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The human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) progresses in three stages:

- The first stage lasts approximately 3 months
- The chronic stage can last from 5-10 years without medication
- The disease then progresses to auto-immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS)

An infected individual may go a long time before they are diagnosed while still contributing to the epidemic.
Estimation of Undiagnosed Prevalence

CD4 cell level is used as an indicator of the progression of the disease. As the disease progresses the CD4 levels drop.
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Problems with models

The biggest problem with dynamic models is specifying the parameters. For the case of HIV dynamics, the transmission and diagnosis rate are the key parameters.

Since some percent of the population is unknowable, it is very difficult to estimate these parameters.
Objectives

- Derive epidemiological parameters in a new way
- Permutate these parameters to understand dynamics
Use Bayesian statistics to find the *proportional change* for each of the HIV infected populations:

\[ p_t = q p_{t-1} \]
First we identify a sampling model that represents our data.

A **binomial distribution** makes sense for looking at the chance of finding an undiagnosed or diagnosed individual in the population of HIV infected individuals:

$$\text{Bin}(x_t; n_t, p_t)$$
The prior for $q$ is:

$$\pi(q) \propto \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$$

centered at the arithmetic estimate from prior literature: 0.979 for undiagnosed and 1.025 for diagnosed.

The prior for the random variable $p_t$ is a beta centered at the previous proportion.

$$\pi(p_t) \propto P(qp_{t-1}n_t - 1, n_t - \alpha)$$

In the case where $t=1$, the previous proportion is taken to be the expert opinion of 20%.
The joint posterior distribution is proportional to the priors multiplied by the likelihoods for all 9 years:

\[
\Pr(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_9, q) \propto \pi(q) \times \prod_{t=1}^{9} \pi(p_t|q, p_{t-1}) \\
\times \mathcal{L}(p_1|x_{t=1}) \times \mathcal{L}(p_2|x_{t=2}) \times \ldots \times \mathcal{L}(p_9|x_{t=9})
\]

Since the posterior distribution doesn’t have a closed form, Metropolis-Hastings nested within a Gibbs sampler is used to sample from the posterior for 100,000 iterations.
Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Posterior Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$q_u$</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q_d$</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can use the proportional change to estimate important epidemiological parameters transmission and diagnosis. The proportional change estimates are used as constraints on the process:

\[ dU = (q_u - 1)Udt + d\omega_t dt \]
\[ dD = (q_d - 1)Ddt + d\omega_t dt \]

where \( d\omega_t \sim Nor(0, \sigma) \) is Brownian white noise.
The simplest model of this process has 3 parameters: transmission ($\tau$), diagnosis ($\delta$), and death ($\epsilon$).

\[
dU = (\tau(U + D) - \delta U - \epsilon U)dt \asymp (1 - q_u)Udt + d\omega_t dt
\]

\[
dD = (\delta U - \epsilon D)dt \asymp (1 - q_d)Ddt + d\omega_t dt
\]

Using the estimates for $q_d$ and $q_u$, we can get estimates for these parameters.
Base Model

\[
dU = (\tau(U + D) - \delta U - \epsilon U) dt \cong (1 - q_u) U dt + d\omega_t dt
\]

\[
dD = (\delta U - \epsilon D) dt \cong (1 - q_d) D dt + d\omega_t dt
\]

\[
\tau = 0.0334 \quad \delta = 0.165
\]
Exhaustion of Susceptibles
Running out of high-risk susceptible individuals would cause the undiagnosed population to decrease over time.

Lack of Access to Care
Some geographic and socio-economic groups have higher rates of HIV and lack consistent access to care.

Anti Retroviral Therapy
96% of infected individuals reported being on ART in a recent study.
For $S \approx T$, transmission is a function of $S$: $S = fT$
The transmission term becomes
$$\tau TS \approx \tau fT^2$$
Lack of Access to Care

For this case, we consider diagnosis as a **constant** that does not depend on the size of the undiagnosed population.
The size of the infected population able to transmit the disease is reduced by $0.96D$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Transmission Rate</th>
<th>Diagnosis Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base model</td>
<td>$\tau(U + D)$</td>
<td>$\delta U$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion of Susceptibles (ES)</td>
<td>$\tau f(U + D)^2$</td>
<td>$\delta U$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Access to Care (LAC)</td>
<td>$\tau(U + D)$</td>
<td>$\delta_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-retroviral Therapies (ART)</td>
<td>$\tau(U + 0.04D)$</td>
<td>$\delta U$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES and LAC</td>
<td>$\tau f(U + D)^2$</td>
<td>$\delta_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES and ART</td>
<td>$\tau f(U + 0.04D)^2$</td>
<td>$\delta U$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC and ART</td>
<td>$\tau(U + 0.04D)$</td>
<td>$\delta_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES, LAC, and ART</td>
<td>$\tau f(U + 0.04D)^2$</td>
<td>$\delta_0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Undiagnosed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$H_0$</th>
<th>$H_1$</th>
<th>$H_2$</th>
<th>$H_3$</th>
<th>$H_1 H_2$</th>
<th>$H_1 H_3$</th>
<th>$H_2 H_3$</th>
<th>$H_1 H_2 H_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg P**

|        | 0.7784 | 0.2121 | **0.8799** | 0.5640 | 0.2120 | 0.2742 | **0.5873** | 0.2877 |

**Notes:**

- **Avg P** represents the average probability across all categories for each year.
- The table entries indicate the probabilities for each combination of $H_i$ values for each year.
Conclusion

Diagnosed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$H_0$</th>
<th>$H_1$</th>
<th>$H_2$</th>
<th>$H_3$</th>
<th>$H_1 H_2$</th>
<th>$H_1 H_3$</th>
<th>$H_2 H_3$</th>
<th>$H_1 H_2 H_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg $P$: 0.8790 0.2989 0.8693 0.9302 0.8693 0.7705 0.9558 0.8693
These results suggest:

- The proportional change of a population can be used to constrain parameters of a dynamical model.
- The population dynamics of the diagnosed and undiagnosed populations are best explained by a lack of access to care and ART usage.
- The diagnosis rate is estimated to be between 3.4% and 16%, lower than the previously estimated 20%.
- The transmission rate is estimated to be 3.3% and depend on only part of the diagnosed population. This is close to the previously estimated 4%. 
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