

Effect of population density on epidemics

Ruiqi Li¹, Peter Richmond² and Bertrand M. Roehner³

Abstract

Investigations of a possible connection between population density and the propagation and magnitude of epidemics have so far led to mixed and unconvincing results. There are three reasons for that. (i) Previous studies did not focus on the appropriate density interval. (ii) For the density to be a meaningful variable the population must be distributed as uniformly as possible. If an area has towns and cities where a majority of the population is concentrated its average density is meaningless. (iii) In the propagation of an epidemic the initial proportion of susceptibles (that is to say persons who have not developed an immunity) is an essential, yet usually unknown, factor. The assumption that most of the population is susceptible holds only for *new* strain of diseases.

It will be shown that when these requirements are taken care of, the size of epidemics is indeed closely connected with the population density. This empirical observation comes as a welcome confirmation of the classical KMK (Kermack-McKendrick 1927) model. Indeed, one of its key predictions is that the size of the epidemic increases strongly (and in a non linear way) with the initial density of susceptibles. An interesting consequence is that, contrary to common beliefs, in sparsely populated territories, like Alaska, Australia or the west coast of the United states the size of epidemics among native populations must have been limited by the low density even for diseases for which the natives had no immunity (i.e., were susceptibles).

Provisional. Comments are welcome.

Version of 10 March 2018

Key-words: epidemic, propagation, population density, Kermack and McKendrick model.

1: School of Systems Science, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China.

Email: liruiqi@mail.bnu.edu.cn

2: School of Physics, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland. Email: peter_richmond@ymail.com

3: Institute for Theoretical and High Energy Physics (LPTHE), University Pierre and Marie Curie, Sorbonne Université, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Paris, France. Email: roehner@lpthe.jussieu.fr

Introduction

To begin with, let us say that although the data that we analyze in this paper are mostly from the early 20th century our objective is *not* to write a historical paper. What guided us is the fact that the phenomenon that we wish to study, namely the density effect in the propagation of epidemics, can only be studied on highly infectious diseases. As one knows, with the possible exception of influenza, such diseases have been practically eliminated in developed countries. It is true that they still exist in developing countries but in most of these countries the accuracy of vital statistics is not very good.

In historical accounts of the contacts between native populations and white immigrants (for instance in the Pacific ocean islands, in Australia or in the United States) it is often said that natives were wiped out by diseases that their immune system could not fight. Most often such claims are made without any supporting evidence being presented in terms of number of deaths due to specific epidemics. As most often native people were living in sparsely populated areas, the question of how population density affects the propagation of epidemics is obviously of central importance. It is this question which was at the origin of the present study. We will come back to it in our conclusion.

Seen from the side of the pathogens, contagion is a form of diffusion in which the virus or bacteria jump from one individual to another. If the transmission takes place through air or water both intuition and mathematical modeling would suggest that it is facilitated by a higher population density¹. The paradox is that in most studies that we know about, the impact of density cannot be seen clearly. This is illustrated below by the results of two papers and by a number of personal observations.

Papers on influenza epidemics

In a study of the pandemic of 1918 in England and Wales (Chowell et al. 2008) the authors observe “we did not find any obvious association between death rates and measures of population density”.

Similarly in a study of the same 1918 epidemic in New Zealand (Haidari et al. 2006) the authors present a plot for ($x =$ population density, $y =$ death rate, $n = 108$) and find the two variables to be basically uncorrelated ($r = 0.17$).

Observations for several contagious diseases

To these sources we can add the following tests which similarly lead to mixed and even puzzling results.

¹As a second step, at a more detailed level, one would of course expect that proximity due to specific human mobility and interactions will also play a role (Li et al. 2017a, 2017b).




Fig. 1a,b,c Relationship between population density by state and death rate, USA, 1918. (a) This graph is for influenza. There is basically no correlation (the correlation is 0.10 and the confidence interval is $(-0.27, 0.45)$) which means that no regression line can be drawn. However, it seems (by comparison with the pneumonia case) that there are some obvious outliers such as: 15=Montana, 2=Colorado, 16=New Hampshire, 22=Pennsylvania, 3=Connecticut. It is not easy to understand why these states have death rates that are abnormally high. (b) The graph of (a) was redrawn with log scales. The correlation, namely -0.068 is still not significant. (c) This graph is for pneumonia. The correlation ($\log d, \log \mu$) is 0.62, $CI = (0.33, 0.80)$. Sources: Density: *Historical Statistics of the United States*, p. 24; death rate: *Mortality Statistics 1918*, p.118.

The 1918 volume of “Mortality Statistics” published by the US Bureau of the Census gives the death rate from influenza for each of the 30 Registration states i.e., the states which recorded death statistics. The (density, death rate) correlation turns out to be equal to 0.10 which, for a probability level of 0.95, is not significant in the standard sense that the confidence interval, namely $(-0.27, 0.45)$ contains 0.

As a matter of fact, the scatter plot has the same shape as the one mentioned above for New Zealand: for densities under 25 per square-kilometer there is a very large dispersion of death rates; then for densities over 50 the plot becomes more orderly, yet with some outliers.

In Fig. 1b the broad range of d suggests to use a log scale. In this case, however, for the sake of consistency one must also use a log scale for μ in spite of the fact that μ has only a fairly narrow range. The reason is that for $d \rightarrow 0$ it is natural to expect $\mu \rightarrow 0$; with two log scales both d and μ will tend to $-\infty$. On the contrary, with $(\log d, \mu)$ the two variables would have different limits.

Do these tests mean that there is no correlation whatsoever between density and death rate? Not necessarily. It simply means that the background noise over-rides any weak association that may exist.

Contagious versus non contagious diseases

Table 1 compares the death rates in large cities with those in rural areas. Here again the results are found to be fairly puzzling. For instance, for contagious diseases, one would expect the death rate ratio cities/rural to be larger than 1. Not only is this

ratio just barely higher than 1 but in addition the ratio for non-contagious diseases is markedly higher than 1. The most intriguing result is the one for pneumonia. Whereas Fig. 1c for 1918 showed a clear excess mortality in places of high density the results for 1940 (the only year for which such data are given in Linder et al. 1947) show higher death rates in rural places. In addition, if one draws the graph of death rates by states one finds that the correlation which existed in 1918 has disappeared in 1940. So, although we ignore the reason of this change, at least the two results are consistent with each other.

Table 1: Comparison of death rates in cities of more than 100,000 and in rural areas, USA, 1940

	Tubercu- losis	Pneu- monia	Syphilis	Average (contagious diseases)	Intra cranial lesion	Disease of the heart	Disease of the coronary	Average (non contagious diseases)
Cities	40.8	55.5	11.1		78.4	23.6	45.4	
Rural	34.0	70.0	8.80		88.0	18.6	23.0	
Cities/Rural	1.20	0.79	1.26	1.08	0.89	1.27	1.97	1.36

Notes: The death rates are per 100,000 population. There is no clear difference between cities and rural areas. The most surprising result is probably the one for pneumonia which, contrary to expectation, is notably higher in rural places (may be related to better medical treatment available in cities). As a preliminary explanation one may posit that the lower rural death rate for diseases of coronary arteries is due to the fact that life in rural places involves more physical activity.

Source: Linder et al. (1947).

Components of the background noise

What is the meaning intended for the expression “background noise”. An illustration from particle physics may be helpful. There are currently experiments under way in order to observe if protons can disintegrate into lighter particles. Such an event can be identified by detecting the particles that it produces. However, in spite of the fact that in such experiments the tank is located deep under ground it is nevertheless hit by particles emitted by the Sun or by the surrounding rocks. This is what physicists call background noise. It is different from purely statistical noise. Whereas the later cannot be reduced (except by taking averages over large numbers of events), the background noise can be reduced for instance by shielding the tank in appropriate ways. In short, the background noise is produced by specific sources which, once clearly identified, may be eliminated.

What are here the factors which contribute to the background noise for epidemics? One can mention the following.

(1) In principle it would be better to consider incidence rates rather than death rates. By considering death rates one mixes two effects: the diffusion of the disease

and the availability (and effectiveness) of medical treatment. For instance death rates from tuberculosis may be higher in poor districts where pulmonary diseases are widespread and where no treatment is provided. However, death rates may be a good proxy for incidence rates for sufficiently large areas.

(2) The existence of large cities in an area makes the average density a fairly biased variable.

(3) The initial percentage of susceptibles which depends on the previous occurrences of the disease.

(4) The climate, whether hot or cold, dry or humid. As an illustration of how the climate effect can generate spurious data it can be mentioned that in the late 19th and early 20th centuries the dry and sunny climate of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada and New Mexico attracted many tuberculosis patients and led to the building of health facilities (sanatoriums, boarding houses and even canvas camps). Naturally, this resulted in highly inflated death rates in the corresponding states.

(5) The age structure of the population. As the 1918 epidemic hit particularly middle-aged persons, if this group is over-represented the total death rate will be higher.

The most important lesson to retain for the following sections is that one should consider *large* density changes so that their impact can overcome the background noise. As a matter of fact, Chowell et al. (2008) and Haidiri et al. (2006) also made the observation that urban areas have higher death rates than rural areas but they did not discuss the noise versus signal levels nor did they specify what must be done to make the signal stand out more clearly.

Empirical evidence

Overview for contagious diseases

Population density (d) is a variable with a broad range of variation, from a few persons per square kilometer in rural areas to a few thousands in big cities. In contrast, the mortality rate (μ) has a rather narrow range of variation. For this reason, if there is to be a relationship between μ and d one would expect μ to depend upon $\log d$. This is the point already emphasized in the introduction when we said that one needs to consider large changes of d . Does this suffice to reveal a definite correlation? Fig. 1c and Table 2 show that this is indeed true at the level of US states for several contagious diseases; yet influenza stands as an exception as shown by Fig. 1b.

The results given in Table 2 show that, at least in this time period, the values of the exponent of the power law were fairly stable in the course of time. The exponent found in the next subsection for the influenza epidemic of 1918, namely 0.22 is in

Table 2: Impact of the population density d on the death rate μ of contagious diseases, US states

	Coefficient of correlation	Exponent of the power law $\mu = Cd^\alpha$
1 Measles, 1915	0.71	0.35 ± 0.17
Measles, 1918	0.47	0.20 ± 0.14
Measles, average		0.28 ± 0.11
2 Diphtheria 1915	0.67	0.24 ± 0.11
Diphtheria 1918	0.56	0.19 ± 0.10
Diphtheria, average		0.22 ± 0.07
3 Whooping cough, 1915	0.13	0.04 ± 0.12
Whooping cough, 1915	0.41	0.17 ± 0.14
Whooping cough, average		0.11 ± 0.09
4 Pneumonia, 1915	0.59	0.10 ± 0.06
Pneumonia, 1918	0.60	0.17 ± 0.08
Pneumonia, average		0.14 ± 0.05
5 Tuberculosis, 1915	0.39	0.12 ± 0.11
Tuberculosis, 1918	0.48	0.15 ± 0.10
Tuberculosis, average		0.14 ± 0.07

Notes: The correlations and regressions are for $(\log d, \log \mu)$. Taking the log of μ is not a necessity (for μ has a small range of variation) but has the advantage of making the regression independent of the way μ is measured (for example per 1,000 or 100,000). These estimates are based on the data of US registration states; there were 25 in 1915 and 30 in 1918. At this level there is no significant correlation for influenza alone; however, most often influenza and pneumonia are counted together. Apart from 1918, in all “normal” years there were about 10 times more pneumonia deaths than influenza deaths. In 1918 the two diseases had about the same death rate. Note that almost all these exponents are under 0.25 which suggest a fairly weak connection ($\alpha = 0$ would mean no connection at all).

Source: Mortality statistics 1919; this volume has a recapitulation for the years 1915 to 1919.

the same range.

It must be emphasized that exponents α in the range 0.10 – 0.25 denote a fairly weak interdependence (obviously for $\alpha = 0$ there would be no relationship at all). That is why this effect can be easily covered by the background noise.

Influenza-pneumonia epidemic

Thanks to a special report published by the US Bureau of the Census (1920) which describes the spread of the influenza epidemic in the fall of 1918 we have far more detailed data in this case than for any other. As in addition this epidemic was particularly strong the relative magnitude of the background noise will be reduced thus providing excellent observation conditions.

Fig. 2 summarizes the situation. Whereas there is a marked density-death rate correlation ($r = 0.90$) on a broad density scale, within rural or urban places it is the background noise which dominates.




Fig. 2 Relationship between population density d and the size μ of the influenza epidemic of September-December 1918. In the graph m means million. The data are for Indiana, Kansas and the city of Philadelphia in Pennsylvania. Influenza and pneumonia deaths are counted together. It can be seen that the relationship between population density holds only on a broad density scale. Inside of the three groups of data points the background fluctuations are strong enough to override the power law. The regression reads (the confidence interval is for a confidence probability of 0.95): $\mu = Cd^\alpha$, $\alpha = 0.22 \pm 0.08$, $C = 3.5$. Source: *Bureau of the Census (1920)*.

Effect of population density on the evolution of the epidemic

Fig. 3 shows that the shape of the evolution curves is very much density dependent. A high density gives a sharp peak whereas low density gives broad bulges.

Determinants of an epidemic: the KMK model

What is our purpose in discussing the KMK model in relation with the question of the impact of population density?

At the beginning of the paper we explained that it is the question of the contacts between native populations and immigrants which motivated the present study. However, this question cannot be settled in a definitive way by relying only on empirical evidence. The reason is that together with their various strains contagious diseases form an unclosed set. If one adds to this uncertainty that one has almost no information about the immune systems of native populations it becomes obvious that




Fig. 3 Evolution of the death rate of the influenza epidemic from September to December 1918. It is remarkable that the curves for Indiana and Kansas are almost the same in spite of a distance of about 1,000 km between them; in contrast the curves are very dependent upon the population density. *Source: Bureau of the Census (1920).*

investigation of specific case-studies can hardly give us an overall understanding.

It is by purpose that the model presented in this section involves only the most basic features of an epidemic, namely contagion, recovery and death. In this way our hope is to capture and understand the very mechanism of epidemics. The fact that local conditions usually do not play a great role is demonstrated by the similarity of the course of the influenza epidemic (one of the few for which extensive daily data are available) in various cities whether in Europe or in the United States.

Parameters and differential equations

A simplified model of an epidemic can be seen as defined by 3 parameters (see Fig. 4)

- (1) An infection (or incidence) rate, β , which describes the transition from health to illness.
- (2) A removal rate, γ , which describes the transition from illness to death or recovery.
- (3) A fatality rate, γ_1 , which defines the proportion of deaths in the wake of the disease.

In the argument which leads to the equations defining the model the crux of the matter is the fact that newly infected persons are generated through interaction between a person that is already infected (described by the variable y) and a susceptible person, i.e., a person not yet infected and who has not yet developed an immunity (described by the variable x). In the differential equation of the model this interaction is described by a product term βxy where β describes the infection process. As the disease progresses the pool of infected persons is depleted because infected persons may die or may recover and then be immune at least for the near future. This removal process will be described by a term $-\gamma y$. In other words there is a competition between infection and removal which can be quantified by the ratio $\rho = x_0\beta/\gamma$.




Fig. 4 Diagram illustrating the mechanism of the KMK model (Kermack and McKendrick 1927) for the propagation of an epidemic. $x(t)$ =persons susceptible to infection, $y(t)$ =infected (and infectious) persons, $z(t)$ =persons who have been infected and whi, at time t are either dead or immune to infection.

This is summarized in the following system of differential equations.

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} dx/dt = -\beta xy & (1.1) \\ dy/dt = \beta xy - \gamma y & (1.2) \\ dz/dt = \gamma y & (1.3) \end{cases}$$

In addition it should be added that $x + y + z = n$ and that we are only interested in non-negative solutions, that is to say: $x(t), y(t), z(t) \geq 0$.

It can easily be shown that z satisfies the following non linear equation:

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = \gamma \left[n - x_0 \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{\gamma} z\right) - z \right] \quad (2)$$

By expanding the exponential to second order one gets a logistic equation which can be solved analytically. This quadratic approximation is valid when $\beta/\gamma \ll 1$ and remains valid as long as z is small enough.

The infection and removal effects are very different from one another

- β is determined by the type of contagion which is a biological factor but it is also highly dependent upon the frequency of inter-individual contacts². It can be expected to be small when the population density is low.

- γ describes the evolution of the disease either to death or to recovery. Thus, it is chiefly a biological parameter which is dependent upon the type of the disease.

Size of the epidemic

When $t \rightarrow \infty$ the variable z which represents the persons affected by the epidemic converges toward a stationary limit which is the solution of the equation:

$$n - z = x_0 \exp [-(\beta/\gamma)z] \quad (3)$$




Fig. 5a,b,c Limiting value of the variable z . The straight line represents the left-hand side of equation (3) whereas the curve represents the exponential in the right-hand side of the same equation. The intersections marked by the green squares correspond to the asymptotic value $z(t \rightarrow \infty)$. **(a)** This figure shows that when $y_0 + z_0 > 0$ there is always an intersection. **(b)** On the contrary if $y_0 + z_0 = 0$, then the epidemic cannot start. **(c)** This figure shows that the intersection moves to the right when the threshold parameter increases.

The functions on the left- and right-hand side of this equation are shown in Fig. 5a,b,c. Fig. 5a shows that when $y_0 + z_0 > 0$ it has always a solution whatever the value of ρ ; however when ρ is close to 1 the epidemic may be small. Fig. 5b shows that when $y_0 + z_0 = 0$, then there is no epidemic unless ρ is larger than 1. Finally, Fig. 5c shows that the limit of z increases when ρ becomes larger. The way the size of the epidemic increases with ρ is shown more precisely in Fig. 6b which is based on a numerical solution of equation (2).

With respect to the question of whether a population can be wiped out by an epidemic which will be discussed in the conclusion it is important to observe that even if

²The relationship between the network structure of the population and the frequency of interactions was examined in Li et al. (2013).

none of the infected persons recovers (which corresponds to $\gamma_1 = 0$ in Fig. 4) the population will *not* be wiped out. Only a fraction of it will die, although it is true that this fraction may become close to one when ρ becomes very large.

Key-role of population density

The threshold parameter $\rho = x_0\beta/\gamma$ is proportional to the initial number of susceptibles which itself, in case of a new disease, is close to the total population. The model does not describe the spatial aspects of the epidemic but as it is formulated for a population n on a given territory it implies that population density and total population are proportional. In other words, n plays the role of population density.

Fig. 6b shows how the size of the epidemic increases with the threshold parameter that is to say, whenever $x_0 \simeq n$, with population density.

In the real world, one expects β also to increase with population density. As explained earlier, β depends upon the number of contacts and one expects people to have more interactions (in stores, public transportation, entertainment places or at work) in cities than in rural places. Needless to say, the level of β in cities depends upon the special features of the city³. For instance, because of the difference in public transportation one would expect β to be higher in Tokyo than in Los Angeles.

Remark

It can be added that the increase of the size of the epidemic with the density is specific to the exact model. In the quadratic approximation (which results in a logistic equation for $z(t)$) the size of the epidemic (that is to say the limit of $z(t)$ when t goes to infinity) is given by the expression:

$$z(\infty) = 2\gamma/(x_0\beta) [x_0 - \gamma/\beta]$$

which, obviously, does not increase with x_0 .

Comparison to observation

The ‘‘Special report’’ gives death rates by month. In a few instances it gives also daily death data which provide a more accurate view of the shape of the curve. In Fig. 7 we tried to determine parameters which would lead to this shape. The height of the peak can be easily controlled through the threshold parameter; this is shown in fig. 7 by the three curves corresponding to different densities. However, a larger ρ will give a curve whose falling part is wider than its raising part whereas in fact the empirical curve is almost symmetrical with respect to its peak value. The descending part can be made shorter by increasing γ . In this way, we can define a set of parameters which approximates fairly closely the empirical curve.

Predictions of the model

³The hydrological environment plays a major role in the spreading of cholera. More generally, the role of population distribution and of human interaction intensity was examined in Li et al. (2017 a,b).




Fig. 6a,b The KMK model. (a) Increase in time of the fraction of the population which has been in contact with the disease. This simulation corresponds to the following parameters: total population: $n = 20$, $x_0 = n - 1$, $\beta = 0.32$, $\gamma = 3$, $\rho = x_0\beta/\gamma = 2.03$. The model's equations must be solved numerically, but there is also an analytic approximation which is shown by the lower curve. The accuracy of this approximation is controlled by the threshold parameter ρ . When ρ is slightly larger than 1, the infection starts slowly and only a small fraction of the population becomes infected. (b) This graph shows the total fraction of the population that has become infected as a function of the threshold parameter. The infection can start as soon as $\rho > 1$; when $\rho > 2.5$ the fraction infected is over 90%.

If we really believe in this model we should use it to make testable predictions. One of its main features is the existence of a threshold under which the death rate falls very abruptly. In other words for sufficiently low densities one should see a sudden drop of the death rates. Practically, however, what we can see is limited by the noise. In our comments about Fig. 2 we have already observed that for rural places the impact of the density becomes over-ridden by the noise. Note that the problem of the noise is more serious for low densities than for high densities because low densities means few deaths which in turn imply high statistical fluctuations. As observed in the first section, such fluctuations come in addition to the background noise. Thus, there is little hope that this threshold transition will be observable.

Conclusion

In this paper it was shown that there is a weak but clearly defined relationship between population density and the death rate of epidemics provided that sufficiently large density changes are considered and background noise is kept under control. It was also shown that population density determines the time dependence of the death rate; thus, large densities (as in Philadelphia) lead to high narrow peaks whereas for




Fig. 7 Predictions of the KMK equations for different densities and comparison with daily deaths in Philadelphia. It can be seen that for the model as well as for Philadelphia the raising and falling parts are nearly exponential. Apart from the population n , the other parameters have the following values: $\beta = 0.32$, $\gamma = 5$, $x_0 = n - 1$, $y_0 = 1$, $z_0 = 0$. Source: *The daily data for Philadelphia are from: Bureau of the Census (1920).*

small densities one observes low and broad humps.

The question of the length of time of an epidemic process would deserve a closer study. In the present paper we considered only the case of influenza + pneumonia, which are diseases for which the incubation time and the length of survival may be as short as a few days. However, for other diseases these times may be much longer: for rabies it is a few months, for AIDS a few years⁴ Needless to say, the longer the process, the more difficult it is to determine its length.

In a recent paper (Richmond et al. 2018) a methodology was developed which allows measurement of the strength of family interactions between spouses or between parents and children. One may wonder whether the propagation of a disease can serve to estimate the proximity between family members and more broadly between people. At this point the only thing one can say is that this would require detailed epidemic micro data that do not seem available.

⁴Rabies and AIDS have specific spreading mechanisms which should be taken into account in any model description.

Epidemics ascribed to a lack of immunity in native populations are often given as the reason of their collapse. The following excerpt taken from Marsh (2004) is typical of this kind of statements:

“Nevada Indians had no immunity to the diseases that white explorers, colonists and settlers brought to their lands. These diseases included smallpox, measles, tuberculosis and others, which ravaged the tribes in great epidemics that killed many, and sometimes all, members of a tribe”.

From a scientific point of view such statements are unsatisfactory for at least three reasons.

(1) It is not easy to determine the moment when a native population has come in contact with persons who may carry pathogens. For instance, it is clear that the Nevada Indians have had contacts with Spanish people for a long time before the area became part of the US following the Mexican-American War of 1846-1848. The main difficulty is that the paucity of sources does not allow us to set a date in a reliable way⁵

(2) Most often native populations have low density. This is of course true for the Nevada Indians. If one takes $d = 1$ person per sq.km as a rough density estimate of native populations and $d = 100$ as the density of present-day France, the death rate due to a contagious disease will be $100^{0.20} = 2.5$ times smaller in the native population. From Table 2 we know that the exponent is slightly disease-dependent; the value of 0.20 taken here represents a rough average.

In short, these two features call into question the notion of sudden collapses due to epidemics.

(3) Most often for native populations there are no census records nor reliable estimates. However, in a few cases there are acceptable data going back to the early 19th century; Alaska and the Tonga Islands in the Pacific are two such cases and, remarkably, their population did not experience any collapse after coming into contact with white travelers. Below we give some additional details for Alaska.

(4) There are indeed documented cases of sudden collapses within one or two decades. If diseases are not the right explanation how can we explain them? There are plenty of possible reasons: starvation when the traditional source of food (e.g., vegetables, salmons, buffaloes) is no longer available, dispersion of tribes and splitting of families which prevents conceptions, or outright killings. Such events can occur simultaneously as documented by Benjamin Madley (2008, 2016) for the California Indians.

⁵Actually, the very definition of the notion of “contact” is unclear. Is the arrival of one or several hunters sufficient to start an epidemic? We do not know. However, one can be sure that irrespective of the initial contact, the disease will spread fairly slowly in low density areas like Alaska, Arizona or Nevada.

For the case of the Alaskan Indians there are two conflicting accounts: Mooney (1929) sees a sharp population fall due to diseases over the period 1740-1780, a time interval for which there are in fact no data available whereas Petroff (1884) bases his account on the population estimates which became available after 1780; these do not show any sizable population decrease in spite of the fact that the tribes of continental Alaska came into contact with white people only by 1840. In other words, in this case there was no immunity shock.

References

- Bureau of the Census 1920: Special tables of mortality from influenza and pneumonia. Indiana, Kansas, and Philadelphia, September 1 to December 31, 1918. Government Printing Office, Washington DC.
- Chowell (G.), Bettencourt (L.M.A.), Johnson (N.), Alonso (W.J.), Viboud (C.) 2008: The 1918-1919 influenza pandemic in England and Wales: spatial patterns in transmissibility and mortality impact. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 7 March 2008.
- Haidari (A.A.), Hazmi (A.A.), Marzouq (H.A.), Armstrong (M.), Colman (A.), Fancourt (N.), McSweeney (K.), Naidoo (M.), Nelson (P.), Parnell (M.), Rangihuna-Winekerei (D.), Selvarajah (Y.), Stantiall (S.), Wilson (N.), Baker (M.) 2006: Death by numbers. New Zealand mortality rates in the 1918 influenza pandemic. Publication of the Wellington School of Medicine and Health Sciences.
- Kermack (W.O.), McKendrick (A.G.) 1927: Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, A*, 115,700-721.
- Li (R.), Tang (M.), Hui (P.-K.) 2013: Epidemic spreading on multi-relational networks. *Acta Physica Sinica*, 62,16,168903.
- Li (R.), Wang (W.), Di (Z.) 2017a: Effects on human dynamics on epidemic spreading in Côte d'Ivoire. *Physica A*, 467,30-40.
- Li (R.), Dong (L.), Zhang (J.), Wang (X.), Wang (W.-X), Di (Z.), Stanley (H.E.) 2017b: Simple spatial scaling rules behind complex cities. *Nature Communications*, 8,1841.
- Linder (F.E.), Grove (R.D.) 1947: Vital statistics rates in the United States, 1900-1940. National Office of Vital Statistics, Government Printing Office, Washington DC.
- Madley (B.) 2008: California's Yuki Indians. *Defining genocide in native American history Western Historical Quarterly* 39,3,303332.
- Madley (B.) 2016: *An American Genocide. The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846-1873.* Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Marsh (C.) 2004: Nevada native Americans. Galopade International.

Mooney (J.) 1929: The aboriginal population of America north of Mexico. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections Vol.80, No 7,1-40.

Petroff (I.) 1884: Report on the population, industries, and resources of Alaska. Prepared at the request of the US Bureau of the Census.

Richmond (P.), Roehner (B.M.) 2018: Exploration of the strength of family links. Physica A 502,1-13.