented by an increase in the probability of switch to opinion  $a$  per contact,  $p_a$ . We assume that

$$p_a(i) = p_a(0) + (p_a(1) - p_a(0)) \frac{(1 + m)i}{1 + mi}, \quad [3]$$

where  $p_a(0)$  is the switching rate per contact in the disease-free state, and  $p_a(1)$  is the switching rate when the entire population is infected;  $m$  is a constant that determines how fast  $p_a$  increases with increasing prevalence (see Figure 1b). Thus, as prevalence of infection increases, so does the switch rate to opinion  $a$  (Eq. (1)). Probability of switching to opinion  $b$  per contact,  $p_b$ , remains fixed throughout the outbreak. The dynamics are described by a flow diagram shown in Figure 1c and are captured by system of ordinary differential equations (6) in Methods section.

Model parameters are summarized in Table 1. In numerical analysis, we use the indicated parameter values, unless stated otherwise. We give the justification for the selection of the values later in the text.

To calculate the basic reproduction number  $R_0$  for this model, we used the Next Generation Matrix method described in (26).



**Fig. 1. Coupling of opinion dynamics and infection transmission dynamics. a** Switch rate function to opinion  $a$  depending on density  $n_a$ . For  $\theta = 0$  and  $k = 1$  the switch rate is linear (blue); for  $\theta > 0$  and  $k = 1$  the switch rate is saturating (red); for  $\theta > 0$  and  $k > 1$  the switch rate is sigmoid (yellow and violet). **b** Per contact probability of switching to opinion  $a$  for different values of  $m$  as a function of the density of infected individuals,  $i$ . **c** Flowchart of coupled opinion and infection transmission model for two types of infectious diseases: SIS model ( $G = 1$ ) and SIR model ( $G = 0$ ); black dashed arrows denote opinion transitions, red solid arrows denote epidemiological transitions.

269 Then  $R_0$  is given by the spectral radius of matrix  $FV^{-1}$  with

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} n_a(0)\beta_a \left( \frac{\omega}{n_a(0)} + (1-\omega) \right) & n_a(0)\beta_a(1-\omega) \\ n_b(0)\beta_b(1-\omega) & n_b(0)\beta_b \left( \frac{\omega}{n_b(0)} + (1-\omega) \right) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_a + c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(0)) & -c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(0)) \\ -c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(0)) & \gamma_b + c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(0)) \end{pmatrix} \quad [4]$$

270  
 271 Here  $(n_a(0), n_b(0))$  are given by the opinion distribution at  
 272 the start of the outbreak and depend on  $k, \theta_a, \theta_b, p_a/p_b$ .

273 For a population, in which only one of the two opinions is  
 274 present (“monobief” population), the epidemic dynamics are  
 275 reduced to the basic SIS/SIR dynamics with a basic repro-  
 276 duction number that is determined by the parameters of the

dominating opinion:

$$R_0^l = \frac{\beta_l}{\gamma_l}, \quad l \in \{a, b\}. \quad [5] \quad 278$$

**Table 1. Summary of model parameters described by system (6) and ranges of values used in numerical examples.**


Name	Description (unit)	Value*
$c$	Social contact rate (individuals/week)	10 [5, 105]
$\omega$	Degree of assortativity	0 [0, 0.95]
$p_a,$ $p_a(0)$	Probability of switching to opinion $a$ per contact when no infectious cases exist	0.4 [0.1, 1.0]
$p_a(1)$	Probability of switching to opinion $a$ per contact when the whole population is infectious	1 [0.6, 1.0]
$p_b$	Probability of switching to opinion $b$ per contact	0.4 [0.1, 0.4]
$\theta_a$	Saturation constant in switch rate function $f_a$	5.0
$\theta_b$	Saturation constant in switch rate function $f_b$	5.0
$k$	Switch rate function shape parameter	2.7 [0.0, 2.7]
$m$	Constant that controls the growth rate of the switch probability $p_a$ as the density of infected individuals increases	[1, 100]
$\beta_a$	Infection rate of susceptible individuals holding opinion $a$ (1/week)	0.8
$\beta_b$	Infection rate of susceptible individuals holding opinion $b$ (1/week)	2.0 (1.5)
$\gamma$	Recovery rate of infectious individuals (1/week)	1.0

\* Intervals were sampled in bifurcation and sensitivity analyses.

**Dynamics of competing opinions.** To understand the effect of the coupling between the disease spread and opinion competition on infection transmission, we first need to consider the dynamics of opinions in the disease-free population. The model indicates that when either one of the two opinions dominates the population (“monobief” population), then this remains unchanged until individuals of the opposing opinion enter the population from outside. As we are mainly interested in situations where two opinions compete in the population, we investigated for which parameter regions a stable co-existence of two opinions is possible. This co-existence depends on the shape of the switch rate functions,  $f_l, l \in \{a, b\}$ , but not on the social contact rate  $c$  or the assortativity parameter  $\omega$ , as these are assumed to be the same for both opinions (Supporting information (SI), Supplementary text).

For linear switch rate functions (Eq. (1),  $\theta_l = 0, k = 1$ ), the stable co-existence of opinions is not possible (Figure 2). As there is no density dependence, the growth of the switch rate functions does not slow down even when the majority of the population is following a certain opinion. If initially both

opinions are present, the opinion with the larger probability of switching per contact  $p_l$  will take over. If, for example, opinion  $a$  is introduced into a monobelief population with opinion  $b$ , it will only be able to persist if  $p_a$  is larger than  $p_b$ . In this case, the population will eventually switch to opinion  $a$  regardless of the initial density of individuals who hold it (Figure 2b). Assortativity degree ( $\omega$ ) and contact rate ( $c$ ) while not affecting the outcome of the opinion competition, determine the speed with which the mono-belief state is reached, such that higher assortativity and lower contact rate prolong the transient period.



**Fig. 2. Opinion competition dynamics for a linear switch rate function.** We consider opinion dynamics in the disease-free population. **a** Bifurcation diagram of  $n_a$  as a function of  $p_a/p_b$ . Red lines: unstable equilibria, blue lines: stable equilibria. Orange area: basin of attraction of the mono-belief  $b$  equilibrium, blue area: basin of attraction of the mono-belief  $a$  equilibrium. **b** Temporal dynamics of  $n_a$  for  $p_a/p_b = 1.5$ . All solutions where initially both opinions are present converge to the state where opinion  $a$  dominates.

If the switch rate functions are non-linear (Eq. (1),  $\theta_l > 0$ ,  $k \geq 1$ ) the opinions can co-exist in a steady state (Figure 3). For switch rate functions that are saturating but not sigmoidal ( $\theta_l > 0$ ,  $k = 1$ ), either stable co-existence is possible, or one of the mono-belief solutions is stable. It depends on the two switch rate functions, whether co-existence is possible or not (Figures 3a, 3d, 3g). Stable co-existence of opinions is possible in the case when the switching functions exhibit saturation at high density of an opinion. Subsequently, the growth of the switch rate function for the dominant opinion slows down when the majority of the population is following that opinion. The stable co-existence state is attracting for all initial situations, in which both opinions are present. The distribution of opinions at this steady state depends entirely on the ratio  $p_a/p_b$  and not on  $p_a$  and  $p_b$  separately (SI, Supplementary text). The larger the ratio  $p_a/p_b$ , the higher is the equilibrium density of  $N_a$  individuals. If permanent co-existence of opinions is impossible, the opinion with higher switch rate per contact ( $p_l$ ,  $l \in \{a, b\}$ ) will take over the population. The interval of  $p_a/p_b$ , in which opinions can co-exist, depends on the saturation constants of the switch rate functions,  $\theta_l$ ,  $l \in \{a, b\}$ . The higher these are (i.e. the faster saturation is achieved) the wider is the  $p_a/p_b$  interval, in which opinions can co-exist. Intuitively, the faster the switch rate functions become saturated, the larger differences between the probabilities of switching per contact can be while still allowing stable co-existence of opinions. For mathematical derivations and further elaborations, see SI, Supplementary text.

If the switch rate functions are sigmoidal (Eq. (1),  $\theta_l > 0$ ,  $k > 0$ ), at least one stable co-existence state of opinions is possible for some parameter regions (Figure 3b, 3e). Additionally, monobelief population states are always locally attracting. I.e., if, for example, the population starts with a sufficiently


large majority believing opinion  $a$ , then after some time the entire population will hold this opinion.

If for a given set of parameters there is only a single unstable co-existence equilibrium (Figures 3b and 3c), the population always ends up as a monobelief population, but it depends on the initial distribution of opinions to which mono-belief it will converge. The proportions of  $n_a$  and  $n_b$  at this unstable steady state depend on the ratio  $p_a/p_b$ . The higher this ratio, the lower is  $n_a$ . This unstable equilibrium separates the state space into the basins of attraction of the  $a$ -monobelief and  $b$ -monobelief populations. This implies that the population with the higher associated switch probability per contact  $p_l$  requires a smaller proportion of individuals of that opinion to invade. This is illustrated in Figure 3g), where  $p_a$  is 1.5 times higher than  $p_b$ , hence it requires much fewer individuals of opinion  $a$  to take over the population.

If, on the other hand, for a given fixed set of parameters several steady states are possible, then their number is odd and at least one of them is locally attractive. For the interpretation of the model, only locally stable steady states are of interest as states in which two opinions can co-exist. Unstable steady states are relevant as boundaries between basins of attraction. In our numerical experiments, we observed at most three different steady states, one of them a stable co-existence state (see Figure 3b). Our analysis and numerical experiments indicate that existence of a stable co-existence state of opinions depends on values of  $p_a/p_b$ ,  $\theta_a$ ,  $\theta_b$ , and  $k$  (SI, Supplementary text). If there are three steady states, two of them are repelling and one is attracting, such that the density  $n_a$  for the attracting state is between the densities  $n_a$  for the repelling states. Therefore, the repelling states mark the boundaries of the basins of attraction for the attracting states. From the bifurcation diagram (Figure 3b) we observe that there are two points where the dynamics of the system change as  $p_a/p_b$  increases from zero (left and right edges of the green region on Figure 3b). These are saddle node bifurcation points which mark the appearance and disappearance of a pair of steady states. If  $p_a/p_b$  is to the left of the green region, then in order to take over the population, nearly the whole population should hold opinion  $a$ . Stable co-existence of opinions is impossible. As  $p_a/p_b$  increases and passes the left edge of the green region, this proportion  $n_a$  needed for opinion  $a$  to take over the population declines (Figure 3b, upper red curve in the green region). More importantly, stable co-existence with opinion  $b$  is now possible and requires a much smaller initial proportion of  $n_a$  for persistence of  $a$ . (Figure 3b, lower red curve in the green region). As  $p_a/p_b$  increases past the right edge of the green region, the “invasion” density threshold for opinion  $a$  further declines. Moreover, as stable co-existence is not possible anymore, it becomes the threshold for complete taking over of the population by opinion  $a$ .

### Epidemic dynamics in a population with competing opinions.

For the purposes of analysis of the feedback between opinion competition and infection dynamics, we are mainly interested in the situation where health-positive and health-neutral opinions can co-exist in a steady state and the monobelief population steady states are locally stable. We therefore focus our attention on sigmoidal opinion switch rate functions and on the parameter region where stable co-existence of opinions is possible. We assume that an infectious disease invades a population, in which the two opinions co-exist at the stable



**Fig. 3. Opinion competition dynamics for saturating and sigmoidal switch rate functions.** The upper row shows bifurcation diagrams of  $n_a$  as a function of  $p_a/p_b$ . For **a** a saturating switch rate function; **b** and **c** sigmoidal switch rate functions. Red lines: unstable equilibria, blue lines: stable equilibria. Orange area: basin of attraction for the equilibrium with opinion  $b$  dominating; blue area: basin of attraction for the equilibrium where opinion  $a$  dominates; green area: basin of attraction of a stable co-existence equilibrium. **d-i** Temporal dynamics of  $n_a$  for different switch rate functions and ratios  $p_a/p_b$ . In all panels  $\theta_a = \theta_b = 5$ .

404 steady state.


405 The opinion switch rate-related parameters are fixed at  $k =$   
 406  $1.6$ ,  $\theta_a = \theta_b = 5$ . Thus the switch rates for both opinions  
 407 are sigmoidal functions. We fix  $p_b = 0.4$ . For most of the  
 408 simulations  $p_a$  and  $p_a(0)$  are fixed to  $0.4$ , thus  $p_a/p_b = 1$   
 409 and the stable co-existence of opinion equilibrium has 50/50  
 410 distribution of health-positive and health-neutral individuals.  
 411 Probability of switching to to opinion  $a$  per contact when the  
 412 whole population is infectious  $p_a(1)$  is bounded by the largest  
 413 possible value it can have, 1. Assortativity degree  $\omega$  and social  
 414 contact rates  $c$  are varied on the intervals which are sufficiently  
 415 wide to recover full range of qualitative dynamics.

416 We consider the dynamics of a respiratory non-fatal infectious  
 417 disease similar to flu. We assume that the infectious period  
 418 lasts on average a week, thus we fixed  $\gamma_a = \gamma_b = 1$  per week.  
 419 Furthermore, we assume that in a population where opinion  $a$   
 420 is dominant, the infection cannot spread because the health-  
 421 positive opinion leads to protective behavior that prevents an  
 422 outbreak of the infection. In a population, where opinion  $b$   
 423 dominates, this health-neutral opinion enables the infection to  
 424 spread. The transmission parameters are set as follows. The  
 425 infection rate of susceptible individuals holding the health-  
 426 positive opinion  $a$  is fixed  $\beta_a = 0.8$  per week, and the infection  
 427 rate for individuals holding the health-positive opinion  $b$  is

fixed  $\beta_b = 2$  per week for SIR model and  $\beta_b = 1.5$  per week  
 for SIS model. This difference of values was necessary, since  
 in the case of SIS the pool of susceptible individuals is being  
 constantly replenished. These settings imply that  $R_0^a = 0.8 < 1$   
 and  $R_0^b = 2 > 1$ .

**Basic reproduction number.** In a situation where both opinions  
 are present at the time the infectious disease comes into the  
 population, the basic reproduction number  $R_0$  depends on the  
 proportions  $n_a$  and  $n_b$ . We assume that these proportions are  
 at steady state at the moment of onset of an epidemic. Recall  
 that  $c$  and  $\omega$  do not influence this steady state distribution  
 of opinions, so the initial situation is the same for all values  
 of those parameters. We therefore can investigate how social  
 contact rate  $c$  and degree of assortativity  $\omega$  impact the epi-  
 demic dynamics without changing the initial steady state of  
 the system. By varying  $c$  and  $\omega$ , we change the way the popu-  
 lation can adapt to an emerging outbreak by communicating  
 about health-positive behavior. With increasing  $c$ , opinions  
 can spread faster, while with increasing  $\omega$ , opinions are more  
 restricted to their subpopulation.

In Figure 4 we investigated how the basic reproduction number  
 $R_0$  changes with changing social contact rate  $c$  and assortati-  
 vity degree  $\omega$  for three settings of the ratio  $p_a/p_b$ :  $0.8$ ,  $1$ , and



**Fig. 4. Impact of mixing patterns on basic reproduction number  $R_0$ .** **a**, **b**, and **c** show contour maps of  $R_0$  as a function of the social contact rate  $c$  and the assortativity  $\omega$ . **a** For  $p_a/p_b = 0.8$  the initial distribution of opinions is  $(s_a(0), s_b(0)) = (0.35, 0.65)$ . **b** For  $p_a/p_b = 1$  we have  $(s_a(0), s_b(0)) = (0.5, 0.5)$ . **c** For  $p_a/p_b = 1.25$  we have  $(s_a(0), s_b(0)) = (0.65, 0.35)$ . The infection rate of susceptible individuals holding opinion  $a$  is fixed  $\beta_b = 2$ , the value used to investigate the dynamics for the SIR system. For the same set of figures with  $\beta_b = 1.5$ , the value used to investigate the dynamics of the SIS model, see Figure S2 in SI.

451 1.25.  
 452 For all three settings of ratio  $p_a/p_b$ , the basic reproduction  
 453 number increases as assortativity  $\omega$  increases, and decreases  
 454 as the social contact rate ( $c$ ) increases. As the ratio  $p_a/p_b$   
 455 increases, the basic reproduction number decreases. We note  
 456 that for high assortativity, the effect of increasing  $c$  is smaller  
 457 than for low assortativity. Overall, we conclude that increasing  
 458 assortativity slows down the spread of opinions and therefore  
 459 leads to higher values of  $R_0$ . Conversely, increasing social  
 460 contact rate  $c$  leads to faster opinion spread and therefore to  
 461 lower  $R_0$ . Therefore, strong assortative mixing by opinions  
 462 can facilitate the outbreak of an infectious disease.

463 **SIR model with opinion competition.** In this section, we consider  
 464 the dynamics beyond the start of an outbreak for an SIR-type  
 465 disease and investigate how it depends on  $c$  and  $\omega$ . We fixed  
 466  $p_a(0)/p_b = 1$  and  $p_a(0)/p_b = 2.5$  and used the respective  
 467 stable co-existence distribution ( $n_a = 0.5, n_b = 0.5$ ) as the  
 468 initial state of the population. We seeded infection by setting  
 469  $i_b(0) = 6 \times 10^{-8}$  and  $s_b(0) = n_b(0) - i_b(0)$ .

470 We investigated the effect of the feedback between opinion  
 471 competition and infection dynamics on the epidemic peak  
 472 and on the peak density of the  $N_a$  population during and  
 473 after the outbreak. We used three settings for parameter  $m$ ,  
 474 which affects the sensitivity of the population to the growth in  
 475 prevalence of infection. As the prevalence increases,  $p(a)$  now  
 476 increases, and this can be slower ( $m = 25$ ) or faster ( $m = 75$ )  
 477 (Figure 5).


478 For all three scenarios the peak prevalence is higher for lower  
 479 contact rates and higher assortativity. The higher is the  
 480 sensitivity of the population  $m$ , the lower is the prevalence  
 481 peak.

482 In Figure 6, the temporal dynamics are shown for some param-  
 483 eter combinations. As a consequence of the feedback between  
 484 the disease and infection dynamics, the density of individ-  
 485 uals who hold opinion  $a$  temporarily increases, with eventual  
 486 return of the population to the pre-outbreak opinion distribu-  
 487 tion. However, for some parameters settings, the population  
 488 may convert completely to opinion  $a$ , thereby preserving the  
 489 memory of the past outbreak. We investigated the parametric  
 490 region, in which this conversion to  $a$  occurs (Figure 5 and


Figure S5 in SI). From Figure ?? it follows that high sensi-  
 491 tivity of the population to rise in prevalence of infection, as  
 492 reflected in parameters  $p_a(1)$  and  $m$  and a high social contact  
 493 enable conversion to opinion  $a$ . In addition, a high degree of  
 494 assortativity also enables opinion  $a$  to become dominant (dark  
 495 blue region in Figures 5a, 5b, and 5c and in Figures S5a and  
 496 S5b in SI). This is unexpected, since high assortativity slows  
 497 down opinion exchange. However, since high assortativity  
 498 also leads to a large  $R_0$ , it leads to a rise in prevalence, and  
 499 therefore increases the probability of switching to opinion  $a$ .

500 More technically, the convergence of the population to a mono-  
 501 belief  $a$  population requires that the  $n_a$  component crosses  
 502 into the basin of attraction of the mono-belief  $a$  steady state  
 503 (red lines on Figures 6a and 6d). Several conditions make this  
 504 event possible: (1) a high prevalence of infection, (2) a fast  
 505 response of the population to increasing prevalence; (3) a high  
 506 rate of switching from opinion  $b$  to  $a$ .

507 In contrast with the standard SIR epidemic, whose dynamics  
 508 display a single peak only, in a situation with feedback between  
 509 the disease dynamics and opinions dynamics multiple epidemic  
 510 peaks may appear (Figure 7). Our numerical analyses indicate  
 511 that in order for multiple epidemic peaks to appear there  
 512 should be a pronounced difference between population  $N_a$   
 513 and  $N_b$  in terms of the preventative measures they adapt (as  
 514 reflected in parameters  $\beta_a$  and  $\beta_b$ ). The upper boundary of the  
 515 region in  $\beta_a - \beta_b$  subspace where multiple peaks appear marks  
 516 the region where the population switches to opinion  $a$  (red  
 517 curve). Therefore, for a fixed  $\beta_b$  as  $\beta_a$  increases multiple peaks  
 518 appear as the population moves to the  $a$ -monobelief state  
 519 (Figure 8). The number of peaks grows as  $\beta_a$  moves closer  
 520 to the boundary. Note that in our analyses, we considered a  
 521 local maximum of prevalence to be a peak if it exceeded  $10^{-8}$ .  
 522 Moreover, the more sensitive the population is to increases in  
 523 the prevalence of infection (as reflected by parameter  $m$ ), the  
 524 larger is the number of peaks that will appear in the region  
 525 adjacent to the boundary where switch of the population to  
 526 opinion  $a$  occurs, see Figure 7 and Figure S4 in SI. Finally, if  
 527 the probability of switch to opinion  $a$  in the population without  
 528 infection,  $p_a(0)$  is significantly smaller than the probability  
 529 of switch to opinion  $b$ ,  $p_b$  the region in  $\beta_a - \beta_b$  space where  
 530 multiple peaks exist is larger (see Figure S3 in SI).  
 531



**Fig. 5. Impact of social contact rate and assortativity on epidemic dynamics.** We consider the dynamics of the SIR system for three scenarios for the sensitivity of the population to increasing prevalence of infection as denoted by parameter  $m$ ,  $m = 25$  for **a** and **d**,  $m = 50$  for **b** and **e**, and  $m = 75$  for **c** and **f**. **a**, **b**, and **c** show heat maps of the peak density of the  $N_a$  population; in the dark blue region the population converts to opinion  $a$ . **d**, **e**, and **f** show contour maps of the peak prevalence.



**Fig. 6. Impact of assortativity on the population adopting opinion  $a$ .** We consider the dynamics of the SIR system. **a** and **d** show density of  $N_a$  population  $n_a$  in time, **b** and **e** show the prevalence of infectious cases in time, **c** and **f** show phase diagrams for three different solutions overlaid over a bifurcation diagram for density of  $N_a$  population,  $n_a$ , component of permanent distributions. **a**, **b**, and **c** are plotted for degree of assortativity  $\omega = 0.2$ , **a**, **b**, and **c** - for  $\omega = 0.6$ . Social contact rate is fixed  $c = 40$ .

522 In summary, for SIR-dynamics we find that feedback between  
 523 opinion dynamics and epidemic dynamics can substantially  
 524 change the epidemic outcomes. The basic reproduction number  
 525  $R_0$  and the peak of an outbreak can be higher if there is

assortative mixing by opinion. In addition, multiple epidemic  
 526 peaks can occur and the response to an epidemic can lead  
 527 to a shift of the population to a state, in which only the  
 528 health-positive opinion is circulating.  
 529



540 **SIS model with opinion competition.** Similarly, for a SIS-infection, 581  
 541 coupling between opinion competition and disease dynamics 582  
 542 can lead to opinion  $a$  taking over the population (Figure 9), 583  
 543 and to the appearance of oscillatory epidemic dynamics (Figure 584  
 544 10). For the SIS epidemic, these oscillatory dynamics can be 585  
 545 sustained epidemic cycles instead of damped oscillations. 586

546 Switching of the whole population to opinion  $a$  causes the 587  
 547 disease to go extinct even when  $R_0 > 1$  for the opinion co- 588  
 548 existence state. Our results indicate that higher sensitivity of 589  
 549 the population to increasing prevalence, as reflected in high 590  
 550 values of  $m$  and  $p_a(1)$ , will result in higher average densities 591  
 551 of  $n_a$ , and for some regions  $n_a = 1$  (Figure 9 and Figure S6 592  
 552 in SI). The higher is the value of  $m$  the lower is the threshold 593  
 553 value of  $p_a(1)$  above which the population switches to opinion 594  
 554  $a$ . Moreover, if  $p_a$  is larger than a threshold value, the state 595  
 555  $n_a = 1$  occurs for a wide range of sensitivity of the population 596  
 556 to the prevalence,  $m$ . Should  $p_a(1)$  exceed the threshold value 597  
 557 significantly, the prevalence reduces considerably. Finally, high 598  
 558 degree of assortativity in the population, on the one hand, 599  
 559 leads to higher endemic prevalence. On the other hand, high 600  
 560 assortativity leads to increase in the  $p_a(1) - m$  subspace where 601  
 561 the population switches to opinion  $a$ . We hypothesize that 602  
 562 this is attributed to the positive effect assortativity has on 603  
 563 infection transmission.

564 In addition to causing the population to switch to opinion  $a$  604  
 565 when a disease invades, the feedback between opinions com- 605  
 566 petition and disease spread can induce sustained oscillatory 606  
 567 epidemic dynamics (Figure 10). We investigated the condi- 607  
 568 tions under which this may happen. We discovered that 608  
 569 oscillatory dynamics mostly require a pronounced difference 609  
 570 in epidemiological properties between individuals  $N_a$  and  $N_b$ , 610  
 571 such that when the whole population holds opinion  $a$ , the 611  
 572 disease becomes extinct and if the whole population believes 612  
 573 opinion  $b$  the disease persists. To show this, we plotted the 613  
 574 amplitude of the epidemic cycle, its period and average value 614  
 575 across an interval of infection rates values for two different 615  
 576 sensitivities of the population reaction to the prevalence of 616  
 577 infectious cases.

578 For a fixed value of infection rate of  $N_b$  individuals,  $\beta_b = 5.5$ , 618  
 579 as infection rate of  $N_a$  individuals  $\beta_a$  increases initially, the 619  
 580 endemic prevalence of infectious cases is constant in time, 620


with the prevalence level increasing (Figure 11a). Once  $\beta_a$  581  
 increases past a threshold value, the constant endemic state is 582  
 replaced by oscillatory dynamics, such that the average preva- 583  
 lence decreases as compared to the constant level it replaces 584  
 (Figure 11b). As  $\beta_a$  increase further, the average prevalence, 585  
 magnitude, and period of the cycle increase (Figure 11c). This 586  
 pattern continues until the prevalence pushes the population 587  
 to convert to opinion  $a$ , at which point the prevalence becomes 588  
 zero and oscillatory dynamics disappear (Figure 10d).

To summarize, given a disease that follows SIS framework, 590  
 adaptive behavior can lead to a number of qualitatively differ- 591  
 ent outcomes. It can lead to the reduction of infection 592  
 prevalence, appearance of sustained epidemic cycles, and com- 593  
 plete eradication of the infection in conditions where the basic 594  
 reproduction number would indicate that the infection will 595  
 persist. Moreover, as the degree of assortativity increases 596  
 and therefore, the basic reproductive number increases, the 597  
 parametric region where opinion  $a$  becomes dominant becomes 598  
 wider. Similar to the SIR model, the parameter region where 599  
 oscillations arise is adjacent to the region where opinion  $a$  600  
 becomes the dominant opinion. 601


## 602 Discussion

603 Using a model that couples opinion competition and infection 603  
 604 spread, we investigated the effects of feedback between the 604  
 two on epidemic dynamics. Our main findings were that the 605  
 opinion distribution landscape can significantly influence the 606  
 outcome of an epidemic. On the one hand, epidemic peaks can 607  
 be reduced, and a population can be completely shifted into a 608  
 health-positive state. On the other hand, damped or sustained 609  
 oscillations of prevalence can appear as transmissibility of the 610  
 infection increases. Parameters related to socializing dynamics 611  
 such as social contact rate and degree of the assortative mixing 612  
 by opinion were among the most important factors leading to 613  
 the appearance of the above phenomena. 614


615 The influence of assortative mixing is two-fold. On the one 615  
 616 hand, assortative mixing slows down the switching of opin- 616  
 617 ions and therefore the possible reaction of the population to 617  
 an epidemic. On the other hand, as the basic reproduction 618  
 number increases as the assortative mixing increases, higher 619  
 assortative mixing leads to higher incidence and therefore to 620



**Fig. 7. Regions of multiple epidemic peaks resulting from feedback between disease dynamics and opinion dynamics.** We consider the dynamics of the SIR model. **a**, **b**, and **c** are contour plots of the number of prevalence peaks for different values of infection rates  $\beta_a$  and  $\beta_b$  for different sensitivity  $m$  of the population to increasing prevalence: **a**  $m = 25$ , **b**  $m = 50$ , and **c**  $m = 75$ . The social contact rate is fixed at  $c = 40$ , and the probability of switch to opinion  $a$  per contact when the entire population is infected is fixed  $p_a(1) = 1$ , and the assortativity degree is fixed  $\omega = 0$ . The area above the red curve denotes the outcome where the population switched to opinion  $a$ . As  $m$  increases this region expands.



**Fig. 8. Temporal dynamics with multiple epidemic peaks resulting from feedback between disease dynamics and opinion dynamics.** We consider the dynamics of the SIR system. Panels show time series of infection prevalence, and of the density of the  $N_a$  population,  $n_a$  for different values of infection rate  $\beta_a$ . The social contact rate was fixed at  $c = 40$ , the upper bound of the probability of switching to opinion  $a$  was set to  $p_a(1) = 1$ , the sensitivity parameter  $m$  was set to  $m = 75$ , the infection rate of  $N_b$  individuals was set to  $\beta_b = 4.15$ , and the assortativity degree is fixed  $\omega = 0$ .




**Fig. 9. Impact of social contact rate and assortativity on the average endemic prevalence of infectious cases and average long-term opinion distribution.** We consider the dynamics of the SIS system. **a**, **b**, and **c** show heat maps of the long term average density of the  $N_a$  population. **d**, **e**, and **f** show heat maps of the long term average infection prevalence. If the epidemic dynamics are periodic, then the average is taken over a period. **a** and **d** show scenarios with sensitivity of reaction to prevalence given by  $m = 25$ . **b** and **e** show scenarios with sensitivity of reaction to prevalence given by  $m = 50$ . **c** and **f** show scenarios with sensitivity of reaction to prevalence given by  $m = 75$ . The dark blue region in the top row and dark blue region in the bottom row denote the outcome where the population switched to opinion  $a$  and the disease becomes extinct. The infection rate of  $N_b$  individuals was set  $\beta_b = 1.5$ .


621 a stronger reaction of the population, eventually even pushing  
 622 the population into a state where the health-positive opinion  
 623 is dominating. However, if assortativity is too high, its pro-  
 624 moting effect on prevalence is not sufficient to help spread the  
 625 health-protective opinion, and the population will experience a  
 626 large epidemic peak. This effect on opinion spread is mitigated  
 627 if the social contact rate is high.

628 Our model differs from earlier work incorporating awareness  
 629 into epidemic modelling (2, 4) in that we consider both opinions  
 630 as possibly attractive, such that a health-positive individuals  
 631 may switch to a health-neutral opinion through contact with  
 632 others who hold that opinion. This switching, which leads  
 633 individuals to adopt a more risky health behavior, can therefore

634 spread in the same way as health-positive behavior. In the  
 635 papers (2, 4), awareness for the risks of infection decayed, when  
 636 the infection was not present in the population, eventually  
 637 leading to a completely unaware population. In contrast, in  
 638 our model both opinions can co-exist in a steady state, also in a  
 639 disease-free situation. The possibility of this outcome depends  
 640 on the shape of opinion switch rate function. The potential  
 641 of a stable co-existence of the two opinions implies that the  
 642 impact of a new epidemic depends on the initial proportion  
 643 of individuals with a health-positive opinion. Such an initial  
 644 situation can be influenced, e.g., by educational interventions  
 645 or other types of communication about future epidemic risks.  
 646 Appearance of oscillatory epidemic dynamics due to the feed-



**Fig. 10. Impact of assortativity and sensitivity of reaction to the prevalence of infectious cases on the appearance of periodic epidemic dynamics.** We consider the dynamics of the SIS system. **a** and **b** show heat maps of the average prevalence. If the epidemic dynamics are periodic, then the average is taken over a period. **c** and **d** show heat maps of the period of the epidemic cycle. The period is equal to zero if the dynamics are stationary. **e** and **f** show heat maps of the amplitude of epidemic cycle. The amplitude is zero if the dynamics are stationary. **a**, **c**, and **e** show scenarios with sensitivity of reaction to prevalence given by  $m = 50$ . **b**, **d**, and **f** show scenarios with sensitivity of reaction to prevalence given by  $m = 75$ . The dark blue region above the red line denotes the outcome where the population switched to opinion  $a$  and the disease becomes extinct. The probability of switch to opinion  $a$  when no infectious cases are present is fixed  $p_a(0) = 0.28$ , the probability of switch to opinion  $a$  when the whole population is infected is fixed to  $p_a(1) = 0.6$ . Social contact rate is fixed  $c = 10$ .



**Fig. 11. Sustained oscillatory dynamics resulting from feedback between disease dynamics and opinion dynamics.** We consider the dynamics of the SIS system. Panels show time series for the prevalence of infectious cases and density of  $N_a$  population,  $n_a$  for different values of infection rate of  $N_a$  population,  $\beta_a$ . The contact rate for information exchange is fixed  $c = 10$ , the probability of switch to opinion  $a$  when no infectious cases are present is fixed  $p_a(0) = 0.28$ , the probability of switch to opinion  $a$  per contact when the whole population is infected is fixed  $p_a(1) = 0.6$ , the constant that controls the growth of the switch rate to opinion  $a$  is fixed  $m = 75$ , and the infection rate of  $N_b$  individuals is fixed to  $\beta_b = 5.5$ .

tribute to the possibility of the population converting to the health positive opinion. In our experiments, the parametric regions where these two phenomena take place always appeared adjacent to each other.

The model can be extended to address present-day epidemic concerns, such as dynamics of infectious vaccine-preventable diseases. Vaccine uptake rate for well-known infectious diseases (e.g., measles, influenza) as well as for emerging ones (e.g., COVID-19) is fraught by reluctance of the part of the population to vaccinate (29–33). While circulation of vaccine uptake-endorsing opinions is subject to both communication from public health authorities as well as to interpersonal exchanges (30, 34, 35), the circulation of anti-vaccination sentiment depends on social norms within the local network and interpersonal communications within the network (34–36). The models that considered the role of interpersonal communications on the vaccination uptake and its effect on epidemic dynamics (27, 28), while coupling vaccination strategies with the population epidemic state, modeled the growth of the vaccinating population contingent on the presence of the disease, while its opposite, non-vaccinating sentiment, did not depend on the population state. Our framework which allows for symmetric treatment of health-positive and health-neutral sentiments is well-suited for investigation of vaccination opinion dynamics with or without the disease.

Our framework can bring interesting qualitative insights for the dynamics of a vaccine preventable disease characterized by waning immunity (e.g. measles, pertussis, influenza). In the conditions of waning immunity, it is highly important to keep up consistently high vaccination uptake rate if not to eradicate the disease, at least to avoid the overcrowding of the health care system. Another important consideration, in the context of infectious diseases characterized by waning immunity, is the process of waning and boosting of immunity which can cause pronounced oscillation dynamics (37). Therefore, for infectious

back between health opinion dynamics and disease spread was observed both in the analysis of real world data (1, 5) and simulated trajectories produced by socio-epidemiological models (27, 28). In the present work, by means of considering changes in the dynamics across the parameter landscape, we gained insights into which properties of the system cause the appearance of oscillations. Pronounced difference between the carriers of two opinions in terms of infection rates as well as high average infection rate is one of the conditions for which oscillatory dynamics arise. Another important factor for the appearance of oscillations is a high rate of opinion exchange (as captured by the social contact rate) and high sensitivity of the population to prevalence. These two factors also con-

diseases characterized by waning and boosting of immunity, presence of adaptive behavior with respect to vaccination, can give rise to rich dynamics highly relevant for the efforts of health authorities.

In this work, we assumed that the social exchange does not necessarily require physical contacts (interactions that have a probability of infection transmission), i.e. in a situation where the physical contact may decrease, the information exchange and thus, opinion dynamic will proceed unimpeded. However, in real life, at least some of the social contacts will terminate if the physical contact rate is reduced. Thus, if health-positive individuals practice social distancing then opinion dynamics and subsequently epidemic dynamics will be altered in a number of ways that may not necessarily benefit the population. For example, given a reduction of social contact rate for the health-positive individuals, it may be necessary they are present at a higher proportion, in order to maintain steady presence in the population.

Our simple model has rich dynamics, appearance of which depends on the functional responses and parameter values. For example, as our analyses have shown, the shape of the functional response plays a key role in the dynamics of health opinions/behaviors and subsequently in epidemic dynamics. Therefore, to be able to use the model for qualitative and quantitative predictions it is paramount to accurately identify functional representations for the opinion switch rates and for behavioral response to the epidemic spread. Having these at hand will enable the design of information interventions to be well-tailored to the specific time frame of the epidemic.

## Materials and Methods

The system of ordinary equations (6) describes the coupled dynamics of infection spread and opinion competition.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{ds_a(t)}{dt} &= -s_a(t)c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(t)) + s_b(t)c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(t)) \\
 &\quad -s_a\lambda_a(t) + G\gamma_a i_a(t) \\
 \frac{di_a(t)}{dt} &= -i_a(t)c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(t)) + i_b(t)c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(t)) \\
 &\quad +s_a\lambda_a(t) - \gamma_a i_a(t) \\
 \frac{dr_a(t)}{dt} &= -r_a(t)c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(t)) + r_b(t)c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(t)) \\
 &\quad + (1-G)\gamma_a i_a(t) \\
 \frac{ds_b(t)}{dt} &= s_a(t)c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(t)) - s_b(t)c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(t)) \\
 &\quad -s_b\lambda_b(t) + G\gamma_b i_b(t) \\
 \frac{di_b(t)}{dt} &= i_a(t)c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(t)) - i_b(t)c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(t)) \\
 &\quad +s_b\lambda_b(t) - \gamma_b i_b(t) \\
 \frac{dr_b(t)}{dt} &= r_a(t)c(1-\omega)f_b(n_b(t)) - r_b(t)c(1-\omega)f_a(n_a(t)) \\
 &\quad + (1-G)\gamma_b i_b(t)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{6}$$

where

$$G = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for a SIS model,} \\ 0 & \text{for a SIR model.} \end{cases}
 \tag{7}$$

and  $\lambda_a$  and  $\lambda_b$  are specified by equations (2).

**Model code** The model was implemented in MATLAB R2021b (38). The code producing the analyses and figures for this study is available at <https://github.com/aiteslya/TwoOpinion> (39).

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.** Please include your acknowledgments here, set in a single paragraph. Please do not include any acknowledgments in the Supporting Information, or anywhere else in the manuscript.

1. M Bootsma, N Ferguson, The effect of public health measures on the 1918 influenza pandemic in U.S. cities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **104**, 7588–7593 (2007).
2. S Funk, E Gilad, C Watkins, J VAA, The spread of awareness and its impact on epidemic outbreaks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 6872–6877 (2009).
3. D He, J Dushoff, T Day, J Ma, D Earn, Mechanistic modelling of the three waves of the 1918 influenza pandemic. *Theor. Ecol.* **4**, 283–288 (2011).
4. N Perra, D Balcan, B Gonçalves, A Vespignani, Towards a characterization of behavior-disease models. *PLOS ONE* **6**, 1–15 (2011).
5. D He, J Dushoff, T Day, J Ma, D Earn, Inferring the causes of the three waves of the 1918 influenza pandemic in England and Wales. *Proc. Royal Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* **280** (2013).
6. J Lau, X Yang, H Tsui, J Kim, Impacts of SARS on health-seeking behaviors in general population in Hong Kong. *Prev. Medicine* **41**, 454–462 (2005).
7. Y Hsu, Y Chen, H Wei, Y Yang, Y Chen, Risk and Outbreak Communication: Lessons from Taiwan's Experiences in the Post-SARS Era. *Heal. Secur.* **15**, 165–169 (2017) PMID: 28418746.
8. R Goodwin, SJ Gaines, L Myers, F Neto, Initial psychological responses to swine flu. *Int. J. Behav. Medicine* **18**, 88–92 (2011).
9. S Pedro, et al., Conditions for a Second Wave of COVID-19 Due to Interactions Between Disease Dynamics and Social Processes. *Front. Phys.* **8**, 428 (2020).
10. I Rosenstock, The health belief model and preventive health behavior. *Heal. Educ. Monogr.* **2**, 354–386 (1974).
11. C Bauch, D Earn, Vaccination and the theory of games. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **101**, 13391–13394 (2004).
12. S Marvel, H Hong, A Papush, S Strogatz, Encouraging moderation: Clues from a simple model of ideological conflict. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 118702 (2012).
13. F Colaiori, C Castellano, Interplay between media and social influence in the collective behavior of opinion dynamics. *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 042815 (2015).
14. S Wang, L Rong, J Wu, Bistability and multistability in opinion dynamics models. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **289**, 388–395 (2016).
15. M Salathé, S Bonhoeffer, The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks. *J. The Royal Soc. Interface* **5**, 1505–1508 (2008).
16. A Pananos, et al., Critical dynamics in population vaccinating behavior. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 13762–13767 (2017).
17. W Choi, E Shim, Optimal strategies for vaccination and social distancing in a game-theoretic epidemiological model. *J. Theor. Biol.* **505**, 110422 (2020).
18. I Kiss, J Cassell, M Recker, P Simon, The impact of information transmission on epidemic outbreaks. *Math. biosciences* **225**, 1–10 (2010).
19. A Teslya, et al., Impact of self-imposed prevention measures and short-term government-imposed social distancing on mitigating and delaying a COVID-19 epidemic: A modelling study. *PLOS Medicine* **17**, 1–21 (2020).
20. G Rubin, R Amlôt, L Page, S Wessely, Public perceptions, anxiety, and behaviour change in relation to the swine flu outbreak: cross sectional telephone survey. *BMJ* **339** (2009).
21. M Young, G Norman, K Humphreys, Medicine in the popular press: The influence of the media on perceptions of disease. *PLOS ONE* **3**, 1–7 (2008).
22. C Ferrari, J Pinasco, N Saintier, Coupling epidemiological models with social dynamics. *Bull. Math. Biol.* **83** (2021).
23. G Agaba, Y Kyrychko, K Blyuss, Mathematical model for the impact of awareness on the dynamics of infectious diseases. *Math. Biosci.* **286**, 22–30 (2017).
24. C Holling, The functional response of predators to prey density and its role in mimicry and population regulation. *Memoirs Entomol. Soc. Can.* **97**, 5–60 (1965).
25. E Rogers, *Diffusion of innovations*. (New York: Free Press.), (1995).
26. O Diekmann, H Heesterbeek, H Britton, *Mathematical Tools for Understanding Infectious Disease Dynamics*. (Princeton University Press), (2013).
27. C Bauch, Imitation dynamics predict vaccinating behaviour. *Proc. Biol. sciences* **272**, 1669–1675 (2005).
28. A d'Onofrio, P Manfredi, P Poletti, The interplay of public intervention and private choices in determining the outcome of vaccination programmes. *PLOS ONE* **7**, 1–10 (2012).
29. D Gust, N Darling, A Kennedy, B Schwartz, Parents With Doubts About Vaccines: Which Vaccines and Reasons Why. *Pediatrics* **122**, 718–725 (2008).
30. A Shaham, G Chodick, V Shalev, D Yamin, Personal and social patterns predict influenza vaccination decision. *BMC Public Heal.* **20** (2020).
31. R Dodd, E Cvejic, C Bonner, K Pickles, K McCaffery, Willingness to vaccinate against COVID-19 in Australia. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* pp. 318–319 (2021).
32. J Lazarus, et al., A global survey of potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. *Nat. Medicine* pp. 225–228 (2021).
33. S Solis Arce, et al., COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy in low- and middle-income countries. *Nat. Medicine* pp. 1385–1394 (2021).
34. E Brunson, The Impact of Social Networks on Parents' Vaccination Decisions. *Pediatrics* **131**, e1397–e1404 (2013).
35. S Quinn, et al., The influence of social norms on flu vaccination among African American and White adults. *Heal. Educ. Res.* **32**, 473–486 (2017).
36. A Kata, Anti-vaccine activists, Web 2.0, and the postmodern paradigm—an overview of tactics and tropes used online by the anti-vaccination movement. *Vaccine* **30** (2012).
37. J Heffernan, K MJ, Implications of vaccination and waning immunity. *Proc. Royal Soc. B* **276**, 2071–2080 (2009).
38. MATLAB, 9.11.0.1769968 (R2021b). (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts), (2021).
39. A Teslya, V Buskens, H Nunner, M Kretzschmar, The effect of competition between health opinions on epidemic dynamics. *GitHub* (2021).