

Unifying incidence and prevalence under a time-varying general branching process

Mikko S. Pakkanen^{1,¶,*}, Xenia Miscouridou^{2,*}, Tresnia Berah¹, Swapnil Mishra^{2,3}, Thomas A. Mellan^{2,*} and Samir Bhatt^{2,3,¶,*}

¹Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London

²Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College London

³Section of Epidemiology, Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen

*Joint authorship

¶Corresponding authors: m.pakkanen@imperial.ac.uk, s.bhatt@imperial.ac.uk

3 April 2022

Abstract

Renewal equations are a popular approach used in modelling the number of new infections, i.e., incidence, in an outbreak. We develop a stochastic model of an outbreak based on a time-varying variant of the Crump–Mode–Jagers branching process. This model accommodates a time-varying reproduction number and a time-varying distribution for the generation interval. We then derive renewal-like integral equations for incidence, cumulative incidence and prevalence under this model. We show that the equations for incidence and prevalence are consistent with the so-called back-calculation relationship. We analyse two particular cases of these integral equations, one that arises from a Bellman–Harris process and one that arises from an inhomogeneous Poisson process model of transmission. We outline an argument to show that the incidence integral equations that arise from both of these specific models agree with the renewal equation used ubiquitously in infectious disease modelling. We present a numerical discretisation scheme to solve these equations, and use this scheme to estimate rates of transmission from both a Bellman–Harris process and Poisson process for Influenza, Measles, Smallpox and SARS incidence.

Keywords: incidence, prevalence, branching process, Crump–Mode–Jagers process, reproduction number, back-calculation, renewal equation, time varying reproduction number, inhomogeneous Poisson process.

1 Introduction

Mathematical descriptions of infectious disease outbreaks are fundamental to forecasting and simulating the dynamics of epidemics, as well as to understanding the mechanics of how transmission occurs. The epidemiological quantities of interest are *incidence* (the number of new infections at a given time point), *cumulative incidence* (the total number of infections up to a given time point) and *prevalence* (the number of infected individuals at a given time point). Taking a somewhat reductive perspective, it can be said that two main popular frameworks co-exist when modelling an infectious disease outbreak, namely, *individual-based models* juxtaposed with *governing equations*. Individual-based models are not only simple to understand in terms of their fundamental assumptions but have also proven extremely impactful [19]. However, mathematical tractability is limited, reliable estimates of expectations may require millions of simulations given the fat-tailed, multiplicative nature of epidemics, and inference can be challenging, with parameter inter-dependence making sensitivity analysis unreliable. In contrast, governing equations tend to have a stronger physical interpretation, are easier to perform inference over, and can be embedded in complex models easily [20].

The most widely known set of governing equations was presented in the seminal work of Kermack and McKendrick [31], where they studied the number and distribution of infections of a transmissible disease as it progresses through a population over time. They constructed classes, called *compartments*, and modelled the propagation of infectious disease via interactions among these compartments. The result is the popular *susceptible–infected–recovered* (SIR) model, variants of which are widely used in epidemiology. SIR models provide an intuitive mechanism for understanding disease transmission, and in the original derivation of [31], they were noted to be similar to the Volterra equation [40]. The Volterra equation (of the second kind) or more commonly, the *renewal equation*, is another popular governing equation [10, 14, 21, 38]. A large body of work in infectious disease epidemiology is based around the renewal equation and many modifications exist [1, 12, 22, 42]. There is a connection between specific compartmental models and renewal equations [11, 41] but this link has not been established in full generality. The vast majority of renewal frameworks model only incidence, and the explicit link between prevalence and incidence often requires the use of a latent process for incidence [8].

Between individual-based and governing equation models are stochastic *branching processes*. Branching processes are applied in the modelling of epidemics by first constructing a stochastic process where infected individuals transmit disease according to simple rules, and then deriving a governing equation for the average behaviour. For example Galton–Watson processes, where individuals infect other individuals at generations specified by a fixed time, provide a tractable and intuitive way of modelling the spread of an infectious disease [2, 25]. In 1948, Bellman and Harris [4] elegantly captured a more complex underlying infection mechanism by formulating an age-dependent branching process, where the age-dependence alludes to individuals who infect other individuals after a random interval of time. Interestingly, the expectation of the Bellman–Harris process [4] follows a renewal equation, whereby their framework links




Figure 1: Simulation of an age-dependent Bellman–Harris branching process in terms of prevalence. Left plot shows the Monte Carlo mean (red) alongside the theoretical mean (green). Right plot shows both the Monte Carlo and theoretical mean, overlaid on the underlying 1,000 simulated trajectories (translucent black lines). In this example, the time-varying reproduction number is given by $R(t) = 1.15 + \sin(0.15t)$, while the generation interval follows the Gamma(3, 1) distribution. Algorithm 2, given below, is used to compute the theoretical mean.

the two worlds of individual-based modelling and governing equations. The age-dependence assumption of Bellman and Harris allows, in particular, for the variable time between exposure to a pathogen and subsequent transmission to be modelled more realistically, and provides a framework encoding useful biological characteristics of the infecting pathogen, such as incubation periods and non-monotonic infectiousness. Crump, Mode [15, 16] and (independently) Jagers [30] further extended the Bellman-Harris process into a general branching process where individuals not only can infect at random times, but can do so randomly over the duration of their infection (as opposed to the Bellman-Harris process where all subsequent infections generated by each infected individual happen at a single random time).

The original formulation by Bellman and Harris [3], along with subsequent work by Harris [29], the work of Crump, Mode and Jagers [15, 16, 30] as well as the perspective of Bharucha-Reid [6] with specific application to epidemics, all focused on the simple case of a constant/basic reproduction number R_0 . The form of this renewal equation when only considering R_0 is exactly what is commonly used in epidemic modelling where the incidence of infections $I(t)$ follows a renewal equation given by

$$I(t) = R_0 \int_0^\infty I(t-u)g(u)du,$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is the probability density function (PDF) of the generation interval. Introducing a *time-varying* reproduction number $R(t)$ within the Bellman–Harris process in general does not simply entail replacing R_0 with $R(t)$ in the renewal equation. While justifications based on heuristic arguments such as Lotka’s [35] (used in tracking the numbers of females in an age-structured population) or the one given by Fraser [21] are valid within their respective contexts,

these arguments lose their validity when considering a stochastic age-dependent branching process with a time-varying reproduction process [5, 32, 33]. Indeed, we will demonstrate that these arguments are only valid for the specific case of incidence, not for prevalence or cumulative incidence. Furthermore, to our knowledge, no one has previously investigated a time-varying reproduction process under the more general Crump–Mode–Jagers framework.

In this paper, we introduce an outbreak model based on a time-varying version of the Crump–Mode–Jagers process, which we formulate using random characteristics [33]. Notably, Bellman–Harris, Galton–Watson and Markov branching processes are all special cases of this process. In our novel time-varying Crump–Mode–Jagers process, we specifically allow the statistical properties of infections, i.e., “offspring”, generated by each individual to vary over time. Building on this model, we can lay down a general, stochastic process foundation for incidence, cumulative incidence and prevalence, and characterise the renewal-like integral equations they follow. We show that the equations for prevalence and incidence are consistent with the well-known back-calculation relationship [8, 17] used in infectious disease epidemiology. We also outline an argument to show that the common renewal equation used ubiquitously for modelling incidence [14, 21] is in fact, under specific conditions, equivalent to the integral equation for incidence in our framework. Additionally, we formulate a novel reproduction process where infections occur randomly over the duration of each individual’s infection according to an inhomogeneous Poisson process. The model thus eschews the common assumption that infections happen instantaneously at a random time, as in the Bellman–Harris process, but still admits analytically tractable integral equations for prevalence and incidence. Finally, we introduce an efficient discretisation algorithm for our newly derived integral equations and apply it to the Bayesian modelling of incidence for Influenza [23], Measles [28], SARS [34] and Smallpox [24].

2 Model and theoretical results

2.1 Time-varying Crump–Mode–Jagers outbreak model

Throughout the paper, we shall work with an infectious disease outbreak model based on the Crump–Mode–Jagers (CMJ) branching process, which we extend to allow transmission dynamics vary over time. Our formulation is inspired by Vatutin and Zubkov [46, 47], who give an exposition of the corresponding time-invariant CMJ process using *random characteristics*. In our time-varying CMJ outbreak model, the initial infection occurs at non-random time $\tau \geq 0$. All subsequent infections are “progeny” of this index case, and we shall denote the set of these infected individuals by \mathcal{I}^* . We denote the set of all infected individuals (i.e., including the index case) by \mathcal{I} .

The index case corresponds to an individual endowed with a collection of random elements indexed by the infection time,

$$\{L^\tau, \chi^\tau(\cdot), N^\tau(\cdot)\}_{\tau \geq 0},$$

where, for any $\tau \geq 0$,

- L^τ is a positive random variable representing the amount of time the individual remains infected,
- $\chi^\tau(\cdot)$ is a stochastic process on $[0, \infty)$ which we shall call the *random characteristic* of the individual, and
- $N^\tau(\cdot)$ is a counting process on $[0, \infty)$ keeping track of the new infections, i.e., “offspring”, generated by the individual.

For completeness, we set $N^\tau(u) := 0 =: \chi^\tau(u)$ for $u < 0$. (We will explain the precise roles of $\chi^\tau(\cdot)$ and $N^\tau(\cdot)$ shortly.) The objects L^τ , $\chi^\tau(\cdot)$, and $N^\tau(\cdot)$ are typically interdependent, as we shall see below, whilst the interdependence of $(L^\tau, \chi^\tau(\cdot), N^\tau(\cdot))$ and $(L^{\tau'}, \chi^{\tau'}(\cdot), N^{\tau'}(\cdot))$ for different τ and τ' is in fact immaterial and will be glossed over. We shall moreover endow each individual $i \in \mathcal{I}^*$ with an IID copy $\{L_i^\tau, \chi_i^\tau(\cdot), N_i^\tau(\cdot)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$ of $\{L^\tau, \chi^\tau(\cdot), N^\tau(\cdot)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$.

Suppose now that individual $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is infected at (possibly random) time $\tau_i \geq \tau$. Intuitively, the infection time τ_i then “selects” $L_i^{\tau_i}$, $\chi_i^{\tau_i}(\cdot)$, and $N_i^{\tau_i}(\cdot)$ from $\{L_i^\tau, \chi_i^\tau(\cdot), N_i^\tau(\cdot)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$, which the subsequent infection dynamics of this individual will “follow.” (Note that the collection $\{L_i^\tau, \chi_i^\tau(\cdot), N_i^\tau(\cdot)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$ is “unconditionally” independent of the infection time τ_i .) More concretely, $N_i^{\tau_i}(u)$ now stands for the number of new infections generated by the individual i up to time $u + \tau_i$.

Example 1 (Bellman–Harris process). The Bellman–Harris branching model can informally be characterised, in the context of epidemics, by the principle that each individual generates a random number of new infections which occur *simultaneously* at a random time. Once these new infections have occurred, the individual immediately ceases to be infectious. Let $\xi(\cdot)$ be a stochastic process on $[0, \infty)$ with values in $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, \dots\}$, independent of $\{L^\tau\}_{\tau \geq 0}$, and then define

$$N^\tau(u) := \begin{cases} 0, & u < L^\tau, \\ \xi(\tau + L^\tau), & u \geq L^\tau. \end{cases}$$

This specification gives rise to the time-varying Bellman–Harris branching process studied by Kimmel [32]. When the distributions of L^τ and $\xi(t)$ do not depend on the time parameters $\tau \geq 0$ and $t \geq 0$, we recover the classical Bellman–Harris process [4]. Epidemiologically, the Bellman–Harris process can be applied to modelling diseases where the *majority* of secondary infections happen at a specific time rather than over the duration of the infection.

Example 2 (Inhomogeneous Poisson process model). In contrast to the Bellman–Harris process, we can consider a more realistic epidemiological model where each infected individual generates new infections randomly and *one by one* according to an inhomogeneous Poisson process until they cease to be infectious. This process, with a constant rate of transmission has been previously studied in the context of the generation time [45]. The infinitesimal rate at




Figure 2: Schematic of infections generated under a Bellman–Harris process and an inhomogeneous Poisson process model. In a Bellman–Harris process, after a generation interval, new infections happen at the same time (instantaneously). In the inhomogeneous Poisson process model, an individual is infectious for a period, over which their infectiousness varies, and they produce infections one by one.

time t of new infections generated by an individual originally infected at time $\tau \leq t$ is specified as

$$\rho(t)k(t - \tau),$$

where $\rho(\cdot)$ is a non-negative function that models population-level variation in transmissibility while $k(\cdot)$ is another non-negative function describing how individual-level infectiousness varies over time [45]. For example, specifying $k(t)$ to be low or zero for small t can be used to incorporate an incubation period in the model. Let $\Phi(\cdot)$ be a unit-rate, homogeneous Poisson process on $[0, \infty)$, independent of $\{L^\tau\}_{\tau \geq 0}$. Then we can define this model explicitly by

$$N^\tau(u) := \begin{cases} \Phi\left(\int_0^u \rho(v + \tau)k(v)dv\right), & u < L^\tau, \\ \Phi\left(\int_0^{L^\tau} \rho(v + \tau)k(v)dv\right), & u \geq L^\tau. \end{cases}$$

(If $\rho(t) \equiv \rho$ and $k(t) \equiv k$, both constant, then new infections follow a homogeneous Poisson process with rate ρk until the individual is no longer infected.)

Example 3 (Lévy and Cox process models). In the inhomogeneous Poisson process model of Example 2, tractability does not hinge on the assumption that $\Phi(\cdot)$ is a Poisson process. We could in fact replace it with a more general, integer-valued Lévy process (i.e., a process with independent and identically distributed increments), where jumps need not be unit-sized (e.g., a compound Poisson process). Similarly, replacing the deterministic function $\rho(\cdot)$ with a stochastic process, as long as it is independent of $\Phi(\cdot)$, would be straightforward. In the Poisson case, this would turn $N^\tau(\cdot)$ into a doubly-stochastic Cox process. However, for simplicity and concreteness, we shall stick to the simpler setting of Example 2.

Remark 4 (Epidemiological interpretation of L^τ and k). In the Bellman–Harris process of Example 1, L^τ is directly interpreted as the generation interval [45], that is, the time taken for the secondary cases to be infected by a primary case. In the Bellman–Harris process all infections happen at the same time — for example in Figure 2 we have $\xi(\tau + L^\tau) = 3$, after

L^τ time units has elapsed since the primary case was infected at time τ . In contrast, the inhomogenous Poisson process model of Example 2 (and also the Lévy and Cox process models of Example 3), L^τ corresponds to how long an individual remains infected (the duration of infection). During this period, an individual can infect others with rate that depends on $\rho(\cdot)$, which describes calendar-time variation of overall infectiousness in the population, and on $k(\cdot)$, which describes how the infectiousness of each infected individual varies over the course of their infection. The individual's infectiousness profile $k(\cdot)$ can be set as constant, i.e., variation in the individual's infectiousness is only due to calendar-time variation in overall infectiousness.

The random characteristic is used merely as a book-keeping device, to keep track of whether an individual has been infected in the past, and is infected at the moment, respectively. It is fundamental to obtaining a unified derivation of both cumulative incidence and prevalence in what follows.

Example 5 (Cumulative incidence and prevalence). The random characteristic (in fact non-random!)

$$\chi^\tau(u) := \begin{cases} 0, & u < 0, \\ 1, & u \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

determines whether the individual has been infected by time $u + \tau$, and is therefore used to derive cumulative incidence. The random characteristic

$$\chi^\tau(u) := \begin{cases} 0, & u < 0, \\ 1, & u \in [0, L^\tau), \\ 0, & u \geq L^\tau, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

determines whether the individual remains infected at time $u + \tau$, is used to derive prevalence.

2.2 Cumulative incidence and prevalence

We will now derive integral equations for cumulative incidence and prevalence under this model. To this end, we study the statistic

$$Z(t, \tau) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \chi_i^{\tau_i}(t - \tau_i), \quad t \geq \tau \geq 0,$$

recalling that τ is the infection time of the index case. For $t < \tau$, we set $Z(t, \tau) := 0$ for completeness. For the given random characteristic (6), $Z(t, \tau)$ tallies the number of infections occurred by time t and for (7) the number of infected individuals at time t , respectively. Our goal is to derive an equation for the expectation of $Z(t, \tau)$.

Firstly, singling out the index case, we get

$$Z(t, \tau) = \chi^\tau(t - \tau) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^*} \chi_i^{\tau_i}(t - \tau_i). \quad (8)$$

The key insight in the analysis of (8) is to stratify the infected individuals in \mathcal{I}^* according to their (unique) “ancestor” among the individuals infected by the index case. More concretely, let $i_1, i_2, \dots \in \mathcal{I}^*$ label the “offspring” of the index case in chronological order, i.e., so that $\tau \leq \tau_{i_1} \leq \tau_{i_2} \leq \dots$, and let $\mathcal{I}_k \subset \mathcal{I}^*$ for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$ denote the set consisting of i_k and its “progeny.” We can then write

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^*} \chi_i^{\tau_i}(t - \tau_i) = \sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} \underbrace{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \chi_i^{\tau_i}(t - \tau_i)}_{=: Z_k(t)}.$$

This is an analogue of the *principle of first generation* for the Bellman–Harris process [29, Theorem 6.1] (see also [32, p. 5]).

Now, conditional on the random times $\tau_{i_1}, \tau_{i_2}, \dots$, the random variables $Z_1(t), Z_2(t), \dots$ can be shown to be mutually independent, with $Z_k(t)$ equal in distribution to $\tilde{Z}(t, \tau_{i_k})$, where $\{\tilde{Z}(t, \tau)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$ is an independent copy of $\{Z(t, \tau)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$ (independent of $\tau_{i_1}, \tau_{i_2}, \dots$, in particular). Thus,

$$f(t, \tau) := \mathbb{E}[Z(t, \tau)] = \mathbb{E}[\chi^\tau(t - \tau)] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} Z_k(t)\right],$$

where, using the tower property of conditional expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} Z_k(t)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} Z_k(t) \mid \tau_{i_1}, \tau_{i_2}, \dots\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} \mathbb{E}[Z_k(t) \mid \tau_{i_1}, \tau_{i_2}, \dots]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}(t, \tau)]_{\tau=\tau_{i_k}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\tilde{Z}(t, \tau)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$ is equal in distribution to $\{Z(t, \tau)\}_{\tau \geq 0}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}(t, \tau)]_{\tau=\tau_{i_k}}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k: \tau_{i_k} \leq t} f(t, \tau_{i_k})\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{\tau < v \leq t} f(t, v) \Delta N^\tau(v - \tau)\right] \\ &= \sum_{\tau < v \leq t} f(t, v) \mathbb{E}[\Delta N^\tau(v - \tau)] \\ &= \int_{(0, t-\tau]} f(t, u + \tau) d\Lambda^\tau(u), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta N^\tau(u) &:= N^\tau(u) - \lim_{v \rightarrow u^-} N^\tau(v), \\ \Lambda^\tau(u) &:= \mathbb{E}[N^\tau(u)], \end{aligned}$$

for any $u \geq 0$. Therefore, the function $(t, \tau) \mapsto f(t, \tau)$ is governed by the integral equation

$$f(t, \tau) = \mathbb{E}[\chi^\tau(t - \tau)] + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} f(t, u + \tau) d\Lambda^\tau(u), \quad t \geq \tau \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

For the random characteristic (6), $f(t, \tau)$ is the cumulative incidence at time t , and we shall denote it by $\text{CI}(t, \tau)$. Since $\mathbb{E}[\chi^\tau(t - \tau)] = 1$ in this case for $t \geq \tau$, the equation (9) transforms into

$$\text{CI}(t, \tau) = 1 + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \text{CI}(t, u + \tau) d\Lambda^\tau(u). \quad (10)$$

In the case (7), $f(t, \tau)$ is the prevalence at time t , which we henceforth denote by $\text{Pr}(t, \tau)$. In this case,

$$\mathbb{E}[\chi^\tau(t - \tau)] = \mathbb{P}[t - \tau < L^\tau] = 1 - G^\tau(t - \tau), \quad t \geq \tau,$$

where $G^\tau(\cdot)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of L^τ . Writing $\overline{G}^\tau(\cdot) := 1 - G^\tau(\cdot)$ for the survival function associated with $G^\tau(\cdot)$, we have then

$$\text{Pr}(t, \tau) = \overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \text{Pr}(t, u + \tau) d\Lambda^\tau(u). \quad (11)$$

Example 12 (Bellman–Harris process, cont’d). Let us consider the Bellman–Harris case of Example 1 and write $R(t) := \mathbb{E}[\xi(t)]$ for the (time-varying) *reproduction number* at time $t \geq 0$. Let us also denote the indicator function of a set A by $\mathbf{1}_A$. Using the tower property and the independence between $\xi(\cdot)$ and $\{L^\tau\}_{\tau \geq 0}$, we get then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^\tau(u) &= \mathbb{E}[N^\tau(u)] = \mathbb{E}[\xi(L^\tau + \tau) \mathbf{1}_{\{u \geq L^\tau\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\xi(L^\tau + \tau) \mid L^\tau] \mathbf{1}_{\{u \geq L^\tau\}}] \\ &= \int_{(0, u]} R(u' + \tau) dG^\tau(u'). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (10) and (11), respectively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CI}(t, \tau) &= 1 + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \text{CI}(t, u + \tau) R(u + \tau) dG^\tau(u), \\ \text{Pr}(t, \tau) &= \overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \text{Pr}(t, u + \tau) R(u + \tau) dG^\tau(u), \end{aligned}$$

which agree with [32, Theorem 5.1]. When $G^\tau(\cdot)$ admits a PDF $g^\tau(\cdot)$, the case most relevant in practice, we can simplify the equations further to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CI}(t, \tau) &= 1 + \int_0^{t-\tau} \text{CI}(t, u + \tau) R(u + \tau) g^\tau(u) du, \\ \text{Pr}(t, \tau) &= \overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_0^{t-\tau} \text{Pr}(t, u + \tau) R(u + \tau) g^\tau(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Example 13 (Inhomogeneous Poisson process model, cont’d). To analyse the Poisson process model of Example 2, we shall assume that the CDF $G^\tau(\cdot)$ of L^τ admits a PDF $g^\tau(\cdot)$, as above. We have then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^\tau(u) &= \mathbb{E}[N^\tau(u)] = \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\int_0^u \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{u < L^\tau\}} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\int_0^{L^\tau} \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{u \geq L^\tau\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking the independence between $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\{L^\tau\}_{\tau \geq 0}$ and the tower property of conditional expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\int_0^u \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{u < L^\tau\}} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\int_0^u \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \right) \right] \mathbb{P}[u < L^\tau] \\ &= \overline{G}^\tau(u) \int_0^u \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\int_0^{L^\tau} \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{u \geq L^\tau\}} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\int_0^{L^\tau} \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{u \geq L^\tau\}} \middle| L^\tau \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\int_0^\ell \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv \right) \right]_{\ell=L^\tau} \mathbf{1}_{\{u \geq L^\tau\}} \right] \\ &= \int_0^u \int_0^{u'} \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv g^\tau(u') du'. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (14) by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{G}^\tau(u) \int_0^u \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv &= \int_0^u \int_0^{u'} \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv d\overline{G}^\tau(u') + \int_0^u \overline{G}^\tau(u') \rho(u' + \tau) k(u') du' \\ &= - \int_0^u \int_0^{u'} \rho(v + \tau) k(v) dv g^\tau(u') du' + \int_0^u \rho(u' + \tau) k(u') \overline{G}^\tau(u') du', \end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{d\overline{G}^\tau(u)}{du} = -\frac{dG^\tau(u)}{du} = -g^\tau(u)$. Therefore,

$$\Lambda^\tau(u) = \int_0^u \rho(u' + \tau) k(u') \overline{G}^\tau(u') du',$$

whereby the equations for cumulative incidence and prevalence read as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CI}(t, \tau) &= 1 + \int_0^{t-\tau} \text{CI}(t, u + \tau) \rho(u + \tau) k(u) \overline{G}^\tau(u) du, \\ \text{Pr}(t, \tau) &= \overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_0^{t-\tau} \text{Pr}(t, u + \tau) \rho(u + \tau) k(u) \overline{G}^\tau(u) du, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, in this case.

Remark 15 (Probability generating functions). In the Bellman–Harris case of Examples 1 and 12, we can also analyse the distribution of $Z(t, \tau)$ via its *generating function* $\phi(s; t, \tau) := \mathbb{E}[s^{Z(t, \tau)}]$, $s \in [-1, 1]$, letting us study, e.g., higher moments. Concretely, one can show that $\phi(\cdot; t, \tau)$ satisfies the integral equations

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(s; t, \tau) &= s \overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau) + s \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \psi(\phi(s; t, u + \tau); u + \tau) dG^\tau(u), \\ \phi(s; t, \tau) &= s \overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \psi(\phi(s; t, u + \tau); u + \tau) dG^\tau(u), \end{aligned}$$

for random characteristics (6) and (7), respectively, where $\psi(s; t) := \mathbb{E}[s^{\xi(t)}]$, $s \in [-1, 1]$. These are special cases of [32, Equations (3.3) and (3.4)], whilst self-contained re-derivations in the case where $G^\tau(\cdot)$ does not depend on the infection time τ are given in [4].

Remark 16 (Relationship between $\rho(t)$ and $R(t)$). The quantity $R(t)$ in the context of the Bellman–Harris process (Examples 1 and 12) is more precisely the *instantaneous* reproduction number, i.e., the expected number of secondary cases arising from a primary case when those infections occur at time t . In the context of a real-time epidemic, $R(t)$ is generally interpreted as the the average number of secondary cases that would arise from a primary case infected at time t if conditions remained the same after time t [21]. The quantity $\rho(t)$ in the Poisson process model (Examples 2 and 13), in contrast, is a time varying transmission rate, i.e., scaled by time, and therefore exists on a different scale. An alternative way of analysing $R(\cdot)$ is to use the *case reproduction number* $\mathcal{R}(t)$ [27, 49], which represents the average number of secondary cases arising from a primary case infected at time t , i.e., transmissibility after time t . It is similarly possible to also analyse $\rho(\cdot)$ through the case reproduction number and therefore compare the rates of transmission in both models commensurably. Namely, given $\rho(\cdot)$ and $R(\cdot)$, they can be transformed to $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ and be comparable on the same scale via the convolutions

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_{\text{Pois}}(t) &= \int_t^\infty \rho(u)k(u-t)\overline{G}^t(u-t)du, \\ \mathcal{R}_{\text{BH}}(t) &= \int_t^\infty R(u)g^t(u-t)du.\end{aligned}$$

2.3 Incidence

Incidence is defined as the time-derivative of cumulative incidence. To derive an integral equation for incidence à la (10) and (11), we shall assume that the function $\Lambda^\tau(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable, that is,

$$\Lambda^\tau(u) = \int_0^u \lambda^\tau(u')du', \quad (17)$$

for some continuous function $\lambda^\tau(\cdot)$, which can be assumed non-negative here, given that $N^\tau(\cdot)$ is a counting process. This assumption rules out lattice-type occurrence of infections, and is satisfied with $\lambda^\tau(u) = \rho(u+\tau)k(u)\overline{G}^\tau(u)$ in Example 13 provided $\rho(\cdot)$ and $k(\cdot)$ are continuous, and with $\lambda^\tau(u) = R(u+\tau)g^\tau(u)$ in Example 12 provided $R(\cdot)$ is continuous and $G^\tau(\cdot)$ possesses a continuous PDF $g^\tau(\cdot)$.

Now, under (17), we have for any $t > \tau$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{CI}(t+\varepsilon, \tau) - \text{CI}(t, \tau) &= \int_0^{t+\varepsilon-\tau} \text{CI}(t+\varepsilon, u+\tau)\lambda^\tau(u)du - \int_0^{t-\tau} \text{CI}(t, u+\tau)\lambda^\tau(u)du \\ &= \int_{t-\tau}^{t+\varepsilon-\tau} \text{CI}(t+\varepsilon, u+\tau)\lambda^\tau(u)du\end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$+ \int_{[0, t-\tau)} (\text{CI}(t+\varepsilon, u+\tau) - \text{CI}(t, u+\tau))\lambda^\tau(u)du. \quad (19)$$

Firstly,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{t-\tau}^{t+\varepsilon-\tau} \text{CI}(t+\varepsilon, u+\tau)\lambda^\tau(u)du = \underbrace{\text{CI}(t, t)}_{=1} \lambda^\tau(t-\tau) = \lambda^\tau(t-\tau),$$

and, secondly,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{[0, t-\tau)} (\text{CI}(t + \varepsilon, u + \tau) - \text{CI}(t, u + \tau)) \lambda^\tau(u) du \\ = \int_{[0, t-\tau)} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{CI}(t + \varepsilon, u + \tau) - \text{CI}(t, u + \tau)}{\varepsilon} \lambda^\tau(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, incidence, defined as the time-derivative

$$I(t, \tau) := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \text{CI}(t, \tau),$$

satisfies

$$I(t, \tau) = \lambda^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_{[0, t-\tau)} I(t, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du, \quad t > \tau \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

The case $t = \tau$, excluded hitherto, requires some extra care, though. Cumulative incidence, by definition, equals zero before the index case is infected at time τ , whilst it then jumps to one. Hence, cumulative incidence, when understood as a function on the entire real line, satisfies

$$\text{CI}(t, \tau) = \mathbf{1}_{[0, \infty)}(t - \tau) + \int_0^{t-\tau} \text{CI}(t, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The derivative of $t \mapsto \text{CI}(t, \tau)$, hence incidence, at τ does not exist in the classical sense due to the jump in cumulative incidence, but we can nevertheless understand it as a Dirac delta function $\delta(\cdot - \tau)$ in a distributional sense. (We recall that the Dirac delta function is a generalised function with the characteristic property $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \delta(y - x) dx = f(y)$.) We can reconcile the equation $I(t, \tau) = \delta(t - \tau)$ for $t = \tau$ and equation (20) by noting that for $t > \tau$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^\tau(t - \tau) &= \lambda^\tau(t - \tau) \mathbf{1}_{\{t-\tau\}}(t - \tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda^\tau(u) \mathbf{1}_{\{t-\tau\}}(u) \underbrace{\delta(t - \tau - u)}_{=\delta(t - (\tau + u))} du \\ &= \int_{\{t-\tau\}} I(t, \tau + u) \lambda^\tau(u) du, \end{aligned}$$

whereby the right-hand side of (20) satisfies

$$\lambda^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_{[0, t-\tau)} I(t, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du = \int_{[0, t-\tau]} I(t, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du.$$

Consequently, we find that incidence is governed by the equation

$$I(t, \tau) = \delta(t - \tau) + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} I(t, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du, \quad t \geq \tau \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

(We have adjusted the domain of integration from $[0, t - \tau]$ to $(0, t - \tau]$. This is simply to ensure no integral appears on the right-hand side when $t = \tau$. For $t > \tau$, this adjustment is immaterial.) For $t < \tau$, we set $I(t, \tau) := 0$.

Remark 22. In (19) we pre-emptively omitted integration over the point $t - \tau$. This is in fact crucial due to the subsequent appearance of the Dirac delta function, as otherwise we would have “double-counted” its contribution to incidence, which is embodied in the term (18) already.

Example 23 (Incidence for the Bellman–Harris process and Poisson process model).

Under the aforementioned assumptions, equations (20) and (21) read as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(t, \tau) &= R(t)g^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_{[0, t-\tau)} \mathbb{I}(t, u + \tau)R(u + \tau)g^\tau(u)du, & t > \tau \geq 0, \\ \mathbb{I}(t, \tau) &= \delta(t - \tau) + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \mathbb{I}(t, u + \tau)R(u + \tau)g^\tau(u)du, & t \geq \tau \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

respectively, for the Bellman–Harris process of Examples 1 and 12, and as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(t, \tau) &= \rho(t)k(t - \tau)\overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau) + \int_{[0, t-\tau)} \mathbb{I}(t, u + \tau)\rho(u + \tau)k(u)\overline{G}^\tau(u)du, & t > \tau \geq 0, \\ \mathbb{I}(t, \tau) &= \delta(t - \tau) + \int_{(0, t-\tau]} \mathbb{I}(t, u + \tau)\rho(u + \tau)k(u)\overline{G}^\tau(u)du, & t \geq \tau \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, for the Poisson process model of Examples 2 and 13.

2.4 Consistency with back-calculation

Back-calculation is a standard method to recover prevalence from incidence by convolving the survival function of the generation interval with incidence [8, 17]. We will now show that the equations we have obtained for prevalence and incidence are consistent with the back-calculation relationship under the assumption (17) and the additional assumption that the CDF $G^\tau(\cdot)$ does not depend on the infection time τ , in which case we write $G(\cdot)$ and $\overline{G}(\cdot)$ in lieu of $G^\tau(\cdot)$ and $\overline{G}^\tau(\cdot)$, respectively.

Let f and \tilde{f} be two functions, one of which may be a generalised function, such that $f(t) = 0$ for any $t < 0$ and $\tilde{f}(t) = 0$ for any $t < \tau$. Their convolution can be expressed as

$$(f * \tilde{f})(t) := \int_{[\tau, t]} f(t - s)\tilde{f}(s)ds$$

for any $t \geq \tau$ and equals zero otherwise. We proceed now to show that the back-calculation relationship

$$\overline{G} * \mathbb{I}(\cdot, \tau) = \text{Pr}(\cdot, \tau) \quad (25)$$

holds, with the convention $\overline{G}(t) := 0$ for any $t < 0$. Starting from (21), we have

$$\overline{G} * \mathbb{I}(\cdot, \tau) = \overline{G} * \delta(\cdot - \tau) + \overline{G} * \int_{(0, \cdot - \tau]} \mathbb{I}(\cdot, u + \tau)\lambda^\tau(u)du, \quad (26)$$

where the first term on the right-hand side can be computed as

$$(\overline{G} * \delta(\cdot - \tau))(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{G}(t - s)\delta(s - \tau)ds = \overline{G}(t - \tau), \quad t \geq \tau. \quad (27)$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (26) vanishes for any argument $t \leq \tau$, so it suffices

to consider $t > \tau$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\overline{G} * \int_{(0, \cdot - \tau]} I(\cdot, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du \right)(t) &= \int_{[\tau, t]} \overline{G}(t - s) \int_{(0, s - \tau]} I(s, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du ds \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{G}(t - s) I(s, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < u \leq s - \tau\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq s \leq t\}} du ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where the indicator functions can be re-organised as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}_{\{0 < u \leq s - \tau\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq s \leq t\}} &= \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < u\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{u \leq s - \tau\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq s\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq t\}} \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < u\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{u + \tau \leq s\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{u \leq t - \tau\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq t\}} \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{\{u + \tau \leq s \leq t\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < u \leq t - \tau\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{G}(t - s) I(s, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < u \leq s - \tau\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq s \leq t\}} du ds &= \int_{(0, t - \tau]} \int_{[\tau, t]} \overline{G}(t - s) I(s, u + \tau) ds \lambda^\tau(u) du \\
&= \int_{(0, t - \tau]} \overline{G} * I(\cdot, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Combining (27), (28) and (29), we have altogether

$$(\overline{G} * I(\cdot, \tau))(t) = \overline{G}(t - \tau) + \int_{(0, t - \tau]} \overline{G} * I(\cdot, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du, \quad t \geq \tau.$$

We note that $\overline{G} * I(\cdot, \tau)$ satisfies the same equation as $\text{Pr}(\cdot, \tau)$, namely (11). As long as the solution to this equation is unique, a question which has been previously studied by Kimmel [32], we can conclude that the back-calculation relationship (25) holds.

Remark 30 (Modelling HIV incidence from prevalence). HIV is an example of a disease where, due to long incubation times, routine surveillance generally returns prevalence — not incidence [18]. However, what is of interest to policy makers is incidence, not prevalence [9]. Common approaches all make use of the back-calculation relationship through convolving a latent function for incidence with the survival function $\overline{G}(\cdot)$ [9, 37, 44]. Our argument above shows that there is no need to model incidence as a latent function, rather one can fit $\rho(\cdot)$ or $R(\cdot)$ directly to prevalence data using the prevalence integral equation for $\text{Pr}(t, \tau)$, after which $I(t, \tau)$ can be computed directly without need for a latent incidence function. This relationship therefore can help facilitate simpler or more pragmatic modelling choices.

2.5 Consistency with a common renewal equation model for incidence

The key difference between our newly derived integral equations and the common renewal equation used [14, 21, 38] is the inclusion of the parameter τ that initially arises due the timing

of the index case. The inclusion of τ means that we need to work with $I(t, \tau)$, not simply $I(t)$, and also gives rise to terms outside of the integral depending on whether one is interested in incidence, cumulative incidence or prevalence.

As in Section 2.4, we assume that $G^\tau(\cdot)$ does not depend on τ , i.e., we work with $G(\cdot)$, and we moreover assume that $G(\cdot)$ has a PDF $g(\cdot)$. In this context, when extended to accommodate general initial infection time τ , the common renewal equation for incidence would be tantamount to the integral equation

$$I_{\text{Ren}}(t, \tau) = \delta(t - \tau) + R(t) \int_{(0, t-\tau]} I_{\text{Ren}}(t - u, \tau) g(u) du, \quad t \geq \tau. \quad (31)$$

We conjecture that the renewal equation (31) in fact agrees with the integral equation (21) in the Bellman–Harris case, that is,

$$I(t, \tau) = I_{\text{Ren}}(t, \tau), \quad t \geq \tau \geq 0,$$

and we provide an argument that strongly supports this conjecture. While we focus on the Bellman–Harris case (Examples 1 and 12) here for simplicity, the argument also generalises to the Poisson process model (Examples 2 and 13) simply by replacing $R(\cdot)$ with $\rho(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$ with $k(\cdot)\overline{G}(\cdot)$, respectively, throughout.

To this end, we consider natural *discrete* versions of (21) and (31) given by

$$\tilde{I}(t, \tau) = \delta_{t, \tau} + \sum_{u=1}^{t-\tau} \tilde{I}(t, u + \tau) R(u + \tau) g(u), \quad t = \tau, \tau + 1, \tau + 2, \dots, \quad (32)$$

$$\tilde{I}_{\text{Ren}}(t, \tau) = \delta_{t, \tau} + R(t) \sum_{u=1}^{t-\tau} \tilde{I}_{\text{Ren}}(t - u, \tau) g(u), \quad t = \tau, \tau + 1, \tau + 2, \dots, \quad (33)$$

respectively, where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker symbol defined by $\delta_{i,i} := 1$ and $\delta_{i,j} := 0$ for $i \neq j$. (We will discuss discretisations more generally and comprehensively from a computational perspective in Section 3.1.) We shall now show that

$$\tilde{I}(t, \tau) = \tilde{I}_{\text{Ren}}(t, \tau) \quad (34)$$

holds for any $t \geq \tau \geq 0$ using mathematical induction. To carry out induction, we introduce a “bespoke” order \prec of the set $\mathbb{T} := \{(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : t \geq \tau \geq 0\}$ whereby $(t', \tau') \prec (t, \tau)$ holds if $t' < t$ or $(t' = t \text{ and } \tau' > \tau)$. More concretely, the order looks like this:

$$(0, 0) \prec (1, 1) \prec (1, 0) \prec (2, 2) \prec (2, 1) \prec (2, 0) \prec (3, 3) \prec \dots$$

We note first that if $\tau = t$, then (34) holds trivially as

$$\tilde{I}(t, t) = \delta_{t,t} = 1 = \delta_{t,t} = \tilde{I}_{\text{Ren}}(t, t), \quad (35)$$

confirming, in particular, the base case equality $\tilde{I}(0, 0) = \tilde{I}_{\text{Ren}}(0, 0)$. For the induction step, we fix $(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{T}$ and assume that

$$\tilde{I}(t', \tau') = \tilde{I}_{\text{Ren}}(t', \tau') \quad \text{for any } (t', \tau') \in \mathbb{T} \text{ such that } (t', \tau') \prec (t, \tau), \quad (36)$$

with a view to showing that (34) holds. Thanks to (35), it suffices to consider the case $t > \tau$ only. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{I}}(t, \tau) &\stackrel{\text{by (32)}}{=} \underbrace{\delta_{t, \tau}}_{=0} + \sum_{u=1}^{t-\tau} \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}(t, u + \tau)}_{\substack{=\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t, u + \tau) \\ \text{by (36)}}} R(u + \tau)g(u) \\ &\stackrel{\text{by (33)}}{=} \sum_{u=1}^{t-\tau} \left(\underbrace{\delta_{t, u + \tau}}_{=\delta_{t-\tau, u}} + R(t) \sum_{s=1}^{t-\tau-u} \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t - s, u + \tau)g(s) \right) R(u + \tau)g(u) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$= R(t) \left(g(t - \tau) + \sum_{u=1}^{t-\tau} \sum_{s=1}^{t-\tau-u} \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t - s, u + \tau) R(u + \tau)g(s)g(u) \right), \quad (38)$$

since $(t, u + \tau) \prec (t, \tau)$. Further, exchanging the order of summation in the double sum yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u=1}^{t-\tau} \sum_{s=1}^{t-\tau-u} \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t - s, u + \tau) R(u + \tau)g(s)g(u) &= \sum_{s=1}^{t-\tau} g(s) \sum_{u=1}^{t-s-\tau} \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t - s, u + \tau)}_{\substack{=\tilde{\mathbb{I}}(t-s, u + \tau) \\ \text{by (36)}}} R(u + \tau)g(u) \\ &\stackrel{\text{by (32)}}{=} \sum_{s=1}^{t-\tau} g(s) \left(\tilde{\mathbb{I}}(t - s, \tau) - \underbrace{\delta_{t-s, \tau}}_{=\delta_{t-\tau, s}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{t-\tau} g(s) \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}(t - s, \tau)}_{\substack{=\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t-s, \tau) \\ \text{by (36)}}} - g(t - \tau), \end{aligned}$$

since both $(t - s, u + \tau) \prec (t, \tau)$ and $(t - s, \tau) \prec (t, \tau)$. Plugging the result into (38) and recalling that $t > \tau$, we find, indeed, that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{I}}(t, \tau) = \underbrace{\delta_{t, \tau}}_{=0} + R(t) \sum_{s=1}^{t-\tau} \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t - s, \tau)g(s) \stackrel{\text{by (33)}}{=} \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{\text{Ren}}(t, \tau),$$

completing the induction step.

In summary, this argument suggests that the common renewal equation (31) for incidence, a reformulation of the ones used in [14, 21, 38], is equivalent to the integral equation (21). To turn this argument using discrete equations into a fully rigorous proof of equivalence at the level of *integral* equations (21) and (31), we would still have to show that the former equations are indeed approximated by the latter and investigate the existence and uniqueness of solutions to them. This is, however, beyond the scope of the present paper, and we hope to address the question in future work.

Remark 39 (Equivalence does not extend beyond incidence). In the case of prevalence or cumulative incidence, the equivalence between the common renewal equation and our newly derived integral equations is broken. This is easy to see by examining the substitution step in (37). If we considered cumulative incidence, for example, a constant one instead of the Kronecker symbol would be introduced in the substitution and we simply could not factor $R(t)$ out of the sums in (38). This illustrates why the common renewal equation is a special case of

our integral equations only when the index case is infected at time $\tau = 0$ and when considering incidence. Simpler renewal equations that do not involve varying dependence on the parameter τ for prevalence or cumulative incidence are not possible.

3 Numerical implementation and empirical application

3.1 Discretisation of integral equations

The integral equations for cumulative incidence, prevalence and incidence under the assumption (17) are all special cases of a generic equation

$$f(t, \tau) = h(t, \tau) + \int_0^{t-\tau} f(t, u + \tau) \lambda^\tau(u) du, \quad t \geq \tau \geq 0, \quad (40)$$

with the choices

$$h(t, \tau) := \begin{cases} 1, & f = \text{CI}, \\ \overline{G}^\tau(t - \tau), & f = \text{Pr}, \\ \lambda^\tau(t - \tau), & f = \text{I (for } t > \tau). \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

Recall that for the Bellman–Harris process of Examples 1 and 12, we substitute $\lambda^\tau(u) du := R(u + \tau) g^\tau(u) du$ and for the Poisson process model of Examples 2 and 13, $\lambda^\tau(u) du := \rho(u + \tau) k(u) \overline{G}^\tau(u) du$.

A key hurdle in solving the equation (40) is that on the right-hand side, $f(t, u)$ for $\tau \leq u \leq t$ appears — not $f(u, \tau)$ for $\tau \leq u \leq t$. What this means is that in order to solve $f(t, 0)$ for $t \geq 0$, say, we need to actually solve $f(t, \tau)$ for any pair (t, τ) such that $t \geq \tau \geq 0$. This is in fact why we left the initial infection time τ as a free parameter. (Alternatively, we could view (40) as a system of coupled integral equations, indexed by τ , that need to be solved simultaneously.)

Solving the equation (40) numerically is greatly facilitated if we introduce the auxiliary quantity $f_c(t) := f(c, c - t)$ for any $c \geq t \geq 0$. From (40) we can deduce that, for fixed $c \geq 0$, the *single-argument* function $f_c(\cdot)$ is governed by the renewal-like integral equation

$$f_c(t) = h(c, c - t) + \int_0^t f_c(t - u) \lambda^{c-t}(u) du, \quad c \geq t \geq 0.$$

We then recover $f(t, 0)$ for $t \geq 0$ via $f(t, 0) = f_t(t)$. In practice, we are interested in solving $f(t, 0)$ discretely for $t = 0, \Delta, \dots, N\Delta$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Delta > 0$. To this end, we approximate $f_{n\Delta}(\cdot)$ recursively by

$$\widehat{f}_{n\Delta}(i\Delta) := \begin{cases} f_{n\Delta}(0) = f(n\Delta, n\Delta) = h(n\Delta, n\Delta), & i = 0, \\ h(n\Delta, (n - i)\Delta) + \sum_{j=1}^i \widehat{f}_{n\Delta}((i - j)\Delta) \lambda^{(n-i)\Delta}(j\Delta) \Delta, & i = 1, \dots, n, \end{cases}$$

for any $n = 0, \dots, N$. For clarity, we present the entire procedure in pseudo-code as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Discretisation of integral equations

Require: functions $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\lambda(\cdot)$

Require: step size $\Delta > 0$

Require: number of time steps $N \in \mathbb{N}$

```
1: for  $n = 0, \dots, N$  do
2:   for  $i = 0, \dots, n$  do
3:     if  $i = 0$  then
4:        $\widehat{f}_{n\Delta}(i\Delta) \leftarrow h(n\Delta, n\Delta)$ 
5:     else
6:        $\widehat{f}_{n\Delta}(i\Delta) \leftarrow h(n\Delta, (n-i)\Delta) + \sum_{j=1}^i \widehat{f}_{n\Delta}((i-j)\Delta) \lambda^{(n-i)\Delta}(j\Delta)\Delta$ 
7:     end if
8:   end for
9: end for
10: return  $\widehat{f}_{n\Delta}(n\Delta)$  ( $\approx f(n\Delta, 0)$ ) for any  $n = 0, \dots, N$ 
```

Algorithm 2 Discretisation of integral equations, vectorised

Require: functions $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\lambda(\cdot)$

Require: step size $\Delta > 0$

Require: number of time steps $N \in \mathbb{N}$

```
1:  $H \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} h(0,0) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ h(\Delta, \Delta) & h(\Delta, 0) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ h(2\Delta, 2\Delta) & h(2\Delta, \Delta) & h(2\Delta, 0) & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ h(N\Delta, N\Delta) & h(N\Delta, (N-1)\Delta) & h(N\Delta, (N-2)\Delta) & \dots & h(N\Delta, 0) \end{bmatrix}$ 
```

```
2:  $L \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^0(N\Delta) & \lambda^0((N-1)\Delta) & \lambda^0((N-2)\Delta) & \dots & \lambda^0(\Delta) \\ 0 & \lambda^\Delta((N-1)\Delta) & \lambda^\Delta((N-2)\Delta) & \dots & \lambda^\Delta(\Delta) \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda^{2\Delta}((N-2)\Delta) & \dots & \lambda^{2\Delta}(\Delta) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \lambda^{(N-1)\Delta}(\Delta) \end{bmatrix}$ 
```

```
3:  $F \leftarrow$  empty  $(N+1) \times (N+1)$  matrix
4:  $F[1 : (N+1), 1] \leftarrow H[1 : (N+1), 1]$ 
5: for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  do
6:    $B \leftarrow F[(i+1) : (N+1), 1 : i] \odot L[1 : (N-i+1), (N-i+1) : N]$ 
7:    $F[(i+1) : (N+1), i+1] \leftarrow H[(i+1) : (N+1), i+1] + \text{RowSum}(B)$ 
8: end for
9: return  $\text{diag}(F) = (\widehat{f}_0(0), \widehat{f}_\Delta(\Delta), \dots, \widehat{f}_{N\Delta}(N\Delta))$ 
```

Example 42. Concretely, in the Bellman–Harris case, we set

$$\lambda^{(n-i)\Delta}(j\Delta) := R((n-i+j)\Delta)g^{(n-i)\Delta}(j\Delta),$$

while in the case of the Poisson process model,

$$\lambda^{(n-i)\Delta}(j\Delta) := \rho((n-i+j)\Delta)k(j\Delta)\overline{G}^{(n-i)\Delta}(j\Delta).$$

A simplified version of the algorithm for cumulative incidence in the Bellman–Harris case is found in Appendix A.

In practice, the double for-loop in Algorithm 1 may lead to computational inefficiency when N is large and an interpreted language is used, so it is useful to refine it by vectorisation. To this end, for a matrix $A = [A[s, t]]_{1 \leq s \leq m, 1 \leq t \leq n}$, we write $A[i : j, k : l]$ for the sub-matrix $[A[s, t]]_{i \leq s \leq j, k \leq t \leq l}$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq j \leq m$ and $1 \leq k \leq l \leq n$. (If $i = j$, we simply write i in lieu of $i : j$.) We also denote by \odot element-wise (Hadamard) multiplication of matrices. The vectorised version of Algorithm 1 is given as Algorithm 2. This matrix computation is possible by observing that all relevant values of the functions $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\lambda(\cdot)$ can be stored in the matrices H and L , respectively. To facilitate implementation in languages such as R, Algorithm 2 uses one-indexed matrices in contrast to Algorithm 1.

Further computational savings can be attained in Algorithm 2 by observing that the top-left corner of the matrix L typically contains very small values since $g^\tau(u)$ and $\overline{G}^\tau(u)$ are small with large u . Therefore the matrices L and F can in practice be truncated with a small error in the computation of $\text{diag}(F)$. We illustrate the use of these algorithms in Figure 1, where we compute prevalence using Algorithm 2 and compare the results with statistical estimates of prevalence from a Monte Carlo simulation.

3.2 Bayesian inference on empirical incidence data

We perform Bayesian inference to estimate the time-varying case reproduction number $\mathcal{R}(t)$, as defined in Remark 16, from historical incidence data for Influenza [23], Measles [28], SARS [34] and Smallpox [24]. These data have been extensively used in validating renewal equation frameworks [14]. We fit integral equations using both the Bellman–Harris process (Examples 1 and 12) and the inhomogeneous Poisson process model (Examples 2 and 13) specifications therein — recall that the difference between these two models is that the Bellman–Harris process assumes each individual creates all its secondary infections at the same (random) time, whereas in the inhomogeneous Poisson process models infections are created randomly, one-by-one over the (random) duration of an individual’s infection modulated by their infectiousness. In both models, we work with $G^\tau(\cdot) = G(\cdot)$ that does not depend on τ . As demonstrated in Section 2.5, the respective integral equations agree at the level of discretisations with the common renewal equation ubiquitously used in the modelling of incidence [14]. In the Poisson process model, we assume that the infectiousness distribution is the same as the generation distribution, i.e., $k(\cdot) = g(\cdot)$. For consistency with previously published estimates [14], and without loss of generality, we will model incidence assuming the initial infection occurs at time $\tau = 0$.

	$\phi \sim \text{Normal}^+(0, 2)$
	$\sigma \sim \text{Exponential}(50)$
	$\epsilon \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma)$
Bellman–Harris =	$\begin{cases} R(t) &= R(t-1) + \epsilon_t \\ \mathcal{R}(t) &= \int_t^\infty R(u)g(u-t)du \\ I(t, \tau) &= \delta(t-\tau) + \int_0^{t-\tau} I(t, u+\tau)R(u+\tau)g(u)du \end{cases}$
Poisson process =	$\begin{cases} \rho(t) &= \rho(t-1) + \epsilon_t \\ \mathcal{R}(t) &= \int_t^\infty \rho(u)g(u-t)\bar{G}(u-t)du \\ I(t, \tau) &= \delta(t-\tau) + \int_0^{t-\tau} I(t, u+\tau)\rho(u+\tau)k(u)\bar{G}(u)du \end{cases}$
	$y \sim \text{Negative Binomial}(I(t, 0), \phi)$

Table 1: Hierarchical Bayesian model for estimating incidence for a Bellman–Harris and Poisson process

To estimate the case reproduction number $\mathcal{R}(t)$, we first introduce probabilistic models for the functions $R(\cdot)$ (Bellman–Harris process) and $\rho(\cdot)$ (Poisson process model) through a stochastic random walk process. The generative model for both processes is shown in Table 1. In both cases the priors and the likelihood are the same but the integral equations for $I(t, \tau)$ differ. Note that, as discussed in Remark 16, $R(t)$ is an absolute number (counts) while $\rho(t)$ is a rate (counts/time), and therefore these two quantities are not directly comparable on the same scale. Whilst both $R(\cdot)$ and $\rho(\cdot)$ are used directly in inference, for summary and to aid comparability we transform both $R(\cdot)$ and $\rho(\cdot)$ to $\mathcal{R}(t)$, which represents the average number of secondary cases arising from a primary case infected at time t , i.e., transmissibility after time t . In Table 1, the Negative Binomial likelihood is re-parameterised to mean–variance formulation, y is the observed count data (number of infections), ϕ is the overdispersion parameter and σ is the random walk variance parameter. The observed count data and generation intervals were obtained from [13, 14]. The priors were selected to be weakly informative and were generally robust to change.

Algorithm 2 was used to discretise and solve $t \mapsto I(t, 0)$ — recall that τ is a parameter that is intrinsically involved in the solution of the integral equation, although we can ultimately restrict our attention to $t \mapsto I(t, 0)$ only, having assumed that the first infection occurs at time $\tau = 0$. For all data sets, an arbitrary seeding period of 10 days was used to correct for poor surveillance in the early epidemic. The seeding period was not included in the likelihood and we found our fits to be robust to different choices of seeding duration. Posterior sampling was performed using Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (1000 warmup/1000 sampling with multiple chains) in the Bayesian probabilistic programming language Numpyro [7, 39]. Posterior predictive




Figure 3: Bayesian modelling of incidence for Influenza [23], Measles [28], SARS [34] and Smallpox [24]. Plots show the case reproduction number $\mathcal{R}(t)$, and incidence for the Bellman–Harris process (first row for each disease) and the Poisson process model (second row for each disease). Solid black lines in all plots are means, and the two red envelopes are the interquartile and 95% credible intervals. The horizontal blue line indicates $\mathcal{R} = 1$. The x -axis in all plots is time measured in days.




Figure 4: Fitted WAIC model comparison for Influenza [23], Measles [28], Smallpox [24] and SARS [34]. Circles are deviance estimates, dark lines are the standard errors for each WAIC estimate, the grey triangle is the standard error in the difference between WAIC estimates, and the grey line the associated standard error of this difference. See [36] for more details.

checks were performed by examining R-hat and K-hat distributions.

Figure 4 shows the estimated case reproduction numbers, $\mathcal{R}(t)$, under the Bellman–Harris process and the Poisson process model. The results on $\mathcal{R}(t)$ for Influenza and SARS in both models are very similar, except that $\mathcal{R}(t)$ for the Poisson process model is slightly lower. This difference reflects the underlying assumption that secondary infections occur over the duration of the primary infection, rather than at once as in the Bellman–Harris process. In contrast, for Measles and Smallpox, the differences in $\mathcal{R}(t)$ are slightly more pronounced in terms of the timing of the main infection peak. These differences are due to the much longer generation interval compared to Influenza and SARS.

Bayesian model selection using the *Watanabe–Akaike information criterion* (WAIC) [48] revealed large uncertainty in WAIC estimates (Figure 3). However, for small sample sizes and skewed distributions these individual standard errors can be unreliable [36, 48]. When comparing the standard error differences *between* models we find that the WAIC between the Poisson process model and the Bellman–Harris process is significant for Measles and Smallpox, but not for Influenza and SARS. These differences are also mirrored when computing Akaike weights, where the Poisson process model is definitively preferable for Measles and Smallpox. These results are intuitive — for example for Measles, it is unlikely that the Bellman–Harris assumption of all infections happening at the same time is plausible given the long generation time. In contrast, this seems more plausible for Influenza where all infections can happen at one time. However, the evidence for choosing one model over the other is not strong, and differences are likely to become more noticeable when we employ more complex models that account for under-reporting and/or include more data.

4 Discussion

Our primary goal in this paper is to bridge the worlds of individual-based models and mechanistic models to gain from the best of both. To this end, we began by choosing the most general branching process available — the Crump–Mode–Jagers process [15, 16, 30]. In the Crump–Mode–Jagers process, an epidemic is created at an individual level where, from a single infected individual, subsequent infections occur at random times according to their level of infectiousness. To our knowledge, for the first time, we generalise the Crump–Mode–Jagers process to allow for time-varying reproduction process for new infections. Indeed, rather than assuming the distribution of new infections to be constant (corresponding to a basic reproduction number) we allow the distribution to change over time — a dynamic essential in modelling real outbreaks [27]. We find that under this generalisation, a general integral equation arises from the Crump–Mode–Jagers process. Our framework also allows us to specify the dynamics of how new infections arise (in addition to them changing over time). Studying first the case where each infected individual produces all of their secondary cases, or “offspring”, at the same random time, we recover the well known Bellman–Harris process [4]. Studying a more complex assumption where each infection can give rise to its offspring over the duration of its infection

(an inhomogenous Poisson process) we derive a new renewal equation, which to our knowledge, has not been previously presented. Remarkably, we find that despite the Poisson process model being much more complex than the simple Bellman–Harris assumption, the resultant integral equation has exactly the same form as the Bellman–Harris integral equation, only instead of the generation interval CDF, the survival probability is used. This simple equation for a more complicated model allows practitioners to readily switch between the Poisson and Bellman-Harris models depending on the particular modelling problem.

Through starting from a stochastic process, we are able to define prevalence, incidence and cumulative incidence as summary statistics (via moments) of an individual-based infection process. The benefit of defining these well known epidemiological quantities from a single stochastic process is that they are, by design, consistent with one another — i.e., they are parameterised with the same generation interval and transmission rate (either $\rho(t)$ or $R(t)$). This allows practitioners to fit to prevalence for example, and easily recover incidence with no additional fitting. We mathematically show that this is the case and prove our equations for prevalence and incidence are consistent under the commonly used back-calculation technique in epidemiology [8]. Given ever increasing amount of infectious disease surveillance, being able to model prevalence and incidence simultaneously under the same process can greatly improve estimates of the rates of the reproduction number. A recent example is the COVID-19 pandemic where several countries collected high quality data on both cases (incidence) and serology (prevalence) [20].

We outline an argument suggesting that the incidence integral equations we recover from the Bellman–Harris process and from the Poisson process model are in fact in agreement with the renewal equation commonly used in the modelling of incidence [14]. Specifically, the common renewal equation can be conjectured to be a special case of our incidence equations under the scenario where the first infection occurs at a specific, non-random, time. We also show that our equations are more general, and accommodate the modelling of prevalence, cumulative incidence, complex importation functions, and time-varying generation times [32]. The common renewal equation is computationally simpler as it does not involve the time τ of the first infection and simplifies the problem from two-dimensional to one-dimensional. We have however, introduced an efficient algorithm which primarily relies on row sums and element-wise multiplications of matrices to compute our more general integral equations. Given the ability of modern computers to perform these operations using parallel computation, we do not believe the computational overhead of our more general integral equations is meaningfully greater than the simple renewal equations. However, our more general renewal integral allow for a far greater range of modelling choices, where, and most critically, the assumptions behind these choices are explicit.

We have attempted to put the modelling of infectious diseases using renewal equations on a firm mathematical ground. In doing so, we have once again made explicit the connection between branching processes [4, 15] and renewal equations. Explicit links between renewal equations and SEIR models [12] and Hawkes processes [41] have been previously noted. It is likely other such

relationships exist, and this is an interesting area of further study. Of additional interest is to use our framework to study the more complex Lévy and Cox process models, which may produce renewal equations with even more realistic dynamics. Equally, recent frameworks [26, 43] have extended the seminal work of [49] to estimate case reproduction number on graphs — connecting these two approaches is an interesting area of future research. Finally, our framework, and the vast majority previous frameworks, only consider the mean integral equation and ignore the dynamics of higher-order moments. Using our framework, we can recover these moments from our stochastic process and formulate more accurate likelihoods for model fitting.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Centre funding from the UK Medical Research Council under a concordat with the UK Department for International Development, the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Modelling Methodology and Community Jameel. This research was also partly funded by the Imperial College COVID-19 Research Fund. S. Bhatt acknowledges The UK Research and Innovation (MR/V038109/1), the Academy of Medical Sciences Springboard Award (SBF004/1080), The MRC (MR/R015600/1), The BMGF (OPP1197730), Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust BRC Funding (RDA02), The Novo Nordisk Young Investigator Award (NNF20OC0059309) and The NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Modelling Methodology.

References

- [1] G. K. Aldis and M. G. Roberts. “An integral equation model for the control of a smallpox outbreak”. *Mathematical Biosciences* 195.1 (2005), pp. 1–22. DOI: [10.1016/j.mbs.2005.01.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2005.01.006).
- [2] R. Bartoszyński. “Branching Processes and the Theory of Epidemics”. *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1965–1966, vol. IV*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967, pp. 259–269.
- [3] R. Bellman and T. Harris. “On age-dependent binary branching processes”. *The Annals of Mathematics* 55 (1952), pp. 280–295. DOI: [10.2307/1969779](https://doi.org/10.2307/1969779).
- [4] R. Bellman and T. E. Harris. “On the theory of age-dependent stochastic branching processes”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 34 (1948), pp. 601–604. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.34.12.601](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.34.12.601).
- [5] T. Berah, T. A. Mellan, X. Miscouridou, S. Mishra, K. V. Parag, M. S. Pakkanen, and S. Bhatt. “Unifying the effective reproduction number, incidence, and prevalence under a stochastic age-dependent branching process”. arXiv preprint. 2021. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2107.05579v1>.

- [6] A. T. Bharucha-Reid. “On the stochastic theory of epidemics”. *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. IV*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956, pp. 111–119.
- [7] E. Bingham, J. P. Chen, M. Jankowiak, F. Obermeyer, N. Pradhan, T. Karaletsos, R. Singh, P. A. Szerlip, P. Horsfall, and N. D. Goodman. “Pyro: Deep universal probabilistic programming”. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 20 (2019), 28:1–28:6. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v20/18-403.html>.
- [8] R. Brookmeyer and M. H. Gail. “A method for obtaining short-term projections and lower bounds on the size of the AIDS epidemic”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83.402 (1988), pp. 301–308. DOI: [10.1080/01621459.1988.10478599](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1988.10478599).
- [9] T. Brown, L. Bao, J. W. Eaton, D. R. Hogan, M. Mahy, K. Marsh, B. M. Mathers, and R. Puckett. “Improvements in prevalence trend fitting and incidence estimation in EPP 2013”. *AIDS* 28.Supplement 4 (2014), S415–S425. DOI: [10.1097/QAD.0000000000000454](https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0000000000000454).
- [10] S. Cauchemez, P. Nouvellet, A. Cori, T. Jombart, T. Garske, H. Clapham, S. Moore, H. L. Mills, H. Salje, C. Collins, I. Rodriguez-Barraquer, S. Riley, S. Truelove, H. Algarni, R. Alhakeem, K. AlHarbi, A. Turkistani, R. J. Aguas, D. A. Cummings, M. D. Van Kerkhove, C. A. Donnelly, J. Lessler, C. Fraser, A. Al-Barrak, and N. M. Ferguson. “Unraveling the drivers of MERS-CoV transmission”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113.32 (2016), pp. 9081–9086. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1519235113](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1519235113).
- [11] D. Champredon, J. Dushoff, and D. J. D. Earn. “Equivalence of the Erlang-distributed SEIR epidemic model and the renewal equation”. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 78.6 (2018), pp. 3258–3278. DOI: [10.1137/18M1186411](https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1186411).
- [12] D. Champredon, M. Li, B. M. Bolker, and J. Dushoff. “Two approaches to forecast Ebola synthetic epidemics”. *Epidemics* 22 (2018), pp. 36–42. DOI: [10.1016/j.epidem.2017.02.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2017.02.011).
- [13] A. Cori, S. Cauchemez, N. M. Ferguson, C. Fraser, E. Dahlgvist, P. A. Demarsh, T. Jombart, Z. N. Kamvar, J. Lessler, S. Li, J. A. Polonsky, J. Stockwin, R. Thompson, and R. van Gaalen. “EpiEstim: Estimate Time Varying Reproduction Numbers from Epidemic Curves”. R package version 2.2-4. 2020. URL: <https://cran.r-project.org/package=EpiEstim>.
- [14] A. Cori, N. M. Ferguson, C. Fraser, and S. Cauchemez. “A new framework and software to estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics”. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 178.9 (2013), 1505–1512. DOI: [10.1093/aje/kwt133](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwt133).
- [15] K. S. Crump and C. J. Mode. “A general age-dependent branching process. I”. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 24.3 (1968), pp. 494–508. DOI: [10.1016/0022-247X\(68\)90005-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(68)90005-X).

- [16] K. S. Crump and C. J. Mode. “A general age-dependent branching process. II”. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 25.1 (1969), pp. 8–17. DOI: [10.1016/0022-247X\(69\)90210-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(69)90210-8).
- [17] R. E. Crump and G. F. Medley. “Back-calculating the incidence of infection of leprosy in a Bayesian framework”. *Parasites & Vectors* 8 (2015), Article number: 534. DOI: [10.1186/s13071-015-1142-5](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-015-1142-5).
- [18] J. W. Eaton, T. M. Rehle, S. Jooste, R. Nkambule, A. A. Kim, M. Mahy, and T. B. Hallett. “Recent HIV prevalence trends among pregnant women and all women in sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for HIV estimates”. *AIDS* 28.Supplement 4 (2014), S507–S514. DOI: [10.1097/QAD.0000000000000412](https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0000000000000412).
- [19] N Ferguson, D Laydon, G Nedjati Gilani, N Imai, K Ainslie, M Baguelin, S Bhatia, A Boonyasiri, Z. Cucunuba Perez, G Cuomo-Dannenburg, A Dighe, I Dorigatti, H Fu, K Gaythorpe, W Green, A Hamlet, W Hinsley, L Okell, S Van Elsland, H Thompson, R Verity, E Volz, H Wang, Y Wang, P Walker, P Winskill, C Whittaker, C Donnelly, S Riley, and A Ghani. “Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand”. Technical report, Imperial College London. 2020. URL: <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-9-impact-of-npis-on-covid-19/>.
- [20] S. Flaxman, S. Mishra, A. Gandy, H. J. T. Unwin, T. A. Mellan, H. Coupland, C. Whittaker, H. Zhu, T. Berah, J. W. Eaton, M. Monod, Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team, A. C. Ghani, C. A. Donnelly, S. Riley, M. A. C. Vollmer, N. M. Ferguson, L. C. Okell, and S. Bhatt. “Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe”. *Nature* 584.7820 (2020), pp. 257–261. DOI: [10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7).
- [21] C. Fraser. “Estimating individual and household reproduction numbers in an emerging epidemic”. *PLoS ONE* 2.8 (2007), e758. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0000758](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0000758).
- [22] C. Fraser, S. Riley, R. M. Anderson, and N. M. Ferguson. “Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak controllable”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101.16 (2004), pp. 6146–6151. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.0307506101](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0307506101).
- [23] W. H. Frost and E. Sydenstricker. “Influenza in Maryland: Preliminary statistics of certain localities”. *Public Health Reports* 34.11 (1919), pp. 491–504. DOI: [10.2307/4575056](https://doi.org/10.2307/4575056).
- [24] R. Gani and S. Leach. “Transmission potential of smallpox in contemporary populations”. *Nature* 414.6865 (2001), pp. 748–751. DOI: [10.1038/414748a](https://doi.org/10.1038/414748a).
- [25] W. M. Getz and J. O. Lloyd-Smith. “Basic methods for modeling the invasion and spread of contagious diseases”. *Disease Evolution*. Vol. 71. DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2006, pp. 87–109. DOI: [10.1098/rsif.2006.0185](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2006.0185).
- [26] M. Gomez-Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, and A. Krause. “Inferring networks of diffusion and influence”. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data* 5.4 (2012). DOI: [10.1145/2086737.2086741](https://doi.org/10.1145/2086737.2086741).

- [27] K. M. Gostic, L. McGough, E. B. Baskerville, S. Abbott, K. Joshi, C. Tedijanto, R. Kahn, R. Niehus, J. A. Hay, P. M. De Salazar, J. Hellewell, S. Meakin, J. D. Munday, N. I. Bosse, K. Sherrat, R. N. Thompson, L. F. White, J. S. Huisman, J. Scire, S. Bonhoeffer, T. Stadler, J. Wallinga, S. Funk, M. Lipsitch, and S. Cobey. “Practical considerations for measuring the effective reproductive number, R_t ”. *PLoS Computational Biology* 17.12 (2020), e1008409. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009679](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009679).
- [28] C. Groendyke, D. Welch, and D. R. Hunter. “Bayesian inference for contact networks given epidemic data”. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 38.3 (2011), pp. 600–616. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9469.2010.00721.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9469.2010.00721.x).
- [29] T. E. Harris. *The Theory of Branching Processes*. Berlin: Springer, 1963.
- [30] P. Jagers. *Branching Processes with Biological Applications*. London: Wiley, 1975.
- [31] W. O. Kermack and A. G. McKendrick. “A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics”. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 115.772 (1927), pp. 700–721. DOI: [10.1098/rspa.1927.0118](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1927.0118).
- [32] M. Kimmel. “The point-process approach to age- and time-dependent branching processes”. *Advances in Applied Probability* 15.1 (1983), pp. 1–20. DOI: [10.2307/1426979](https://doi.org/10.2307/1426979).
- [33] M. Kimmel and D. E. Axelrod. *Branching Processes in Biology*. New York: Springer, 2002. DOI: [10.1007/b97371](https://doi.org/10.1007/b97371).
- [34] M. Lipsitch, T. Cohen, B. Cooper, J. M. Robins, S. Ma, L. James, G. Gopalakrishna, S. K. Chew, C. C. Tan, M. H. Samore, D. Fisman, and M. Murray. “Transmission dynamics and control of severe acute respiratory syndrome”. *Science* 300.5627 (2003), pp. 1966–1970. DOI: [10.1126/science.1086616](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1086616).
- [35] A. J. Lotka. “Studies on the mode of growth of material aggregates”. *American Journal of Science* s4-24.141 (1907), pp. 199–216. DOI: [10.2475/ajs.s4-24.141.199](https://doi.org/10.2475/ajs.s4-24.141.199).
- [36] R. McElreath. *Statistical Rethinking: A Bayesian Course with Examples in R and Stan*. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 2018.
- [37] H. Nishiura, H. Yanai, T. Yoshiyama, and M. Kakehashi. “Simple approximate back-calculation method applied to estimate HIV prevalence in Japan”. *Japanese Journal of Infectious Diseases* 57.3 (2004), pp. 133–135.
- [38] P. Nouvellet, A. Cori, T. Garske, I. M. Blake, I. Dorigatti, W. Hinsley, T. Jombart, H. L. Mills, G. Nedjati-Gilani, M. D. Van Kerkhove, C. Fraser, C. A. Donnelly, N. M. Ferguson, and S. Riley. “A simple approach to measure transmissibility and forecast incidence”. *Epidemics* 22 (2018), pp. 29–35. DOI: [10.1016/j.epidem.2017.02.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2017.02.012).
- [39] D. Phan, N. Pradhan, and M. Jankowiak. “Composable effects for flexible and accelerated probabilistic programming in NumPyro”. arXiv preprint. 2019. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1912.11554>.
- [40] A. D. Polyanin and A. V. Manzhirov. *Handbook of Integral Equations*. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 1998. DOI: [10.1201/9781420050066](https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420050066).

- [41] M. A. Rizoïu, L. Xie, S. Sanner, M. Cebrian, H. Yu, and P. Van Henteryck. “Expecting to be HIP: Hawkes intensity processes for social media popularity”. *26th International World Wide Web Conference (WWW 2017)*. 2017. DOI: [10.1145/3038912.3052650](https://doi.org/10.1145/3038912.3052650).
- [42] M. G. Roberts. “Modelling strategies for minimizing the impact of an imported exotic infection”. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 271.1555 (2004), pp. 2411–2415. DOI: [10.1098/rspb.2004.2865](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2004.2865).
- [43] I Routledge, J. R. E. Chevez, Z. M. Cucunuba, M. G. Rodriguez, C Guinovart, K Gustafson, K Schneider, P. G. T. Walker, A. C. Ghani, and S Bhatt. “Estimating spatiotemporally varying malaria reproduction numbers in a near elimination setting”. *Nature Communications* 9 (2018), Article number: 2476. DOI: [10.1038/s41467-018-04577-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04577-y).
- [44] J. A. Salomon, E. E. Gakidou, and C. J. L. Murray. “Methods for modeling the HIV/AIDS epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa”. Technical report, World Health Organization. 1999. URL: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/66264>.
- [45] Å. Svensson. “A note on generation times in epidemic models”. *Mathematical Biosciences* 208.1 (2007), pp. 300–311. DOI: [10.1016/j.mbs.2006.10.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2006.10.010).
- [46] V. A. Vatutin and A. M. Zubkov. “Branching processes. I”. *Probability theory. Mathematical statistics. Theoretical cybernetics, Vol. 23*. Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki. Moscow: Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Inform., 1985, pp. 3–67, 154.
- [47] V. A. Vatutin and A. M. Zubkov. “Branching processes. II”. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics* 67.6 (1993). Probability theory and mathematical statistics, 1, pp. 3407–3485. DOI: [10.1007/BF01096272](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01096272).
- [48] A. Vehtari, A. Gelman, and J. Gabry. “Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-validation and WAIC”. *Statistics and Computing* 27.5 (2017), pp. 1413–1432. DOI: [10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4).
- [49] J. Wallinga and P. Teunis. “Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome reveal similar impacts of control measures”. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 160.6 (2004), pp. 509–516. DOI: [10.1093/aje/kwh255](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwh255).

A Discretising cumulative incidence under the Bellman–Harris process

For the convenience of the reader, we present a simplified example how the integral equation for cumulative incidence under the Bellman–Harris process (Examples 1 and 12) can be discretised using the methodology of Section 3.1. While we consider, for the sake of concreteness, cumulative incidence, corresponding to $h(\cdot, \cdot) = 1$, adapting the example to prevalence or incidence is straightforward by re-specifying $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ following (41). We also assume that $g^\tau(\cdot) = g(\cdot)$ does not depend on τ .

To solve for cumulative incidence $t \mapsto \text{CI}(t, 0)$, we work with the equation

$$f_c(t) = \underbrace{h(c, c-t)}_{=1} + \int_0^t f_c(t-u)\lambda^{c-t}(u)du, \quad c \geq t \geq 0,$$

connected with cumulative incidence via $\text{CI}(t, 0) = f_t(t)$, $t \geq 0$. Suppose we choose $\Delta = 1$ as step size and wish to obtain an approximant $\hat{f}_n(n)$ of $f_n(n) = \text{CI}(n, 0)$ for $n = 0, \dots, N$. Then, we simply perform the recursive computation

$$\hat{f}_n(i) := \begin{cases} f_n(0) = f(n, 0) = h(n, 0) = 1, & i = 0, \\ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^i \hat{f}_n(i-j)\lambda^{n-i}(j), & i = 1, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

As pointed out in Example 42, for the Bellman–Harris process, $\lambda^{n-i}(j) := R(n-i+j)g(j)$. For any n , the computation in (43) requires a for-loop over i , as shown in Algorithm 3. In the course of the computation, we store the values of $\hat{f}_n(\cdot)$ into an $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ matrix F , the diagonal of which will contain the values $\hat{f}_0(0), \hat{f}_1(1), \dots, \hat{f}_N(N)$ we are ultimately interested in.

Algorithm 3 Discretisation of integral equations, cumulative incidence under Bellman–Harris

Require: number of time steps $N \in \mathbb{N}$

Require: generation time PDF $g(n)$ at $n = 1, \dots, N$

Require: reproduction number $R(n)$ at $n = 1, \dots, N$

1: $F \leftarrow$ empty $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ matrix

2: $F[1 : (N+1), 1] \leftarrow 1$

3: **for** $n = 1, \dots, N$ **do**

4: **for** $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

5: $F[n+1, i+1] \leftarrow 1 + \sum_{j=1}^i R(n-i+j)F[n+1, i-j+1]g(j)$

6: **end for**

7: **end for**

8: **return** $\text{diag}(F) = (\hat{f}_0(0), \hat{f}_1(1), \dots, \hat{f}_N(N))$

Remark 44. For the Poisson process model (Examples 2 and 13), the algorithm would be identical except that $g(\cdot)$ is replaced by $k(\cdot)\overline{G}(\cdot)$ and $R(\cdot)$ is replaced by $\rho(\cdot)$.