

# TRUE EPIDEMIC GROWTH CONSTRUCTION THROUGH HARMONIC ANALYSIS

STEVEN G. KRANTZ<sup>1</sup>

PETER POLYAKOV<sup>2</sup>

ARNI S.R. SRINIVASA RAO<sup>3</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we have proposed a two phase procedure (combining discrete graphs and wavelets) for constructing a true epidemic growth. In the first phase graph theory based approach was developed to update partial data available and in the second phase we used this partial data to generate a plausible complete data through wavelets. This procedure although novel and implementable, still leave some questions unanswered.

[2000]MSC: 05C90, 42C40, 92D30

*Key words and phrases:* building complete data from a partial data, convergence of graphs, wavelets

## 1. BASIS, MOTIVATION AND INTRODUCTION

In general, it is not easy to build the true epidemic growth curve in a timely fashion for any newly emerging epidemic and the chances of building the true growth picture worsens with poor disease reporting. As we know, preparedness for an epidemic spread is a primary public health concern for any health departments. Epidemic reporting of a disease is a fundamental event in understanding two key parameters in epidemiology, namely, epidemic diffusion within a population and growth at a population level. Normally, for a real-time epidemic the reporting of cases is rarely complete, especially if the epidemic is new or symptoms

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, USA.  
Email: sk@math.wustl.edu

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.  
Email: polyakov@uwyo.edu

<sup>3</sup>Laboratory for Theory and Mathematical Modeling, Division of Infectious Diseases and Division of Epidemiology, Medical College of Georgia and Department of Mathematics, Augusta University, Augusta, Georgia, USA. Email: arrao@augusta.edu

are unknown or symptoms are yet to be discovered. For viruses with shorter incubation periods without virus shedding during the incubation period, any delay in reporting or lack of reporting could lead to a severe epidemic due to absence of controlling measures. For example, for ebola, the average incubation period is between 2 and 21 days, and an individual diagnosed with the ebola virus does not spread the virus to others during this period. Suppose some of these individuals with ebola are not diagnosed (and hence not reported to the health care facilities); then, after 21 days, these individuals will (unknowingly) spread ebola to others. There are other viruses whose incubation period is small but they are contagious during this period, for example influenza. Even for epidemics with established symptoms, the reporting could be nowhere close to complete and the impact of reporting on epidemic surveillance can then be theoretically measured (Rao, 2012).

In this study, we are trying to attempt a classical problem in epidemic reporting within a novel framework within harmonic analysis principles. This study develops methodologies of constructing complete data from a partial data using wavelets.

## 2. FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

We are raising here very fundamental questions in epidemic reporting. For example, does an epidemic case reporting over time follow any pattern? Or, in any particular situation, does an epidemic reporting pattern have anything to do with the actual epidemic wave? Actual epidemic or a true epidemic wave is the number of all cases (reported and not reported) as a function of time. Is there any strong or weak association between “epidemic reporting patterns” and “epidemic waves” in general? Suppose we cannot generalize such an association for every epidemic, then will there be any such association for a particular epidemic?

In any epidemic, we can hardly observe the actual (true) epidemic wave, and what we construct as a wave is mostly based on reporting numbers of disease cases. The central questions in which we are interested can be summarized as follows:

- (i) How far the reporting of an epidemic is helping us in accurate prediction of an epidemic, especially if it is an emerging epidemic? and how far such an association is clarified (which it is not otherwise) using methods of harmonic analysis?
- (ii) It is seldom that the cases generated in a population are completely detected, so the question that remains unanswered during most of the time in a newly emerging epidemic is: will there be any way to back-calculate

and reproduce these numbers lost in detection and, if so, to what extent can we reconstruct accurately an epidemic growth (before control measures are implemented)?

There are other related questions but first we want to see from the lens of wavelet/harmonic/PDE analysis because we believe there could be some useful light to be unearthed in this way.

Hence, it is always challenging to construct true epidemic waves because population vaccination and control policies depend on understanding the true ground level reality of disease cases.

### 3. WAVELETS

In the past thirty-five years there has developed a new branch of harmonic analysis called *wavelet theory*—see (Meyer/Ryan, 1993), (Meyer, 1998), (Hernandez/Weiss, 1996), (Walker, 1997), (Strichartz, 1993), (Labate/Weiss/Wilson, 2013). Largely based on the ideas of Yves Meyer, wavelet theory replaces the traditional Fourier basis of sine functions and cosine functions with a more flexible and adaptable basis of wavelets. The advantages of wavelets are these:

- (a) The wavelet expansion of a function can be localized both in the time and the space variable;
- (b) The wavelet expansion can be customized to particular applications;
- (c) Because of (b), the wavelet expansion is more accurate than the traditional Fourier expansion and also more rapidly converging.

Wavelet theory has revolutionized the theory of image compression, the theory of signal processing, and the theory of partial differential equations. It will be a powerful new tool in the study of epidemiology, particularly in the analysis of epidemic growth curves.

### 4. THEORETICAL STRATEGY

First we propose to build the true wave of an epidemic (through some harmonic analysis set-up and assumptions) which is otherwise unknown directly. Then, by assuming a fraction of this constructed wave was reported out of a true wave, we will then determine how an observed wave appears. These fractions are variables, so we will have several patterns of waves representing one true epidemic wave. We will have to draw conclusions which one of these representations is an ideal candidate for building a true epidemic. There will be some noise in our modeling of the epidemic curve, and we will use some noise reduction techniques before finalizing a pattern (here noise could arise due to reporting error in disease data).

Suppose an epidemic wave was observed within a time interval  $[t_0, t_n]$ , where  $t_n - t_0$  could be in weeks, months, years etc. Suppose  $[t_0, t_n]$  is partitioned into a set  $S$  of sub-intervals  $\{[t_0, t_1], (t_1, t_2], \dots, (t_{n-1}, t_n]\}$ , where  $t_i - t_{i-1}$  could be in days, weeks depending upon the situation. Let  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  be the number of cases reported and number of cases those are occurred but not reported, respectively, within the interval  $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Let  $f$  be the function whose domain is set of time intervals  $\{[t_{i-1}, t_i] \mid \forall i\}$  and whose range is the set  $T = \{a_i + b_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  (See Figure 4.1). Here  $f$  need not be one to one function because two time intervals within  $S$  could have same number of epidemic cases. Let  $f_1$  be the function defined as  $f_1 : \{[t_{i-1}, t_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \rightarrow A$ , where  $A = \{a_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  (See Figure 4.2). We call  $f_1$  as a fractional function of  $f$ . The reason we call this function a fractional function is that it maps each time interval into corresponding number of reported cases in each of these intervals. Total fraction of reported cases  $\sum_i a_i / \sum_i (a_i + b_i) \in [0, 1]$  during  $[t_0, t_n]$  is distributed into  $n$ - time intervals. Whereas,

$$\sum_i \frac{a_i}{a_i + b_i} = \begin{cases} n & \text{if all disease cases are reported during } [t_0, t_n] \\ < n & \text{if any one interval in } S \text{ there exists under reporting of diseases cases} \end{cases}$$

Given that the  $f_1$  is known, the question will be, whether can we estimate (or speculate)  $f$ ? Once we are able to estimate some form of  $f$ , then, how can we test for accuracy of these form(s) obtained. We could define another fractional function  $f_2$  as  $f_2 : \{[t_{i-1}, t_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \frac{A}{T}$  where  $\frac{A}{T} = \left\{ \frac{a_i}{a_i + b_i} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n \right\}$  and one could attempt (to develop techniques) to estimate (or speculate)  $f$  from  $f_2$ . In the Figure 4.2, the fractional epidemic wave pattern is not fully describing true epidemic wave pattern. Purely from fractional epidemic wave, it is not easy to speculate true epidemic wave pattern. Additional information on  $b_i$  values is needed for better prospects in speculation of  $f$ .

**4.1. Generating wavelets from sampled epidemic data:** Let us consider availability of data as per the Figure 4.1 on reported cases. Suppose each point on the y-axis is considered as a sampled point (out of many sets of plausible reported cases at that point). We call it a sampled point because we are not sure the point we obtain at any time intervals  $[t_0, t_1]$  and  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$  for the reported cases represents a true epidemic curve and that was one of the main assumptions in this paper. Total number of reported cases within a time interval is a combination of cases that were reported to the public health system (See Figure 4.4). When we know the total number of reported cases within a time




FIGURE 4.1. a) True epidemic wave and b) Fractional epidemic wave.  $a_i$  values are part of  $a_i + b_i$  values for each  $i$ . We have newly introduced the phrase *fractional epidemic waves* in this work. These fractional epidemic waves concept we are using with other ideas explained in this paper to develop new ideas related to *fractional wavelets*. In a sense, fractional wavelets represent fractions of overall wavelet. This Figure serves as a foundational concept to link the idea of fractional reporting waves with reporting errors.

interval, then this number could be resultant of one of the several combinations of cases reported as shown in the Figure 4.4. Within each interval the combination of cases reported is unknown but the total reported cases out of actual diseases cases within each interval are fixed (because we will take a single point reference of total reported cases within each interval). These reported cases are  $a'_i$ 's in Figure 4.1. Given that there exists a sampled point within each of the time intervals, and with some support for each of the  $a_i$  (say,  $supp(a_i)$ ), we will construct wavelet for




FIGURE 4.2. Functions of true and fractional epidemic waves based on reported and actual time series epidemic data.




FIGURE 4.3. Wavelets constructed from sampled reported data with supports. Black color points on wavelets represent sampled point (of total reported cases). Each wavelet is constructed with the pairs of information  $\{a_i, supp(a_i)\}$  available. One of the key technical features is that we are proposing through this Figure is to construct wavelets within each interval to quantify the level of reporting cases out of actual cases.

each time interval  $[t_0, t_1]$  and  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$ . Sampled point at a time interval we mean, the final combination of cases reported (out of actual cases) those were considered as final reporting number for that interval. How we decide the support is not clear right now, but we will use from a data which was used to get the sampled point  $a_i$ . Here sampled point does not necessarily mean statistical sampled point. In the Figure 4.4, for the interval  $[t_0, t_1]$ , the graph connecting each of the black circle (vertex) within each square forms a graph. Although the




FIGURE 4.4. Total reported cases within an interval of time could be formed from a sampled cases out of total cases. We drew graphs using black colored filled circles in this Figure to represent total reported cases in few of the situations out of all possible diseases reporting patterns. The sample point of reported cases represents the total reported cases at each time interval. Hence the size of all graphs at each interval was kept the same. Similarly, the size of graphs between different time intervals are kept different for demonstration purpose only and actual reported cases between different time intervals could be constant or not.




FIGURE 4.5. Convergence of graph at sample point to graph at complete reporting. From sampled point number of reported cases to the evolution of actual reported cases. This situation arises due to improved epidemic surveillance.




FIGURE 4.6. Evolution of reporting of epidemic cases and returning to recovered stage

sizes of each of these graphs are same, i.e. 7, but their shapes are different and the sampled point is 7. The sampled point cannot be used easily to represent the shape of the graph unless location of each node (in this case a physical address or geographical location of each node) is known. One way to construct the support could be from the graph associated with each sampled point. Using the pairs of information  $\{a_i, \text{supp}(a_i)\}$  we will construct wavelets as shown in Figure 4.3. Sampled points within each interval  $[t_0, t_1]$  and  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$  gives number of the reported cases and support constructed from graphs within each of these intervals. Within each square or a rectangle in the Figure 4.4, if the size of a graph increases to the maximum possible size (i.e. when all cases are reported), then information to construct corresponding support increases.

Let  $G_i$  be the graph corresponding to a sampled point  $a_i$  for the interval  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  and suppose  $G_i^c$  be the graph with all possible reported cases being reported, then  $G_i \rightarrow G_i^c$  ( $G_i$  converges to  $G_i^c$ ) for all  $i$ . In  $G_i^c$  the number of vertices are the number of actual disease cases and edges are connected between closest vertices. In reality,  $G_i^c$  is not possible to draw because we would not be able to observe all cases. It is challenging to understand before hand what fraction of the size of  $G_i^c$  would be the size of  $G_i$ , and this guess could give the speed of convergence to  $G_i^c$  from  $G_i$ . Actual time steps taken from  $G_i$  to  $G_i^c$  for each  $i$  is not constant. We assume there will be a finite number of time steps to reach from  $G_i$  to  $G_i^c$ . Usually  $c$  is not constant as well because the error rates vary. So, we let  $c_0$  corresponds to complete reporting at  $t_0$ ,  $c_1$  at  $t_1$ , and so on for  $c_n$  at  $t_n$ . Let at  $t_0$  the graph be






FIGURE 4.7. Distribution of reported cases into present time interval and to past time intervals. Reported cases found in a time interval in the column are distributed into respective bins of a time interval as shown through arrows.

$G_i$ , at  $t_1$  the graph be  $G_i^{t_1}$  and so on. The corresponding sizes of graphs be  $|E_i^{t_j}|$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, c_i$ , and

$$|E_i^{t_0}| < |E_i^{t_1}| < \dots < |E_i^{t_{c_i}}| \text{ for each } i.$$

But the inequality,

$$|E_i^{t_j}| < |E_l^{t_{j+1}}| \text{ for some } i \neq l \text{ and } l = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

need not hold. The explanation for these inequalities is as follows: graphs within each time interval could converge toward actual disease cases but the size of the graph across various time intervals need not follow any monotonic property because degrees of error in reported cases could vary over time. Let  $G_i$  is represented by  $(V_i, E_i)$  and  $G_i^c$  is represented by  $(V_i^c, E_i^c)$  and as the reporting of diseases cases improves the values of  $(V_i, E_i)$  increases such that they become exactly  $(V_i^c, E_i^c)$  which we denote here as  $G_i \rightarrow G_i^c$ . See Figure 4.5.

We define  $|E_i^{t_j}|$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  as local steady-state values and  $\max_i (|E_i^{t_j}|)$  as global steady-state value.

**Proposition 1.** *The size of each graph within  $[t_{i-1}, t_i)$  could reach local steady-state and the global steady-state is equal to the one of the local steady-states.*




FIGURE 4.8. Meyer wavelets of order 3 for various situations for equally spaced interval of (a)  $[-4,4]$ , (b)  $[0,6]$ , (c)  $[-20,20]$ , (d)  $[0,3]$ , (e) with order 10 for  $[-2.5, 2.5]$

For each  $i$ ,  $|E_i^{t_0}|$  and  $G_i$  are associated with reported cases. For any  $i$ ,  $|E_i^{t_0}| = |E_i^{t_{c_i}}|$  then  $G_i$  and  $G_i^{t_{c_i}}$  are identical, and this situation refers to complete reporting of disease cases. If  $|E_i^{t_0}| < |E_i^{t_{c_i}}|$ , for any  $i$ , then local steady-state for this  $i$  attained at  $t_0$ .

*Remark 2.* If  $|E_i^{t_0}| = |E_i^{t_{c_i}}|$  for each  $i$  and  $\max_i (|E_i^{t_j}|) = |E_i^{t_0}|$ , then the global steady-state also attains at  $t_0$ . If  $|E_i^{t_0}| \neq |E_i^{t_{c_i}}|$  for all  $i$ , then the global steady-state attains at a time greater than  $t_0$ .

When  $|E_i^{t_0}| \neq |E_i^{t_{c_i}}|$  for each  $i$ , then the global steady-state value could provide information on degree of reporting error to some extent. If  $|E_i^{t_0}| = |E_i^{t_{c_i}}|$  for some  $i$ , and by chance at this  $i$ , the global steady-state occurs then that wouldn't provide any information on degree of reporting errors, because at several other  $i$  values we will have  $|E_i^{t_0}| < |E_i^{t_{c_i}}|$  and actual total epidemic cases are more than sample epidemic cases.

Above, statements in the Proposition 1 and in the Remark 2 will alter when multiple reporting exists in one or more of the time intervals considered. Multiple reporting of cases is usually defined as reporting of a disease case more than once and treating it as more than one event of disease occurrence. When multiple reporting exists at each  $i$ , then  $\max_i (|E_i^{t_j}|) \neq |E_i^{t_0}|$  is not the global steady-state. A mixed situation where multiple reporting and under reporting simultaneously exists within the longer time interval  $[t_0, t_n]$  is treated separately.

With this method, we will develop a series of wavelets.

Given the information to construct Figure 4.5(a), and the rapidity at which this graph evolves from the Figure 4.5(a) to the Figure 4.5(d) (which we might refer above as *support*) to attain the Figure 4.5(d) is known, then combined with the information stored in the Figure 4.6, we can then construct Figure 4.3. Within each of the intervals  $[t_0, t_1]$  and  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$ , the information of the Figures 4.5-4.6, will be used to construct series of wavelets.

For example, if some  $\Psi(t)$  and some  $\Phi(t)$  together describe the epidemic wave of a true epidemic, and if pairs of functions  $\{(\Psi_i(t), \Phi_i(t))\}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  represent the epidemic wave of those representing fractions of this true epidemic, then one of our central ideas is in determining which of these fractional wave is closest to the true epidemic. Usually data/information to construct a couple of such fractional wavelets could be observed in an emerging epidemic, say  $(\Psi_a(t), \Phi_a(t))$  and  $(\Psi_b(t), \Phi_b(t))$ , so the first step is to construct these pairs of wavelets. These fractional wavelets are constructed on partial data (partial in the sense that observed data on disease cases in an emerging epidemic is not complete). The question we are attempting is: can we predict  $(\Psi(t), \Phi(t))$  from either one of or from both of the fractional wavelets. [**Note:** There is no terminology of “fractional wavelet” in the literature, but we are calling  $(\Psi_a(t), \Phi_a(t))$  and  $(\Psi_b(t), \Phi_b(t))$  the fractional wavelet]. For this, let us consider Meyer wavelets which are readily available and could be a good first step to start with to explain our epidemic situation. We will define Meyer wavelet and briefly describe them below:

The Meyer wavelet is an orthogonal wavelet created by Yves Meyer. It is a continuous wavelet, and has been applied to the study of adaptive filters, random fields, and multi-fault classification.

**Definition 3.** The Meyer wavelet is an infinitely differentiable function that is defined in the frequency domain in terms of a function  $\nu$  as follows:

$$\Psi(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\nu\left(\frac{3|\omega|}{2\pi} - 1\right)\right) e^{j\omega/2} & \text{if } 2\pi/3 < |\omega| < 4\pi/3 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\nu\left(\frac{3|\omega|}{2\pi} - 1\right)\right) e^{j\omega/2} & \text{if } 4\pi/3 < |\omega| < 8\pi/3 \\ 0 & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here

$$\nu(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x < 0 \\ x & \text{if } 0 < x < 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } x > 1. \end{cases}$$

There are other possible choices for  $\nu$ .

The Meyer scaling function is given by

$$\Phi(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} & \text{if } |\omega| < 2\pi/3 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\nu\left(\frac{3|\omega|}{2\pi} - 1\right)\right) & \text{if } 2\pi/3 < |\omega| < 4\pi/3 \\ 0 & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Of course it holds, as usual, that

$$\sum_k \left| \hat{\Phi}(\omega + 2\pi k) \right|^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi}$$

and

$$\hat{\Phi}(\omega) = m_0(\omega/2) \cdot \hat{\Phi}(\omega/2)$$

for some  $2\pi$ -periodic  $m_0(\omega/2)$ . Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\omega) &= e^{i\omega/2} \overline{m_0(\omega/2 + \pi)} \hat{\Phi}(\omega/2) \\ &= e^{i\omega/2} \sum_k \overline{\hat{\Phi}(\omega + 2\pi(2k + 1))} \hat{\Phi}(\omega/2) \\ &= e^{i\omega/2} \left( \hat{\Phi}(\omega + 2\pi) + \hat{\Phi}(\omega - 2\pi) \right) \hat{\Phi}(\omega/2). \end{aligned}$$

It turns out that the wavelets

$$\Psi_{j,k}(x) = 2^{j/2} \Psi(2^j x - k)$$

form an orthonormal basis for the square integrable functions on the real line.

One proposition that could be formed is “if a wavelet is constructed on the partial data of a particular series of events in a population, then this wavelet will not be fully compared with a wavelet constructed from the full data series of all events in the same population.” Building a measure associated with these two wavelets is interesting and there could be several such measures based on the level of completeness in the data. Because we are dealing with true versus reported disease cases this measure (a set of points each representing a distance between true and observed cases) could be termed the *error* in reporting of disease cases. These kind of measures will be very helpful (such measures after further filtration can be useful for practical epidemiologists). Instead of constructing wavelets for the overall epidemic duration, we will construct wavelets within intervals  $[t_0, t_1]$  and  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$  as described in the Figure 4.3. As the reported cases within an interval improve, described as in the Figure 4.5, wavelets configuration improves. Each of the fractional wavelets obtained from partial data will be

updated using the information shown in the Figure 4.7. Meyer wavelets for various equally spaced intervals are demonstrated in the Figure 4.8.

4.1.1. *Computation.* Suppose a sample point is obtained for an interval  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$ . An improvement of reported cases is tried to ascertain from the data obtained in the subsequent time intervals. One way to update this is from future epidemic cases those were infected and or diagnosed for the period  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  but made available during any of the intervals  $(t_i, t_{i+1}]$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n - 1$ . That is, sum of the epidemic cases those were reported during  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  and those reported during each of the future time intervals  $(t_i, t_{i+1}]$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n - 1$  and belong to the interval  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  will be treated as improved number of reported cases for the interval  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$ . We will update reported number of cases in a previous interval from future available reported cases that was associated with previous time interval. Hence, the evolution of the data for the interval  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  can be used to construct graphs shown in Figure 4.5. Since this evolution is assumed to observe for a long period, it is assumed that  $G_i$  will be convergent to  $G_i^c$  approximately. As an epidemic progresses, we update the intervals  $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$  with newly available information during  $(t_i, t_{i+1}]$  and as  $i$  approaches  $n$  then those intervals nearby to  $n$  will have less chance of evolution or less chance of up-gradation (due to truncation effect). Once the reporting numbers are complete, we will similarly study recover stage of an epidemic and hence collect the data to compute the Figure 4.6. Accumulation of old cases in new intervals are distributed back to respective time intervals is schematically described in the Figure 4.7. This procedure will update the reported cases in past as long as at least one reported case is observed in the present time interval that belongs to one of the past time interval. Based on the location of the reported cases the graphs constructed will be updated as well. Hence for each present time interval we observe a reported case that belongs to one of the past time interval, the fractional wavelets will become graphically closer to the complete (or true) wavelet for that time interval.

One way to assess closest fractional wavelet is to compare some features of fractional wavelets with a PDE/ODE model of an emerging epidemic.

## 5. WHAT WE CAN ACHIEVE THROUGH SUCH AN ANALYSIS?

We provide a group of epidemic growth scenarios inspired from the harmonic analysis set-up. A couple of scenarios from this could represent true epidemic growth curves. [We will have to evolve a strategy to short list a couple of plausible true scenarios.] With this, we will be in a position to assess the level of under-reporting in a particular epidemic. So the strategy we are proposing could

be beneficial in not only building a true epidemic but also assessing the level of reporting error in an epidemic. We provide the true epidemic with noise to illustrate our claim.

In addition to the gain in construction of true epidemic, we also propose new methods that blend harmonic analysis with dynamical systems and sampling strategy. In this way, harmonic analysis is used to bridge the gap between unknown and known information in disease epidemiology. Suppose we determine one of the fractional wavelets, say  $(\Psi_a(t), \Phi_a(t))$ , is closest to the true wavelet; then finding a measure which is the difference between  $(\Psi_a(t), \Phi_a(t))$  and  $(\Psi(t), \Phi(t))$  will complete mapping of the epidemic at time  $t$ . However determining which one of the fractions  $(\Psi_i(t), \Phi_i(t))$  is closest to the true is not so easy. But if there are no significant multiple reporting of disease cases then the largest fractional wavelet could be assumed to be the one with shortest measure [Note: Still we need to provide more clarity on strategy to determine the closest available fractional wavelet].

We are trying to use wavelets to extract full data from a partial data. We have argued how various combinations of partial data can be used for discrete constructions which in turn form a supporting information to construct wavelets. These two aspects makes our proposed work very innovative. In summary, what we are trying to develop through this paper is, given that we have partial data of an event (here we mean event of reporting of disease cases), we will construct the complete event data. Wavelets, in this work, are occupying key role in processing of built-up or accumulated data to build complete event data. The event here is the reported number of cases in a time interval and these reported cases represent only partial number of actual epidemic cases. Through this paper we demonstrated a method of improving of partial data to close to a data which could be complete. How do we plan to update our data reported in an interval and bring it closer to actual number of disease cases is described in this paper.

This exploration will assist in better visualization of any emerging epidemic spread in a more realistic sense. We also believe that our methods could provide additional tools for those epidemic modelers who frequently use modeling tools such as ODE and PDE to begin with. We are not only looking for academic development through this project, but, also a clear non-trivial body of techniques for applications of harmonic analysis that has never been seen before in-terms of developing epidemic analysis. We plan to come up with some interesting insights on how to construct wavelets for medical applications. The bottom line is that we will be able to help public health planners for better management and courses

of action during emerging epidemics. The kind of analysis we present here to fill missing pieces of epidemic reporting information can be applied to other areas, for example, constructing total rhythm of a heart beat from partial information, etc

## 6. QUESTIONS STILL REMAIN

Within what span of time we can generate a true epidemic from its emergence using the harmonic analysis set-up? Can we predict the full picture of an epidemic from only partial data? Can we measure the validity and the accuracy of an epidemic growth curve? Can we measure the timeliness of our analysis?

## GLOBAL VIEW

We have identified a gap in the methods of understanding true epidemic growth and spread and tried to address this by proposing a novel method. We are proposing through this study that wavelets could offer a road map closer to finding a practical solution (we are aware that a perfect solution is impossible by any method because some of the disease cases in any situation are never reported). Technical aspects of the story line was depended on construction of discrete graphs and *fractional wavelets*. Fractional wavelets are newly introduced to the literature through this study. A solution through wavelets is also not trivial because there is no ready-made set of wavelets available which will offer a timely road-map. So we have introduced a novel strategy. Hence we argue that our approach will help to come closer to our aims of understanding epidemics in a more accurate and timely fashion. As a bi-product, we can develop techniques for data scientists to analyze disease surveillance.

## REFERENCES

- [4] Hernández, E. and Weiss, G. (1996). *A First Course on Wavelets*, CRC Press LLC.
- [5] Krantz, S.G. (1999). *A Panorama of Harmonic Analysis*. Carus Mathematical Monographs, vol. 27. Mathematical Association of America, Washington.
- [7] Labate, D., Weiss, G., Wilson, E. (2013). Wavelets, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 60 (2013), pp. 66-76.
- [3] Meyer, Y. (1998) *Wavelets, Vibrations and Scalings*. With a preface in French by the author. CRM Monograph Series, 9. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- [2] Meyer, Y., Ryan, R.D. (1993). *Wavelets: Algorithms and Applications*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia.
- [1] Rao ASRS (2012). Understanding theoretically the impact of reporting of disease cases in epidemiology, *J. Theoret. Biol.* 302 (2012), 89–95.
- [8] Strichartz, R.S. (1993). How to make wavelets. *Am. Math. Mon.* 100(6), 539–556 (1993).

- [6] Walker, J. S. (1997). Fourier analysis and wavelet analysis. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* 44 (1997), no. 6, 658–670.
- [9] Krantz, S. G. (2019). Fourier Analysis and Differential Equations with wavelets and applications (book in preparation).