

MULTISCALE ANALYSIS FOR A VECTOR-BORNE EPIDEMIC MODEL

MAX O. SOUZA

ABSTRACT. Traditional studies about disease dynamics have focused on global stability issues, due to their epidemiological importance. Here, we study a classical SIR-SI model for arboviruses in two different directions: we begin by describing an alternative proof of previously known global stability results by using only a Lyapunov approach. In the sequel, we take a different view and we argue that vectors and hosts can have very distinctive intrinsic time-scales, and that such distinctiveness can be extended to the disease dynamics. Under these hypotheses, we show that two asymptotic regimes naturally appear: the fast host dynamics and the fast vector dynamics. The former regime yields, at leading order, a SIR model for the hosts, but with a rational incidence rate. In this case, the vector disappears from the model, and the dynamics is similar to a directly contagious disease. The latter yields a SI model for the vectors, with the hosts disappearing from the model. Numerical results show the performance of the approximation, and a rigorous proof validates the reduced models.

1. INTRODUCTION

Vector-borne diseases in general, and arboviruses in particular, are a contemporary major challenge for epidemiologists, public health officers to name a few. Indeed, while in the turning from the nineteenth to the twentieth century witnessed a discovering caused by arboviruses as for instance dengue and malaria, the turning from the twentieth to twentieth first century is witnessing a sustained emergence of these diseases around the globe. Presently, Dengue is a leading cause of serious illness and death among children in some Asian and Latin American countries—[49]— and Malaria pathogens are acquiring resistance to the first line of treatment in South Asia [8]. Additionally, the West Nile virus is now endemic in Africa, Asia, Oceania and it now established North America [37], while Chikungunya disease which has its origin in Africa has now progressed into Southern Asia and Oceania—see [39, 38]—and now there are documented cases in Europe [11]. Such an emergence seems to be mainly caused by the spreading of some of the associated vectors. Thus, *Aedes Aegypti* and *Aedes Albopictus* have experienced a major increase in spreading in recent decades [25]. Moreover, some of the diseases evolve from being benign into more lethal forms. This is the case, for instance, of the Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever which has become significantly more prevalent in recent years cf. [23]. Thus even for innocuous diseases as Chikungunya disease, there are concerns of further antigenic evolution—see for instance [41]. In addition, there are also arboviruses that attack only animals as, for instance heartworm in dogs, which is transmitted by *Aedes Albopictus* [22]. Finally, we also have a number of diseases caused by tick [14].

Traditional modelling in epidemiology focuses on global stability of equilibria, since this characterises if a disease will become endemic and this is a major concern for public health officers. This view dates back to the original work by Ross on Malaria—cf. [40] and [20], where the concept of a basic reproductive number (R_0) was introduced and became a modelling paradigm—see [45] for a very recent review on the works by Ross and Macdonald from a medical modelling point of view. In a fairly large class of models, we can define R_0 unambiguously and it can be shown that if $R_0 < 1$ the disease is extinct while if $R_0 > 1$ it becomes endemic—see [17]. In the former case this usually means that the disease-free state is globally asymptotically stable, while in the latter case may indicate an analogous situation for a disease-present state or simply that the disease is prevalent—in the sense used in dynamical systems parlance. The literature on mathematical epidemiology is too vast, and we limit ourselves to some references: [17] and [4]

Date: July 7, 2022.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 92D30; Secondary 34E13.

Key words and phrases. Arboviruses, Dengue, Lyapunov Functions, Multiscale Asymptotics.

The author acknowledges many useful discussions held in the Dengue Modeling initiative developed at the CMA/FGV, where part of this work was performed. The author also acknowledges the workshops and support of PRONEX Dengue under CNPQ grant # 550030/2010-7. The author is partially supported by CNPq grant # 309616/2009-3 and FAPERJ grant # 110.174/2009.

Parameter	Meaning
N_h^* and N_v^*	Number of hosts and vectors;
μ_h^* and μ_v^*	birth rate for hosts and vectors;
β_h^* and β_v^*	probability of a host being infected by a vector and vice-versa;
b^*	Biting rate;
γ^*	removal rate;
m^*	Number of alternative blood sources;
A^*	Vector recruitment rate.

TABLE 1. Description of parameters meaning in the compartmental model depicted in Figure 1.

as contemporary research monographs. Textbook introductions can be found in [9] or [32]. The classical monographs are [6] and [18] which contain a number of original contributions. A recent review is [21]. For more information on some arboviruses, see [34] and the recent review in [5] for Dengue, and [24] and the more recent review in [30] for Malaria. There is also a growing concern about the economic costs of managing these diseases, and some of this work is reviewed in [29].

In the specific case of arboviruses, the dynamics and ecology of both the vector and host turn out to be important. Once again the literature is extensive and refer the we reader to [26, 42, 31, 44, 7] for general information in describing the ecology of mosquitos in general and the *Ae. Aegypti* and *Albopictus* in particular. From a modelling perspective, a number of questions have been investigated as the possibility of vertical transmission for Dengue in [1], effect of temperature [51, 52], insecticide resistance [28], and the connection between imported cases and co-infections by different serotypes [2].

In what follows, we shall take a different view and look at different features of the dynamics of such arboviruses diseases. More specifically, we shall argue that the vector and hosts can have very different time-scales, and upon this assumption, show how classical ideas of asymptotic analysis can be used to derive new models from old ones, and how these simplified models might contribute to the understanding of such dynamics.

1.1. Time-scales in vector-borne diseases. Vector-borne diseases are different from direct contagious ones since there is indirect transmission from host to the vector and vice-versa. Their dynamical behaviour will depend both on the dynamics of the vector, of the host and on their interaction. In order to organise the discussion, we shall take as a basic framework the simplest, and probably the most natural, model from the point of view of mass-action epidemiological modelling: the coupling of a SIR model for the host and a SI model for the vector that was first developed by [6, 18], and is given schematically in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Compartmental description of the arbovirus model by [6, 18].

The meaning of the model parameters that appear in Figure 1 is given in Table 1. Here starred variables indicate dimensional quantities. The variables S , I and R have the usual epidemiological meaning, with the subscript indicating if they refer to the hosts or to the vectors. In Figure 1, we can view each arrow single arrow as a clock that determines when there is a compartment transition. The typical time-scale of these clocks will depend on the particular value of the parameters, and we shall give some indication below of the possible scales that one might expect to observe. As in any description of parameters of epidemiological models, we should stress that their variability can be very large, and extremely dependent on particular factors as the pathogen itself, the vector, and the geography among many others. See [27] and [16] for two different discussions about these variability.

For the host compartments that are four such clocks: $N_h^* \mu_h^*$, μ_h^* , $\beta_h b^* / (N_h^* + m^*) I_v^*$ and γ^* . The choice of the first one is a standard simplification, and implies that the population is constant. While this is a reasonable modelling assumption in many cases, there might be exceptions when one is interested in a long time span, or when the mortality is high due to the deaths caused by the disease [33]. The second one is the host death rate, and it is related to average host life expectancy. Naturally, it depends both on the host and on the particular geographical region, but for humans we shall have $1/\mu_h \geq 50$ years, unless in case of diseases with severe mortality, as it can be the case of large epidemics of yellow fever due to the high mortality of the severe cases [48]. The third clock controls the infection events, and as we shall see in Section 2, it can be faster or slower than its twin clock for the vectors. The fourth clock is the removal rate. Its values depends on the particular disease and on the particular host. For instance, for Dengue $1/\gamma$ can vary from 1 to eight days, but there are indications that it can be larger in patients with Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever [12]. In Malaria it can varies from 5 to 10 days in treated adults, but it can be as large as 48 days in young children, and 120 days in non-treated patients [35].

For the vector compartments there are three such clocks: A^* / μ_v^* is, likewise its host twin, chosen with A^* constant as a simplification, and its suitability depends mainly on the particular geography and vector. The second clock is the vector death rate. In laboratory one can have female mosquitos living about 20 days [46], while in the wild this expected lifespan can be as small as 2 days [15]. These values will be also affected by variables as temperature, rainfall among others [13]. The last clock describes the frequency at which mosquitos get infected. It has a large variance depend on the species—eg. [3]. For *Aedes Aegypti*, in particular, it can be larger due to the fact that its feeding is easily disturbed, and hence it might need to bite many hosts in order to complete its feeding [43].

The discussion above suggest that there might be a number of situations where one can have all the vector clocks faster than the host clocks. We shall call such a situation the *Fast Vector Dynamics*. The dual regime, the *Fast Host Dynamics*, where one has the host clocks faster than the vector clocks seems less likely but, as observed above, situations like large epidemics of yellow fever might be a possible scenario where such model is relevant. A more precise identification of these different regimes in terms of the underlying parameters is deferred to Section 2.

1.2. Outline. In Section 2, we describe the basic model studied and review some of its properties. An alternative presentation of global stability results, using only a Lyapunov approach, is given in Section 3. In Section 4, we study the *Fast Vector Dynamics* limit. This regime yields a reduced SIR system with modified non-linear incidence rates. In addition, it also yields a transition layer corrector for which an explicit solution can be written, and an explicit representation of the so-called slow manifold can be found. We also present a number of numerical illustrations of the approximation together with a theorem that guarantees that such an approximation is uniform for all time, with the proof given in A. The dual limit, the *Fast Host Dynamics*, yields a reduced SI system and it seems to be somewhat less interesting from a biological point of view; it is presented briefly in Section 5; the numerical results are similar to the ones obtained for the *Fast Vector Dynamics* and thus are omitted. Nevertheless, we do illustrate the reduction to the slow manifold that, in this case, is just a curve. Section 6 draws some concluding remarks.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Review of the model and non-dimensionalisation.** The compartmental model shown in Figure 1 can be describe by the following system:

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{S}_h^* &= \mu_h^*(N_h^* - S_h^*) - \frac{\beta_h^* b^*}{N_h^* + m^*} S_h^* I_v^* \\ \dot{I}_h^* &= \frac{\beta_h^* b^*}{N_h^* + m^*} S_h^* I_v^* - (\mu_h^* + \gamma^*) I_h^* \\ \dot{R}_h^* &= \gamma^* I_h^* - \mu_h^* R_h^* \\ \dot{S}_v^* &= A^* - \mu_v^* S_v^* - \frac{\beta_v^* b^*}{N_h^* + m^*} S_v^* I_h^* \\ \dot{I}_v^* &= \frac{\beta_v^* b^*}{N_h^* + m^*} S_v^* I_h^* - \mu_v^* I_v^* \end{cases}$$

System (1) has been comprehensively studied by [19], and extensively used for studies of Dengue as described, for instance, in [34].

We shall non-dimensionalise System 1 by letting

$$(S_h^*, I_h^*, R_h^*) = N_h^* (S_h, I_h, R_h) \quad \text{and} \quad (S_v^*, I_v^*) = \frac{A^*}{\mu_v^*} (S_v, I_v).$$

Also

$$t^* = (\Delta^*)^{-1} t,$$

where $(\Delta^*)^{-1}$ is, for the time being, an arbitrary time-scale. We immediately obtain the new System

$$\begin{cases} \dot{S}_h &= \mu_h(1 - S_h) - \delta S_h I_v \\ \dot{I}_h &= \delta S_h I_v - (\mu_h + \gamma) I_h \\ \dot{R}_h &= \gamma I_h - \mu_h R_h \\ \dot{S}_v &= \mu_v(1 - S_v) - \sigma S_v I_h \\ \dot{I}_v &= \sigma S_v I_h - \mu_v I_v \end{cases}$$

where

$$\delta = \frac{\beta_h^* b^* A^*}{\mu_v^* \Delta^* (N_h^* + m^*)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma = \frac{\beta_v^* b^* N_h^*}{\Delta^* (N_h^* + m^*)}$$

Also

$$\gamma = \frac{\gamma^*}{\Delta^*}, \quad \mu_h = \frac{\mu_h^*}{\Delta^*} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_v = \frac{\mu_v^*}{\Delta^*}.$$

As observed in [19], the non-negative orthant of \mathbb{R}^5 is invariant by the flow of (1), and it is conservative, i.e., if the initial values of the host compartments sum to N_h^* and the initial values of the vector compartments sum to A^*/μ_v^* , then this holds for all time.

In view of this observation, if the initial conditions for the host fractions add to one, with the same being true for the vector fractions initial conditions, then this will be preserved by the evolution. Therefore, we can work with the simplified, but equivalent, model below:

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{X} &= \mu_h(1 - X) - \delta X Z \\ \dot{Y} &= \delta X Z - (\mu_h + \gamma) Y \\ \dot{Z} &= \sigma(1 - Z) Y - \mu_v Z \end{cases}$$

where

$$X = S_h, \quad Y = I_h \quad \text{and} \quad Z = I_v.$$

System (2) has the following two equilibrium points

- (1) The disease free equilibrium: $X^* = 1, Y^* = Z^* = 0$.
- (2) The endemic equilibrium:

$$X^* = \frac{1}{R_0} \frac{1 + R_0 D_0}{1 + D_0}, \quad Y^* = \frac{\mu_h}{\mu_h + \gamma} (1 - X^*), \quad Z^* = D_0 \frac{(1 - X^*)}{X^*},$$

$$R_0 = \frac{\sigma \delta}{\mu_v (\mu_h + \gamma)} \quad \text{and} \quad D_0 = \frac{\mu_h}{\delta}.$$

The dynamics of System (2) was studied by [19] who showed, using the theory of monotone dynamical systems, the global stability of the equilibria: the disease free equilibrium for $R_0 \leq 1$, and the endemic equilibrium for $R_0 > 1$. They also showed that for sufficiently small μ_h the approach to the endemic equilibrium is oscillatory. We shall come back to the global stability issue in Section 3.

2.2. Scalings. We now give some indication on the magnitude of the non-dimensional parameters appearing in System 2, in particular towards the values that might lead to the fast vector dynamics. We refer the reader to the introduction for a more biological discussion and for more general references.

We shall use $\Delta^* = \gamma^*/2$, so that $(\Delta^*)^{-1}$ is twice the typical time that host remains infectious once it has acquired the disease. Thus, we shall always have $\gamma = 1/2$. We shall also take $m^* = 0$ for simplicity, and $\beta_h = \beta_v = 0.5$. For the host death rate, we shall assume an average life expectancy of 60 years and, thus, we shall use $\mu_h^* = 0.0000463 \text{ days}^{-1}$.

As discussed above, the infectious time can vary depending on the disease, age, and if there is treatment available. The biting rate will depend on the particular vector, and of the are being modelled. Also, a typical value of A^*/μ_v^* will be dependent on the infestation level. Therefore, we shall not make any a priori hypothesis on those values, and instead we shall show the variation of the non-dimensional parameters. Also, since μ_h^* is quite small, μ_h will also be small, and we shall concentrate on δ, μ_v e σ .

We begin with μ_v , and show contour plots as a function of $(\Delta^*)^{-1}$ and of the expected lifespan of the mosquito in Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. Scaling for μ_v depending on the average lifespan of the vector, and on twice the average infectious time of the host. Although the level curves are just lines, the graph helps to assess the order size of the parameters. A level curve with value L was labelled with a certain value of ϵ , if $\log(L\epsilon) \in [-1, 0.8]$. This is equivalent to say that $L = a\epsilon^{-1}$, with $a \in [a_0, a_1]$, with $a_0 \approx 0.2$ and $a_1 \approx 2$. Based on the discussion in Section 1.1 and on the values on the level curves, we observe that the range $0.01 \leq \epsilon \leq 0.1$ seems to match a number of possible scenarios in epidemiological modelling.

With the assumed parameters, we have that

$$\sigma = b^*/2\Delta^* \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \sigma I.$$

Thus, in Figure 3 we plot the level curves of these expressions. See the corresponding caption for more details, and the caption corresponding to Figure 2 for an explanation about the labeling of the level curves.

The pictures in Figures 2 and 3 suggest both that the proposed regimes are effective, but also that might be a number of other regimes that need to be studied in addition. Additionally, we point out that $\epsilon = 0.01$, seems to be a plausible scaling for Dengue in urban centres—the reader is referred to the discussion in Section 1.1.




FIGURE 3. Possible scalings for σ and δ . For the values of b^* that obtained in the literature, the level curves of σ are naturally around $\sigma \sim (0.01)^{-1}$. Notice that we can easily have δ of the same order of magnitude than σ in the case of reasonably large infestations, but for more moderate cases of $I \approx 0.1$, we shall typically $\delta = \mathcal{O}(1)$. We refer to the discussion in Section 1.1 for a discussion about these values.

3. GLOBAL STABILITY ANALYSIS

Traditionally, the main focus on study about epidemiological systems as (1) is on global stability issues. In particular a proof of global stability for System (1) using the theory of competitive systems can be found in [19]. More recently, [10] has studied a similar system but with a saturated bilinear incidence. In particular, [10] proved global stability by using a Lyapunov function for the disease-free equilibrium, and by competitive systems for the endemic equilibrium. [47] has studied the same system, and provide a Lyapunov proof for the disease-free. The proof presented by [47] for the endemic equilibrium seems to apply only if, in our notation, one has $X^* = 1$. But in this case, we must necessarily have $R_0 = 1$. Also a proof using a Lyapunov approach for the disease free equilibrium, and another proof, also using competitive systems, for the endemic equilibrium can be found in [50].

In what follows, we provide an alternative proof for the global stability of (1) using only Lyapunov functions.

Theorem 1. *Let R_0 be defined as above. Then for $R_0 \leq 1$ the disease-free equilibrium is globally asymptotic stable, while for $R_0 > 1$ the endemic equilibrium is globally asymptotic stable.*

Proof. Although the proof for $R_0 \leq 1$ is available in the literature, as discussed above, we provide it here both for the sake of completeness of presentation, and because the proof given here is somewhat simpler than the available ones.

Suppose $R_0 \leq 1$ and consider the following Lyapunov function

$$V(X, Y, Z) = X - \log X + Y + \frac{\delta}{\mu_v} Z.$$

Then

$$\dot{V} = \dot{X} \left(1 - \frac{1}{X} \right) + \dot{Y} + \dot{Z}$$

On substituting

$$\dot{V} = -\mu_h \frac{(1-X)^2}{X} - (\mu_h + \gamma)(1-R_0)Y - R_0ZY,$$

which is negative for $0 \leq R_0 \leq 1$, and X, Y, Z in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$.

For $R_0 > 1$, let

$$V(X, Y, Z) = X - X^* \log \frac{X}{X^*} + Y - Y^* \log \frac{Y}{Y^*} + \frac{\delta X^*}{\mu_v} \left(Z - Z^* \log \frac{Z}{Z^*} \right).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \dot{X} \left(1 - \frac{X^*}{X}\right) + \dot{Y} \left(1 - \frac{Y^*}{Y}\right) + \frac{\delta X^*}{\mu_v} \dot{Z} \left(1 - \frac{Z^*}{Z}\right) \\ &= \mu_h \left[1 + X^* - X - \frac{X^*}{X}\right] + (\mu_h + \gamma) Y^* + \frac{\delta X^*}{\mu_v} Z^* + \frac{\sigma \delta X^*}{\mu_v} (1 - Z) Y + \\ &\quad - \delta \frac{X Z Y^*}{Y} - (\mu_h + \gamma) Y - \frac{\sigma \delta X^* Z^*}{\mu_v} (1 - Z) \frac{Y}{Z}\end{aligned}$$

On using that

$$(\mu_h + \gamma) Y^* = \mu_h (1 - X^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\delta X^*}{\mu_v} Z^* = \mu (1 - X^*),$$

we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \mu_h \left[3 - X^* - X - \frac{X^*}{X}\right] + (\mu_h + \gamma) (R_0 X^* (1 - Z^*) - 1) Y + \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma \delta X^*}{\mu_v} Y \left[2Z^* - Z - \frac{Z^*}{Z}\right] - \frac{\delta X Z Y^*}{Y}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$R_0 (1 - Z^*) = R_0 \frac{1 + D_0}{1 + R_0 D_0} = \frac{1}{X^*},$$

we are left with

$$\dot{V} = \mu_h \left[3 - X^* - X - \frac{X^*}{X}\right] + \frac{\sigma \delta X^*}{\mu_v} Y \left[2Z^* - Z - \frac{Z^*}{Z}\right] - \frac{\delta X Z Y^*}{Y}.$$

Writing

$$X + \frac{X^*}{X} = X + \frac{(X^*)^2}{X} + \frac{X^*(1 - X^*)}{X},$$

using that

$$X + \frac{(X^*)^2}{X} \geq 2X^*,$$

and on noticing that a similar calculation holds for the second bracket, we find:

$$(3) \quad \dot{V} \leq 3\mu_h (1 - X^*) - \mu_h (1 - X^*) \frac{X^*}{X} - \frac{\sigma \delta X^* Z^* (1 - Z^*)}{\mu_v Z} Y - \frac{\delta X Z Y^*}{Y}.$$

Let us write

$$R = -\mu_h (1 - X^*) \frac{X^*}{X} - \frac{\sigma \delta X^* Z^* (1 - Z^*)}{\mu_v Z} Y - \frac{\delta X Z Y^*}{Y}.$$

By the Arithmetic-Geometric inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}R &\leq -3 \left[\mu_h (1 - X^*) X^* \frac{\sigma \delta}{\mu_v} X^* Z^* (1 - Z^*) \delta Y^* \right]^{1/3} \\ &= -3 \left[\mu_h^2 (1 - X^*)^3 D_0 X_0^* R_0 (1 - Z^*) \delta \right]^{1/3} \\ &= -3 (1 - X^*) \left[\mu_h^2 D_0 \delta \right]^{1/3} \\ &= -3 (1 - X^*) \mu_h.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that

$$\dot{V} \leq 0,$$

in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$.

In order to show that the V is a strict Lyapunov function, we recall that the inequality in (3) is strict unless $X = X^*$ and $Z = Z^*$. However, in this case we have that

$$\begin{aligned} R &= -\mu_h(1-X^*) - \frac{\sigma\delta X^*}{\mu_v}(1-Z^*)Y - \frac{\delta X^*Z^*Y^*}{Y} \\ &= -\mu_h(1-X^*) - (\mu_h + \gamma)Y - \delta D_0(1-X^*)\frac{Y^*}{Y} \\ &= -\mu_h(1-X^*) \left[1 + \frac{Y}{Y^*} + \frac{Y^*}{Y} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{Y}{Y^*} + \frac{Y^*}{Y} \geq 2,$$

with equality only when $Y = Y^*$, we conclude that $R < -\mu_h(1-X^*)$, except on $(X, Y, Z) = (X^*, Y^*, Z^*)$ where we have equality. Therefore, we have $\dot{V} < 0$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$, except in the endemic equilibrium. \square \square

4. THE FAST VECTOR DYNAMICS

As discussed above, we want to describe the dynamics of System (2), when we have:

$$\sigma = \bar{\sigma}\varepsilon^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_v = \bar{\mu}_v\varepsilon^{-1}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1,$$

while all other parameters are of order one.

Direct substitution in (2) lead us to the following initial value problem:

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{X} &= \mu_h(1-X) - \delta XZ \\ \dot{Y} &= \delta XZ - (\mu_h + \gamma)Y \\ \varepsilon \dot{Z} &= \bar{\sigma}(1-Z)Y - \bar{\mu}_v Z \end{cases}$$

subject to the initial condition

$$X(0) = X_0, \quad Y(0) = Y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad Z(0) = Z_0.$$

On a formal basis, since we already know that the dynamics of (2) cannot be chaotic, we expect that the right hand side of the last equation balances out, leaving $\dot{Z} \approx 0$, i.e, that the vector population is nearly in equilibrium. Under these hypothesis, we obtain the following System:

$$(5) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{X} &= \mu_h(1-X) - \delta \frac{\sigma XY}{\sigma Y + \mu_v} \\ \dot{Y} &= \delta \frac{\sigma XY}{\sigma Y + \mu_v} - (\mu_h + \gamma)Y \\ \dot{Z} &= 0 \end{cases}$$

Notice that System (5) can be seen as a SIR system with a modified, rational, incidence rate. While the above derivation is heuristic, we shall show that it can be obtained from a consistent multiscale asymptotic expansion and, moreover, that such an expansion can be rigorously justified.

4.1. Asymptotic expansion. Let

$$\varepsilon \tau = t.$$

Then, we seek a composite expansion of the form

$$\begin{aligned} X &= X^0(t) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \\ Y &= Y^0(t) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \\ Z &= Z^0(t) + \hat{Z}^0(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \hat{Z}^0(\tau) = 0.$$

On substituting the proposed expansion in (4), we obtain to leading order the following differential-algebraic system:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^0 &= \mu_h(1 - X^0) - \delta X^0 Z^0 \\ Y_t^0 &= \delta X^0 Z^0 - (\mu_h + \gamma)Y^0 \\ 0 &= \bar{\sigma}(1 - Z^0)Y^0 - \bar{\mu}_v Z^0. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$(6) \quad Z^0(t) = \frac{\bar{\sigma}Y^0(t)}{\bar{\sigma}Y^0(t) + \bar{\mu}_v}.$$

and hence, we obtain the system:

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} X_t^0 &= \mu_h(1 - X^0) - \delta \frac{\bar{\sigma}X^0Y^0}{\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v} \\ Y_t^0 &= \delta \frac{\bar{\sigma}X^0Y^0}{\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v} - (\mu_h + \gamma)Y^0 \end{cases}$$

with initial condition $X^0(0) = X_0$ and $Y^0(0) = Y_0$.

Notice that, in general, we shall have $Z^0(0) \neq Z_0$. Such a mismatch in the initial condition, should be corrected by \hat{Z}^0 . Thus, \hat{Z}^0 should satisfy both $Z^0(0) = \hat{Z}^0 - Z^0(0)$ (it adjusts for the correct initial condition) and $\hat{Z}^0(\tau) \rightarrow 0$, as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ (it has a local character). In order to solve for \hat{Z}^0 , we first observe that

$$X^0(t) = X^0(\varepsilon\tau) = X^0(0) + \varepsilon\tau X_t^0(0) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2),$$

with similar expansions for $Y^0(t)$ and $Z^0(t)$.

Hence, we find that \hat{Z}^0 satisfies

$$\hat{Z}_\tau^0 = -(\bar{\sigma}Y_0 + \bar{\mu}_v)\hat{Z}^0,$$

i.e

$$(8) \quad \hat{Z}^0(\tau) = \left(Z_0 - \frac{\bar{\sigma}Y_0}{\bar{\sigma}Y_0 + \bar{\mu}_v} \right) e^{-(\bar{\sigma}Y_0 + \bar{\mu}_v)\tau}.$$

4.2. Global stability analysis of the asymptotic system. Before we can assert the quality of the approximation provided by (6), (7) and (8), we need a better understanding of the dynamics of the reduced system. We begin with the following basic result:

Proposition 1. *Let*

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(X^0, Y^0) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid X^0 + Y^0 \leq 1, \quad X^0, Y^0 \geq 0\}.$$

Then \mathcal{S} is invariant by the flow of (7). In particular, the corresponding solutions are global in time.

Proof. Since $Y^0 = 0$ is an invariant set, a solution with $Y^0 \geq 0$ at any time, will remain this property. Also, when $X^0 = 0$, the flow points inside \mathcal{S} . Thus, for an initial condition in \mathcal{S} , we also have $X^0 \geq 0$. Finally, $(X^0 + Y^0)_t \leq 0$. \square \square

System (7) has two equilibrium points in the positive quadrant:

- (1) $X_* = 1, Y_* = 0$.
- (2)

$$X_* = \frac{(\mu_h + \gamma)\bar{\mu}_v + \nu_h\bar{\sigma}}{(\mu_h + \delta)\bar{\sigma}} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_* = \frac{\delta\mu_h\bar{\sigma} - (\mu_h^2 + \gamma\mu_h)\bar{\mu}_v}{\mu_h^2 + (\gamma + \delta)h + \delta\gamma\bar{\sigma}}.$$

Remark 1. *Notice that $X_* = X^*$ and $Y_* = Y^*$. Thus the equilibrium of (7) correspond to the projections in the XY plane of the equilibria of (2). Notice also that*

$$Z_* = \frac{\bar{\sigma}Y_*}{\bar{\sigma}Y_* + \bar{\mu}_v} = Z^*.$$

The next result shows that the dynamics of Systems (11) and (7) are qualitatively equivalent, in the sense that either both end up in the disease free equilibrium or in the endemic one.

Theorem 2. *Let*

$$\bar{R}_0 = \frac{\delta \bar{\sigma}}{\bar{\mu}_v(\nu_h + \gamma)}$$

Then $\bar{R}_0 = R_0$, and for $R_0 \leq 1$ the disease free equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable. For $R_0 > 1$, the endemic equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable.

Proof. The assertion about R_0 is clear. For the global stability, let

$$F(Y^0) = \frac{\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v}{Y^0}$$

Then F is a Dulac function for the System (7) in proper compact subsets of \mathcal{S} , since we have:

$$\partial_{X^0}[\mu_h(1 - X^0)F(Y^0) - \delta X^0] + \partial_{Y^0}[\delta X^0 - (\mu_h + \gamma)(\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v)] = -\mu_h F(Y^0) - \delta - \bar{\sigma}(\mu_h + \gamma) < 0.$$

Thus, the system cannot have a closed orbit in the interior of \mathcal{S} . For $R_0 \leq 1$, the only equilibrium in \mathcal{S} is $(1, 0)$. Thus all orbits must converge to this equilibrium point.

The linearisation of (7) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}^0 \\ \bar{Y}^0 \end{pmatrix}_T = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu_h - \delta \frac{\bar{\sigma}Y^0}{\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v} & -\bar{\sigma} \delta X^0 \frac{\bar{\mu}_v}{(\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v)^2} \\ \delta \frac{\bar{\sigma}Y^0}{\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v} & \bar{\sigma} \delta X^0 \frac{\bar{\mu}_v}{(\bar{\sigma}Y^0 + \bar{\mu}_v)^2} - \mu_h - \gamma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}^0 \\ \bar{Y}^0 \end{pmatrix}$$

For the disease free equilibrium, the eigenvalues of the Jacobian are $-\mu_h$ and $(\mu_h + \gamma)(R_0 - 1)$. Thus, the disease free equilibrium is a locally asymptotically stable node for $R_0 < 1$, and a saddle for $R_0 > 1$. In the latter case, the unique orbit that approaches the disease free equilibrium is easily shown to be the intersection of \mathcal{S} with $Y^0 = 0$. Thus, all the other orbits must approach the endemic equilibrium. \square \square

4.3. Asymptotic convergence and numerical results. The asymptotic expansions derived in 4.1 can be shown to be indeed asymptotic. The ideas used here are similar to the ones used to formalise Kinetic Menton's theory—cf. [36] and references therein for instance. In particular, we have the following:

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathfrak{X}^\varepsilon(t) = (X(t), Y(t), Z(t))$ and $\mathfrak{X}^0(t, \tau) = (X^0(t), Y^0(t), Z^0(t) + \hat{Z}^0(\tau))$. Denote the uniform norm in $[0, \infty)$ by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Then, for sufficient small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of ε , such that*

$$\|\mathfrak{X} - \mathfrak{X}^0\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Moreover, let

$hfX^0(t) = (X^0(t), Y^0(t), Z^0(t))$. Then there are constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that, for $t > C_1\varepsilon$, we have

$$\|\mathfrak{X}^\varepsilon(t) - \hat{\mathfrak{X}}^0(t)\| \leq C_2\varepsilon.$$

The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Appendix A.

We now present some numerical illustrations. We first observe that the hallmark of the Fast Vector Dynamics is that

$$(9) \quad \frac{\bar{\sigma}(1 - Z(t))Y(t)}{\bar{\mu}_v Z(t)} = 1.$$

In Figures 4 and 5 we check performance of the approximation in terms of (9) for two different parameter sets: the first one has $\mu_h =$, $\gamma =$, $\delta =$, $\bar{\mu}_v =$, and $\bar{\sigma} =$; the second set has the same values but with $\mu_h = \dots$. Two verifications are performed: in Figure 4, we verify the performance of the approximation with a fixed small ε , but with a number of different initial conditions; in Figure 5, we now fix an initial condition, but have a number of different values of ε .






FIGURE 4. We show the ratio in (9) is attained for the set parameters described. In these numerical experiments we have $\varepsilon = 0.01$, and a set of ten initial conditions that was randomly generated—but kept constant for the two figures. For both sets, the endemic equilibrium is globally stable, but typically these equilibria will be attained around time $t = 10$ for the first parameter set, and about $t = 700$ for the second set. Hence, convergence to (9) at earlier times as shown in the graphs is not a consequence of convergence to equilibrium.


We now present further results for a third parameter set in Figure 6. There we compare the full model with the asymptotic model. As expected, the approximation of $X(t)$ by $X^0(t)$ and of $Y(t)$ by $Y^0(t)$ are indeed uniform for all time, while the approximation of $Z(t)$ by $Z^0(t)$ fail to be uniform in an initial layer. Notice also that such non-uniform behaviour is suppressed by including the corrector term in the initial layer.




(A) Parameter set 1



(B) Parameter set 1 — detail



(C) Parameter set 2



(D) Parameter set 2 — detail

FIGURE 5. The dependence of the ratio given by (9) for a fixed initial condition as a function of the gauge parameter ϵ . For the two parameter sets, the results are similar in the sense that for $\epsilon \leq 0.02$, the approximation seems to perform very efficiently.

5. THE FAST HOST DYNAMICS

Analogous to the previous case, we now assume that the dynamics of the host is much faster than the dynamics of the vector. In this case, one might expect that host populations is nearly in equilibrium. Hence, we should have $\dot{X} \approx 0$ and $\dot{Y} \approx 0$, i.e, we should have the system

$$(10) \quad \begin{cases} 0 &= \mu_h(1-X) - \delta \frac{\sigma XY}{\sigma Y + \mu_v} \\ 0 &= \delta \frac{\sigma XY}{\sigma Y + \mu_v} - (\mu_h + \gamma)Y \\ \dot{Z} &= \sigma(1-Z)Y - \mu_v Z \end{cases}$$

Equation (10) can be seen as a SI system for the vector, with a modified incidence rate.

In order to justify System (10), we assume that

$$\delta = \bar{\delta}\epsilon^{-1}, \quad \mu_h = \bar{\mu}_h\epsilon^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = \bar{\gamma}\epsilon^{-1}.$$

Thus, we are interested in solve

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} \epsilon \dot{X} &= \bar{\mu}_h(1-X) - \bar{\delta}XZ \\ \epsilon \dot{Y} &= \bar{\delta}XZ - (\bar{\mu}_h + \bar{\gamma})Y \\ \dot{Z} &= \sigma(1-Z)Y - \mu_v Z \end{cases}$$




FIGURE 6. In (a) we show that the error in the composite approximation stays well within the expected bounds. The non uniformity within an initial transition layer is first seen in (b) when compare the norms of the leading-order terms without the transition corrector in Z . The insets show that larger discrepancy indeed comes from the lack of the corrector \hat{Z} . Such non uniformity is also clearly depicted in (d), with the inset showing the effectiveness of the composite approximation for the Z component, while (c) shows that the leading order for X (and Y in the inset)—without any correctors—work also effectively well.

subject to the initial condition

$$X(0) = X_0, \quad Y(0) = Y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad Z(0) = Z_0.$$

In what follows, we formally derive the leading order asymptotic expansion and provide a global analysis together with some numerical results. The proof of asymptotness is very similar to the FVD regime, and hence it is omitted.

5.1. Asymptotic expansion. As before, we let $\varepsilon\tau = t$. The asymptotic expansion now take the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= X^0(t) + \hat{X}^0(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \\ Y(t) &= Y^0(t) + \hat{Y}^0(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \\ Z(t) &= Z^0(t) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 7. The slow manifold dynamics. As already indicated by the Figures 4 and 5, we also have that the most of the trajectory remains asymptotically close to the manifold.

Here, we shall also have

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{X}^0(\tau), \hat{Y}^0(\tau)) = 0.$$

At leading order, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \bar{\mu}_h(1 - X^0) - \bar{\delta}X^0Z^0 \\ 0 &= \bar{\delta}X^0Z^0 - (\bar{\mu}_h + \bar{\gamma})Y^0 \\ Z_t^0 &= \sigma(1 - Z^0)Y^0 - \mu_\nu Z^0 \end{aligned}$$

We can solve for X^0 and Y^0 obtaining

$$X^0 = \frac{\bar{\mu}_h}{\bar{\delta}Z^0 + \bar{\mu}_h} \quad \text{and} \quad Y^0 = \frac{\bar{\delta}\bar{\mu}_h}{\bar{\mu}_h + \bar{\gamma}} \frac{Z^0}{\bar{\delta}Z^0 + \bar{\mu}_h}.$$

Thus the last equation becomes

$$Z_t^0 = \mu_\nu Z^0 \left(R_0 D_0 \frac{1 - Z^0}{Z^0 + D_0} - 1 \right).$$

Also, we write

$$Z^0(t) = Z^0(\varepsilon\tau) = Z^0(0) + \varepsilon\tau Z^0(0) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2\tau^2),$$

hence, since $Z^0(0) = Z_0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}_\tau^0 &= \bar{\mu}_h \hat{X}^0 - \bar{\delta} \hat{X}^0 Z_0 \\ \hat{Y}_\tau^0 &= \bar{\delta} \hat{X}^0 Z_0 = (\bar{\gamma} + \bar{\mu}_h) \hat{Y}^0 \end{aligned}$$

The solution can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{X}^0 \\ \hat{Y}^0 \end{pmatrix} = e^{tA} \begin{pmatrix} X_0 - \frac{\bar{\mu}_h}{\bar{\delta}Z_0 + \bar{\mu}_h} \\ Y_0 - \frac{\bar{\delta}\bar{\mu}_h}{\bar{\mu}_h + \bar{\gamma}} \frac{Z_0}{\bar{\delta}Z_0 + \bar{\mu}_h} \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} -\bar{\mu}_h & -\bar{\delta}Z_0 \\ \bar{\delta}Z_0 & -(\bar{\gamma} + \bar{\mu}_h) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that the eigenvalues of A always have negative real part, and hence that

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} (X^0(\tau), Y^0(\tau)) = 0.$$

5.2. Global stability analysis. The equilibria are $Z_0 = 0$ and $Z_0 = Z^*$. Since

$$\frac{d}{dZ_0} \left(Z_0 \left[R_0 D_0 \frac{1-Z_0}{D_0+Z_0} - 1 \right] \right) = R_0 D_0 \frac{1-Z_0}{D_0+Z_0} - 1 - R_0 D_0 \frac{1+D_0}{(D_0+Z_0)^2} Z_0$$

At $Z_0 = 0$, its value is $R_0 - 1$. So the origin is globally asymptotically stable for $R_0 < 1$.

At $Z_0 = Z^*$ its value is

$$\frac{1 + R_0 D_0}{R_0(1 + D_0)} (1 - R_0)$$

Hence Z^* is globally asymptotically stable, if $R_0 > 1$.

When $R_0 = 1$, we have

$$Z_0 \left[R_0 D_0 \frac{1-Z_0}{D_0+Z_0} - 1 \right] = -\frac{D_0 Z_0}{D_0+Z_0} (Z_0 + 1) < 0, \quad Z_0 \geq 0.$$

Hence, $Z_0 = 0$ is also globally asymptotic stable when $R_0 = 1$.

5.3. Numerical results. The results for the components are qualitatively similar to the fast vector dynamics, and hence are omitted. Nevertheless, the reduction of the dynamics to the slow manifold is more dramatic in this case as shown in figure 8.




FIGURE 8. Slow manifold dynamics for the fast host regime.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

As observed in the introduction, diseases that are vector-borne have a number of features that distinguish them from contagious ones. Typically, time scales for the dynamics of the host and vectors are not within the same order, since mosquitos, for instance, that are a prevalent vector for such diseases have a very fast life cycle compared to humans. With this in mind, we investigated the dynamical consequences of having host and vector dynamics with distinct time scales in the classical arbovirus model introduced by [6, 18]. The natural regimes to look in this model are the *fast vector dynamics* (FVD) and *fast host dynamics* (FHD). While the former seems to be the most natural choice, we take the view that there might be scenarios where the latter may be observed.

By means of a formal multiscale asymptotic analysis, we study both regimes. For the FVD, we find the leading order dynamics yields a SIR model for the host, with a modified incidence rate. Thus, the vector is removed from the model being present only parametrically as a function of the host infected fraction. Such a relationship, apart from its mathematical interest, might also be useful in verifying if field data is

conformant, within the model, with the regime hypothesis. Additionally, the FHD regime yields an even more dramatic reduction with an SI model for the vectors, again with a modified incidence rate. Numerical results presented show that the approximation is indeed uniformly asymptotic in time. An interesting feature of the studied regimes is that they do not imply any condition on R_0 , and hence are compatible with a variety of disease developments from the point of view of global dynamics. Indeed, for both reduced models, the equilibria are preserved by the asymptotic approximation, and the global stability dynamics is consistent with the global stability dynamics of the full model. Finally, we have confirmed rigorously the asymptotic character of the approximation up to the derived order. Due to the large variance of the parameters as measured in many different cases, we do not claim that these regimes are necessarily the most important, or the more prevalent. Nevertheless, they do provide a model problem where the reduction can be effectively carried out, and indicate how the dynamics can be described by such reduced models. In addition, the parameters that give rise to such regimes, particularly the Fast Vector Dynamics, are consistent with a number of concrete epidemiological scenarios.

These results suggest both that there is a need of understanding the magnitude of the parameters that appear in the theoretical modellings since typically what is measured, and what is modelled are different—even if related. These results also suggest that other scalings can be investigated. In particular, as the complexity of the models grows with the use of meta-population models to account for a number of inhomogeneities in scenarios modelled, we might expect that such reductions can provide additional insight for the theory.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

The proof of Theorem 3 is divided in several lemmas.

We write system (7) in a more concise form as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{W}} &= \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}, Z), \\ \dot{Z} &= \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}, Z).\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{W}(t) = (X(t), Y(t))^t$ and \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} being the appropriate entries of the right hand side of (4). We shall write

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^0 + \varepsilon \hat{\mathbf{W}}^0 + \varepsilon \mathbf{Q} \quad \text{and} \quad Z = Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0 + \varepsilon \bar{Z},$$

with

$$\hat{\mathbf{W}}^0 = \frac{X_0}{\bar{\sigma}Y_0 + \bar{\mu}_v} \left(Z_0 - \frac{\bar{\sigma}Y_0}{\bar{\sigma}Y_0 + \bar{\mu}_v} \right) e^{-(\bar{\sigma}Y_0 + \bar{\mu}_v)t/\varepsilon} (1, -1)^t.$$

Notice that since $\hat{\mathbf{W}}^0$ is bounded, we need only to prove that (\mathbf{Q}, \bar{Z}) exist, are bounded, and are unique. In this case, we can then take $C = \|(\mathbf{Q}, \bar{Z})\|_\infty$. First, we observe that

$$\dot{\mathbf{W}}^0 + \dot{\hat{\mathbf{W}}}^0 = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) + K(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{Z}^0 + \dot{\hat{Z}}^0 = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) + L(t),$$

where

$$K(t) = \delta \hat{Z}^0(t/\varepsilon)(X^0(t) - X_0) \quad \text{and} \quad L(t) = \bar{\sigma} \hat{Z}^0(t/\varepsilon)(Y^0(t) - Y_0).$$

In particular, because of the fast decay of \hat{Z}^0 , and because $L(0) = K(0) = 0$, it follows that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\int_0^\infty K(t) dt, \quad \int_0^\infty L(t) dt \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Since \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are quadratic, we write:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}, Z) &= \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) + \varepsilon D_{\mathbf{W}} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) \mathbf{Q} + \varepsilon D_Z \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) \bar{Z} + \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \delta \bar{X} \bar{Y} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}; \\ \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}, Z) &= \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) + \varepsilon D_{\mathbf{W}} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) \mathbf{Q} + \varepsilon D_Z \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) \bar{Z} + \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \bar{\sigma} \bar{Y} Z.\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} = (\bar{X}, \bar{Y})^t$.

Let $T(t, s)$ be the fundamental solution to the linearised system

$$(12) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{Q}} \\ \dot{\bar{Z}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{\mathbf{W}}\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) & D_Z\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) \\ D_{\mathbf{W}}\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) & D_Z\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q} \\ \bar{Z} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then direct integration yields

Lemma 1. *The functions (\mathbf{Q}, \bar{Z}) satisfy the following integral equation:*

$$(13) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q} \\ R \end{pmatrix} = T(t, 0) \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 \\ R_0 \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon \delta \int_0^t T(t, s) \begin{pmatrix} \delta \bar{X} \bar{Y} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \bar{\sigma} \bar{Y} Z \end{pmatrix} ds + \\ - \int_0^t T(t, s) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{W}}^0(s) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} ds - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t T(t, s) \begin{pmatrix} K(s) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ L(s) \end{pmatrix} ds.$$

Moreover, the last term is bounded uniformly in ε .

We also have the following large time behaviour result for the linearised system (12):

Lemma 2. *Let $(\mathbf{Q}(t), \bar{Z}(t))$ be a solution to (12). Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{Q}(t), \bar{Z}(t)) = \mathbf{0}.$$

In particular, the solutions to (12) are bounded uniformly in time any given ε . Moreover, they are also uniformly bounded in $\varepsilon \leq 1$, for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. For notation convenience, let us write (12) as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{Q}} \\ \dot{\bar{Z}} \end{pmatrix} = A(\mathbf{W}^0, Z^0 + \hat{Z}^0) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q} \\ \bar{Z} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and (X_0, Y_0, Z_0) . From Theorem 2, we know that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{W}^0(t), Z^0(t) + \hat{Z}^0(t/\varepsilon)) = (\mathbf{W}^*, Z^*),$$

where (\mathbf{W}^*, Z^*) will be the globally asymptotic stable equilibrium given by Theorem 1. Therefore, there exists $T > 0$, such that $t > T$ implies that A is negative-definite. Since $\hat{Z}^0 \rightarrow 0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We can choose T such this holds for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$.

Because of the continuity of the solution with respect to the initial conditions, we have that T is a continuous function of the initial conditions. Since these lie on a compact set, we can pick T such that A is negative definite for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and for all (X_0, Y_0, Z_0) , such that $X_0, Y_0 \geq 0$, $X_0 + Y_0 \leq 1$ and $0 < Z_0 \leq 1$. But then, for any such (X_0, Y_0, Z_0) and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, we have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} T(t, T) = 0.$$

Therefore, for any initial condition $(Q_0, R_0)^t$, we shall have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} T(t, 0) \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 \\ R_0 \end{pmatrix} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} T(t, T) T(T, 0) \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 \\ R_0 \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

□

□

Proof of Theorem 3. First, we observe that the nonlinear term in (13) is locally Lipschitz, hence a standard fixed point yields existence and uniqueness for $0 \leq t < t_0$, for some, possibly small, t_0 .

From the decaying of $\hat{\mathbf{W}}^0$ and from Lemma 1, we conclude that the two last terms of (13) are uniformly bounded in time and ε .

Moreover, Lemma 2 implies that the first two terms on the right hand side of (13) are also uniformly bounded in time and in ε , for sufficiently small ε . Thus, we conclude that the same also holds true for $(Q, R)^t$. Therefore, the solution to (13) is globally defined in time, and it is bounded uniformly in ε , if the latter is sufficiently small.

The last assumption follows from the first, together with the fact that

$$\hat{Z}^0(\tau) \rightarrow 0.$$

□

□

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Adams and M. Boots. How important is vertical transmission in mosquitoes for the persistence of dengue? insights from a mathematical model. *Epidemics*, 2(1):1–10, Mar 2010.
- [2] M. Aguiar, S. Ballesteros, B. W. Kooi, and N. Stollenwerk. The role of seasonality and import in a minimalistic multi-strain dengue model capturing differences between primary and secondary infections: complex dynamics and its implications for data analysis. *J Theor Biol*, 289:181–96, Nov 2011.
- [3] A. Aldemir, H. Bedir, B. Demirci, and B. Alten. Biting activity of mosquito species (diptera: Culicidae) in the turkey-armenia border area, ararat valley, turkey. *J Med Entomol*, 47(1):22–7, Jan 2010.
- [4] R. M. Anderson and R. M. May. *Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control*. Oxford science publications. Oxford University Press, Oxford ;etc.¿, ;1st ed. 1991, repr.¿ edition, 1995.
- [5] M. Andraud, N. Hens, C. Marais, and P. Beutels. Dynamic epidemiological models for dengue transmission: a systematic review of structural approaches. *PLoS One*, 7(11):e49085, 2012.
- [6] N. T. J. Bailey. *The mathematical theory of infectious diseases*. Griffin, 1975.
- [7] R. Barrera, M. Amador, and G. G. Clark. Ecological factors influencing aedes aegypti (diptera: Culicidae) productivity in artificial containers in salinas, puerto rico. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 43(3):484–492, 2006.
- [8] J. G. Breman. Resistance to artemisinin-based combination therapy. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 12(11):820–822, 11 2012.
- [9] N. Britton. *Essential mathematical biology*. Springer Verlag, 2003.
- [10] L. Cai, S. Guo, X. Li, and M. Ghosh. Global dynamics of a dengue epidemic mathematical model. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 42(4):2297–2304, Nov. 2009.
- [11] CDC. Geographic distribution of chikungunya virus.
- [12] C. Chastel. Eventual role of asymptomatic cases of dengue for the introduction and spread of dengue viruses in non-endemic regions. *Front Physiol*, 3:70, 2012.
- [13] S.-C. Chen and M.-H. Hsieh. Modeling the transmission dynamics of dengue fever: implications of temperature effects. *Sci Total Environ*, 431:385–91, Aug 2012.
- [14] F. Dantas-Torres, B. B. Chomel, and D. Otranto. Ticks and tick-borne diseases: a one health perspective. *Trends Parasitol*, 28(10):437–46, Oct 2012.
- [15] M. R. David, R. L. de Oliveira, and R. M. de Freitas. Container productivity, daily survival rates and dispersal of aedes aegypti mosquitoes in a high income dengue epidemic neighbourhood of rio de janeiro: presumed influence of differential urban structure on mosquito biology. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz*, 104:927–932., 2009.
- [16] J.-C. Desenclos. Transmission parameters of vector-borne infections. *Med Mal Infect*, 41(11):588–93, Nov 2011.
- [17] O. Diekmann and J. Heesterbeek. *Mathematical epidemiology of infectious diseases: model building, analysis and interpretation*. Wiley series in mathematical and computational biology. Wiley, Chichester, 2000.
- [18] K. Dietz. Transmission and control of arbovirus diseases. In D. Ludwig and K. L. Cooke, editors, *Epidemiology*, pages 104–121. SIAM, 1975.
- [19] L. Esteva and C. Vargas. Analysis of a dengue disease transmission model. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 150(2):131–151, June 1998.
- [20] M. G. *The epidemiology and control of malaria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- [21] N. C. Grassly and C. Fraser. Mathematical models of infectious disease transmission. *Nat Rev Micro*, 6(6):477–487, 06 2008.
- [22] N. G. Gratz. Critical review of the vector status of aedes albopictus. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*, 18(3):215–227, 2004.
- [23] D. J. Gubler. Dengue and dengue hemorrhagic fever. *Clin Microbiol Rev*, 11(3):480–96, Jul 1998.
- [24] K. JC. On the use of mathematical models of malaria transmission. *Acta Trop*, 49(1):1–25, 1991.
- [25] L. Lambrechts, T. W. Scott, and D. J. Gubler. Consequences of the expanding global distribution of aedes albopictus for dengue virus transmission. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, 4(5):e646, 2010.
- [26] C. C. Lord. Modeling and biological control of mosquitoes. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc*, 23(2 Suppl):252–64, 2007.
- [27] P. M. Luz, C. T. Codeço, E. Massad, and C. J. Struchiner. Uncertainties regarding dengue modeling in rio de janeiro, brazil. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz*, 98(7):871–8, Oct 2003.
- [28] P. M. Luz, C. T. Codeço, J. Medlock, C. J. Struchiner, D. Valle, and A. P. Galvani. Impact of insecticide interventions on the abundance and resistance profile of aedes aegypti. *Epidemiol Infect*, 137(8):1203–15, Aug 2009.
- [29] P. M. Luz, C. J. Struchiner, and A. P. Galvani. Modeling transmission dynamics and control of vector-borne neglected tropical diseases. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, 4(10):e761, 2010.
- [30] S. Mandal, R. R. Sarkar, and S. Sinha. Mathematical models of malaria—a review. *Malar J*, 10:202, 2011.
- [31] L. E. Muir and B. H. Kay. Aedes aegypti survival and dispersal estimated by mark-release-recapture in northern australia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, 58(3):277–82, Mar 1998.
- [32] J. D. Murray. *Mathematical biology*, volume Vol. 17-18 of *Interdisciplinary applied mathematics*. Springer, New York, 3rd ed edition, 2002.
- [33] G. Ngwa and W. Shu. A mathematical model for endemic malaria with variable human and mosquito populations. *Math. Comput. Model.*, 32(7-8):747–763, Oct. 2000.
- [34] H. Nishiura. Mathematical and statistical analyses of the spread of dengue. *Dengue Bulletin*, 30:51–67, 2006.
- [35] L. C. Okell, C. J. Drakeley, T. Bousema, C. J. M. Whitty, and A. C. Ghani. Modelling the impact of artemisinin combination therapy and long-acting treatments on malaria transmission intensity. *PLoS Med*, 5(11):e226; discussion e226, Nov 2008.
- [36] R. O’Malley. *Singular perturbation methods for ordinary differential equations*. Springer, 1991.
- [37] L. R. Petersen and M. Fischer. Unpredictable and difficult to control—the adolescence of west nile virus. *N Engl J Med*, 367(14):1281–4, Oct 2012.
- [38] A. M. Powers. Chikungunya. *Clin Lab Med*, 30(1):209–19, Mar 2010.

- [39] A. M. Powers, A. C. Brault, R. B. Tesh, and S. C. Weaver. Re-emergence of chikungunya and o'nyong-nyong viruses: evidence for distinct geographical lineages and distant evolutionary relationships. *J Gen Virol*, 81(Pt 2):471–9, Feb 2000.
- [40] R. R. *The prevention of malaria*. London: Murray, 2nd edition, 1911.
- [41] S. Rajapakse, C. Rodrigo, and A. Rajapakse. Atypical manifestations of chikungunya infection. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg*, 104(2):89–96, Feb 2010.
- [42] T. W. Scott, P. H. Amerasinghe, A. C. Morrison, L. H. Lorenz, G. G. Clark, D. Strickman, P. Kittayapong, and J. D. Edman. Longitudinal studies of aedes aegypti (diptera: Culicidae) in thailand and puerto rico: blood feeding frequency. *J Med Entomol*, 37(1):89–101, Jan 2000.
- [43] T. W. Scott, E. Chow, D. Strickman, P. Kittayapong, R. A. Wirtz, L. H. Lorenz, and J. D. Edman. Blood-feeding patterns of aedes aegypti (diptera: Culicidae) collected in a rural thai village. *J Med Entomol*, 30(5):922–7, Sep 1993.
- [44] T. W. Scott, A. C. Morrison, L. H. Lorenz, G. G. Clark, D. Strickman, P. Kittayapong, H. Zhou, and J. D. Edman. Longitudinal studies of aedes aegypti (diptera: Culicidae) in thailand and puerto rico: population dynamics. *J Med Entomol*, 37(1):77–88, Jan 2000.
- [45] D. L. Smith, K. E. Battle, S. I. Hay, C. M. Barker, T. W. Scott, and F. E. McKenzie. Ross, Macdonald, and a theory for the dynamics and control of mosquito-transmitted pathogens. *PLoS Pathog*, 8(4):e1002588, 2012.
- [46] L. M. Styer, S. L. Minnick, A. K. Sun, and T. W. Scott. Mortality and reproductive dynamics of aedes aegypti (diptera: Culicidae) fed human blood. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis*, 7(1):86–98, 2007.
- [47] J. J. Tewa, J. L. Dimi, and S. Bowong. Lyapunov functions for a dengue disease transmission model. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 39(2):936–941, Jan. 2009.
- [48] O. Tomori. Yellow fever: the recurring plague. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci*, 41(4):391–427, 2004.
- [49] WHO. Dengue and severe dengue.
- [50] H. Yang, H. Wei, and X. Li. Global stability of an epidemic model for vector-borne disease, 2010-04-01.
- [51] H. M. Yang, M. L. G. Macoris, K. C. Galvani, M. T. M. Andrighetti, and D. M. V. Wanderley. Assessing the effects of temperature on dengue transmission. *Epidemiol Infect*, 137(8):1179–87, Aug 2009.
- [52] H. M. Yang, M. L. G. Macoris, K. C. Galvani, M. T. M. Andrighetti, and D. M. V. Wanderley. Assessing the effects of temperature on the population of aedes aegypti, the vector of dengue. *Epidemiol Infect*, 137(8):1188–202, Aug 2009.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, R. MÁRIO SANTOS BRAGA, S/N, 22240-920, NITERÓI, RJ, BRASIL.

E-mail address: msouza@mat.uff.br