

Utilizing a Capture-Recapture Strategy to Accelerate Infectious Disease Surveillance

Lin Ge*, Yuzi Zhang, Lance A. Waller, and Robert H. Lyles

Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A

**email*: lge_biostat@outlook.com

SUMMARY: Monitoring key elements of disease dynamics (e.g., prevalence, case counts) is of great importance in infectious disease prevention and control, as emphasized during the COVID-19 pandemic. To facilitate this effort, we propose a new capture-recapture (CRC) analysis strategy that takes misclassification into account from easily-administered, imperfect diagnostic test kits, such as the Rapid Antigen Test-kits or saliva tests. Our method is based on a recently proposed “anchor stream” design, whereby an existing voluntary surveillance data stream is augmented by a smaller and judiciously drawn random sample. It incorporates manufacturer-specified sensitivity and specificity parameters to account for imperfect diagnostic results in one or both data streams. For inference to accompany case count estimation, we improve upon traditional Wald-type confidence intervals by developing an adapted Bayesian credible interval for the CRC estimator that yields favorable frequentist coverage properties. When feasible, the proposed design and analytic strategy provides a more efficient solution than traditional CRC methods or random sampling-based biased-corrected estimation to monitor disease prevalence while accounting for misclassification. We demonstrate the benefits of this approach through simulation studies that underscore its potential utility in practice for economical disease monitoring among a registered closed population.

KEY WORDS: Credible Interval; Misclassification; Non-representative Sampling; Sensitivity; Specificity.

1. Introduction

Spurred by the COVID-19 pandemic, healthcare experts, policy makers, and government administrators have become increasingly aware of the importance of infectious disease monitoring in a particular geographic region, densely populated district, or vulnerable community. Applying regular disease surveillance efforts among such populations can help assess the prevalence and alert policy makers of the need to address an emerging or worsening crisis. However, many voluntary-based epidemiological surveillance programs produce biased data, as they often oversample positive cases (Menni et al., 2020). A common example arose during voluntary testing programs on university campuses during the recent pandemic, as students, staff and faculty were more likely to seek testing if they were feeling sick or had recent contact with active cases. That is, people with symptoms or health concerns may be more likely to participate in passive surveillance surveys, leading to overestimation of true disease prevalence in a closed community.

In epidemiology or public health-related surveillance research, the capture-recapture (CRC) approach, which was borrowed from ecology studies to estimate the size of wildlife populations, is now commonly advocated for estimating case counts and prevalences. Applications of CRC have been directed toward many infectious diseases, such as HIV (Poorolajal et al., 2017), Hepatitis C (Wu et al., 2005) and tuberculosis (Dunbar et al., 2011; Carvalho et al., 2020; Perez Duque et al., 2020). For accurate estimation, one key assumption that is often made is that there are no population-level associations between disease status and probability of observation; this is known as the Lincoln-Petersen, or “LP” condition in two-stream CRC analysis. Classic tools such as the Lincoln-Petersen (Lincoln, 1930; Petersen, 1986) and Chapman estimators (Chapman, 1951) are built on this assumption. However, it is often questionable in practice, and violating it may lead to biased estimation of the prevalence or population size (Brenner, 1995). While great effort has been directed toward relaxation

of such assumptions, many sources (Agresti, 1994; Hook and Regal, 1995; Cormack, 1999) point out that applying popular CRC estimation strategies in practice is almost always fraught with pitfalls; this includes significant drawbacks to the popular log-linear modeling paradigm (Fienberg, 1972; Baillargeon and Rivest, 2007; Jones et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2023). To better explore relationships between multiple CRC data sources, some researchers (Chatterjee and Mukherjee, 2016; Zhang and Small, 2020; Zhang et al., 2023) have proposed sensitivity analysis to evaluate the uncertainty caused by different levels of association. However, it is generally recognized that a design-based approach would be the only sure-fire way to ensure the LP condition in practice (Seber et al., 1982; Chao et al., 2008; Lyles et al., 2022, 2023). When feasible, this approach achieves the crucial requirement by introducing a second random sampling-based surveillance effort implemented carefully so as to ensure a case identification process that is independent of the existing non-representative disease surveillance data stream (Lyles et al., 2022). When it can be appropriately implemented in a closed and enumerable population, this sampling strategy leads to an unbiased maximum likelihood (ML) estimator of the case count, which is typically far more precise than classical CRC estimators derived under the LP condition. This comes about on the strength of a so-called “anchor stream” design, which precisely identifies a crucial conditional sampling probability parameter associated with the random sampling-based data stream (Lyles et al., 2022, 2023).

A common challenge when analyzing epidemiological surveillance data is that the diagnostic method for ascertaining disease status may be prone to error. That is, the diagnostic results observed in disease surveillance programs may rely on imperfect tests or diagnostic devices, which can lead to misclassification errors. Although an imperfect test result can lead to biased estimation, it is often the case that no gold standard is available to assess presence or absence of a particular disease (Glasziou et al., 2008; Walter et al., 2012). On the other hand,

even when an accurate diagnostic test exists, some common but imperfect tests offer benefits such as ease of application, lower cost, and immediacy of results during the epidemiological disease screening process. However, these tests will generally suffer from a lack of gold-standard accuracy and sensitivity (Soh et al., 2012). Regarding imperfect disease status indications obtained from a single random sampling-based data source observed with error, numerous studies (Levy and Kass, 1970; Rogan and Gladen, 1978; Gastwirth, 1987) have offered feasible solutions by incorporating known or estimated misclassification parameters, such as the sensitivity (Se) and specificity (Sp). Yet, few researchers have discussed this issue under the CRC paradigm, particularly when dealing with disease surveillance data. When assuming the false-positive and false-negative rates are known, Brenner (1996) and Ramos et al. (2020) developed methods to adjust the error-prone surveillance data streams. More recently, Ge et al. (2023) proposed a generalized anchor stream design to account for misclassification errors, incorporating the CRC paradigm to identify an estimable positive predictive value (PPV) parameter to facilitate estimation of the cumulative incidence of breast cancer recurrence among a select population subsetted from the Georgia Cancer Registry-based Cancer Recurrence Information and Surveillance Program (CRISP).

In this article, we propose a CRC strategy to leverage an existing general disease surveillance effort, supplemented by what can be a relatively small random sample. Our approach is based on an extension and generalization of previously proposed methods rooted in the anchor stream design (Lyles et al., 2022, 2023; Ge et al., 2023), in order to target unbiased estimation of disease prevalence while accounting for imperfect disease diagnoses based, for example, on the Rapid Antigen test-kits or saliva-based tests commonly applied during the COVID-19 pandemic. The proposed strategy allows for the estimation of disease case counts within a closed population region or community. The approach justifies fallible diagnostic status indications obtained via both data streams by leveraging manufacturer-reported sen-

sitivity and specificity information, while preserving the independence and random sampling properties of the anchor stream. Importantly, we thus relax the strict stipulation requiring accurate test results in prior proposals of the anchor stream design (Lyles et al., 2022, 2023; Ge et al., 2023) in such disease monitoring settings, and accommodate imperfect diagnostic results via both data streams. In turn, this extension allows for the potential acceleration of epidemiological surveillance programs during an infectious disease season or pandemic.

2. Methods

2.1 *Misclassification Parameters*

The two misclassification parameters Se (sensitivity) and Sp (specificity) are very commonly measured in assessing diagnostic tests, as they quantify the proportion of the test's positive and negative results that are true positives and true negatives. Sensitivity is the conditional probability of a positive test result given the tested individual is truly diseased, i.e., $Se = \Pr(\text{Test positive} \mid \text{diseased})$. Specificity is the conditional probability of a negative test result given the tested individual is truly non-diseased, i.e., $Sp = \Pr(\text{Test negative} \mid \text{non-diseased})$. Conversely, false positive results are defined as $\Pr(\text{Test positive} \mid \text{non-diseased}) = 1 - Sp$, and false negative results as $\Pr(\text{Test negative} \mid \text{diseased}) = 1 - Se$. In this article, we use these definitions for the misclassification parameters to adjust for misclassified disease status in our estimates.

2.2 *Anchor Stream Design*

We build on prior considerations of the anchor stream design without misclassification (Lyles et al., 2022, 2023) along with extensions that proposed a justified CRC estimator based on an estimable PPV for targeting cumulatively incident case counts (Ge et al., 2023). Here, we leverage the same design strategy to surveil disease within an enumerated registry population without the stipulation that the anchor stream must employ a perfect diagnostic

testing method. The existing surveillance effort, referred to as Stream 1, typically selects those at high risk of disease preferentially and is also likely to use an error-prone testing method. We subsequently obtain a random sample of individuals from the registered target population as the “anchor stream”, or Stream 2, which is carefully designed to be agnostic (independent) of Stream 1 (Lyles et al., 2022, 2023). Importantly, we allow each of the two surveillance efforts to be based on its own error-prone diagnostic method characterized by known values of Se and Sp as provided by the manufacturer of the diagnostic device or test-kit.

Benefiting from this design, the anchor stream alone provides its own valid and defensible sampling-based estimator based on known manufacturer-specified Se and Sp (Ge et al., 2023). However, Stream 2 is typically expected to include a relatively small sample size, and is likely to identify far fewer potential cases relative to Stream 1. Assuming the total population size (N_{tot}) of the closed community or registry is known in advance, the bias-corrected true prevalence estimator π_c and the corresponding case count estimator (\hat{N}_{RS}) based on the Stream 2 random sample with size (n) and known sensitivity (Se_2) and specificity (Sp_2) are given by the following formulae (Rogan and Gladen, 1978; Gastwirth, 1987; Levy and Kass, 1970; Ge et al., 2023):

$$\hat{\pi}_c = \frac{\hat{\pi} + Sp_2 - 1}{Se_2 + Sp_2 - 1}, \quad \hat{N}_{RS} = N_{tot}\hat{\pi}_c, \quad \hat{Var}(\hat{N}_{RS}) = N_{tot}^2 \hat{Var}(\hat{\pi}_c) \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\pi} = n^+/n$, and n^+ denotes the number of individuals identified as test positives in the random sample. When calculating the bias-corrected prevalence estimator $\hat{\pi}_c$, one needs to consider a threshold justification as follows (Ge et al., 2023) in light of the natural constraint

$1 - Sp_2 \leq \hat{\pi} \leq Se_2$ that exists in the general error-prone testing problem:

$$\hat{\pi}_c = \begin{cases} 0 & \hat{\pi} \leq 1 - Sp_2 \\ 1 & \hat{\pi} \geq Se_2 \\ \hat{\pi}_c & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Given that the total population is closed and finite, a recently developed variance estimator $\hat{Var}(\hat{\pi}_c)$ (Ge et al., 2023) incorporates a finite population correction (FPC) given by Cochran (Cochran, 1977) together with an elusive but necessary second term, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Var}(\hat{\pi}_c) = & \frac{1}{(Se_2 + Sp_2 - 1)^2} \left\{ \left[\frac{n(N_{tot} - n)}{N_{tot}(n-1)} \right] \frac{\hat{\pi}(1 - \hat{\pi})}{n} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{N_{tot}} [\hat{\pi}_c Se_2(1 - Se_2) + (1 - \hat{\pi}_c) Sp_2(1 - Sp_2)] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

When the anchor stream applies a perfect test (i.e., $Se_2 = Sp_2 = 1$), the variance estimator in equation (3) reduces to the standard FPC-corrected sampling-based variance estimator, i.e., $\hat{Var}(\hat{\pi}_c) = \left[\frac{n(N_{tot} - n)}{N_{tot}(n-1)} \right] \frac{\hat{\pi}(1 - \hat{\pi})}{n}$. Moreover, when the total population size N_{tot} is relatively small and the anchor stream sample size n is large in comparison to N_{tot} , the finite population effect leads to a substantial reduction in variance.

2.3 A Novel Capture-Recapture (CRC) Estimator

We now assume that the disease assessment methods applied via the anchor stream design are fallible in both data streams, with known Sensitivity (Se_1, Se_2) and Specificity (Sp_1, Sp_2). A novel CRC estimator using all available data is justified using maximum likelihood (ML) based on a general multinomial model for the nine cell counts defined in Table 1.

[Table 1 about here.]

The likelihood contributions presented in Table 1 are based on defining the parameters, $\phi = \Pr(\text{sampled in Stream 1})$, $\pi_1 = \Pr(\text{true + | sampled in Stream 1})$, $\pi_{01} = \Pr(\text{true + | sampled not in Stream 1})$. In addition, we have a known parameter $\psi = \Pr(\text{sampled in Stream 2})$, which is under the investigator's control and can be fixed as the proportion of

the N_{tot} individuals represented in Stream 2. While it is assumed that the sensitivity and specificity parameters are known, the subscripts reflect the fact that both can differ across surveillance efforts (i.e., different testing methods can be applied in Stream 1 and Stream 2). When both disease assessments are accurate, meaning that all 4 Se/Sp parameters can be assumed equal to 1, cell counts n_3 and n_4 and their likelihood contributions in Table 1 will be zero. In that case, the estimators previously proposed by Lyles et al. (2023) can be applied directly for case count estimation.

For the purpose of point estimation of the true prevalence or case count, the vector of nine cell counts in Table 1 can be modeled as a multinomial sample with likelihood proportional to $\prod_{j=1}^9 p_j^{n_j}$, where p_j denotes the likelihood contribution corresponding to the j th cell. That is, for point estimation one can assume

$$(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_9) \sim \text{multinomial}(N_{tot}, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_9) \quad (4)$$

The MLE for the unknown parameters in Table 1 can be obtained numerically, and we find that two of them are available in closed form. The exception is the parameter π_1 , for which we offer an approximation ($\hat{\pi}_1^*$) in order to facilitate in turn a closed-form approximation to the MLE of the true disease prevalence. The MLE for the other parameters in Table 1, along with $\hat{\pi}_1^*$, are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi} &= \frac{n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4 + n_5 + n_6}{N_{tot}} \\ \hat{\pi}_1^* &= \frac{\frac{n_1 + n_3 + n_5}{n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4 + n_5 + n_6} + Sp_1 - 1}{Se_1 + Sp_1 - 1} \\ \hat{\pi}_{01} &= \frac{\frac{n_7}{n_7 + n_8} + Sp_2 - 1}{Se_2 + Sp_2 - 1} \end{aligned}$$

The overall disease prevalence is a function of these parameters, and thus an initial closed-form CRC estimator for disease case counts is derived accordingly:

$$\hat{N}_{CRC} = N_{tot}[\hat{\pi}_1^* \hat{\phi} + \pi_{01}(1 - \hat{\phi})]. \quad (5)$$

Importantly, however, the variance-covariance matrix implied by a multinomial model for

the cell counts in Table 1 ignores standard and non-standard FPC effects that are in play under the anchor stream design. For this reason, a traditional multivariate delta method approach applied to the estimator in equation (5) while assuming the multinomial covariance structure will tend to overestimate the variance unless both data streams sample only a small proportion of the N_{tot} individuals in the finite target population. Nevertheless, we find empirically that the covariances among the MLEs for the unknown parameters in Table 1 are negligible, as they would be theoretically if the multinomial covariance structure applied.

In order to accommodate FPC adjustments, we first tailor the estimator of π_1 by approximating it via $\psi\hat{\pi}_{11} + (1 - \psi)\hat{\pi}_{10}$, where $\hat{\pi}_{11} = \frac{n_1+n_4}{n_1+n_2+n_3+n_4} + Sp_2 - 1$ and $\hat{\pi}_{10} = \frac{n_5}{n_5+n_6} + Sp_1 - 1$ are estimates of the prevalence among individuals sampled by both data streams, and individuals only sampled by Stream 1, respectively. This leads to a second closed-form estimator, which compares well empirically with equation (5) across a broad range of conditions:

$$\hat{N}_{CRC} = N_{tot}[\psi\hat{\pi}_{11}\hat{\phi} + (1 - \psi)\hat{\pi}_{10}\hat{\phi} + \pi_{01}(1 - \hat{\phi})] \quad (6)$$

We subsequently make use of two variance approximations for the CRC estimator in (6), as follows:

$$\hat{V}_k(\hat{N}_{CRC}) = N_{tot}^2[\hat{d}_{11}^2\hat{V}_k(\hat{\pi}_{11}) + \hat{d}_{10}^2\hat{V}_k(\hat{\pi}_{10}) + \hat{d}_{01}^2\hat{V}_k(\hat{\pi}_{01})], \quad k = 1, 2 \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{d}_{11} = \psi\hat{\phi}$, $\hat{d}_{10} = (1 - \psi)\hat{\phi}$, $\hat{d}_{01} = 1 - \hat{\phi}$. For $k = 1$, the approximate variance incorporates no FPC adjustments, i.e., $\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{11}) = \frac{1}{(Se_2 + Sp_2 - 1)^2} \frac{\tilde{\pi}_{11}(1 - \tilde{\pi}_{11})}{n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4}$, $\tilde{\pi}_{11} = \frac{n_1 + n_4}{n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4}$; $\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{10}) = \frac{1}{(Se_1 + Sp_1 - 1)^2} \frac{\tilde{\pi}_{10}(1 - \tilde{\pi}_{10})}{n_5 + n_6}$, $\tilde{\pi}_{10} = \frac{n_5}{n_5 + n_6}$; $\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{01}) = \frac{1}{(Se_2 + Sp_2 - 1)^2} \frac{\tilde{\pi}_{01}(1 - \tilde{\pi}_{01})}{n_7 + n_8}$, $\tilde{\pi}_{01} = \frac{n_7}{n_7 + n_8}$.

As a result, the variance estimator $\hat{V}_1(\hat{N}_{CRC})$ is a conservative approximation for the variance of (6) based on a tailored version of the multivariate delta method (5) that assumes a standard multinomial covariance structure applies to Table 1. In contrast, the scenario where $k = 2$ incorporates FPC adjustments (Cochran, 1977) together with the misclassification effect adjustments in (3), applying them to $\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{11})$, $\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{10})$ and $\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{01})$ in (7). That is,

$$\hat{V}_2(\hat{\pi}_{ij}) = FPC_{ij}\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{ij}) + \hat{V}_{extra}^{ij}, \quad i, j = 0, 1 \quad (8)$$

where $FPC_{11} = \frac{N_{11}(N_1 - N_{11})}{N_1(N_{11} - 1)}$, $FPC_{10} = \frac{(N_1 - N_{11})N_{11}}{N_1(N_1 - N_{11} - 1)}$, $FPC_{01} = \frac{N_{01}(N_{tot} - N_1 - N_{01})}{(N_{tot} - N_1)(N_{01} - 1)}$, $N_1 = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4 + n_5 + n_6$, $N_{11} = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4$, $N_{01} = n_7 + n_8$. The details of the extra variance terms (\hat{V}_{extra}^{ij}) are available in Appendix. This provides an alternative FPC-adjusted variance estimator, $\hat{V}_2(\hat{N}_{CRC})$, which we recommend for use in conjunction with the CRC estimator in (6).

2.4 An Adapted Bayesian Credible Interval Approach for Inference

Many references have pointed out that Wald-type confidence intervals (CIs) often show poor performance when proportions are extreme and/or the sample size is limited (Ghosh, 1979; Blyth and Still, 1983; Agresti and Coull, 1998; Brown et al., 2001). To potentially improve the frequentist coverage properties of the intervals accompanying the CRC estimator (6) for disease case counts while adjusting the variance for finite population effects, we adopt a Bayesian credible interval based on a weakly informative Dirichlet prior on a multinomial model.

Our approach is similar in spirit to a recent proposal for the case of no misclassification (Lyles et al., 2023). Specifically, we implement a scale and shift adjustment to a typical posterior credible interval for \hat{N}_{CRC} based on a Jeffreys' Dirichlet(1/2, 1/2, ..., 1/2) prior for the cell probabilities in Table 1, which yields the corresponding posterior distribution in (9):

$$Dirichlet(n_1 + 1/2, n_2 + 1/2, \dots, n_9 + 1/2) \quad (9)$$

The traditional 95% credible interval is defined using 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles of the target estimand in (6) based on this posterior distribution via posterior samples, i.e., $\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)}$, $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$. To adjust the variance for finite population effects, we define a new *scale* parameter a and a *shift* parameter b as follows:

$$a^{(s)} = \sqrt{\hat{V}_2(\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)}) / \hat{V}_1(\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)})}, \quad b^{(s)} = \hat{N}_{CRC}(1 - a^{(s)}) \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{V}_1(\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)})$ and $\hat{V}_2(\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)})$ are the estimated unadjusted variance and FPC-adjusted variance for $\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)}$ based on applying equation (7) to the s -th set of posterior-sampled cell counts. Posterior draws $\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)}$ are then scaled and shifted, i.e.,

$$\tilde{N}_{CRC}^{(s)} = a^{(s)}\hat{N}_{CRC}^{(s)} + b^{(s)} \quad (11)$$

This adjusts the posterior distribution to have a mean equal to \hat{N}_{CRC} and incorporates adjustments to the variance for finite population and misclassification effects. We refer to the interval (LL_{ab}, UL_{ab}) as the proposed Bayesian credible interval for \hat{N}_{CRC} by taking the 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles from the posterior draws in (11).

While the proposed Bayesian credible interval will typically be narrower than alternatives based on Stream 2 only, it can be conservative under certain conditions (e.g., if the Stream 2 sampling rate is large). As a comparator, we recommend examining the Bayesian credible interval proposed by Ge et al. (2023) for accompanying the Stream 2 only random sampling-based estimator $\hat{\pi}_c$ in (1) under finite sampling conditions; we refer to the corresponding interval for the case count as $N_{tot} \times (LL_{RS}, UL_{RS})$. In practice, we promote the use of the narrower of this interval and the interval based on eqn.(11); this approach is evaluated in our subsequent simulation studies.

3. Simulation Study

We conducted simulations to assess the properties of the case count estimators of N along with the proposed credible interval approach. The first simulation is designed to study performance across a wide range of parameter settings. The population size of N_{tot} was set to 200, 500 and 1,000, while the true disease prevalence was also examined over a range ($p=0.1, 0.3, 0.5$). Data were generated in such a way that among those with disease, 50% of individuals exhibited symptoms. In contrast, only 10% of those without disease showed symptoms. The Stream 1 sample was drawn to reflect voluntary-based non-representative

surveillance data, selecting 80% of individuals with symptoms for testing as opposed to 10% of those without symptoms. Stream 2 was generated as the anchor stream independently of Stream 1, with the sampling rate varied over a wide range ($\psi=0.1, 0.3, 0.5$). Both streams included misclassified diagnostic results, controlled by known parameters (Se_1, Sp_1) and (Se_2, Sp_2) to produce a range of high, moderate and low levels of misclassification (e.g., $Se, Sp=0.95, 0.9, 0.85$). We conducted 5,000 simulations for each setting, and we report results for the proposed Bayesian credible intervals for inference based on 1,000 Dirichlet posterior draws.

[Table 2 about here.]

Table 2 summarizes the simulation results with $N=1,000$ and low misclassification level (e.g., $Se_1, Sp_1 = 0.9; Se_2, Sp_2 = 0.95$). In this simulation setting, we compare the CRC estimators with the random sampling-based estimator \hat{N}_{RS} justified by the corresponding pre-specified sensitivity and specificity parameters. For the CRC estimators, we report the results for the numerical MLE \hat{N}_{CRC}^* for N along with the closed-form estimator \hat{N}_{CRC} based on equation (6). As mentioned previously, a standard error to accompany the numerical \hat{N}_{CRC}^* is not directly available and thus we only report the average point estimate as well as its empirical standard deviation (SD) in the table. While the numerical estimator \hat{N}_{CRC}^* provides better precision in some cases, the difference is slight and the closed-form estimator \hat{N}_{CRC} is much more convenient for use in practice.

The simulation results in Table 2 indicate that all three estimators are virtually unbiased, while the CRC estimators show a clear improvement in estimation precision. Furthermore, the proposed FPC-adjusted Bayesian credible interval provides better coverage properties compared to the Wald-type confidence interval and its mean width is narrower than that of the Wald-type interval in most settings, especially when the sampling rate (ψ) is low.

Comparing the low misclassification setting in Table 2 with the moderate and high mis-

classification levels in Table 3 and Table 4 respectively, it is clear that as the misclassification level increases, the estimated standard errors and the widths of the interval become larger. While the point estimate of \hat{N}_{CRC} exhibits slight bias for the low prevalence and sampling rate scenario ($p = 0.1$, $\psi = 0.1$) at high misclassification level (Table 4) due to thresholding the negative prevalence estimation to zero, the proposed Bayesian credible interval approach still provides reliable interval estimation for the disease case count estimation.

[Table 3 about here.]

[Table 4 about here.]

The improvement in estimation precision and reduced interval widths are achieved on the basis of the anchor stream design, even though only 10% anchor stream samples were collected from the target population. A more expanded set of simulation scenarios for the population sizes $N_{tot} = (200, 500)$ can be found in the Web Appendix A in *Supporting Information* (Web Tables 1-6).

4. Discussion

In this article, we propose a more flexible capture-recapture strategy for accelerating infectious disease monitoring, accounting for imperfect diagnostic or test results. We believe that this work is timely and well-motivated for monitoring the prevalence or case counts of infectious diseases such as COVID-19 or measles among a registered population, e.g. schools, communities, and geographic regions, when a diagnostic device or test-kit leverages an imperfect test for rapid results. To adjust for misclassified diagnostic signals, we extend recently proposed anchor stream design and methods (Lyles et al., 2022, 2023) for CRC analysis in epidemiological disease surveillance without misclassification by incorporating pre-specified sensitivity and specificity information from manufactured test kits. Our empirical studies demonstrate valid case count estimation accounting for misclassification errors, and show

an apparent and expected precision improvement compared to estimation via the random sampling-based estimator alone.

When focusing on disease monitoring in a closed and registered population from which a representative random sample can be drawn and misclassification parameters associated with the diagnostic device or test-kit are available from the manufacturer, the proposed method for anchor stream-based CRC analysis is relatively easy to implement in practice. It is important to note, however, that the anchor stream sample must be drawn carefully to assure not only its representativeness but also its independence relative to the voluntary testing stream (Lyles et al., 2022). Our empirical studies indicate that leveraging a relatively small anchor stream sample together with arbitrarily non-representative voluntary test results can unlock a much more precise estimator of the true case count or prevalence in the target population than could be achieved through either sample alone. Along with existing disease surveillance data streams, this method can provide accurate and timely results.

During the COVID-19 pandemic or in other infectious disease monitoring efforts, the proposed CRC strategy may be useful for application among registered populations for periodic monitoring of infectious disease prevalence in a robust and economical way. The key is to have reliable information about the misclassification parameters (sensitivity and specificity) for each surveillance effort. In this article, we assume that the sensitivity and specificity parameters utilized in the analysis are provided by the manufacturer and are correct. As a first extension, it would be straightforward to account for uncertainty in the values provided by the manufacturer via an imputation step in the event that the data upon which they are based could be obtained. A second extension could be to consider the possible issue of transportability. That is, the actual sensitivity and specificity parameters operating in practical settings may be lower than those determined through professional examination in the laboratory, due to improper or inconsistent implementation of the diagnostic device

or test-kit. In future work, it could be useful to seek the incorporation of external or internal validation data to estimate these operational parameters. Leveraging this extra information would lead to additional uncertainty in the estimation, but could also further expand the practical uses of this CRC strategy in solving real-world problems.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Institute of Health (NIH)/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (P30AI050409; Del Rio PI), the NIH/National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (UL1TR002378; Taylor PI), the NIH/National Cancer Institute (R01CA234538; Ward/Lash MPIs), and the NIH/National Cancer Institute (R01CA266574; Lyles/Waller MPIs).

References

- Agresti, A. (1994). Simple capture-recapture models permitting unequal catchability and variable sampling effort. *Biometrics* **50**, 494–500.
- Agresti, A. and Coull, B. A. (1998). Approximate is better than “Exact” for interval estimation of binomial proportions. *American Statistician* .
- Baillargeon, S. and Rivest, L.-P. (2007). Rcapture: loglinear models for capture-recapture in *r*. *Journal of Statistical Software* **19**, 1–31.
- Blyth, C. R. and Still, H. A. (1983). Binomial confidence intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* .
- Brenner, H. (1995). Use and limitations of the capture-recapture method in disease monitoring with two dependent sources. *Epidemiology* pages 42–48.
- Brenner, H. (1996). Effects of misdiagnoses on disease monitoring with capture—recapture methods. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* **49**, 1303–1307.

- Brown, L. D., Cai, T. T., and DasGupta, A. (2001). Interval estimation for a binomial proportion. *Statistical science* **16**, 101–133.
- Carvalho, C., Alba, S., Harris, R., Abubakar, I., van Hest, R., Correia, A. M., Gonçalves, G., and Duarte, R. (2020). Completeness of TB notification in Portugal, 2015: An inventory and capture-recapture study. *International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* .
- Chao, A., Pan, H.-Y., and Chiang, S.-C. (2008). The petersen–lincoln estimator and its extension to estimate the size of a shared population. *Biometrical Journal: Journal of Mathematical Methods in Biosciences* **50**, 957–970.
- Chapman, D. G. (1951). *Some properties of the hypergeometric distribution with applications to zoological simple censuses*. University of California Publications in Statistics.
- Chatterjee, K. and Mukherjee, D. (2016). On the estimation of homogeneous population size from a complex dual-record system. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **86**, 3562–3581.
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques, 3rd Edition*. John Wiley.
- Cormack, R. M. (1999). Problems with using capture-recapture in epidemiology: an example of a measles epidemic. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* **52**, 909–914.
- Dunbar, R., Van Hest, R., Lawrence, K., Verver, S., Enarson, D., Lombard, C., Beyers, N., and Barnes, J. (2011). Capture-recapture to estimate completeness of tuberculosis surveillance in two communities in south africa. *The International journal of tuberculosis and lung disease* **15**, 1038–1043.
- Fienberg, S. E. (1972). The multiple recapture census for closed populations and incomplete 2^k contingency tables. *Biometrika* **59**, 591–603.
- Gastwirth, J. L. (1987). The statistical precision of medical screening procedures: application to polygraph and aids antibodies test data. *Statistical Science* **2**, 213–222.
- Ge, L., Zhang, Y., Waller, L. A., and Lyles, R. H. (2023). Enhanced inference for finite

- population sampling-based prevalence estimation with misclassification errors. Technical report, arXiv.
- Ge, L., Zhang, Y., Ward, K. C., Lash, T. L., Waller, L. A., and Lyles, R. H. (2023). Tailoring capture-recapture methods to estimate registry-based case counts based on error-prone diagnostic signals. *Statistics in Medicine* **42**, 2928–2943.
- Ghosh, B. K. (1979). A comparison of some approximate confidence intervals for the binomial parameter. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* .
- Glasziou, P., Irwig, L., and Deeks, J. J. (2008). When should a new test become the current reference standard? *Annals of internal medicine* **149**, 816–821.
- Hook, E. B. and Regal, R. R. (1995). Capture-Recapture Methods in Epidemiology: Methods and Limitations. *Epidemiologic Reviews* **17**, 243–264.
- Jones, H. E., Hickman, M., Welton, N. J., De Angelis, D., Harris, R. J., and Ades, A. E. (2014). Recapture or precapture? Fallibility of standard capture-recapture methods in the presence of referrals between sources. *American Journal of Epidemiology* .
- Levy, P. S. and Kass, E. H. (1970). A three-population model for sequential screening for bacteriuria. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **91**, 148–154.
- Lincoln, F. C. (1930). Calculating waterfowl abundance on the basis of banding returns. *U.S. Department of Agriculture* .
- Lyles, R. H., Zhang, Y., Ge, L., England, C., Ward, K., Lash, T. L., and Waller, L. A. (2022). Using capture-recapture methodology to enhance precision of representative sampling-based case count estimates. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* .
- Lyles, R. H., Zhang, Y., Ge, L., and Waller, L. A. (2023). A design and analytic strategy for monitoring disease positivity and case characteristics in accessible closed populations. Technical report, arXiv. 2212.04911.
- Menni, C., Valdes, A. M., Freidin, M. B., Sudre, C. H., Nguyen, L. H., Drew, D. A., Ganesh,

- S., Varsavsky, T., Cardoso, M. J., El-Sayed Moustafa, J. S., Visconti, A., Hysi, P., Bowyer, R. C., Mangino, M., Falchi, M., Wolf, J., Ourselin, S., Chan, A. T., Steves, C. J., and Spector, T. D. (2020). Real-time tracking of self-reported symptoms to predict potential COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* .
- Perez Duque, M., Hansen, L., Antunes, D., and Sá Machado, R. (2020). Capture-recapture study to estimate the true incidence of tuberculosis in portugal, 2018. *European Journal of Public Health* **30**, ckaa165–795.
- Petersen, C. G. J. (1986). The yearly immigration of young plaice into the limfjord from the german sea. *Report of the Danish Biological Station for 1985* **6**, 1–48.
- Poorolajal, J., Mohammadi, Y., and Farzinara, F. (2017). Using the capture-recapture method to estimate the human immunodeficiency virus-positive population. *Epidemiology and Health* **39**,.
- Ramos, P. L., Sousa, I., Santana, R., Morgan, W. H., Gordon, K., Crewe, J., Rocha-Sousa, A., and Macedo, A. F. (2020). A review of capture-recapture methods and its possibilities in ophthalmology and vision sciences. *Ophthalmic Epidemiology* **27**, 310–324.
- Rogan, W. J. and Gladen, B. (1978). Estimating prevalence from the results of a screening test. *American journal of epidemiology* **107**, 71–76.
- Seber, G. A. F. et al. (1982). *The estimation of animal abundance and related parameters*. Blackburn press Caldwell, New Jersey.
- Soh, B., Lee, W., Kench, P., Reed, W., McEntee, M., Poulos, A., and Brennan, P. (2012). Assessing reader performance in radiology, an imperfect science: lessons from breast screening. *Clinical Radiology* **67**, 623–628.
- Walter, S. D., MacAskill, P., Lord, S. J., and Irwig, L. (2012). Effect of dependent errors in the assessment of diagnostic or screening test accuracy when the reference standard is imperfect. *Statistics in Medicine* .

- Wu, C., Chang, H.-G., McNutt, L.-A., and Smith, P. (2005). Estimating the mortality rate of hepatitis c using multiple data sources. *Epidemiology & Infection* **133**, 121–125.
- Zhang, B. and Small, D. S. (2020). Number of healthcare workers who have died of covid-19. *Epidemiology* **31**, e46.
- Zhang, Y., Chen, J., Ge, L., Williamson, J. M., Waller, L. A., and Lyles, R. H. (2023). Sensitivity and uncertainty analysis for two-stream capture-recapture methods in disease surveillance. *Epidemiology*.
- Zhang, Y., Ge, L., Waller, L. A., and Lyles, R. H. (2023). On some pitfalls of the log-linear modeling framework for capture-recapture studies in disease surveillance. Technical report, arXiv.

Supporting Information

Web Appendix A, referenced in Section 3, is available with this paper at the Biometrics website on Wiley Online Library.

Received October 2007. Revised February 2008. Accepted March 2008.

Appendix

Details for Extra Variance in the FPC-adjusted variance estimator

The FPC-adjusted variance estimator is derived following the same strategy as the variance estimator for the bias-corrected prevalence estimator in (3) (Ge et al., 2023) and each such variance estimator has the following form.

$$\hat{V}_2(\hat{\pi}_{ij}) = FPC_{ij}\hat{V}_1(\hat{\pi}_{ij}) + \hat{V}_{extra}^{ij}, \quad i, j = 0, 1$$

where \hat{V}_{extra}^{ij} is derived as follows:

$$\hat{V}_{extra}^{11} = \frac{1}{(Se_2 + Sp_2 - 1)^2} \frac{1}{N_1} [\hat{\pi}_{11} Se_2 (1 - Se_2) + (1 - \hat{\pi}_{11}) Sp_2 (1 - Sp_2)] \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\hat{V}_{extra}^{10} = \frac{1}{(Se_1 + Sp_1 - 1)^2} \frac{1}{N_1} [\hat{\pi}_{10} Se_1 (1 - Se_1) + (1 - \hat{\pi}_{10}) Sp_1 (1 - Sp_1)] \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\hat{V}_{extra}^{01} = \frac{1}{(Se_2 + Sp_2 - 1)^2} \frac{1}{N_{tot} - N_1} [\hat{\pi}_{01} Se_2 (1 - Se_2) + (1 - \hat{\pi}_{01}) Sp_2 (1 - Sp_2)] \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Table 1
Cell Counts and Likelihood Contributions

Cell	Observation Type ^a	Likelihood
n_1	Sampled in S1 and S2, Test +	$p_1 = \psi[Se_2Se_1\pi_1 + (1 - Sp_2)(1 - Sp_1)(1 - \pi_1)]\phi$
n_2	Sampled in S1 and S2, Test -	$p_2 = \psi[(1 - Se_2)(1 - Se_1)\pi_1 + Sp_2Sp_1(1 - \pi_1)]\phi$
n_3	Sampled in S1 and S2, Test + in S1, Test - in S2	$p_3 = \psi[(1 - Se_2)Se_1\pi_1 + Sp_2(1 - Sp_1)(1 - \pi_1)]\phi$
n_4	Sampled in S1 and S2, Test - in S1, Test + in S2	$p_4 = \psi[Se_2(1 - Se_1)\pi_1 + (1 - Sp_2)Sp_1(1 - \pi_1)]\phi$
n_5	Sampled in S1, not S2, Test +	$p_5 = (1 - \psi)[Se_1\pi_1 + (1 - Sp_1)(1 - \pi_1)]\phi$
n_6	Sampled in S1, not S2, Test -	$p_6 = (1 - \psi)[(1 - Se_1)\pi_1 + Sp_1(1 - \pi_1)]\phi$
n_7	Sampled in S2, not S1, Test +	$p_7 = \psi[Se_2\pi_{01} + (1 - Sp_2)(1 - \pi_{01})](1 - \phi)$
n_8	Sampled in S2, not S1, Test -	$p_8 = \psi[(1 - Se_2)\pi_{01} + Sp_2(1 - \pi_{01})](1 - \phi)$
n_9	Not Sampled in S1 or S2	$p_9 = (1 - \psi)(1 - \phi)$

^a S1: Stream 1, S2: Stream 2

Table 2
Comparing the Performance of Estimators with $N=1,000$ and Low Misclassification Level ^a

Prevalence p	Sampling Rate ψ	Estimator ^b	Mean	SD	Avg. SE	Avg. width ^c	CI Coverage (%)
$N_{true} = 100$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	100.2	38.2	37.2	145.8	93.3
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	100.3	31.0	30.8	120.7 (116.6)	92.8 (94.1)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	100.3	31.0	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	100.4	20.1	20.1	79.0	94.3
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	100.3	17.1	17.7	69.5 (69.5)	95.4 (95.6)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	100.3	17.0	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	99.8	14.5	14.4	56.4	95.4
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	99.8	12.8	13.5	52.9 (53.2)	95.8 (95.6)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	99.8	12.6	-	-	-
$N_{true} = 300$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	298.4	49.6	49.7	194.8	95.3
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	298.5	39.8	40.4	158.2 (156.6)	94.4 (95.0)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	298.5	39.8	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	300.6	26.4	26.2	102.7	95.2
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	300.1	21.6	22.4	87.9 (88.3)	95.6 (95.7)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	300.2	21.6	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	299.9	18.1	18.1	70.9	94.9
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	299.8	15.5	16.5	64.8 (65.7)	96.1 (96.6)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	299.9	15.3	-	-	-
$N_{true} = 500$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	499.3	53.6	53.3	208.8	95.3
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	499.3	44.5	44.1	173.0 (170.3)	94.5 (95.0)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	499.4	44.5	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	500.6	27.9	27.9	109.4	94.5
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	500.3	23.4	24.2	94.7 (95.1)	95.8 (96.0)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	500.3	23.3	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	499.8	19.2	19.2	75.2	94.6
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	500.0	16.6	17.6	68.8 (69.9)	96.2 (96.3)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	500.0	16.4	-	-	-

^a $Se_1, Sp_1 = 0.9, Se_2, Sp_2 = 0.95$

^b \hat{N}_{CRC} shows results calculated based on closed-form estimator in equation (6) and \hat{N}_{CRC}^* refers to the numerical MLE

^c The Wald-based CI for \hat{N}_{RS} is evaluated by multiplying equation (3) by N_{tot}^2 . The Wald-based CI for \hat{N}_{CRC} is determined using equation (8), along with a proposed FPC-adjusted Bayesian credible interval (**Bold**)

Table 3
Comparing the Performance of Estimators with $N=1,000$ and Moderate Misclassification Level ^a

Prevalence p	Sampling Rate ψ	Estimator ^b	Mean	SD	Avg. SE	Avg. width ^c	CI Coverage (%)
$N_{true} = 100$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	100.2	47.2	46.9	184.0	94.7
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	101.5	38.2	40.4	158.4 (142.2)	97.4 (94.4)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	101.4	38.3	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	100.0	26.1	26.0	102.1	95.3
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	100.2	23.2	23.5	92.3 (89.9)	95.2 (95.0)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	100.2	23.1	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	100.1	19.1	19.3	75.5	95.1
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	100.1	17.6	18.3	71.7 (71.2)	95.3 (95.3)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	100.1	17.3	-	-	-
$N_{true} = 300$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	300.0	57.9	57.4	225.0	94.8
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	299.5	48.2	47.7	187.0 (184.5)	94.0 (94.8)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	299.5	48.1	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	300.0	31.2	31.0	121.4	95.0
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	299.9	26.8	27.1	106.2 (106.4)	94.8 (95.2)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	299.8	26.7	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	299.8	22.4	22.2	86.9	94.6
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	299.9	19.8	20.5	80.5 (81.2)	95.7 (95.9)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	299.8	19.5	-	-	-
$N_{true} = 500$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	500.2	61.7	60.5	237.1	94.7
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	501.3	51.3	50.5	198.1 (194.9)	94.6 (94.9)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	501.3	51.3	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	500.4	32.6	32.4	127.2	95.2
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	499.9	27.6	28.4	111.3 (111.6)	95.5 (95.7)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	499.9	27.5	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	500.0	23.1	23.0	90.4	95.7
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	500.1	20.3	21.3	83.4 (84.3)	95.9 (96.0)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	500.0	20.0	-	-	-

^a $Se_1, Sp_1 = 0.85, Se_2, Sp_2 = 0.9$

^b \hat{N}_{CRC} shows results calculated based on closed-form estimator in equation (6) and \hat{N}_{CRC}^* refers to the numerical MLE

^c The Wald-based CI for \hat{N}_{RS} is evaluated by multiplying equation (3) by N_{tot}^2 . The Wald-based CI for \hat{N}_{CRC} is determined using equation (8), along with a proposed FPC-adjusted Bayesian credible interval (**Bold**)

Table 4
Comparing the Performance of Estimators with $N=1,000$ and High Misclassification Level ^a

Prevalence p	Sampling Rate ψ	Estimator ^b	Mean	SD	Avg. SE	Avg. width ^c	CI Coverage (%)
$N_{true} = 100$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	101.0	55.9	58.3	228.7	95.3
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	103.7	46.1	51.3	201.1 (168.3)	98.5 (94.3)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	103.6	46.1	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	99.9	33.4	32.8	128.6	94.5
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	100.1	29.6	30.1	118.0 (110.0)	95.4 (94.5)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	100.0	29.5	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	99.8	24.6	24.7	96.8	95.4
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	99.8	22.9	23.6	92.4 (89.7)	95.7 (95.6)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	99.8	22.4	-	-	-
$N_{true} = 300$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	302.2	67.1	67.1	262.9	94.9
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	301.1	56.5	56.8	222.6 (217.8)	95.1 (95.3)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	301.1	56.5	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	300.6	37.0	36.9	144.5	94.4
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	300.7	32.6	32.8	128.5 (128.4)	94.9 (95.0)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	300.7	32.4	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	300.1	27.4	27.0	106.0	94.5
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	300.1	25.0	25.3	99.0 (99.5)	95.2 (95.2)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	300.1	24.6	-	-	-
$N_{true} = 500$	0.1	\hat{N}_{RS}	500.0	70.0	69.7	273.1	94.9
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	499.3	59.2	58.6	229.7 (225.9)	94.4 (94.9)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	499.4	59.1	-	-	-
	0.3	\hat{N}_{RS}	500.0	38.3	38.1	149.3	94.6
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	500.2	33.2	33.6	131.9 (131.9)	95.2 (95.2)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	500.3	32.9	-	-	-
	0.5	\hat{N}_{RS}	500.0	27.2	27.8	108.8	96.2
		\hat{N}_{CRC}	499.9	24.8	25.8	101.1 (101.7)	95.6 (95.8)
		\hat{N}_{CRC}^*	500.0	24.2	-	-	-

^a $Se_1, Sp_1 = 0.8, Se_2, Sp_2 = 0.85$

^b \hat{N}_{CRC} shows results calculated based on closed-form estimator in equation (6) and \hat{N}_{CRC}^* refers to the numerical MLE

^c The Wald-based CI for \hat{N}_{RS} is evaluated by multiplying equation (3) by N_{tot}^2 . The Wald-based CI for \hat{N}_{CRC} is determined using equation (8), along with a proposed FPC-adjusted Bayesian credible interval (**Bold**)