Statistics in Medicine



Statistics in Medicine

Contribution to the discussion of AIDS and COVID-19: A Tale of Two Pandemics and the Role of Statisticians by Ellenberg and Morris.

Journal:	Statistics in Medicine
Manuscript ID	Draft
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Commentary
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Isham, Valerie; UCL,
Keywords:	HIV, Covid-19, epidemic modelling

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts Contribution to the discussion of AIDS and COVID-19: A Tale of Two Pandemics and the Role of Statisticians by Ellenberg and Morris.

Valerie Isham, 2 February 2021

Ellenberg and Morris give an excellent and comprehensive discussion of the considerable challenges for statisticians, working alongside scientists from many other disciplines, in their quest to understand the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2, and to design and develop intervention strategies that, ultimately, can bring the Covid-19 pandemic under control. In doing so, they point out some of the similarities and differences between the current pandemic and that of HIV/AIDS almost 40 years ago. In this contribution, I will highlight some comparisons from a modelling perspective.

The models used for HIV in the 1980s were broadly similar to many of those used for Covid-19 today. Mechanistic deterministic or stochastic compartmental models, with varying degrees of complexity but largely based on the traditional SIR form, were used for scenario analyses while statistical curve fitting methods enabled short-term prediction. Longer-term output based on fitted models with specific assumptions was used, then as now, to provide bounds on what might occur if there were no changes in behaviour or policy. Since then, computational advances have allowed the development and analysis of very much more complex model structures including network and agent-based models fitted to huge data sets, but then, with far fewer resources available, only simple stratified models were feasible. The fitted models and their output, based on different structures and assumptions, were interpreted separately: the methods of model combination and uncertainty quantification employed today¹ that make due allowance for uncertainty in model structure as well as in data and assumed parameter values were lacking then, and expert elicitation was informal.

Mechanistic models were generally analysed by numerical solution of differential equations or by using simulations, although qualitative understanding and important insights were obtained algebraically. For example, simple deterministic models allowing heterogeneity of the rate of effective contacts were used to show that at the beginning of the epidemic it was the index of dispersion of the rates, rather than their mean, that was driving the spread². This understanding informed a policy decision to target information especially towards those with contact rates in the top tail of the distribution. Then, as now, in assessing behaviour changes it was difficult to separate the effect of such policies from that of experiencing illness and death among close friends and family.

In an SIR model, the R is generally described as *removed*, rather than *recovered* as by Ellenberg and Morris. As such, this class consists of those no longer contributing to the transmission of infection: often those who are recovered but, depending the application, it can also include those who have died or been quarantined (extra model compartments can be added to distinguish these states if required). In the case of HIV, simple SIR models were used from the outset, with the earliest models designating the I (infective) stage to consist of those infected with HIV, who would progress to the R stage on diagnosis with full AIDS, it being assumed that after diagnosis they would no longer have infectious contacts. The state-

space of the simple three-stage SIR model was gradually extended to allow for population heterogeneity by incorporating age structure and other factors affecting infectivity and disease progression, for heterogeneity of mixing through varying contact rates among different subpopulations, for variable infectivity at different stages of the infectious period, and for different modes of transmission³. The unrealistic but convenient Markov assumption of an exponentially distributed incubation period was sometimes avoided by using a Weibull distribution with its algebraically tractable hazard function, or by adding further compartments so that it was represented as a sum of independent exponential variables (the method of stages). Compartmental models for Covid-19 have a similar overall form, although with much larger populations at risk of infection and for which regional variation is an important source of additionally heterogeneity. Much finer gradations of states are now computationally tractable and very detailed population structures can be assumed. In the early stages of both pandemics, there was great uncertainty about mechanisms, distributions and parameter values and a corresponding need for sensitivity analyses and modification of assumptions as more evidence became available.

Ellenberg and Morris describe the many problems associated with data for Covid-19. For HIV, initially, data were very limited. The time scales and courses of the two infections are very different, but the lack of data on asymptomatic infections with Covid-19 in some sense parallels that on early infections with HIV where there was a long and largely asymptomatic incubation period before AIDS symptoms developed. The primary data were of AIDS diagnoses and, except for transfusion recipients, times of infections could generally not be pinpointed. In the same way that data on the outbreak of Covid-19 on the Diamond Princess cruise ship provided early information on Covid-19 transmission, so these transfusion data provided information on the distribution of the incubation period between infection with HIV and diagnosis with full AIDS (albeit that distribution might not be the same for those infected by other means). Convolution of the estimated distribution of the incubation period with the unknown HIV incidence curve would give an estimate of the incidence of AIDS diagnoses and so, in reverse, deconvolution using data on AIDS incidence allowed the back-calculation of the incidence of HIV infections up until the current time; similar methods are used with Covid-19 to infer infections from case data. Finally, forward convolution could be used to predict the numbers of future AIDS cases³⁻⁶. These predictions would not include anyone not yet infected, but given the length of the incubation period, should not seriously underestimate the true values in the short-term.

Non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) were used from the outset to control HIV, as they are now for Covid-19. One of the most important uses of model scenarios is in helping to develop and assess possible strategies for the use of NPIs, as well as to compare vaccination regimes, to inform government policies worldwide. The state spaces of compartmental models can easily be extended to include vaccinated individuals, although assumptions must be made about the appropriate (time-dependent) levels of protection from disease and reduction in transmission that vaccination confers. However, incorporating NPIs in such models is often challenging, as many are not well set-up properly to incorporate highly local or individual measures. While, to an extent, simple scaling parameters can be introduced to

allow for the reduction in effective contacts resulting from NPIs such as mask wearing or social distancing, track-and-trace measures are most easily incorporated in highly detailed agent-based models. Modelling behavioural responses and compliance with interventions and, also, allowing for possible feedback from individual experiences of the course of the pandemic itself, present further challenges. Once control measures are decided upon, the models can be used to suggest what data should be collected to assess their effects, and a particular problem, given the incredibly rapid evolution of the pandemic, is how to use observed data to disentangle the effects of different interventions applied simultaneously or in overlapping time periods, or to different populations.

As well as the much more rapid spread of infection, and the very much greater computing power now available, there are other significant differences between Covid-19 and HIV/AIDS. The speed at which the Covid-19 epidemic is spreading through the global population means that epidemic modellers and statisticians are working under much greater time pressure to provide model output and updates to inform official policy. However, the need to ensure that the many assumptions, caveats and accompanying estimates of uncertainty are carefully communicated to (and understood by) policy makers remains unchanged. The modelling and statistical communities working on Covid-19 are orders of magnitude bigger than the handful of those working on HIV/AIDS 40 years ago. Building from that base, and by gaining experience in the intervening years through tackling the frequent human and animal epidemics occurring round the world, there is now a substantial network of researchers with good multidisciplinary and international links able to bring their skills to bear on the pandemic. Much more can be done very quickly: there are many new sources of data to be understood and assimilated, following the huge advances in genome sequencing and phylogenetics, and in just a year several vaccines for SARS-Cov-2 have been developed, tested and rolled-out around the world. On the other hand, effective treatments are still in the early stages of identification and development. In contrast, there have been very considerable advances in antiviral prophylactics and treatments for HIV infection over the last 40 years, but there is still no vaccine.

For the future, further pandemics are inevitable; since 2014, five Public Health Emergencies of International Concern have been declared, four due to viruses of zoonotic origin⁷. Given the wide-ranging and serious effects of pandemics such as Covid-19 on individuals and nations, planning and preparedness are essential and present many challenges for modellers⁸. Not least among these is a need to widen the interdisciplinary network of modellers yet further by including social scientists and economists, with the aim of combining behavioural, economic and epidemic models to provide a transparent methodology for assessing together the health and economic effects of pandemics.

1. Bowman, V. E., Silk, D.S., Dalrymple, U. and Woods, D.C. (2020) Uncertainty quantification for epidemiological forecasts of COVID-19 through combinations of model predictions. *arXiv*:2006.10714

2. Anderson, R. M., Medley, G. F., May, R. M. and Johnson, A. M. (1986) A preliminary study of the transmission dynamics of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), the causative agent of AIDS, *IMA J. Math. Appl. Med. Biol.* 3, 229–263.

3. Isham, V. (1988) Mathematical modelling of the transmission dynamics of HIV and AIDS: a review (with discussion). *J. R. Statist. Soc.*, A151, 5–30,120–123.

4. Brookmeyer, R. and Gail M. H. (1986) Minimum size of the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) epidemic in the United States. *Lancet*, Dec 6;2(8519):1320-2.

5. Brookmeyer, R. and Gail M. H. (1987) Methods of projecting the AIDS epidemic. *Lancet*, Jul 11;2(8550):99.

6. Isham, V. (1989) Estimation of the incidence of HIV infection - the back-projection method. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond.*, B325, 75–84.

7. WHO (2021) The Second report on progress by the Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness & Response.

8. Dangerfield, C., Hollingsworth, D., Isham, V. and Mollison, D. (2021) Eds. Challenges for future pandemics *Epidemics* special issue. In preparation.

PRICE