

Social divisions and risk perception can drive divergent epidemic dynamics and large second and third waves

Mallory J. Harris*¹ and Erin A. Mordecai¹

¹ Biology Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94301

*Corresponding author (mharris9@stanford.edu)

May 20, 2022

1 Abstract

2 During infectious disease outbreaks, individuals may adopt protective measures like
3 vaccination and physical distancing in response to awareness of disease burden. Prior
4 work showed how feedback between epidemic intensity and awareness-based behavior
5 shapes disease dynamics (e.g., producing plateaus and oscillations). These models often
6 overlook social divisions, where population subgroups may be disproportionately
7 impacted by a disease and more responsive to the effects of disease within their group.
8 We hypothesize that socially divided awareness-based behavior could fundamentally
9 alter epidemic dynamics and shift disease burden between groups.

10 We develop a compartmental model of disease transmission in a population split into
11 two groups to explore the impacts of *awareness separation* (relatively greater in- versus
12 out-group awareness of epidemic severity) and *mixing separation* (relatively greater in-
13 versus out-group contact rates). Protective measures are adopted based on awareness of
14 recent disease-linked mortality. Using simulations, we show that groups that are more
15 separated in awareness have smaller differences in mortality. Fatigue-driven
16 abandonment of protective behavior can drive additional infection waves that can even
17 exceed the size of the initial wave, particularly if uniform awareness drives early
18 protection in one group, leaving that group largely susceptible to future infection.
19 Finally, vaccine or infection-acquired immunity that is more protective against
20 transmission and mortality may indirectly lead to more infections by reducing
21 perceived risk of infection, and thereby reducing vaccine uptake. The dynamics of
22 awareness-driven protective behavior, including relatively greater awareness of
23 epidemic conditions in one's own group, can dramatically impact protective behavior
24 uptake and the course of epidemics.

25 Introduction

26 When an infectious disease causes substantial disease burden and death, people may
27 respond to the true or perceived risk of infection by modifying their behavior (1–5). In
28 turn, protective behaviors like physical distancing, mask wearing, and vaccination may
29 suppress transmission, reducing peak and total infections and disease-linked mortality
30 (3, 6, 7). Bidirectional feedback between epidemic outcomes and awareness-based
31 behavior may lead to unexpected and nonlinear dynamics, such as plateaus and
32 oscillations in cases over time (8–11). Mathematical models that split the population into
33 categories with respect to the disease (i.e., compartments) and mathematically define
34 transition rates between different states are widely used to understand such complex
35 epidemic dynamics. Compartmental models may incorporate the impact of awareness
36 as a function of deaths or cases that reduces transmission evenly across the population
37 (8, 9). The spread of epidemic-related information has also been modeled as an
38 additional contagion process that is distinct from but potentially linked to disease
39 transmission (11–15). However, real populations are sharply divided in physical
40 interactions, demography, ideology, education, housing and employment structures,
41 and information access; these social divisions can impact both the transmission of
42 pathogens and information within and between groups, altering epidemic dynamics.
43 The impacts of such asymmetrically spreading disease and awareness in a highly
44 divided population are not well understood (16–18).

45 Populations may be subdivided based on an array of factors (e.g., race, ethnicity, age,
46 and geography), with marked differences in pathogen exposure and infection severity
47 (17, 19–23). Risk of pathogen introduction may vary between groups: high income
48 groups may encounter pathogens endemic to other regions through international travel,
49 low income groups may have heightened likelihood of exposure connected to poor
50 housing quality and insufficient occupational protections, and certain regions and
51 occupations experience greater risks of exposure to zoonotic illnesses (19, 24–27). Once a
52 pathogen is introduced, it may spread at different rates within groups based on factors
53 like housing density and access to healthcare (20, 24, 28). Further, the severity of
54 infection may vary directly with group identity due to underlying biological differences
55 (e.g., age or sex), as a function of co-morbidities especially prevalent in one group due
56 to underlying inequities (e.g., lung disease connected to environmental pollution or
57 heart disease associated with factors driven by structural racism), or through
58 heterogeneity in access to and quality of healthcare (20–22, 28–32). Physical barriers
59 (e.g., geographic boundaries, schools, residential segregation, and incarceration) and
60 preferential mixing with members of one’s own group may reduce contact and
61 subsequent transmission between groups, a characteristic we describe as *separated*
62 *mixing* (19, 33–36). Infectious disease models that account for differences in

63 vulnerability within subgroups of a population and separated mixing can help to
64 illustrate the emergence of health inequities and justify structural interventions to
65 reduce these disparities (37–40). However, such models may miss an important
66 behavioral dimension by failing to account for variation in awareness-based behavior
67 changes among groups.

68 Awareness and behavioral heterogeneity can significantly alter disease dynamics: for
69 example, local awareness in a network with strong clustering can stop the pathogen
70 from spreading altogether, while clustering in vaccine exemptions may lead to
71 outbreaks (14, 41, 42). Although personal risk perception may be responsive to risk in
72 other groups, and behavior may be influenced by population-level social norms and
73 mass media, attitudes toward diseases and protective behaviors may also vary
74 considerably between groups and correspond to actual risk and personal experiences of
75 close social ties with the disease (43–48). While prior awareness-based models have
76 examined outcomes given different sources of information (i.e., local or global), we aim
77 to characterize risk perception based on group-level information in a population split
78 into two distinct and well-defined groups (49). We define *separated awareness* as greater
79 in- versus out-group awareness in a split population and predict that, by producing
80 behavioral responses more reflective of each group's risk, it may reduce differences
81 between groups in disease burden (50). Understanding the impacts of separation with
82 respect to mixing and awareness on disease dynamics may be important for
83 characterizing differences in epidemic burden and effectively intervening to mitigate
84 population inequities (37, 39, 40, 50, 51).

85 Here, we investigate the impacts of intergroup divisions on epidemic dynamics using
86 an awareness-based model for transmission of an infectious disease, in which adoption
87 of protective measures (either nonpharmaceutical interventions or vaccinations) is
88 linked to recent epidemic conditions and mediated by awareness.

89 We ask:

- 90 1. How do separated awareness and mixing interact to affect differences between
91 groups in epidemic dynamics?
- 92 2. How does fatigue interact with awareness separation to affect long-term
93 epidemic dynamics?
- 94 3. When vaccines are introduced, how does immunity interact with awareness
95 separation to affect long-term epidemic dynamics?


96 Results

97 1. Separated mixing and awareness

98 To understand how separation in awareness and mixing interact to alter short-term
99 epidemic dynamics in a split population, we model awareness-based adoption of
100 nonpharmaceutical interventions (Equation 1); all model parameters are defined in
101 Supplementary Table 1 and a compartmental diagram is provided as Supplementary
102 Figure 1. The population is split into two groups: group a and group b , and individuals
103 in each group can switch between unprotective behavior and protective behavior that
104 reduces transmission but cannot change their group. We arbitrarily designate group a
105 as having greater underlying vulnerability to infection or disease-linked mortality in all
106 of the following scenarios. Specifically, in this section the sole initial difference between
107 groups is caused by introducing the pathogen into group a alone at prevalence $I_a(0) =$
108 0.001; all other parameters are equivalent between groups. To simplify short-term
109 awareness-based behavior, this scenario does not incorporate memory or fatigue ($\ell = 1$
110 and $\phi = 0$). First, we allow both mixing (h ; which drives the contact and contagion
111 process) and awareness (ϵ ; which drives protective behavior adoption) to be either
112 uniform (functioning like a single population) (0.5) or highly separated (0.99).

113 The groups experience identical epidemic dynamics when mixing is uniform (Figure
114 1A, B), as the pathogen introduced into group a quickly spreads into group b and
115 circulates evenly within and between groups. When groups mix separately, differences
116 in epidemic dynamics between groups arise and depend on awareness separation
117 (Figure 1C, D). When mixing is separated but awareness is uniform, epidemic shape
118 differs in both timing and magnitude between groups, increasing the peak size and total
119 infections in the more vulnerable (earlier epidemic introduction) group a and
120 decreasing both in group b (Figure 1C). Specifically, uniform awareness reduces total
121 infections in group b , which adopts protective behavior by observing mortality in group
122 a at a point when infections within group b remain relatively low (Figure 1C,
123 Supplementary Figure 3B, D, E). Meanwhile, uniform awareness causes group a to
124 underestimate disease severity due to the lack of early mortality in group b , leading to
125 decreased early protective behavior and a larger outbreak (Figure 1C, Supplementary
126 Figure 3A, C, E). When awareness is separated, group b has little awareness of the
127 emerging epidemic localized to group a , while group a responds to its relatively higher
128 early disease burden with increased awareness, driving epidemic dynamics between
129 the two groups to be similar in shape but delayed in time for group b (Figure 1D).
130 Therefore, awareness separation reduces the differences between groups in epidemic
131 shape (e.g., peak size, total infections), while mixing separation offsets them in time
132 (Figure 1C, D).

133 The finding that awareness separation reduces differences between groups in severe
 134 outcomes also holds when groups differ in their transmission coefficients, infectious
 135 periods, and infection fatality rates (Supplementary Figures 4, 5, 6).




136
 137 **Figure 1. Epidemic peaks are offset in time between groups when mixing is separated**
 138 **(C, D), and in magnitude when awareness is uniform but mixing is separated (C).** Plots
 139 show numbers of infections over time in group a (maroon) and group b (blue) under four
 140 scenarios: awareness is uniform (A, C; $\epsilon = 0.5$) or separated (B, D; $\epsilon = 0.99$); mixing is
 141 uniform (A, B; $h = 0.5$) or separated (C, D; $h = 0.99$). We assume the pathogen is introduced
 142 only in group a (maroon) at prevalence 0.001 and that all other parameters are equivalent
 143 between groups: transmission coefficient ($\beta = 0.2$), infectious period ($\frac{1}{\rho} = 10$), infection fatality
 144 rate ($\mu = 0.01$), protective measure efficacy ($\kappa = 0.3$), responsiveness ($\theta = 100$), memory
 145 ($\ell = 1$), and fatigue ($\phi = 0$). Lines overlap under separated mixing (top row).

146 2. Fatigue and awareness separation

147 We introduce memory and fatigue to examine the long-term impacts of separated
148 awareness when awareness-driven protective behavior is abandoned over time. Once
149 again, the pathogen is introduced into group *a* alone and all other parameters are
150 equivalent between groups. To maintain between-group differences, we assume
151 separated mixing ($h = 0.99$).

152 In all cases, when protective behavior wanes with fatigue, three distinct peaks emerge
153 before transmission plateaus at low levels and declines gradually (Figure 2). The initial
154 difference between groups with uniform awareness (Figures 1C, 2A) means that group
155 *b* retains a relatively larger proportion of susceptible individuals who avoided infection
156 in the first wave by rapidly adopting protective behaviors. As a result, the second and
157 third wave in group *b* exceed its first wave in peak and total infections (Figure 2A).
158 Meanwhile, uniform awareness causes the second wave in group *a* to be smaller and
159 delayed by about 400 days compared to separated awareness (Figure 2A vs. B). As
160 shown in the case without memory and fatigue (Figure 1), when both mixing and
161 awareness are separated, the groups differ mainly in the timing of epidemic peaks
162 rather than in their magnitude, before converging on a long and slow decline (i.e.,
163 shoulder; Figure 2B) (9).



164

165 *Figure 2. Fatigue and long-term memory produce multiple epidemic peaks, which exceed*
166 *the size of the initial peak in group b when uniform awareness and separated mixing*
167 *leave that group with a high proportion of susceptible people following the first wave.*
168 *We initialize the model with separated mixing ($h = 0.99$), long-term memory ($\ell = 30$), and*
169 *fatigue ($\phi = 0.02$); all other parameters are the same as in Figure 1. We consider infections in*
170 *group a (maroon) and group b (blue) over a longer time period (1000 days, compared to 200 days*
171 *in Figure 1). The panels correspond to (A) uniform awareness ($\epsilon = 0.5$) and (B) separated*
172 *awareness ($\epsilon = 0.99$).*

173 3. Immunity and awareness separation

174 Next, we consider the implications of awareness-based vaccine uptake in a split
175 population given waning immune protection against infection and durable protection
176 against mortality (Equation 3, Supplementary Figure 2). We model immunity from
177 prior infection as equivalent to immunity from vaccination. Unlike in the previous
178 analyses, the pathogen is now introduced at the same prevalence in both populations
179 simultaneously to ensure that group *a* and *b* begin the post-vaccine period with similar
180 levels of immunity. Group differences are driven by an infection fatality rate in group *a*
181 that is twice that of group *b*. Again, we assume separated mixing ($h = 0.99$) to maintain
182 distinct dynamics between the groups.

183 After an initial large wave, vaccination and waning immunity lead to damped cycles of
184 infections and deaths (Figure 3). As was the case with the nonpharmaceutical
185 intervention model (Figure 1), when awareness drives vaccination behavior, separated
186 awareness helps to reduce differences between-group differences in mortality (Figure
187 3D vs. C). Group *a* becomes vaccinated at a higher rate in response to the greater
188 number of deaths observed in group *a*, an effect that is most notable during the second
189 epidemic peak (Figure 3D). Therefore, with separated awareness group *a* also has fewer
190 infections than group *b* in later waves (Figure 3B), while infection dynamics remain
191 identical (despite the larger disparity in deaths) in the uninformed awareness scenario
192 (Figure 3A), the opposite of the nonpharmaceutical intervention scenario (Figure 2).

193 Because vaccination protects against infections and deaths, and recent deaths feed back
194 to influence awareness-driven vaccine uptake, we explored the tradeoff between
195 immune protection and epidemic dynamics in the post-vaccine period. Assuming that
196 vaccination and infection reduce both the transmission coefficient and infection fatality
197 rate to an equivalent extent, we examine the total effect of variation in immune
198 protection on epidemic dynamics and their feedbacks on vaccine uptake rate. As
199 expected, greater immune protection reduces the number of deaths by directly reducing
200 the infection fatality rate. However, because of awareness-driven vaccine uptake,
201 vaccination can produce diminishing returns at the population scale where doubling
202 immune protection from death and infection only reduces total deaths by about one
203 eighth due to the compensatory reduction in vaccine uptake (Figure 4A), despite
204 doubling individual protection for vaccinated people. Since a more effective immune
205 response reduces mortality, the perceived risk associated with infection declines and
206 fewer people become vaccinated (Figure 4B). The tradeoff between the direct impacts of
207 immune protection on preventing infections and reduced uptake produces a nonlinear
208 relationship between total infections and immune protection (Figure 4C). At low
209 immune protection, infections remain approximately constant as immune protection

210 improves. At higher levels of immune protection, reduced uptake with improving
211 immune protection leads to more infections (Figure 4C).

212 Separated awareness drives greater differences between groups in vaccination
213 behavior—the higher-risk group *a* gets vaccinated at a higher rate in response to
214 awareness of the higher numbers of deaths in that group (Figure 4B). This in turn
215 increases differences in infections (group *a* experiences lower infection rates; Figure 4C)
216 but decreases differences in mortality between groups (death rates are lower for group *a*
217 but higher for group *b* than in the uniform awareness scenario; Figure 4A). Since group
218 *a* is at a higher inherent risk of mortality given infection, separated awareness
219 differentially promotes vaccination and reduces infection in this group, while uniform
220 awareness misleads group *a* into ignoring its higher risk of mortality (Figure 4A, B,
221 solid versus dashed lines).

222


223

224

225


226

227



228
 229 **Figure 3. Waning immunity and awareness-based vaccination drive epidemic cycles;**
 230 **separated awareness reduces the disparity in deaths (C vs. D) as more-vulnerable group**
 231 **a members become vaccinated at a higher rate.** We consider infections (A, B) and deaths (C,
 232 D) given awareness-based vaccination, where vaccination begins at day 200, indicated with
 233 vertical arrows. In the pre-vaccine period, regardless of awareness separation, infection dynamics
 234 are identical between groups but deaths are higher in group a (maroon) than group b (blue) due
 235 to a doubly high infection fatality rate ($\mu_a = 0.02$ and $\mu_b = 0.01$; C, D). In the post-vaccine
 236 period, we compare uniform awareness ($\epsilon = 0.5$) (A, C) and separated awareness ($\epsilon = 0.99$) (B,
 237 D). Other parameter values are: $\beta = 0.2$ (transmission coefficient), $\kappa = 0.05$ (transmission-
 238 reducing immunity), $\zeta = 0.05$ (mortality-reducing immunity), $\omega = \phi = 0.01$ (waning
 239 immunity), infectious period ($\frac{1}{\rho} = 10$), $\theta = 20$ (responsiveness), $\ell = 30$ (memory), $h = 0.99$
 240 (separated mixing), $I_0 = 0.001$ (initial infection prevalence).

241



242

243 **Figure 4. Greater immune protection (from vaccination and infection) leads to lower**
244 **death rates (A), which in turn decreases vaccination rates (B) and increases infection**
245 **rates (C); separated awareness reduces disparities in death rates (A) as groups are**
246 **vaccinated at different rates proportional to their risks of death (B), creating**
247 **differences in infection rates (C). We vary transmission-reducing immunity and mortality-**
248 **reducing immunity, assigning both parameters the same values ($\kappa = \zeta$) and define this quantity**
249 **as immune protection, which we assume is equivalent for vaccine- and infection-derived**
250 **immunity. The x-axis is reversed because smaller values indicate stronger protection. We**
251 **examine the impacts of stronger immune protection (lower values of κ and ζ) on total deaths (A),**
252 **vaccinations (B), and infections (C) in the post-vaccine period ($t = 200$ through $t = 2000$),**
253 **depending on awareness separation. We compute each quantity for group a (maroon) and group**
254 **b (blue) given uniform (dashed lines; $\epsilon = 0.5$) or separated (solid lines; $\epsilon = 0.99$) awareness.**
255 **Other parameter values are the same as Figure 3.**

256

257 Discussion

258 Awareness separation and social divisions may interact to fundamentally alter disease
259 dynamics, creating or erasing differences among groups in the timing and magnitude of
260 epidemic peaks. Uniform awareness can exacerbate differences between population
261 subgroups when the more vulnerable group (e.g., the group where the pathogen is
262 introduced or the group with higher infection fatality rates) underestimates the in-
263 group risk of disease and fails to adopt early protective measures (Figures 1, 4). At the
264 same time, the initially less-vulnerable group receives indirect protection from
265 observing and responding to epidemic effects in the more vulnerable group, adopting
266 protective measures that reduce their total and peak infections (Figures 1, 4). However,
267 when awareness-driven behavior fades with fatigue, the relative disease burden may
268 shift between groups such that the group that initially had fewer infections has
269 relatively more infections in subsequent waves, especially when uniform awareness
270 protects the initially less-vulnerable group during the first wave of infection (Figure 2).
271 Awareness separation diminishes between-group differences in severe outcomes
272 (Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, Supplementary Figures 3, 4, 5, 6), but may do so by increasing
273 differences in behavior and infections (Figures 3, 4, Supplementary Figure 6). For
274 example, when the more vulnerable group has a higher rate of disease-linked mortality,
275 awareness separation leads them to have higher vaccine uptake in response to their
276 heightened perceived (and actual) risk, narrowing the difference in mortality (Figure 4).
277 More broadly, awareness separation generally closes differences between groups by
278 producing preferential uptake of preventative measures by the group with the greatest
279 recent mortality, which is usually the group at greatest current risk.

280 In this model, greater awareness separation generally reduces differences in severe
281 outcomes between groups because the awareness process explicitly responds to severe
282 outcomes (deaths). But the magnitude of these impacts may vary depending on
283 behavioral and social processes. To assess the robustness of our conclusions about the
284 effects of awareness separation, the same scenarios could be evaluated across different
285 models of awareness-based behavior changes, including saturation at a certain
286 threshold for deaths (9), consideration of both lethal and non-lethal impacts of disease
287 (e.g., hospitalizations and cases), or optimization to balance the benefits of protection
288 against the costs of various measures (8, 10, 52). The latter approach may clarify a point
289 that is not addressed in our analysis: although awareness separation may reduce
290 disparities in severe disease-linked outcomes, this phenomenon is not necessarily
291 equitable or desirable. In fact, if self-protection is associated with significant costs,
292 already-vulnerable populations may suffer compounding costs as they balance self-
293 protection against significant disease risk without adequate support from a broader
294 community that does not share their risks (52–55). Further, structural inequities often

295 leave population subgroups that are vulnerable to larger, more severe outbreaks with
296 reduced access to protective measures like health education, treatment, vaccination, and
297 paid leave (5, 20, 46, 48, 56–60). Resulting differences in rates of protective behavior
298 uptake and effectiveness can compound disparities between groups and reduce the
299 protective impact of awareness separation for more-vulnerable groups.

300 Epidemics are complex phenomena that typically involve heterogeneous mixing among
301 groups of people that differ in biological and social risk factors, dynamic evolution of
302 host behavior, pathogen infectiousness, and immune evasion, and ever-changing
303 epidemiological and policy responses to real and perceived risk. Despite this range of
304 potential drivers, we show here that a simple model that captures two key social
305 processes—awareness-driven protective behavior in a split population that can be
306 separated in mixing and awareness—can drive many of the complex dynamics
307 observed in emerging epidemics like Covid-19. For example, when awareness is
308 uniform and mixing is separated, the group in which the pathogen is introduced later
309 can experience second and third waves that exceed the initial wave in size (Figure 2).
310 This trend resembles one observed in the United States during the first year of the
311 Covid-19 pandemic, where certain regions where the virus was introduced early (e.g.,
312 New York City metropolitan area) experienced a large early wave and relatively few
313 infections over the rest of the year, while other regions (e.g., the southern United States)
314 generally had small early waves and larger second and third waves. Many hypotheses
315 have been introduced to explain this phenomenon (e.g., seasonal climate factors and
316 population density) and several factors may have contributed to this pattern (61, 62).
317 Yet, in our model these dramatic differences among populations in epidemic waves
318 occur despite the groups being identical in transmission rates and disease outcomes and
319 are entirely due to awareness-driven behavior with uniform awareness among groups
320 (Figure 2). Although the current analysis does not examine causation, we have
321 demonstrated how a simple behavioral process can qualitatively reproduce complex
322 epidemic dynamics observed in real populations.

323 Feedback between vaccine efficacy and awareness-based vaccine uptake can also
324 produce the counterintuitive scenario where vaccines that cause a greater reduction in
325 transmission and mortality lead to more total infections, even as deaths are reduced
326 (Figure 4). If, as we assume here, protective behavior is driven by awareness of severe
327 outcomes like mortality, awareness separation may reduce differences in deaths
328 between groups while widening differences in cases (Figures 3, 4). Accounting for
329 awareness-based adoption of protective behavior is therefore critical for understanding
330 complicated epidemic dynamics such as plateaus and cycles (Figures 2, 3), accurately
331 deploying protective measures, and assessing their impact across different diseases and
332 population subgroups (8, 9, 50).

333 Here we have considered arbitrarily defined groups that can be separated in mixing
334 and awareness but initially differ only in the timing of pathogen introduction (Figures
335 1, 2) or in infection fatality rate (Figures 3, 4), but real social groupings may fall along a
336 number of social, demographic, and geographic lines. The most relevant groupings
337 with respect to awareness and disease risk may depend on the disease, while the
338 assumption of two distinct and identifiable groups may not fully capture relevant social
339 dynamics. For infectious diseases that are generally more prevalent and severe in
340 children (e.g., pertussis and measles), risk may depend on age while awareness is split
341 between parents of young children versus adults without children or among parents
342 with different sentiments towards childhood vaccination (63). In the context of Covid-
343 19, disease burden and attitudes toward preventative measures (e.g., masks and
344 vaccines) have differed markedly across race, age, and socioeconomic status and over
345 time, demonstrating how intersecting and imperfectly overlapping identities may
346 interact to determine attitudes, protective behaviors, and risk (64–66). Moreover,
347 ideological and social factors that do not correspond directly to disease risk (e.g.,
348 political affiliation) may influence decision-making and cause the level of protective
349 behavior in certain subgroups to diverge sharply from their relative risk for severe
350 disease, potentially overcoming the effects of awareness separation (46, 67). This
351 process could be incorporated into our model by splitting the population into
352 additional groups with respect to a cultural contagion or (mis)information spread
353 process and allowing protective measures to be adopted based on awareness or contact
354 with protective in-group members and rejected through fatigue or aversion to
355 protective measures displayed by the opposite group (68, 69).

356 Although we assumed that awareness was directly proportional to recent mortality,
357 external influences like partisanship (46, 67), media coverage (70), misinformation (71),
358 and policy (3) may alter the perception of risk or the adoption of protective measures at
359 both the individual and group level. Group identification and assessment of relative
360 risk may be unclear or inaccurate based on uncertainty at the beginning of the outbreak,
361 misinformation about risk factors, a gradient in risk (e.g., gradually increasing risk with
362 age), lack of data stratification, or unobserved risk factors. Attitudes based on one
363 disease may carry over to another disease even if risk factors differ. Relative risk across
364 groups may also vary across time and space, potentially leading to inaccurate
365 assessment based on prior conditions: for example, a mild initial epidemic wave can
366 mislead a group into believing they are inherently more protected and thereby relaxing
367 protective behaviors. Cognitive interventions that increase the accuracy of individual
368 risk perception, especially in high-risk groups, may help to reduce between-group
369 differences in disease burden (72, 73). To realistically capture actual behavioral
370 responses to disease outbreaks and to understand the extent of awareness separation in
371 real populations, our model could be parameterized using a combination of

372 epidemiological, survey, mobility, and social media data (9, 74, 75). Considering
373 awareness separation as a social process that may interact with mixing, fatigue, waning
374 immunity, pathogen evolution, and pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical
375 interventions may help to explain how humans are affected by and respond to
376 infectious diseases in the presence of social divisions.

377 **Methods**

378 **Nonpharmaceutical intervention model**

379 We model disease transmission with awareness-based adoption of nonpharmaceutical
380 interventions that reduce transmission rates. See Supplementary Figure 1 for a
381 compartmental diagram for this model and Supplementary Table 1 for parameter
382 definitions. We model disease transmission with a Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered-
383 Deceased (SIRD) model, tracking the proportion of the population in each compartment
384 through time. New infections arise through contact between susceptible and infected
385 individuals, with transmission coefficient β . Individuals exit the infectious
386 compartment at per capita rate ρ , the inverse of infectious period $\frac{1}{\rho}$ and either recover or
387 die. The infection fatality rate, or fraction of individual exiting the infectious
388 compartment who die, is μ (meaning that recovery after infection occurs with
389 probability $1 - \mu$).

390 We further categorize the population based on whether they adopt behavior that is
391 Protective (P) or Unprotective (U). Compartment names contain two letters, the first
392 indicating disease status and the second indicating behavior (e.g., SU denotes
393 Susceptible people with Unprotective behaviors). We track the attitudes of Recovered
394 and Deceased individuals (at the time of death), although they do not contribute
395 directly to transmission. Protective measure efficacy against infection is indicated by a
396 scaling factor κ (where $\kappa = 0$ corresponds to complete protection and $\kappa = 1$ corresponds
397 to no protection). Protective measures affect the behavior of both susceptible and
398 infected individuals, so transmission rate is reduced by a factor of κ^2 in encounters
399 where both parties have adopted protective measures. Living individuals can switch
400 between protective and unprotective attitudes. Unprotective individuals adopt
401 protective behaviors based on awareness ($\alpha(t)$), which is the product of deaths over the
402 past ℓ days (making ℓ a measure of memory) and a responsiveness constant θ .
403 Protective behaviors are abandoned due to fatigue at per capita rate ϕ .

404 The population is split into two groups of equal size, where group membership is fixed,
405 and each group contains all epidemiological compartments. The groups are labelled as a
406 and b and indicated as a subscript in compartment names (e.g., SU_a corresponds to

407 Susceptible-Unprotective individuals in group a). Parameters may vary between
 408 groups, as indicated by subscripts (e.g., θ_a corresponds to responsiveness in group a). If
 409 parameters are equivalent for both groups, we exclude the subscript (e.g., $\theta = \theta_a = \theta_b$).

410 Preferential within-group mixing is represented by homophily parameter h ,
 411 corresponding to the proportion of contacts that are within-group. When h is 0.5,
 412 mixing is *uniform*, meaning that individuals are equally likely to contact members of
 413 their own group as members of the opposite group. As h approaches 1, mixing becomes
 414 increasingly separated, meaning that contacts are increasingly concentrated within
 415 groups. Similarly, we consider separation in awareness, ϵ , or the relative weight of in-
 416 group versus out-group awareness of deaths for protective behavior.

417 The system of equations for group a is as follows (equations for group b can be derived
 418 symmetrically):

$$\begin{aligned} S\dot{U}_a &= -\beta S U_a ((h)(I U_a + \kappa I P_a) + (1-h)(I U_b + \kappa I P_b)) - \theta S U_a \alpha_a(t) + \phi S P_a \\ S\dot{P}_a &= -\beta \kappa S P_a ((h)(I U_a + \kappa I P_a) + (1-h)(I U_b + \kappa I P_b)) + \theta S U_a \alpha_a(t) - \phi S P_a \\ I\dot{U}_a &= \beta S U_a ((h)(I U_a + \kappa I P_a) + (1-h)(I U_b + \kappa I P_b)) - \theta I U_a \alpha_a(t) + (\phi - \rho) I P_a \\ I\dot{P}_a &= \beta \kappa S P_a ((h)(I U_a + \kappa I P_a) + (1-h)(I U_b + \kappa I P_b)) + \theta I U_a \alpha_a(t) - (\phi + \rho) I P_a \\ R\dot{U}_a &= (1 - \mu) \rho I U_a - \theta R U_a \alpha_a(t) + \phi R P_a \\ R\dot{P}_a &= (1 - \mu) \rho I P_a + \theta R U_a \alpha_a(t) - \phi R P_a \\ D\dot{U}_a &= \mu \rho I U_a \\ D\dot{P}_a &= \mu \rho I P_a \end{aligned}$$

419 (Equation 1)

420 where $\alpha_a(t)$ is the awareness equation for group a :

$$\alpha_a(t) = \int_{t-\ell}^t \left((\epsilon_a) (D\dot{U}_a + D\dot{P}_a) + (1 - \epsilon_a) (D\dot{U}_b + D\dot{P}_b) \right) dt$$

421 (Equation 2)

422 Vaccination model

423 We develop an alternative model of awareness-based vaccine uptake. See
 424 Supplementary Figure 2 for a compartmental diagram for this model and
 425 Supplementary Table 1 for parameter definitions. Here, the second letter of
 426 compartment names indicates immune status: Unprotective (U), Transmission and
 427 Mortality-Reducing Immunity (T), or Mortality-Reducing Immunity (M).

428 As in the nonpharmaceutical intervention model, susceptible people without prior
 429 immunity (SU) may become infected and then recover or die according to baseline
 430 infection parameter values. Susceptible individuals may become vaccinated and

431 transition directly to the recovered compartment, bypassing infection, at a rate
 432 dependent on the awareness equation (Equation 2). There may be a lag between the
 433 beginning of the epidemic and vaccine introduction at time point t_v . To evaluate long-
 434 term immune effects of vaccination and infection on epidemic dynamics, we
 435 incorporate waning immunity.

436 After vaccination or infection, individuals temporarily have complete protection from
 437 infection (RT). At per capita rate ω , they regain susceptibility to infection, this time with
 438 transmission and mortality-reducing immunity (i.e., ST). As in the nonpharmaceutical
 439 intervention model, transmission-reducing protection scales transmission rates for
 440 susceptible and infected individuals by a constant. Additionally, immunity from
 441 infection reduces disease-linked mortality by scaling factor ζ . Transmission-reducing
 442 immunity is lost at per capita rate ϕ , while the mortality-reducing immunity is retained
 443 over the course of the simulation, reflecting how neutralizing antibody production may
 444 decay over time while cellular immune responses are more durable (76). Susceptible
 445 individuals with mortality-reducing immunity alone (SM) may regain transmission-
 446 reducing immunity via vaccination, which occurs based on the same awareness
 447 function as vaccination of people without immune protection.

448 The system of equations for this model in a population without groups is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{S}U &= -\beta SU(IU + \kappa IT + IM) - \theta SU \int_{t-\ell}^t (D\dot{U} + D\dot{T} + D\dot{M}) dt \\
 \dot{S}T &= \omega RT - \beta \kappa ST(IU + \kappa IT + IM) - \phi ST \\
 \dot{S}M &= -\beta SM(IU + \kappa IT + IM) - \theta SM \int_{t-\ell}^t (D\dot{U} + D\dot{T} + D\dot{M}) dt + \phi ST \\
 \dot{I}U &= \beta SU(IU + \kappa IT + IM) - \rho IU \\
 \dot{I}T &= \beta \kappa ST(IU + \kappa IT + IM) - \rho IT \\
 \dot{I}M &= \beta SM(IU + \kappa IT + IM) - \rho IM \\
 \dot{R}T &= \rho((1 - \mu)IU + (1 - \zeta\mu)(IT + IM)) - \omega RT + \theta(SU + SM) \int_{t-\ell}^t (D\dot{U} + D\dot{T} + D\dot{M}) dt \\
 D\dot{U} &= (\mu\rho)IU \\
 D\dot{T} &= (\zeta\mu\rho)IT \\
 D\dot{M} &= (\zeta\mu\rho)IM
 \end{aligned}$$

449 (Equation 3)

450 The equations for a split population with separated mixing and awareness can be
 451 derived following Equation 1.

452 **Simulations**

453 We ran simulations in R version 4.0.2, using the `dede` function in the `deSolve` package,
454 which solves systems of differential equations (77). The population begins as almost
455 fully susceptible ($S(0) \approx 1$), with a small initial infection prevalence ($I(0)$) to seed the
456 outbreak and no protective behaviors.

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464 **Author contributions**

465 MJH and EAM conceived of project and designed models; MJH conducted analyses;
466 EAM and MJH interpreted simulations and wrote the manuscript.

467 **Competing interests**

468 All authors declare that there are no competing interests.

469 **Data and code availability**

470 Code used to conduct these analyses are available on Github at:

471 <https://github.com/mjharris95/divided-disease>

472 **Funding**


473 MJH was supported by the Knight-Hennessy Scholars Program. EAM was supported
474 by the National Science Foundation (DEB-2011147), with support from the Fogarty
475 International Center, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences
476 (R35GM133439), the Terman Award, and seed grants from the Stanford King Center on
477 Global Health, Woods Institute for the Environment, and Center for Innovation in
478 Global Health.

479 Supplementary files

480 *Supplementary Table 1. Parameter dictionary providing parameter symbols,*
 481 *descriptions, and values for different scenarios. The parenthetical numbers in the values*
 482 *column indicate the scenario where the parameter takes the given values (1: separated mixing*
 483 *and awareness; 2: fatigue and awareness separation; 3: immunity and awareness separation).*


Parameter	Description	Value
β	Transmission coefficient	0.2 (1, 2, 3)
$1/\rho$	Infectious period	10 (1, 2, 3)
μ	Infection fatality rate	0.01 (1,2); $\mu_a = 0.01$ and $\mu_b = 0.02$ (3)
κ	Transmission and infection reduction with protective behavior	0.3 (1, 2); 0.05 (3)
θ	Responsiveness	100 (1, 2); 20 (3)
ℓ	Memory	0 (1); 30 (2, 3)
ϕ	Fatigue (NPI model)/waning transmission-reducing immunity (vaccine model)	0 (1); 0.02 (2); 0.01 (3)
h	Homophily	0.5 (uniform) or 0.99 (separated) (1); 0.99 (separated) (2, 3)
ϵ	Assortative awareness level	0.5 (uniform) or 0.99 (separated) (1, 2, 3)
ω	Return to susceptibility (waning immunity)	0.01 (3)
ζ	Mortality reduction	0.05 (3)
t_v	Vaccination Start Time	200 (3)

484



485

486 **Supplementary Figure 1. Compartmental diagram for non-pharmaceutical intervention**
487 **model that tracks status with respect to infection and attitude toward protective**
488 **behaviors.** The first letter of each compartment name gives the state with respect to the disease
489 transmission process (S=Susceptible, I=Infectious, R=Recovered, D=Deceased) and the second
490 letter of each compartment name gives state with respect to awareness-driven protective behavior
491 (U=Unprotective, P=Protective). Squares are colored based on state with respect to disease.
492 Potential transitions are indicated with arrows. Brown arrows indicate awareness-based
493 adoption of protective measures. This diagram corresponds to the model described in Equation 1.




494
495 *Supplementary Figure 2. Compartmental diagram for vaccination model that tracks*
496 *status with respect to infection and immune status. The first letter of each compartment*
497 *name gives the state with respect to the disease transmission process (S=Susceptible,*
498 *I=Infectious, R=Recovered, D=Deceased) and the second letter of each compartment name gives*
499 *immune status (U=Unprotective, T=Transmission and Mortality-Blocking, M=Mortality-*
500 *Blocking alone). Squares are colored based on state with respect to disease. Potential transitions*
501 *are indicated with arrows. Brown arrows indicate awareness-based vaccination. This diagram*
502 *corresponds to the model described in Equation 3.*

503

504 **Effects of awareness separation on protective behavior and infections**

505 To understand the mechanism by which awareness separation reduces between-group
 506 differences in Figure 1, we consider early disease and awareness dynamics for both
 507 groups given separated mixing ($\epsilon = 0.99$) and uniform or separated awareness ($\epsilon = 0.5$
 508 and $\epsilon = 0.99$ respectively).



509 Awareness -- Uniform ($\epsilon=0.5$) — Separated ($\epsilon=0.99$)

510 **Supplementary Figure 3. Separated awareness reduces between-group differences by**
 511 **removing group b's awareness of the emerging epidemic and augmenting group a's**
 512 **response to the introduction of the pathogen.** We initialize our model using the same
 513 parameters as Figure 1 with separated mixing ($h = 0.99$). We compare uniform


514 awareness ($\epsilon = 0.5$; dashed lines) and separated awareness ($\epsilon = 0.99$; solid lines). At the
515 top, we compare early time series (through $t = 80$) of (A) protective attitude prevalence
516 in group a; (B) protective attitude prevalence in group b; (C) infection prevalence in
517 group a; (D) infection prevalence in group b. Panel E is a phase portrait of protective
518 attitude prevalence against total infections in group a (maroon) and group b (blue).
519 Points indicate values at $t = 80$, corresponding to the end of the time series in panels A-
520 D. Arrows indicate differences in protective attitude prevalence (gray) and total
521 infections (black) at $t = 80$ for separated versus uniform awareness, with letters
522 corresponding to time series panel labels.

523

524 **Awareness separation reduces effects on mortality of different between-** 525 **group differences**

526 We demonstrate that the finding in Figure 1 applies across alternative scenarios where
527 the pathogen is introduced in both groups at the same prevalence, but the groups differ
528 in their transmission coefficients (β), infection fatality rates (μ), or infectious period ($\frac{1}{\rho}$)
529 (Supplementary Figures 4, 5, 6). Note that, when transmission coefficient (β) varies
530 between groups, contacts between group a and group b will have transmission
531 coefficient $\sqrt{\beta_a \beta_b}$, the geometric mean of the transmission coefficient of both groups.


532 Differences between groups that directly influence force of infection such as variation in
533 transmission coefficient and infectious period, lead to differences in epidemic shape
534 between the groups when mixing is separated (Supplementary Figures 4, 5). Given
535 uniform awareness, epidemic shape is unaffected by mixing separation when group
536 differences do not directly affect the transmission process (e.g., heterogeneity in
537 infection fatality rates (Supplementary Figure 6). In all scenarios, separated awareness
538 decreases differences in deaths between the two groups, although it may not eliminate
539 differences in epidemic burden. In scenarios where groups have different forces of
540 infections, differences in infections are also reduced with separated awareness
541 (Supplementary Figures 4, 5). However, separated awareness increases the difference in
542 infections when groups have different infection fatality rates, as observed in the
543 vaccination scenario in the main text (Figures 3, 4).



544


545 **Supplementary Figure 4. Separated awareness reduces differences in epidemic size**
 546 **between groups in epidemic size that arise from differences in transmission rates**
 547 **coupled with separated mixing.** Plots of (A) infections and (B) deaths over time in group a
 548 (maroon) and group b (blue). We consider different levels of awareness separation [left column:
 549 uniform awareness ($\epsilon = 0.5$); right column: separated awareness ($\epsilon = 0.99$)] and mixing
 550 separation [top row: uniform mixing ($h = 0.5$); bottom row: separated mixing ($h = 0.99$)]. The
 551 groups are initialized so that group a has a greater transmission coefficient than group b
 552 ($\beta_a = 0.21$ and $\beta_b = 0.19$). We assume the pathogen is introduced in both groups at prevalence
 553 0.0005. All other parameter values are the same as those used in Figure 1: infectious period
 554 ($\frac{1}{\rho} = 10$), infection fatality rate ($\mu = 0.01$), protective measure efficacy ($\kappa = 0.3$), responsiveness
 555 ($\theta = 100$), memory ($\ell = 1$), and fatigue ($\phi = 0$).

Infectious Period ($1/\rho_a = 11.11$; $1/\rho_b = 9.09$)



556

557 **Supplementary Figure 5. Separated awareness reduces differences in epidemic size**
 558 **between groups in epidemic size that arise from differences in infectious period coupled**
 559 **with separated mixing.** Plots of (A) infections and (B) deaths over time in group a (maroon)
 560 and group b (blue). We consider different levels of awareness separation [left column: uniform
 561 awareness ($\epsilon = 0.5$); right column: separated awareness ($\epsilon = 0.99$)] and mixing separation [top
 562 row: uniform mixing ($h = 0.5$); bottom row: separated mixing ($h = 0.99$)]. The groups are
 563 initialized so that group a has a longer infectious period than group b ($\frac{1}{\rho_a} = 11.11$ and $\frac{1}{\rho_b} =$
 564 9.09). We assume the pathogen is introduced in both groups at prevalence 0.0005. All other
 565 parameter values are the same as those used in Figure 1: transmission coefficient (β), infection
 566 fatality rate ($\mu = 0.01$), protective measure efficacy ($\kappa = 0.3$), responsiveness ($\theta = 100$),
 567 memory ($\ell = 1$), and fatigue ($\phi = 0$).



568

569 **Supplementary Figure 6. Separated awareness reduces differences in mortality between**
 570 **groups arising from differences in their infection fatality rates and causes differences in**
 571 **infections between the groups.** Plots of (A) infections and (B) deaths over time in group a
 572 (maroon) and group b (blue). We consider different levels of awareness separation [left column:
 573 uniform awareness ($\epsilon = 0.5$); right column: separated awareness ($\epsilon = 0.99$)] and mixing
 574 separation [top row: uniform mixing ($h = 0.5$); bottom row: separated mixing ($h = 0.99$)]. The
 575 groups are initialized so that group a has a higher infection fatality rate than group b ($\mu_a =$
 576 0.015 and $\mu_b = 0.0067$). We assume the pathogen is introduced in both groups at prevalence
 577 0.0005 . All other parameter values are the same as those used in Figure 1: transmission
 578 coefficient (β), infectious period ($\frac{1}{\rho} = 10$), protective measure efficacy ($\kappa = 0.3$), responsiveness
 579 ($\theta = 100$), memory ($\ell = 1$), and fatigue ($\phi = 0$).

580 Works Cited

- 581 1. L. An, *et al.*, Development of a coronavirus social distance attitudes scale. *Patient*
582 *Education and Counseling* (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2020.11.027>.
- 583 2. G. J. W. Cheok, *et al.*, Appropriate attitude promotes mask wearing in spite of a
584 significant experience of varying discomfort. *Infection, Disease & Health* **26**, 145–151
585 (2021).
- 586 3. Y. Yan, *et al.*, Measuring voluntary and policy-induced social distancing behavior
587 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**,
588 e2008814118 (2021).
- 589 4. C. A. Gidengil, A. M. Parker, B. J. Zikmund-Fisher, Trends in risk perceptions
590 and vaccination intentions: A longitudinal study of the first year of the H1N1 pandemic.
591 *American Journal of Public Health* **102**, 672–679 (2012).
- 592 5. B. J. Ridenhour, *et al.*, “Effects of trust, risk perception, and health behavior on
593 COVID-19 disease burden: Evidence from a multi-state US survey” (2021)
594 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.17.21266481>.
- 595 6. J. Abaluck, *et al.*, “Impact of community making on COVID-19: A cluster-
596 randomized trial in Bangladesh.” *Science* **375**, eabi9069 (2021).
- 597 7. J. Toor, *et al.*, Lives saved with vaccination for 10 pathogens across 112 countries
598 in a pre-COVID-19 world. *eLife* **10**, e67635 (2021).
- 599 8. R. F. Arthur, J. H. Jones, M. H. Bonds, Y. Ram, M. W. Feldman, Adaptive social
600 contact rates induce complex dynamics during epidemics. *PLOS Computational Biology*
601 **17**, e1008639 (2021).
- 602 9. J. S. Weitz, S. W. Park, C. Eksin, J. Dushoff, Awareness-driven behavior changes
603 can shift the shape of epidemics away from peaks and toward plateaus, shoulders, and
604 oscillations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 32764–32771 (2020).
- 605 10. C. Eksin, J. S. Shamma, J. S. Weitz, Disease dynamics in a stochastic network
606 game: a little empathy goes a long way in averting outbreaks. *Scientific Reports* **7**, 44122
607 (2017).
- 608 11. N. Perra, D. Balcan, B. Gonsalves, A. Vespignani, Towards a Characterization of
609 Behavior-Disease Models. *PLOS ONE* **6**, e23084 (2011).
- 610 12. C. Granell, S. Gómez, A. Arenas, Dynamical interplay between awareness and
611 epidemic spreading in multiplex networks. *Physical Review Letters* **111**, 128701 (2013).

- 612 13. K. T. D. Eames, Networks of influence and infection: Parental choices and
613 childhood disease. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **6**, 811–814 (2009).
- 614 14. S. Funk, E. Gilad, C. Watkins, V. A. A. Jansen, The spread of awareness and its
615 impact on epidemic outbreaks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **106**, 6872–
616 6877 (2009).
- 617 15. L. He, L. Zhu, Modeling the COVID-19 epidemic and awareness diffusion on
618 multiplex networks. *Communications in Theoretical Physics* **73**, 035002 (2021).
- 619 16. D. Acevedo-Garcia, Residential segregation and the epidemiology of infectious
620 diseases. *Social Science & Medicine (1982)* **51**, 1143–1161 (2000).
- 621 17. P. Farmer, Social inequalities and emerging infectious diseases. *Emerging*
622 *Infectious Diseases* **2**, 259–269 (1996).
- 623 18. S. N. Grief, J. P. Miller, Infectious Disease Issues in Underserved Populations.
624 *Primary Care* **44**, 67–85 (2017).
- 625 19. S. K. Greene, A. Levin-Rector, J. L. Hadler, A. D. Fine, Disparities in reportable
626 communicable disease incidence by census tract-level poverty, New York City,
627 20062013. *American Journal of Public Health* **105**, e27–e34 (2015).
- 628 20. T. Poteat, G. A. Millett, L. E. Nelson, C. Beyrer, Understanding COVID-19 risks
629 and vulnerabilities among black communities in America: The lethal force of
630 syndemics. *Annals of Epidemiology* **47**, 1–3 (2020).
- 631 21. Z. Li, P. Wang, G. Gao, C. Xu, X. Chen, Age-period-cohort analysis of infectious
632 disease mortality in urban-rural China, 19902010. *International Journal for Equity in Health*
633 **15**, 55 (2016).
- 634 22. D. R. Williams, L. A. Cooper, COVID-19 and health equity: A new kind of “herd
635 immunity”. *JAMA* **323**, 2478–2480 (2020).
- 636 23. J. Zelner, *et al.*, Racial disparities in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)
637 mortality are driven by unequal infection risks. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **72**, e88–e95
638 (2020).
- 639 24. E. A. Benfer, *et al.*, Eviction, Health Inequity, and the Spread of COVID-19:
640 Housing Policy as a Primary Pandemic Mitigation Strategy. *Journal of Urban Health* **98**,
641 1–12 (2021).
- 642 25. M. Cubrich, On the frontlines: Protecting low-wage workers during COVID-19.
643 *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy* **12**, S186.

- 644 26. P. W. Dhewantara, *et al.*, Epidemiological shift and geographical heterogeneity in
645 the burden of leptospirosis in China. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty* **7**, 57 (2018).
- 646 27. S. Pramasivan, *et al.*, Spatial distribution of Plasmodium knowlesi cases and their
647 vectors in Johor, Malaysia: In light of human malaria elimination. *Malaria Journal* **20**, 426
648 (2021).
- 649 28. S. C. Quinn, *et al.*, Racial disparities in exposure, susceptibility, and access to
650 health care in the US H1N1 influenza pandemic. *American Journal of Public Health* **101**,
651 285–293 (2011).
- 652 29. T. Takahashi, *et al.*, Sex differences in immune responses that underlie COVID-19
653 disease outcomes. *Nature* **588**, 315–320 (2020).
- 654 30. X. Wu, R. C. Nethery, M. B. Sabath, D. Braun, F. Dominici, Air pollution and
655 COVID-19 mortality in the united states: Strengths and limitations of an ecological
656 regression analysis. *Science Advances* **6**, eabd4049 (2020).
- 657 31. R. Calvin, *et al.*, Racism and Cardiovascular Disease in African Americans. *The*
658 *American Journal of the Medical Sciences* **325**, 315–331 (2003).
- 659 32. H. M. Lane, R. Morello-Frosch, J. D. Marshall, J. S. Apte, Historical redlining is
660 associated with present-day air pollution disparities in U.S. cities. *Environmental Science*
661 *& Technology Letters* **2022**, 345-350 (2022).
- 662 33. I. A. Doherty, V. J. Schoenbach, A. A. Adimora, Sexual mixing patterns and
663 heterosexual HIV transmission among African Americans in the southeastern United
664 States. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999)* **52**, 114–120 (2009).
- 665 34. R. Rothenberg, S. Q. Muth, S. Malone, J. J. Potterat, D. E. Woodhouse, Social and
666 geographic distance in HIV risk. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* **32**, 506–512 (2005).
- 667 35. C. R. K. Arnold, *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence in a university community: A
668 longitudinal study of the impact of student return to campus on infection risk among
669 community members. *medRxiv*, 2021.02.17.21251942 (2021).
- 670 36. M. Harris, E. Tessier-Lavigne, E. Mordecai, The interplay of policy, behavior, and
671 socioeconomic conditions in early COVID-19 epidemiology in Georgia. *Journal of the*
672 *Georgia Public Health Association* **8** (2021).
- 673 37. E. T. Richardson, *et al.*, Reparations for Black American descendants of persons
674 enslaved in the U.S. and their potential impact on SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Social*
675 *Science & Medicine* **276**, 113741 (2021).

- 676 38. J. A. Jacquez, C. P. Simon, J. Koopman, L. Sattenspiel, T. Perry, Modeling and
677 analyzing HIV transmission: tThe effect of contact patterns. *Mathematical Biosciences* **92**,
678 119–199 (1988).
- 679 39. K. C. Ma, T. F. Menkir, S. Kissler, Y. H. Grad, M. Lipsitch, Modeling the impact of
680 racial and ethnic disparities on COVID-19 epidemic dynamics. *eLife* **10**, e66601 (2021).
- 681 40. J. Zelner, *et al.*, There are no equal opportunity infectors: Epidemiological
682 modelers must rethink our approach to inequality in infection risk. *PLOS Computational*
683 *Biology* **18**, e1009795 (2022).
- 684 41. J. L. Herrera-Diestra, L. A. Meyers, Local risk perception enhances epidemic
685 control. *PLOS ONE* **14**, e0225576 (2019).
- 686 42. S. B. Omer, *et al.*, Geographic clustering of nonmedical exemptions to school
687 immunization requirements and associations with geographic clustering of pertussis.
688 *American Journal of Epidemiology* **168**, 1389–1396 (2008).
- 689 43. J. Brug, *et al.*, SARS risk perception, knowledge, precautions, and information
690 sources, the Netherlands. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* **10**, 1486–1489 (2004).
- 691 44. T. Oraby, V. Thampi, C. T. Bauch, The influence of social norms on the dynamics
692 of vaccinating behaviour for paediatric infectious diseases. *Proceedings of the Royal*
693 *Society B: Biological Sciences* **281**, 20133172 (2014).
- 694 45. D. Holtz, *et al.*, Interdependence and the cost of uncoordinated responses to
695 COVID-19. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
696 **117**, 19837–19843 (2020).
- 697 46. S. R. Christensen, *et al.*, Political and personal reactions to COVID-19 during
698 initial weeks of social distancing in the United States. *PLOS ONE* **15**, e0239693 (2020).
- 699 47. C. Anthonj, B. Diekkrüger, C. Borgemeister, Thomas Kistemann, Health risk
700 perceptions and local knowledge of water-related infectious disease exposure among
701 Kenyan wetland communities. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*
702 **222**, 34–48 (2019).
- 703 48. L. Simione, C. Gnagnarella, Differences between health workers and general
704 population in risk perception, behaviors, and psychological distress related to COVID-
705 19 spread in Italy. *Frontiers in Psychology* **11** (2020).
- 706 49. S. Funk, M. Salathé, V. A. A. Jansen, Modelling the influence of human
707 behaviour on the spread of infectious diseases: a review. *Journal of The Royal Society*
708 *Interface* **7**, 1247–1256 (2010).

- 709 50. B. Steinegger, L. Arola-Fernández, C. Granell, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, A. Arenas,
710 Behavioural response to heterogeneous severity of COVID-19 explains temporal
711 variation of cases among different age groups. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
712 *Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **380**, 20210119 (2022).
- 713 51. D. Weston, K. Hauck, R. Amlôt, Infection prevention behaviour and infectious
714 disease modelling: a review of the literature and recommendations for the future. *BMC*
715 *Public Health* **18**, 336 (2018).
- 716 52. C. Barrett, K. Bisset, J. Leidig, A. Marathe, M. Marathe, Economic and social
717 impact of influenza mitigation strategies by demographic class. *Epidemics* **3**, 19–31
718 (2011).
- 719 53. A. L. Skinner-Dorkenoo, *et al.*, Highlighting COVID-19 racial disparities can
720 reduce support for safety precautions among white U.S. residents. *Social Science &*
721 *Medicine* **301**, 114951 (2022).
- 722 54. C. Atchison, *et al.*, Early perceptions and behavioural responses during the
723 COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional survey of UK adults. *BMJ Open* **11**, e043577
724 (2021).
- 725 55. J. Jay, *et al.*, Neighbourhood income and physical distancing during the COVID-
726 19 pandemic in the United States. *Nature Human Behaviour* **4**, 1294–1302 (2020).
- 727 56. S. A. P. Clouston, J. Yukich, P. Anglewicz, Social inequalities in malaria
728 knowledge, prevention and prevalence among children under 5 years old and women
729 aged 15-49 in Madagascar. *Malaria Journal* **14**, 499 (2015).
- 730 57. N. Williams, *et al.*, Assessment of racial and ethnic disparities in access to
731 COVID-19 vaccination sites in Brooklyn, New York. *JAMA Network Open* **4**, e2113937
732 (2021).
- 733 58. S. Cardona, N. Felipe, K. Fischer, N. J. Sehgal, B. E. Schwartz, Vaccination
734 disparity: Quantifying racial inequity in COVID-19 vaccine administration in Maryland.
735 *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* **98**, 464–468 (2021).
- 736 59. J. Heymann, *et al.*, US sick leave in global context: US eligibility rules widen
737 inequalities despite readily available solutions. *Health Affairs* **40**, 1501–1509 (2021).
- 738 60. S. Dryhurst, *et al.*, Risk perceptions of COVID-19 around the world. *Journal of Risk*
739 *Research* **23**, 994–1006 (2020).
- 740 61. Y. Ma, S. Pei, J. Shaman, R. Dubrow, K. Chen, Role of meteorological factors in
741 the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States. *Nature Communications* **12** (2021).

- 742 62. K. T. L. Sy, L. F. White, B. E. Nichols, Population density and basic reproductive
743 number of COVID-19 across United States counties. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0249271 (2021).
- 744 63. S. Bhattacharyya, C. T. Bauch, A game dynamic model for delayer strategies in
745 vaccinating behaviour for pediatric infectious diseases. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **267**,
746 276–282 (2010).
- 747 64. A. J. Schulz, *et al.*, Moving health education and behavior upstream: lessons from
748 COVID-19 for addressing structural drivers of health inequities. *Health Education &*
749 *Behavior* **47**, 519–524 (2020).
- 750 65. E. J. van Holm, C. K. Wyczalkowski, P. A. Dantzler, Neighborhood conditions
751 and the initial outbreak of COVID-19: The case of Louisiana. *Journal of Public Health*, 1–6
752 (2020).
- 753 66. A. R. Maroko, D. Nash, B. T. Pavilonis, COVID-19 and inequity: A comparative
754 spatial analysis of New York City and Chicago hot spots. *Journal of Urban Health* **97**, 461
755 (2020).
- 756 67. G. Grossman, S. Kim, J. M. Rexer, H. Thirumurthy, Political partisanship
757 influences behavioral responses to governors' recommendations for COVID-19
758 prevention in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**,
759 24144–24153 (2020).
- 760 68. P. E. Smaldino, J. H. Jones, Coupled dynamics of behaviour and disease
761 contagion among antagonistic groups. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 1–17.
- 762 69. R. S. Mehta, N. A. Rosenberg, Modelling anti-vaccine sentiment as a cultural
763 pathogen. *Evolutionary Human Sciences* **2**, e21 (2020).
- 764 70. S. S. Shanta, Md. H. A. Biswas, The impact of media awareness in controlling the
765 spread of infectious diseases in terms of SIR model. *Mathematical Modelling of*
766 *Engineering Problems* **7**, 368–376 (2020).
- 767 71. J. Lee, J. Choi, R. K. Britt, Social Media as risk-attenuation and misinformation-
768 amplification station: How social media interaction affects misperceptions about
769 COVID-19. *Health Communication*, 1–11 (2021).
- 770 72. A. H. Sinclair, S. Hakimi, M. L. Stanley, R. A. Adcock, G. R. Samanez-Larkin,
771 Pairing facts with imagined consequences improves pandemic-related risk perception.
772 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- 773 73. A. H. Sinclair, *et al.*, Imagining a personalized scenario selectively increases
774 perceived risk of viral transmission for older adults. *Nature Aging* **1**, 677–683 (2021).

- 775 74. L. Shen, *et al.*, Emotional attitudes of Chinese citizens on social distancing during
776 the COVID-19 outbreak: Analysis of social media data. *JMIR Medical Informatics* **9**,
777 e27079 (2021).
- 778 75. S. Chang, *et al.*, Mobility network models of COVID-19 explain inequities and
779 inform reopening. *Nature* **589**, 82–87 (2020).
- 780 76. M. K. Siggins, R. S. Thwaites, P. J. M. Openshaw, Durability of immunity to
781 SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses. *Trends in Microbiology* **29**, 648–662 (2021).
- 782 77. K. Soetaert, T. Petzoldt, R. W. Setzer, Solving differential equations in R: Package
783 deSolve. *Journal of Statistical Software* **33**, 1–25 (2010).