

Dynamics of Virus and Immune Response in Multi-Epitope Network

Cameron J. Browne*, Hal Smith†

Abstract

The host immune response can often efficiently suppress a virus infection, which may lead to selection for immune-resistant viral variants within the host. For example, during HIV infection, an array of CTL immune response populations recognize specific epitopes (viral proteins) presented on the surface of infected cells to effectively mediate their killing. However HIV can rapidly evolve resistance to CTL attack at different epitopes, inducing a dynamic network of interacting viral and immune response variants. We consider models for the network of virus and immune response populations, consisting of Lotka-Volterra-like systems of ordinary differential equations. Stability of feasible equilibria and corresponding uniform persistence of distinct variants are characterized via a Lyapunov function. We specialize the model to a “binary mutation” setting, where for n epitopes there can be 2^n distinct viral variants mapped on a hypercube graph. The dynamics in several cases are analyzed and sharp polychotomies are derived characterizing persistent variants. In particular, we prove that if the viral fitness costs for gaining resistance to each epitope are equal, then the system of 2^n virus strains converges to a “perfectly nested network” with less than or equal to $n + 1$ persistent virus strains. Overall, our results suggest that *immunodominance*, i.e. relative strength of immune response to an epitope, is the most important factor determining the persistent network structure.

1 Introduction

The dynamics of virus and immune response within a host can be viewed as a complex ecological system. Both predator-prey and competitive interactions are especially important during a host infection. The immune response predates on the pathogen, and distinct viral strains compete for a target cell population, while immune response populations compete for the virus since their proliferation occurs upon pathogen recognition. The immune response can cause significant mortality of the virus, which may lead to selection for immune-resistant viral variants within the host. For example during HIV infection, an extensive repertoire of CTL immune effectors recognize specific epitopes (viral proteins) presented on the surface of infected cells to effectively mediate their killing, however HIV can rapidly evolve resistance to CTL attack at different epitopes. The ensuing battle precipitates a dynamic network of interacting viral strains and immune response variants, analogous to an ecosystem of rapidly evolving prey countering attack from a diverse collection of predators.

While the virus-immune interactions may be quite complex, patterns and structure can emerge. For the cellular immune response, a consistent and reproducible hierarchy of T cell populations organize in response to multiple epitopes of a pathogen, according to their (vertical) *immunodominance*, i.e. relative expansion levels of the responding immune populations within the host [19]. Vertical T cell immunodominance patterns are highly variable among HIV infected individuals and change over time, largely due to sequence variability in the viral “quasispecies” [24]. Rapidly evolving pathogens, such as HIV and HCV, can evade the immune response via mutations at multiple epitopes. The pattern of epitope mutations, called the *escape pathway*, is of significant interest, and there is some evidence that the viral evolution is predictable [3]. The fitness of an emerging viral mutant strain, along with the strength of the CTL response, certainly affect the selection pressure for a single epitope mutation [14]. However the concurrent interaction of diverse virus and immune response populations necessitate considering the whole system together in order to understand viral escape

*E-mail: cambrowne@louisiana.edu. Mathematics Department, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA.

†School of Mathematical & Statistical Sciences, Arizona State University.

of multiple epitopes [24]. In this paper, we introduce and analyze mathematical models for the dynamics of virus and immune response in a network determined by interaction at multiple epitopes.

A large amount of work on modeling within-host virus dynamics has been based on the “standard” virus model; an ordinary differential equation system describing the coupled changes in target cells, infected cells, and free virus particles through time in an infected individual [28]. The CTL immune response has been included in variations of the standard virus model by considering an immune effector population which kills and is activated by infected cells according to a mass-action (bilinear) rate, although other functional forms for the activation rate have been utilized [6, 9]. Nowak et al. [25], along with other subsequent works [5, 16, 32], have considered the dynamics of multiple virus strains which are attacked by strain-specific CTL immune response populations (“one-to-one” virus-immune network). However the assumption of strain-specific immune response does not correspond to the biological reality that CTLs are specific to epitopes and, in general, multiple epitopes will be shared among virus strains.

Multi-epitope models have been utilized with different datasets cataloging several epitope specific CTL response and viral escape mutations, in order to quantify escape rates and patterns [24, 23, 27]. Earlier work often considered escape dynamics at epitopes separately, but some recent work has emphasized the concurrent interaction of distinct CTLs with the virus at multiple epitopes. Ganusov et al. [12, 13] explicitly include multiple CTL clones specific to different epitopes in the standard virus model, and utilize statistical approaches on a linearized version of the model to estimate rates of escape. Althaus et al. and van Deutekom et al. have also considered multiple epitopes and viral strains in the standard virus model, although results were mostly based on stochastic simulations [1, 11].

Browne [8] recently analyzed the stability and uniform persistence of a multi-epitope virus-immune model with a *perfectly nested* interaction network. The model setup mirrors a tri-trophic chemostat ecosystem with a single resource (healthy cells), and a network of consumers (viral strains) and their predators (immune variants). The perfectly nested network constrains the viral escape pathway so that resistance to multiple epitopes is built sequentially in the order of the immunodominance hierarchy. The successive rise of more broadly resistant prey (coming with a fitness cost) and weaker but more generalist predators, in a perfectly nested fashion, is the route to persistence of nested bacteria-phage communities argued in [17, 34, 20, 22, 21]. The analysis of more complex interaction networks, which allow arbitrary viral escape pathways for building multi-epitope resistance, will be addressed in this paper.

Here we extend the previous work by analyzing a within-host virus model with a general interaction network of multiple variants of virus and immune response. We characterize the structure of feasible equilibria, along with finding a Lyapunov function for stability and corresponding uniform persistence of distinct variants. Next, we consider the “binary mutation” case where a viral strain is either completely susceptible (0) or has evolved complete resistance (1) to immune attack at a specific epitope, in which for n epitopes, there can be 2^n distinct viral variants distinguished by their immune resistance profile. After deriving some graph-theoretic properties of feasible equilibria, we consider several special cases where the Lyapunov function can be applied to classify dynamics. In particular, if we constrain the virus-immune response network to be “strain-specific”, “perfectly nested”, or have $n = 2$ epitopes, sharp polychotomies are derived characterizing persistent variants. Finally, we prove that if the viral fitness costs for gaining resistance to each epitope are equal, then the system of 2^n virus strains converges to a perfectly nested network with less than or equal to $n + 1$ persistent virus strains. Overall, our results suggest that *immunodominance* is the most important factor determining the viral escape pathway.

2 Mathematical model

We consider the following general virus-immune dynamics model, as in Browne [8], which includes a population of target cells (X), m competing virus strains (Y_i denotes strain i infected cells), and n variants of immune response (Z_j):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dX}{dt} &= b - cX - X \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i Y_i, \\ \frac{dY_i}{dt} &= \beta_i Y_i X - \delta_i Y_i - Y_i \sum_{j=1}^m r_{ij} Z_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{dZ_j}{dt} = q_j Z_j \sum_{i=1}^n r_{ij} Y_i - \mu_j Z_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The function $f(X) = b - cX$ represents the net growth rate of the uninfected cell population. The parameter β_i is the infection rate and δ_i is the decay rate for infected cells infected with virus strain i . The parameter μ_j denotes the decay rate of the immune response population j . We assume immune killing and activation rates are mass-action, representative of these events occurring as immune response cells recognize epitopes on the surface of infected cells. The parameter r_{ij} describes the killing/interaction rate of immune population Z_j on a strain- i infected cell, whereas $q_j r_{ij}$ describes the corresponding activation rate for Z_j (proportional to interaction rate r_{ij}). In the present paper, we assume that virus load (the abundance of virions) is proportional to the amount of (productively) infected cells. This assumption has frequently been made for HIV since the dynamic of free virions occurs on a much faster time scale than the other variables. Another reason for not explicitly including free virus in our present work is to keep the tri-trophic chemostat ecological structure of resource-prey-predators, allowing for more general applicability in community ecology.

The model can be rescaled by introducing the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \frac{c}{b} X, & y_i &= \frac{\delta_i}{b} Y_i, & \tau &= ct, \\ a_{ij} &= \frac{r_{ij}}{\delta_i}, & \gamma_i &= \frac{\delta_i}{c}, & \sigma_j &= \frac{\mu_j}{c}, \\ \mathcal{R}_i &= \frac{b\beta_i}{c\delta_i}, & \rho_j &= \frac{\mu_j}{bq_j}, \end{aligned}$$

The model then becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= 1 - x - x \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{R}_i y_i, \\ \dot{y}_i &= \gamma_i y_i \left(\mathcal{R}_i x - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} Z_j \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ \dot{Z}_j &= \frac{\sigma_j}{\rho_j} Z_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} y_i - \rho_j \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here \mathcal{R}_i represents the basic reproduction number of virus strain i . Note that ρ_j represents the reciprocal of the immune response fitness excluding the (rescaled) avidity to each strain j . The $m \times n$ nonnegative matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ describes the virus-immune *interaction network*, which determines each immune effector population's avidity to the distinct viral strains. In section 4, we will introduce biologically reasonable simplifications to constrain the network size and define a reproduction number for each immune response. The following proposition from [8] establishes the non-negativity and boundedness of solutions.

Proposition 2.1. *Consider the system (2) with initial conditions $\vec{w}_0 = (x(0), \vec{y}(0), \vec{Z}(0))$ belonging to the non-negative cone of \mathbb{R}^{1+m+n} (denoted by \mathbb{R}_+^{1+m+n}). Solutions remain non-negative for all time t and there exists a bounded set in \mathbb{R}_+^{1+m+n} which attracts all solutions.*

In preceding work on chemostat-type models with predator-prey networks, either a “one-to-one” network [35, 20] or perfectly nested network [8, 20] is assumed. Here we consider the model (2) with general interaction network, analyzing feasible equilibria and stability in the next section.

3 Equilibria and Lyapunov function

A general non-negative equilibrium point, $\mathcal{E}^* = (x^*, \vec{y}^*, \vec{Z}^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{1+m+n}$, of system (2) will be characterized in terms of the positive virus and immune variant components. Define the “*persistent variant sets*” associated with \mathcal{E}^* as:

$$\Omega_y = \{i \in [1, m] : y_i^* > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_z = \{j \in [1, n] : Z_j^* > 0\}. \tag{3}$$

In addition, define the following subsets of \mathbb{R}_+^{1+m+n} :

$$\Omega = \left\{ (x, \vec{y}, \vec{Z}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{1+m+n} \mid y_i, z_j > 0 \text{ if } i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z \right\}, \quad \Gamma_\Omega = \Omega \cap \{y_i, z_j = 0, \ i \notin \Omega_y, j \notin \Omega_z\}. \quad (4)$$

Here the set Γ_Ω is called the *positivity class* of \mathcal{E}^* . Notice that the dimension of the subset Γ_Ω is $1 + |\Omega_y| + |\Omega_z|$, where the notation $|\Omega_y|$ ($|\Omega_z|$) denotes the *cardinality* of the set Ω_y (Ω_z). The equilibrium \mathcal{E}^* must satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} a_{ij} y_i^* &= \rho_j, \quad j \in \Omega_z \\ \left(1 + \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} \mathcal{R}_i y_i^* \right) &= \frac{1}{x^*} \\ \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} Z_j^* &= \mathcal{R}_i x^* - 1, \quad i \in \Omega_y \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We note that $\mathcal{R}_i > 1$, $i \in \Omega_y$ must hold, even in the absence of CTL response. Each virus strain i (cells infected with strain i), y_i , has a set of CTLs, z_j , that recognize and attack y_i . We call this set the *epitope set of y_i* , denoted by Λ_i , where $\Lambda_i := \{j \in [1, n] : a_{ij} > 0\}$, i.e. $j \in \Lambda_i$, if y_i is *not* completely resistant to CTL Z_j .

Following Hofbauer and Sigmund [15], we call an equilibrium $\mathcal{E}^* = (x^*, y^*, Z^*)$ of (2) *saturated* if the following holds when \mathcal{E}^* has zero components:

$$\mathcal{R}_i x^* - 1 - \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} Z_j^* \leq 0, \quad \forall i \notin \Omega_y, \quad \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} a_{ij} y_i^* - \rho_j \leq 0, \quad \forall j \notin \Omega_z. \quad (6)$$

Note that if \mathcal{E}^* has all positive components, i.e. $\Omega_y = [1, m]$ and $\Omega_z = [1, n]$, the inequalities (6) trivially hold. Note also that each term in (6) is an ‘‘invasion eigenvalue’’ of the Jacobian matrix evaluated at \mathcal{E}^* and thus a saturated equilibrium enjoys a weak stability against invasion by missing species. It immediately follows that a stable equilibrium must be saturated. As part of the main theorem later in this section, we will conversely show that every saturated equilibrium is stable. First, the following proposition states that there exists at least one saturated equilibrium, with the proof in the Appendix A.1.

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a saturated equilibrium of system (2).*

More properties of relevant equilibria can be ascertained. The following proposition states that any equilibria in the same positivity class must share the same value at x^* .

Proposition 3.2. *If $\mathcal{E}' = (x', y', Z')$ and $\mathcal{E}'' = (x'', y'', Z'')$ are both equilibria in the same positivity class, Γ_Ω , then $x' = x''$.*

Proof. Let A' denote the submatrix of A which contains only the rows in Ω_y and columns in Ω_z . Then the equilibrium conditions for \mathcal{E}' can be rewritten as:

$$y' A' = \rho', \quad A' \vec{Z}' = \frac{\vec{\mathcal{R}}'}{1 + y' \vec{\mathcal{R}}'} - \vec{1},$$

where ρ' is the row vector with components ρ_j where $j \in \Omega_z$, $\vec{\mathcal{R}}'$ is the column vector with components \mathcal{R}_i where $i \in \Omega_y$ and $\vec{1}$ is the vector with all components one. Since \mathcal{E}'' satisfies the same conditions, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} (y' - y'') A' &= \mathbf{0}, \quad A' (\vec{Z}' - \vec{Z}'') = \left(\frac{(y'' - y') \vec{\mathcal{R}}'}{(1 + y' \vec{\mathcal{R}}')(1 + y'' \vec{\mathcal{R}}')} \right) \vec{\mathcal{R}}', \\ \Rightarrow 0 &= (y' - y'') A' (\vec{Z}' - \vec{Z}'') = (y' - y'') \left(\frac{(y'' - y') \vec{\mathcal{R}}'}{(1 + y' \vec{\mathcal{R}}')(1 + y'' \vec{\mathcal{R}}')} \right) \vec{\mathcal{R}}' \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow 0 &= \left((y' - y'')\vec{\mathcal{R}}' \right)^2 \Rightarrow y'\vec{\mathcal{R}}' = y''\vec{\mathcal{R}}' \\ \Rightarrow x' &= x'' \end{aligned}$$

□

The previous proposition implies that if an equilibrium $\mathcal{E}^* = (x^*, y^*, Z^*)$ exists in positivity class Γ_Ω , then any equilibrium $\mathcal{E}' = (x', y', Z')$ belonging to Γ_Ω will satisfy the following Lotka-Volterra equilibria conditions within Γ_Ω :

$$\vec{r}' = B'\vec{v}', \quad \vec{r}' = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{\mathcal{R}}'x^* - \vec{1} \\ \vec{\rho}' \end{pmatrix}, \quad B' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A' \\ (A')^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where A' is the submatrix of A with rows in Ω_y and columns in Ω_z , ρ' is the row vector with components ρ_j where $j \in \Omega_z$, $\vec{\mathcal{R}}'$ is the column vector with components \mathcal{R}_i where $i \in \Omega_y$, and $\vec{v}' = (y', Z')^T$. Note that if the cardinality of Ω_y and Ω_z are equal ($|\Omega_y| = |\Omega_z|$) and A' is non-singular, then clearly \mathcal{E}^* is unique in its positivity class, Γ_Ω . More generally, if B' is non-singular, then \mathcal{E}^* is unique in Γ_Ω . The following proposition sharpens the condition for uniqueness of an equilibrium within a positivity class, and shows that in such equilibria the number of virus strains either is equal to or exactly one more than the number of immune responses.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose the equilibrium $\mathcal{E}^* = (x^*, y^*, Z^*)$ exists in positivity class Γ_Ω , where (y^*, Z^*) satisfy the linear system of equations (7) and the cardinality of Ω_y and Ω_z are $|\Omega_y| = m'$ and $|\Omega_z| = n'$. Then \mathcal{E}^* is the unique equilibrium in Γ_Ω , i.e. $\vec{v} = (y^*, Z^*)^T$ is the unique solution to (7), if and only if $\text{Ker}(A')^T \cap \vec{\mathcal{R}}'^\perp = \{0\}$ and $\text{Ker}(A') = \{0\}$.*

Moreover, if \mathcal{E}^* is the unique equilibrium in Γ_Ω , then one of the following holds:

(i) $m' = n'$, and $x^* = 1 / \left(1 + (\vec{\rho}')^T (A')^{-1} \vec{\mathcal{R}}' \right)$.

(ii) $m' = n' + 1$, and $x^* = \vec{1}^T C_{(n'+1)}^{-1}$, where $C_{(n'+1)}^{-1}$ is the last column in the $(n' + 1) \times (n' + 1)$ matrix inverse of $C = \begin{pmatrix} A & \vec{\mathcal{R}}' \end{pmatrix}^T$.

Proof. The submatrix A' is $m' \times n'$ where $m' = |\Omega_y|$ and $n' = |\Omega_z|$. In the proof of Proposition 3.2, we ascertain that there are distinct equilibria in positivity class Γ_Ω if and only if either $y' \neq y''$ or $Z' \neq Z''$. It is shown that

$$y' - y'' \in \text{Ker}(A')^T \cap \vec{\mathcal{R}}'^\perp \text{ and } Z' - Z'' \in \text{Ker}A'.$$

Therefore, the condition

$$\text{Ker}(A')^T \cap \vec{\mathcal{R}}'^\perp = \{0\} \text{ and } \text{Ker}(A') = \{0\}$$

is equivalent to uniqueness of \mathcal{E}^* in Γ_Ω .

Moreover $\text{Ker}(A')^T \cap \vec{\mathcal{R}}'^\perp = \{0\}$ if and only if the augmented $(n' + 1) \times m'$ matrix C' consisting of adding the final row $\vec{\mathcal{R}}'^T$ to $(A')^T$ has trivial kernel. Applying the rank-nullity theorem, we obtain that C' has rank equal to m' . Since rank cannot exceed the number of rows, $m' \leq n' + 1$. Applying to A' , gives rank equal to n' and $n' \leq m'$. Thus $n' \leq m' \leq n' + 1$.

In the case (i), $m' = n'$, the matrix A is invertible and so from the equilibria equations (5), we obtain $x^* = 1 / \left(1 + (\vec{\rho}')^T (A')^{-1} \vec{\mathcal{R}}' \right)$. Finally, consider case (ii), $m' = n' + 1$. Since $n' = \text{rank}(A') = \text{rank}((A')^T)$, by the rank-nullity theorem we obtain that $\text{null}((A')^T) = 1$. We claim that $\text{Ker}(A')^T$ contains a vector \vec{w} such that $\vec{w}^T \vec{\mathcal{R}}' = 1$ and $\sum_i w_i = x^*$. Since the matrix C (defined in previous paragraph) has trivial Kernel, it is invertible. Let \vec{w} be the last column of C^{-1} . Then it is not hard to see that $(A')^T \vec{w} = \vec{0}$ and $(\vec{\mathcal{R}}')^T \vec{w} = 1$. Furthermore

$$0 = \vec{w}^T A' \vec{Z}' = \vec{w}^T \left(\vec{\mathcal{R}}' x^* - \vec{1} \right) = x^* \vec{w}^T \vec{\mathcal{R}}' - \sum_i w_i = x^* - \sum_i w_i.$$

Thus $x^* = \sum_i w_i = \vec{1}^T C_{n'+1}^{-1}$.

□

Notice from the above proof that if an equilibrium \mathcal{E}^* is not unique in its positivity class Γ_Ω , then Γ_Ω contains an infinite number (a continuum) of equilibria. Conversely, if \mathcal{E}^* is unique in a positivity class Γ_Ω containing n' (persistent) immune responses, then there are either (i) n' virus strains or (ii) $n' + 1$ virus strains in Γ_Ω .

Additionally some results on existence of saturated equilibria in Lotka-Volterra systems can be recast in our setting. For example, a sufficient condition for \mathcal{E}^* to be saturated (and unique equilibrium in Γ_Ω) is if the matrix $-B'$ in (7) is a P -matrix, i.e. all principal minors of $-B'$ are positive, by Theorem 15.4.5 in [15].

In what follows, we will be interested the global behavior of solutions to system (2). In doing so, we will determine which viral strains and immune responses uniformly persist [33] and which go extinct. Define the system to be Ω_{yz} permanent if

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists \epsilon, M > 0 \text{ and } T(\vec{w}_0) \text{ such that } M > y_i(t), Z_j(t) > \epsilon, \quad i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z, \quad \forall t > T(\vec{w}_0), \text{ and} \\ &\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_i(t), Z_j(t) = 0, \quad i \notin \Omega_y, j \notin \Omega_z, \quad \text{for every solution with initial condition } \vec{w}_0 \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

We will sometimes use the terminology that y_i, Z_j $i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z$ are uniformly persistent and $y_i, Z_j \rightarrow 0$ $i \notin \Omega_y, j \notin \Omega_z$ to signify the system being Ω_{yz} permanent.

In the spirit of permanence as a sufficient condition for existence of a unique interior rest point in Lotka-Volterra systems [15], we find the following proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *If the system is Ω_{yz} permanent, then there is a unique equilibrium \mathcal{E} in the positivity class Γ_Ω .*

Proof. By Theorem 6.2 in [31], Ω_{yz} permanence implies that there exists an equilibrium in the positivity class Γ_Ω . Suppose by way of contradiction that there are two equilibria, \mathcal{E}' and \mathcal{E}'' , in Γ_Ω . By Proposition 3.2, $x' = x''$. Since the remaining equilibria equations (5) are linear, it can be shown that the line through \mathcal{E}' and \mathcal{E}'' consist entirely of equilibria. Then, we can find equilibria arbitrarily close to the boundary of Γ_Ω . This contradicts the fact that the system is Ω_{yz} permanent. \square

Now we state the main theorem of this section concerning the persistence of viral and immune variants. It builds off a result by Korytowski and Smith concerning bacteria-phage communities in a generalized Lotka-Volterra system [21].

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{E}^* = (x^*, \vec{y}^*, \vec{Z}^*)$ is a non-negative equilibrium of system (2) with positivity class Γ_Ω . Suppose further that \mathcal{E}^* is saturated, i.e. the inequalities (6) hold. Then \mathcal{E}^* is locally stable and $x(t) \rightarrow x^*$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Furthermore, if \mathcal{E}^ is the unique equilibrium in its positivity class Γ_Ω and the inequalities (6) are strict, then $y_i, Z_j \rightarrow 0$ for all $i \notin \Omega_y, j \notin \Omega_z$. If $i \in \Omega_y$ and $a_{ij} = 0 \quad \forall j \in \Omega_z$, i.e. $\Lambda_i \cap \Omega_z = \emptyset$, then $y_i \rightarrow y_i^*$ and $x^* = 1/\mathcal{R}_i$. In addition, omega limit sets corresponding to positive initial conditions are contained in invariant orbits satisfying*

$$\sum_{i \in \Omega_y} \mathcal{R}_i y_i = \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} \mathcal{R}_i y_i^* \tag{8}$$

$$\dot{y}_i = \gamma_i y_i \left(\sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} (Z_j^* - Z_j) \right) \quad i \in \Omega_y \tag{9}$$

$$\dot{Z}_j = \frac{\sigma_j}{\rho_j} Z_j \left(\sum_{i \in \Omega_y} a_{ij} (y_i - y_i^*) \right) \quad j \in \Omega_z,$$

and for each $i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z$, y_i and Z_j persist (the system is Ω_{yz} permanent) with asymptotic averages converging to equilibria values, i.e.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t y_i(s) ds = y_i^*, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t Z_j(s) ds = Z_j^*,$$

In the case that there are less than or equal to two persistent viral strains with non-empty epitope sets (restricted to Ω_z), i.e. $|\{i \in \Omega_y : \Lambda_i \cap \Omega_z \neq \emptyset\}| \leq 2$, then \mathcal{E}^* is globally asymptotically stable.

Proof. Consider the following Lyapunov function:

$$\begin{aligned} W(x, \vec{y}, \vec{Z}) &= x - x^* \ln \frac{x}{x^*} + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \left(y_i - y_i^* \ln \frac{y_i}{y_i^*} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\rho_j}{\sigma_j} \left(Z_j - Z_j^* \ln \frac{Z_j}{Z_j^*} \right) \\ &:= W_1 + W_2 + W_3, \end{aligned}$$

where the term with logarithm should be omitted if the corresponding coordinate in the particular equilibrium is zero. Then taking the time derivatives, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W}_1 &= 1 - x - \frac{x^*}{x} + x^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{R}_i y_i (x^* - x), \\ \dot{W}_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\mathcal{R}_i x - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} Z_j \right) (y_i - y_i^*), \\ \dot{W}_3 &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} y_i - \rho_j \right) (Z_j - Z_j^*) \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W} &= 1 - x - \frac{x^*}{x} + x^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\mathcal{R}_i (y_i x^* - y_i^* x) - y_i + y_i^* \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} Z_j \right) \right] - \sum_{j=1}^n \left[Z_j^* \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} y_i + \rho_j (Z_j - Z_j^*) \right] \\ &= 1 - x - \frac{x^*}{x} + x^* + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i (\mathcal{R}_i x^* - 1) + \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} y_i^* \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} Z_j - \mathcal{R}_i x \right) + \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} Z_j^* \left(\rho_j - \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} y_i \right) - \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_j Z_j \\ &= 1 - x - \frac{x^*}{x} + x^* + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \left(\mathcal{R}_i x^* - 1 - \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} Z_j^* \right) + \sum_{j=1}^n Z_j \left(\sum_{i \in \Omega_y} a_{ij} y_i^* - \rho_j \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} y_i^* \left(1 - \mathcal{R}_i x^* + \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} Z_j^* \right) + (x^* - x) \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} \mathcal{R}_i y_i^* \\ &= 1 - x - \frac{x^*}{x} + x^* + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \left(\mathcal{R}_i x^* - 1 - \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} Z_j^* \right) + \sum_{j=1}^n Z_j \left(\sum_{i \in \Omega_y} a_{ij} y_i^* - \rho_j \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in \Omega_y} y_i^* \left(1 - \mathcal{R}_i x^* + \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} Z_j^* \right) + (x^* - x) \frac{1 - x^*}{x^*} \\ &= -\frac{1}{x^* x} (x - x^*)^2 + \sum_{i \notin \Omega_y} y_i \left(\mathcal{R}_i x^* - 1 - \sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} Z_j^* \right) + \sum_{j \notin \Omega_z} Z_j \left(\sum_{i \in \Omega_y} a_{ij} y_i^* - \rho_j \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we make use of equilibrium conditions (5) in the final line. By the assumed inequalities (6), we obtain that $\dot{W} \leq 0$, and thus \dot{W} is a Lyapunov function at the equilibrium \mathcal{E}^* . Noting that \mathcal{E}^* is the unique minimizer of W , we obtain that \mathcal{E}^* is (locally) stable. Additionally, since $\dot{W} \leq 0$ and $W \rightarrow \infty$ as y_i, z_j goes to 0 or ∞ for $i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z$, we find that for any solution there exists $p, P > 0$ such that $p \leq y_i, z_j \leq P$ for $i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z$. Applying La Salle's Invariance principle, the ω -limit set corresponding to any solution of (2) with positive initial conditions is contained in the largest invariant set, \mathcal{L} , where $\dot{W} = 0$. Clearly $\dot{W} = 0 \Rightarrow x = x^*$, thus $x = x^*$ in \mathcal{L} . This implies that $x(t) \rightarrow x^*$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all solutions with positive

initial conditions. Furthermore if the inequalities (6) are strict, then $y_i = 0, z_j = 0$ in \mathcal{L} for $i \notin \Omega_y, j \notin \Omega_z$. This implies that omega limit sets corresponding to positive initial conditions are contained in invariant orbits satisfying (9) and (8). Since \mathcal{E}^* is the unique equilibrium in Γ , utilizing a similar argument as [15], we find that for each $i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z$, solutions y_i, Z_j in the invariant set \mathcal{L} satisfy:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t y_i(s) ds = y_i^*, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t Z_j(s) ds = Z_j^*. \quad (10)$$

For any solution:

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_i(t) \geq y_i^* \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} Z_j(t) \geq Z_j^*.$$

Therefore, y_i and $Z_j, i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z$, are uniformly weakly persistent. Theorem 2.1 implies that the key hypotheses of Corollary 4.8 from [31] are satisfied, and thus weak uniform persistence implies strong uniform persistence for these variants. In addition, note that if $i \in \Omega_y$ and $a_{ij} = 0 \forall j \in \Omega_z$, i.e. $\Lambda_i \cap \Omega_z = \emptyset$, then $\dot{y}_i = 0$ and therefore $y_i = y_i^*$ for this component on the invariant set \mathcal{L} by (10).

Finally, we show that if $|\{i \in \Omega_y : \Lambda_i \cap \Omega_z \neq \emptyset\}| \leq 2$, then \mathcal{E}^* is globally asymptotically stable. Without loss of generality suppose that $\{i \in \Omega_y : \Lambda_i \cap \Omega_z \neq \emptyset\} = \{1, 2\}$. Then $\mathcal{R}_1 y_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 y_2 = \mathcal{R}_1 y_1^* + \mathcal{R}_2 y_2^*$ by (8) since $y_i = y_i^* \ i > 2$ on the invariant set \mathcal{L} for any other strains where $\Lambda_i \cap \Omega_z = \emptyset$. Now clearly there exists time t_1 such that $y_1(t_1) = y_1^*$ by (10), and this implies that $y_2(t_1) = y_2^*$ by the previous sentence. Without loss of generality assume $t_1 = 0$. Differentiating (8) twice and evaluating at time $t = 0$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{R}_1 \ddot{y}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 \ddot{y}_2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{R}_i \gamma_i \left[\gamma_i \left(\sum_{j \in \Omega_z} (Z_j^* - Z_j(0)) \right)^2 - y_i(0) \left(\sum_{j \in \Omega_z} a_{ij} \frac{\sigma_j}{\rho_j} Z_j \sum_{k \in \Omega_y} a_{kj} (y_k(0) - y_k^*) \right) \right] \\ 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{R}_i \gamma_i^2 \left(\sum_{j \in \Omega_z} (Z_j^* - Z_j(0)) \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from the fact that $y_k(0) = y_k^*$ for $k = 1, 2$, and $a_{kj} = 0$ for $k > 2$. The only way the above equation can be satisfied is if $Z_j(0) = Z_j^*$ for all j . Then $y_i(0) = y_i^*, Z_j(0) = Z_j^*, i \in \Omega_y, j \in \Omega_z$. Thus \mathcal{E}^* is globally asymptotically stable in this case. \square

More general results can be obtained in special cases, in particular, the inequalities (6) need not be strict for persistence results in certain cases discussed in Section 4. However, the global convergence to persistent variants is still an open question when there are more than two persistent immune responses. Note that the proof for global stability of “strictly saturated” equilibria \mathcal{E}^* with $|\Omega_z| \leq 2$ does not extend to $|\Omega_z| > 2$. Our numerical simulations that we have conducted support the global stability of \mathcal{E}^* . We conjecture that an equilibrium \mathcal{E}^* of (2), which is unique in its positivity class Γ_Ω and satisfies inequalities (5) strictly, is globally asymptotically stable for positive initial conditions regardless of the dimension of Γ_Ω .

4 Special Cases of Multi-epitope model

Suppose there are n epitopes each recognized by a specific CTL variant population. Recall that each virus strain i (cells infected with strain i), y_i , has an *epitope set* defined by $\Lambda_i := \{j \in [1, n] : a_{ij} > 0\}$, i.e. $j \in \Lambda_i$, if y_i is *not* resistant to CTL z_j . To make further progress on the analysis of model (2), it is useful to make the following assumption:

$$\forall i \in [1, m] : \quad a_{ij} = a_j > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad j \in \Lambda_i. \quad (11)$$

Recall that $a_{ij} = r_{ij}/\delta_i$, where r_{ij} is the killing/interaction rate and δ_i is the infected cell death rate. Thus, we might assume that each strain has identical infected cell death rate $\delta_i = \delta$ (so that they differ only in

infection or viral production rate) and $r_{ij} = r_j > 0$ for all i such that $j \in \Lambda_i$, i.e. the immune response Z_j either attacks strain i at rate r_j or strain i is resistant to Z_j . Since a cell infected by virus strain i can be either resistant or susceptible to each of the n CTL variants, there are in principle 2^n possible viral mutant strains distinguished by their (basic) reproduction number, \mathcal{R}_i , and epitope set, Λ_i . The quantity $\mathcal{I}_j := \frac{a_j}{\rho_j} = \frac{bq_j r_j}{\delta_i \mu_j}$ describes the reproductive potential of immune population j . We say that an immune response Z_j is *immunodominant* over another immune response Z_k if $\mathcal{I}_j > \mathcal{I}_k$. Sometimes we refer to the immune response Z_j with maximal \mathcal{I}_j as immunodominant.

After rescaling the immune response variables as $z_j = a_j Z_j$ and introducing the parameter $s_j = 1/\mathcal{I}_j$, we obtain the following system:

$$\dot{x} = 1 - x - x \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{R}_i y_i, \quad \dot{y}_i = \gamma_i y_i \left(\mathcal{R}_i x - 1 - \sum_{j \in \Lambda_i} z_j \right), \quad \dot{z}_j = \frac{\sigma_j}{s_j} z_j \left(\sum_{i: j \in \Lambda_i} y_i - s_j \right), \quad (12)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Each of the potential virus strains can be represented by a binary string of length n signifying its resistance profile (epitope set), i.e. $y_i \cong i_1 \dots i_n$ where $i_j = 0$ if $j \in \Lambda_i$ and $i_j = 1$ if $j \notin \Lambda_i$. In the full virus mutant network, $m = 2^n$ and no particular ordering is assumed, but we allow $m \leq 2^n$ and choose convenient orderings for constrained networks in special cases considered in subsequent subsections.

First, notice that the 2^n potential virus strains can be viewed in a mutational pathway network, where each strain is a vertex in the *hypercube graph* according to the strain's epitope set represented as a binary sequence. The n -dimensional hypercube graph, denoted Q_n , can be generated by connecting two distinct vertices (binary sequences of length n) with an edge if their *Hamming distance* is exactly one. In other words, for our setting, viral strains $y_i \cong i_1 \dots i_n$ and $y_j \cong j_1 \dots j_n$ are connected by an edge, which we denote $y_i \sim y_j$, if the sequences $i_1 \dots i_n$ and $j_1 \dots j_n$ differ in exactly one slot, i.e. $|\{k \in [1, n] : i_k \neq j_k\}| = 1$. In this way, y_i can mutate into y_j (or vice-versa) through a single epitope mutation if $y_i \sim y_j$. We use the notation $d(y_i, y_j)$ to denote the *Hamming distance* between the sequences corresponding to strains y_i and y_j ; $d(y_i, y_j) = |\{k \in [1, n] : i_k \neq j_k\}|$. Note that the wild-type virus, denoted here by y_w , is represented by the sequence of all zeroes since it is susceptible to attack by all immune responses. Since each mutation of an epitope comes with a fitness cost, we should assume that

$$\text{If } y_i \sim y_j \text{ and } d(y_i, y_w) < d(y_j, y_w), \text{ then } \mathcal{R}_i > \mathcal{R}_j. \quad (13)$$

We can establish some restrictions on the positivity class of feasible equilibria in model (12) based on graph-theoretic considerations of the viral strains viewed in the hypercube graph. In particular, we show that equilibria with persistent viral strains forming a cycle of order 2^j in the associated hypercube graph can only occur in degenerate cases. For $2 \leq j \leq n$, there are 2^{n-j} disjoint 2^j -cycles which cover the vertices of the hypercube graph Q_n . In particular, it is well-known that there is a *Hamiltonian* cycle covering Q_n . The following proposition concerns feasibility of equilibria with cycles in the viral mutational pathway network.

Proposition 4.1. *For $n \geq 2$, consider model (12). Let $2 \leq j \leq n$ and $\ell = 2^j$. Suppose there is a simple ℓ -cycle in the representative hypercube graph, $y_{k_1} \sim y_{k_2} \sim \dots \sim y_{k_\ell} \sim y_{k_1}$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^i \mathcal{R}_{k_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^{d(y_i, y_w)} \mathcal{R}_{k_i} \neq 0$, then there can not be an equilibrium with $y_{k_1}^*, y_{k_2}^*, \dots, y_{k_\ell}^* > 0$.*

Proof. Fix $2 \leq j \leq n$ and let $\ell = 2^j$. Each simple cycle of length ℓ can be seen as an embedded hypercube graph on 2^j vertices, Q_j , corresponding to binary strings where $n-j$ slots are fixed to be all zeros or all ones. Without loss of generality suppose that these fixed slots are indices $[j+1, n]$ corresponding to z_{j+1}, \dots, z_n . Without loss of generality, assume that the epitope sets of y_1, \dots, y_ℓ all contain $[j+1, n]$, more precisely $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} \Lambda_i = [j+1, n]$, and there is an ℓ -cycle between their corresponding vertices in the hypercube graph, given as $y_1 \sim \dots \sim y_\ell \sim y_1$. Suppose that $y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_\ell^* > 0$. Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^i \frac{\dot{y}_i}{\gamma_i y_i^*} = x^* \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^i \mathcal{R}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^i - (z_{j+1}^* + \dots + z_n^*) \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^i - (z_1^* + \dots + z_j^*) \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \binom{j-1}{i} (-1)^i \\ &= x^* \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^i \mathcal{R}_i = x^* \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (-1)^{d(y_i, y_w)} \mathcal{R}_i. \end{aligned}$$

□

A couple remarks about the above proposition are in order. First, we highlight the of case $j = 2$ of Proposition 4.1, which implies the generic non-existence of equilibria with persistent viral strains forming a 4-cycle in the associated hypercube graph. In particular, if viral strains y_{k_1}, \dots, y_{k_4} form a cycle, then there exists an equilibrium \mathcal{E}^* with $y_{k_1}^*, \dots, y_{k_4}^* > 0$ only if $\sum_{i=1}^4 (-1)^{p_i} \mathcal{R}_{k_i} = 0$ where $p_i = d(y_{k_i}, y_w)$. In Section 4.3, the degeneracy of “four-cycle equilibria” will be detailed further for the case of $n = 2$ epitopes. In general, for $n \geq 2$, there are 2^{n-2} disjoint 4-cycles which cover the vertices of Q_n , and their unions form larger cycles with order as powers of two. Each of these cycles of order 2^j , $j \geq 2$, can be seen as an embedded j -dimensional hypercube. Thus the proposition establishes the degeneracy of equilibria with positive viral components forming an embedded hypercube subgraph in the associated hypercube Q_n , which suggests that these combinations of viral strains generally do not persist together in model (12).

In the following subsections, we analyze a few special cases of the multi-epitope model where stable equilibria can be sharply characterized by quantities derived from the parameters. Throughout the following, we assume without loss of generality that immune responses z_1, \dots, z_n are ordered according to an immunodominance hierarchy:

$$s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_n, \quad \text{i.e. } \mathcal{I}_1 \geq \mathcal{I}_2 \geq \dots \geq \mathcal{I}_n \quad (14)$$

Sections 4.1 and 4.2 mostly summarize previous analytical results when the network is constrained to be “one-to-one” and perfectly nested, respectively. These cases provide nice applications of our general Theorem 3.1, and also are important for the analysis of the full network. We consider the full network with $m = 2^n$ virus strains in section 4.3 for $n = 2$ epitopes, and in section 4.4 for arbitrary n in the special case of equal fitness costs for each epitope mutation.

4.1 Strain-Specific network

First, consider the case where $m = n$ and $\Lambda_i = \{i\}$ in model (12), i.e. A is a diagonal $n \times n$ matrix, $A = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, in system (2). This particular assumption of a “one-to-one” interaction network, where each immune response population attacks a unique specific viral strain, has been considered in [35, 20, 22, 5]. In this case, model (12) reduces to the following $n + 1$ -strain and n -immune variant model:

$$\dot{x} = 1 - x - x \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}_i y_i, \quad \dot{y}_i = \gamma_i y_i (\mathcal{R}_i x - 1 - z_i), \quad \dot{y}_{n+1} = \gamma_{n+1} y_{n+1} (\mathcal{R}_{n+1} x - 1), \quad \dot{z}_i = \frac{\sigma_i}{s_i} z_i (y_i - s_i), \quad (15)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, n$. We impose the additional assumption that \mathcal{R}_i are decreasing with i , along with our immunodominance hierarchy (14), to avoid degeneracy,

$$\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2 > \dots > \mathcal{R}_n. \quad (16)$$

For $k \in [1, n]$ define:

$$\mathcal{P}_k = \mathcal{P}_{k-1} + s_k \mathcal{R}_k, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P}_0 = 1, s_k = 1/\mathcal{I}_k. \quad (17)$$

More generally we can define $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}} = 1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{R}_i s_i$ for any subset $\mathcal{J} \subseteq [1, n]$. For each $k \in [0, n]$, define the following equilibria:

$$\mathcal{E}_{k+1}^\dagger = (x^\dagger, y^\dagger, z^\dagger), \quad x^\dagger = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}}, \quad y_i^\dagger = s_i, \quad z_i^\dagger = \frac{\mathcal{R}_i}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}} - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (18)$$

$$y_{k+1}^\dagger = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{P}_k}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}}, \quad z_{k+1}^\dagger = 0, \quad y_i^\dagger = z_i^\dagger = 0, \quad i > k + 1,$$

$$\mathcal{E}_k^\dagger = (x^\dagger, y^\dagger, z^\dagger), \quad x^\dagger = \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_k}, \quad y_i^\dagger = s_i, \quad z_i^\dagger = \frac{\mathcal{R}_i}{\mathcal{P}_k} - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (19)$$

$$y_i^\dagger = z_i^\dagger = 0, i \geq k+1, \quad y_i^\dagger = z_i^\dagger = 0, \quad i > k,$$

Let $k \in [1, n+1]$ be maximal such that

$$\mathcal{R}_k > 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{R}_i s_i$$

where the sum on the right vanishes if $k = 1$. There are two cases depending on whether (for $k < n+1$)

$$\mathcal{R}_k > 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{R}_i s_i$$

or not. If the inequality holds (for $k < n+1$), then there is a unique saturated equilibrium, \mathcal{E}_k^\dagger , with $\Omega_z = \Omega_y = [1, k]$ and if it does not or $k = n+1$, then there is a unique saturated equilibrium, \mathcal{E}_k^\dagger , with $\Omega_z = [1, k-1], \Omega_y = [1, k]$. The inequalities (6) are strict in either case so the system is Ω_{yz} permanent and $y_i, z_j \rightarrow 0$ for all $i \notin \Omega_y, j \notin \Omega_z$, by Theorem 3.1.

In fact, much more can be said about the asymptotic behavior of solutions. In particular, the other conclusions of Theorem 3.1 imply that the components y_i, z_j where $i \notin \Omega_y, j \notin \Omega_z$ converge to zero, the asymptotic means of the persistent variants converge to equilibria values, and the global attractor satisfies (9) which consists of k or $k-1$ distinct planar Lotka-Volterra predator-prey differential equations for (y_i, z_i) constrained by the relation $\sum_i \mathcal{R}_i y_i = \sum_i \mathcal{R}_i s_i$. This fact was utilized in a chemostat model by Wolkowicz [35] to prove that a unique saturated equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable for $k = 1, 2$ (including when $\Omega_z = \{1, 2\}, \Omega_y = \{1, 2, 3\}$). These results are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *If $\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{P}_1$, let k be the largest integer in $[1, n]$ such that $\mathcal{R}_k > \mathcal{P}_k$, otherwise let $k = 0$. If $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} \leq \mathcal{P}_k$, then for $1 \leq i \leq k$, y_i, z_i are uniformly persistent (if $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} > \mathcal{P}_k$, y_{k+1} also persists), and the other variants globally converge to zero, $x(t) \rightarrow 1/\mathcal{P}_k$ (if $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} > \mathcal{P}_k$, $x(t) \rightarrow 1/\mathcal{P}_{k+1}$ and $y_{k+1}(t) \rightarrow 1 - \frac{\mathcal{P}_k}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}}$) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Additionally, the corresponding equilibria (\mathcal{E}_k^\dagger or $\mathcal{E}_{k+1}^\dagger$) are locally stable (globally asymptotically stable when $k = 0, 1, 2$), asymptotic averages converge to equilibria, and the global attractor satisfies (8) and (9).*

If the assumptions of decreasing and distinct reproduction numbers are relaxed, then the system can have degeneracies which allow for multiple saturated equilibria. However when the full network for n epitopes containing 2^n strains is considered (the strain-specific network is a subgraph in the representative hypercube graph), we can relax assumptions while avoiding any degeneracy of ‘‘strain-specific equilibria’’. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, we identify the viral strain y_i with the binary sequence $i_1 \dots i_n$ where $i_j = 1$ for all $j \neq i$ and $i_i = 0$, and $y_{n+1} \cong 1 \dots 1$. Note in other sections we use different orderings of the strains on the hypercube. Then denoting the wild strain as y_w , where $y_w \cong 0 \dots 0$, we have $d(y_i, y_w) = n-1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. We assume that for any $i, j \in [1, 2^n]$, if $y_i \sim y_j$, then $d(y_i, y_w) < d(y_j, y_w) \Rightarrow \mathcal{R}_i > \mathcal{R}_j$ as mentioned before since mutations incur fitness costs.

We claim that any equilibrium \mathcal{E} with $\Omega_z \subseteq [1, n]$ and $\Omega_y \subseteq [1, n+1]$ is saturated only if $\Omega_z = [1, n]$ and $\Omega_y \supseteq [1, n]$. In other words \mathcal{E}_n^\dagger and $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}^\dagger$ are the only strain-specific equilibria which can be saturated in the full hypercube network. Suppose by way of contradiction that we can choose $i, j \in [1, n]$ such that $i \in \Omega_z$ and $j \notin \Omega_z$. Then consider strain y_ℓ such that $\Lambda_\ell = \{i, j\}$, i.e. $y_\ell \sim y_i$ and $y_\ell \sim y_j$. At equilibrium \mathcal{E} , its invasion rate is given by $\frac{y_\ell}{\gamma_\ell y_\ell} = (\mathcal{R}_\ell - \mathcal{R}_i)/\mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{J}$ or \mathcal{R}_{n+1} with $\mathcal{J} \subset [1, n]$. Since $\mathcal{R}_\ell > \mathcal{R}_i$, equilibrium \mathcal{E} can not be saturated. The conditions for equilibria \mathcal{E}_n^\dagger to be saturated is as follows in the general model:

$$(|\Lambda_\ell| - 1) \mathcal{P}_n + \mathcal{R}_\ell \leq \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\ell} \mathcal{R}_i \quad \forall \ell \in [n+1, 2^n] \quad (20)$$

We will further analyze the full network for special cases of $n = 2$ epitopes and equal viral fitness costs of mutations from each of n epitopes, in Sections 4.3 and 4.4, respectively. First, we examine key results from Browne [8] in the case of a perfectly nested network.

4.2 Nested Network

While the virus-immune epitope interaction network generally can be quite complex, patterns of viral escape and dynamic immunodominance hierarchies often emerge. In observations of HIV infection, the initial CTL response occurs at a few immunodominant epitopes and is followed by viral mutations at these epitopes conferring resistance, along with a fall in these specific CTLs and rise in subdominant CTLs [24]. This pattern continues, albeit at diminishing rates as time proceeds, resulting in viral strains with resistance at multiple epitopes and corresponding fitness costs, along with subdominant CTLs of increasing breadth. An idealized description of this process is a *perfectly nested network*, where resistance to multiple epitopes is built sequentially according to the immunodominance hierarchy. Nested networks have been of recent interest in explaining the biodiversity and structure of bacteria-phage communities [17, 20, 34], and there is some evidence that nestedness is a feature of HIV-CTL dynamics [18, 24, 11]. In a recent work [8], the stability of equilibria, along with uniform persistence or extinction of the populations are characterized for system (12) in the case of a perfectly nested network.

The perfectly nested network consists of n epitope specific CTLs, z_1, \dots, z_n , and $m = n + 1$ virus strains y_1, \dots, y_{n+1} where the epitope set of y_i is $\Lambda_i = \{i, \dots, n\}$ (having escaped immune responses z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}). The equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= 1 - x - x \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}_i y_i, & \dot{y}_i &= \gamma_i y_i \left(\mathcal{R}_i x - 1 - \sum_{j \geq i} z_j \right), & \dot{y}_{n+1} &= \gamma_{n+1} y_{n+1} (\mathcal{R}_{n+1} x - 1), \\ \dot{z}_i &= \frac{\sigma_i}{s_i} z_i \left(\sum_{j \leq i} y_j - s_i \right), & & \text{where } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

As before we assume a fitness cost for each mutation, and here we also assume a strict immunodominance:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2 > \dots > \mathcal{R}_{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_1 > \mathcal{I}_2 > \dots > \mathcal{I}_n.$$

Out of a multitude of non-negative equilibria ($> 2^n$), there are $2n + 2$ feasible attractors, the stability of which depend upon quantities derived from parameters. For $k \geq 1$ define:

$$\mathcal{Q}_k = \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} + (s_k - s_{k-1})\mathcal{R}_k, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{Q}_0 = 1, s_0 = 0, s_k = 1/\mathcal{I}_k. \quad (22)$$

Then, for each $k \in [0, n]$, define the following equilibria:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k+1} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}), \quad \tilde{x} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}}, \tilde{y}_i = s_i - s_{i-1}, \tilde{z}_i = \frac{\mathcal{R}_i - \mathcal{R}_{i+1}}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k, \quad (23)$$

$$\tilde{y}_{k+1} = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_k}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}}, \tilde{z}_{k+1} = 0, \quad \tilde{y}_i = \tilde{z}_i = 0 \quad \text{for } k+1 < i \leq n$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}), \quad \bar{x} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_k}, \bar{y}_i = s_i - s_{i-1}, \bar{z}_i = \frac{\mathcal{R}_i - \mathcal{R}_{i+1}}{\mathcal{Q}_k} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < k, \quad (24)$$

$$\bar{y}_k = s_k - s_{k-1}, \bar{z}_k = \frac{\mathcal{R}_k}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1, \quad \bar{y}_i = \bar{z}_i = 0 \quad \text{for } k < i \leq n, \bar{y}_{k+1} = 0$$

Equilibrium $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k+1}$ represents the appearance of escape mutant y_{k+1} from equilibrium $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$.

The main result of [8] is summarized as follows:

Theorem 4.2 ([8]). *If $\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{Q}_1$, let k be the largest integer in $[1, n]$ such that $\mathcal{R}_k > \mathcal{Q}_k$, otherwise let $k = 0$. If $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$, then for $1 \leq i \leq k$, y_i, z_i are uniformly persistent (if $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} > \mathcal{Q}_k$, y_{k+1} persists), and the other variants globally converge to zero, $x(t) \rightarrow 1/\mathcal{Q}_k$ (if $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} > \mathcal{Q}_k$, $x(t) \rightarrow 1/\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ and $y_{k+1}(t) \rightarrow 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_k}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}}$) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Additionally, the corresponding equilibria ($\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k+1}$ or $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$) are locally stable (globally asymptotically stable when $k = 0, 1, 2$), asymptotic averages converge to equilibria, and the global attractor satisfies (8) and (9).*

Proof. The theorem is proved in [8], and also can be seen as a direct application of Theorem 3.1. \square




Figure 1: (a) The full virus-immune network on $n = 3$ epitopes visualized through the viral escape pathway hypercube graph, \mathcal{Q}_3 . (b) The strain-specific (one-to-one) network, as a subgraph of the hypercube graph. (c) The perfectly nested network, as a subgraph of the hypercube graph. (d) The full network on $n = 2$ epitopes.

Theorem 4.2 suggests a stable diverse set of viral strains and immune response which can be built up by the nested accumulation of epitope resistance and rise of subdominant CTLs. The diversity achieved depends upon potential breadth n and “immune invasion” number at epitope $k \leq n$, $\mathcal{R}_k/\mathcal{Q}_k$, which depends upon the strengths of CTL directed at the k epitopes in immunodominance hierarchy and the viral fitness costs of k sequential mutations, along with initial fitness \mathcal{R}_1 . Observe that since \mathcal{R}_k decreases and \mathcal{Q}_k increases with breadth k , Theorem 4.2 implies exclusion of y_{k+1} is more likely as the breadth k increases. Additionally, it is shown in [8] that the rate of y_{k+1} invasion decreases as the breadth k increases, which is consistent with several studies showing rate of HIV viral escape from CTL responses slows down after acute infection, along with relatively few escapes [2, 12].

Overall, the analysis in the case of the nested network confirms some patterns of multi-epitope viral escape and reinforces the importance of strong immune responses directed at conserved epitopes (high fitness cost for resistance) in order to control HIV with CTL response. However, constraining multi-epitope resistance to be built in a nested fashion leaves out other potential mutational pathways. The question remains, with n epitopes targeted by distinct immune responses, what are the potential escape patterns and stable equilibria? We begin to answer this question in the next subsection in the simplest case of multiple epitopes, $n = 2$.

4.3 Dynamics for full network on $n = 2$ epitopes

If two epitopes are concurrently targeted by two distinct specific immune responses, which escape pathway will the virus follow and what mutant strains persist? In the nested network, we assumed that the virus escaped the most immunodominant response. However, in general, both *CTL pressure* and *virus fitness cost* determine selective advantage of a resistant mutant. For a single epitope, an escape mutant y_2 invades the wild-type y_1 , if its reproductive number, $\mathcal{R}_2 = f\mathcal{R}_1$, is large enough given the CTL pressure, $s_1\mathcal{R}_1$; in particular, if $(f - s_1)\mathcal{R}_1 > 1$, where f is the fitness proportion of the wild-type reproductive number \mathcal{R}_1 and $s_1 = 1/\mathcal{I}_1$ is the immune response reproduction number as before. For the general case of $n = 2$ epitopes, although the situation is fundamentally more complex, we will sharply characterize the dynamics in this section and the results suggest that immunodominance may play a larger role than viral fitness in determining the structure of the persistent virus-immune network.

The full network for $n = 2$ epitopes (shown in Fig. 1(d)) consists of 2 CTL populations, z_1 and z_2 , and $m = 4$ virus strains, y_i $i = 1, \dots, 4$, each with an associated binary string describing their resistance profile; $y_1 \cong 00$, $y_2 \cong 10$, $y_3 \cong 01$, $y_4 \cong 11$. Recall that a 0 in the j^{th} slot of the binary string signifies susceptible to z_j , whereas 1 signifies resistance; for example y_2 (10) is resistant to z_1 but susceptible to z_2 . We assume that z_1 is strictly immunodominant, i.e. $\mathcal{I}_1 > \mathcal{I}_2$ or $s_1 < s_2$. Each epitope escape comes with a fitness cost as before, therefore the viral reproduction numbers satisfy $\mathcal{R}_1 > \max(\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3) \geq \min(\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3) > \mathcal{R}_4$. We note that the fitness cost for resistance to z_1 may be greater than or equal to the fitness cost to z_2 , in other words the fitness of mutant y_2 is less than or equal to y_3 ($\mathcal{R}_2 \leq \mathcal{R}_3$). Conversely, it may be the case that resistance to the dominant immune response, z_1 , comes at less cost than resistance to the weaker response ($\mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_3$). Our underlying assumptions are summarized below:

$$\mathcal{I}_1 > \mathcal{I}_2 \quad (s_1 < s_2), \quad \mathcal{R}_1 > \max(\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3) \geq \min(\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3) > \mathcal{R}_4 \quad (25)$$

For clarity, we write the 7 equations in model (12) for this case $n = 2$ with the chosen index notation:

$$\dot{x} = 1 - x - x \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{R}_i y_i, \quad \dot{y}_1 = \gamma_1 y_1 (\mathcal{R}_1 x - 1 - (z_1 + z_2)), \quad \dot{y}_2 = \gamma_2 y_2 (\mathcal{R}_2 x - 1 - z_2), \quad (26)$$

$$\dot{y}_3 = \gamma_3 y_3 (\mathcal{R}_3 x - 1 - z_1), \quad \dot{y}_4 = \gamma_4 y_4 (\mathcal{R}_4 x - 1), \quad \dot{z}_1 = \frac{\sigma_1}{s_1} z_1 (y_1 + y_3 - s_1), \quad \dot{z}_2 = \frac{\sigma_2}{s_2} z_2 (y_1 + y_2 - s_2),$$

The dynamics are rigorously characterized in the Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 stated below. The theorems together present a sharp polychotomy which delineates the stability of nine potential distinct equilibria, along with a degenerate case where a continuum of equilibria exists, and the corresponding uniform persistence of variants in each case. First, we list these nine potential equilibria with corresponding component values. In this way, we can capture all of the possible equilibrium *forms* and avoid listing equilibria that are always unstable. Note that there are five feasible equilibria (which can be *strictly* saturated) with both immune responses, z_1 and z_2 , persistent: the nested and “strain-specific” type (with 2 or 3 virus strains), along with a new form where y_1, y_2, y_3 coexist. The distinct regimes are determined by the values of the reproductive numbers and the following quantities

$$\mathcal{Q}_1 = 1 + \mathcal{R}_1 s_1, \quad \mathcal{Q}_2 = \mathcal{Q}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 (s_2 - s_1), \quad \mathcal{P}_2 = 1 + s_1 \mathcal{R}_3 + s_2 \mathcal{R}_2, \quad \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3 - \mathcal{R}_1. \quad (27)$$

The following equilibria have two immune responses present:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2 = \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_3}, \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_2, 0, \tilde{y}_4, \tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2 \right), \quad \bar{\mathcal{E}}_2 = \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_2}, \bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2, 0, 0, \bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2 \right), \quad \hat{\mathcal{E}}_2 = \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}, \hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2, \hat{y}_3, 0, \hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2 \right) \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2^\dagger = \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_3}, 0, y_2^\dagger, y_3^\dagger, y_4^\dagger, z_1^\dagger, z_2^\dagger \right), \quad \mathcal{E}_2^\ddagger = \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_2}, 0, y_2^\ddagger, y_3^\ddagger, 0, z_1^\ddagger, z_2^\ddagger \right), \quad \text{where}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y}_1 &= \bar{y}_1 = s_1, \quad \tilde{y}_2 = \bar{y}_2 = s_2 - s_1, \quad \tilde{y}_4 = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}_4}, \quad \tilde{z}_1 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{R}_4}, \quad \tilde{z}_2 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{R}_4} - 1, \quad \bar{z}_1 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{Q}_2}, \quad \bar{z}_2 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{Q}_2} - 1, \\ \hat{y}_1 &= \frac{\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{R}} - 1, \quad \hat{y}_2 = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}} + s_2 - s_1, \quad \hat{y}_3 = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}}, \quad \hat{z}_1 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{R}}, \quad \hat{z}_2 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_3}{\mathcal{R}}, \\ y_2^\dagger &= y_2^\ddagger = s_2, \quad y_3^\dagger = y_3^\ddagger = s_1, \quad y_4^\dagger = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{R}_4}, \quad z_1^\dagger = \frac{\mathcal{R}_3}{\mathcal{R}_4} - 1, \quad z_2^\dagger = \frac{\mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{R}_4} - 1, \quad z_1^\ddagger = \frac{\mathcal{R}_3}{\mathcal{P}_2} - 1, \quad z_2^\ddagger = \frac{\mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{P}_2} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

The four equilibria with one or zero immune responses are:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1 &= \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_2}, s_1, 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_1}{\mathcal{R}_2}, 0, 0, \frac{\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{R}_2}, 0 \right), \quad \bar{\mathcal{E}}_1 = \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_1}, s_1, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_1} - 1, 0 \right), \quad (29) \\ \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0 &= \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_1}, 1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_1}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0 \right), \quad \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The theorems classifying dynamics for model (26) with strict immunodominance, $s_1 < s_2$, are as follows (proofs are in Appendix A.2):




Figure 2: Bifurcation at $\mathcal{R}_4 = \mathcal{R}$: line of equilibria (a) $\mathcal{R}_4 < \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow y_3 \rightarrow \hat{y}_3, y_4 \rightarrow 0$ (b) Line of equilibria at $\mathcal{R}_4 = \mathcal{R}$ where all variants persist. (c) $\mathcal{R}_4 > \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow y_3 \rightarrow 0, y_4 \rightarrow \hat{y}_4$.

Theorem 4.3 (Stability of equilibria with one or zero immune response). *Consider the model with two epitopes (26) under the assumptions (25) and suppose positive initial conditions, i.e. $x(0), y_i(0), z_j(0) > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 4, j = 1, 2$. Then the following results hold:*

- i. If $\mathcal{R}_1 < 1$, then $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$ is GAS (globally asymptotically stable).
- ii. If $1 < \mathcal{R}_1 \leq \mathcal{Q}_1$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0$ is GAS.
- iii. If $\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{Q}_1 \geq \mathcal{R}_2$, then $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_1$ is GAS.
- iv. If $\mathcal{Q}_2 \geq \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{Q}_1$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ is GAS.

Theorem 4.4 (Stability of equilibria with two immune responses present). *Consider the model with two epitopes (26) under the assumptions (25) and suppose positive initial conditions, i.e. $x(0), y_i(0), z_j(0) > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 4, j = 1, 2$. Then the stability of equilibria (28) are characterized as follows:*

1. if $\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{Q}_2$ and $\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$, then $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is GAS.
2. if $\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{R}_4$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is GAS.
3. if $\mathcal{Q}_2 < \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\mathcal{R}_4 < \mathcal{R}$, then $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is (locally) stable. Additionally, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = \hat{x} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_4(t) = 0$, and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t y_i(s) ds = \hat{y}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t z_j(s) ds = \hat{z}_j, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Furthermore $y_i, z_j, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, 2$ are uniformly persistent.

4. if $\mathcal{P}_2 < \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{P}_2$, then \mathcal{E}_2^\dagger is GAS.
5. if $\mathcal{Q}_2 < \mathcal{P}_2 < \mathcal{R}_4 < \mathcal{R}$, then \mathcal{E}_2^\ddagger is GAS.
6. If $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_4$, then there is a continuum of saturated equilibria which forms a line connecting $y_4 = 0$ and $y_3 = 0$ boundaries at \hat{y}_3 and \hat{y}_4 , respectively, in the (y_3, y_4) plane.

We make the following observations concerning the above theorems. First, note that the inequalities in the hypotheses of Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 cover all possible parameter combinations under the conditions (25). Indeed, observe that $\mathcal{P}_2 \leq \mathcal{Q}_2 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{R} \leq 0$ and of course $\mathcal{Q}_2, \mathcal{P}_2 > 0$, therefore the case $\mathcal{P}_2 \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$ falls under case 1 or case 2 of the theorem. Additionally, $\mathcal{R} > \mathcal{Q}_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{Q}_2$, separating this case from the cases considered in Theorem 4.3. Note also that any equilibrium, \mathcal{E}^* , with $z_2^* > 0$ and $z_1^* = 0$ or $y_3^* > 0$ and $y_2^* = 0$ will not be saturated when $s_1 < s_2$.

For the case $\mathcal{R}_4 = \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2 < \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{P}_2$, both equilibria $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2$ and $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$ are saturated, but the inequalities (6) are not strict. In this case, there are a continuum of saturated (neutrally stable) non-negative equilibria with




Figure 3: Convergence to $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ with (a) healthy cells and virus, (b) Immune response. Despite a “single epitope advantage” of y_3 , the mutant y_2 (resistant to immunodominant response z_1) excludes y_3 in the two-epitope scenario. The parameters are as follows: $\mathcal{R}_1 = 12.5$, $\mathcal{R}_2 = 3$, $\mathcal{R}_3 = 10$, $\mathcal{R}_4 = 2$, $\mathcal{I}_1 = 6.67$, $\mathcal{I}_2 = 5$, thus $\mathcal{Q}_1 < \mathcal{R}_2 < \mathcal{Q}_2$. Also, $\gamma_i = \gamma = 70$ and $\sigma_j = 10$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, $j = 1, 2$, and initial conditions are $x(0) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_1}$, $y_1(0) = 1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_1}$, $y_2(0) = y_3(0) = 0.1$, $y_4(0) = 0.001$, $z_1(0) = z_2(0) = 0.01$. The comparison of single-epitope invasion eigenvalues yields $\lambda_2 = 0.044\gamma < \lambda_3 = 1.86\gamma$, and the single-epitope densities are $y_2^* = 0.042 < y_3^* = 0.65$.




Figure 4: (a) Convergence to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_2$ after decreasing \mathcal{R}_1 from 12.5 to 12 and increasing \mathcal{R}_2 from 3 to 5 (with all other parameters the same as for Fig. 3). (b) Convergence to $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$ after decreasing \mathcal{R}_1 from 12 to 11.8. (c) Convergence to \mathcal{E}_2^\dagger after decreasing \mathcal{R}_1 from 11.8 to 11.5. (d) Convergence to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_2$ after increasing \mathcal{R}_4 to 3.6. Note z_1 and z_2 both persist in these simulations.

Strains	$\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{Q}_2$, $\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$	$\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{R}_4$	$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_4$	$\mathcal{R}_4 < \mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{Q}_2 < \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{P}_2$	$\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{P}_2$, $\mathcal{P}_2 < \mathcal{R}$	$\mathcal{Q}_2 < \mathcal{P}_2$ < $\mathcal{R}_4 < \mathcal{R}$
x^*	$\frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_2}$	$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_4}$	$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}$	$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}$	$\frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_2}$	$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_4}$
y_1^* (00)	s_1	s_1	$\frac{\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{R}} - 1 + y_4^*$	$\frac{\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{R}} - 1$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$
y_2^* (10)	$s_2 - s_1$	$s_2 - s_1$	$1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}} + s_2 - s_1 - y_4^*$	$1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}} + s_2 - s_1$	s_2	s_2
y_3^* (01)	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}} - y_4^*$	$1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}}$	s_1	s_1
y_4^* (11)	$\mathbf{0}$	$1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}_4}$	y_4^*	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$1 - \frac{\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{R}_4}$
Stable Equilib.	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2$	$\mathcal{E}(y_4^*), 0 \leq y_4^* \leq 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}}$	$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$	\mathcal{E}_2^\dagger	\mathcal{E}_2^\ddagger

Table 1: Stable equilibria values for healthy & infected cells in Theorem 4.4 where six regimes sharply characterize distinct viral strain persistence scenarios ($\mathbf{0}$ components go extinct) when both immune responses z_1 & z_2 persist (when $\mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{Q}_2$). Note that if $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$, then only z_1 and y_1, y_2 can persist and the dynamics are detailed in Theorem 4.3.

$x(t) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}$ and $y_4(t) \rightarrow 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}} - y_3^*$, where $0 \leq y_3^* \leq 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_2}{\mathcal{R}}$. The endpoints of the line of equilibria in the (y_3, y_4) plane correspond to $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2$ and $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$, where $\tilde{y}_3 = 0$ and $\hat{y}_4 = 0$, respectively. The bifurcation at $\mathcal{R}_4 = \mathcal{R}$ is illustrated in Figure 2. When $\mathcal{R}_4 \neq \mathcal{R}$, it is not possible for all y_i to persist, as the dynamics will fall into one of the cases in Theorems 4.3 and 4.4. These results illustrate Proposition 4.1, which precludes the possibility of equilibria with all components y_i positive when $\mathcal{R}_4 \neq \mathcal{R}$ since the viral strains form a 4-cycle in the associated hypercube graph.

An *interesting finding* is that strain y_2 (10) is present in all equilibria (and uniformly persistent) with mutation, even if it has a much higher fitness cost than y_3 (01), i.e. $\mathcal{R}_3 \gg \mathcal{R}_2$. Thus, if escape occurs in the two epitope setting, the viral quasispecies always includes the mutant y_2 with resistance to the immunodominant epitope, z_1 . We can characterize the (linearized) invasion rate of an escape mutant, say y_2 , from the single epitope, z_1 , by calculating $\frac{y_2}{y_2}$ at equilibrium $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$, to obtain $\lambda_2 = \gamma_2 \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_2}{\mathcal{Q}_1} - 1 \right) = \frac{\mathcal{R}_2}{1 + \mathcal{R}_1 s_1} - 1$. The mutant y_2 then converges to $y_2^* = 1 - \frac{1 + \mathcal{R}_1 s_1}{\mathcal{R}_2}$, in equilibrium $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$. The comparable quantities for mutant y_3 in escaping the single epitope z_2 (in the absence of z_1) are $\lambda_3 = \gamma_3 \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_3}{1 + \mathcal{R}_1 s_2} - 1 \right)$ and $y_3^* = 1 - \frac{1 + \mathcal{R}_1 s_2}{\mathcal{R}_3}$. Even when y_3 (escaping z_2) has larger invasion characteristics in the single epitope escape setting ($y_3^* > y_2^*$ and $\lambda_3 > \lambda_2$), y_2 will still persist and may actually exclude y_3 in the two epitope model. Figure 3 depicts simulations of this scenario of y_2 excluding y_3 despite the larger selective advantage of y_3 in the single epitope setting. Figure 4 shows further simulations of (26), which are all consistent with assertions of Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4.

There are two special cases of model (26) where analysis further suggests the superior role of immunodominance over viral reproductive fitness. First, if we relax the assumption of strict immunodominance hierarchy, i.e. we allow that $s_1 = s_2$, then a “strictly saturated” non-negative equilibrium \mathcal{E}^* has the following properties: $z_1^* > 0 \Leftrightarrow z_2^* > 0$ and $y_2^* > 0 \Leftrightarrow y_3^* > 0$. The calculations for this case are presented in the Appendix A.3. Essentially, non-trivial strictly saturated equilibria are of the form $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2, \mathcal{E}_2^\dagger$ or \mathcal{E}_2^\ddagger with the corresponding parameter regimes as defined in Table 1. Therefore, in the case of equal immunodominance ($s_1 = s_2$), no matter the fitness of the distinct mutant strains y_2 and y_3 , both strains can only persist together. Next, consider the case where the viral fitness cost to each epitope is equal, say the cost is $c = 1 - f$, and the strict immunodominance holds, $s_1 > s_2$. Then $\mathcal{R}_2 = \mathcal{R}_3 = f\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_4 = f^2\mathcal{R}_1$. This scenario will be analyzed in further generality for n epitopes in the next section. The result for this special case of model (26) is that one of the nested equilibria, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i$ or $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i$ ($i = 0, 1, 2$) will be globally asymptotically stable. Thus, in contrast to the previous special case ($s_1 = s_2$) where viral fitness did not determine persistence, here (in this special case of equal viral fitness costs) we find that persistence is determined by immunodominance.

The above results indicate that the *immunodominance hierarchy is the most important factor in directing epitope escape, more so than viral fitness cost*. In addition, the persistent variants depend upon reproductive numbers and quantities defined in (27), implying that the escape pathway depends upon the entire interacting

system, not just the parameters associated with the single epitopes and corresponding resistant viral mutant strains. Both of these implications coincide with the findings in an *in vivo* study of HIV patients [24]. From a broader ecological point of view, our results suggest top-down control of food webs, where top predators have more influence than intermediate species, along with the interconnectedness of complex ecological networks.

4.4 Uniform fitness costs for escape on full n -epitope network

We consider the full network for n epitopes, in the special case where each viral mutation of an epitope incurs a uniform fitness cost, $c = 1 - f$, where $f \in (0, 1)$ is the ratio between reproduction number of mutant and descendent strain. In particular, indexing the wild-strain here as $y_1 = y_w$ with fitness \mathcal{R}_1 , then we make the following assumption on the 2^n viral strains in the full network:

$$d(y_i, y_1) = p \Rightarrow \mathcal{R}_i = f^p \mathcal{R}_1, \quad \forall i \in [1, 2^n], \quad (30)$$

where $d(y_i, y_1)$ is the Hamming distance between the associated binary sequences of the viral strains as defined earlier. Note that since the wild-strain y_1 is susceptible at all epitopes ($y_1 \cong 0 \cdots 0$), a viral strain y_i with $d(y_i, y_1) = p$, $p \in [0, n]$ has mutated p epitopes and thus has a (susceptible) epitope set of cardinality $n - p$, i.e. $|\Lambda_i| = n - p$. Then, we can write the model (12) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= 1 - x - x \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} \mathcal{R}_i y_i, \\ \dot{y}_i &= \gamma_i y_i \left(f^p \mathcal{R}_1 x - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n-p} z_{i_j} \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, 2^n, \quad d(y_i, y_1) = p, \quad \Lambda_i = \{i_1, \dots, i_{n-p}\}, \quad p \in [0, n], \\ \dot{z}_j &= \frac{\sigma_j}{s_j} z_j \left(\sum_{i:j \in \Lambda_i} y_i - s_j \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

As before, we assume the immunodominance hierarchy (14), $s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_n$. We denote the viral strains associated with “nested” (sequential) escape, in addition to the wild strain y_1 , as y_2, \dots, y_{n+1} . This means that for $i = 1, \dots, n$, the epitope set of y_i is $\Lambda_i = \{i, \dots, n\}$ (having escaped immune responses z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}) and $\Lambda_{n+1} = \emptyset$. Our main result of this section is, informally, that viral escape from n epitopes follows a “nested pattern” when the hierarchy (14) is strict. In other words, one of the nested equilibria, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k+1}$ or $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$ (introduced in Section 4.2) is stable. In the Appendix A.4, we show that two other classes of equilibria, namely “strain-specific” and “one-mutation” equilibria, are unstable in this case of equal fitness costs, even when inequalities (14) are not strict. Now for the main theorem, we assume the strict immunodominance hierarchy:

$$s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_n. \quad (32)$$

Theorem 4.5. *Consider model (31), the full network on n epitopes ($m = 2^n$) with equal fitness costs (30) and strict immunodominance hierarchy (32). Suppose y_i , $i \in [1, n+1]$, is indexed so that $\Lambda_i = \{i, \dots, n\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $\Lambda_{n+1} = \emptyset$. Then $y_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $i \in [n+2, 2^n]$, and Theorem 4.2 holds in system (31). In particular, y_i, z_i are uniformly persistent for $1 \leq i \leq k \leq n$ when $\mathcal{R}_k > \mathcal{Q}_k$ (and y_{k+1} is also persistent if $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} > \mathcal{Q}_k$).*

Proof. If $\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{Q}_1$, let k be the largest integer in $[1, n]$ such that $f^{k-1} \mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_k > \mathcal{Q}_k$, otherwise let $k = 0$. We will apply Theorem 3.1. It suffices to check the invasion rate for y_ℓ in (6) for $\ell \in [n+2, 2^n]$ since Theorem 4.2 establishes the result in the perfectly nested submodel consisting of y_1, \dots, y_{n+1} and z_1, \dots, z_n . First suppose that $f^k \mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_{k+1} \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$. Let $\ell \in [n+2, 2^n]$ and it suffices to consider $\Lambda_\ell \cap [1, k]$ since the calculations will be considered at equilibrium $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$ where $z_i^* = 0$ for all $i \geq k+1$. Suppose that $d(y_\ell, y_1) = p$ where $p \in [1, n-1]$. Then $\mathcal{R}_\ell = f^p \mathcal{R}_1$. Consider the invasion rate for y_ℓ at the equilibrium $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$:

$$\frac{\dot{y}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell y_\ell} = \frac{f^p \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 - \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\ell \cap [1, k]} \bar{z}_i$$

If $p > k$, then clearly

$$\frac{\dot{y}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell y_\ell} \leq \frac{f^p \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 < \frac{f^k \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 \leq 0.$$

If $p \leq k$, $|\Lambda_\ell| = n - p \geq n - k$ and note that $\Lambda_\ell \neq \Lambda_{k+1} = \{k+1, \dots, n\}$ (where Λ_{k+1} is the epitope set of y_{k+1}). Thus, $[1, k] \cap \Lambda_\ell \neq \emptyset$. By (24), for $2 \leq i \leq k-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{z}_i - \bar{z}_{i-1} &= \frac{\mathcal{R}_i - \mathcal{R}_{i+1} - (\mathcal{R}_{i-1} - \mathcal{R}_i)}{\mathcal{Q}_k} \\ &= \frac{-f^{i-2} \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} (f^2 - 2f + 1) \\ &= \frac{-f^{i-2} \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} (f-1)^2 < 0 \quad \text{for } f \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly $\bar{z}_k - \bar{z}_{k-1} < 0$, and thus at equilibrium $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$, we find

$$\bar{z}_k < \bar{z}_{k-1} < \dots < \bar{z}_1.$$

If $p = k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{y}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell y_\ell} &\leq \frac{f^p \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 - \bar{z}_k \\ &\leq \frac{f^k \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 - \left(\frac{f^{k-1} \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 \right) \\ &< 0 \quad \text{for } f \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

If $p \leq k-1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{y}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell y_\ell} &< \frac{f^p \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 - \bar{z}_k \\ &\leq \frac{f^{k-1} \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 - \left(\frac{f^{k-1} \mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_k} - 1 \right) \\ &= 0 \quad \text{for } f \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the equilibrium $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$ is saturated with inequalities (6) strictly holding and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_k$ is unique in its positivity class. Thus Theorem 3.1 can be applied to obtain the conclusions of Theorem 4.2. If $f^k \mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_{k+1} > \mathcal{Q}_k$, then a similar argument works with $x^* = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_{k+1}}$ instead of $x^* = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_k}$, which shows that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k+1}$ is stable in that case. \square

In Figure 5, we illustrate Theorem 4.5 by numerical solution of the model (31) in the case of $n = 3$ epitopes. The simulations show that after some transient dynamics, only the viral strains associated with the nested network, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 , persist. In other words, the full network of $n = 3$ epitopes (displayed in Figure 1(a)) converges to the perfectly nested subgraph (displayed in Figure 1(c)).

5 Discussion

In this paper, we analyzed a virus model consisting of target cells, multiple virus strains and several immune response populations. The interaction of virus and immune response is described by a network reflecting the avidity of each distinct immune response in recognizing each particular virus strain. We find some general conditions on stability and feasibility of equilibria, along with uniformly persistent virus and immune response variants by utilizing Lyapunov function techniques.

We specialize the model to consider the scenario where the immune response populations are n different CTL lines, each specific to a particular epitope, and there are 2^n virus strains containing all possible combinations of (resistance conferring) epitope mutations. In this case, the virus-immune network can be




Figure 5: Example dynamics in case of uniform fitness cost and $n = 3$ epitopes. The solutions converge to the “nested equilibrium” $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_4$ where y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 persist and other y_i go extinct. Note that there are transient oscillations in the persistent viral and immune variant populations for a large period of time before convergence to the equilibrium. The parameters are as follows: wild-type viral fitness $\mathcal{R}_1 = 11.8$, mutant fitness proportion $f = 0.9$, $s_1 = 0.167$, $s_2 = 0.175$, $s_3 = 0.185$, $\gamma_i = 3.5$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $\gamma_i = 17.5$ for $5 \leq i \leq 8$, $\sigma_1 = 0.5$, $\sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = 2.5$. Initial conditions are $x(0) = 1$, $y_i(0) = 0.01$, $z_j(0) = 0.001$, $1 \leq i \leq 8$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$.

translated to an n -dimensional hypercube graph representative of the potential pathways of immune escape by the virus. The number of uniformly persistent viral strains and CTL populations can be built up in an ordered fashion dependent on derived invasion thresholds for “one-to-one” and “perfectly nested” subgraphs. For the full network of 2^n viral strains, we characterize the dynamics in two cases: (i) $n = 2$ epitopes and (ii) equal fitness costs for each of n epitopes. Distinct parameter regimes delineate stability of multiple potential feasible equilibria for the case (i) with $n = 2$ CTL populations. The escape pathway always includes the mutant resistant to the immunodominant epitope, even when it suffers a relatively high fitness cost. In case (ii), the network of 2^n viral strains always converges to a perfectly nested subgraph with less than or equal to $n + 1$ strains.

The results indicate that a diverse viral “quasispecies” can be built through resistance mutations at multiple epitopes and the immunodominance hierarchy is the most important factor determining the escape pathway. These notions are supported by observations in HIV infection. Indeed, the efficacy and breadth of cognate CTL immune responses increase within-host HIV diversity, driving viral evolution so that different combinations of multiple epitope escapes become prevalent in the viral population [27]. Also, recent studies have shown that immunodominance hierarchies in HIV are major determinants of viral escape from multiple epitopes [3, 24], in particular immunodominance was found to play a substantially larger role than the viral fitness costs and other factors [24]. Understanding the main factors shaping viral escape pathways and immune dynamics is important for design of effective vaccines and immunotherapies.

Future research can build upon the results presented here in several ways. First, since rapid evolution of HIV due to CTL pressure is motivation for our model, mutation between the different viral strains can be explicitly included in the model. Preliminary simulations from stochastic versions of the model show that qualitative dynamics are preserved under mutation. Rigorous global perturbation arguments in the deterministic setting may be attempted to show the effect of small mutation rates, however for the general case, this would rely upon the conjecture of global stability for equilibria. Thus, another important theoretical question is proving global stability when uniform persistence occurs. Finally, further extensions of our work can be applicable to other dynamic ecological systems, such as the coevolving network of HIV and antibodies within a host.

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge support by the Simons Foundation Grant 355819.

A Appendix

A.1 Existence of saturated equilibrium

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We find it somewhat easier to work with the unscaled system (1) so we introduce some new parameters into it. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be so small that $b - \epsilon(m + n) > 0$ and $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ be a homotopy parameter. Our perturbed system is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} X' &= b - cX - \lambda X \sum_i \beta_i Y_i - \epsilon(m + n) \\ Y_i' &= \lambda Y_i \left(\beta_i X - \sum_j r_{ij} Z_j \right) - \delta_i Y_i + \epsilon, 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ Z_j' &= \lambda q_j Z_j \sum_i r_{ij} Y_i - \mu_j Z_j + \epsilon q_j, 1 \leq j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

We refer to the vector field on the right side as $G(W, \lambda, \epsilon)$, where $W = (X, Y, Z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+n+1}$. Then $G(W, 1, 0)$ is the vector field given in equations (1).

Straightforward calculation establishes that

$$\begin{aligned} (X + \sum_i Y_i + \sum_j Z_j/q_j)' &= b - cX - \sum_i \delta_i Y_i - \sum_j \frac{\mu_j}{q_j} Z_j \\ &\leq b - d(X + \sum_i Y_i + \sum_j Z_j/q_j) \end{aligned}$$

for $d = \min\{c, \delta_i, \mu_j\}$. Fix $p > b/d$ and let

$$\mathcal{U} = \{W \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+n+1} : X + \sum_i Y_i + \sum_j Z_j/q_j \leq p\}$$

We claim that there are no equilibria on the boundary of \mathcal{U} . Notice that any equilibrium $E = (X, Y, Z) \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfies $Y_i > 0$ and $Z_j > 0$. If it belongs to the boundary of \mathcal{U} , then either $X = 0$ or $X + \sum_i Y_i + \sum_j Z_j/q_j = p$. Each of these is easy to rule out. Suppose, for example the latter holds. Then the left side of the differential inequality above vanishes at E so we have $0 \leq b - pb$, a contradiction to $p > b/d$.

Now we can employ degree theory, as in Hofbauer and Sigmund. By Homotopy invariance of degree we have that $\deg(G(\bullet, 1, \epsilon), \mathcal{U}) = \deg(G(\bullet, 0, \epsilon), \mathcal{U})$ and the latter is easy to compute since it is linear and has a unique equilibrium $\tilde{E} \in \mathcal{U}$

$$\deg(G(\bullet, 0, \epsilon), \mathcal{U}) = \text{sgn det } G_W(\tilde{E}, 0, \epsilon) = \text{sgn}(-1)^{m+n+1} c \prod_i \delta_i \prod_j \mu_j = (-1)^{m+n+1}$$

As the degree is nonzero, $G(\bullet, 1, \epsilon)$ has at least one equilibrium in the interior of \mathcal{U} for each small ϵ . Now, the argument for the existence of a saturated equilibrium of $G(\bullet, 1, 0)$ follows as in Hofbauer & Sigmund's text [15] by taking limits as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

A.2 Two-epitope model: dynamics when $s_1 < s_2$

Proof of Theorems 4.3 and 4.4. We apply Theorem 3.1 for each equilibrium and case. First in Theorem 4.3:

Case i.:

$$\dot{W} = -\frac{1}{x}(x-1)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^4 (1 - \mathcal{R}_i) y_i - \sum_{i=1}^2 s_i z_i$$

Case ii.:

$$\dot{W} = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_1 x}(\mathcal{R}_1 x - 1)^2 - \sum_{i=2}^4 \frac{y_i}{\mathcal{R}_0} (\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^2 s_i z_i$$

Case iii.:

$$\dot{W} = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_1 x} (\mathcal{Q}_1 x - 1)^2 - \frac{y_3}{\mathcal{Q}_1} (\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_3) - \sum_{i=2,4} \frac{y_i}{\mathcal{Q}_1} (\mathcal{Q}_1 - \mathcal{R}_i) - z_2 (s_2 - s_1)$$

Case iv.:

$$\dot{W} = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_2 x} (\mathcal{R}_2 x - 1)^2 - \frac{y_3}{\mathcal{R}_2} (\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_3) - \frac{y_4}{\mathcal{R}_2} (\mathcal{R}_2 - \mathcal{R}_4) - \frac{z_2}{\mathcal{R}_2} (\mathcal{Q}_2 - \mathcal{R}_2)$$

In case iii, on the invariant set L we have $x = 1/\mathcal{Q}_1$, $y_3 = y_4 = 0$ and $z_2 = 0$. If $\mathcal{R}_1 < \mathcal{Q}_1$, then $\dot{W} = 0 \Rightarrow y_2 = 0$, otherwise $\mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{Q}_1 \Rightarrow \dot{y}_2 = 0$. Either way the equation $\dot{x} = 0$ implies that $y_1 = y_1^*$ and $y_2 = 0$. Thus $\dot{y}_1 = 0$, which implies $z_1 = z_1^*$. Therefore in this case L consists solely of the equilibrium $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$.

In case iv, i.e. $\mathcal{Q}_1 < \mathcal{R}_2 \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$, then we prove $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ is GAS. Here, $\dot{W} = 0$ iff $x = x^* = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_1}$, $y_3 = y_4 = 0$, and $z_2 = 0$. (Note if $\mathcal{Q}_2 > \mathcal{R}_2$, $z_2 = 0$ is immediate. If not, we can still reason that the asymptotic average of z_2 must converge to $z_2^* = 0$, hence $z_2 = 0$.) In addition by Theorem 3.1, we can obtain $y_2 = y_2^* = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Q}_1}{\mathcal{R}_1}$. The last relation combined with $x = x^*$ implies that $y_1 = y_1^* = s_1$. Then $\dot{y}_1 = 0$ implies $z_1 = z_1^*$. Thus L consists solely of the equilibrium $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$.

Next in Theorem 4.4:

Case 1: $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_2$:

$$\dot{W} = \frac{-1}{\mathcal{Q}_2 x} (\mathcal{Q}_2 x - 1)^2 - \frac{y_3}{\mathcal{Q}_2} (\mathcal{Q}_2 - \mathcal{R}) - \frac{y_4}{\mathcal{Q}_2} (\mathcal{Q}_2 - \mathcal{R}_4).$$

Notice that $\dot{W} \leq 0$ when $\mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$ and $\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$. Also, the equilibrium $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is non-negative when $\mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{Q}_2$. If $\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{Q}_2$ and $\mathcal{R}_4 < \mathcal{Q}_2$, applying Theorem 3.1, all inequalities (6) are strict and only two strains, y_1 and y_2 have non-empty epitope sets, and therefore $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is globally asymptotically stable. If $\mathcal{R}_4 = \mathcal{Q}_2$, then the differential equations in (9) hold along with $\dot{y}_4 = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1,2,4} \mathcal{R}_i y_i = \mathcal{Q}_2 - 1$. Taking asymptotic averages as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [8], we obtain that indeed $y_4 = 0$, and we similarly obtain that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is globally asymptotically stable.

Case 2: $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$:

$$\dot{W} = \frac{-1}{\mathcal{R}_4 x} (\mathcal{R}_4 x - 1)^2 - \frac{y_3}{\mathcal{R}_4} (\mathcal{R}_4 - \mathcal{R}),$$

Notice that $\dot{W} \leq 0$ when $\mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{R}_4$. Also, the equilibrium $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is non-negative when $\mathcal{R}_4 > \mathcal{Q}_2$. Applying Theorem 3.1, we obtain that $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is globally asymptotically stable.

Case 3: $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$:

$$\dot{W} = \frac{-1}{\mathcal{R} x} (\mathcal{R} x - 1)^2 - \frac{y_4}{\mathcal{R}} (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_4),$$

Notice that $\dot{W} \leq 0$ when $\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{R}$. Also, the equilibrium $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2$ is non-negative when $\mathcal{Q}_2 < \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{P}_2$. The result is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1.

Case 4: $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = \mathcal{E}_2^\dagger$:

$$\dot{W} = \frac{-1}{\mathcal{P}_2 x} (\mathcal{P}_2 x - 1)^2 - \frac{y_1}{\mathcal{P}_2} (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{P}_2) - \frac{y_4}{\mathcal{P}_2} (\mathcal{P}_2 - \mathcal{R}_4),$$

Notice that $\dot{W} \leq 0$ when $\mathcal{R} \geq \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{P}_2$. The equilibrium \mathcal{E}_2^\dagger is non-negative when $\min(\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3) > \mathcal{P}_2$. Global stability follows from Theorem 3.1.

Case 5: $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = \mathcal{E}_2^\ddagger$:

$$\dot{W} = \frac{-1}{\mathcal{R}_4 x} (\mathcal{R}_4 x - 1)^2 - \frac{y_1}{\mathcal{R}_4} (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_4),$$

Notice that $\dot{W} \leq 0$ when $\mathcal{R}_4 \leq \mathcal{R}$. Also, the equilibrium \mathcal{E}_2^\ddagger is non-negative when $\mathcal{R}_4 > \mathcal{P}_2$. Global stability follows from Theorem 3.1. \square

A.3 Two-epitope model: dynamics when $s_1 = s_2$

We analyze the feasible stable equilibria with immune response for the case of equal immunodominance of z_1 and z_2 ($s_1 = s_2 = s$) in model (26). First, consider equilibria with one immune response present. Since $s_1 = s_2$, without loss of generality, we can take $z_1^* > 0$. From the equilibrium equations, $y_1^*, y_3^* > 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_3$, which is not possible since $\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_3$. Also, an equilibrium with $y_3^* > 0$ (and $z_2^* = 0$) will not be saturated since $\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_3$, therefore take $y_3^* = 0$. Similarly we can take $y_4^* = 0$. Thus, consider equilibria $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_1$. The equilibrium $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ can not be stable since $s_1 = s_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_1 = \mathcal{Q}_2$, which does not permit conditions for case iv of Theorem 4.3 to be satisfied. The equilibrium $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_1$ will not be ‘‘strictly saturated’’ under conditions for case iii of Theorem 4.3 because there are a continuum of equilibria of the form $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_1(z_2^*)$ where $\bar{z}_1 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_1}{\mathcal{Q}_1} - 1 - z_2^*$, $\bar{z}_2 = z_2^*$.

Now consider the possibility of equilibria with $z_1^*, z_2^* > 0$. Observe that at least two of the viral strain components y_1^*, y_2^*, y_3^* are positive and $y_2^* = y_3^*$ from the \dot{z}_1, \dot{z}_2 equations. Therefore $y_2^*, y_3^* > 0$ and for the case $s_1 = s_2$, non-trivial strictly saturated equilibria are of the form $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_2, \mathcal{E}_2^\dagger$ or \mathcal{E}_2^\ddagger with the corresponding parameter regimes as defined in Table 1.

A.4 Instability of ‘‘one-mutation’’ and ‘‘strain-specific’’ equilibria for model (31)

We assume equal viral fitness costs for mutation from each of n epitopes, yielding system (31), as described in Section 4.4. Consider the set \mathcal{S}_1 of n viral strains which have exactly one mutation, i.e. $y_i \in \mathcal{S}_1 \Rightarrow d(y_i, y_1) = 1$. For clarity here, we label these strains as $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{y_i^1 \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ where y_i^1 has escaped z_i but is susceptible all other immune responses. Note that y_1^1 is strain y_2 with our ‘‘nested’’ indexing introduced in Section 4.2. The subsystem only containing these viral strains looks as follows:

$$\dot{x} = 1 - x - x \sum_{i=1}^n f\mathcal{R}_1 y_{i1}, \quad \dot{y}_i^1 = \gamma_i^1 y_i^1 \left(f\mathcal{R}_1 x - 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} z_j \right), \quad \dot{z}_i = \frac{\sigma_i}{s_i} z_i \left(\sum_{j \neq i} y_j^1 - s_i \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (33)$$

A positive equilibrium $\mathcal{E}_1^* = (x^*, \vec{y}^*, \vec{z}^*)$ to (33) satisfies

$$A\vec{y}^* = \vec{s}, \quad x^* = \frac{1}{1 + f\mathcal{R}_1 \sum y_i^{1*}}, \quad A\vec{z}^* = (f\mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1)\vec{1},$$

where $A = \vec{1}(\vec{1})^T - I_n$, $A^{-1} = \frac{1}{n-1}\vec{1}(\vec{1})^T - I_n$, $\vec{y} = (y_1^1, y_2^1, \dots, y_n^1)^T$,

where I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. Here we find that:

$$y_i^{1*} = \frac{1}{n-1} \left(-(n-2)s_i + \sum_{j \neq i} s_j \right), \quad x^* = \frac{n-1}{n-1 + f\mathcal{R}_1 \sum_i s_i}, \quad z_i^* = \frac{1}{n-1} (f\mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1)$$

Assuming our hierarchy $s_i \leq s_{i+1}$, then $y_i^{1*} > 0$ if $s_1 > \sum_{i>1} (s_n - s_i)$ and $z_i^* > 0$ if $f\mathcal{R}_1 (n-1 - \sum_i s_i) > n-1$. If these conditions are satisfied, then the equilibrium \mathcal{E}_1^* is saturated in the subsystem (33) where $y_i \in \mathcal{S}_1$. However, if we consider a larger network of viral strains, then equilibrium \mathcal{E}_1^* is always unstable in this case with equal fitness costs for mutation. Indeed, consider the wild strain $y_1 \cong 0 \cdots 0$ and strain $y_3 \cong 110 \cdots 0$, which correspond to backward and forward mutations from the strain $y_1^1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$. We calculate their invasion rates at equilibrium \mathcal{E}_1^* . Note that y_1 has reproduction number \mathcal{R}_1 and y_3 has reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_3 = f^2\mathcal{R}_1$. In order for \mathcal{E}_1^* to be saturated (stable), we find that:

$$\frac{\dot{y}_1}{\gamma_1 y_1} = \mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i^* \leq 0, \quad \frac{\dot{y}_3}{\gamma_3 y_3} = f^2 \mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1 - \sum_{i=3}^n z_i^* \leq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1 - \frac{n}{n-1} (f\mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1) \leq 0, \quad f^2 \mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1 - \frac{n-2}{n-1} (f\mathcal{R}_1 x^* - 1) \leq 0$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{R}_1 x^* (fn - (n - 1)) \geq 1, \quad f \mathcal{R}_1 x^* (f(n - 1) - (n - 2)) \leq 1 \\
&\Leftrightarrow f > \frac{n - 1}{n}, \quad f((n - 1)f - (n - 2)) \leq nf - (n - 1) \\
&\Leftrightarrow 0 \geq (n - 1)(f - 1)^2
\end{aligned}$$

However, $(n - 1)(f - 1)^2 > 0$ for all $f \neq 1, n > 1$, giving a contradiction. Thus \mathcal{E}_1 can only be stable when restricted to the subsystem (33) consisting of strains in \mathcal{S}_1 , and becomes unstable in the larger network in this case.

Similarly, we can show that the ‘‘strain-specific’’ (or ‘‘one-to-one’’) equilibria, \mathcal{E}_n^\dagger and $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}^\dagger$ (introduced in Section (4.1)), are always unstable in this case of uniform fitness costs. Indeed, for clarity here, denote y_i^o as the viral strain with epitope set $\Lambda_i^o = \{i\}$, and y_{n+1} as the strain which has completely escaped all z_i , i.e. $\Lambda_{n+1} = \emptyset$. Then \mathcal{E}_n^\dagger (and $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}^\dagger$) consist of equilibria where $y_i^{o*} > 0$ (and $y_{n+1}^* > 0$). First, consider the case that $\mathcal{R}_{n+1} = f^n \mathcal{R}_1 \leq \mathcal{P}_n^o = 1 + \sum_i s_i \mathcal{R}_i^o = 1 + f^{n-1} \mathcal{R}_1 \sum_i s_i$ and $f^{n-1} \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{P}_n^o$, so that \mathcal{E}_n^\dagger is positive, but \mathcal{E}_n^\dagger is not positive. Then consider the invasion rate of viral strain $y_{n-1} \cong 1 \cdots 100$ (with $\Lambda_{n-1} = \{n - 1, n\}$) and reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_{n-1} = f^{n-2} \mathcal{R}_1$. Utilizing (20), if \mathcal{E}_n^\dagger is stable, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}_n^o + f^{n-2} \mathcal{R}_1 \leq 2f^{n-1} \mathcal{R}_1 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{R}_1 f^{n-2} (f^2 - 2f + 1) \leq 0, \quad \text{since } f^n \mathcal{R}_1 \leq \mathcal{P}_n^o,
\end{aligned}$$

which is clearly a contradiction since $(f^2 - 2f + 1) = (f - 1)^2 > 0$ for $f < 1$. A similar argument applies to $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}^\dagger$ in the case $f^n \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{P}_n^o$. Thus the ‘‘strain-specific’’ equilibria are always unstable for system (31).

References

- [1] C. L. Althaus and R.J. De Boer. Dynamics of immune escape during hiv/siv infection. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 4:e1000103, 2008.
- [2] Becca Asquith, Charles TT Edwards, Marc Lipsitch, and Angela R McLean. Inefficient cytotoxic t lymphocyte-mediated killing of hiv-1-infected cells in vivo. *PLoS Biol*, 4(4):e90, 2006.
- [3] Barton, J.P., Goonetilleke, N., Butler, T.C., Walker, B.D., McMichael, A.J. and Chakraborty, A.K., 2016. Relative rate and location of intra-host HIV evolution to evade cellular immunity are predictable. *Nature communications*, 7.
- [4] Rebecca Batorsky, Rinat A Sergeev, and Igor M Rouzine. The route of hiv escape from immune response targeting multiple sites is determined by the cost-benefit tradeoff of escape mutations. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 10(10):e1003878, 2014.
- [5] Nara Bobko and Jorge P Zubelli. A singularly perturbed hiv model with treatment and antigenic variation. *Mathematical biosciences and engineering: MBE*, 12(1):1–21, 2015.
- [6] Cameron J Browne. Immune response in virus model structured by cell infection-age. *Mathematical biosciences and engineering: MBE*, 13(5), 2016.
- [7] Cameron J Browne. A multi-strain virus model with infected cell age structure: Application to hiv. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 22:354–372, 2015.
- [8] C. J. Browne, *Global Properties of Nested Network Model with Application to Multi-Epitope HIV/CTL Dynamics*, *J. Math. Biol.* (2017). doi:10.1007/s00285-017-1102-0
- [9] De Boer, R.J., 2012. Which of our modeling predictions are robust?. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 8(7), p.e1002593.
- [10] Patrick De Leenheer and Sergei S Pilyugin. Multistrain virus dynamics with mutations: a global analysis. *Mathematical Medicine and Biology*, 25(4):285–322, 2008.

- [11] H.W. Van Deutekom, G. Wijnker, and R.J. De Boer. The rate of immune escape vanishes when multiple immune responses control an hiv infection. *Journal of immunology*, 191:3277–3286, 2013.
- [12] V. V. Ganusov, N. Goonetilleke, M. K.P Liu, G. Ferrari, G. M. Shaw, A. J. McMichael P. Borrow, B. T. Korber, and A. S. Perelson. Fitness costs and diversity of the cytotoxic t lymphocyte (ctl) response determine the rate of ctl escape during acute and chronic phases of hiv infection. *Journal of virology*, 85(20):10518–10528, 2011.
- [13] V. V Ganusov, R. A. Neher, and A. S. Perelson. Mathematical modeling of escape of hiv from cytotoxic t lymphocyte responses. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2013.01:P01010, 2013.
- [14] Ganusov, V.V. and De Boer, R.J., 2006. Estimating costs and benefits of CTL escape mutations in SIV/HIV infection. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 2(3), p.e24.
- [15] Josef Hofbauer and Karl Sigmund. *Evolutionary games and population dynamics*. Cambridge university press, 1998.
- [16] Yoh Iwasa, Franziska Michor, and Martin Nowak. Some basic properties of immune selection. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 229(2):179–188, 2004.
- [17] Luis F Jover, Michael H Cortez, and Joshua S Weitz. Mechanisms of multi-strain coexistence in host–phage systems with nested infection networks. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 332:65–77, 2013.
- [18] Taylor A Kessinger, Alan S Perelson, and Richard A Neher. Inferring hiv escape rates from multi-locus genotype data. *Immune system modeling and analysis*, page 348, 2015.
- [19] Kloverpris, H.N., McGregor, R., McLaren, J.E., Ladell, K., Harndahl, M., Stryhn, A., Carlson, J.M., Koofhethile, C., Gerritsen, B., Kesmir, C. and Chen, F., 2015. CD8+ TCR bias and immunodominance in HIV-1 infection. *The Journal of Immunology*, p.1400854.
- [20] Daniel A Korytowski and Hal L Smith. How nested and monogamous infection networks in host-phage communities come to be. *Theoretical ecology*, 8(1):111–120, 2015.
- [21] Daniel A Korytowski and Hal L Smith. Persistence in Phage-Bacteria Communities with Nested and One-to-One Infection Networks. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-B*.
- [22] Daniel A Korytowski and Hal L Smith. A special class of Lotka-Volterra Models of Bacteria-Virus Infection Networks. in volume “Applied Analysis with Applications in Biological and Physical Sciences”, Editors: Cushing, J.M., Saleem, M., Srivastava, H.M., Khan, M.A., Merajuddin, M., ICMBAA, Aligarh, India, June 2015, published (2016) Springer, NY. <http://www.springer.com/us/book/9788132236382>
- [23] Sivan Leviyang and Vitaly V Ganusov. Broad ctl response in early hiv infection drives multiple concurrent ctl escapes. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 11(10):e1004492, 2015.
- [24] Michael KP Liu, Natalie Hawkins, Adam J Ritchie, Vitaly V Ganusov, Victoria Whale, Simon Brackenridge, Hui Li, Jeffrey W Pavlicek, Fangping Cai, Melissa Rose-Abrahams, et al. Vertical t cell immunodominance and epitope entropy determine hiv-1 escape. *The Journal of clinical investigation*, 123(1):380–393, 2013.
- [25] Martin A Nowak and Charles RM Bangham. Population dynamics of immune responses to persistent viruses. *Science*, 272(5258):74–79, 1996.
- [26] Martin A Nowak, Robert M May, and Karl Sigmund. Immune responses against multiple epitopes. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 175(3):325–353, 1995.
- [27] Pandit, A. and de Boer, R.J., 2014. Reliable reconstruction of HIV-1 whole genome haplotypes reveals clonal interference and genetic hitchhiking among immune escape variants. *Retrovirology*, 11(1), p.56.

- [28] A. S. Perelson and P. W. Nelson, Mathematical analysis of HIV-1 dynamics in vivo. *SIAM Review*, 41:3-44, 1999.
- [29] M Recker and S Gupta. Conflicting immune responses can prolong the length of infection in plasmodium falciparum malaria. *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, 68(4):821–835, 2006.
- [30] S. J. Schreiber. Generalist and specialist predators that mediate permanence in ecological communities. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 36:133–148, 1997.
- [31] Hal L Smith, Horst R Thieme, and Horst R Thieme. *Dynamical systems and population persistence*, volume 118. American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, 2011.
- [32] Max O Souza and Jorge P Zubelli. Global stability for a class of virus models with cytotoxic t lymphocyte immune response and antigenic variation. *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, 73(3):609–625, 2011.
- [33] Horst R Thieme. Persistence under relaxed point-dissipativity (with application to an endemic model). *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 24(2):407–435, 1993.
- [34] Joshua S Weitz, Timothée Poisot, Justin R Meyer, Cesar O Flores, Sergi Valverde, Matthew B Sullivan, and Michael E Hochberg. Phage–bacteria infection networks. *Trends in microbiology*, 21(2):82–91, 2013.
- [35] Wolkowicz, Gail SK. "Successful invasion of a food web in a chemostat." *Mathematical Biosciences* 93.2 (1989): 249-268.