

AN ECO-EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODEL WITH GENERAL FUNCTIONAL RESPONSE OF PREDATOR TO PREY

LOPO F. DE JESUS, CÉSAR M. SILVA, AND HELDER VILARINHO

ABSTRACT. We consider a generalization of the nonautonomous model in [12] by adding a general function corresponding to predation on uninfected preys as well as general functions associated to the vital dynamics of the susceptible prey and predator populations. We obtain persistence and extinction results for the infected prey based on some assumptions on the bidimensional predator-prey subsystem that describes the dynamics in the absence of infected preys. We apply our results to eco-epidemiological models constructed from several predator-prey models existent in the literature. Some illustrative simulation is undertaken.

1. INTRODUCTION

The description of the dynamics of eco-epidemiological systems is a subject that have been receiving increasing attention by the researchers interested in mathematical biology. The inclusion of infected classes in predator-prey models has shown that eco-epidemiological dynamics can show several differences to the original models. In particular, the inclusion of a disease in the preys or in the predators have impact on the population size of the predator-prey community [6, 8].

Additionally, to make models more realistic, it is important, in many situations, to consider time varying parameters. For instance, it is well known in epidemiology that incidence rates are seldom subject to periodic seasonal fluctuations. In the context of eco-epidemiological models, several periodic systems have been studied in the literature [1, 4, 8, 9, 12]. In [12] a class of general non-autonomous eco-epidemiological models with disease in the prey, containing the periodic case as a very particular situation, is considered and threshold conditions for the extinction and persistence of the infected preys are obtained. Related to the periodic version of this model, in [15], it is proved the existence of an endemic periodic orbit. In [12, 15], it is assumed that only infected preys are predated. More recently, based on this model, [11] proposed a family of models that include predation on uninfected preys described by a bilinear functional response and obtained threshold conditions for the extinction and persistence of the disease.

In the previous papers, the functional response of the predator to prey is given by some particular function. Also the vital dynamics of predator and prey is assumed to follow some particular law. In this paper we generalize the model in [11] by considering general functions corresponding to the predation on uninfected prey and

Date: January 6, 2020.

Key words and phrases. Eco-epidemiological model, nonautonomous, strong persistence, extinction, functional response of predator to prey.

L. de Jesus, C. M. Silva and H. Vilarinho were partially supported by FCT through CMA-UBI (project UID/MAT/00212/2019).

also to the vital dynamics of uninfected prey and predator populations. Namely, we consider the following eco-epidemiological model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = g(t, S) - a(t)f(S, P)P - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = h(t, P)P + \gamma(t)a(t)f(S, P)P + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

where S , I and P correspond, respectively, to the susceptible prey, infected prey and predator, $\beta(t)$ is the incidence rate of the disease, $\eta(t)$ is the predation rate of infected prey, $c(t)$ is the death rate in the infective class, $\gamma(t)$ is the rate converting susceptible prey into predator (biomass transfer), $\theta(t)$ is the rate of converting infected prey into predator, $g(t, S)$ and $h(t, P)P$ represent the vital dynamics of the susceptible prey and predator populations, respectively, and $a(t)f(S, P)$ is the predation of susceptible prey. It is assumed that only susceptible preys S are capable of reproducing, i.e. the infected prey is removed by death (including natural and disease-related death) or by predation before having the possibility of reproducing.

The objective of this work is to discuss the uniform strong persistence and extinction of the infectives I in system (1). Recall that the infectives are *uniformly strong persistent* in system (1) if there exist $0 < m_1 < m_2$ such that for every solution $(S(t), I(t), P(t))$ of (1) with positive initial conditions $S(t_0), I(t_0), P(t_0) > 0$, we have

$$m_1 < \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} I(t) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} I(t) < m_2,$$

and we say that the infectives I go to *extinction* in system (1) if

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

for all solutions of (1) with positive initial conditions.

For biological reasons we will only consider for system (1) solutions with initial conditions in the set $(\mathbb{R}^+)^3$.

Our approach is very different to the one in [12] and [11]. In fact, we want to discuss the extinction and strong persistence of the infectives in system (1), having as departure point some prescribed behaviour of the uninfected subsystem corresponding to the dynamics of preys and predators in the absence of disease. We will assume in the major part of this work, more specifically in Section 2, that we have global asymptotic stability of solutions of some special perturbations of the bidimensional predator-prey system that determines the dynamics in the uninfected subspace (the model obtained by letting $I = 0$ in the first and third equations in (1)) and that we will refer to as *uninfected subsystem* (see condition S6) in Section 2). Thus, to apply our results to specific situations in the literature, one must first verify that the underlying uninfected subsystem satisfies our assumptions or, looking at our results differently, we can construct an eco-epidemiological model from a previously studied predator-prey model (the uninfected subsystem) that satisfies our assumptions. We believe that this approach is interesting since it highlights the relation of the dynamics of the eco-epidemiological model with the behaviour of the predator-prey model used in its construction.

We note that, similarly to the thresholds obtained in [11], our thresholds for extinction and uniform strong persistence are not sharp. In spite of this, unlike the conditions for extinction and strong persistence in [11], that rely on parameters that can not, in principle, be computed explicitly (note that conditions (22) and (43)

in [11] depend on q_1), our thresholds can be directly obtained from the parameters and the limit behavior of the predator-(uninfected) prey subsystem.

To illustrate our findings, in section 2, several predator-prey models available in the literature, satisfying our assumptions, are considered and threshold conditions for the corresponding eco-epidemiological model automatically obtained from our results: in our Example 1, we consider the situation where $f \equiv 0$ in system (1), corresponding to a generalized version of the situation studied in [12]; in Example 2, we obtain a particular form for the threshold conditions in the context of periodic models and particularize our result for a model constructed from the predator-prey model in [5]; in Example 3, we start with an uninfected subsystem with Gause-type interaction (a predator-prey model with Holling type II functional response of predator to prey, logistic growth of prey in the absence of predators and exponential extinction of predator in the absence of prey) and, using [10], obtain the corresponding results for the eco-epidemiological model; in Example 4, we consider the eco-epidemiological model obtained from an uninfected subsystem with ratio-dependent functional response of predator to prey, a type interaction considered as an attempt to overcome some known biological paradoxes observed in models with Gause-type interaction and again obtain the corresponding results for the eco-epidemiological model, based on the discussion of ratio-dependent predator-prey systems in [7]; finally, in Examples 5 and 6, we consider eco-epidemiological models, based on the discussion of the corresponding predator-prey models in [14, 16] where the uninfected subsystem has some specific type of non-autonomy in the prey equation (Example 5) or the predator equation (Example 6). For all these examples we present some simulation that corroborate our conclusions.

In the last part of this work, in Section 3, we obtain a threshold condition for persistence for an eco-epidemiological model constructed from the classical Lotka-Volterra model, and thus having Lyapunov stable behavior but not asymptotically stable behavior for the predator-(uninfected) prey subsystem.

2. ECO-EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODELS WITH ASYMPTOTICALLY STABLE BEHAVIOR IN THE PREDATOR-UNINFECTED PREY SUBSPACE

We will assume the following hypothesis concerning the parameter functions and the functions f , g and h appearing in our model:

- S1) The real valued functions a , β , η , c , γ and θ are bounded, nonnegative and continuous;
- S2) The real valued functions f , g and h are locally Lipschitz and, moreover, functions f and g are nonnegative.

Our next assumption relates to the ω -limit of solutions of (1) and is usually fulfilled by mathematical models in eco-epidemiology.

- S3) Each solution of (1) with positive initial condition is bounded and there is a bounded region \mathcal{R} that contains the ω -limit of all solutions of (1) with positive initial conditions.

Notice in particular that condition S3) implies that there is $L > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (S(t) + I(t) + P(t)) < L,$$

for all solutions $(S(t), I(t), P(t))$ of (1) with positive initial conditions.

To proceed, we need to consider two auxiliary equations and one auxiliary system. First, we consider the equation

$$s' = g(t, s), \quad (2)$$

that corresponds to the dynamics of uninfected preys in the absence of infected preys and predators (the first equation in system (1) with $I = 0$, $S = s$ and $P = 0$). We assume the following properties for the solutions of (2):

- S4) Each solution $s(t)$ of (2) with positive initial condition is bounded, bounded away from zero, and globally attractive on $]0, +\infty[$, that is $|s(t) - v(t)| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ for each solution $v(t)$ of (2) with positive initial condition.

The second auxiliary equation we consider is the equation

$$y' = h(t, y)y, \quad (3)$$

that corresponds to the dynamics of predators in the absence of the considered preys (the third equation in system (1) with $I = 0$, $S = 0$ and $P = y$).

We need the following property for the solutions of (3):

- S5) Each fixed solution $y(t)$ of (3) with positive initial condition is bounded and globally attractive on $[0, +\infty)$.

Finally, we need the following auxiliary system

$$\begin{cases} x' = g(t, x) - a(t)f(x, z)z \\ z' = h(t, z)z + \gamma(t)a(t)f(x, z)z \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

that describes the behavior of preys and predators in the absence of infected preys (the first and third equations of system (1) with $I = 0$, $S = x$ and $P = z$). We will refer to system (4) as the *uninfected subsystem*. We assume that we are able to construct families of perturbations:

$$\begin{cases} x' = g_{1,\varepsilon}(t, x) - a(t)f(x, z)z - v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)x \\ z' = h_{1,\varepsilon}(t, z)z + \gamma(t)a(t)f(x, z)z \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} x' = g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x) - a(t)f(x, z)z \\ z' = h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, z)z + \gamma(t)a(t)f(x, z)z + v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)z \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

of the uninfected subsystem satisfying:

- S6) The following holds for systems (5) and (6):

- S6.1) for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the functions $g_{i,\varepsilon}$ and $h_{i,\varepsilon}$, $i = 1, 2$, are continuous, the functionals $\varepsilon \mapsto g_{i,\varepsilon}$ and $\varepsilon \mapsto h_{i,\varepsilon}$, $i = 1, 2$, are continuous, $g_{1,0} = g_{2,0} = g$, $h_{1,0} = h_{2,0} = h$,

$$g_{1,\varepsilon}(t, x) \leq g(t, x) \leq g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x)$$

and

$$h_{1,\varepsilon}(t, x) \leq h(t, x) \leq h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x);$$

- S6.2) the real valued function $v : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ verifies $v(\varepsilon) > 0$ for $\varepsilon \in]0, +\infty[$, $v(0) = 0$ and is differentiable near $\varepsilon = 0$ with

$$A < v'(\varepsilon) < B,$$

for some $A, B > 0$ and sufficiently small $\varepsilon \geq 0$;

S6.3) there are constants ρ^u, ρ^ℓ such that, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$0 < \rho^\ell \leq \rho(t) \leq \rho^u;$$

S6.4) there is a family of nonnegative solutions, $\{(x_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t), z_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t))\}$ of system (5), one solution for each $\varepsilon \geq 0$ sufficiently small, such that each solution in the family is globally asymptotically stable in a set containing the set $\{(x, z) \in (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^2 : x > 0 \wedge z > 0\}$ and the function

$$\varepsilon \mapsto (x_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t), z_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t)) \quad \text{is continuous;}$$

S6.5) there is a family of nonnegative solutions, $\{(x_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t), z_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t))\}$ of system (6), one solution for each $\varepsilon \geq 0$ sufficiently small, such that each solution in the family is globally asymptotically stable in a set containing the set $\{(x, z) \in (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^2 : x > 0 \wedge z > 0\}$ and the function

$$\varepsilon \mapsto (x_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t), z_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t)) \quad \text{is continuous.}$$

We write $x_{1,0}^* = x_{2,0}^* = x^*$ and $z_{1,0}^* = z_{2,0}^* = z^*$ for the components of the solutions in S6.4) and S6.5) corresponding to $\varepsilon = 0$. Notice that $(x^*(t), z^*(t))$ is a solution of the uninfected subsystem. For the continuity referred in the last property we consider the usual supremum norm, $\|\cdot\|_0$ (notice that, by S3) the solutions are bounded). Note that we only aim to control a suitable family of perturbed subsystems, so that condition S6) is sufficiently flexible to adapt to a wide range of uninfected subsystems associated to the eco-epidemiological models.

2.1. Main results. In this subsection, we will establish our results on the extinction and uniform strong persistence of the infective prey in system (1), assuming conditions S1) to S6). Given a function f we will use throughout the paper the notations $f^\ell = \inf_{t \geq 0} f(t)$, $f^u = \sup_{t \geq 0} f(t)$ and, for a ω -periodic function f we use the notation $\bar{f} = (1/\omega) \int_0^\omega f(s) ds$.

We define

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)x^*(s) - \eta(s)z^*(s) - c(s) ds \quad (7)$$

where we still denote by $(x^*(t), z^*(t))$ any particular solution of system (4) with positive initial conditions and

$$\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)s^*(s) - \eta(s)y^*(s) - c(s) ds. \quad (8)$$

where $s^*(t)$ and $y^*(t)$ are particular solutions, respectively, of (2) and (3) with positive initial conditions. Notice that, using the global attractivity of solutions of (2) and (3) in $]0, +\infty[$ and the global attractivity of solutions of (4), we can easily conclude that (7) and (8) are independent of the particular solutions of (2) and (3) with positive initial conditions considered.

Theorem 1. *Assume that conditions S1) to S5) hold. If there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) < 0$, then the infectives in system (1) go to extinction.*

Proof. Assume that there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) < 0$ and let $s^*(t)$ and $y^*(t)$ be particular solutions, respectively, of (2) and (3) with positive initial conditions.

Since functions β and η are bounded, there are $\kappa > 0$, $t_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for $t \geq t_0$ and $\delta \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$, we have

$$\int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)(s^*(s) + \delta) - \eta(s)(y^*(s) - \delta) - c(s) ds \leq -\kappa < 0. \quad (9)$$

Let $(S(t), I(t), P(t))$ be a solution of (1) with positive initial conditions. We will prove first that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Assume that (10) does not hold. Then, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $I(t) > \varepsilon$ for all sufficiently large t . By the first equation of (1) we have

$$S' \leq g(t, S)$$

and thus $S(t) \leq s(t)$, where $s(t)$ is the solution of (2) with $s(t_0) = S(t_0)$. By condition S4), given $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$, we have $S(t) \leq s^*(t) + \varepsilon$, for all sufficiently large t .

By the third equation of (1), we have

$$P' \geq h(t, P)P$$

and thus $P(t) \geq y(t)$, where $y(t)$ is the solution of (3) with $y(t_0) = P(t_0)$. By condition S5), given $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$, we have $P(t) \geq y^*(t) - \varepsilon$, for all sufficiently large t .

By the second equation of (1), we have

$$I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \leq [\beta(t)(s^*(t) + \varepsilon) - \eta(t)(y^*(t) - \varepsilon) - c(t)]I,$$

for all sufficiently large t . Denoting by $[\alpha]$ the integer part of α and integrating the previous equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(t) &\leq I(t_0) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t \beta(r)(s^*(r) + \varepsilon) - \eta(r)(y^*(r) - \varepsilon) - c(r) dr \right\} \\ &\leq I(t_0) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \lfloor (t-t_0)/\lambda \rfloor \lambda} \beta(r)(s^*(r) + \varepsilon) - \eta(r)(y^*(r) - \varepsilon) - c(r) dr \right\} \\ &\quad \times e^{\lambda(\beta^u(s^*)^u + \varepsilon(\beta^u + \eta^u))} \\ &\leq I(t_0) e^{-\lfloor (t-t_0)/\lambda \rfloor \kappa} e^{\lambda(\beta^u(s^*)^u + \varepsilon(\beta^u + \eta^u))}, \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large t . Since $\lfloor (t-t_0)/\lambda \rfloor \kappa \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, we get a contradiction to the hypothesis that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $I(t) > \varepsilon$ for sufficiently large t . We conclude that (10) holds.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Next we will prove that for sufficiently large t

$$I(t) \leq \varepsilon e^{h\lambda}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$h = \sup_{t \geq 0} |\beta(t)(s^*(t) + \varepsilon_0) - \eta(t)(y^*(t) - \varepsilon_0) - c(t)|.$$

By (10), there exists $t_1 \geq t_0$ such that $I(t_1) < \varepsilon$.

Assume, by contradiction that (11) does not hold. Then, there is $t_2 > t_1$ such that $I(t_2) > \varepsilon e^{h\lambda}$. Since $I(t_1) < \varepsilon$, there is $t_3 \in]t_1, t_2[$ such that $I(t_3) = \varepsilon$ and

$I(t) > \varepsilon$, for all $t \in]t_3, t_2[$. Integrating we get, by (9),

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon e^{h\lambda} < I(t_2) &\leq I(t_3) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_3}^{t_2} \beta(r)(s^*(r) + \varepsilon) - \eta(r)(y^*(r) - \varepsilon) - c(r) dr \right\} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \exp \left\{ \int_{t_3 + \lfloor (t_2 - t_3)/\lambda \rfloor \lambda}^{t_2} \beta(r)(s^*(r) + \varepsilon_0) - \eta(r)(y^*(r) - \varepsilon_0) - c(r) dr \right\} \\ &\leq \varepsilon e^{h\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

with is a contradiction. Thus, we conclude that (11) holds and, since $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $I(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, as claimed. \square

Theorem 2. *Assume that conditions S1) to S3) and S6) hold. If there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) > 0$, then the infectives in system (1) are uniformly strong persistent.*

Proof. Assume that there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) > 0$ and let us fix particular families of solutions of systems (5) and (6), respectively $(x_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t), z_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t))$ and $(x_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t), z_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t))$, with positive initial conditions and satisfying S6.4) and S6.5). Then, we can choose $t_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for $t \geq t_0$ and $\delta \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ we have

$$\int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)(x^*(s) - \delta) - \eta(s)(z^*(s) + \delta) - c(s) ds \geq \kappa > 0. \quad (12)$$

Let $(S(t), I(t), P(t))$ be a solution of (1) with positive initial conditions. We will prove first that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t) \geq \frac{v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)}{(1 + \beta^u)(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)} > 0. \quad (13)$$

Assume that for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t) < \frac{v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)}{(1 + \beta^u)(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)}.$$

Then, we conclude that there is $t_1 > t_0$, such that

$$I(t) < \frac{v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)}{(1 + \beta^u)(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)},$$

for each $t \geq t_1$. By the first and third equations of (1) and the inequalities in S6.1) we have

$$\begin{cases} S' \leq g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, S) - a(t)f(S, P)P \\ P' \leq h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, P)P + \gamma(t)a(t)f(S, P)P + v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)P \end{cases}.$$

Letting $(\hat{x}_\varepsilon(t), \hat{z}_\varepsilon(t))$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} x' = g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x) - a(t)f(x, z)z \\ z' = h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, z)z + \gamma(t)a(t)f(x, z)z + v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)z \end{cases}$$

with $\hat{x}_\varepsilon(t_1) = S(t_1)$ and $\hat{z}_\varepsilon(t_1) = P(t_1)$. We have $S(t) \leq \hat{x}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $P(t) \leq \hat{z}_\varepsilon(t)$ for $t \geq t_1$. By the global stability assumption in S6.5), we have

$$|x_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \hat{x}_\varepsilon(t)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |z_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \hat{z}_\varepsilon(t)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty$$

and, by continuity, again according to S6.5), we have for sufficiently large t

$$\begin{aligned} |z^*(t) - \hat{z}_\varepsilon(t)| &\leq |z^*(t) - z_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t)| + |z_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \hat{z}_\varepsilon(t)| \\ &\leq \|z^* - z_{2,\varepsilon}^*\|_0 + |z_{2,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \hat{z}_\varepsilon(t)| \\ &\leq \varphi(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

with $\varphi(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In particular, for sufficiently large t ,

$$P(t) \leq \hat{z}_\varepsilon(t) \leq \varphi(\varepsilon) + z^*(t). \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, by the first and third equations of (1), we have

$$\begin{cases} S' \geq g_{1,\varepsilon}(t, S) - a(t)f(S, P)P - v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)S \\ P' \geq h_{1,\varepsilon}(t, P)P + \gamma(t)a(t)f(S, P)P \end{cases}$$

Letting $(\tilde{x}_\varepsilon(t), \tilde{z}_\varepsilon(t))$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} x' = g_{1,\varepsilon}(t, x) - a(t)f(x, z)z - v(\varepsilon)\rho(t)x \\ z' = h_{1,\varepsilon}(t, z)z + \gamma(t)a(t)f(x, z)z \end{cases}$$

with $\tilde{x}(t_1) = S(t_1)$ and $\tilde{z}(t_1) = P(t_1)$, we have $S(t) \geq \tilde{x}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $P(t) \geq \tilde{z}_\varepsilon(t)$, for all $t \geq t_1$. By the global stability assumption in S6.4), we have

$$|x_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \tilde{x}_\varepsilon(t)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |z_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \tilde{z}_\varepsilon(t)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty.$$

and, by the continuity property in S6.5), for sufficiently large t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x^*(t) - \tilde{x}_\varepsilon(t)| &\leq |x^*(t) - x_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t)| + |x_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \tilde{x}_\varepsilon(t)| \\ &\leq \|x^* - x_{1,\varepsilon}^*\|_0 + |x_{1,\varepsilon}^*(t) - \tilde{x}_\varepsilon(t)| \\ &\leq \psi(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

with $\psi(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In particular, for sufficiently large t ,

$$S(t) \geq \tilde{x}_\varepsilon(t) \geq x^*(t) - \psi(\varepsilon). \quad (15)$$

By the second equation in (1), (12), (14) and (15) we get, for $t \geq t_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)S(s) - \eta(s)P(s) - c(s) ds \\ &\geq \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)(x^*(s) - \psi(\varepsilon)) - \eta(s)(z^*(s) + \varphi(\varepsilon)) - c(s) ds \geq \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\max\{\varphi(\varepsilon), \psi(\varepsilon)\} < \varepsilon_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(t) &= I(t_1) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_1}^t \beta(s)S(s) - \eta(s)P(s) - c(s) ds \right\} \\ &\geq I(t_1) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_1}^t \beta(s)(x^*(s) - \psi(\varepsilon)) - \eta(s)(z^*(s) + \varphi(\varepsilon)) - c(s) ds \right\} \\ &\geq I(t_1) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_1}^{t_1 + \lfloor (t-t_1)/\lambda \rfloor \lambda} \beta(s)(x^*(s) - \psi(\varepsilon)) - \eta(s)(z^*(s) + \varphi(\varepsilon)) - c(s) ds \right\} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\lambda(\beta^u \psi(\varepsilon) + \eta^u((z^*)^u + \varphi(\varepsilon)) + c^u)} \\ &\geq I(t_1) e^{\lfloor (t-t_1)/\lambda \rfloor \kappa} e^{-\lambda(\beta^u \psi(\varepsilon) + \eta^u((z^*)^u + \varphi(\varepsilon)) + c^u)}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction to the fact that, according to S3), $I(t)$ is bounded. We conclude that (13) holds.

Next we will prove that there is $m_1 > 0$ such that for any solution $(S(t), I(t), P(t))$ with positive initial condition,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t) > m_1. \quad (16)$$

Assume that (16) does not hold. Then, given $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$, there exists a sequence of initial values $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $x_n = (S_n, I_n, P_n)$ and $S_n > 0$, $I_n > 0$ and $P_n > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, x_n) < \frac{\rho^u v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)}, \quad (17)$$

where $(S(t, x_n), I(t, x_n), P(t, x_n))$ denotes the solution of (1) with initial conditions $S(0) = S_n$, $I(0) = I_n$, and $P(0) = P_n$. By (13), given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are two sequences $(t_{n,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(s_{n,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with

$$s_{n,1} < t_{n,1} < s_{n,2} < t_{n,2} < \dots < s_{n,k} < t_{n,k} < \dots$$

and $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} s_{n,k} = +\infty$, such that

$$I(s_{n,k}, x_n) = \frac{\rho^\ell v(\varepsilon/n)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)}, \quad I(t_{n,k}, x_n) = \frac{\rho^u v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)} \quad (18)$$

and, for all $t \in]s_{n,k}, t_{n,k}[$,

$$\frac{\rho^u v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)} < I(t, x_n) < \frac{\rho^\ell v(\varepsilon/n)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)}. \quad (19)$$

By the second equation in (1) and S3), for sufficiently large t , we have

$$I'(t, x_n) = [\beta(t)S(t, x_n) - \eta(t)P(t, x_n) - c(t)]I(t, x_n) \geq -(\eta^u L + c^u)I(t, x_n).$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\int_{s_{n,k}}^{t_{n,k}} \frac{I'(r, x_n)}{I(r, x_n)} dr \geq -(\eta^u L + c^u)(t_{n,k} - s_{n,k})$$

and thus $I(t_{n,k}, x_n) \geq I(s_{n,k}, x_n) e^{-(\eta^u L + c^u)(t_{n,k} - s_{n,k})}$. By (18), and S6.3) we get

$$\frac{\rho^u v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{\rho^\ell v(\varepsilon/n)} \geq \frac{\rho(t_{n,k})v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{\rho(s_{n,k})v(\varepsilon/n)} \geq e^{-(\eta^u L + c^u)(t_{n,k} - s_{n,k})}$$

and therefore we have

$$t_{n,k} - s_{n,k} \geq \frac{\log(\rho^\ell/\rho^u) + \log(v(\varepsilon/n)/v(\varepsilon/n^2))}{\eta^u L + c^u} \rightarrow +\infty \quad (20)$$

as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, since, by S6), S6.2) and S6.3) we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{v(\varepsilon/n)}{v(\varepsilon/n^2)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{n v'(\varepsilon/n)}{2 v'(\varepsilon/n^2)} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{An}{2B} = +\infty.$$

By the first and third equations of (1) and (19), we have, for $t \in]s_{n,k}, t_{n,k}[$,

$$\begin{cases} S' \leq g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, S(t, x_n)) - a(t)f(S(t, x_n), P(t, x_n))P(t, x_n) \\ P' \leq h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, P(t, x_n))P(t, x_n) + \gamma(t)a(t)f(S, P(t, x_n))P(t, x_n) + \rho(t)v(\varepsilon/n)P(t, x_n) \end{cases}.$$

Letting $(\hat{x}_{n,k}(t), \hat{z}_{n,k}(t))$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} x' = g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x) - a(t)f(x, z)z \\ z' = h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, z)z + \gamma(t)a(t)f(x, z)z + \rho(t)v(\varepsilon/n)z \end{cases}$$

with $\hat{x}_{n,k}(s_{n,k}) = S(s_{n,k})$ and $\hat{z}_{n,k}(s_{n,k}) = P(s_{n,k})$. We conclude that $S(t, x_n) \leq \hat{x}_{n,k}(t)$ and $P(t, x_n) \leq \hat{z}_{n,k}(t)$, for each $t \in]s_{n,k}, t_{n,k}[$. By S4), given $\delta > 0$, we have

$$|x_{2,\varepsilon/n}^*(t) - \hat{x}_{n,k}(t)| < \delta/2 \quad \text{and} \quad |z_{2,\varepsilon/n}^*(t) - \hat{z}_{n,k}(t)| < \delta/2,$$

for all sufficiently large k (that depends on n). By continuity, for sufficiently large n and all sufficiently large $k \geq K(n)$, we have

$$|z^*(t) - \hat{z}_{n,k}(t)| \leq |z^*(t) - z_{2,\varepsilon/n}^*(t)| + |z_{2,\varepsilon/n}^*(t) - \hat{z}_{n,k}(t)| \leq \delta.$$

In particular, for sufficiently large n , all sufficiently large $k \geq K(n)$ and for $t \in]s_{n,k(n)}, t_{n,k(n)}[$, we have

$$P(t) \leq \hat{z}_{n,k}(t) \leq z^*(t) + \delta. \quad (21)$$

Similar computations show that, for sufficiently large n , all sufficiently large $k \geq K(n)$ and for $t \in]s_{n,k(n)}, t_{n,k(n)}[$, we obtain

$$S(t) \geq \tilde{x}_{n,k}(t) \geq x^*(t) - \delta. \quad (22)$$

Notice that, for a given δ , eventually considering a larger n , we can take the same n and k in (14) and (15).

Given $l > 0$, by (20) we can choose $T > 0$ such that $t_{n,k} - s_{n,k} > l\lambda$ for all $n \geq T$. Therefore, by (18), (14) and (15), and by the second equation in (1), for $n \geq T$ and $k \geq K(n)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\rho(t_{n,k})v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)} \\ &= I(t_{n,k}, x_n) \\ &\geq I(s_{n,k}, x_n) \exp \left\{ \int_{s_{n,k}}^{t_{n,k}} \beta(r)S(r) - \eta(r)P(r) - c(r) dr \right\} \\ &\geq I(s_{n,k}, x_n) \exp \left\{ \kappa l + \int_{s_{n,k} + \lfloor (t_{n,k} - s_{n,k})/\lambda \rfloor}^{t_{n,k}} \beta(r)(x^*(r) - \delta) - \eta(r)(z^*(r) + \delta) - c(r) dr \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{\rho(s_{n,k})v(\varepsilon/n)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)} e^{\kappa l - \lambda(\beta^u \delta + \eta^u((z^*)^u + \delta) + c^u)} \\ &> \frac{\rho(s_{n,k})v(\varepsilon/n)}{(1 + \theta^u \eta^u)(1 + \beta^u)}, \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large l (that requires that T is sufficiently large). We conclude that

$$\frac{\rho^u v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{\rho^\ell v(\varepsilon/n)} \geq \frac{\rho(t_{n,k})v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{\rho(s_{n,k})v(\varepsilon/n)} > 1$$

and this contradicts the fact that, by S6.2) and S6.3), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\rho^u v(\varepsilon/n^2)}{\rho^\ell v(\varepsilon/n)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{2\rho^u v'(\varepsilon/n^2)/n^3}{\rho^\ell v'(\varepsilon/n)/n^2} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{2\rho^u A}{n\rho^\ell B} = 0.$$

We conclude that there is $m_1 > 0$ such that $\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t) > m_1$ and the result follows from S3). \square

In the remaining of this section we will apply Theorems 1 and 2 to some particular cases of model (1).

2.2. Example 1 - Models with no predation on uninfected preys. In this section we will consider a family of models with no predation on uninfected preys by letting $f \equiv 0$. This family generalises the family of models in [12] by allowing a very general form for the vital dynamics of predators and preys. Thus, still assuming conditions S1) to S6), we consider in this subsection the following model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = g(t, S) - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = h(t, P)P + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases} . \quad (23)$$

In this context, (7) and (8) become

$$\mathcal{R}_{np}^\ell(\lambda) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)s^*(s) - \eta(s)y^*(s) - c(s) ds \quad (24)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{np}^u(\lambda) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)s^*(s) - \eta(s)y^*(s) - c(s) ds. \quad (25)$$

where $s^*(t)$ and $y^*(t)$ are particular solutions, respectively, of (2) and (3). We obtain the corollaries of Theorems 1 and 2:

Corollary 1. *If there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{np}^u(\lambda) < 0$ then the infectives in system (23) go to extinction.*

Corollary 2. *If there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{np}^\ell(\lambda) > 0$ then the infectives in system (23) are uniform strong persistent.*

As we already mentioned, model (23) includes the model discussed in [12] as the particular case where $g(t, S) = \Lambda(t) - \mu(t)S$ and $h(t, P) = b(t) - r(t)P$, with Λ , μ , r and b nonnegative, continuous and bounded functions satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\omega_1} \Lambda(s) ds > 0, & \quad \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\omega_2} \mu(s) ds > 0, \\ \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\omega_3} r(s) ds > 0 & \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\omega_4} b(s) ds > 0, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $w_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$:

$$\begin{cases} S' = \Lambda(t) - \mu(t)S - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = (b(t) - r(t)P)P + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases} . \quad (26)$$

Note that, for the model in (26), condition S1) is assumed, condition S2) is immediate from the particular forms of the functions g and h , conditions S4) and S5) follow from Lemmas 1 and 3 in [12] and condition S6) is a consequence of the fact that, in this setting, systems (5) and (6) are uncoupled and small perturbations of each of the equations in those systems is globally asymptotically stable by Lemmas 1 and 3 in [12]. Finally, condition S3) follows from Theorem 1 in [12]. We also note that $\mathcal{R}_{np}^u(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{np}^\ell(\lambda)$ coincide with the corresponding numbers in [12].

Another possible choice for the functions g and h is $h(t, P) = -(\delta_1(t) + \delta_2(t)P)$, with δ_1 and δ_2 continuous and nonnegative functions and $g(t, S) = k(t, S)S$ with k a continuous and bounded function satisfying the conditions: $\partial k / \partial S(t, s) < 0$, for every $t, s \geq 0$; $k(t, 0) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$; there is $S_1(t) > 0$ such that $k(t, S_1(t)) = 0$, for every $t \geq 0$. This choice makes the underlying predator-uninfected prey subsystem

in model (23) correspond to the model studied in section 3 of [3] with the function $f \equiv 0$. System (23) becomes in this case:

$$\begin{cases} S' = k(t, S)S - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = -(\delta_1(t) + \delta_2(t)P)P + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases} . \quad (27)$$

Notice that the study of the function $k(t, S)$ in [3] allow us to conclude easily that conditions S1) to S5) are satisfied for this model. Condition S6) is a consequence of the fact that systems (5) and (6) are uncoupled and small perturbations of each of the equations in those systems is globally asymptotically stable (the global asymptotic stability of the first equation is consequence of Lemma 3.1 in [3] and the global asymptotic stability of the second equation is trivial).

To do some simulation, we consider the following particular set of parameters: $g(t, S) = (0.7 - 0.6S)S$; $\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))$; $\eta(t) = 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))$; $c(t) = 0.1$; $h(t, P) = -0.2 - 0.3P$; $\theta(t) = 0.9$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (0.7 - 0.6S)S - \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI \\ I' = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI - 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI - 0.1I \\ P' = -0.2 - 0.3P + 0.63(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI \end{cases} , \quad (28)$$

We first consider $\beta_0 = 0.075$ and obtain, $\mathcal{R}_0 \approx 0.87 < 1$ and we conclude that we have extinction of the infected prey (figure 1). Next we assume that $\beta_0 = 0.09$ and obtain $\mathcal{R}_0 \approx 1.05 > 1$ and we conclude that we have uniform strong persistence of the infected prey (figure 2). In the extinction scenario we considered the following initial conditions in time $t = 0$: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (2.66, 0.51, 0.9)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.6, 0.2, 0.3)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.15, 0.7, 0.6)$. In the uniform strong persistence situation we considered the following initial conditions in time $t = 0$: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.5, 0.1, 0.4)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.4, 0.8, 0.7)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.036, 0.387, 0.153)$.




FIGURE 1. Extinction: $\beta_0 = 0.075$.




FIGURE 2. Uniform strong persistence: $\beta_0 = 0.09$.

2.3. Example 2 - Models with periodic coefficients. In this subsection we consider a family of models with periodic parameters and predation on uninfected preys that, in general, is not included in the general family of models considered in [11]. For periodic models, the thresholds become easier to deal with.

Assume that there is $\omega > 0$ such that all parameters in (1) are ω -periodic functions. In this case, (7) and (8) become, respectively,

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\omega) = \int_0^\omega \beta(s)x^*(s) - \eta(s)z^*(s) - c(s) ds,$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}^u(\omega) = \int_0^\omega \beta(s)s^*(s) - \eta(s)y^*(s) - c(s) ds.$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\omega) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{\overline{\beta x^*}}{\overline{\eta z^* + c}} > 1$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}^u(\omega) < 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{\overline{\beta s^*}}{\overline{\eta y^* + c}} < 1.$$

where $s^*(t)$ and $y^*(t)$ are particular solutions, respectively, of (2) and (3), and $(x^*(t), z^*(t))$ still denotes a solution of (4). Define

$$\mathcal{R}_{per}^\ell = \frac{\overline{\beta x^*}}{\overline{\eta z^* + c}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{per}^u = \frac{\overline{\beta s^*}}{\overline{\eta y^* + c}}.$$

We obtain the following corollaries of Theorems 1 and 2:

Corollary 3. *If $\mathcal{R}_{per}^u < 1$ then the infectives in model (1) with periodic coefficients go to extinction.*

Corollary 4. *If $\mathcal{R}_{per}^\ell > 1$ then the infectives in model (1) with periodic coefficients are uniform strong persistent.*

Note that the corollaries in [12], concerning the periodic case, are particular cases of the corollaries above. In fact, in [12] we have $f \equiv 0$ and in this case, as argued in the previous section, $(s^*(t), y^*(t))$ is a particular solution of (4), condition S1) is assumed, condition S2) is immediate, conditions S3) to S6) follow from results in [12]. Thus, when $f \equiv 0$, we get similar thresholds to the ones in the mentioned paper:

$$\mathcal{R}_{per}^\ell = \mathcal{R}_{per}^u = \frac{\overline{\beta s^*}}{\overline{\eta y^* + c}}.$$

We will focus now on a particular models with a function g that is different from the corresponding function in [11]. We consider the following setting: $g(t, S) = (\Lambda - \mu S)S$; $a(t) = a$; $f(S, P) = S$; $h(t, P) = b - rP$; $\gamma(t) = \gamma$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (\Lambda - \mu S)S - aSP - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = (b - rP)P + \gamma aSP + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases}, \quad (29)$$

For this model, condition S1) is assumed, condition S2) is immediate from the particular forms of the functions g and h , conditions S4) and S5) hold for our

particular functions as already discussed in section 2.2. In this context, an endemic equilibrium exists if $\Lambda r > ab$, is given by

$$\left(\frac{\Lambda r - ab}{r\mu + \gamma a^2}, \frac{b\mu + \gamma a\Lambda}{r\mu + \gamma a^2} \right)$$

and the uninfected subsystem can be discussed using [5]. In fact, the global asymptotic stability result proved in section 3 of [5] implies that, if $r\Lambda > ab$, condition S6) is satisfied. Finally, condition S3) is consequence of the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *There is a bounded region that contains the ω -limit of all orbits of (29).*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since, by the first equation in (29), $S' \leq (\Lambda - \mu S)S$, we conclude that

$$S(t) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} + \varepsilon, \quad (30)$$

for all t sufficiently large. Additionally, we get

$$\sup_{S \in \mathbb{R}} (\Lambda - \mu S)S \leq \left(\Lambda - \frac{\mu\Lambda}{2\mu} \right) \frac{\Lambda}{2\mu} = \frac{\Lambda^2}{4\mu}. \quad (31)$$

Adding the first two equations in (29) and using (30) and (31) we have, for all t sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} (S + I)' &= (\Lambda - \mu S)S - c(t)I \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda^2}{4\mu} + c(t)S - c(t)(S + I) \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda^2}{4\mu} + c^u \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} + c^u \varepsilon - c^\ell (S + I). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} (S + I)(t) \leq \frac{1}{c^\ell} \left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{4\mu} + c^u \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \right) := A. \quad (33)$$

Finally, by the third equation in (29) and (32), given $\varepsilon > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} P' &= (b - rP)P + \gamma aSP + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \\ &\leq (b + \gamma aA + \theta^u \eta^u A - rP)P, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

for sufficiently large t . Thus,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(t) \leq \frac{1}{r} (b + \gamma aA + \theta^u \eta^u A) := B.$$

Equations (32) and (34) show that the region

$$\{(S, I, P) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq S + I \leq A \text{ and } 0 \leq P \leq B\}$$

contains the ω -limit of any orbit. The result is proved. \square

To do some simulation in the this scenario, we consider the following parameters in (29): $\Lambda = 0.7$; $\mu = 0.18$; $a = 0.4$; $\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))$; $\eta(t) = 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))$; $c(t) = 0.1$; $b = 0.8$; $r = 0.6$; $\theta(t) = 0.9$; $\gamma = 0.1$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (0.7 - 0.18S)S - 0.4SP - \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI \\ I' = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI - 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI - 0.1I \\ P' = (0.8 - 0.6P)P + 0.04SP + 0.63(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

We have $\mathcal{R}_{per}^u = 3.764\beta_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_{per}^\ell = 0.745\beta_0$. Thus, if $\beta_0 < 0.266$, we have extinction of the infectives and, if $\beta_0 > 1.342$, we have persistence of the infectives. In figure 3, we present simulation results for $\beta_0 = 0.2$ (extinction) and in figure 4, we present simulation results for $\beta_0 = 1.4$ (uniform strong persistence). To obtain figures 3 and 4 where the extinction and uniform strong persistence situations were addressed, respectively, the following initial conditions, in time $t = 0$, were used $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.811, 0.0624, 1.388)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.388, 0.06, 1.388)$ corresponding, respectively, to a disease-free solution and an (approximately) periodic solution. The other two initial conditions are, for the extinction case, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.6, 0.16, 0.46)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.0975, 0.044, 0.76)$. For the case of uniform strong persistence we considered, in time $t = 0$, the initial conditions $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.5, 0.1, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.4, 0.04, 0.7)$.




FIGURE 3. Exinction: $\beta_0 = 0, 2$.




FIGURE 4. Uniform strong Persistence: $\beta_0 = 1, 4$.

2.4. Example 3 - Models with Gause-type uninfected subsystem. A model with Michaelis-Menten (or Holling type II) functional response of predator to infected prey is now considered. The uninfected model obtained is a particular case of a Gause-type model (see [10]). We consider the following setting: $g(t, S) = (\Lambda - \mu S)S$; $a(t) = a$; $f(S, P) = SP/(m + S)$ with $m > 0$; $h(t, P) = -dP$ and $\gamma(t) = \gamma$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (\Lambda - \mu S)S - a\frac{SP}{m+S} - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = -dP + \gamma a\frac{SP}{m+S} + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases}, \quad (36)$$

In this context, the uninfected system was discussed in [10]. If $\gamma a \leq d$ or $\gamma a > d$ and $\Lambda/\mu \leq dm/(\gamma a - d)$, we have that the equilibrium point $(\Lambda/\mu, 0)$ is globally

asymptotically stable in the set $\{(x, z) \in (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^2 : x > 0 \wedge z \geq 0\}$. If

$$\frac{dm}{\gamma a - d} < \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \leq m + \frac{2dm}{\gamma a - d},$$

we have that the equilibrium point

$$\left(\frac{dm}{\gamma a - d}, \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu} - \frac{dm}{\gamma a - d} \right) \left(m + \frac{dm}{\gamma a - d} \right) \right)$$

is globally asymptotically stable in the set $\{(x, z) \in (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^2 : x > 0 \wedge z > 0\}$. Thus, under the conditions above, we conclude that condition S6) holds. For model (36), condition S1) is assumed, condition S2) is immediate from the particular forms of the functions g and h , condition S4) holds, as already discussed, and condition S5) is immediate. Finally, condition S3) can be obtained using similar arguments to the ones in Lemma 1.

To do some simulation, in this scenario we assumed that $g(t, S) = (0.7 - 0.6S)S$; $a = 0.978$; $\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))$; $\eta(t) = 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))$; $c(t) = 0.1$; $d = 0.3$; $m = 2$; $\gamma = 0.9$; $\theta(t) = 0.9$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (0.7 - 0.6S)S - 0.978 \frac{SP}{2+S} - \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI \\ I' = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI - 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI - 0.1I \\ P' = -0.3P + 0.8802 \frac{SP}{2+S} + 0.63(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

When $\beta_0 = 0,07$ we obtain approximately $\mathcal{R}_{per}^u \approx 0,82 < 1$ and we conclude that we have extinction (figure 7). When $\beta_0 = 0,6$ we obtain approximately $\mathcal{R}_{per}^l \approx 1.2 > 1$ and we conclude that the infectives are uniform strong persistent (figure 8).

In the extinction scenario we considered the following initial conditions in time $t = 0$: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.66, 0.51, 0.9)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.6, 0.2, 0.3)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (2.45, 0.7, 0.6)$. In the uniform strong persistent situation we considered the initial conditions in $t = 0$: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.036, 0.387, 0.153)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.5, 0.1, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.4, 0.04, 0.7)$.




FIGURE 5. Extinction: $\beta_0 = 0.07$.




FIGURE 6. Uniform strong Persistence: $\beta_0 = 0.6$.

2.5. Example 4 - Models with ratio-dependent uninfected subsystem. The functional response of predator to prey in the uninfected subsystem in the next example is ratio-dependent. Ratio-dependent functional responses were considered to overcome some paradoxes identified in Gause-type systems (see [7] and the references therein). We consider the following setting: $g(t, S) = (\Lambda - \mu S)S$; $a(t) = a$; $f(S, P) = SP/(mP + S)$ with $m > 0$; $h(t, P) = -dP$ and $\gamma(t) = \gamma$. The following model is obtained:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (\Lambda - \mu S)S - a\frac{SP}{mP+S} - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = -dP + \gamma a\frac{SP}{mP+S} + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases} \quad (38)$$



In this context, the uninfected system was discussed in [7]. In that paper it was shown that, if $d \geq \gamma a$ and $a < m\Lambda$ we have that the equilibrium point $(\Lambda/\mu, 0)$ is globally asymptotically stable in the set $\{(x, z) \in (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^2 : x > 0 \wedge z \geq 0\}$ (note that this conditions lead to extinction of the predator). Under the conditions above, we conclude that condition S6) holds. For model (38), condition S1) is assumed, condition S2) is immediate from the particular forms of the functions g and h , condition S4) holds, as already discussed, and condition S5) is immediate. Finally, condition S3) can be obtained using similar arguments to the ones in Lemma 1.

To do some simulation, in this scenario we assumed that $g(t, S) = (0.7 - 0.6S)S$; $a = 0.4$; $\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))$; $\eta(t) = 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))$; $c(t) = 0.1$; $d = 0.4$; $m = 2$; $\gamma = 0.8$; $\theta(t) = 0.9$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (0.7 - 0.6S)S - 0.4\frac{SP}{2P+S} - \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI \\ I' = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI - 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI - 0.1I \\ P' = -0.4P + 0.32\frac{SP}{2P+S} + 0.63(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

When $\beta_0 = 0,08$ we obtain approximately $\mathcal{R}_{per}^u \approx 0.93 < 1$ and we conclude that we have extinction (figure 7). When $\beta_0 = 0.25$ we obtain approximately $\mathcal{R}_{per}^l \approx 2.9 > 1$ and we conclude that the infectives are uniformly strong persistent (figure 8).

In the extinction case we considered the following initial conditions in time $t = 0$: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (2.66, 0.514, 0.9)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.2, 0.2, 0.3)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.45, 0.7, 0.6)$. In the uniform strong persistent situation we considered the initial conditions: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.0357, 0.387, 0.1525)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.5, 0.1, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.4, 0.04, 0.7)$, in $t = 0$.

FIGURE 7. Extinction: $\beta_0 = 0.08$.FIGURE 8. Uniform strong Persistence: $\beta_0 = 0.25$.

2.6. Example 5 - Models with time-varying coefficients in the uninfected subsystem I. We now consider an example where the uninfected model is nonautonomous. For this model we will be able to obtain explicit thresholds based on the study of the underlying susceptible prey/predator subsystem in [16]. Assuming that $g(t, S) = (p + qh(t) - dh(t)S)S$ with $h(t)$ continuous and satisfying $h^\ell < h(t) < h^u$ for some constants $h^\ell, h^u > 0$, $f(S, P) = S$, $a(t) = b$, $h(t, P) = -q$ and $\gamma(t) = d/b$ in (1), we obtain the following particular model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (p + qh(t) - dh(t)S)S - bSP - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = -qP + dSP + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases}, \quad (40)$$

where we continue to assume that β , η , c and θ are continuous functions.

For model (40), condition S1) is assumed, condition S2) is immediate from the particular forms of the functions g and h , condition S3) can be obtained using similar arguments to the ones in Lemma 1, condition S4) holds, as already discussed, and condition S5) is immediate.

The results in [23] allow us to conclude that, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the interior equilibrium $((q - h^u\varepsilon)/d, (p + (h^u)^2\varepsilon)/b)$ of system

$$\begin{cases} x' = (p + \varepsilon(h^u)^2 + (q - h^u\varepsilon)h(t) - dh(t)x)x - bxz \\ z' = -(q - h^u\varepsilon)z + dxz \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

is globally asymptotically stable in the region $\{(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x, z > 0\}$. Notice that system (41) corresponds, in this case, to system (6) with $v(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$, $\rho(t) = h(t)$, $g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x) = (p + (q + h^u\varepsilon)h(t) - dh(t)x)x$ and $h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x) = -q + (h^u - h(t))\varepsilon$.

By [23], we can also conclude that, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the interior equilibrium $((q + \varepsilon)/d, (p - 2\varepsilon h^u)/b)$ of system

$$\begin{cases} x' = (p - 2\varepsilon h^u + (q + \varepsilon)h(t) - dh(t)x)x - bxz \\ z' = -(q + \varepsilon)z + dxz \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

is globally asymptotically stable in the region $\{(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x, z > 0\}$. Notice that system (42) corresponds, in this case, to system (5) with $v(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$, $\rho(t) = h(t)$, $g_{1,\varepsilon}(t, x) = (p - 2\varepsilon h^u + qh(t) - dh(t)x)x$ and $h_{1,\varepsilon}(t, x) = -q - \varepsilon$.

Naturally, the continuity of functions

$$\varepsilon \mapsto ((q - h^u \varepsilon)/d, (p + (h^u)^2 \varepsilon)/b) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \mapsto ((q + \varepsilon)/d, (p - 2\varepsilon h^u)/b)$$

is immediate and we conclude that condition S6) also holds.

For this model, the numbers (7) and (8) become:

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)q/d - \eta(s)p/b - c(s) ds$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)(p + qh)/d - c(s) ds.$$

When the parameters are periodic, we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}_{per,2}^\ell = \frac{qb\bar{\beta}}{d(p\bar{\eta} + b\bar{c})} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{per,2}^u = \frac{(p + qh)\bar{\beta}}{d\bar{c}}$$

and we have the following corollaries of Theorems 1 and 2:



Corollary 5. *Assume that the parameters in model (40) are periodic. If $\mathcal{R}_{per,2}^u < 1$ then the infectives in model (40) go to extinction.*

Corollary 6. *Assume that the parameters in model (40) are periodic. If $\mathcal{R}_{per,2}^\ell > 1$ then the infectives in model (40) are uniformly strong persistent.*

To do some simulation, we consider the following setting: $p = 0.7$, $q = 0.7$, $h(t) = 0.5(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))$, $d = 0.18$, $b = 0.3$, $\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))$, $\eta(t) = 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))$, $c(t) = 0.1$ and $\theta(t) = 0.9$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = (0.7 + (1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))(0.35 - 0.09S))S - \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI - 0.3SP \\ I' = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(2\pi t))SI - 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI - 0.1I \\ P' = -0.7P + 0.18SP + 0.63(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

When $\beta_0 = 0.01$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{per,2}^\ell \approx 0.58 < 1$ and we conclude that the infectives go to extinction (figure 11). When $\beta_0 = 0.5$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{per,2}^\ell \approx 1.12 > 1$ and we conclude that the infectives are strong persistent (figure 12). In the extinction and strong persistent situations we considered, in $t = 0$, respectively, the initial condition $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (7.16, 0.15, 4.5)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (2.48, 0.38, 1.95)$. In both situations, we also considered the initial conditions $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.5, 0.1, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.4, 0.04, 0.7)$ in $t = 0$.

FIGURE 9. Extinction: $\beta_0 = 0.01$.FIGURE 10. Strong Persistence: $\beta_0 = 0.5$.

Note that according to [16], if h in system (40) is replaced by a nonnegative and bounded function then, when $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$, a sufficient condition for system (41) to be globally asymptotically stable is that $h \in \mathcal{F}_{[WIP]}$, where $\mathcal{F}_{[WIP]}$ denotes the class of real functions defined in $[0, +\infty[$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \int_{\tau_n}^{\sigma_n} h(t) dt = +\infty,$$

for every pair of sequences satisfying $\tau_n < \sigma_n < \tau_{n+1}$, $\liminf(\sigma_n - \tau_n) > 0$ and $\limsup(\tau_{n+1} - \sigma_n) > 0$. See also [23] for a necessary and sufficient condition. Thus if one would be able to prove, in this more general situation that the global asymptotic stability of solutions persist under small perturbations of the form (5) and (6), like we have done for systems with a bounded and bounded away from zero function h , one would still have a theoretical result for this larger class of systems.

2.7. Example 6 - Models with time-varying coefficients in the uninfected subsystem II. Like in the previous subsection, in this we will consider as example with nonautonomous uninfected model but, unlike the uninfected model in the previous subsection, here the time-varying parameters arise in the predator equation. Assuming that $g(t, S) = q$ with $h(t)$ continuous and satisfying $h^\ell < h(t) < h^u$ for some constants $h^\ell, h^u > 0$, $f(S, P) = S$, $a(t) = b$, $h(t, P) = -p + qh(t) - bh(t)P$ and $\gamma(t) = d/b$ in (1), we obtain the following particular model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = qS - bSP - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = (-p + qh(t) - bh(t)P)P + dSP + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases}, \quad (44)$$

where we continue to assume that β , η , c and θ are continuous functions.

Model (44) was considered in [14] where global asymptotic stability for the disease-free equilibrium was obtained. For the same model, in [2], under suitable conditions, the global asymptotic stability for the endemic equilibrium was also obtained. The results

in [2] allow us to conclude that, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the interior equilibrium $((p - (h^u)^2\varepsilon)/d, (q - h^u\varepsilon)/b)$ of system

$$\begin{cases} x' = (q - h^u\varepsilon)x - dxz \\ z' = (-p + \varepsilon(h^u)^2 + (q - h^u\varepsilon)h(t) - bh(t)z)z + dxz \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

is globally asymptotically stable in the region $\{(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x, z > 0\}$. Notice that system (45) corresponds, in this case, to system (6) with $v(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$, $\rho(t) = h(t)$, $g_{2,\varepsilon}(t, x) = q + (h(t) - h^u)\varepsilon$ and $h_{2,\varepsilon}(t, z) = -p + (h^u)^2\varepsilon + (q - h^u\varepsilon)h(t) - bh(t)z$.

By [14], we can also conclude that, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the interior equilibrium $((q - \varepsilon)/b, (p - 2\varepsilon h^u)/d)$ of system

$$\begin{cases} x' = (q - \varepsilon)x - bxz \\ z' = (-p + 2\varepsilon h^u + (q - \varepsilon)h(t) - bh(t)z)z + dxz \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

is globally asymptotically stable in the region $\{(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x, z > 0\}$. Notice that system (5) corresponds, in this case, to system (46) with $v(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$, $\rho(t) = h(t)$, $g_{1,\varepsilon}(t, x) = (q - \varepsilon)x$ and $h_{1,\varepsilon}(t, z) = -p + 2\varepsilon h^u + (q - \varepsilon)h(t) - bh(t)z$.

As we can see, the continuity of functions

$$\varepsilon \mapsto ((p - (h^u)^2\varepsilon)/d, (q - h^u\varepsilon)/b) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \mapsto ((q - \varepsilon)/b, (p - 2\varepsilon h^u)/d)$$

is immediate.

Let

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)p/d - \eta(s)q/b - c(s) ds$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)(p - qh)/d - c(s) ds$$

When the parameters are periodic, we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}_{per,3}^\ell = \frac{pb\bar{\beta}}{d(p\bar{\eta} + b\bar{c})} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{per,3}^u = \frac{(p - qh)\bar{\beta}}{d\bar{c}}$$

and we have the following corollaries of Theorems 1 and 2:



Corollary 7. *Assume that the parameters in model (44) are periodic. If $\mathcal{R}_{per,3}^u < 1$ then the infectives in model (44) go to extinction.*

Corollary 8. *Assume that the parameters in model (44) are periodic. If $\mathcal{R}_{per,3}^\ell > 1$ then the infectives in model (44) are uniformly strong persistent.*

To do some simulation, we consider the following setting: $p = 0.7$, $q = 0.9$, $h(t) = 0.5(1 + 0.7 \cos(100\pi\sqrt{t}))$, $d = 0.18$, $b = 0.3$, $\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(100\pi\sqrt{t}))$, $\eta(t) = 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 100\pi\sqrt{t}))$, $c(t) = 0.1$ and $\theta(t) = 0.9$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = 0.9S - 0.3SP - \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(100\pi\sqrt{t}))SI \\ I' = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(100\pi\sqrt{t}))SI - 0.7(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 100\pi\sqrt{t}))PI - 0.1I \\ P' = (-0.7 + (0.45 - 0.15P)(1 + 0.7 \cos(100\pi\sqrt{t})))P \\ \quad + 0.63(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi + 100\pi\sqrt{t}))PI + 0.18SP \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

When $\beta_0 = 0.04$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{per,3}^u \approx 0.78 < 1$ and we conclude that the infectives go to extinction (figure 11). When $\beta_0 = 0.5$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{per,3}^\ell \approx 1.12 > 1$ and we conclude that the infectives are uniformly strong persistent (figure 12). In the extinction and strong persistent situations we considered, in $t = 0$, respectively, the initial condition $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (3.342, 0.15, 2.23)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (3.889, 0.15, 2.334)$ corresponding, respectively, to a disease-free solution and an (approximately) periodic solution. In both situations, we also considered, in $t = 0$, the initial conditions $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.5, 0.1, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.4, 0.04, 0.7)$.

FIGURE 11. Extinction: $\beta_0 = 0.01$.FIGURE 12. Strong Persistence: $\beta_0 = 0.5$.

Based on the simulation carried out, including a considerable amount of tests undertaken for the several models studied, but for parameters that fall into the regions where we are not able to decide, based on Theorems 1 and 2, if we have extinction or uniform strong persistence (regions where $\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) > 1$ and $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) < 1$), we conjecture that for the model considered in examples 1 to 6, we have extinction when

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^{t+\lambda} \beta(s)x^*(s) - \eta(t)z^*(s) - c(s) ds < 0.$$

3. PERSISTENCE IN ECO-EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODEL WITH CLASSICAL LOTKA-VOLTERRA INTERACTION

In section 2 we considered that in the predator/uninfected prey subspace we had asymptotic stability. This doesn't correspond to the behavior of the classical Lotka-Volterra model, considered independently by Alfred Lotka and Vito Volterra, where the interior equilibrium was stable in the sense of Lyapunov but not asymptotically stable. In this section, we consider the following eco-epidemiological model, where in the uninfected subspace we have a classical Lotka-Volterra model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = \alpha S - aSP - \beta(t)SI \\ I' = \beta(t)SI - \eta(t)PI - c(t)I \\ P' = \gamma aSP - bP + \theta(t)\eta(t)PI \end{cases}, \quad (48)$$

We will assume the following structural hypothesis concerning constants and the parameter functions in our model:

S1*) The constants α , a , γ and b are positive and the real valued functions β , η , c and θ are bounded, nonnegative and continuous.

Define the number

$$\mathcal{R}_{LV}^\ell = \frac{b\beta^\ell}{\gamma a} - \frac{\alpha\eta^u}{a} - c^u.$$

Now we present our main result on model (48).

Theorem 3. *Assume that $S1^*$ holds. If $\mathcal{R}_{LV}^\ell > 0$ then the infectives in system (48) are uniformly strong persistent.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{R}_{LV}^\ell > 0$. Then, there is $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\frac{b\beta^\ell}{\gamma a} - \frac{\alpha\eta^u}{a} - c^u \geq \kappa > 0. \quad (49)$$

Let $(S(t), I(t), P(t))$ be a solution of (48) with positive initial conditions. Assume by contradiction that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t) = 0.$$

Then, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $t_1 > 0$, such that $I(t) < \varepsilon$, for each $t \geq t_1$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By the first and third equations of (48), we have

$$\begin{cases} S' \leq \alpha S - aSP \\ P' \leq \gamma aSP - bP + \theta^u \eta^u P \varepsilon \end{cases}$$

Letting $(x_{0,\varepsilon}(t), z_{0,\varepsilon}(t))$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} x' = \alpha x - axz \\ z' = \gamma axz - (b - \theta^u \eta^u \varepsilon)z \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

with $x_{0,\varepsilon}(0) = S(0)$ and $z_{0,\varepsilon}(0) = P(0)$, we have $S(t) \leq x_{0,\varepsilon}(t)$ and $P(t) \leq z_{0,\varepsilon}(t)$.

Consider the system

$$\begin{cases} x' = \alpha x - axz \\ z' = \gamma axz - bz \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

and let $(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{z}(t))$ be the solution of (51) with $\tilde{x}(0) = x_{0,\varepsilon}(0)$ and $\tilde{z}(0) = z_{0,\varepsilon}(0)$

If $(x_{0,\varepsilon}(t), z_{0,\varepsilon}(t))$ and $(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{z}(t))$ have rationally dependent periods, then by continuity of the family of systems (50) with respect to parameters and by boundedness of solutions, we conclude that

$$|\tilde{x}(t) - x_{0,\varepsilon}(t)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{z}(t) - z_{0,\varepsilon}(t)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (52)$$

Otherwise, assume that the periods of $(x_{0,\varepsilon}(t), z_{0,\varepsilon}(t))$ and $(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{z}(t))$ are rationally independent.

By [22], the period in the classical autonomous Lotka-Volterra equations, in particular in (50), is an increasing and strictly monotonic function of the energy. Thus eventually letting $\varepsilon > 0$ be smaller, we can make the period of the solution of (51) be rationally dependent with the period of the new solution of (50). Therefore, we still have (52) for $(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{z}(t))$ and the new family of solutions with rationally dependent periods that we have found. Thus, there are functions φ_1, ψ_1 such that $\varphi_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ and $\psi_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and

$$|\tilde{x}(t) - x_{0,\varepsilon}(t)| < \varphi_1(\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{z}(t) - z_{0,\varepsilon}(t)| < \psi_1(\varepsilon). \quad (53)$$

In particular, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$P(t) \leq z_{0,\varepsilon}(t) \leq \tilde{z}(t) + \psi_1(\varepsilon). \quad (54)$$

By the first and third equations of (48) again, we have

$$\begin{cases} S' \geq \alpha S - aSP - \beta^u \varepsilon S \\ P' \geq \gamma aSP - bP \end{cases}$$

Letting $(x_{\varepsilon,0}(t), z_{\varepsilon,0}(t))$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} x' = \alpha x - axz - \beta^u \varepsilon x \\ z' = \gamma axz - bz \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

with $x_{\varepsilon,0}(0) = S(0)$ and $z_{\varepsilon,0}(0) = P(0)$. We have $S(t) \geq x_{\varepsilon,0}(t)$ and $P(t) \geq z_{\varepsilon,0}(t)$. Letting now $(\hat{x}(t), \hat{z}(t))$ be the solution of (51) with $\hat{x}(0) = x_{\varepsilon,0}(0)$ and $\hat{z}(0) = z_{\varepsilon,0}(0)$ and applying to (50) and (55) similar arguments to the ones that allowed us to conclude (53),

we conclude that there are functions φ_2, ψ_2 such that $\varphi_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ and $\psi_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and

$$|\widehat{x}(t) - x_{\varepsilon,0}(t)| < \varphi_2(\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad |\widehat{z}(t) - z_{\varepsilon,0}(t)| < \psi_2(\varepsilon).$$

In particular, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$S(t) \geq x_{\varepsilon,0}(t) \geq \widehat{x}(t) - \varphi_2(\varepsilon). \quad (56)$$

Noting that the average along each component of the solution of the Lotka-Volterra equations remains constant and thus equal to the corresponding coordinate of the equilibrium point, and letting $\widetilde{\omega}$ and $\widehat{\omega}$ be, respectively, the period of the solutions $(\widehat{x}(t), \widehat{z}(t))$ and $(\widetilde{x}(t), \widetilde{z}(t))$, by (56), (54) and the second equation in (48) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_0}^t \beta(s)S(s) - \eta(s)P(s) - c(s) ds \\ & \geq \int_{t_0}^t \beta(s)(\widehat{x}(s) - \varphi_2(\varepsilon)) - \eta(s)(\widetilde{z}(s) + \psi_1(\varepsilon)) - c(s) ds \\ & \geq \beta^\ell \int_{t_0}^t \widehat{x}(s) ds - \eta^u \int_{t_0}^t \widetilde{z}(s) ds - (c^u + \max\{\psi_1(\varepsilon), \varphi_2(\varepsilon)\}(\beta^u + \eta^u))(t - t_0) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Next, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t - t_0} \int_{t_0}^t \widehat{x}(s) ds &= \frac{1}{t - t_0} \left(\int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \lfloor (t-t_0)/\widehat{\omega} \rfloor \widehat{\omega}} \widehat{x}(s) ds + \int_{t_0 + \lfloor (t-t_0)/\widehat{\omega} \rfloor \widehat{\omega}}^t \widehat{x}(s) ds \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{t - t_0} \left(\lfloor \frac{t-t_0}{\widehat{\omega}} \rfloor \frac{b\widehat{\omega}}{\gamma a} + \int_{t_0 + \lfloor (t-t_0)/\widehat{\omega} \rfloor \widehat{\omega}}^t \widehat{x}(s) ds \right) \rightarrow \frac{b}{\gamma a}, \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t - t_0} \int_{t_0}^t \widetilde{z}(s) ds &= \frac{1}{t - t_0} \left(\int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \lfloor (t-t_0)/\widetilde{\omega} \rfloor \widetilde{\omega}} \widetilde{z}(s) ds + \int_{t_0 + \lfloor (t-t_0)/\widetilde{\omega} \rfloor \widetilde{\omega}}^t \widetilde{z}(s) ds \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{t - t_0} \left(\lfloor \frac{t-t_0}{\widetilde{\omega}} \rfloor \frac{\alpha \widetilde{\omega}}{a} + \int_{t_0 + \lfloor (t-t_0)/\widetilde{\omega} \rfloor \widetilde{\omega}}^t \widetilde{z}(s) ds \right) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{a}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

Finally, again by the second equation in (48) and by (57), (58) and (59), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(t) &= I(t_0) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t \beta(s)S(s) - \eta(s)P(s) - c(s) ds \right\} \\ &\geq I(t_0) \exp \left\{ \beta^\ell \int_{t_0}^t \widehat{x}(s) ds - \eta^u \int_{t_0}^t \widetilde{z}(s) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (c^u + \max\{\psi_1(\varepsilon), \varphi_2(\varepsilon)\}(\beta^u + \eta^u))(t - t_0) \right\} \\ &\geq I(t_0) \exp \left\{ \left(\beta^\ell \frac{b}{\gamma a} - \eta^u \frac{\alpha}{a} - c^u - \max\{\psi_1(\varepsilon), \varphi_2(\varepsilon)\}(\beta^u + \eta^u) \right) (t - t_0) \right\} \\ &\geq I(t_0) \exp \{ (\kappa - \max\{\psi_1(\varepsilon), \varphi_2(\varepsilon)\}(\beta^u + \eta^u)) (t - t_0) \}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $I(t) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, as long as $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small and this contradicts the fact that $I(t)$ is bounded. We conclude that the infectives are weak persistent:

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t) > 0. \quad (60)$$

Having established the weak persistence of the infectives, the strong persistence is obtained by similar arguments to the ones used in Theorem 2. \square

To illustrate our findings, we consider the following parameters: $\alpha = 0.7$, $a = 1.2$, $\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + 0.4 \cos(2\pi t))$, $\eta(t) = 0.5(1 + 0.4 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))$, $c(t) = 0.1$, $\gamma = 0.5$, $b = 0.7$, $\theta(t) = 0.9$. We obtain the model:

$$\begin{cases} S' = 0.7S - 1.2SP - \beta_0(1 + 0.4 \cos(2\pi t))SI \\ I' = \beta_0(1 + 0.4 \cos(2\pi t))SI - 0.5(1 + 0.4 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI - 0.1I \\ P' = 0.6SP + 0.45(1 + 0.4 \cos(\pi + 2\pi t))PI - 0.7P \end{cases}, \quad (61)$$

When $\beta_0 = 0.9$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{LV} \approx 0,13 > 0$ and we conclude that the infectives are uniformly strong persistent (figure 13). We can see that in figure 14 that the limiting behavior of the trajectories lie in the SI subspace and that, in fact, the infectives are uniformly strong persistent.

We considered the following initial conditions in $t = 0$: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.8, 1.7, 0.7)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.6, 1.7, 0.5)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.4, 1.3, 0.3)$ for the plots in figures 13 and 14. Additionally, in figure 13, we also consider orbits contained in the SI plane corresponding to following initial conditions in $t = 0$: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.0041, 0.3531, 0)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.0065, 1.2949, 0)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.0845, 0.4234, 0)$.




FIGURE 13. Strong Persistence: $\beta_0 = 0.9$.




FIGURE 14. Strong persistence: $\beta_0 = 0.9$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. P. Dobson, *The population biology of parasite-induced changes in host behavior*, Q. Rev. Biol. 30 (1988), 139–165.
- [2] A. O. Ignat'ev, *On the Global Asymptotics Stability of the Equilibrium of the Lotka-Volterra Equations in a Varying Environment*, Differ. Equ. 3 (2014), 286–291.
- [3] M. Garrione and C. Rebelo, *Persistence in seasonally varying predator-prey systems via the basic reproduction*, Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. 30, 73–98 (2016)
- [4] M. Friend, *Avian disease at the Salton Sea*, Hydrobiologia, 161 (2002), 293306.
- [5] B. S. Goh, *Global stability in two species interactions*, J. Math Biology 3, 313–318 (1976)
- [6] H. W. Hethcote, W. Wang, L. Han and Z. Ma, *A predator-prey model with infected prey*, Theor. Popul. Biol. 66 (2004), 259–268.

- [7] Hsu, S. B., Hwang, T. W. and Kuang, Y., Global analysis of the Michaelis–Menten-type ratio-dependent predator-prey system, *J. Math. Biol.* 42 (2001), 489–506.
- [8] M. Koopmans, B. Wilbrink, M. Conyn, G. Natrop, H. van der Nat and H. Vennema, *Transmission of H7N7 avian influenza A virus to human beings during a large outbreak in commercial poultry farms in the Netherlands*, *Lancet.* 363 (2004), 587–593.
- [9] J. R. Krebs, Optimal foraging: decision rules for predators, In: Krebs, J. R., Davies, N.B. (Eds.), *Behavioural Ecology: an Evolutionary approach*, First ed. Blackwell Scientific Publishers, Oxford, (1978), 2363.
- [10] Kuang, Y. and Freedman, H.I., Uniqueness of limit cycles in Gause-type models of predator-prey systems, *Math. Biosc.* 88 (1988), 67–84
- [11] Yang Lu, Xia Wang, Shengqiang Liu, A non-autonomous predator-prey model with infected prey, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. B* 23, 3817-3836 (2018)
- [12] Xingge Niu, Tailei Zhang, Zhidong Teng, The asymptotic behavior of a nonautonomous eco-epidemic model with disease in the prey, *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 35, 457-470 (2011)
- [13] C. Rebelo, A. Margheri, N. Bacaër, Persistence in seasonally forced epidemiological models, *J. Math. Biol.* 64 (6) (2012) 933–949.
- [14] Saito Y., Sugie J., Lee Y.H., Global asymptotic stability for predatorprey models with environmental time-variations, *Applied Mathematics Letters* 24 (2011), 1973–1980.
- [15] C. M. Silva, Existence of Periodic Solutions for Eco-Epidemic Model with Disease in the Prey, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 53 (2017), 383-397.
- [16] Sugie, J., Saito, Y. and Fan, M., Global asymptotic stability for predator-prey systems whose prey receives time-variation of the environment, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 139 (2011), 3475–3483.
- [17] W. Wang, X.-Q. Zhao, Threshold dynamics for compartmental epidemic models in periodic environments, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* 20 (3), 699-717 (2008)
- [18] P. Van den Driessche, J. Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission, *Math Biosci.* 180 (2002)29-48.
- [19] N. Bacar, S. Guernaoui. The epidemic Threshold of vector-borne diseases with seasonality, *J. Math. Biol.* 53 (2006), 421-436.
- [20] Xiao-Qiang Zhao, *Dynamical Systems in Population Biology*, Springer, 2003
- [21] O. Diekmann, J.A.P Heesterbeek, J.A.J Metz , On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio \mathcal{R} in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous population, *J. Math. Biol* 28 (1990) 365.
- [22] Waldvogel, J, *The Period in the Lotka-Volterra System is Monotonic*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 114 (1986), 78–184.
- [23] W. Zheng, J. Sugie, *A necessary and sufficient condition for global asymptotic stability of time-varying LotkaVolterra predatorprey systems*, *Nonlinear Anal.* 127 (2015), 128–142.
- [24] W. Zheng, J. Sugie, *Uniform global asymptotic stability of time-varying LotkaVolterra predatorprey systems*, *Applied Mathematics Letters.* 87 (2019), 125–133.

L. F. DE JESUS DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DA BEIRA INTERIOR, 6201-001 COVILHÃ, PORTUGAL

E-mail address: lopo.jesus@ubi.pt

C. M. SILVA, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DA BEIRA INTERIOR, 6201-001 COVILHÃ, PORTUGAL

E-mail address: csilva@ubi.pt

H. VILARINHO, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DA BEIRA INTERIOR, 6201-001 COVILHÃ, PORTUGAL

E-mail address: helder@ubi.pt