

Assessing Hepatitis A virus epidemics by stochastic model in six (Primary Health Care) centres in Thanjavur District, Tamil Nadu, South India

S. Udayakumar* and D. R. Kirubaharan

Department of Mathematics, A. V. V. M. Sri Pushpam College, Poondi, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract

A stochastic model, two state Markov Chain, was applied to HAV seroprevalence data by age group from the Six Primary Health Centres (PHCs) viz., Thirukkattupalli, Kurungulam, Pillaiyarnatham, Kudikadu, Kovilvenni and Budalur of the Thanjavur District, Tamil Nadu, South India. Age specific Risk Rate, Markov Risk Rate (MRR) and its weighed sum, Total MRR were defined and used as novel measures to prioritize age groups for allocating vaccine and to decide in which PHC regions vaccine should be used to prevent Hepatitis A. All age groups whose MRR was over 20 are strongly recommended to be vaccinated first. Pillaiyarnatham and Budalur were predicted to be the PHC regions with a high risk of hepatitis A virus epidemic and therefore suggested that they should be under close surveillance.

Keywords: Age specific seroprevalence, Epidemiology Stochastic Process, Hepatitis A Virus, Markov process, Markov Risk Rate, PHC regions

INTRODUCTION

Hepatitis A (formerly known as infectious hepatitis) is caused by an enterovirus. It is clinically characterized by malaise, fever, nausea, vomiting and jaundice. The patient may recover completely in 3 to 6 weeks or in some cases, the patient's condition may worsen ending in coma and death. The disease is endemic throughout the world (Park, 1995).

This disease can be controlled/prevented by (i) Isolation of cases and disinfection of faeces and vomits (ii) Providing better hygienic and sanitary conditions, e.g., safe water supply, sanitary disposal of human excreta, promoting food hygiene, enforcing sanitary measures in hotels, restaurants and other eating establishments (iii) proper sterilization of needles and syringes and (iv) administration of human normal immunoglobulin to all contacts before or within a week of exposure (Park, 1995).

Hepatitis A creates worldwide public health problem. There has been growing interest over recent years in the survey of its seroprevalence. Using this information we may provide effective data for forecasting and controlling the hepatitis A epidemic.

To study the epidemiological features of Hepatitis A in the surroundings of Thanjavur District, Tamil Nadu, South India, six Primary Health Centres (PHCs) were

investigated. A Stochastic Model, two-state Markov Chain, was applied to the age-specific hepatitis A seroprevalence data obtained from the six PHCs selected.

EPIDEMIC MATERIALS AND METHODS

Samples were taken randomly from the six PHCs and the sera were tested for the presence of specific anti-HAV antibody by an I_g -G-capture enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA). A positive result is a competitive rate $> 40\%$.

Epidemiological Factors (Park, 1995)

(i) **Agent:** Hepatitis A virus (HAV), an enterovirus

(ii) **Source of infection:** Man is the only source of infection. Many infections are subclinical or mild, but all are sources of infection. There is no carrier state.

(iii) **Infective material:** Mainly human faeces. Blood is infective for a short period during the stage of viraemia.

(iv) **Age:** The disease is most common among children. By the age of 5 years, 90 percent of children have serological evidence of HAV infection.

(v) **Immunity:** Most people in endemic areas acquire infection through subclinical infection. An attack of hepatitis A generally provides protection against a second attack.

(vi) **Mode of transmission:** (i) **Faecal-oral route:** This is the most common route of spread, *via* contaminated water and food. (ii) **Direct contact:** Person to person contact can also spread the infection, *via* contaminated hands or objects in conditions, of poor sanitation and

*Corresponding Author
email: jagkans@yahoo.com

overcrowding. (iii) **Blood:** Hepatitis A is rarely transmitted by blood or blood products.

(vii) **Incubation period:** 15 to 50 days (usually 28 days).

MODEL

Multistep transmission matrix of Markov chain

Assume: $\{X_t = 0\}$: the rate of uninfected people at age t ;

$\{X_t = 1\}$: the rate of infected people at age t ;

P : Probability ,

$P_{ij}(t)$: Probability from state i to state j at age $t, i, j = 0, 1.$

Transmission probability of Hepatitis A infection process in 2' 2 matrix (Medhi, 1994)

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{00}(t) & P_{01}(t) \\ P_{10}(t) & P_{11}(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

All elements in matrix P are non-negative numbers:

$$\sum_{j=0}^1 P_{ij}(t) = 1, \quad i = 0, 1$$

Infected peoples are not re-infected by Hepatitis A virus, (Medhi, 1994)

Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_{10}(t) &= 0 \\ P_{11}(t) &= 1 \\ P_{01}(t) &= 1 - P_{00}(t) \\ P_{00}(t) &= \{X_{t+1} = 0 \mid X_t = 0\} \\ &= P\{X_{t+1} = 0\} / P\{X_t = 0\} \dots\dots(1) \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(2)}(t) &= P(t)P(t+1) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} P_{00}(t) & P_{01}(t) \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_{00}(t+1) & P_{01}(t+1) \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} P_{00}(t)P_{00}(t+1) & 1 - P_{00}(t)P_{00}(t+1) \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Using multistep transmission matrix we may write

$$P^{(n)}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} P_{00}^{(n)}(t) & P_{01}^{(n)}(t) \\ P_{10}^{(n)}(t) & P_{11}^{(n)}(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \prod_{k=1}^{t+n-1} P_{00}(k) & 1 - \prod_{k=1}^{t+n-1} P_{00}(k) \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

From (1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_{00}^{(n)}(t) &= \prod_{k=t} P_{00}(k) \\ &= P\{X_{t+n} = 0\} / P\{X_t = 0\} \dots\dots\dots (2) \end{aligned}$$

So, the multistep transmission process can be obtained by $P\{X_t = 0\}$.

Method of calculation:

The original data of age distribution of Hepatitis A epidemic in Budalur PHC in 2010 were used to calculate multistep transmission process. Here 't' is the state of 'age group' and from equation (2)

We get

$$P_{00}(t) = P\{X_t = 0\}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} P_{01}^{(t)}(0) &= 1 - P_{00}(t) \\ &= 1 - P\{X_t = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

From table (1), the multistep transmission probability matrix can be calculated as follows (Medhi, 1994):

$$\begin{aligned} P^2(3) &= \begin{bmatrix} P_{00}(3)P_{00}(4) & 1 - P_{00}(3)P_{00}(4) \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.988 \times 0.967 & 1 - 0.988 \times 0.967 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.955 & 0.045 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

From the multistep transmission probability matrix, an epidemic prediction can be obtained. So for $t = 3$ from table (1) we get $P_{01}(3) = 0.120$, from the above results, we get $P_{01}^{(2)}(3) = 0.605$. Therefore, those in the uninfected group will have the probability of infection of 0.120 between the ages of 20 – 29 and 0.045 between the ages of 30 – 39.

RESULTS

From the Stochastic Model, the MRR is set up as a new measure of infection risk. MRR_t the age-specific risk rate, varies as the product of the proportion susceptible at a given age' t' with the probability of becoming infected in two age / time steps, $P_{01}^{(2)}(t)$.

Its calculated formula is

$$MRR_t = 100 P \{X_t = 0\} P_{01}^{(2)}(t). \quad [2]$$

Total MRR, another new index, is the weighed sum of these age-specific rates.

Its formula is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total MRR} &= \int_0^{\infty} 0.1 t MRR_t dt. \\ &= \sum 0.1 t MRR_t. \quad [2] \end{aligned}$$

Results of the models derived for each six PHCs studied are given in tables 1 to 6. In every table the last column shows that there is a wide variation in the MRR_t and the total MRR for the different PHC's.

CONCLUSION

The novel Index, MRR_t , varies as the product of the proportion susceptible at a given age t and the probability of becoming infected in two age/time steps, $P_{01}^{(2)}(t)$. Two-step transitions $P_{01}^{(2)}(t)$ are used in the

novel index of MRR to show both age and time effects, which is validly based on the assumption that the age effects are stable over time. If there are novel seroprevalence data that suggest stationarity in average Hepatitis A virus is obsolete, the rates of the new data should be cited by the stochastic model. That is because the stationarity of age effects in time is relative to the cross-sectional seroprevalence surveys, and so only consecutive seroprevalence investigation at different time points can provide the data for separating age and time effects in the Hepatitis A virus epidemic process.

Another new index, the total MRR, provides a reasonable estimate of the disease burden in the whole PHC area. The total MRR is the weighed sum of age-specific rates. The weight co-efficient is based on the age group disease burden, which is positively correlated with age 't'. Therefore the authors assumed that the weighed co-efficient is positively correlated to age 't'. The acquisition of infection by children is often asymptomatic with fewer consequences, both in terms of health care and work loss. However, when high rates

Table 1. Results of the model derived for the Thirukkattupalli PHC

| Age | No.Examined | Anti-HAV (-) | t | $P\{X_t=0\}$ | $P_{00}(t)$ | $P_{01}(t)$ | $P_{01}^{(0)}(0)$ | (%) | MRR |
|---------|-------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Born | - | - | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | - |
| 1 – 9 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 0.600 | 0.600 | 0.400 | 0.400 | 40 | 35.988 |
| 10 – 19 | 20 | 8 | 2 | 0.400 | 0.667 | 0.333 | 0.600 | 60 | 13.64 |
| 20 – 29 | 38 | 15 | 3 | 0.395 | 0.988 | 0.120 | 0.605 | 60 | 1.761 |
| 30 – 39 | 55 | 21 | 4 | 0.382 | 0.967 | 0.033 | 0.618 | 61 | 22.614 |
| 40 – 49 | 31 | 5 | 5 | 0.161 | 0.422 | 0.578 | 0.839 | 84 | 10.366 |
| 50 – | 22 | 3 | 6 | 0.136 | 0.844 | 0.156 | 0.864 | 86 | - |
| | | | | | | | | Total | 21.09 |

Table 2. Results of the model derived for the Kurungulam PHC

| Age | No. Examined | Anti-HAV (-) | t | $P\{X_t=0\}$ | $P_{00}(t)$ | $P_{01}(t)$ | $P_{01}^{(0)}(0)$ | (%) | MRR |
|---------|--------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Born | - | - | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | - |
| 1 – 9 | 100 | 60 | 1 | 0.600 | 0.600 | 0.400 | 0.400 | 40 | 36.024 |
| 10 – 19 | 200 | 80 | 2 | 0.400 | 0.666 | 0.334 | 0.600 | 60 | 13.36 |
| 20 – 29 | 300 | 120 | 3 | 0.400 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.600 | 60 | 0.0 |
| 30 – 39 | 500 | 200 | 4 | 0.400 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.600 | 60 | 25.68 |
| 40 – 49 | 350 | 50 | 5 | 0.143 | 0.358 | 0.642 | 0.857 | 86 | 10.01 |
| 50 – | 250 | 30 | 6 | 0.120 | 0.839 | 0.161 | 0.88 | 88 | - |
| | | | | | | | | Total | 21.55 |

Table 3. Results of the model derived for the Pillaiyarnatham PHC

| Age | No.Examined | Anti-HAV (-) | t | $P\{X_t=0\}$ | $P_{00}(t)$ | $P_{01}(t)$ | $P_{01}^{(0)}(0)$ | (%) | MRR |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Born | - | - | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | - |
| 1 – 9 | 50 | 32 | 1 | 0.640 | 0.640 | 0.360 | 0.360 | 36 | 34.688 |
| 10 – 19 | 37 | 17 | 2 | 0.459 | 0.717 | 0.283 | 0.541 | 54 | 13.494 |
| 20 – 29 | 62 | 28 | 3 | 0.452 | 0.985 | 0.015 | 0.548 | 54 | 1.220 |
| 30 – 39 | 38 | 17 | 4 | 0.447 | 0.988 | 0.012 | 0.553 | 55 | 35.894 |
| 40 – 49 | 43 | 19 | 5 | 0.442 | 0.988 | 0.012 | 0.558 | 55 | 2.033 |
| 50 – | 82 | 35 | 6 | 0.427 | 0.966 | 0.034 | 0.573 | 57 | - |
| | | | | | | | | Total | 21.907 |

Table 4. Results of the model derived for the Kudikadu PHC

| Age | No. Examined | Anti-HAV (-) | t | $P\{X_t=0\}$ | $P_{00}(t)$ | $P_{01}(t)$ | $P_{01}^{(0)}(0)$ | (%) | MRR |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Born | - | - | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | - |
| 1 – 9 | 130 | 126 | 1 | 0.969 | 0.969 | 0.031 | 0.031 | 03 | 11.724 |
| 10 – 19 | 200 | 176 | 2 | 0.880 | 0.908 | 0.092 | 0.120 | 12 | 19.976 |
| 20 – 29 | 340 | 255 | 3 | 0.750 | 0.852 | 0.148 | 0.250 | 25 | 11.55 |
| 30 – 39 | 220 | 164 | 4 | 0.745 | 0.993 | 0.007 | 0.255 | 25 | 0.968 |
| 40 – 49 | 176 | 124 | 5 | 0.704 | 0.944 | 0.056 | 0.296 | 29 | 7.884 |
| 50 – | 98 | 65 | 6 | 0.663 | 0.941 | 0.059 | 0.337 | 33 | - |
| | | | | | | | | Total | 12.96 |

Table 5. Results of the model derived for the Kovilvenni PHC

| Age | No.Examined | Anti-HAV (-) | t | $P\{X_t=0\}$ | $P_{00}(t)$ | $P_{01}(t)$ | $R_{01}^{(0)}(0)$ | (%) | MRR |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Born | - | - | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | - |
| 1 – 9 | 128 | 92 | 1 | 0.718 | 0.718 | 0.282 | 0.718 | 71 | 21.755 |
| 10 – 19 | 97 | 67 | 2 | 0.697 | 0.971 | 0.029 | 0.303 | 30 | 6.273 |
| 20 – 29 | 83 | 54 | 3 | 0.653 | 0.937 | 0.063 | 0.347 | 34 | 8.031 |
| 30 – 39 | 62 | 38 | 4 | 0.612 | 0.937 | 0.063 | 0.388 | 38 | 12.852 |
| 40 – 49 | 55 | 28 | 5 | 0.517 | 0.844 | 0.156 | 0.483 | 48 | 13.493 |
| 50 – | 42 | 19 | 6 | 0.453 | 0.876 | 0.124 | 0.547 | 54 | - |
| | | | | | | | | Total | 17.769 |

Table 6. Results of the model derived for the Budalur PHC

| Age | No.Examined | Anti-HAV (-) | t | $P\{X_t=0\}$ | $P_{00}(t)$ | $P_{01}(t)$ | $P_{01}^{(0)}(0)$ | (%) | MRR |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Born | - | - | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | - |
| 1 – 9 | 87 | 80 | 1 | 0.927 | 0.927 | 0.073 | 0.073 | 07 | 36.894 |
| 10 – 19 | 53 | 31 | 2 | 0.603 | 0.650 | 0.350 | 0.397 | 39 | 26.712 |
| 20 – 29 | 41 | 21 | 3 | 0.517 | 0.857 | 0.143 | 0.483 | 48 | 16.182 |
| 30 – 39 | 17 | 07 | 4 | 0.415 | 0.802 | 0.198 | 0.585 | 58 | 10.250 |
| 40 – 49 | 22 | 08 | 5 | 0.390 | 0.939 | 0.061 | 0.610 | 61 | 19.812 |
| 50 – | 13 | 02 | 6 | 0.205 | 0.525 | 0.475 | 0.795 | 79 | - |
| | | | | | | | | Total | 27.89 |

of HAV infection continues among older children and adults, or are deferred until older ages, the disease burden will be greater.

In some PHC regions the MRR_1 was high for children aged 1–9 followed by lower MRR for older people, the total MRR is the lowest as of those shown.

In some of the P.H.C. regions like Kudikadu, MRR_{10} – for aged group 10–19, is higher and MRR for other age groups is lower.

The authors suggest using total MRR to target whole P.H.C. regions for vaccination, and using age specific MRR_i to target the age groups to be vaccinated.

In 2010 MRR_1 in Budalur, Pillaiyarnatham, Kurungulam and the MRR_{10} in Budalur were over 20. The total MRR in Budalur and Pillaiyarnatham were over 20 which was higher than the warning value. These PHC areas are of high risk areas and should be kept under closer surveillance.

REFERENCES

Basu, A.K. 2003. *Introduction to Stochastic Process*, Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi.

Bharacha-Reid, A.T. 1960. *Elements of the theory of Markov Processes and their Applications*, Dover Publications New York.

Biwas, S. 2006. *Stochastic processes in Demography and Applications*. New Central Book Agency, Kolkata.

Cox, D. R. and H. D. Miller. 1970. *The Theory of Stochastic Processes*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, London.

Davidson Medical. www.davidsonmed.com

Long, B.C., Phipps, W. J. and Cassneyer, V. 1960. *Shaffer's Medical and Surgical Nursing*. B.T.Publications, New Delhi.

Medhi. J. 1994. *Stochastic Processes*. New Age International Publishers, New Delhi.

Park, J. K., 1995. *Essentials of Community Health Nursing*. Banarsidas Bhanot, Jabalpur.

Park, K. 2009. *Park's Text Book of Preventive and Social Medicine*. Banarsidas Bhanot, Jabalpur.

Paul, G. Hoel, Sidney, C. Port, Charles, J. Stone. 1991. *Introduction to Stochastic Processes*. Waveland Press Inc., Illinois.

Samuel, Karlin and Howard, M. Taylor. 1975. *A First Course in Stochastic Processes*. (Second Edition), Academic Press, Messachussetts.