

PERSISTENCE IN PHAGE-BACTERIA COMMUNITIES WITH NESTED AND ONE-TO-ONE INFECTION NETWORKS

DANIEL A. KORYTOWSKI AND HAL L. SMITH

School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287, USA

ABSTRACT. We show that a bacteria and bacteriophage system with either a perfectly nested or a one-to-one infection network is permanent, a.k.a uniformly persistent, provided that bacteria that are superior competitors for nutrient devote the least to defence against infection and the virus that are the most efficient at infecting host have the smallest host range. By ensuring that the density-dependent reduction in bacterial growth rates are independent of bacterial strain, we are able to arrive at the permanence conclusion sought by Jover et al [1]. The same permanence results hold for the one-to-one infection network considered by Thingstad [7] but without virus efficiency ordering. Additionally we show the global stability for the nested infection network, and the global dynamics for the one-to-one network.

1. INTRODUCTION

Jover, Cortez, and Weitz [1] observe that some bipartite infection networks in bacteria and virus communities tend to have a nested structure, characterized by a hierarchy among both host and virus strains, which determines which virus may infect which host. They argue that trade-offs between competitive ability of the bacteria hosts and defence against infection and, on the part of virus, between virulence and transmissibility versus host range can sustain a nested infection network (NIN). Specifically, they find that: “bacterial growth rate should decrease with increasing defence against infection” and “the efficiency of viral infection should decrease with host range”. Their findings are based on the analysis of a Lotka-Volterra model incorporating the above-mentioned trade-offs which strongly suggests that the perfectly nested community structure of n -host bacteria and n -virus is permanent, or uniformly persistent [2, 4].

Inspired by their work, in [6] we replace the Lotka-Volterra model by a chemostat based model in which bacteria compete for a growth-limiting nutrient. In a chemostat model, each bacterial strain is endowed with a break-even concentration, R^* , of nutrient below which it cannot grow such that, in the absence of virus, only the strain with smallest R^* survives. Thus, within a community of bacteria competing for a single limiting nutrient, the competitiveness of the various strains are naturally ordered by their R^* values. In [6], we show that nested infection networks of arbitrary size are permanent provided that R^* values increase with increasing defence against infection and that the efficiency of viral infection should decrease with host range. We also show how a bacteria-virus community with NIN of arbitrary size can be assembled by the successive addition of one new species at a time, answering the question of “How do NIN come to be?”.

We show that the Lotka-Volterra based model of Jover et al [1] can be modified in such a way that the permanence conclusions which they sought can be attained. The key is to ensure that density-dependent reduction in bacterial growth rates be independent of bacterial strain. Following [1], we assume that virus strain V_i is characterized by its adsorption rate ϕ_i and its burst size β_i , both of which are assumed to be independent of which host strain it infects, and its specific death rate n_i . The density of bacteria strain i is denoted by B_i , and its specific growth rate is r_i . The “mean field”, density-dependent depression of growth due to inter and intra-specific competition term $\sum_j a_j B_j$ is common to all strains. The equations of our model are the following.

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} B'_i &= B_i \left(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j B_j \right) - B_i \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} \phi_j V_j \\ V'_i &= \beta_i \phi_i V_i \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ji} B_j - n_i V_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

where matrix M captures the infection network structure:

$$M_{ij} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1, & V_j \text{ infects } H_i \\ 0, & V_j \text{ does not infect } H_i \end{array} \right\}$$

In the system considered in [1], the bacterial host dynamics in the absence of virus is modeled as $B'_i = r_i B_i (1 - K^{-1} \sum_j B_j)$; a consequence of this is the simplex of equilibria $\sum_j B_j = K$. We avoid this.

Motivated by the work of Jover et al [1] and the work of Thingstad [7], we consider two special network structures: nested infection networks (NIN) with upper triangular matrix M , and one-to-one infection networks (OIN) with $M = I$, the identity matrix.

The scaling of variables

$$P_i = \phi_i V_i, \quad H_i = B_i, \quad e_i = \frac{\beta_i \phi_i}{n_i},$$

exposes a virus infection efficiency parameter e_i for each virus. Hereafter, we consider the resulting scaled system:

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} H'_i &= H_i \left(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j H_j \right) - H_i \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} P_j \\ P'_i &= e_i n_i P_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n M_{ji} H_j - \frac{1}{e_i} \right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

System (1.2) defines a dissipative dynamical system on the nonnegative orthant of \mathbb{R}^{2n}

Proposition 1.1. *Solutions of (1.2) with nonnegative (positive) initial data are well-defined for all $t \geq 0$ and remain nonnegative (positive). In addition, the system has a compact global attractor. Indeed, if $F(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{P_i(t)}{e_i n_i}$ then*

$$F(t) \leq \frac{Q}{W} + (F(0) - \frac{Q}{W})e^{-Wt} \leq \max\{F(0), \frac{Q}{W}\},$$

and

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{r_i}{W}\right) \frac{r_i}{a_i},$$

where $K = \max_{i=1}^n \{H_i(0), \frac{r_i}{a_i}\}$, $W = \min_{i=1}^n \{n_i\}$ and $Q = \sum_{i=1}^n (W + r_i)K$.

Proof. Existence and positivity of solutions follow from the form of the right hand side. Therefore, $H'_i(t) \leq H_i(t)(r_i - a_i H_i(t))$. Hence $H_i(t) \leq K$ and $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} H_i(t) \leq r_i/a_i$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dF}{dt} &= \sum_{i=1}^n r_i H_i - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n H_i \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j H_j \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{P_i}{e_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n r_i H_i - W \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{P_i}{e_i n_i} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (W + r_i) H_i - WF. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate on $F(t)$ follows by bounding the first summation by Q and integrating; the estimate on the limit superior follows from the estimate of the limit superior of the H_i above and by integration. \square

2. NESTED INFECTION NETWORKS

If M is upper triangular, then our system becomes:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} H'_i &= H_i \left(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j H_j - \sum_{j \geq i} P_j \right) \\ P'_i &= e_i n_i P_i \left(\sum_{j \leq i} H_j - \frac{1}{e_i} \right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Let E^* be the equilibrium of the system where each component is positive. From the second equation of (2.1),

$$H_1^* = \frac{1}{e_1}, \quad H_j^* = \frac{1}{e_j} - \frac{1}{e_{j-1}}, \quad j > 1$$

These are all positive if

$$(2.2) \quad e_1 > e_2 > e_3 > \cdots > e_n$$

Let $F_i(H) = r_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j H_j$, then at E^* from the first equation of (2.1), $F_i(H^*) = \sum_{j \geq i} P_j^*$. Let

$$(2.3) \quad Q_n = \frac{a_1}{e_1} + \left(\frac{a_2}{e_2} - \frac{a_2}{e_1} \right) + \left(\frac{a_3}{e_3} - \frac{a_3}{e_2} \right) + \cdots + \left(\frac{a_n}{e_n} - \frac{a_n}{e_{n-1}} \right)$$

The right hand side of $F_i(H^*)$ is positive, and decreases as i increases, therefore $F_i(H^*)$ needs to be positive and decreasing which is satisfied by

$$(2.4) \quad Q_n < r_n$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad r_1 > r_2 > \cdots > r_n.$$

Inequalities (2.4) and (2.5) can be combined to give

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{a_1}{e_1} \leq Q_j \leq Q_n < r_n < r_j, \quad 1 \leq j < n.$$

Proposition 2.1. E^* exists if and only if (2.2), (2.4) and (2.5) hold. In fact,

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} H_1^* &= \frac{1}{e_1}, \quad H_j^* = \frac{1}{e_j} - \frac{1}{e_{j-1}}, \quad j > 1, \\ P_j^* &= r_j - r_{j+1}, \quad j < n, \quad P_n^* = r_n - Q_n. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the above also implies the existence of a unique equilibrium E^\dagger with all components positive except for $P_n = 0$. In fact,

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} H_n^\dagger &= H_n^* + \frac{P_n^*}{a_n}, \quad H_j^\dagger = H_j^*, \quad 1 \leq j < n, \\ P_j^\dagger &= P_j^*, \quad j < n, \quad P_n^\dagger = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.2. (2.6) implies the existence of an unique family of equilibria E_k^* with $H_j, P_j = 0$, $j > k$ described by (2.7), but with Q_k replacing Q_n . Another family of equilibria, E_k^\dagger , exists with $H_j = 0$, $j > k$ and $P_j = 0$, $j \geq k$ described by (2.8), but with Q_k replacing Q_n . There are many other equilibria but we have no need to enumerate all of them.

Hereafter, we assume without further comment that (2.4), and (2.5) hold.

We write $H_{i,\infty} = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} H_i(t)$ and H_i^∞ with limit superior in place of limit inferior.

Proposition 2.3. (a) If $(\sum_{j \leq i} H_j(t))^\infty < \frac{1}{e_i}$ then $P_i(t) \rightarrow 0$.
 (b) If $i < j$, $P_i(0) > 0$, and if $(H_{i+1} + H_{i+2} + \cdots + H_j)^\infty < \frac{1}{e_j} - \frac{1}{e_i}$ then $P_j(t) \rightarrow 0$.
 (c) If $i < j$, $H_i(0) > 0$, and if $(P_i + P_{i+1} + \cdots + P_{j-1})^\infty < (r_i - r_j)$ then $H_j(t) \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. of (a): The equation for P_i implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \log P_i^{\frac{1}{n_i e_i}} = \sum_{j \leq i} H_j(t) - \frac{1}{e_i}$$

If $(\sum_{j \leq i} H_j(t))^\infty < \frac{1}{e_i}$ is false, then $P_i \rightarrow \infty$, a contradiction to P_i being bounded. Assertion (a) is transparent.

Proof of (b): If $i < j$, $P_i(0) > 0$, and if $(H_{i+1} + H_{i+2} + \cdots + H_j)^\infty < \frac{1}{e_j} - \frac{1}{e_i}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \log \frac{P_i^{\frac{1}{n_i e_i}}}{P_j^{\frac{1}{n_j e_j}}} &= \frac{P'_i}{e_i n_i P_i} - \frac{P'_j}{n_j e_j P_j} \\ &= \frac{-1}{e_i} + \frac{1}{e_j} - (H_{i+1} + H_{i+2} + \cdots + H_j) \geq \epsilon, t \geq T \end{aligned}$$

for some $\epsilon, T > 0$. Therefore, $\frac{P_i^{\frac{1}{n_i e_i}}}{P_j^{\frac{1}{n_j e_j}}} \rightarrow \infty$, and since P_i, P_j are bounded,

$P_j(t) \rightarrow 0$.

Proof of (c): assume that $H_i(0) > 0$ and $(P_i + P_{i+1} + \cdots + P_{j-1})^\infty < (r_i - r_j)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \log \frac{H_i(t)}{H_j(t)} &= \frac{H'_i}{H_i} - \frac{H'_j}{H_j} \\ &= (r_i - r_j) - (P_i(t) + P_{i+1}(t) + \cdots + P_{j-1}(t)) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\frac{H_i}{H_j} \rightarrow \infty$, and since H_i, H_j are bounded, $H_j(t) \rightarrow 0$. \square

If there are no virus present, then host H_1 drives the other hosts to extinction.

Lemma 2.4. *If $P_i \equiv 0, 1 \leq i \leq n, H_1(0) > 0$ then $H_1 \rightarrow \frac{r_1}{a_1}$.*

Proof. Since $P_i \equiv 0, H_{i+1} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (c) for $1 \leq i < n$. Therefore $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists T > 0$ such that $\forall t \geq T, \sum_{j=2}^n a_j H_j(t) < \epsilon$. Then for $t > T, H'_1 > H_1(r_1 - a_1 H_1 - 2\epsilon)$. Therefore $H_{1,\infty} \geq \frac{r_1 - 2\epsilon}{a_1}$ and since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $H_{1,\infty} \geq \frac{r_1}{a_1}$. On the other hand, $H'_1 \leq H_1(r_1 - a_1 H_1)$, so $H_1^\infty \leq \frac{r_1}{a_1}$. Therefore $H_1 \rightarrow \frac{r_1}{a_1}$. \square

Now we show that H_1 persists if initially present regardless of who else is around; similarly, H_1 and V_1 persist if initially present regardless of which other host and virus are present.

Proposition 2.5. (a) *If $H_1(0) > 0$, then $H_1^\infty \geq \frac{1}{e_1}$.*

(b) *If $H_1(0) > 0$ and $P_1(0) > 0$, then*

$$H_1^\infty \geq \frac{1}{e_1}, \quad P_1^\infty \geq \min\left\{r_1 - r_2, \frac{r_1 e_1 - a_1}{e_1}\right\}.$$

Proof. of (a). Assume the conclusion is false. Then $P_1 \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (a).

If $P_i(0) = 0$ for all i , then $H_1(t) \rightarrow \frac{r_1}{a_1} \geq \frac{1}{e_1}$ by Lemma 2.4 and (2.6), so we suppose that $P_i(0) > 0$ for some i . Let k denote the smallest such integer i for which $P_i(0) > 0$.

If $k = 1$, then, as noted above, $P_1 \rightarrow 0$ and so $H_2 \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (c). Then $P_2 \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (a) or (b).

If $k = 2$, then $P_1 \equiv 0$ so $H_2 \rightarrow 0$ by Lemma 2.3 (c) since H_1 and H_2 share the same virus. Since $(H_1 + H_2)^\infty = H_1^\infty < \frac{1}{e_1} < \frac{1}{e_2}$, it follows that $P_2 \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (a). Now we can use Proposition 2.3 (c) to show $H_3 \rightarrow 0$ and then Proposition 2.3 (a) or (b) to show $P_3 \rightarrow 0$.

If $k > 2$, then $P_1 \equiv P_2 \equiv \dots \equiv P_{k-1} \equiv 0$ and $P_k(0) > 0$. As H_1, \dots, H_{k-1} share the same virus, then $H_i \equiv 0$ or $H_i \rightarrow 0$ for $1 < i \leq k-1$ by Proposition 2.3 (c). $H_k \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (c). Then, $P_k \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (a) since $(\sum_{j \leq k} H_j)^\infty = H_1^\infty < \frac{1}{e_1} < \frac{1}{e_k}$. So $H_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (c). Proposition 2.3 (a) or (b) implies that $P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$.

We see that for all values of k , $H_2, \dots, H_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$ and $P_1, \dots, P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$. Successive additional applications of Proposition 2.3 (a) or (b) and (c) then imply that $H_2, \dots, H_n \rightarrow 0$ and $P_1, \dots, P_n \rightarrow 0$. But, then for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$H_1'(t)/(H_1) \geq r_1 - \epsilon - a_1 H_1, \quad t \geq T.$$

This implies that $H_1^\infty > \frac{r_1}{a_1} > \frac{1}{e_1}$, by (2.4), a contradiction. This completes the proof of the first assertion.

Proof of (b): Now, suppose that $H_1(0) > 0, P_1(0) > 0$ and $P_1^\infty < r_1 - r_2$.

Proposition 2.3 (c) implies that $H_2 \rightarrow 0$. By Proposition 2.3 (b), $P_2 \rightarrow 0$. Applying Proposition 2.3 (c) with $i = 1$ and $j = 3$, as $(P_1 + P_2)^\infty = P_1^\infty < r_1 - r_2 < r_1 - r_3$, we conclude that $H_3 \rightarrow 0$. Then, Proposition 2.3 (b) implies that $P_3 \rightarrow 0$. Clearly, we can continue sequential application of Proposition 2.3 (b) and (c) to conclude that $H_i, P_i \rightarrow 0$ for $i > 1$. Then we use that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \log H_1 P_1^{\frac{a_1}{e_1 n_1}} &= \frac{H_1'}{H_1} + \frac{a_1 P_1'}{P_1 e_1 n_1} \\ &= r_1 - \frac{a_1}{e_1} - P_1 - \text{terms that go to zero} \end{aligned}$$

to conclude that $P_1^\infty \geq \frac{r_1 e_1 - a_1}{e_1}$. \square

Lemma 2.6 (Lemma 1.2 [6]). *Let $x(t)$ be a bounded positive solution of the Lotka-Volterra system*

$$x'_i = x_i(r_i + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}x_j), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n$$

and suppose there exists $k < n$ and $m, M, \delta > 0$ such that $m \leq x_i(t) \leq M$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, $t > 0$, $x_{k+1}(t) \leq \delta$, $t > 0$, and $x_j(t) \rightarrow 0$ for $j > k + 1$. Suppose also that the $k \times k$ subsystem obtained by setting $x_j = 0$, $j > k$ has a unique positive equilibrium $p = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k)$. Then

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x_i(t) dt = p_i + O(\delta), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

The same expression holds for the limit superior.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

- (a) *There exists $\epsilon_k > 0$ such that if $H_i(0) > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $P_j(0) > 0$, $1 \leq j \leq k - 1$, then*

$$H_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } P_{j,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k - 1.$$

- (b) *There exists $\epsilon_k > 0$ such that if $H_i(0) > 0$, $P_i(0) > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, then*

$$H_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad P_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

Proof. We use the notation $[H_i]_t \equiv \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t H_i(s) ds$. Our proof is by mathematical induction using the ordering of the $2n$ cases as follows

$$(a, 1) < (b, 1) < (a, 2) < (b, 2) < \dots < (a, n) < (b, n)$$

where (a, k) denotes case (a) with index k .

The cases $(a, 1)$ and $(b, 1)$ follow immediately from Proposition 2.5 and Corollary 4.8 in [4] with persistence function $\rho = \min\{H_1, P_1\}$ in case $(b, 1)$. The latter result says that weak (limsup) uniform persistence implies strong (liminf) uniform persistence when the dynamical system is dissipative.

For the induction step, assuming that (a, k) holds, we prove that (b, k) holds and assuming that (b, k) holds, we prove that $(a, k + 1)$ holds.

We begin by assuming that (a, k) holds and prove that (b, k) holds. We consider solutions satisfying $H_i(0) > 0, P_i(0) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Note that other components $H_j(0)$ or $P_j(0)$ for $j > k$ may be positive or zero, we make no assumptions. As (a, k) holds, there exists $\epsilon_k > 0$ such that $H_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $P_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k$, $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. We need only show the existence of $\delta > 0$ such that $P_{k,\infty} \geq \delta$ for every solution with initial values as described above. In fact, by Corollary 4.8 in [4],

weak uniform persistence implies strong uniform persistence, it suffices to show that $P_k^\infty \geq \delta$.

If $P_k^\infty < r_k - r_{k+1}$, then $H_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (c). Then, by Proposition 2.3 (b), $P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$. Clearly, we may sequentially apply Proposition 2.3 (b) and (c) to show that $H_j \rightarrow 0, P_j \rightarrow 0$ for $j \geq k+1$.

If there is no $\delta > 0$ such that $P_k^\infty \geq \delta$ for every solution with initial data as described above, then for every $\delta > 0$, we may find a solution with such initial data such that $P_k^\infty < \delta$. By a translation of time, we may assume that $P_k(t) \leq \delta, t \geq 0$ for $0 < \delta < r_k - r_{k+1}$ to be determined later. Then $H_j, P_j \rightarrow 0, j \geq k+1$. Now, as (a, k) holds, we may apply Lemma 2.6. The subsystem with $H_i = 0, k+1 \leq i \leq n$ and $P_i = 0, k \leq i \leq n$ has a unique positive equilibrium by Proposition 2.1. See Remark 2.2. The equation

$$\frac{P'_k}{P_k e_k n_k} = \sum_{j \leq k} H_j - \frac{1}{e_k}$$

implies that

$$\frac{1}{t} \log \frac{P_k^{e_k n_k}(t)}{P_k^{e_k n_k}(0)} = \sum_{j \leq k} [H_j]_t - \frac{1}{e_k}.$$

By (2.8) and Lemma 2.6, we have for large t

$$\sum_{j \leq k} [H_j]_t - \frac{1}{e_k} = \sum_{j \leq k} H_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{e_k} + O(\delta) = \frac{1}{e_{k-1}} + q - \frac{1}{e_k} + O(\delta)$$

where $q = \frac{1}{a_k}(r_k - Q_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{e_{k-1}} - \frac{1}{e_k} > 0$. On choosing δ small enough and an appropriate solution, then $\sum_{j \leq k} [H_j]_t - \frac{1}{e_k} > q/2$ for large t , implying that $P_k \rightarrow +\infty$, a contradiction. We have proved that (a, k) implies (b, k) .

Now, we assume that (b, k) holds and prove that $(a, k+1)$ holds. We consider solutions satisfying

$H_i(0) > 0, P_i(0) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $H_{k+1}(0) > 0$. As (b, k) holds by assumption, and following the same arguments as in the previous case, we only need to show that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $H_{k+1}^\infty \geq \delta$ for all solutions with initial data as just described.

If $H_{k+1}^\infty < \frac{1}{e_{k+1}} - \frac{1}{e_k}$, then $P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (b) and then $H_{k+2} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (c). This reasoning may be iterated to yield $H_i \rightarrow 0, k+2 \leq i \leq n$ and $P_i \rightarrow 0, k+1 \leq i \leq n$.

If there is no $\delta > 0$ such that $H_{k+1}^\infty \geq \delta$ for every solution with initial data as described above, then for every $\delta > 0$, we may find a solution with such initial data such that $H_{k+1}^\infty < \delta$. By a translation of

time, we may assume that $H_{k+1}(t) \leq \delta$, $t \geq 0$ for $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{e_{k+1}} - \frac{1}{e_k}$ to be determined later. Then $H_j, P_j \rightarrow 0, j \geq k+2$ and $P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$. Now, using that (b, k) holds, we apply Lemma 2.6. The subsystem with $H_i = 0, P_i = 0, k+1 \leq i \leq n$ has a unique positive equilibrium by Proposition 2.1. See Remark 2.2. The equation for H_{k+1} is

$$\frac{H'_{k+1}}{H_{k+1}} = r_{k+1} - \sum_{j=1}^k a_j H_j - \sum_{j=k+1}^n a_j H_j - \sum_{j=k+1}^n P_j$$

Integrating, we have

$$\frac{1}{t} \log \frac{H_{k+1}(t)}{H_{k+1}(0)} = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} a_j [H_j]_t + O(1/t)$$

By Remark 2.2 and Lemma 2.6, we have that for all large t By (2.7) and Lemma 2.6, we have that for all large t

$$\sum_{j=1}^k a_j [H_j] = \sum_{j=1}^k a_j H_j^* + O(\delta) = Q_n + O(\delta)$$

since $H_{k+1}(t) \leq \delta$, $[H_{k+1}]_t = O(\delta)$. Now, $Q_n > 0$ so by choosing δ sufficiently small and an appropriate solution, we can ensure that the right hand side is bounded below by a positive constant for all large t , implying that $H_{k+1}(t)$ is unbounded. This contradiction completes our proof that (b, k) implies $(a, k+1)$. Thus, our proof is complete by mathematical induction. \square

Corollary 2.8. *For every solution of (2.1) starting with all components positive, we have that*

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t H_i(s) ds \rightarrow H_i^*, \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_i(s) ds \rightarrow P_i^*$$

where H_i^*, P_i^* are as in (2.7).

For every solution of (2.1) starting with all components positive except

$P_n(0) = 0$, *we have that*

$$(2.10) \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t H_i(s) ds \rightarrow H_i^\dagger, \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_i(s) ds \rightarrow P_i^\dagger$$

where H_i^\dagger, P_i^\dagger are as in (2.8).

Proof. This follows from the previous theorem together with Theorem 5.2.3 in [2]. \square

3. GLOBAL STABILITY FOR NIN IN A SPECIAL CASE

Positive equilibrium E^* exists so we can write the system as

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} H'_i &= H_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j (H_j^* - H_j) + \sum_{j \geq i} (P_j^* - P_j) \right) \\ P'_i &= e_i n_i P_i \left(\sum_{j \leq i} (H_j - H_j^*) \right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Let $U(x, x^*) = x - x^* - x^* \log x/x^*$, $x, x^* > 0$, be the familiar Volterra function and let

$$V = \sum_i c_i U(H_i, H_i^*) + \sum_i d_i U(P_i, P_i^*)$$

where c_1, \dots, c_n and d_1, \dots, d_n are to be determined.

Then the derivative of V along solutions of (3.1), \dot{V} , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= - \left(\sum_i c_i (H_i - H_i^*) \right) \left(\sum_j a_j (H_j - H_j^*) \right) - \sum_i c_i (H_i - H_i^*) \sum_{j \geq i} (P_j - P_j^*) \\ &\quad + \sum_i d_i e_i n_i (P_i - P_i^*) \sum_{j \leq i} (H_j - H_j^*) \end{aligned}$$

We aim to choose parameters so that the last two terms cancel each other. The second summation may be rewritten as $\sum_i (P_i - P_i^*) \sum_{j \leq i} c_j (H_j - H_j^*)$ so that the last two sums may be combined as $\sum_i (P_i - P_i^*) \sum_{j \leq i} (d_i e_i n_i - c_j) (H_j - H_j^*)$. It vanishes if $\forall i, d_i e_i n_i - c_j = 0$, $j \leq i$. Taking $i = n$, we see that the c_j must be identical so $c_j = a$ for all j for some $a > 0$ and $d_i = a/e_i n_i$. Therefore, in this case, we have

$$\dot{V} = - \left(\sum_i a (H_i - H_i^*) \right) \left(\sum_j a_j (H_j - H_j^*) \right)$$

If, in addition, $a_j = a$ for all j , then we have

$$(3.2) \quad \dot{V} = -a^2 \left(\sum_i H_i - \sum_i H_i^* \right)^2$$

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that (2.4) holds and $a_j = a > 0$, $1 \leq j \leq n$ in (3.1). Then E^* is globally asymptotically stable relative to the open positive orthant of \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} .*

With the same assumptions, but H_i^\dagger, V_i^\dagger replacing H_i^*, V_i^* and additionally $P_n \equiv 0$, E^\dagger is globally asymptotically stable relative to the open positive orthant of \mathbb{R}_+^{2n-1} .

Proof. We first note that since $V(H(t), P(t)) \leq V(H(0), P(0)), t \geq 0$ for every positive solution of (3.1), each component is bounded above and below: $0 < p \leq x(t) \leq P, t \geq 0$, where $x = H_i, P_j$ and p, P may depend on the solution.

Consider a positive solution of (3.1). By LaSalle's invariance principle, every point in its (invariant) limit set L must satisfy $\sum_i H_i = \sum_i H_i^*$ since $L \subset \{(H, V) : \dot{V} = 0\}$. Since $V(x) \leq V(H(0), P(0))$ for all $x \in L$, L belongs to the interior of the positive orthant and it is bounded away (but maybe not uniformly) from the boundary of the orthant. We now consider a trajectory belonging to L ; until further notice, all considerations involve this solution. Notice that this solution satisfies

$$(3.3) \quad H_i' = H_i \left(\sum_{j \geq i} (P_j^* - P_j) \right)$$

$$(3.4) \quad P_i' = e_i n_i P_i \left(\sum_{j \leq i} (H_j - H_j^*) \right)$$

From (3.4), we see that $P_n' \equiv 0$ so $P_n(t)$ is constant. Then, $H_n' = H_n(P_n^* - P_n)$ so $H_n(t)$ is either converging exponentially fast to zero, blowing up to infinity, or identically constant depending on the value of P_n . The only alternative that is consistent with L being invariant, bounded, and bounded away from the boundary of the orthant is that $H_n(t)$ is constant and that $P_n = P_n^*$. As we use a similar argument repeatedly below, we refer to it as our standard argument.

Since H_n is constant and $\sum_i H_i$ is constant, equal to $\sum_i H_i^*$, then so is $\sum_{i \leq n-1} H_i$ a constant. But now we face the same dilemma as above with the equation (3.4) with $i = n - 1$ since the sum in parentheses is constant. By our standard argument, the only alternative is that this constant is zero, i.e., that $\sum_{i \leq n-1} H_i = \sum_{i \leq n-1} H_i^*$ and $P_{n-1}(t)$ is constant. The former implies that

$$H_n = \sum_i H_i - \sum_{i \leq n-1} H_i = H_n^*.$$

Suppose that $1 < k \leq n$ and that $H_i(t) \equiv H_i^*, P_i(t) \equiv P_i^*, i \geq k$, hold. We claim that $H_{k-1}(t) \equiv H_{k-1}^*, P_{k-1}(t) \equiv P_{k-1}^*$. As $P_k(t)$ is constant, (3.4) implies that $\sum_{j \leq k} H_j(t) = \sum_{j \leq k} H_j^*$ and since $H_k = H_k^*$, it follows that $\sum_{j \leq k-1} H_j(t) = \sum_{j \leq k-1} H_j^*$. Notice that if $k = 2$, then

the latter gives that $H_1 = H_1^*$. Now from (3.4), $P'_{k-1}(t) = 0$ so $P_{k-1}(t)$ is constant. This implies, by (3.3) and our standard argument, that $H'_{k-1} = 0$ and $P_{k-1}(t) = P_{k-1}^*$. If $k = 2$, we are done: $H_1 = H_1^*$, $P_1 = P_1^*$. If $k > 2$, then $\sum_{j \leq k-2} H_j(t) = \sum_{j \leq k-1} H_j(t) - H_{k-1}(t)$ is constant so from (3.4) and our standard argument we conclude that $P'_{k-2} = 0$ and that $\sum_{j \leq k-2} H_j(t) = \sum_{j \leq k-2} H_j^*$. The latter implies that

$$H_{k-1} = \sum_{j \leq k-1} H_j - \sum_{j \leq k-2} H_j = \sum_{j \leq k-1} H_j^* - \sum_{j \leq k-2} H_j^* = H_{k-1}^*.$$

This completes our proof of the claim. By induction, we conclude that $H_i(t) \equiv H_i^*$, $P_i(t) \equiv P_i^*$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, i.e., our solution is identical to E^* . Since we considered an arbitrary solution starting at a point of L , it follows that $L = \{E^*\}$. As our chosen solution was an arbitrary positive solution, we have established the result.

The arguments are nearly identical for the E^\dagger case. From (3.3), $H'_n = 0$ since $P_n \equiv 0$, therefore the standard argument starts at $n - 1$ instead. \square

4. ONE-TO-ONE INFECTION NETWORK

$M = I$ in the one-to-one infection network so the equations then becomes:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} H'_i &= H_i \left(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j H_j \right) - H_i P_i \\ P'_i &= e_i n_i P_i \left(H_i - \frac{1}{e_i} \right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

The principle equilibrium for the one-to-one infection network are now described.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists an equilibrium E^* with H_i and P_i positive for all i if and only if the following inequality holds:*

$$(4.2) \quad \tilde{Q}_n < r_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \quad \tilde{Q}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{e_i}.$$

In fact,

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} H_j^* &= \frac{1}{e_j}, \quad j \geq 1, \\ P_j^* &= r_j - \tilde{Q}_n, \quad j \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The positive equilibrium E^* is unique.

We also note the existence of a unique equilibrium E^\dagger , with all components positive except for $P_n = 0$, given by

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} H_j^\dagger &= H_j^*, \quad 1 \leq j < n, \\ H_n^\dagger &= H_n^* + \frac{P_n^*}{a_n}, \\ P_j^\dagger &= P_j^* - P_n^* = r_j - r_n, \quad j \leq n, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $r_n < r_j, j \neq n$.

Remark 4.2. We will assume hereafter that

$$(4.5) \quad r_1 > r_2 > \cdots > r_n.$$

This hypothesis ensures the existence of a family of equilibria $E_k^*, E_k^\dagger, 1 \leq k \leq n$, characterized as follows. E_k^* with $H_j, P_j = 0, j > k$ is described by (4.3) but with \tilde{Q}_k replacing \tilde{Q}_n . E_k^\dagger satisfies $H_j = 0, j > k$ and $P_j = 0, j \geq k$ described by (4.4) but with \tilde{Q}_k replacing \tilde{Q}_n .

Proposition 4.3. (a) If $H_i(t)^\infty < \frac{1}{e_i}$ then $P_i(t) \rightarrow 0$.

(b) If $i < j, H_i(0) > 0$, and $(P_i - P_j)^\infty < r_i - r_j$, then $H_j(t) \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. of (a). The equation for P_i implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \log P_i^{\frac{1}{e_i}} = H_i(t) - \frac{1}{e_i}$$

If $H_i(t)^\infty < \frac{1}{e_i}$ then $P_i \rightarrow 0$.

Proof of (b). Assume that $i < j, H_i(0), H_j(0) > 0$ and $(P_i - P_j)^\infty < r_i - r_j$. As

$$\frac{d}{dt} \log \frac{H_i(t)}{H_j(t)} = \frac{H_i'}{H_i} - \frac{H_j'}{H_j} = (r_i - r_j) - (P_i(t) - P_j(t)),$$

it follows that $\frac{H_i}{H_j} \rightarrow \infty$, which by the boundedness of H_i, H_j , implies that $H_j(t) \rightarrow 0$. \square

Lemma 4.4. If $P_1 \equiv 0, H_1(0) > 0$ then $H_1 \rightarrow \frac{r_1}{a_1}$.

Proof. Since $P_1 \equiv 0, H_i \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 2.3 (b) for $1 < i \leq n$. Therefore, $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists T > 0$ such that $\forall t \geq T, \sum_{j=2}^n a_j H_j(t) < \epsilon$. Then for $t > T, H_1' > H_1(r_1 - a_1 H_1 - 2\epsilon)$. Therefore $H_{1,\infty} \geq \frac{r_1 - 2\epsilon}{a_1}$ and since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $H_{1,\infty} \geq \frac{r_1}{a_1}$. On the other hand, $H_1' \leq H_1(r_1 - a_1 H_1)$, so $H_1^\infty \leq \frac{r_1}{a_1}$. Therefore $H_1 \rightarrow \frac{r_1}{a_1}$. \square

Proposition 4.5. (a) If $H_1(0) > 0$, then $H_1^\infty \geq \frac{1}{e_1}$.

(b) If $H_1(0) > 0$ and $P_1(0) > 0$, then

$$H_1^\infty \geq \frac{1}{e_1}, \quad P_1^\infty \geq \min\left\{r_1 - r_2, \frac{r_1 e_1 - a_1}{e_1}\right\}.$$

Proof. of (a): Assume the conclusion is false. Then $P_1 \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 4.3 (a). Then $H_2 \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 4.3 (b). Therefore by sequential applications of Proposition 4.3 (a) and (b), we can conclude that $H_i, P_i \rightarrow 0$, for $i > 1$. But, then

$$H_1'/(H_1) \geq r_1 - \epsilon - a_1 H_1 > r_n - \epsilon - a_1 H_1 > \frac{a_1}{e_1} - \epsilon - a_1 H_1, \quad t \geq T$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $T > 0$ (recall that $r_i > r_n$ from (4.5) and $\frac{a_1}{e_1} < r_1$ from (4.2)). This implies that $H_1^\infty > \frac{1}{e_1}$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of the first assertion.

Proof of (b): Now, suppose that $H_1(0) > 0, P_1(0) > 0$ and $P_1^\infty < r_1 - r_2$. Then $(P_1 - P_2)^\infty \leq P_1^\infty < r_1 - r_2$, therefore Proposition 4.3 (b) implies that $H_2 \rightarrow 0$. Then $P_2 \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 4.3 (a). Then $(P_2 - P_3)^\infty \leq P_2^\infty < r_2 - r_3$ therefore Proposition 4.3 (b) implies that $H_3 \rightarrow 0$. Clearly, we can continue sequential applications of Proposition 4.3 (a) and (b) to conclude that $H_i, P_i \rightarrow 0$ for $i > 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \log H_1 P_1^{\frac{a_1}{e_1 n_1}} &= \frac{H_1'}{H_1} + \frac{a_1 P_1'}{P_1 e_1 n_1} \\ &= r_1 - \frac{a_1}{e_1} - P_1 - \text{terms that go to zero} \end{aligned}$$

to conclude that $P_1^\infty \geq \frac{r_1 e_1 - a_1}{e_1}$. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

(a) *There exists $\epsilon_k > 0$ such that if $H_i(0) > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $P_j(0) > 0$, $1 \leq j \leq k - 1$, then*

$$H_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k \quad \text{and} \quad P_{j,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k - 1.$$

(b) *There exists $\epsilon_k > 0$ such that if $H_i(0) > 0, P_i(0) > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, then*

$$H_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad P_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

Proof. We use the notation $[H_i]_t \equiv \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t H_i(s) ds$. Our proof is by mathematical induction using the ordering of the $2n$ cases as follows

$$(a, 1) < (b, 1) < (a, 2) < (b, 2) < \cdots < (a, n) < (b, n)$$

where (a, k) denotes case (a) with index k .

The cases $(a, 1)$ and $(b, 1)$ follow immediately from Proposition 4.5 and Corollary 4.8 in [4] with persistence function $\rho = \min\{H_1, P_1\}$ in case $(b, 1)$.

For the induction step, assuming that (a, k) holds, we prove that (b, k) holds and assuming that (b, k) holds, we prove that $(a, k + 1)$ holds.

We begin by assuming that (a, k) holds and prove that (b, k) holds. We consider solutions satisfying $H_i(0) > 0, P_i(0) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Note that other components $H_j(0)$ or $P_j(0)$ for $j > k$ may be positive or zero, we make no assumptions. As (a, k) holds, there exists $\epsilon_k > 0$ such that $H_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, 1 \leq i \leq k$ and $P_{i,\infty} \geq \epsilon_k, 1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. We need only show the existence of $\delta > 0$ such that $P_{k,\infty} \geq \delta$ for every solution with initial values as described above. In fact, by the above-mentioned result that weak uniform persistence implies strong uniform persistence, it suffices to show that $P_k^\infty \geq \delta$.

If $P_k^\infty < r_k - r_{k+1}$, then $H_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 4.3 (b). Then, by Proposition 4.3 (a), $P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$. Clearly, we may sequentially apply Proposition 4.3 (b) and (a) to show that $H_j \rightarrow 0, P_j \rightarrow 0$ for $j \geq k + 1$.

If there is no $\delta > 0$ such that $P_k^\infty \geq \delta$ for every solution with initial data as described above, then for every $\delta > 0$, we may find a solution with initial data such that $P_k^\infty < \delta$. By a translation of time, we may assume that $P_k(t) \leq \delta, t \geq 0$ for $0 < \delta < r_k - r_{k+1}$ to be determined later. Then $H_j, P_j \rightarrow 0, j \geq k + 1$. Now, as (a, k) holds, we may apply Lemma 2.6. The subsystem with $H_i = 0, k + 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $P_i = 0, k \leq i \leq n$ has a unique positive equilibrium by Proposition 4.1. See Remark 4.2. The equation

$$\frac{P'_k}{P_k e_k n_k} = H_k - \frac{1}{e_k}$$

implies that

$$\frac{1}{t} \log \frac{P_k^{\frac{1}{e_k n_k}}(t)}{P_k^{\frac{1}{e_k n_k}}(0)} = [H_k]_t - \frac{1}{e_k}.$$

By (4.4) and Lemma 2.6, we have for large t

$$[H_k]_t - \frac{1}{e_k} = H_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{e_k} + O(\delta) = H_k^* + \frac{P_k^*}{a_k} - \frac{1}{e_k} + O(\delta) = \frac{P_k^*}{a_k} + O(\delta) > 0$$

Implying that $P_k \rightarrow +\infty$, a contradiction. We have proved that (a, k) implies (b, k) .

Now, we assume that (b, k) holds and prove that $(a, k + 1)$ holds. We consider solutions satisfying $H_i(0) > 0, P_i(0) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $H_{k+1}(0) > 0$. As (b, k) holds by assumption, and following the same arguments as in the previous case, we only need to show that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $H_{k+1}^\infty \geq \delta$ for all solutions with initial data as just described.

If $H_{k+1}^\infty < \frac{1}{e_{k+1}}$, then $P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 4.3 (a) and then $H_{k+2} \rightarrow 0$ by Proposition 4.3 (b). This reasoning may be iterated to yield $H_i \rightarrow 0$, $k+2 \leq i \leq n$ and $P_i \rightarrow 0$, $k+1 \leq i \leq n$.

If there is no $\delta > 0$ such that $H_{k+1}^\infty \geq \delta$ for every solution with initial data as described above, then for every $\delta > 0$, we may find a solution with such initial data such that $H_{k+1}^\infty < \delta$. By a translation of time, we may assume that $H_{k+1}(t) \leq \delta$, $t \geq 0$ for $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{e_{k+1}}$ to be determined later. Then $H_j, P_j \rightarrow 0$, $j \geq k+2$ and $P_{k+1} \rightarrow 0$. Now, using that (b, k) holds, we apply Lemma 2.6. The subsystem with $H_i = 0, P_i = 0$, $k+1 \leq i \leq n$ has a unique positive equilibrium by Proposition 4.1. See Remark 4.2. The equation for H_{k+1} is

$$\frac{H'_{k+1}}{H_{k+1}} = r_{k+1} - \sum_{j=1}^k a_j H_j - \sum_{j=k+1}^n a_j H_j - P_{k+1}$$

Integrating, we have

$$\frac{1}{t} \log \frac{H_{k+1}(t)}{H_{k+1}(0)} = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} a_j [H_j]_t + O(1/t)$$

By (4.3) and Lemma 2.6, we have that for all large t

$$\sum_{j=1}^k a_j [H_j]_t = \sum_{j=1}^k a_j H_j^* + O(\delta) = \tilde{Q}_n + O(\delta).$$

Since $H_{k+1}(t) \leq \delta$, $[H_{k+1}]_t = O(\delta)$. Now, $\tilde{Q}_n > 0$ so by choosing δ sufficiently small and an appropriate solution, we can ensure that the right hand side is bounded below by a positive constant for all large t , implying that $H_{k+1}(t)$ is unbounded. This contradiction completes our proof that (b, k) implies $(a, k+1)$. Thus, our proof is complete by mathematical induction. \square

Corollary 4.7. *For every solution of (4.1) starting with all components positive, we have that*

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t H_i(s) ds \rightarrow H_i^*, \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_i(s) ds \rightarrow P_i^*$$

where H_i^*, P_i^* are as in (4.3).

For every solution of (4.1) starting with all components positive except $P_n(0) = 0$, we have that

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t H_i(s) ds \rightarrow H_i^\dagger, \quad \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_i(s) ds \rightarrow P_i^\dagger$$

where H_i^\dagger, P_i^\dagger are as in (4.4).

Proof. This follows from the previous theorem together with Theorem 5.2.3 in [2]. \square

5. GLOBAL DYNAMICS FOR THE ONE-TO-ONE NETWORK

Using the positive equilibrium E^* , we can write the system as

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} H'_i &= H_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j (H_j^* - H_j) + P_i^* - P_i \right) \\ P'_i &= e_i n_i P_i (H_i - H_i^*), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

As before, we define

$$V = \sum_i c_i U(H_i, H_i^*) + \sum_i d_i U(P_i, P_i^*)$$

where c_1, \dots, c_n and d_1, \dots, d_n are to be determined.

Then the derivative of V along solutions of (5.1), \dot{V} , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= - \left(\sum_i c_i (H_i - H_i^*) \right) \left(\sum_j a_j (H_j - H_j^*) \right) - \sum_i c_i (H_i - H_i^*) (P_i - P_i^*) \\ &\quad + \sum_i d_i e_i n_i (P_i - P_i^*) (H_i - H_i^*) \end{aligned}$$

Letting $c_i = a_i$ and $d_i = \frac{a_i}{e_i n_i}$ causes the last two summations to cancel each other out. Therefore in this case we have

$$(5.2) \quad \dot{V} = - \left(\sum_i a_i H_i - \sum_i a_i H_i^* \right)^2$$

Below, we use the notation $(H(t), P(t))$ for the $2n$ -vector solution $(H_1(t), H_2(t), \dots, H_n(t), P_1(t), \dots, P_n(t))$.

Theorem 5.1. *The ω -limit set of a positive solution of (5.1) is either E^* or it consists of non-constant entire orbits, $(H(t), P(t))$, satisfying all of the following:*

- (a) $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i H_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i H_i^*$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (b) $\prod_{i=1}^n P_i(t)^{a_i/e_i n_i}$ is independent of t .
- (c) $\forall i$, $(H_i(t), P_i(t))$ is a positive solution of the conservative planar system

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} H'_i &= H_i (P_i^* - P_i) \\ P'_i &= e_i n_i P_i (H_i - H_i^*). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the ω -limit set of a solution of (5.1) with all components positive except $P_n \equiv 0$ is either E^\dagger or it consists of non-constant entire orbits, as in the previous case, on the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i H_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i H_i^\dagger$ with $H_n(t) \equiv H_n^\dagger$ and with $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P_i(t)^{a_i/e_i n_i}$ independent of t . Furthermore, for $1 \leq i < n$, $(H_i(t), P_i(t))$ satisfies (5.3) but with H_i^\dagger, V_i^\dagger replacing H_i^*, V_i^* .

Proof. We first note that since $V(H(t), P(t)) \leq V(H(0), V(0)), t \geq 0$ for every positive solution of (5.1), each component is bounded above and below: $0 < p \leq x(t) \leq P, t \geq 0$, where $x = H_i, P_j$ and p, P may depend on the solution.

Consider a positive solution of (5.1). By LaSalle's invariance principle, every point in its (invariant) limit set L must satisfy $\sum_i a_i H_i = \sum_i a_i H_i^*$ since $L \subset \{(H, V) : \dot{V} = 0\}$. As in the *NIN* case, L belongs to the interior of the positive orthant and it is bounded away from the boundary of the orthant. We now consider a trajectory belonging to L ; until further notice, all considerations involve this solution. Notice that this solution satisfies (5.3). Thus on L , the system decouples into n independent planar conservative systems, the positive solution of which is either periodic or is the positive equilibrium. See e.g. section 2.3 of [2]. Notice that $\sum_i \frac{a_i P_i'}{e_i n_i P_i} = \sum_i a_i (H_i - H_i^*) = 0$, consequently $\prod_{i=1}^n P_i(t)^{a_i/e_i n_i}$ is independent of t .

If $E^* \in \omega$ -limit set, then $E^* = \omega$ -limit set, since E^* is stable. Consequently, if $E^* \notin L$, then at least one of the (H_i, P_i) must be a non-trivial periodic orbit.

The arguments are nearly identical for the case that the solution satisfies $P_n \equiv 0$ and other coordinates positive. Liapunov function V differs from the previous one only in that the sum goes from one to $n - 1$ in the second summation and H_i^\dagger, V_i^\dagger replace H_i^*, V_i^* ; the choice of the c_i and d_i are as before. (5.2) is changed only in that superscript \dagger replaces $*$.

We only note that the counterpart to (5.3) for $i = n$ reads $H_n' = 0$. As $\sum_i a_i (H_i - H_i^\dagger) = 0$ on the limit set and since any positive periodic limiting solution must satisfy $\int_0^T H_i dt = H_i^\dagger$, it follows that $H_n \equiv H_n^\dagger$. \square

In the special case that $n = 2$, since $H_1 (P_1)$ can be expressed in terms of $H_2 (P_2)$, on $\{(H, V) : \dot{V} = 0\}$, every solution in L is periodic (possible constant).

REFERENCES

- [1] Jover LF, Cortez MH, Weitz JS (2013) Mechanisms of multi-strain coexistence in hostphage systems with nested infection networks, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 332: 65-77
- [2] J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund, *Evolutionary Games*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
- [3] H. Thieme, Persistence under relaxed point-dissipativity (with applications to an endemic model), *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 24 (1993), 407-435.
- [4] H. Smith and H. Thieme, *Dynamical Systems and Population Persistence*, GSM 118, Amer. Math. Soc. , Providence R.I., 2011.
- [5] H. Smith and P. Waltman, *The Theory of the Chemostat*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.
- [6] D. Korytowski, H.L. Smith, How Nested and Monogamous Infection Networks in Host-Phage Communities Come to be, *Theoretical Ecology*, Volume 8, Issue 1 (2015), 111-120.
- [7] Thingstad TF (2000) Elements of a theory for the mechanisms controlling abundance, diversity, and biogeochemical role of lytic bacterial viruses in aquatic systems, *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 45: 1320-1328.