

Approximation Methods for Analyzing Multiscale Stochastic Vector-borne Epidemic Models

Xin Liu^{*1}, Anuj Mubayi^{†2}, Dominik Reinhold^{‡3}, and Liu Zhu^{§1}

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, Clemson University

²School of Human Evolution and Social Change; Simon A. Levin Mathematical Computational and Modeling Science Center, Arizona State University-Tempe

³Department of Biostatistics and Informatics, University of Colorado Denver

June 13, 2018

Abstract

Stochastic epidemic models, generally more realistic than deterministic counterparts, have often been seen too complex for rigorous mathematical analysis because of level of details it requires to comprehensively capture the dynamics of diseases. This problem further becomes intense when complexity of diseases increases as in the case of vector-borne diseases (VBD). The VBDs are human illnesses caused by pathogens transmitted among humans by intermediate species, which are primarily arthropods. In this study, a stochastic VBD model, capturing demographic stochasticity and different host and vector dynamic scales, is developed and novel mathematical methods are described and evaluated to systematically analyze the model and understand its complex dynamics. The VBD model incorporates some relevant features of the VBD transmission process including demographical, ecological and social mechanisms. The analysis is based on dimensional reductions and model simplifications via scaling limit theorems. The results suggest that the dynamics of the stochastic VBD depends on a threshold quantity \mathcal{R}_0 , the initial size of infectives, and the type of scaling in terms of host population size. The quantity \mathcal{R}_0 for deterministic counterpart of the model, interpreted as threshold condition for infection persistence as is mentioned in the literature for many infectious disease models, can be computed. Different scalings yield different approximations of the model, and in particular, if vectors have much faster dynamics, the effect of the vector dynamics on the host population averages out, which largely reduces the dimension of the model. Specific scenarios are also studied using simulations for some fixed sets of parameters to draw conclusions on dynamics. Further stochastic analysis will result in closed formulation of important metrics for disease surveillance such as likelihood of an outbreak and prevalence of a vector borne infectious disease as function of demographical and ecological parameters.

Keywords: *Vector-borne disease model; SIS compartment model; Functional law of large numbers; Functional Central limit theorem; Fast and slow dynamics; multiscale analysis; quasi-stationary distributions; time to extinction.*

*Email: xliu9@clemson.edu

†Email: amubayi@asu.edu

‡Email: dominik.reinhold@ucdenver.edu

§Email: liuz@g.clemson.edu

1 Introduction

Vector-Borne Diseases (VBDs) are infections transmitted by the bite of infected arthropod species, such as mosquitoes, ticks, triatomine bugs, sandflies, and blackflies. It has been shown a century ago that hematophagous (blood-sucking) arthropods transmit particular types of viruses, bacteria, protozoa, and helminths to humans and between animals and humans. Since then, there has been a large number of reports of outbreaks of vector-borne diseases, such as Malaria, Dengue, Chagas diseases, and Leishmaniasis, and the diseases were responsible for more human deaths in the 20th centuries than all other causes combined (cf. Gubler (1991); Philip and Rozeboom (1973)). Newly emerging and reemerging vector borne diseases, such as Zika, have recently drawn public attention because of nature of health consequences to new born babies.

Nowadays, changes in land-use, globalization of trade and travel, social upheaval, and intensive new interventions (for example, excessive use of insecticide spraying may change vector behavior and they may become insecticide resistant) have increased the challenges in controlling vector-borne diseases in many regions. VBDs pose serious public health threats throughout the world. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), vector-borne diseases account for more than 17% of all infectious diseases cases, causing more than one million deaths annually (WHO (2014)). In the USA, west Nile virus, zika, malaria, dengue, chikungunya, eastern equine encephalitis, and St. Louis encephalitis are common diseases that are transmitted by vectors. The transmission and spread of vector-borne diseases are determined by complex interactions between the hosts (either humans or nonhuman hosts), vectors species (e.g. specific mosquito species), and various pathogens. Important biological properties underlying the transmission of VBDs include survival, development, reproduction of vectors and of pathogens in vectors, vectors' biting rate, and hosts' (humans and nonhumans) behaviors, all of which are associated with environmental conditions and variations (cf. Mubayi et al. (2010); Pandey et al. (2013); Towers et al. (2016); Sheets et al. (2010); Kribs-Zaleta and Mubayi (2012); Brauer et al. (2016); Gorahava et al. (2015); Yong et al. (2015); Malik et al. (2012)). Many of the biological and ecological characteristics of VBDs remain either uncertain or lack enough data to clearly understand its role.

Mathematical models can be used as a tool to systematically help understand the complex behavior of VBD systems in spite of limitation in data related to a VBD. The increasing availability of alternate data, from a variety of sources including surveys and entomological field studies, provide the ability to model complex ecosystems enabling human decision-making. Models have the potential to facilitate more accurate assessment of such systems and to provide a basis for more efficient and targeted approaches to treatment and scheduling, through an improved understanding of the disease and transmission dynamics. Stochastic models can be used to incorporate random inherent characteristics of epidemic and provide estimates of variability in model outputs. However, the complexity in the models presents many mathematical challenges. The focus of the current study is to provide a unified approach to simplify complex stochastic epidemic models for VBDs, using techniques from probability theory such as the functional law of large numbers (FLLN) and the functional central limit theorem (FCLT).

There is an extensive literature on stochastic modeling of epidemics. Multivariate Markov jump processes are commonly used in stochastic epidemic models (cf. Bartlett (1956); Kurtz (1981); Ball (1983); Mubayi (2008)). Researchers have studied numerous stochastic phenomena such as the distribution of final size of an epidemic (cf. Greenwood and Gordillo (2009)), stochastically sustained oscillations to explain the semi-regular recurrence of outbreaks (cf. Kuske et al. (2007)), stochastic amplification of an epidemic (cf. Alonso et al. (2007)), quasi-stationary distributions, which capture variances in endemic states (cf. Allen (2008); Isham (1991); Nåsell (2002); Bani et al. (2013); van Doorn and Pollett (2013); Champagnat and Villemonais (2016); Britton and

Traoré (2017)), time to extinction of the disease (cf. Andersson and Britton (2012); Britton (2010); Schwartz et al. (2009); Mubayi and Greenwood (2013)), and critical community sizes needed to have epidemics (cf. Nåsell (2005); Bartlett (1960); Keeling and Grenfell (1997); Lloyd-Smith et al. (2005)). In particular, in both van Doorn and Pollett (2013) and Champagnat and Villemonais (2016), sufficient conditions on the existence and uniqueness of quasi-stationary distributions are studied.

Fluid and diffusion approximations (also known as FLLN and FCLT) are classical approaches in probability to simplify complex stochastic systems. Kurtz (1978) is a pioneer in developing such approximations for density dependent Markov chains (see also Kurtz (1981); Ethier and Kurtz (1986)). Recently, Kang and Kurtz (2013) gave a systematic approach for developing FLLNs for multiscale chemical reaction networks. Later, in Kang et al. (2014), the authors provide sufficient conditions for FCLTs of multiscale Markov chains. However, verifying these sufficient conditions for specific complex systems is nontrivial. We show that these sufficient conditions hold in our analysis (for Case II defined below) to establish the FCLT. In multiscale systems, fluid approximations can achieve dimension reduction via appropriate scaling limit theorems, which can significantly simplify the original complex structure (cf. Kang and Kurtz (2013)). It is worth mentioning that dimension reduction methods for VBD models have been studied for deterministic models in literature, although different from the scaling limit theorem approach. For example, Pandey et al. (2013) and Souza (2014) used model similar to the VBD model considered here and derived a simple host-only model from a complex vector-host model by assuming that infection dynamics in the vectors are fast compared to those of the hosts. On the other hand, epidemiological time scales are often used to reduce the dimensionality by identifying components of the model that are evolving naturally at slow, moderate and fast times. These methods are used to corroborate the results of time-scale approximations (see Song et al. (2002)).

Procedure in this study: To thoroughly explain the methodology, we start with a basic model, the vector-borne SIS model, which has been used to study several vector-borne diseases (cf. Anderson and May (1992)). In the vector-borne SIS model, both host and vector individuals are classified as either *susceptible* or *infectious*. We assume that the host population size is fixed and is denoted by a positive integer-valued parameter n , and the vector population size is a random variable whose mean is C_0n , where C_0 is a positive integer-valued constant. For each n , we have a model and a collection of stochastic processes. We study these models as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in two scaling cases. In **Case I**, hosts and vectors evolve at the same rate as $n \rightarrow \infty$, while in **Case II**, vectors have much faster dynamics than hosts as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For both cases, analogous to FLLN, we develop deterministic processes, which are referred to as *fluid limits*, to capture the mean behaviors of the stochastic systems and to study the stability of equilibrium points. We next, analogous to FCLT, establish *diffusion limits*, which are solutions of stochastic differential equations (SDEs), to characterize the statistical fluctuations of the original stochastic systems around their fluid limits. These approximations reduce the dimension of the original system from 3 to 2 under Case I, and to 1 under Case II, which largely simplify the analyses. Especially in Case II, the vector-host system is reduced to a host-only system, where the new transmission parameter is the composite human-to-human transmission rate taking into account both vector-to-host and host-to-vector rates. Comparing the equilibria of the vector-host model and the host-only model can provide understanding of this new transmission parameter in terms of the parameters of the vector-host model. At last, we apply the fluid and diffusion limits to study the quasi-stationary distribution of the original system. Britton and Traoré (2017) have recently studied a vector-borne SIS model similar to our Case I, but with fixed host and vector population sizes, and they apply similar fluid and diffusion limits to study the quasi-stationary distribution and the extinction times. Model approximations and various sub models are summarized in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The original model and its various approximations analyzed in this study

The main contribution of the present paper is as follows. (i) Under the scaling Case II, the stochastic model has fast vector and slow host dynamics. Although there is literature on multiscale deterministic vector-borne epidemic models (see Song et al. (2002); Pandey et al. (2013); Souza (2014)), our work is, to our knowledge, the first to study multiscale stochastic vector-borne epidemic models. We rigorously justify the fast and slow scalings, under which the fast vector dynamic is averaged out, and the fluid and diffusion limits for hosts are established. (ii) We provide a convenient and efficient way to study the long time behavior (e.g., quasi-stationary distributions) of the original stochastic system via the fluid and diffusion limits. We draw the following conclusions: When the basic reproduction number \mathcal{R}_0 is greater than 1: in Case I, since the vector population size has a variance that is linearly growing in time, there is no quasi-stationary distribution, and in Case II, the quasi-stationary distribution is approximately normally distributed. However, we also observe that if the vector population size is fixed, under Case I, the quasi-stationary distribution exists and is approximately normally distributed (also see Britton and Traoré (2017) for similar results).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the stochastic vector-borne SIS model, explain the two scaling cases, and define the basic reproduction number. Section 3 collects all the main results on fluid and diffusion approximations. In Section 4, we study the long time behavior of the stochastic vector-borne SIS model, including quasi-stationary distributions, using the fluid and diffusion limits. We present simulation results in Section 5. In Section 6, a brief discussion is provided. Some fundamental results on equilibrium points of differential equations and matrix exponentials are given in Appendix A and B, the stochastic vector-borne SIS model with fixed host and vector population sizes is briefly studied in Appendix C, and all proofs can be found in Appendix D. At last, two notation tables are provided in Appendix E.

2 Methods

2.1 Model description

Mathematical models have a long history of providing important insight into disease dynamics and control. We study the vector-borne SIS model, in which both host and vector individuals are classified as either *susceptible* or *infectious*. We assume that the infected hosts can recover

and become susceptible immediately again, while vectors stay infectious till they die. The host population size is assumed to be fixed and is denoted by the positive integer-valued parameter n , and the initial vector population size is equal to $C_0 n$, where C_0 is a positive constant. Denote by $S_h^n(t)$ and $I_h^n(t)$ the numbers of susceptible and infected hosts at time t , and similarly, $S_v^n(t)$ and $I_v^n(t)$ the numbers of susceptible and infected vectors at time t .

We assume that the vector biting rate, birth rate, and death rate are all constant, and there is no feeding preference or host competence. Let β_h^n denote the disease transmission rate to hosts from a typical infectious vector. Noting that $I_v^n(t)/n$ gives the average number of vectors per host, we see that $\beta_h^n I_v^n(t)/n$ measures the infection rate for susceptible hosts. Next denote by γ_h^n the recovery rate for infected hosts. For vectors, let γ_v^n represent the equal birth and death rate per vector, and β_v^n be the disease transmission rate to vectors from a typical infectious host. The ratio $I_h^n(t)/n$ can be interpreted as the probability that a vector contacts an infectious host, and so $\beta_v^n I_h^n(t)/n$ measures the infection rate for susceptible vectors.

We model the infection, recovery, birth, and death processes using independent unit-rate Poisson processes (see Theorem 4.1 of Chapter 6 in Ethier and Kurtz (1986)). More precisely, we have the following system of equations: For $t \geq 0$,

$$S_h^n(t) = S_h^n(0) - N_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \frac{I_v^n(u) S_h^n(u)}{n} du \right) + N_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t I_h^n(u) du \right), \quad (2.1)$$

$$I_h^n(t) = I_h^n(0) + N_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \frac{I_v^n(u) S_h^n(u)}{n} du \right) - N_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t I_h^n(u) du \right), \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_v^n(t) &= S_v^n(0) + N_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t [S_v^n(u) + I_v^n(u)] du \right) - N_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \frac{I_h^n(u) S_v^n(u)}{n} du \right) \\ &\quad - N_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t S_v^n(u) du \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

$$I_v^n(t) = I_v^n(0) + N_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \frac{I_h^n(u) S_v^n(u)}{n} du \right) - N_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t I_v^n(u) du \right), \quad (2.4)$$

where $N_i^n, i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, are independent unit-rate Poisson processes, which are independent of the initials $S_h^n(0), I_h^n(0), S_v^n(0)$, and $I_v^n(0)$.

We note that the host population size $S_h^n(t) + I_h^n(t)$ is equal to n for all $t \geq 0$, and the vector population size $S_v^n(t) + I_v^n(t)$ is a random variable. However, the expected vector population size $\mathbb{E}(S_v^n(t) + I_v^n(t))$ is equal to its initial value $C_0 n$ for all $t \geq 0$. The epidemic system can be completely described by a 3-dimensional process (I_h^n, S_v^n, I_v^n) . From the formulation in (2.1) – (2.4), it can be seen that (I_h^n, S_v^n, I_v^n) is a continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC) with infinite state space $\{0, 1, \dots, n\} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$, where \mathbb{N}_0 is the set of non-negative integers. We also observe that once the infection process (I_h^n, I_v^n) reaches the state $(0, 0)$, it will stay at $(0, 0)$ forever, and the process S_v^n will then become a linear birth and death process with equal birth and death rate γ_v^n per individual. Some long time properties of (I_h^n, S_v^n, I_v^n) will be studied in Section 4.

2.2 Asymptotic scales

We consider two asymptotic scales as the host population size becomes large, i.e., $n \rightarrow \infty$. In Case I, vectors and hosts evolve on the same scale, while in Case II, vectors evolve much faster than hosts. More precisely, let $\beta_h, \gamma_h, \beta_v, \gamma_v$ be positive constants. We have the following two cases.

Case I: *Both hosts and vectors evolve at rate $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Host: } & \beta_h^n \rightarrow \beta_h, \quad \gamma_h^n \rightarrow \gamma_h, \\ \text{Vector: } & \beta_v^n \rightarrow \beta_v, \quad \gamma_v^n \rightarrow \gamma_v. \end{aligned}$$

Case II: *Vectors evolve much faster at rate $\mathcal{O}(\alpha(n))$ and hosts evolve at rate $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Host: } & \beta_h^n \rightarrow \beta_h, \quad \gamma_h^n \rightarrow \gamma_h, \\ \text{Vector: } & \frac{\beta_v^n}{\alpha(n)} \rightarrow \beta_v, \quad \frac{\gamma_v^n}{\alpha(n)} \rightarrow \gamma_v, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \alpha(n)/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\alpha(n)/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To understand the above scaling cases, let's assume the time unit is one day. During one day, we measure the transmission rate β_h^n and recovery rate γ_h^n for hosts, and transmission rate β_v^n and equal birth and death rate γ_v^n for vectors. Due to the interaction between hosts and vectors, as the host population size n varies, these parameters also vary, and so we let the parameters depend on n . The scaling Case I simply says as the host population size grows, these parameters approach some steady values. Under Case II, we observe that the transmission rate β_v^n and the birth and death rate γ_v^n are much larger than the parameters for hosts, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To understand the scaling parameter $\alpha(n)$, one could sample a sequence of parameter estimates $\{(\beta_h^n, \gamma_h^n, \beta_v^n, \gamma_v^n)\}_{n=n_0}^N$ for $N - n_0$ different population sizes, and plot the ratio γ_v^n/γ_h^n as a function of n to observe the order of $\alpha(n)$, because $\gamma_v^n/\gamma_h^n \approx \alpha(n)\gamma_h/\gamma_v$. Mathematically, we require $\alpha(n)/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\alpha(n)/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, e.g., $\alpha(n) = n^{2/3}$, to develop the scaling limit theorems.

2.3 Basic reproduction number

The basic reproduction number, \mathcal{R}_0 , is defined as the expected number of secondary cases caused by one infectious individual introduced into a susceptible population during his/her infectious period. It is a measure of the success of an invasion into a population; if $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, a larger outbreak and endemic is possible, whereas if $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, the infection will certainly die out in the long run. The reproduction number of the VBD is defined in a similar way, and could depend on vector mortality rate, pathogen development rate, and host competence and recovery rate (cf. Lord et al. (1996)).

Using next generation matrix approach (Van den Driessche and Watmough (2002)), it is straight forward to compute the basic reproduction number, R_0 for the deterministic counterpart of the Model (2.1) – (2.4). The \mathcal{R}_0 is given as

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\beta_h}{\gamma_v}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{C_0 n \beta_v}{n \gamma_h}\right)}.$$

We note that β_h/γ_v represents the average number of newly infected host individuals produced by a typical infectious vector during its mean survival time period, and $C_0\beta_v/\gamma_h$ represents the average number of newly infected vector individuals produced by a typical infectious host during its mean infection time period. Thus, the basic reproduction number \mathcal{R}_0 (geometric mean) is the average number of newly infected host individuals generated by a typical infectious host individual via vector-host and host-vector transmissions.

3 Model Simplifications: Fluid and Diffusion Approximations

The transient behavior of (I_h^n, S_v^n, I_v^n) is rather complex and cannot be analyzed easily. In this section, we simplify the original epidemic model by establishing the fluid and diffusion approximations through scaling limit theorems for the system equations (2.1) – (2.4). We first consider the fluid scaling, under which the processes are divided by the host population size n . These rescaled processes are referred to as *fluid scaled processes*. Using FLLN methods, we establish the deterministic limits of the fluid scaled processes in Theorems 3.1 and 3.3. These limits are called *fluid limits*, and they capture the average behavior of the fluid scaled processes as the host population size grows to infinity. To characterize the statistical fluctuations of the fluid scaled processes around their fluid limits, we next study the difference between the fluid scaled processes and their fluid limits, which we refer to as the deviation process. We show that the suitably scaled deviation processes converge weakly to SDEs (see Theorems 3.6 and 3.7), which will be referred to as *diffusion limits*.

3.1 Fluid approximations

We define the following fluid scaled processes. For $t \geq 0$,

$$\bar{S}_h^n(t) = \frac{S_h^n(t)}{n}, \quad \bar{I}_h^n(t) = \frac{I_h^n(t)}{n}, \quad \bar{S}_v^n(t) = \frac{S_v^n(t)}{n}, \quad \bar{I}_v^n(t) = \frac{I_v^n(t)}{n}. \quad (3.1)$$

In particular, for $t \geq 0$, the quantities $\bar{S}_h^n(t)$ and $\bar{I}_h^n(t)$ represent the densities of susceptible and infected host individuals at time t , respectively, and $\bar{S}_v^n(t)$ and $\bar{I}_v^n(t)$ represent the numbers of susceptible and infected vectors per host at time t , respectively. We also observe that

$$\bar{I}_h^n(t) + \bar{S}_h^n(t) = 1, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, under the fluid scaling, the system can be completely described by $(\bar{I}_h^n, \bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$.

In the following, we present the fluid limits in both scaling cases. The stability properties of the fluid limits are also studied. (The definitions of different stability concepts are provided in Appendix A.) In Case I, as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$, the fluid scaled vector population size $\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t)$ approaches the constant C_0 , and *the system dimension is reduced to two*.

Theorem 3.1. *In Case I, assume that $\mathbb{E}[(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0)) - (i_h(0), i_v(0))] \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for some constant vector $(i_h(0), i_v(0)) \in \{(x, y) : 0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq C_0\}$. Then for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |(\bar{I}_h^n(s), \bar{S}_v^n(s), \bar{I}_v^n(s)) - (i_h(s), s_v(s), i_v(s))| \right] \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $s_v(t) = C_0 - i_v(t)$, and (i_h, i_v) is the unique solution of the following ODEs with initial value $(i_h(0), i_v(0))$. For $t \geq 0$,

$$\frac{di_h(t)}{dt} = \beta_h i_v(t)(1 - i_h(t)) - \gamma_h i_h(t), \quad (3.3)$$

$$\frac{di_v(t)}{dt} = \beta_v i_h(t)(C_0 - i_v(t)) - \gamma_v i_v(t). \quad (3.4)$$

Theorem 3.2. *The ODEs in (3.3) and (3.4) have two equilibrium points*

$$E^f = (0, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad E^e = \left(\frac{C_0 \beta_h \beta_v - \gamma_h \gamma_v}{C_0 \beta_h \beta_v + \beta_v \gamma_h}, \frac{C_0 \beta_h \beta_v - \gamma_h \gamma_v}{\beta_h \beta_v + \beta_h \gamma_v} \right),$$

and

- (i) the disease free equilibrium E^f is globally asymptotically stable when $\mathcal{R}_0 \leq 1$, it is globally exponentially stable when $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, and it is unstable when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$;
- (ii) when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, the endemic equilibrium E^e is locally asymptotically stable, and it is globally asymptotically stable when $(i_h(0), i_v(0)) \in (0, 1] \times (0, C_0]$.

In Case II, the vectors evolve much faster than the hosts as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, at each time point t , the vectors stay in their equilibrium state, which depends on the state of the hosts at t . Accordingly, the system state can be determined by the state of the hosts, and *the system dimension is reduced to one*. To characterize the equilibrium state of $(\bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$, we define for $t \geq 0$ and a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2$, a measure Γ^n on $[0, t] \times E$ as follows:

$$\Gamma^n([0, t] \times E) = \int_0^t 1_{\{(\bar{S}_v^n(s), \bar{I}_v^n(s)) \in E\}} ds.$$

Theorem 3.3. *Under Case II, assume that $\mathbb{E}[|(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0)) - (i_h(0), i_v(0))|] \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for some constant vector $(i_h(0), i_v(0)) \in \{(x, y, z) : 0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq C_0\}$. Then for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\bar{I}_h^n(s) - i_h(s)| \right] \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where i_h is the unique solution to the following ODE with initial value $i_h(0)$. For $t \geq 0$,

$$\frac{di_h(t)}{dt} = \frac{C_0 \beta_h \beta_v i_h(t) (1 - i_h(t))}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v} - \gamma_h i_h(t). \quad (3.5)$$

Furthermore, for $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$,

$$\Gamma^n([0, t] \times E) \rightarrow \int_0^t 1_{\left\{ \left(\frac{C_0 \gamma_v}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v}, \frac{C_0 \beta_v i_h(t)}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v} \right) \in E \right\}} ds. \quad (3.6)$$

Theorem 3.4. *The ODE in (3.5) has two equilibrium points*

$$E^f = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad E^e = \frac{C_0 \beta_h \beta_v - \gamma_h \gamma_v}{C_0 \beta_h \beta_v + \beta_v \gamma_h},$$

and

- (i) the disease free equilibrium E^f is globally asymptotically stable when $\mathcal{R}_0 \leq 1$, it is globally exponentially stable when $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, and it is unstable when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$;
- (ii) when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, the endemic equilibrium E^e is locally asymptotically stable, and it is globally asymptotically stable when $i_h(0) \in (0, 1]$.

Remark 3.5.

- (i) In scaling Case I, the hosts and vectors evolve at the same rate as $n \rightarrow \infty$ towards their fluid limits defined in (3.3) and (3.4). The equilibrium points of these ODEs are derived by letting the derivative on the LHS of (3.3) and (3.4) be 0, and solve $\beta_h i_v^* (1 - i_h^*) - \gamma_h i_h^* = 0$ and $\beta_v i_h^* (C_0 - i_v^*) - \gamma_v i_v^* = 0$ for (i_h^*, i_v^*) .

- (ii) In scaling Case II, the vectors have much shorter life cycles. From (3.6), in the fluid limit at time $t > 0$, the vectors are in the quasi-equilibrium state $(\frac{C_0\gamma_v}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v}, \frac{C_0\beta_v i_h(t)}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v})$, which depends on the state of the hosts $i_h(t)$.

3.2 Diffusion approximations

In this section, we characterize the statistical fluctuations of the fluid scaled processes around their fluid limits that are developed in Section 3.1. To achieve this, we define the diffusion scaled processes: For $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}_h^n(t) &= \sqrt{n}(\bar{S}_h^n(t) - s_h(t)), \\ \hat{I}_h^n(t) &= \sqrt{n}(\bar{I}_h^n(t) - i_h(t)), \\ \hat{S}_v^n(t) &= \sqrt{n}(\bar{S}_v^n(t) - s_v(t)), \\ \hat{I}_v^n(t) &= \sqrt{n}(\bar{I}_v^n(t) - i_v(t)).\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

From (3.2), and the fact that $i_h(t) + s_h(t) = 1$, we note that $\hat{I}_h^n(t) + \hat{S}_h^n(t) = 0$, and so it suffices to study $(\hat{I}_h^n, \hat{S}_v^n, \hat{I}_v^n)$. Further noting that $S_v^n(0) + I_v^n(0) = C_0 n$ and $s_v(t) + i_v(t) = C_0$ for $t \geq 0$, so we have $\hat{S}_v^n(0) + \hat{I}_v^n(0) = 0$.

Theorem 3.6. Consider Case I, and assume that $(\hat{I}_h^n(0), \hat{S}_v^n(0), \hat{I}_v^n(0))$ converges in distribution to some random variable $(\hat{I}_h(0), \hat{S}_v(0), \hat{I}_v(0))$ with $\hat{S}_v(0) + \hat{I}_v(0) = 0$, and that

$$\sqrt{n}(\beta_h^n - \beta_h) \rightarrow \hat{\beta}_h, \quad \sqrt{n}(\gamma_h^n - \gamma_h) \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}_h, \quad \sqrt{n}(\beta_v^n - \beta_v) \rightarrow \hat{\beta}_v, \quad \sqrt{n}(\gamma_v^n - \gamma_v) \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}_v.\tag{3.8}$$

Then $(\hat{I}_h^n, \hat{S}_v^n, \hat{I}_v^n)$ converges in distribution to $(\hat{I}_h, \hat{S}_v, \hat{I}_v)$, where $(\hat{I}_h, \hat{S}_v, \hat{I}_v)$ is the unique solution to the following SDEs: For $t \geq 0$,

$$\hat{I}_h(t) = \hat{I}_h(0) + \int_0^t [\beta_h s_h(u) \hat{I}_v(u) - (\beta_h i_v(u) + \gamma_h) \hat{I}_h(u)] du + \int_0^t [\hat{\beta}_h i_v(u) s_h(u) - \hat{\gamma}_h i_h(u)] du,\tag{3.9}$$

$$+ \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_h i_v(u) s_h(u) + \gamma_h i_h(u)} dB_1(u),\tag{3.10}$$

$$\hat{S}_v(t) = \hat{S}_v(0) + \int_0^t [-\beta_v s_v(u) \hat{I}_h(u) - \beta_v i_h(u) \hat{S}_v(u) + \gamma_v \hat{I}_v(u)] du + \int_0^t [-\hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) s_v(u) + \hat{\gamma}_v i_v(u)] du,$$

$$+ \int_0^t \sqrt{\gamma_v (C_0 + s_v(u))} dB_2(u) - \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_v i_h(u) s_v(u)} dB_3(u),$$

$$\hat{I}_v(t) = \hat{I}_v(0) + \int_0^t [\beta_v s_v(u) \hat{I}_h(u) + \beta_v i_h(u) \hat{S}_v(u) - \gamma_v \hat{I}_v(u)] du + \int_0^t [\hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) s_v(u) - \hat{\gamma}_v i_v(u)] du$$

$$+ \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_v i_h(u) s_v(u)} dB_3(u) + \int_0^t \sqrt{\gamma_v i_v(u)} dB_4(u),$$

with $B_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, being four independent standard Brownian motions, which are independent of $(\hat{I}_h(0), \hat{S}_v(0), \hat{I}_v(0))$.

Theorem 3.7. Consider Case II, and assume that $\hat{I}_h^n(0)$ converges in distribution to some random variable $\hat{I}_h(0)$, and that

$$\sqrt{n}(\beta_h^n - \beta_h) \rightarrow \hat{\beta}_h, \quad \sqrt{n}(\gamma_h^n - \gamma_h) \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}_h, \quad \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{\beta_v^n}{\alpha(n)} - \beta_v \right) \rightarrow \hat{\beta}_v, \quad \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{\gamma_v^n}{\alpha(n)} - \gamma_v \right) \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}_v.\tag{3.11}$$

Then \hat{I}_h^n converges weakly to \hat{I}_h , where \hat{I}_h is the unique solution of the following SDE: For $t \geq 0$,

$$\hat{I}_h(t) = \hat{I}_h(0) + \int_0^t D(i_h(u), \hat{I}_h(u))du + \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_h i_v^*(u)(1 - i_h(u)) + \gamma_h i_h(u)} dB(u), \quad (3.12)$$

with B being a standard Brownian motion independent of $\hat{I}_h(0)$, $i_v^*(t) = \frac{C_0 \beta_v i_h(t)}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & D(i_h(t), \hat{I}_h(t)) \\ &= \hat{\beta}_h i_v^*(t)(1 - i_h(t)) - \hat{\gamma}_h i_h(t) \\ &+ \frac{\beta_h(1 - i_h(t))(C_0 \hat{\beta}_v i_h(t) - \hat{\beta}_v i_h(t) i_v^*(t) - \hat{\gamma}_v i_v^*(t))}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v} \\ &+ \frac{((C_0 \beta_h \beta_v - \gamma_h \gamma_v) \gamma_v - (C_0 \beta_h \beta_v + \gamma_h \beta_v) \beta_v i_h(t)^2 - 2(C_0 \beta_h \beta_v + \gamma_h \beta_v) \gamma_v i_h(t)) \hat{I}_h(t)}{(\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Remark 3.8.

- (i) The assumptions in (3.8) and (3.11) say that the parameters associated with the host population size, n , should converge to the steady values at the same rate as or faster than $O(1/\sqrt{n})$.
- (ii) Comparing the diffusion limits \hat{I}_h under the two different scaling cases in Theorems 3.6 and 3.7, we observe that the diffusion coefficients (i.e., the coefficients before the Brownian motions) in (3.10) and (3.12) are similar except that the equilibrium i_v^* appears in (3.12) and the regular fluid limit i_v in (3.10). The diffusion coefficient is in this sense more complex in Case I than in Case II. However, compared to (3.9) (Case I), the drift of \hat{I}_h in (3.13) (Case II) is more complex because it contains all the quasi-equilibrium information of \hat{I}_v and \hat{S}_v .
- (iii) In Theorem 3.6, we observe that

$$\hat{S}_v(t) + \hat{I}_v(t) = \int_0^t \sqrt{\gamma_v(C_0 + s_v(u))} dB_2(u) + \int_0^t \sqrt{\gamma_v i_v(u)} dB_4(u),$$

which is normally distributed with mean 0 and variance $\int_0^t [\gamma_v(C_0 + s_v(u)) + \gamma_v i_v(u)] du = 2\gamma_v C_0 t$. From (4.5), below, we see that $S_v^n(t) + I_v^n(t) \approx n(s_v(t) + i_v(t)) + \sqrt{n}(\hat{S}_v(t) + \hat{I}_v(t)) = C_0 n + \sqrt{n}(\hat{S}_v(t) + \hat{I}_v(t))$. Thus $S_v^n(t) + I_v^n(t)$ is approximately normally distributed with mean $C_0 n$ and variance $2n\gamma_v C_0 t$.

4 Quasi-stationary distributions

There are many stochastic systems arising in epidemic modeling in which the disease eventually *dies out*, yet appears to be persistent over any reasonable time scale. We are often interested in such long time behavior of a stochastic epidemic process which has zero as an absorbing state for the infected population, almost surely. The hitting time of this state, namely the *extinction time*, can be large compared to the physical time and the population size can fluctuate for a large amount of time before extinction actually occurs. This phenomenon can be understood by the study of *quasi-stationary distributions*. The quasi-stationary distribution or conditional limiting distribution has proved to be a powerful tool for describing properties of Markov population processes such as recurrent epidemics as modeled in Darroch and Seneta (1965); Kryscio and Lefèvre (1989). The computation of these distributions is critical, as the expected time to extinction starting from

quasi-stationarity and the *critical community size* for epidemic to die out within a specified time for various ranges of \mathcal{R}_0 can also be then computed (cf. van Doorn and Pollett (2013); Mubayi and Greenwood (2013)). In finite-state systems the existence of a quasi-stationary distributions is guaranteed. However, in infinite-state systems this may not always be so (cf. Pollett (1995); van Doorn and Pollett (2013); Champagnat and Villemonais (2016)).

In this section, novel results on long time properties of (I_h^n, S_v^n, I_v^n) , including quasi-stationarity, are obtained for large n based on the fluid and diffusion approximations developed in Section 3. For simplicity, we assume that $\hat{\beta}_h = \hat{\gamma}_h = \hat{\beta}_v = \hat{\gamma}_v = 0$ in (3.8) and (3.11), which happens when the parameters associated with host population n converges to their limits faster than $O(1/\sqrt{n})$.

4.1 Case II

Let's first study Case II, in which the system dimension is reduced to one, and it suffices to consider the process I_h^n . From the diffusion scaling in (3.7), we have

$$I_h^n(t) = ni_h(t) + \sqrt{n}\hat{I}_h^n(t).$$

Using the diffusion approximation developed in Theorem 3.7, we have for large n ,

$$I_h^n(t) \approx \underbrace{ni_h(t)}_{\text{Fluid approximation}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_h(t)}_{\text{Diffusion approximation}}, \quad \text{in distribution.} \quad (4.1)$$

The above approximation implies that the long time behavior of I_h^n can be studied through the analysis of i_h and \hat{I}_h . The stability of the equilibrium points of i_h is provided in Theorem 3.4. In the following we study the distribution of $\hat{I}_h(t)$ for large enough t such that $i_h(t)$ is near its stable equilibrium point.

Define for $t \geq 0$,

$$C(t) = \frac{(C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v)\gamma_v - (C_0\beta_h\beta_v + \gamma_h\beta_v)\beta_v i_h(t)^2 - 2(C_0\beta_h\beta_v + \gamma_h\beta_v)\gamma_v i_h(t)}{(\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v)^2},$$

$$\sigma(t) = \sqrt{\beta_h i_v^*(u)(1 - i_h(u)) + \gamma_h i_h(u)},$$

where $i_v^*(t) = \frac{C_0\beta_v i_h(t)}{\beta_v i_h(t) + \gamma_v}$. Then \hat{I}_h satisfies the following 1-dimensional linear SDE. For $t \geq 0$,

$$d\hat{I}_h(t) = C(t)\hat{I}_h(t)dt + \sigma(t)dB(t). \quad (4.2)$$

When $\mathcal{R}_0 \leq 1$, the disease free equilibrium point 0 is globally asymptotically stable for the fluid limit $i_h(t)$. Thus there exists $t^* > 0$ such that $i_h(t) \approx 0$ for $t \geq t^* > 0$. So when $t \geq t^*$, we have

$$C(t) \approx C_f = \frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v}{\gamma_v} \leq 0, \quad \sigma(t) \approx \sigma_f = 0,$$

and the SDE in (4.2) is reduced to be the following ODE

$$d\hat{I}_h(t) \approx C_f \hat{I}_h(t)dt.$$

Solving the above ODE, we have

$$\hat{I}_h(t) \approx e^{C_f(t-t^*)}\hat{I}_h(t^*). \quad (4.3)$$

Thus when $C_f < 0$, i.e. $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, $\hat{I}_h(t)$ approaches 0 exponentially fast.

When $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, and $i_h(0) = E^e$, where E^e is the endemic equilibrium point of the fluid limit $i_h(t)$. Noting that E^e is globally asymptotically stable, it follows that $i_h(t) = E^e$ for $t \geq 0$. Then for $t \geq 0$,

$$C(t) \equiv C_e = \frac{-(C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v)}{\beta_v i_h^* + \gamma_v} < 0, \quad \sigma(t) \equiv \sigma_e = \sqrt{2\gamma_h i_h^*}, \quad (4.4)$$

and the SDE in (4.2) is reduced to be the following homogeneous linear SDE:

$$d\hat{I}_h(t) = C_e \hat{I}_h(t) dt + \sigma_e dB(t),$$

We also note that \hat{I}_h is a one-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Solving the above SDE, we have

$$\hat{I}_h(t) = e^{C_e t} \hat{I}_h(0) + \int_0^t e^{C_e(t-s)} \sigma_e dB(s).$$

It follows that

$$\text{Var}(\hat{I}_h(t)) = \text{Var}(e^{C_e t} \hat{I}_h(0)) + \text{Var}\left(\int_0^t e^{C_e(t-s)} \sigma_e dB(s)\right) = e^{2C_e t} \text{Var}(\hat{I}_h(0)) + \int_0^t e^{2C_e(t-s)} ds,$$

and the limiting covariance of \hat{I}_h is then given by

$$\Sigma^* \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\hat{I}_h(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t e^{2C_e(t-s)} \sigma_e^2 ds = -\frac{\sigma_e^2}{2C_e}.$$

Conjecture 4.1. *For large host population size n ,*

- (i) *when $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, it follows from (4.3) and Theorem 3.4 (i) that $I_h^n(t)$ approaches 0 exponentially fast as $t \rightarrow \infty$;*
- (ii) *when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, the quasi-stationary distribution of I_h^n can be approximated by a normal distribution with mean nE^e and covariance matrix $n\Sigma^*$, where $E^e = \frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v}{C_0\beta_h\beta_v + \beta_v\gamma_h}$ is the endemic equilibrium point, and $\Sigma^* = -\frac{\sigma_e^2}{2C_e}$ with C_e and σ_e defined in (4.4).*

4.2 Case I

Case I is more complex than Case II since we need to study the 3-dimensional diffusion limit $(\hat{I}_h, \hat{S}_v, \hat{I}_v)$. In particular, some results on matrix exponentials, which are provided in Appendix B, are required to solve linear ODEs and SDEs.

From the diffusion scaling in (3.7), we have

$$(I_h^n(t), S_v^n(t), I_v^n(t)) = n(i_h(t), s_v(t), i_v(t)) + \sqrt{n}(\hat{I}_h^n(t), \hat{S}_v^n(t), \hat{I}_v^n(t)).$$

Using the diffusion approximation developed in Theorem 3.6, we have for large n ,

$$(I_h^n(t), S_v^n(t), I_v^n(t)) \approx \underbrace{n(i_h(t), s_v(t), i_v(t))}_{\text{Fluid approximation}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{n}(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{S}_v(t), \hat{I}_v(t))}_{\text{Diffusion approximation}}, \quad \text{in distribution.} \quad (4.5)$$

The stability of the equilibrium points of (i_h, s_v, i_v) is provided in Theorem 3.2. In the following we focus on the limiting distribution of $(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{S}_v(t), \hat{I}_v(t))$.

For $t \geq 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} C(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} -(\gamma_h + \beta_h i_v(t)) & 0 & \beta_h s_h(t) \\ -\beta_v s_v(t) & -\beta_v i_h(t) & \gamma_v \\ \beta_v s_v(t) & \beta_v i_h(t) & -\gamma_v \end{pmatrix}, \\ \sigma(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_h i_v(t) s_h(t) + \gamma_h i_h(t)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\gamma_v (C_0 + s_v(t))} & -\sqrt{\beta_v i_h(t) s_v(t)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\beta_v i_h(t) s_v(t)} & \sqrt{\gamma_v i_v(t)} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{B}(t) &= (B_1(t), B_2(t), B_3(t), B_4(t))', \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Phi(t) = (\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{S}_v(t), \hat{I}_v(t)).$$

Then the diffusion limit process Φ satisfies the following 3-dimensional linear SDE.

$$d\Phi(t) = C(t)\Phi(t)dt + \sigma(t)d\mathbf{B}(t). \quad (4.6)$$

If $\mathcal{R}_0 \leq 1$, then the disease free equilibrium point $(0, C_0, 0)$ is globally asymptotically stable for the fluid limit $(i_h(t), s_v(t), i_v(t))$. Thus there exists $t^* > 0$ such that $(i_u(t), s_v(t), i_v(t)) \approx (0, C_0, 0)$ for $t \geq t^* > 0$. Then for $t \geq t^*$,

$$C(t) \approx C_f \equiv \begin{pmatrix} -\gamma_h & 0 & \beta_h \\ -C_0\beta_v & 0 & \gamma_v \\ C_0\beta_v & 0 & -\gamma_v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma(t) \approx \sigma_f \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2C_0\gamma_v} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, when $t \geq t^*$, $(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{I}_v(t))$ can be approximated by the following 2-dimensional homogeneous linear ODE:

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{I}_h(t) &\approx [-\gamma_h \hat{I}_h(t) + \beta_h \hat{I}_v(t)]dt, \\ d\hat{I}_v(t) &\approx [C_0\beta_v \hat{I}_h(t) - \gamma_v \hat{I}_v(t)]dt. \end{aligned}$$

Solving the ODE, we have the following approximation:

$$(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{I}_v(t)) \approx e^{\tilde{C}_f(t-t^*)}(\hat{I}_h(t^*), \hat{I}_v(t^*)), \quad t \geq t^*, \quad (4.7)$$

where $\tilde{C}_f = \begin{pmatrix} -\gamma_h & \beta_h \\ C_0\beta_v & -\gamma_v \end{pmatrix}$. It can easily be seen that when $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, the matrix \tilde{C}_f has two distinct negative eigenvalues $\lambda_{f,1}$, and $\lambda_{f,2}$. Thus from (B.1), for $t \geq 0$,

$$e^{\tilde{C}_f t} = [\mathbf{v}_{f,1}, \mathbf{v}_{f,2}] \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_{f,1}t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_{f,2}t} \end{pmatrix} [\mathbf{v}_{f,1}, \mathbf{v}_{f,2}]^{-1}, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{f,1}, \mathbf{v}_{f,2}$ are the eigenvectors corresponding to $\lambda_{f,1}, \lambda_{f,2}$. From (4.7) and (4.8), it follows that when $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, $(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{I}_v(t))$ approaches $(0, 0)$ exponentially fast as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

When $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, and $(i_h(0), i_v(0)) = E^e$, where E^e is the endemic equilibrium point E^e of the fluid limit $(i_h(t), i_v(t))$, which is globally asymptotically stable. Let i_h^e, i_v^e denote the components of E^e , $s_h^e = 1 - i_h^e$, and $s_v^e = C_0 - i_v^e$. Then $(i_h(t), s_h(t), i_v(t), s_v(t)) = (i_h^e, s_h^e, i_v^e, s_v^e)$ for $t \geq 0$. Now

for $t \geq 0$,

$$C(t) \equiv C_e = \begin{pmatrix} -(\gamma_h + \beta_h i_v^e) & 0 & \beta_h s_h^e \\ -\beta_v s_v^e & -\beta_v i_h^e & \gamma_v \\ \beta_v s_v^e & \beta_v i_h^e & -\gamma_v \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.9)$$

$$\sigma(t) \equiv \sigma_e = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_h i_v^e s_h^e + \gamma_h i_h^e} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\gamma_v (C_0 + s_v^e)} & -\sqrt{\beta_v i_h^e s_v^e} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\beta_v i_h^e s_v^e} & \sqrt{\gamma_v i_v^e} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.10)$$

In this case, the solution of the SDE in (4.6) can be approximated by the following 3-dimensional homogeneous linear SDE:

$$d\mathbf{\Phi}(t) = C_e \mathbf{\Phi}(t) dt + \sigma_e d\mathbf{B}(t). \quad (4.11)$$

Now note that $\mathbf{\Phi}$ is a three-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Solving the above SDE, we have the following approximation:

$$\mathbf{\Phi}(t) = \exp\{C_e t\} \mathbf{\Phi}(0) + \int_0^t \exp\{C_e(t-s)\} \sigma_e d\mathbf{B}(s), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (4.12)$$

The covariance of $\mathbf{\Phi}(t)$ then has the following approximation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\mathbf{\Phi}(t)) &= \text{Var}(\exp\{C_e t\} \mathbf{\Phi}(0)) + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \exp\{C_e(t-s)\} \sigma_e dB(s) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \exp\{C_e t\} \text{Var}(\mathbf{\Phi}(0)) \exp\{C_e t\}' \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \exp\{C_e(t-s)\} \sigma_e \sigma_e' \exp\{C_e(t-s)\}' ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

We note that C_e has three distinct eigenvalues, of which one is equal to 0, and the other two are negative. Denote by $\lambda_{e,1}$, and $\lambda_{e,2}$ the two negative eigenvalues. From (B.1), we have

$$e^{C_e t} = [\mathbf{v}_{e,0}, \mathbf{v}_{e,1}, \mathbf{v}_{e,2}] \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_{e,1} t} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{\lambda_{e,2} t} \end{pmatrix} [\mathbf{v}_{e,0}, \mathbf{v}_{e,1}, \mathbf{v}_{e,2}]^{-1}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{e,0}, \mathbf{v}_{e,1}, \mathbf{v}_{e,2}$ are the eigenvectors corresponding to 0, λ_1, λ_2 .

Lemma 4.2. *The variances of $\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{S}_v(t)$, and $\hat{I}_v(t)$ approach ∞ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

The above lemma implies that $(\hat{I}_h, \hat{S}_v, \hat{I}_v)$ has no quasi-stationary distribution, due to the fact that the vector population size is not fixed; rather at time t , $S_v^n(t) + I_v^n(t)$ is approximately normally distributed with mean $C_0 n$ and variance $2n\gamma_v C_0 t$ (see Remark 3.8 (i)), which results in high variability of $(S_v^n(t), I_v^n(t))$ for large t . However, when the vector population size is fixed, it can be shown that when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, (I_h^n, I_v^n) admits a quasi-stationary distribution, which is approximately normal with mean nE^e and variance $n\Sigma^*$ given in (C.14) in Appendix C.

Conjecture 4.3. *For large population size n ,*

- (i) *when $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, we get from (4.7) and Theorem 3.2 (i) that $(I_h^n(t), I_v^n(t))$ approaches 0 exponentially fast as $t \rightarrow \infty$;*

- (ii) when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, for the epidemic model with fixed host population size and random vector population size defined in (2.1) – (2.4), (I_h^n, I_v^n) has no quasi-stationary distribution.
- (iii) when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, for the epidemic model with fixed host and vector population sizes defined in (C.1) – (C.4), (I_h^n, I_v^n) admits a quasi-stationary distribution, which can be approximated by a normal distribution with mean nE^e and variance $n\Sigma^*$ given in (C.14) in Appendix C.

5 Numerical experiments

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to validate the approximations established for quasi-stationary distributions.

Example 5.1. Let $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$ and consider the scaling Case I. In this example, we compare the simulated second moments of \hat{I}_h^n, \hat{S}_v^n , and \hat{I}_v^n with the second moments of \hat{I}_h, \hat{S}_v , and \hat{I}_v , respectively, and observe the behaviors of the moments as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We set the initial value of $\{(\bar{I}_h^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)); t \geq 0\}$ to be endemic equilibrium point

$$E^e = \left(\frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v}{C_0\beta_h\beta_v + \beta_v\gamma_h}, \frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v}{\beta_h\beta_v + \beta_h\gamma_v} \right).$$

Noting that E^e is globally asymptotically stable, the fluid limit $(i_h(t), i_v(t)) = E^e$ for all $t \geq 0$.

We let $n = 10000$, $\beta_h^n = 0.2$, $\beta_v^n = 0.1$, $\gamma_h^n = 0.3$, $\gamma_v^n = 0.1$, and $C_0 = 5$.

- (i) We consider the vector-borne SIS model defined in (2.1) – (2.4). We generate 50 sample paths, and calculate the simulated second moments of \hat{I}_h^n, \hat{S}_v^n , and \hat{I}_v^n .

From the analysis in Section 4.2, $(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{S}_v(t), \hat{I}_v(t))$ satisfies the SDE (4.11), and its covariance matrix is given in (4.13). We also note that $(\hat{I}_h(0), \hat{S}_v(0), \hat{I}_v(0)) = 0$, and from (4.12), $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{S}_v(t), \hat{I}_v(t))] = (0, 0, 0)$. So the second moments of \hat{I}_h, \hat{S}_v , and \hat{I}_v equal to their variances.

From Figure 2, we see that the variances in (4.13) provide nice approximations for the second moments of the pre-limits, and all variances increase as the time t increases, which validates the conclusion that the system has no quasi-stationary (see Summary 4.3 (ii)).

- (ii) We consider the vector-borne SIS model defined in (C.1) – (C.4). We generate 50 sample paths, and calculate the simulated second moments of \hat{I}_h^n , and \hat{I}_v^n .

From Appendix C, (\hat{I}_h, \hat{I}_v) satisfies the SDE (C.11), and its covariance matrix is given in (C.13). From (C.12), it follows that $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{I}_v(t))] = (0, 0)$, and the second moments of \hat{I}_h and \hat{I}_v equal to their variances.

From Figure 3, we see that the variances in (C.13) provide nice approximations for the second moments of the pre-limits, and all variances become stable as the time t increases, which validates the conclusion that the system has a quasi-stationary (see Summary 4.3 (iii)).

Example 5.2. Let $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, and consider the scaling Case II. We study the behavior of the fluid scaled processes in the system defined in (2.1) – (2.4). Let $n = 100$, $\beta_h^n = 0.2$, $\gamma_h^n = 0.3$, $\beta_v^n = 0.1n^{\frac{2}{3}}$, $\gamma_v^n = 0.2n^{\frac{2}{3}}$ and $C_0 = 5$. Set $(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0)) = \left(\frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v + 1}{C_0\beta_h\beta_v + \beta_v\gamma_h}, \frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v - \gamma_h\gamma_v + 1}{\beta_h\beta_v + \beta_h\gamma_v} \right)$, which is not equal to either equilibrium point. We simulate 10 sample paths of \bar{I}_h^n , and plot them together with the fluid limit in Figure 4.




Figure 2: Simulated second moments of \hat{I}_h^n , \hat{S}_v^n , and \hat{I}_v^n , and the variance of \hat{I}_h , \hat{S}_v , and \hat{I}_v for the model (2.1) – (2.4).




Figure 3: Simulated second moments of \hat{I}_h^n , and \hat{I}_v^n , and the variance of \hat{I}_h , and \hat{I}_v for the model (2.1) – (2.4).




Figure 4: Fluid scaled Processes \bar{I}_h^n and its fluid Limit i_h under scaling Case II.

6 Discussion

Epidemic processes are essentially stochastic, but analyses of these stochastic models are often far from straightforward. This paper provides novel analysis approaches of simple stochastic epidemic models for vector-borne infectious diseases. Our approach uses several probabilistic and statistical techniques to reduce the dimension of the system and develop important mathematical quantities

for understanding disease outbreaks and persistence. Rather than focusing on any specific disease, we instead rigorously analyzed a simple model and introduced several techniques that can be potentially used to study more general and complex disease models. Techniques that are explained here include martingales, scaling limit theorems, and quasi-stationary distributions. Specifically, the vector-borne epidemic model is formulated as a multi-dimensional CTMC. Using the fluid and diffusion approximations for CTMCs, efficient approximations of quasi-stationary distributions are provided.

References

- Allen, L. J. (2008). An introduction to stochastic epidemic models. In *Mathematical epidemiology*, pages 81–130. Springer.
- Alonso, D., McKane, A. J., and Pascual, M. (2007). Stochastic amplification in epidemics. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 4(14):575–582.
- Anderson, R. M. and May, R. M. (1992). *Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control*. Oxford university press.
- Andersson, H. and Britton, T. (2012). *Stochastic epidemic models and their statistical analysis*, volume 151. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Ball, F. (1983). The threshold behaviour of epidemic models. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 20(2):227–241.
- Bani, R., Hameed, R., Szymanowski, S., Greenwood, P., Kribs-Zaleta, C., and Mubayi, A. (2013). Influence of environmental factors on college alcohol drinking patterns. *Mathematical Bioscience and Engineering*, 10:1281–1300.
- Bartlett, M. (1956). Deterministic and stochastic models for recurrent epidemics. In *Proceedings of the third Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, volume 4, page 109.
- Bartlett, M. (1960). The critical community size for measles in the united states. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, pages 37–44.
- Beretta, E. and Capasso, V. (1986). On the general structure of epidemic systems. Global asymptotic stability. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 12(6, Part A):677 – 694.
- Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley-Interscience, 2nd edition.
- Brauer, F., Castillo-Chavez, C., Mubayi, A., and Towers, S. (2016). Some models for epidemics of vector-transmitted diseases. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 1(1):79–87.
- Britton, T. (2010). Stochastic epidemic models: A survey. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 225(1):24–35.
- Britton, T. and Traoré, A. (2017). A stochastic vector-borne epidemic model: Quasi-stationarity and extinction. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 289:89–95.
- Champagnat, N. and Villemonais, D. (2016). Exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distribution and Q-process. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 164(1):243–283.
- Darroch, J. N. and Seneta, E. (1965). On quasi-stationary distributions in absorbing discrete-time finite markov chains. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 2(1):88–100.

- Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. (1986). *Markov processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, New York.
- Gorahava, K. K., Rosenberger, J. M., and Mubayi, A. (2015). Optimizing insecticide allocation strategies based on houses and livestock shelters for visceral leishmaniasis control in Bihar, India. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*, 93(1):114–122.
- Greenwood, P. E. and Gordillo, L. F. (2009). Stochastic epidemic modeling. In *Mathematical and statistical estimation approaches in epidemiology*, pages 31–52. Springer.
- Gubler, D. J. (1991). Insects in disease transmission. In *Hunter tropical medicine, 7th edition*. Philadelphia (PA): WB Saunders, pages 981–1000.
- Isham, V. (1991). Assessing the variability of stochastic epidemics. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 107(2):209–224.
- Kang, H.-W. and Kurtz, T. G. (2013). Separation of time-scales and model reduction for stochastic reaction networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(2):529–583.
- Kang, H.-W., Kurtz, T. G., and Popovic, L. (2014). Central limit theorems and diffusion approximations for multiscale markov chain models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(2):721–759.
- Keeling, M. J. and Grenfell, B. (1997). Disease extinction and community size: Modeling the persistence of measles. *Science*, 275(5296):65–67.
- Kribs-Zaleta, C. M. and Mubayi, A. (2012). The role of adaptations in two-strain competition for sylvatic *Trypanosoma cruzi* transmission. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 6(2):813–835.
- Kryscio, R. J. and Lefèvre, C. (1989). On the extinction of the SIS stochastic logistic epidemic. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 26(4):685–694.
- Kurtz, T. G. (1978). Strong approximation theorems for density dependent markov chains. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 6(3):223–240.
- Kurtz, T. G. (1981). *Approximation of population processes*, volume 36. SIAM.
- Kurtz, T. G. (1992). Averaging for martingale problems and stochastic approximation. In Karatzas, I. and Ocone, D., editors, *Applied Stochastic Analysis*, pages 186–209, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Kuske, R., Gordillo, L. F., and Greenwood, P. (2007). Sustained oscillations via coherence resonance in SIR. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 245(3):459–469.
- Lloyd-Smith, J. O., Cross, P. C., Briggs, C. J., Daugherty, M., Getz, W. M., Latto, J., Sanchez, M. S., Smith, A. B., and Swei, A. (2005). Should we expect population thresholds for wildlife disease? *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 20(9):511–519.
- Lord, C., Woolhouse, M., Heesterbeek, J., and Mellor, P. (1996). Vector-borne diseases and the basic reproduction number: A case study of african horse sickness. *Medical and veterinary entomology*, 10(1):19–28.
- Malik, T., Salceanu, P., Mubayi, A., Tridane, A., and Imran, M. (2012). West nile dynamics: Virus transmission between domestic and wild bird populations through vectors. *Can. Appl. Math. Quart*, 20:535–556.

- Mubayi, A. (2008). *The role of environmental context in the dynamics and control of alcohol use*. Arizona State University.
- Mubayi, A., Castillo-Chavez, C., Chowell, G., Kribs-Zaleta, C., Siddiqui, N. A., Kumar, N., and Das, P. (2010). Transmission dynamics and underreporting of Kala-azar in the indian state of Bihar. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 262(1):177–185.
- Mubayi, A. and Greenwood, P. E. (2013). Contextual interventions for controlling alcohol drinking. *Mathematical Population Studies*, 20(1):27–53.
- Nåsell, I. (2002). Stochastic models of some endemic infections. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 179(1):1–19.
- Nåsell, I. (2005). A new look at the critical community size for childhood infections. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 67(3):203–216.
- Oksendal, B. (2003). *Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 6th edition.
- Pandey, A., Mubayi, A., and Medlock, J. (2013). Comparing vector-host and SIR models for dengue transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 246(2):252–259.
- Perko, L. (2013). *Differential equations and dynamical systems*, volume 7. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Philip, C. B. and Rozeboom, L. E. (1973). Medico-veterinary entomology: a generation of progress. *History of entomology*.
- Pollett, P. (1995). The determination of quasistationary distributions directly from the transition rates of an absorbing markov chain. *Mathematical and computer modelling*, 22(10-12):279–287.
- Schwartz, I. B., Billings, L., Dykman, M., and Landsman, A. (2009). Predicting extinction rates in stochastic epidemic models. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2009(01):P01005.
- Sheets, D., Mubayi, A., and Kojouharov, H. V. (2010). Impact of socio-economic conditions on the incidence of visceral leishmaniasis in Bihar, India. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research*, 20(6):415–430.
- Song, B., Castillo-Chavez, C., and Aparicio, J. P. (2002). Tuberculosis models with fast and slow dynamics: the role of close and casual contacts. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 180(1):187–205.
- Souza, M. O. (2014). Multiscale analysis for a vector-borne epidemic model. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 68(5):1269–1293.
- Towers, S., Brauer, F., Castillo-Chavez, C., Falconar, A. K., Mubayi, A., and Romero-Vivas, C. M. (2016). Estimate of the reproduction number of the 2015 Zika virus outbreak in Barranquilla, Colombia, and estimation of the relative role of sexual transmission. *Epidemics*, 17:50–55.
- Van den Driessche, P. and Watmough, J. (2002). Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 180(1-2):29–48.

- van Doorn, E. A. and Pollett, P. K. (2013). Quasi-stationary distributions for discrete-state models. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 230(1):1–14.
- WHO (2014). World health organization factsheet on the vector borne diseases report. [Accessed 9 April 2018].
- Yong, K. E., Mubayi, A., and Kribs, C. M. (2015). Agent-based mathematical modeling as a tool for estimating *Trypanosoma cruzi* vector–host contact rates. *Acta tropica*, 151:21–31.

A Appendix: Equilibrium points of Differential Equations

Consider a differential equation:

$$y'(t) = f(y), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^K$. A point $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is called an *equilibrium point* of (A.1) if $f(y_0) = 0$. An equilibrium point y_0 is said to be *stable* if given $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for every solution y of (A.1), when $\|y(0) - y_0\| < \delta$, we have $\|y(t) - y_0\| < \epsilon$ for all $t > 0$; it is said to be *locally asymptotically stable (LAS)* if there exists $a > 0$ such that if $\|y(0) - y_0\| \leq a$, then $y(t) \rightarrow y_0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$; it is said to be *globally asymptotically stable (GAS)* if $y(t) \rightarrow y_0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$; it is *globally exponentially stable (GES)* if y_0 is GAS and there exists $M, \kappa > 0$ such that $\|y(t) - y_0\| \leq Me^{-\kappa t}$; it is said to be *unstable* if it is not stable. (See Chapter 1 in Perko (2013) for more detail.)

B Appendix: Matrix exponentials

The matrix exponential is a matrix function on square matrices. For a $n \times n$ square matrix A , the exponential of A , denoted by e^A or $\exp\{A\}$, is defined as

$$e^A = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^k}{k!}.$$

It is easily seen that, for the special case when $n = 1$, the matrix exponential is reduced to be the regular exponential.

For $k \times k$ square matrices with k distinct real eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$, we have

$$e^{At} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k] \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_1 t} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & e^{\lambda_k t} \end{pmatrix} [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k]^{-1}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$ are the eigenvectors corresponding to $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$. (See Chapter 1 in Perko (2013) for more detail.)

C Appendix: Vector-borne SIS with fixed vector population size

We consider a stochastic vector-borne SIS model, in which the population sizes of hosts and vectors are assumed to be n and $C_0 n$, respectively, where C_0 is some positive constant. The system equations can be formulated by using independent unit rate Poisson processes $N_i^n, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. For $t \geq 0$, we have

$$S_h^n(t) = S_h^n(0) - N_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \frac{I_v^n(u) S_h^n(u)}{n} du \right) + N_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t I_h^n(u) du \right), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

$$I_h^n(t) = I_h^n(0) + N_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \frac{I_v^n(u) S_h^n(u)}{n} du \right) - N_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t I_h^n(u) du \right), \quad (\text{C.2})$$

and

$$S_v^n(t) = S_v^n(0) - N_3^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \frac{I_h^n(u) S_v^n(u)}{n} du \right) + N_4^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t I_v^n(u) du \right), \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$I_v^n(t) = I_v^n(0) + N_3^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \frac{I_h^n(u) S_v^n(u)}{n} du \right) - N_4^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t I_v^n(u) du \right). \quad (\text{C.4})$$

We note that the epidemic system can be described by the 2-dimensional CTMC (I_h^n, I_v^n) with a finite state space $\{0, 1, \dots, n\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, C_0 n\}$. Furthermore, (I_h^n, I_v^n) has an absorbing state $(0, 0)$, and a unique stationary distribution $\delta_{(0,0)}$.

We still consider the two scaling cases in Section 2.2, and the reproduction number is the same as in Section 2.3. The fluid and diffusion approximations can be established similar to Theorems 3.1 – 3.4, 3.6, and 3.7. In particular, for both cases, the fluid limits of (I_h^n, I_v^n) are the same as Theorems 3.1 – 3.4. For Case II, the diffusion limit of \hat{I}_h^n is the same as Theorem 3.7. In the following, we give the diffusion approximation under Case I.

Theorem C.1. *Consider Case I, and assume that $(\hat{I}_h^n(0), \hat{I}_v^n(0))$ converges in distribution to some random variable $(\hat{I}_h(0), \hat{I}_v(0))$, and that*

$$\sqrt{n}(\beta_h^n - \beta_h) \rightarrow \hat{\beta}_h, \quad \sqrt{n}(\gamma_h^n - \gamma_h) \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}_h, \quad \sqrt{n}(\beta_v^n - \beta_v) \rightarrow \hat{\beta}_v, \quad \sqrt{n}(\gamma_v^n - \gamma_v) \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}_v.$$

Then we have that $(\hat{I}_h^n, \hat{I}_v^n)$ converges in distribution to (\hat{I}_h, \hat{I}_v) , where (\hat{I}_h, \hat{I}_v) is the unique solution to the following stochastic integral equations: For $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_h(t) &= \hat{I}_h(0) + \int_0^t \beta_h s_h(u) \hat{I}_v(u) - (\gamma_h + \beta_h i_v(u)) \hat{I}_h(u) + \hat{\beta}_h i_v(u) s_h(u) - \hat{\gamma}_h i_h(u) du \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_h i_v(u) s_h(u) + \gamma_h i_h(u)} dB_1(u), \\ \hat{I}_v(t) &= \hat{I}_v(0) + \int_0^t \beta_v s_v(u) \hat{I}_h(u) - (\gamma_v + \beta_v i_h(u)) \hat{I}_v(u) + \hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) s_v(u) - \hat{\gamma}_v i_v(u) du \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_v i_h(u) s_v(u) + \gamma_v i_v(u)} dB_2(u), \end{aligned}$$

with B_1 and B_2 being two independent standard Brownian motions.

We next study the quasi-stationary distribution of (I_h^n, I_v^n) when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$. Using the fluid and diffusion approximations, we have for large n ,

$$(I_h^n(t), I_v^n(t)) \approx \underbrace{n(i_h(t), i_v(t))}_{\text{Fluid approximation}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{n}(\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{I}_v(t))}_{\text{Diffusion approximation}}, \quad \text{in distribution.}$$

For $t \geq 0$, let

$$C(t) = \begin{pmatrix} -(\gamma_h + \beta_h i_v(t)) & \beta_h s_h(t) \\ \beta_v s_v(t) & -(\gamma_v + \beta_v i_h(t)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_h i_v(t) s_h(t) + \gamma_h i_h(t)} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\beta_v i_h(t) s_v(t) + \gamma_v i_v(t)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

$$\mathbf{B}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} B_1(t) \\ B_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

and

$$\hat{I}(t) = (\hat{I}_h(t), \hat{I}_v(t)).$$

Then the diffusion limit process \hat{I} satisfies the following 2-dimensional linear SDE:

$$d\hat{I}(t) = C(t)\hat{I}(t)dt + \sigma(t)d\mathbf{B}(t). \quad (\text{C.8})$$

When $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$ and $(i_h(0), i_v(0)) = E^e$, where E^e is the globally asymptotically stable endemic equilibrium point of $(i_h(t), i_v(t))$. Then for $t \geq 0$, $(i_u(t), i_v(t)) = E^e$, and it follows that

$$C(t) \equiv C_e = \begin{pmatrix} -(\gamma_h + \beta_h i_v^e) & \beta_h s_h^e \\ \beta_v s_v^e & -(\gamma_v + \beta_v i_h^e) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

$$\sigma(t) \equiv \sigma_e = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_h i_v^e s_h^e + \gamma_h i_h^e} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\beta_v i_h^e s_v^e + \gamma_v i_v^e} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

The SDE in (C.8) can be simplified as the following 2-dimensional homogeneous linear SDE

$$d\hat{I}(t) = C_e \hat{I}(t)dt + \sigma_e d\mathbf{B}(t). \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Solving the above SDE, we have

$$\hat{I}(t) = \exp\{C_e t\}\hat{I}(0) + \int_0^t \exp\{C_e(t-s)\}\sigma_e dB(s), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (\text{C.12})$$

whose covariance matrix is given as

$$\text{Var}(\hat{I}(t)) = \exp\{C_e t\}\text{Var}(\hat{I}(0))\exp\{C_e t\}' + \int_0^t \exp\{C_e(t-s)\}\sigma_e \sigma_e' \exp\{C_e(t-s)\}' ds. \quad (\text{C.13})$$

It can be seen that when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, the matrix C_e has two distinct negative eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 . Thus, from (B.1), we have

$$\Sigma^* \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\hat{I}(t)) = \int_0^\infty \exp\{C_e s\}\sigma_e \sigma_e' \exp\{C_e s\}' ds < \infty. \quad (\text{C.14})$$

D Appendix: Proofs

We provide all the proofs in this section. The Poisson processes in our model (2.1) – (2.4) depend on the parameter n , and the LLN and CLT results from Kurtz (1978) or Chapter 11 of Ethier and Kurtz (1986) cannot be applied directly. To prove convergence in distribution for the sequences of stochastic processes in Theorems 3.1, 3.3, 3.6 and 3.7, we first show the C -tightness of the sequences, and then characterize the uniqueness of the weak limits.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space; all random variables and stochastic processes described in this work are, without loss of generality, defined on this common probability space. The following notation will be used. Let $\mathbb{R}_+^K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^K : x_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, K\}$. Denote by $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}_+^K)$ the space of right continuous functions with left limits (RCLL) from $[0, \infty)$ to \mathbb{R}_+^K equipped with the usual Skorohod topology, and $\mathcal{C}_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+^K)$ the space of twice differentiable bounded functions from $\mathbb{R}_+^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. A stochastic process X with values in \mathbb{R}^K will be regarded as a random variable with values in $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^K)$. A sequence of RCLL stochastic processes $\{X^n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is said to be C -tight if $\{X^n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is tight and any weak limit has continuous sample paths. Convergence in

distribution of random variables/stochastic processes X^n to X will be denoted as $X^n \Rightarrow X$.

The following theorem from Billingsley (1999) will be used in the proofs.

Theorem D.1 (Billingsley (1999)). *The sequence of stochastic processes $\{X^n(t); t \geq 0\}$ in $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^K)$ is C -tight if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

(i) For any $T \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{a \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X^n(t)| > a \right) = 0, \quad n \geq 1.$$

(ii) For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 < \infty$,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_1 + \delta} |X^n(t_2) - X^n(t_1)| > \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

D.1 Proofs for Case I

In this section, we prove Theorems 3.1, 3.2, and 3.6 for scaling Case I.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. For the unit-rate Poisson processes N_i^n , define

$$\bar{N}_i^n(t) = \frac{1}{n} N_i^n(nt), \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{N}_i^{n,c}(t) = \frac{1}{n} [N_i^n(nt) - nt].$$

We first show the C -tightness of $(\bar{I}_h^n, \bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$. We observe that for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{I}_h^n(t) &= \bar{I}_h^n(0) + \bar{N}_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right), \\ \bar{S}_v^n(t) &= \bar{S}_v^n(0) + \bar{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \\ &\quad - \bar{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right), \\ \bar{I}_v^n(t) &= \bar{I}_v^n(0) + \bar{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that the two conditions in Theorem D.1 hold for $(\bar{I}_h^n, \bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$. Noting that $\bar{I}_h^n(t) \in [0, 1]$ for all $t \geq 0$, we consider $(\bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$, and observe that for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t) &= C_0 + \bar{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \\ &\quad - \bar{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) \end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C_0 + \bar{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) + \bar{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \\ &\quad + \bar{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right). \end{aligned} \tag{D.2}$$

It follows, from (D.1), that

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t)] = C_0, \quad (\text{D.3})$$

and from (D.2), for $T \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t)) \right] \leq C_0 + 2\gamma_v^n \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u)] du = C_0 + 2\gamma_v^n C_0 T,$$

which implies that the condition in Theorem D.1 (i) holds. Next we show that the condition in Theorem D.1 (ii) holds. We note that for $\delta > 0$,

$$\sup_{|t-s| < \delta} |(\bar{I}_h^n(t), \bar{S}_v^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) - (\bar{I}_h^n(s), \bar{S}_v^n(s), \bar{I}_v^n(s))| \leq (\text{I}) + (\text{II}) + (\text{III}) + 2(\text{IV}) + (\text{V}) + (\text{VI}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{I}) &= \sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \left| \bar{N}_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^s \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) \right|, \\ (\text{II}) &= \sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \left| \bar{N}_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^s \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right) \right|, \\ (\text{III}) &= \sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \left| \bar{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^s \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) \right|, \\ (\text{IV}) &= \sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \left| \bar{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^s \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \right|, \\ (\text{V}) &= \sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \left| \bar{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^s \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \right|, \\ (\text{VI}) &= \sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \left| \bar{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^s \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

For (II), noting that $0 \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \bar{I}_h^n(t) \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\text{II})] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \gamma_h^n} |\bar{N}_2^n(\lambda t) - \bar{N}_2^n(\lambda s)| \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \gamma_h^n} \bar{N}_2^n(\lambda |t-s|) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\bar{N}_2^n(\gamma_h^n \delta)] = \gamma_h^n \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

To continue, we note that from functional law of large numbers for Poisson processes, \bar{N}_i^n converges weakly to the identity map from $[0, \infty)$ to $[0, \infty)$, and thus it is certainly tight. Now for (III), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}((\text{III}) > \epsilon) \\ &= \lim_{K \uparrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left((\text{III}) > \epsilon, \sup_{0 \leq u \leq \max\{t,s\} + \delta} [\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t)] \leq K \right) \\ &\quad + \lim_{K \uparrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left((\text{III}) > \epsilon, \sup_{0 \leq u \leq \max\{t,s\} + \delta} [\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t)] > K \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \lim_{K \uparrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|t-s| < \delta} \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \gamma_v^n K} \bar{N}_3^n(\lambda|t-s|) > \epsilon \right) \\
&\quad + \lim_{K \uparrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq \max\{t,s\} + \delta} [\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t)] > K \right) \\
&\leq \lim_{K \uparrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\bar{N}_3^n(\gamma_v^n K \delta)]}{\epsilon} + \lim_{K \uparrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq u \leq \max\{t,s\} + \delta} (\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t))]}{K} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.5}$$

Using similar arguments to those for (III), we can show that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}((\text{I}) > \epsilon) = 0, \tag{D.6}$$

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}((\text{IV}) > \epsilon) = 0, \tag{D.7}$$

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}((\text{V}) > \epsilon) = 0, \tag{D.8}$$

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}((\text{VI}) > \epsilon) = 0. \tag{D.9}$$

The desired condition in Theorem D.1 (ii) follows from (D.4) – (D.9).

Let (i_h, s_v, i_v) be a weak limit. Using the fact that \bar{N}_i^n converges to the identity map from $[0, \infty)$ to $[0, \infty)$, we see that (i_h, i_v) satisfies the ODE system defined by (3.3) and (3.4), and $s_v(t) = C_0 - i_v(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. Finally, since the ODEs (3.3) and (3.4) have a unique solution, we conclude that $(\bar{I}_h^n, \bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$ converges to (i_h, s_v, i_v) weakly. Lastly, we note that from (D.1), for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t))^2 \right] &\leq 4C_0^2 + 4\mathbb{E} \left[\bar{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^T \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) \right]^2 \\
&\quad + 4\mathbb{E} \left[\bar{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^T \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \right]^2 + 4\mathbb{E} \left[\bar{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^T \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) \right]^2 \\
&= 4C_0^2 + 8\gamma_v^n \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u)] du \\
&= 4C_0^2 + 8\gamma_v^n C_0 T,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the uniform integrability of $(\bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$. It now follows that $\mathbb{E}[|(\bar{I}_h^n, \bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n) - (i_h, s_v, i_v)|] \rightarrow 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We investigate the properties of the ODE system (3.3) and (3.4). Let $\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, C_0]$. It can be easily verified that the set Ω is positively invariant for the system (3.3) and (3.4), which says when $(i_h(0), i_v(0)) \in \Omega$ then $(i_h(t), i_v(t)) \in \Omega$ for any $t \geq 0$. For $(x, y) \in \Omega$, let

$$f(x, y) = \beta_h y(1 - x) - \gamma_h x, \tag{D.10}$$

$$g(x, y) = \beta_v x(C_0 - y) - \gamma_v y. \tag{D.11}$$

Then

$$i_h'(t) = f(i_h, i_v), \quad i_v'(t) = g(i_h, i_v).$$

Noting that f and g are Lipschitz continuous, the ODE system (3.3) and (3.4) has a unique solution. The equilibrium points E^f and E^e can be obtained by letting $f(i_h, i_v)$ and $g(i_h, i_v)$ equal to 0, and solving the equations for (i_h, i_v) . We next show the stability properties of E^f and E^e . First, the locally asymptotic stability can be shown by linearizing f and g at the equilibrium point, and observing the eigenvalues of the corresponding Jacobian matrix. For the globally asymptotic stability of E^f . We consider the Lyapunov function $L(i_h, i_v) = ai_h + bi_v$, where a, b are positive constants such that $C_0\beta_v/\gamma_h \leq a/b \leq \gamma_v/\beta_h$. Then L is positive definite, and $\dot{L}(i_h, i_v) = L_x(i_h(t), i_v(t))i'_h(t) + L_y(i_h(t), i_v(t))i'_v(t)$ is nonpositive, and is equal to 0 only when $(i_h, i_v) = E^f$. From Lasalle's theorem, E^f is globally asymptotically stable when $\mathcal{R}_0 \leq 1$. When $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, a and b can be chosen such that $C_0\beta_v/\gamma_h < a/b < \gamma_v/\beta_h$, and then

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{L}(i_h, i_v) &= L_x(i_h(t), i_v(t))i'_h(t) + L_y(i_h(t), i_v(t))i'_v(t) \\ &\leq (bC_0\beta_v - a\gamma_h)i_h(t) + (a\beta_h - b\gamma_v)i_v(t) \\ &\leq -\alpha L(i_h(t), i_v(t)),\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha > 0$ satisfies $(C_0\beta_v + \alpha)(\beta_h + \alpha) \leq \gamma_h\gamma_v$. Hence E^f is exponentially asymptotically stable when $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$. The global asymptotical stability of E^e follows from Theorem 2.1 in Beretta and Capasso (1986). Adapting the notation from Beretta and Capasso (1986), for our system (3.3) and (3.4), let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta_h \\ -C_0\beta_v & 0 \end{pmatrix}, e = \begin{pmatrix} -\gamma_h \\ -\gamma_v \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta_h \\ C_0\beta_v & 0 \end{pmatrix}, c = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It can be verified that when $W_1, W_2 > 0$ satisfy

$$W_1\beta_h \left(\frac{1}{i_h^*} - 1 \right) = W_2C_0\beta_v \left(\frac{1}{i_v^*} - 1 \right),$$

then the matrix $A + \text{diag}(\frac{1}{i_h^*}, \frac{1}{i_v^*})B + \text{diag}(-\frac{\beta_h i_v}{i_h i_h^*}, -\frac{C_0\beta_v i_h}{i_v i_v^*})$ is symmetric, and thus Theorem 2.1 in Beretta and Capasso (1986) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.6. For $t \geq 0$, define

$$\hat{N}_i^n(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(N_i^n(nt) - nt).$$

For $t \geq 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{I}_h^n(t) &= \sqrt{n}(\bar{I}_h^n(t) - i_h(t)) \\ &= \hat{I}_h^n(0) + \sqrt{n} \left(\bar{N}_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) - \beta_h \int_0^t i_v(u) s_h(u) du \right) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{n} \left(\bar{N}_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right) - \gamma_h \int_0^t i_h(u) du \right) \\ &= \hat{I}_h^n(0) + \hat{N}_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) + \sqrt{n} \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du - \beta_h \int_0^t i_v(u) s_h(u) du \right) \\ &\quad - \hat{N}_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right) - \sqrt{n} \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du - \gamma_h \int_0^t i_h(u) du \right) \\ &= \hat{I}_h^n(0) + M_1^n(t) + \beta_h \int_0^t \bar{S}_h^n(u) \hat{I}_v^n(u) du - \int_0^t (\beta_h i_v(u) + \gamma_h) \hat{I}_h^n(u) du,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1^n(t) &= \hat{N}_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) - \hat{N}_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n}(\beta_h^n - \beta_h) \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du - \sqrt{n}(\gamma_h^n - \gamma_h) \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}_v^n(t) &= \hat{S}_v^n(0) + M_2^n(t) - \beta_v \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) \hat{I}_h^n(u) du - \beta_v \int_0^t i_h(u) \hat{S}_v^n(u) du + \gamma_v \int_0^t \hat{I}_v^n(u) du, \\ \hat{I}_v^n(t) &= \hat{I}_v^n(0) + M_3^n(t) + \beta_v \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) \hat{I}_h^n(u) du + \beta_v \int_0^t i_h(u) \hat{S}_v^n(u) du - \gamma_v \int_0^t \hat{I}_v^n(u) du, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_2^n(t) &= \hat{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) - \hat{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) - \hat{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{n}(\beta_v^n - \beta_v) \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du + \sqrt{n}(\gamma_v^n - \gamma_v) \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du, \\ M_3^n(t) &= \hat{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) - \hat{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n}(\beta_v^n - \beta_v) \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du - \sqrt{n}(\gamma_v^n - \gamma_v) \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

We will verify the two conditions in Theorem D.1 to establish the tightness of $(\hat{I}_h^n, \hat{S}_v^n, \hat{I}_v^n)$. We first note that from the functional central limit theorem for unit-rate Poisson processes, $(\hat{N}_1^n, \dots, \hat{N}_6^n)$ converges to a 6-dimensional standard Brownian motion. From Theorem 3.1, and the random time change theorem, we have that

$$(M_1^n, M_2^n, M_3^n)' \Rightarrow (W_1, W_2, W_3)', \quad (\text{D.12})$$

where

$$W_1(t) = \int_0^t [\hat{\beta}_h i_v(u) s_h(u) - \hat{\gamma}_h i_h(u)] du + \int_0^t [\beta_h i_v(u) s_h(u) + \gamma_h i_h(u)] dB_1(u), \quad (\text{D.13})$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(t) &= \int_0^t [-\hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) s_v(u) + \hat{\gamma}_v i_v(u)] du + \gamma_v \int_0^t [C_0 + s_v(u)] dB_2(u) \\ &\quad - \beta_v \int_0^t i_h(u) s_v(u) dB_3(u), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.14})$$

$$W_3(t) = \int_0^t [\hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) s_v(u) - \hat{\gamma}_v i_v(u)] du + \beta_v \int_0^t i_h(u) s_v(u) dB_3(u) + \gamma_v \int_0^t i_v(u) dB_4(u), \quad (\text{D.15})$$

with $B_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, independent standard Brownian motions, i_v and i_u defined by (3.3) and (3.4), $s_u = 1 - i_u$, and $s_v = 1 - i_v$. In particular (M_1^n, M_2^n, M_3^n) satisfies the conditions in Theorem D.1 (i) and (ii). We next observe that for $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2$,

$$|(\hat{I}_h^n(t_2), \hat{S}_v^n(t_2), \hat{I}_v^n(t_2)) - (\hat{I}_h^n(t_1), \hat{S}_v^n(t_1), \hat{I}_v^n(t_1))|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 |M_i^n(t_2) - M_i^n(t_1)| + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\beta_h i_h(u) + \gamma_h + 2\beta_v \bar{S}_v^n(u)) |\hat{I}_h^n(u)| du \\
&\quad + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} 2\beta_v i_h(u) |\hat{S}_v^n(u)| du + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\beta_h \bar{S}_h^n(u) + 2\gamma_v) |\hat{I}_v^n(u)| du \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 |M_i^n(t_2) - M_i^n(t_1)| + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (2\beta_h + 2\beta_v + \gamma_v + 2\gamma_v + 2\beta_v \bar{S}_v^n(u)) (|\hat{I}_h^n(u)|, |\hat{S}_v^n(u)|, |\hat{I}_v^n(u)|) du.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Gronwall's inequality, we have for $T \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |(\hat{I}_h^n(t), \hat{S}_v^n(t), \hat{I}_v^n(t))| &\leq \left(|(\hat{I}_h^n(0), \hat{S}_v^n(0), \hat{I}_v^n(0))| + \sum_{i=1}^3 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_i^n(t)| \right) \\
&\quad \times \exp \left\{ \int_0^T (2\beta_h + 2\beta_v + \gamma_v + 2\gamma_v + 2\beta_v \bar{S}_v^n(u)) du \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\bar{S}_v^n(t) - s_v(t)|] \rightarrow 0$, and $\sup_{t \geq 0} s_v(t) \leq C_0$, we have that for any $M > 0$,

$$\lim_{M \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |(\hat{I}_h^n(t), \hat{S}_v^n(t), \hat{I}_v^n(t))| > M \right) = 0, \quad (\text{D.16})$$

which is essentially the condition in Theorem D.1 (i). Next for $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_1 + \delta} |(\hat{I}_h^n(t_2), \hat{S}_v^n(t_2), \hat{I}_v^n(t_2)) - (\hat{I}_h^n(t_1), \hat{S}_v^n(t_1), \hat{I}_v^n(t_1))| \\
&\leq \sup_{t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_1 + \delta} \sum_{i=1}^3 |M_i^n(t_2) - M_i^n(t_1)| \\
&\quad + \sup_{t_1 \leq u \leq t_1 + \delta} (|\hat{I}_h^n(u)|, |\hat{S}_v^n(u)|, |\hat{I}_v^n(u)|) \int_{t_1}^{t_1 + \delta} (2\beta_h + 2\beta_v + \gamma_v + 2\gamma_v + 2\beta_v \bar{S}_v^n(u)) du.
\end{aligned}$$

From (D.16), we have for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_1 + \delta} |(\hat{I}_h^n(t_2), \hat{S}_v^n(t_2), \hat{I}_v^n(t_2)) - (\hat{I}_h^n(t_1), \hat{S}_v^n(t_1), \hat{I}_v^n(t_1))| > \epsilon \right) = 0. \quad (\text{D.17})$$

The C -tightness of $(\hat{I}_h^n, \hat{S}_v^n, \hat{I}_v^n)$ now follows from (D.16) and (D.17). Let $(\hat{I}_h, \hat{S}_v, \hat{I}_v)$ be any weak limit, then it satisfies the following integral equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I}_h(t) &= \hat{I}_h(0) + \int_0^t [\beta_h s_h(u) \hat{I}_v(u) - (\beta_h i_v(u) + \gamma_h) \hat{I}_h(u)] du + W_1(t), \\
\hat{S}_v(t) &= \hat{S}_v(0) + \int_0^t [-\beta_v s_v(u) \hat{I}_h(u) - \beta_v i_h(u) \hat{S}_v(u) + \gamma_v \hat{I}_v(u)] du + W_2(t), \\
\hat{I}_v(t) &= \hat{I}_v(0) + \int_0^t [\beta_v s_v(u) \hat{I}_h(u) + \beta_v i_h(u) \hat{S}_v(u) - \gamma_v \hat{I}_v(u)] du + W_3(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where W_1, W_2 , and W_3 are defined in (D.13)–(D.15). Noting that s_h, i_h, s_v, i_v are all uniformly bounded, from Oksendal (2003), there exists a unique solution to the above integral equations.

The theorem follows. \square

D.2 Proofs for Case II

To prove the theorems (Theorems 3.3, 3.4, and 3.7) for Case II, we study the generators of the Markov processes $(\bar{I}_h^n, \bar{S}_v^n, \bar{I}_v^n)$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{I}_h^n(t) &= \bar{I}_h^n(0) + \bar{N}_1^n \left(\beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_2^n \left(\gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right), \\ \bar{S}_v^n(t) &= \bar{S}_v^n(0) + \bar{N}_3^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) \\ &\quad - \bar{N}_5^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right), \\ \bar{I}_v^n(t) &= \bar{I}_v^n(0) + \bar{N}_4^n \left(\beta_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(u) du \right) - \bar{N}_6^n \left(\gamma_v^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) du \right).\end{aligned}$$

Then for $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}f(\bar{I}_h^n(t), \bar{S}_v^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) &= f(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{S}_v^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0)) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right] dN_1^n \left(n\beta_h^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_v^n(\tau) \bar{S}_h^n(\tau) d\tau \right) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right] dN_2^n \left(n\gamma_h^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_h^n(\tau) d\tau \right) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right] dN_3^n \left(n\gamma_v^n \int_0^u [\bar{S}_v^n(\tau) + \bar{I}_v^n(\tau)] d\tau \right) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right] dN_4^n \left(n\beta_v^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_h^n(\tau) \bar{S}_v^n(\tau) d\tau \right) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{S}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right] dN_5^n \left(n\gamma_v^n \int_0^u \bar{S}_v^n(\tau) d\tau \right) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right] dN_4^n \left(n\beta_v^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_h^n(u) \bar{S}_v^n(\tau) d\tau \right) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - f(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right] dN_6^n \left(n\gamma_v^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_v^n(\tau) d\tau \right).\end{aligned}$$

Define the following generators $\mathcal{A}_1^n, \mathcal{A}_2^n, \mathcal{A}_3^n$ and $\mathcal{A}^n, \mathcal{B}^n$ for $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$, and $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_1^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) &= n\beta_h^n x_3 (1 - x_1) \left[f(x_1 + \frac{1}{n}, x_2, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\ &\quad + n\gamma_h^n x_1 \left[f(x_1 - \frac{1}{n}, x_2, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\ &\quad + n\gamma_v^n (x_2 + x_3) \left[f(x_1, x_2 + \frac{1}{n}, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\ &\quad + n\beta_v^n x_1 x_2 \left[f(x_1, x_2 - \frac{1}{n}, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + n\gamma_v^n x_2 \left[f(x_1, x_2 - \frac{1}{n}, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\
& + n\beta_v^n x_1 x_2 \left[f(x_1, x_2 x_3 + \frac{1}{n}) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\
& + n\gamma_v^n x_3 \left[f(x_1, x_2, x_3 - \frac{1}{n}) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right], \\
\mathcal{A}_2^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) & = n\beta_h^n x_3(1 - x_1) \left[f(x_1 + \frac{1}{n}, x_2, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\
& + n\gamma_h^n x_1 \left[f(x_1 - \frac{1}{n}, x_2, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right], \\
\mathcal{A}_3^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) & = n\gamma_v^n (x_2 + x_3) \left[f(x_1, x_2 + \frac{1}{n}, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\
& + n\beta_v^n x_1 x_2 \left[f(x_1, x_2 - \frac{1}{n}, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\
& + n\gamma_v^n x_2 \left[f(x_1, x_2 - \frac{1}{n}, x_3) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\
& + n\beta_v^n x_1 x_2 \left[f(x_1, x_2, x_3 + \frac{1}{n}) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\
& + n\gamma_v^n x_3 \left[f(x_1, x_2, x_3 - \frac{1}{n}) - f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = [\beta_h^n x_3(1 - x_1) - \gamma_h^n x_1] \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(x_1, x_2, x_3), \quad (\text{D.18})$$

$$\mathcal{B}^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{1}{\alpha(n)} [\gamma_v^n x_3 - \beta_v^n x_1 x_2] \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \quad (\text{D.19})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\alpha(n)} [\beta_v^n x_1 x_2 - \gamma_v^n x_3] \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_3}(x_1, x_2, x_3). \quad (\text{D.20})$$

Then from Taylor expansion, we have for $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$,

$$\mathcal{A}_1^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \mathcal{A}^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) + \alpha(n)\mathcal{B}^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) + O(n^{-1}) + O(\alpha(n)/n). \quad (\text{D.21})$$

$$\mathcal{A}_2^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \mathcal{A}^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) + O(n^{-1}), \quad (\text{D.22})$$

$$\mathcal{A}_3^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \alpha(n)\mathcal{B}^n f(x_1, x_2, x_3) + O(\alpha(n)/n). \quad (\text{D.23})$$

Proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4. The main idea is adapted from Theorem 2.1 in Kurtz (1992). We first define the following σ -field: For $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{F}_t^n = \sigma(N_i^n(s), i = 1, \dots, 6, I_h^n(s), S_v^n(s), I_v^n(s); s \leq t).$$

From (D.3), we have that for $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{S}_v^n(t) + \bar{I}_v^n(t)] = C_0.$$

We next observe that $\bar{S}_v^n + \bar{I}_v^n$ is a $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ martingale, and

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \bar{S}_v^n + \bar{I}_v^n \rangle_t] = \frac{2\gamma_v^n}{n} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\bar{S}_v^n(u) + \bar{I}_v^n(u)] du \rightarrow 0.$$

From the martingale central limit theorem, we have that

$$\bar{S}_v^n + \bar{I}_v^n \Rightarrow C_0. \quad (\text{D.24})$$

We next establish the relative compactness of Γ^n . From (D.3) and the Markov inequality, we have for $t \geq 0$ and $L > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma^n([0, t] \times [0, L] \times [0, L])] &= \int_0^t \mathbb{P}(\bar{S}_v^n(s) \leq L, \bar{I}_v^n(s) \leq L) ds \\ &\geq \int_0^t \mathbb{P}(\bar{S}_v^n(s) + \bar{I}_v^n(s) \leq L) ds \\ &= t - \int_0^t \mathbb{P}(\bar{S}_v^n(s) + \bar{I}_v^n(s) > L) ds \\ &\geq t \left(1 - \frac{C_0}{L}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that for each $t \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ such that

$$\inf_n \mathbb{E}[\Gamma^n([0, t] \times K)] \geq (1 - \epsilon)t.$$

Then, from Lemma 1.3 in Kurtz (1992), $\{\Gamma^n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is relatively compact. We next show the tightness of $\{\bar{I}_h^n\}$. For $t \geq 0$, define

$$M^n(t) = \bar{I}_h^n(t) - \bar{I}_h^n(0) - \beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du + \gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du. \quad (\text{D.25})$$

Then M^n is a martingale, and

$$\langle M^n \rangle_t = \frac{\beta_h^n}{n} \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du + \frac{\gamma_h^n}{n} \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \rightarrow 0,$$

which yields that $M^n \Rightarrow 0$. From (D.25), we have

$$\bar{I}_h^n(t) = \bar{I}_h^n(0) + \int_0^t [\beta_h^n \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) - \gamma_h^n \bar{I}_h^n(u)] du - M^n(t).$$

We note that there exists a positive constant c_1 such that

$$\int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\beta_h^n \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) - \gamma_h^n \bar{I}_h^n(u)| du \leq c_1 t.$$

Then both conditions in Theorem D.1 can be verified easily, and it follows that \bar{I}_h^n is C -tight. Thus $\{(\bar{I}_h^n, \Gamma^n)\}$ is relatively compact. Now, let $(\bar{I}_h, \bar{\Gamma})$ be a limit point along a subsequence $\{n'\}$. Note

that for $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(\bar{S}_v^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) - f(\bar{S}_v^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_3^n f(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{S}_v^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du \\ &= f(\bar{S}_v^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) - f(\bar{S}_v^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0)) - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{A}_3^n f(\bar{I}_h^n(u), y) \Gamma^n(du \times dy), \end{aligned}$$

which is a martingale. Dividing it by $\alpha(n')$ and letting $n' \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\int_{[0,t]} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{B}f(\bar{I}_h(u), y) \bar{\Gamma}(du \times dy) \quad (\text{D.26})$$

is a local martingale, where for $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$,

$$\mathcal{B}f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = [\gamma_v x_3 - \beta_v x_1 x_2] \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(x_2, x_3) + [\beta_v x_1 x_2 - \gamma_v x_3] \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_3}(x_2, x_3). \quad (\text{D.27})$$

From Lemma 1.4 in Kurtz (1992), there exists a $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ -valued process γ such that for any measurable function $l : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{[0,t]} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} l(s, y) \bar{\Gamma}(ds \times dy) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} l(s, y) \gamma_s(dy) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Thus from (D.26) for all $t \geq 0$, and $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$, we have

$$\int_{[0,t]} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{B}f(\bar{I}_h(u), y) \bar{\Gamma}(du \times dy) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{B}f(\bar{I}_h(u), y) \gamma_u(dy) du = 0, \quad (\text{D.28})$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that (D.26) is a the local martingale that is continuous and of bounded variation. Consequently, we have for a.e. t ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{B}f(\bar{I}_h(t), y) \gamma_t(dy) = 0.$$

Then, from (D.27), we have for a.e. t ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{B}f(\bar{I}_h(t), x) \gamma_t(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} [\gamma_v x_3 - \beta_v \bar{I}_h^n(t) x_2] \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(x_2, x_3) + [\beta_v \bar{I}_h^n(t) x_2 - \gamma_v x_3] \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_3}(x_2, x_3) \gamma_t(dx_2 \times dx_3). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.29})$$

For a given $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let

$$f(x_2, x_3) = \gamma_v \frac{x_3^2}{2} - \beta_v x_1 \frac{x_2^2}{2}.$$

Putting the above f into (D.29), we have for any $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and a.e. t ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} [\beta_v \bar{I}_h(t) x_2 - \gamma_v x_3]^2 \gamma_t(dx_2 \times dx_3) = 0. \quad (\text{D.30})$$

Combining (D.24) and (D.30), we have for a.e. t ,

$$\gamma_t(dx_2 \times dx_3) = \delta\left(\frac{C_0\gamma_v}{\beta_v\bar{I}_h(t)+\gamma_v}, \frac{C_0\beta_v\bar{I}_h^n(t)}{\beta_v\bar{I}_h(t)+\gamma_v}\right)(dx_2 \times dx_3). \quad (\text{D.31})$$

We next note that for $g \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$g(\bar{I}_h^n(t)) - g(\bar{I}_h^n(0)) - \int_{[0,t]} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{A}^n g(\bar{I}_h^n(u), y) \Gamma^n(du \times dx) \quad (\text{D.32})$$

is a martingale. Letting $n' \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$g(\bar{I}_h(t)) - g(\bar{I}_h(0)) - \int_{[0,t]} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{A}g(\bar{I}_h(u), y) \bar{\Gamma}(du \times dx) \quad (\text{D.33})$$

is a local martingale, where for $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\mathcal{A}g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}^n g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = [\beta_h x_3(1-x_1) - \gamma_h x_1]g'(x_1).$$

From (D.31), we have that for $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$g(\bar{I}_h(t)) - g(\bar{I}_h(0)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{A}g\left(\bar{I}_u(u), \frac{C_0\gamma_v}{\beta_v\bar{I}_h(u)+\gamma_v}, \frac{C_0\beta_v\bar{I}_h(u)}{\beta_v\bar{I}_h(u)+\gamma_v}\right) du$$

is a local martingale. Let g be the identity function, then

$$\bar{I}_h(t) - \bar{I}_h(0) - \int_0^t \left(\frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v\bar{I}_h(u)(1-\bar{I}_h(u))}{\beta_v\bar{I}_h(u)+\gamma_v} - \gamma_h\bar{I}_h(u) \right) du$$

is a martingale. Finally, noting that the above martingale is continuous and of bounded variation, it must be 0. Thus we have shown that

$$\bar{I}_h(t) = \bar{I}_h(0) + \int_0^t \left(\frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v\bar{I}_h(u)(1-\bar{I}_h(u))}{\beta_v\bar{I}_h(u)+\gamma_v} - \gamma_h\bar{I}_h(u) \right) du.$$

It can be verified, in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, that the above system has a unique solution. Define

$$h(x) = \frac{C_0\beta_h\beta_v x(1-x)}{\beta_v x + \gamma_v} - \gamma_h x, \quad x \in [0, 1].$$

The locally asymptotic stability can be shown using linearization. For the global and exponential asymptotic stability, we can use the Lyapunov function $L(i_h) = i_h$ for E^e and $L(i_h) = i_h - i_h^* - i_h^* \log(i_h/i_h^*)$ for E^f . \square

Proof of Theorem 3.7. Let $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1$ and $F^n(x_1, x_3) = \beta_h^n x_3(1-x_1) - \gamma_h^n x_1$. We observe that

$$M_1^n(t) := \bar{I}_h^n(t) - \bar{I}_h^n(0) - \int_0^t F^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du$$

is a martingale. Therefore,

$$\hat{I}_h^n(t) := \sqrt{n}(\bar{I}_h^n(t) - i_h(t)) = \sqrt{n}\bar{I}_h^n(0) + \sqrt{n}M_1^n(t) + \sqrt{n} \int_0^t F^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du - \sqrt{n}i_h(t).$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_1, x_3) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F^n(x_1, x_3) = \beta_h x_3(1 - x_1) - \gamma_h x_1, \\ F^*(x_1) &= F(x_1, C_0 \beta_v x_1 / (\beta_v x_1 + \gamma_v)), \\ \bar{F}(x_1, x_3) &= F(x_1, x_3) - F^*(x_1) = \beta_h(1 - x_1) \left[x_3 - \frac{C_0 \beta_v x_1}{\beta_v x_1 + \gamma_v} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$h(x_1, x_3) = -\frac{\beta_h x_3(1 - x_1)}{\beta_v x_1 + \gamma_v},$$

and let $\tilde{h}^n = h/\alpha(n)$. Then

$$M_2^n(t) := \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) - \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_1^n \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du$$

is a martingale. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t F(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du \\ &= \int_0^t F^*(\bar{I}_h^n(u)) du + \int_0^t \bar{F}(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du \\ &= \int_0^t F^*(\bar{I}_h^n(u)) du + \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_1^n \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du + \int_0^t [\bar{F}(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - \mathcal{A}_1^n \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u))] du \\ &= \int_0^t F^*(\bar{I}_h^n(u)) du - M_2^n(t) + [\tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) - \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0))] \\ & \quad + \int_0^t [\bar{F}(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - \mathcal{A}_1^n \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u))] du. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.5), $i_h(t) = \int_0^t F^*(i_h(u)) du$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_h^n(t) &= \hat{I}_h^n(0) + \sqrt{n} M_1^n(t) - \sqrt{n} M_2^n(t) + \int_0^t \sqrt{n} [F^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - F(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u))] du \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \sqrt{n} [F^*(\bar{I}_h^n(u)) - F^*(i_h(u))] du + \sqrt{n} [\tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) - \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0))] \\ & \quad + \sqrt{n} \int_0^t [\bar{F}(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - \mathcal{A}_1^n \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u))] du. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\hat{M}_i^n(t) = \sqrt{n} M_i^n(t), i = 1, 2.$$

We next observe that for $t \geq 0$,

$$[\hat{M}_1^n, \hat{M}_1^n]_t = \frac{1}{n} \left[N_1^n \left(n \beta_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_v^n(u) \bar{S}_h^n(u) du \right) + N_2^n \left(n \gamma_h^n \int_0^t \bar{I}_h^n(u) du \right) \right].$$

Therefore, we have from similar arguments made in the proof of Theorem 3.3,

$$[\hat{M}_1^n, \hat{M}_1^n]_t \rightarrow \beta_h \int_0^t i_v^*(u)(1 - i_h(u))du + \gamma_h \int_0^t i_h(u)du,$$

where $i_v^*(u) = \frac{C_0\beta_v i_h(u)}{\beta_v i_h(u) + \gamma_v}$ for $u \geq 0$, and so

$$\hat{M}_1^n \Rightarrow \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_h i_v^*(u)(1 - i_h(u)) + \gamma_h i_h(u)} dB(u), \quad (\text{D.34})$$

where B is a standard Brownian motion. Now consider \hat{M}_2^n . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & [\hat{M}_2^n, \hat{M}_2^n]_t \\ &= n \int_0^t \left[\tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u-) + \frac{1}{n}, \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right]^2 dN_1^n \left(n\beta_h^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_v^n(v) \bar{S}_h^n(v) dv \right) \\ &+ n \int_0^t \left[\tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u-) - \frac{1}{n}, \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) - \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u-), \bar{I}_v^n(u-)) \right]^2 dN_2^n \left(n\gamma_h^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_h^n(v) dv \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{n\alpha(n)^2} \int_0^t \left[\frac{\beta_h(1 - \bar{I}_h^n(u))}{\beta_v x_1 + \gamma_v} \right]^2 dN_4^n \left(n\beta_v^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_h^n(v) \bar{S}_v^n(v) dv \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{n\alpha(n)^2} \int_0^t \left[\frac{\beta_h(1 - \bar{I}_h^n(u))}{\beta_v x_1 + \gamma_v} \right]^2 dN_6^n \left(n\gamma_v^n \int_0^u \bar{I}_v^n(v) dv \right) \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\hat{M}_2^n \Rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{D.35})$$

Next, using Theorem 3.3, we observe that

$$\int_0^t \sqrt{n} [F^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - F(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u))] du \rightarrow \int_0^t \hat{\beta}_h i_v^*(u)(1 - i_h(u)) - \hat{\gamma}_h i_h(u) du, \quad (\text{D.36})$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} [\tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(t), \bar{I}_v^n(t)) - \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(0), \bar{I}_v^n(0))] \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{D.37})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n} \int_0^t [\bar{F}(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - \mathcal{A}_1^n \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u))] du \\ &= \sqrt{n} \int_0^t [\bar{F}(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - \mathcal{A}^n \tilde{h}^n(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - \mathcal{B}^n h(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) - O(n^{-1})] du \\ &= O(1/\sqrt{n}) - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\alpha(n)} \int_0^t \mathcal{A}^n h(\bar{I}_h^n(u), \bar{I}_v^n(u)) du \\ &+ \sqrt{n} \left[\int_0^t \beta_h(1 - \bar{I}_h^n(u)) \left[\bar{I}_v^n(u) - \frac{C_0\beta_v \bar{I}_h^n(u)}{\beta_v \bar{I}_h^n(u) + \gamma_v} \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \beta_h(1 - \bar{I}_h^n(u)) \frac{C_0 \beta_v^n \bar{I}_h^n(u) - (\beta_v^n \bar{I}_h^n(u) + \gamma_v^n) \bar{I}_v^n(u)}{\alpha(n)(\beta_v \bar{I}_h^n(u) + \gamma_v)} du \Big] \\
\rightarrow & \int_0^t \frac{\beta_h(1 - \bar{I}_h^n(u))(C_0 \hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) - \hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) i_v^*(u) - \hat{\gamma}_v i_v^*(u))}{\beta_v i_h(u) + \gamma_v} du.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.38}$$

At last, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^t \sqrt{n} [F^*(\bar{I}_h^n(u)) - F^*(i_h(u))] du \\
= & \int_0^t \frac{G \gamma_v \hat{I}_h^n(u) - H \beta_v \bar{I}_h^n(u) i_h(u) \hat{I}_h^n(u) - H \gamma_v (\bar{I}_h^n(u) + i_h(u)) \hat{I}_h^n(u)}{(\beta_v \hat{I}_h^n(u) + \gamma_v)(\beta_v i_h(u) + \gamma_v)} du,
\end{aligned}$$

where $G = C_0 \beta_h \beta_v - \gamma_h \gamma_v$ and $H = C_0 \beta_h \beta_v + \gamma_h \beta_v$. We can show the C -tightness of \hat{I}_h^n following similar steps to those in the proof of Theorem 3.6. Let \hat{I}_h be a weak limit of \hat{I}_h^n . Then

$$\hat{I}_h(t) = \hat{I}_h(0) + \int_0^t \sqrt{\beta_h i_v^*(u)(1 - i_h(u)) + \gamma_h i_h(u)} dB(u) + \int_0^t D(i_h(u), \hat{I}_h(u)) du,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D(i_h(u), \hat{I}_h(u)) = & \hat{\beta}_h i_v^*(u)(1 - i_h(u)) - \hat{\gamma}_h i_h(u) \\
& + \frac{\beta_h(1 - i_h(u))(C_0 \hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) - \hat{\beta}_v i_h(u) i_v^*(u) - \hat{\gamma}_v i_v^*(u))}{\beta_v i_h(u) + \gamma_v} \\
& + \frac{(G \gamma_v - H \beta_v i_h(u))^2 - 2H \gamma_v i_h(u) \hat{I}_h(u)}{(\beta_v i_h(u) + \gamma_v)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

D.3 Proof of Lemma 4.2

We study the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of C_e . The right eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue 0 can be taken to be

$$\mathbf{v}_{e,0} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)',$$

where u_1, u_2, u_3 are positive and satisfy the linear equations $-(\gamma_h + \beta_h i_v^e)u_1 + \beta_h s_h^e u_3 = 0$ and $-\beta_v s_v^e u_1 - \beta_v i_h^e u_2 + \gamma_v u_3 = 0$. We next note that the two negative eigenvalues are the same as the eigenvalues of (C.9). Denote by $(v_{11}, v_{21})'$ and $(v_{12}, v_{22})'$ the right eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalues $\lambda_{e,1}$ and $\lambda_{e,2}$ for (C.9). It then follows that $(v_{11}, -v_{21}, v_{21})'$ and $(v_{12}, -v_{22}, v_{22})'$ are the right eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalues $\lambda_{e,1}$ and $\lambda_{e,2}$ for C_e in (4.9). From (4.14), we have

$$e^{C_e t} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & v_{11} & v_{12} \\ u_2 & -v_{21} & -v_{22} \\ u_3 & v_{21} & v_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_{e,1} t} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{\lambda_{e,2} t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & v_{11} & v_{12} \\ u_2 & -v_{21} & -v_{22} \\ u_3 & v_{21} & v_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

We next write

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_{11} & v_{12} \\ v_{21} & v_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_1 & v_{11} & v_{12} \\ u_2 & -v_{21} & -v_{22} \\ u_3 & v_{21} & v_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{u_2+u_3} & \frac{1}{u_2+u_3} \\ a_{11} & -\frac{a_{11}u_1+a_{12}u_3}{u_2+u_3} & -\frac{a_{11}u_1-a_{12}u_2}{u_2+u_3} \\ a_{21} & -\frac{a_{21}u_1+a_{22}u_3}{u_2+u_3} & -\frac{a_{21}u_1-a_{22}u_2}{u_2+u_3} \end{pmatrix},$$

and $e^{C_\epsilon t} =$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & u_1/(u_2+u_3) & u_1/(u_2+u_3) \\ 0 & u_2/(u_2+u_3) & u_2/(u_2+u_3) \\ 0 & u_3/(u_2+u_3) & u_3/(u_2+u_3) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} v_{11}a_{11}e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} + v_{12}a_{21}e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} & v_{11}b_1e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} + v_{12}b_2e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} & v_{11}b_3e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} + v_{12}b_4e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} \\ -v_{21}a_{11}e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} - v_{22}a_{21}e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} & -v_{21}b_1e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} - v_{22}b_2e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} & -v_{21}b_3e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} - v_{22}b_4e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} \\ v_{21}a_{11}e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} + v_{22}a_{21}e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} & v_{21}b_1e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} + v_{22}b_2e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} & v_{21}b_3e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,1}t} + v_{22}b_4e^{\lambda_{\epsilon,2}t} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $b_1 = -(u_1a_{11}+a_{12}u_3)/(u_2+u_3)$, $b_2 = -(u_1a_{21}+u_3a_{22})/(u_2+u_3)$, $b_3 = -(u_1a_{11}-u_2a_{12})/(u_2+u_3)$, and $b_4 = -(u_1a_{21}-u_2a_{22})/(u_2+u_3)$. It follows from (4.13) that the variances of $\hat{I}_h(t)$, $\hat{S}_v(t)$, and $\hat{I}_v(t)$ approach ∞ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

E Appendix: Notation

Parameter	Definition
n	Size of host population.
C_0	Multiple by which vector population scale to host population.
β_h^n	Disease transmission rate to hosts from a typical infectious vector.
γ_h^n	Recovery rate of a typical infected host.
β_h	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_h^n$.
γ_h	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_h^n$.
$\hat{\beta}_h$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}(\beta_h^n - \beta_h)$.
$\hat{\gamma}_h$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}(\gamma_h^n - \gamma_h)$.
β_v^n	Disease transmission rate to vectors from a typical infectious host.
γ_v^n	Equal birth and death rate of a vector.
Parameter scale of Case I:	Both hosts and vectors evolve at rate $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
β_v	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_v^n$.
γ_v	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_v^n$.
$\hat{\beta}_v$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}(\beta_v^n - \beta_v)$.
$\hat{\gamma}_v$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}(\gamma_v^n - \gamma_v)$.
Parameter scale of Case II:	Vectors evolve much faster at rate $\mathcal{O}(\alpha(n))$ and hosts evolve at rate $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\alpha(n)/n \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha(n)/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
β_v	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_v^n}{\alpha(n)}$.
γ_v	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_v^n}{\alpha(n)}$.
$\hat{\beta}_v$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}(\frac{\beta_v^n}{\alpha(n)} - \beta_v)$.
$\hat{\gamma}_v$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}(\frac{\gamma_v^n}{\alpha(n)} - \gamma_v)$.

Table 1: Parameters

Variable/ Process	Definition
$S_h^n(t)$	Number of susceptible hosts at time t when the total host population size is n .
$I_h^n(t)$	Number of infectious hosts at time t when the total host population size is n .
$S_v^n(t)$	Number of susceptible vectors at time t when the total host population size is n .
$I_v^n(t)$	Number of infectious vectors at time t when the total host population size is n .
$\bar{S}_h^n(t) = \frac{S_h^n(t)}{n}$	Ratio of susceptible hosts at time t to the host population size.
$\bar{I}_h^n(t) = \frac{I_h^n(t)}{n}$	Ratio of infectious hosts at time t to the host population size.
$\bar{S}_v^n(t) = \frac{S_v^n(t)}{n}$	Ratio of susceptible vectors at time t to the host population size.
$\bar{I}_v^n(t) = \frac{I_v^n(t)}{n}$	Ratio of infectious vectors at time t to the host population size.
$s_h(t)$	Weak limit of $\bar{S}_h^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$i_h^n(t)$	Weak limit of $\bar{I}_h^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$s_v^n(t)$	Weak limit of $\bar{S}_v^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$i_v^n(t)$	Weak limit of $\bar{I}_v^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$\hat{S}_h^n(t) = \sqrt{n}(\bar{S}_h^n(t) - s_h(t))$	Scaled deviation of $\bar{S}_h^n(t)$ from its limit $s_h(t)$.
$\hat{I}_h^n(t) = \sqrt{n}(\bar{I}_h^n(t) - i_h(t))$	Scaled deviation of $\bar{I}_h^n(t)$ from its limit $i_h(t)$.
$\hat{S}_v^n(t) = \sqrt{n}(\bar{S}_v^n(t) - s_v(t))$	Scaled deviation of $\bar{S}_v^n(t)$ from its limit $s_v(t)$.
$\hat{I}_v^n(t) = \sqrt{n}(\bar{I}_v^n(t) - i_v(t))$	Scaled deviation of $\bar{I}_v^n(t)$ from its limit $i_v(t)$.
$\hat{S}_h(t)$	Weak limit of $\hat{S}_h^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$\hat{I}_h(t)$	Weak limit of $\hat{I}_h^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$\hat{S}_v(t)$	Weak limit of $\hat{S}_v^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$\hat{I}_v(t)$	Weak limit of $\hat{I}_v^n(t)$ as the host population size $n \rightarrow \infty$.
$N_i^n; i = 1, 2, 3, 4$	Independent rate-1 Poisson processes when the total host population size is n .

Table 2: Processes