

DYNAMICS OF A DISCRETE ECO-EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODEL WITH DISEASE IN THE PREY

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

ABSTRACT. Using Mickens nonstandard method, we obtain a discrete family of nonautonomous eco-epidemiological models that include general functions corresponding to the predation of the infected and uninfected preys. We obtain results on the persistence and extinction of the infected preys assuming that the bi-dimensional predator-prey subsystem that describes the dynamics in the absence of the infection satisfies some assumptions. Some examples and simulations are undertaken to illustrate our results.

1. INTRODUCTION

In many situations eco-epidemiological models describe more accurately some ecological system than classical Lotka-Volterra models where the disease is not taken into account. It is known that the inclusion of infected classes in predator-prey models substantially change the dynamics of the original model. In particular, the inclusion of infected classes in the model can have a considerable impact on the population size of the predator-prey community [6, 8].

Lately, several works related to eco-epidemiological models have appeared in the literature. In [2], the authors study the extinction and persistence of the disease in some eco-epidemiological systems; in [1] the global stability of a delayed eco-epidemiological model with Holling type III functional response is addressed, and in [14] the authors study an eco-epidemiological model with harvesting.

We note that the parameters in the eco-epidemiological models referred above are constant. On the other hand, to make models more consistent with reality it is seldom important to consider parameters that vary in time. Recently, several eco-epidemiological models with time varying parameters, particularly models with periodic coefficients have been studied [3, 4, 8, 9, 20, 10]. In the more general situation of nonautonomous models that are not necessarily periodic, threshold conditions for the extinction and persistence of the infected preys are obtained in [20] for a family of non-autonomous eco-epidemiological models with disease in the prey and no predation on uninfected preys. The results in that paper are generalised in [11] for a class of non-autonomous eco-epidemiological models that include general functions corresponding to the predation on uninfected prey and also to the vital dynamics of uninfected prey and predator populations. Note that already in [21] a family of models that include predation on uninfected preys

Date: July 21, 2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 92D30, 39A60.

Key words and phrases. Eco-epidemiological model, difference equations, persistence, extinction.

L. de Jesus, C. M. Silva and H. Vilarinho were partially supported by FCT through CMA-UBI (project UIDB/MAT/00212/2020).

where considered, assuming that predation on uninfected prey is given by a bilinear functional response and also some particular form for the vital dynamics associated with uninfected preys and predators.

The approach in [11] is very different from the one in [20] and [21]: in [11] the uninfected subsystem corresponding to the dynamics of preys and predators in the absence of disease is not assumed to follow some special law but instead the hypothesis are on the stability of the referred uninfected subsystem. This approach allows the application of the results in [11] to eco-epidemiological models constructed from previously studied predator-prey model that satisfies the stability assumptions made.

In all the previous situations the models involved are continuous. In contrast, in this paper we consider a discrete version of the model in [11] obtained by applying Mickens discretization method. For the obtained model we derive a discrete version of the main result in that paper regarding the threshold dynamics of the model. We note that in [7] a discrete eco-epidemiological model was already studied. In contrast with our nonautonomous model, in that paper the model considered is autonomous and assumes no predation on uninfected preys. Additionally, in that paper the discretization method is very different from ours, resulting in a very different form for the equations obtained.

The structure of the present work is the following: in section 2 we derive our model from the corresponding continuous model using Mickens nonstandard discretization scheme, establish our setting and some preliminary results; in section 3 we obtain our main result on extinction and persistence of the infective prey; finally, in section 4, we consider some particular models that illustrate our results.

2. A GENERAL ECO-EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODEL WITH DISEASE IN THE PREY

We consider the following non-autonomous eco-epidemiological model:

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

where S , I and P correspond, respectively, to the susceptible prey, infected prey and predator, $\Lambda(t)$ is the birth rate, $\mu(t)$ is the death rate of susceptible preys, $\beta(t)$ 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, $r(t) - b(t)P$ represent the vital dynamics of the predator populations, $a(t)f(S, I, P)$ is the predation of susceptible prey and $\eta(t)g(S, I, P)$ is the predation of infected 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 aim of this work is to discuss the uniform strong persistence and extinction of the infectives I of the discrete counterpart of the system (1). A possible discretization of the above model, with stepsize h , derived by applying Mickens'

nonstandard finite difference method [13], leads to the following set of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S(nh+h) - S(nh) = h\Lambda(nh) - h\mu(nh)S(nh+h) \\ \quad - ha(nh)f(S(nh+h), I(nh), P(nh))P(nh) \\ \quad - h\beta(nh)S(nh+h)I(nh) \\ I(nh+h) - I(nh) = h\beta(nh)S(nh+h)I(nh) \\ \quad - h\eta(nh)g(S(nh), I(nh), P(nh))I(nh+h) \\ \quad - hc(nh)I(nh+h) \\ P(nh+h) - P(nh) = h(r(nh) - b(nh)P(nh+h))P(nh) + h\gamma(nh)a(nh) \times \\ \quad \times f(S(nh+h), I(nh), P(nh))P(nh) \\ \quad + h\theta(nh)\eta(nh)g(S(nh), I(nh), P(nh))I(nh+h) \end{array} \right. .$$

Using the notation $\xi_n = h\xi(nh)$ for $g = \Lambda, \mu, a, \beta, \eta, c, r, b$ and also $\zeta_n = \zeta(nh)$ for $\zeta = \gamma, \theta$, we obtain the following system of difference equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_{n+1} - S_n = \Lambda_n - \mu_n S_{n+1} - a_n f(S_{n+1}, I_n, P_n) P_n - \beta_n S_{n+1} I_n \\ I_{n+1} - I_n = \beta_n S_{n+1} I_n - \eta_n g(S_n, I_n, P_n) I_{n+1} - c_n I_{n+1} \\ P_{n+1} - P_n = (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n + \gamma_n a_n f(S_{n+1}, I_n, P_n) P_n + \theta_n \eta_n g(S_n, I_n, P_n) I_{n+1} \end{array} \right. . \quad (2)$$

We will assume that

- H1) $(\Lambda_n), (a_n), (\beta_n), (\eta_n), (c_n), (r_n), (b_n), (\gamma_n)$ and (θ_n) are bounded and non-negative sequences and $0 < \mu_n \leq c_n$;
- H2) $(\Lambda_n), (r_n)$ and (b_n) are bounded away from zero;
- H3) $f, g : (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are C^1 nonnegative; for fixed $x, z \geq 0$, $y \mapsto f(x, y, z)$ and $y \mapsto g(x, y, z)$ are nonincreasing; for fixed $y, z \geq 0$, $x \mapsto f(x, y, z)$ is nondecreasing and $x \mapsto g(x, y, z)$ is nonincreasing; for fixed $x, y \geq 0$, $z \mapsto g(x, y, z)$ is nonincreasing and $z \mapsto g(x, y, z)$ is nondecreasing;
- H4) there is $\omega \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{k=n}^{n+\omega} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_k} < 1.$$

It follows from H4) that there are constants $K > 0$ and $\theta \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$\prod_{k=m}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_k} < K\theta^{n-m}, \quad (3)$$

for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $n > m$.

- H5) Given $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a unique solution $((S_n, I_n, P_n))_{n \geq p}$ of system (2) with initial condition $(S_p, I_p, P_p) \in (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^3$.
- H6) Any solution of system (2) with nonnegative (resp. positive) initial condition, (S_q, I_q, P_q) is nonnegative (resp. positive) for all $n \geq q$.

Note that when $f(S_{n+1}, I_n, P_n) = S_{n+1}$ and $g(S_n, I_n, P_n) = P_n$ in (2), the equation can be rewritten in explicit form:

$$\begin{cases} S_{n+1} = \frac{\Theta_n}{\Psi_n} \\ I_{n+1} = \frac{\beta_n \Theta_n + \Psi_n}{\Psi_n \Phi_n} I_n \\ P_{n+1} = \frac{(1+r_n)\Psi_n \Phi_n + \gamma_n a_n \Theta_n \Phi_n + \theta_n \eta_n (\Psi_n + \beta_n \Theta_n) I_n}{\Psi_n \Phi_n (1+b_n P_n)} P_n \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

where $\Psi_n = 1 + \mu_n + \beta_n I_n + a_n P_n$, $\Phi_n = 1 + \eta_n P_n + c_n$ and $\Theta_n = \Lambda_n + S_n$. From (4), we conclude that when $f(S_{n+1}, I_n, P_n) = S_{n+1}$ system (2) is well defined and H6 holds. Let us introduce the notation $f^\ell = \inf f_n$ and $f^u = \sup f_n$.

To proceed, we need to consider two auxiliary equations. The first one corresponds to the dynamics of preys in the absence of infected preys and predators:

$$s_{n+1} - s_n = \Lambda_n - \mu_n s_{n+1}.$$

Rearranging terms, the equation above becomes:

$$s_{n+1} = \frac{\Lambda_n}{1 + \mu_n} + \frac{s_n}{1 + \mu_n}. \quad (5)$$

We have the following lemma that was essentially proved in [12]:

Lemma 1. *We have the following:*

- i) *The solution of equation (5) with $s_p = 0$ is the identically null sequence;*
- ii) *All solutions (s_n) of equation (5) with initial condition $s_0 > 0$ are positive for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- iii) *Given a solution (s_n) of equation (5) with initial condition $s_0 \in [\Lambda^\ell/\mu^u, \Lambda^u/\mu^\ell]$ we have*

$$\frac{\Lambda^\ell}{\mu^u} \leq s_n \leq \frac{\Lambda^u}{\mu^\ell}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;

- iv) *Each fixed solution (s_n) of (5) with initial condition $s_0 \geq 0$ is bounded and globally uniformly attractive on $[0, +\infty)$;*
- v) *There is a constant $D > 0$ such that if (s_n) is a solution of (5) and (\tilde{s}_n) is a solution of the system*

$$s_{n+1} = \frac{\Lambda_n + s_n + \varphi_n}{1 + \mu_n} \quad (6)$$

with $\tilde{s}_0 = s_0$ then

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} |\tilde{s}_n - s_n| \leq D \sup_{n \geq 0} |\varphi_n|.$$

- vi) *There is a constant $E > 0$ such that if (s_n) is a solution of (5) and (\tilde{s}_n) is a solution of the system*

$$s_{n+1} = \frac{\Lambda_n + s_n}{1 + \mu_n + \psi_n} \quad (7)$$

with $\tilde{s}_0 = s_0$ then there is N_1 sufficiently large such that

$$\sup_{n \geq N_1} |\tilde{s}_n - s_n| \leq E \sup_{n \geq N_1} |\psi_n|.$$

Proof. Properties i) to v) follow from Lemma 1 in [12]. To prove vi), let (s_n) be a solution of (5) and (\tilde{s}_n) be a solution of (7) with $\tilde{s}_0 = s_0$. By (5) and (7), we have

$$(\tilde{s}_{n+1} - s_{n+1})(1 + \mu_n) = \tilde{s}_n - s_n - g_n \tilde{s}_{n+1}$$

Therefore, letting $w_n = |\tilde{s}_n - s_n|$, we have

$$w_{n+1}(1 + \mu_n) \leq w_n + |g_n| \tilde{s}_{n+1}$$

and thus

$$w_{n+1} \leq \frac{w_n}{1 + \mu_n} + \frac{|\psi_n| \tilde{s}_{n+1}}{1 + \mu_n}$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By iii) and iv) we get, for n sufficiently large, say $n \geq N_1$,

$$w_{n+1} \leq \frac{w_n}{1 + \mu_n} + \frac{|\psi_n|}{1 + \mu_n} \left[\frac{\Lambda^u}{\mu^\ell + \psi^\ell} + \varepsilon \right]$$

and thus, for $n \geq N_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_n &\leq \left[\frac{\Lambda^u}{\mu^\ell + \psi^\ell} + \varepsilon \right] \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} |\psi_m| \left(\prod_{k=m}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_k} \right) \\ &\leq \left[\frac{\Lambda^u}{\mu^\ell + \psi^\ell} + \varepsilon \right] \sup_{n \geq 0} |\psi_n| K \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \theta^{n-m} \\ &\leq \left[\frac{\Lambda^u}{\mu^\ell + \psi^\ell} + \varepsilon \right] \frac{K\theta}{1 - \theta} \sup_{n \geq 0} |\psi_n|. \end{aligned}$$

Defining $E = K\theta [\Lambda^u / (\mu^\ell + \psi^\ell) + \varepsilon] / (1 - \theta)$, we get

$$\sup_{n \geq N_1} |\tilde{s}_n - s_n| = \sup_{n \geq N_1} w_n \leq w_n \leq E \sup_{n \geq N_1} |\psi_n|,$$

and the result follows. \square

We also need to consider the equation:

$$y_{n+1} - y_n = (r_n - b_n y_{n+1}) y_n.$$

Rearranging terms, we get:

$$y_{n+1} = \frac{r_n y_n + y_n}{1 + b_n y_n} \quad (8)$$

The following lemma holds.

Lemma 2. *We have the following:*

- i) *The solution of equation (8) with $y_p = 0$ is the identically null sequence;*
- ii) *All solutions (y_n) of equation (8) with initial condition $y_0 > 0$ are positive for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- iii) *Given a solution (y_n) of equation (8) with initial condition $y_0 \in [r^\ell / b^u, r^u / b^\ell]$ we have*

$$\frac{r^\ell}{b^u} \leq y_n \leq \frac{r^u}{b^\ell}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;

- iv) *Each fixed solution (y_n) of (8) with initial condition $y_0 > 0$ is bounded and globally uniformly attractive on $]0, +\infty[$;*

v) There is a constant $E > 0$ such that, if (y_n) is a solution of (8) and (\tilde{y}_n) is a solution of the system

$$y_{n+1} = \frac{r_n y_n + y_n}{1 + (b_n + g_n) y_n}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \quad (9)$$

with $\tilde{y}_0 = y_0$ then there is N_1 sufficiently large such that

$$\sup_{n \geq N_1} |\tilde{y}_n - y_n| \leq E \sup_{n \geq N_1} |g_n|.$$

vi) There is a constant $G > 0$ such that, if (y_n) is a solution of (8) and (\tilde{y}_n) is a solution of the system

$$y_{n+1} = \frac{(r_n + h_n) y_n + y_n}{1 + b_n y_n}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \quad (10)$$

with $\tilde{y}_0 = y_0$ then there is N_2 sufficiently large such that

$$\sup_{n \geq N_2} |\tilde{y}_n - y_n| \leq G \sup_{n \geq N_2} |h_n|.$$

Proof. With the change of variable $w_n = 1/y_n$, equation (8) becomes

$$w_{n+1} = \frac{b_n}{r_n + 1} + \frac{w_n}{r_n + 1},$$

equation (9) becomes

$$w_{n+1} = \frac{w_n + b_n + g_n}{r_n + 1}.$$

and equation (10) becomes

$$w_{n+1} = \frac{w_n + b_n}{1 + r_n + h_n}.$$

Using Lemma 1, we obtain ii) to vi). Property i) is immediate. \square

We must assume the following:

H7) Each solution of (2) with positive initial condition is bounded and there is a bounded region \mathcal{R} that contains the ω -limit of all solutions of (2) with positive initial conditions.

Notice in particular that condition H7) implies that there is $L > 0$ such that, for each solution (S_n, I_n, P_n) we have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (S_n + I_n + P_n) < L. \quad (11)$$

The next lemma shows that, when $g(S, I, P) = g_0(S, I)P$, there is an invariant region that attracts all orbits of system (2).

Lemma 3. *Assume that $g(S, I, P) = g_0(S, I)P$. Then, there is $L > 0$ such that, for any solution (S_n, I_n, P_n) of (2), with nonnegative initial conditions, there is $T \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$S_n + I_n + P_n \leq L \quad \text{for } n \geq T.$$

Proof. Let (S_n, I_n, P_n) be a solution of (2) with nonnegative initial conditions $S_q = s_q$, $I_q = i_q$ and $P_q = p_q$. Adding the first two equations in (2) and writing $N_n = S_n + I_n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} N_{n+1} - N_n &= \Lambda_n - \mu_n S_{n+1} - c_n I_{n+1} - a_n f(S_{n+1}, I_n, P_n) P_n \\ &\quad - \eta_n g_0(S_{n+1}, I_n) P_n I_{n+1} \\ &\leq \Lambda_n - \mu_n N_{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\mu_n = \min\{\mu_n, c_n\}$. Thus

$$N_{n+1} \leq \frac{\Lambda_n}{1 + \mu_n} + \frac{N_n}{1 + \mu_n}.$$

By iii) and iv) in Lemma 1, we conclude that, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $S_n + I_n = N_n \leq s_n \leq \Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon$, where s_n is a solution of (5) with initial condition $s_q = N_q$, for n sufficiently large, say $n \geq N_1$.

By the third equation in (2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n+1} &= \frac{P_n + r_n P_n + \gamma_n a_n f(S_{n+1}, I_n, P_n) P_n + \theta_n \eta_n g_0(S_{n+1}, I_n) P_n I_{n+1}}{1 + b_n P_n} \\ &\leq \frac{[r_n + \gamma_n a_n f(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon, 0, 0) + \theta_n \eta_n g_0(0, \Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)] P_n + P_n}{1 + b_n P_n} \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq N_1$. By iii) and iv) in Lemma 2, we conclude that, for any given $\delta > 0$, there is $N_2 \geq N_1$ such that, for all $n \geq N_2$

$$\begin{aligned} P_n &\leq \frac{\sup_{n \geq q} \{r_n + \gamma_n a_n f(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon, 0, 0) + \theta_n \eta_n g_0(0, \Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)\}}{b^\ell} + \delta \\ &\leq \frac{r^u + \gamma^u a^u f(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon, 0, 0) + \theta^u \eta^u g_0(0, \Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)}{b^\ell} + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$S_n + I_n + P_n \leq \frac{\Lambda^u}{\mu^\ell} + \varepsilon + \frac{r^u + \gamma^u a^u f(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon, 0, 0) + \theta^u \eta^u g_0(0, \Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)(\Lambda^u/\mu^\ell + \varepsilon)}{b^\ell} + \delta,$$

and the result follows. \square

To formulate our next assumption we need to consider the system

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} - x_n = \Lambda_n - \mu_n x_{n+1} - a_n f(x_{n+1}, 0, z_n) z_n \\ z_{n+1} - z_n = (r_n - b_n z_{n+1}) z_n + \gamma_n a_n f(x_{n+1}, 0, z_n) z_n \end{cases}. \quad (12)$$

which corresponds to the dynamics of the susceptible preys and the predators in the absence of infected preys. We also need to consider the two families of auxiliary systems:

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} - x_n = \Lambda_n - \mu_n x_{n+1} - a_n f(x_{n+1}, 0, z_n) z_n - \varepsilon x_n \\ z_{n+1} - z_n = (r_n - b_n z_{n+1}) z_n + \gamma_n a_n f(x_{n+1}, \varepsilon, z_n) z_n \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} - x_n = \Lambda_n - \mu_n x_{n+1} - a_n f(x_{n+1}, \varepsilon, z_n) z_n \\ z_{n+1} - z_n = (r_n - b_n z_{n+1}) z_n + \gamma_n a_n f(x_{n+1}, 0, z_n) z_n + \theta_n \eta_n g(x_{n+1}, 0, z_n) \varepsilon \end{cases}. \quad (14)$$

We make the following assumptions concerning systems (13) and (14).

- H8) There is a family of nonnegative solutions $(x_{1,\varepsilon,n}^*, z_{1,\varepsilon,n}^*)$ of system (13), one for each $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, such that each solution in the family is globally asymptotically stable in a set containing $\{(x, y) \in (R_0^+)^2 : x, z > 0\}$ and the function $\varepsilon \mapsto (x_{1,\varepsilon,n}^*, z_{1,\varepsilon,n}^*)$ is continuous.
- H9) There is a family of nonnegative solutions $(x_{2,\varepsilon,n}^*, z_{2,\varepsilon,n}^*)$ of system (14), one for each $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, such that each solution in the family is globally asymptotically stable in a set containing $\{(x, y) \in (R_0^+)^2 : x, z > 0\}$ and the function $\varepsilon \mapsto (x_{2,\varepsilon,n}^*, z_{2,\varepsilon,n}^*)$ is continuous.

We denote the element of the family of solutions in H8) (or H9)) with $\varepsilon = 0$, by (x_n^*, z_n^*) . For each solution (x_n^*, z_n^*) of (13) with $\varepsilon = 0$ and initial conditions (x_0, y_0) with $x_0 > 0$ and $z_0 > 0$, and each $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, define the number

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k x_{k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_k^*, 0, z_k^*)} \quad (15)$$

and for each solution (s_n^*) of (5) with $s_0 > 0$, each solution (y_n^*) of (8) with $y_0 > 0$ and each $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, define the number

$$\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_k^*, 0, y_k^*)} \quad (16)$$

These numbers will be useful in obtaining conditions for permanence and extinction and, in some sense, play the role of upper and lower bounds for the basic reproductive number in this general context. In the following lemma we prove that the numbers above are independent of the particular positive solutions of (5), (8) and (13) considered.

Lemma 4. *The numbers $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda)$ are independent of the particular solutions (s_n^*) of (5) with $s_0 > 0$, (y_n^*) of (8) with $y_0 > 0$ and (x_n^*, z_n^*) of (12) with $x_0 > 0$ and $z_0 > 0$.*

Proof. Write $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x, z)$ for the number in (15) corresponding to the solution $(x, z) = (x_n^*, z_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of (12) with $x_0 > 0$ and $z_0 > 0$.

Let $(x_1^*, z_1^*) = (x_{1,n}^*, z_{1,n}^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(x_2^*, z_2^*) = (x_{2,n}^*, z_{2,n}^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be distinct solutions of (12) with $x_{1,0} > 0, z_{1,0} > 0, x_{2,0} > 0$ and $z_{2,0} > 0$.

Let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small. By assumptions H8) (or H9)), for $k \geq N$ (where $N \in \mathbb{N}$) sufficiently large, we have

$$x_{1,k}^* - \delta \leq x_{2,k}^* \leq x_{1,k}^* + \delta \quad \text{and} \quad z_{1,k}^* - \delta \leq z_{2,k}^* \leq z_{1,k}^* + \delta.$$

Additionally, by H3), there is $c > 0$ such that, for sufficiently large k ,

$$|g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*) - g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{2,k}^* - \delta)| \leq c|z_{1,k}^* - z_{2,k}^* + \delta| \leq 2c\delta$$

and

$$|g(x_{2,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*) - g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*)| \leq c|z_{1,k}^* - z_{2,k}^*| \leq c\delta.$$

Thus, for $n \geq N$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k x_{2,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{2,k}^*, 0, z_{2,k}^*)} \\
& \leq \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k x_{1,k+1}^* + \delta \beta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{2,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^* - \delta)} \\
& \leq \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k x_{1,k+1}^* + \delta \beta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*)} \frac{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*)}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{2,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^* - \delta)} \\
& = \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \left(\frac{1 + \beta_k x_{1,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*)} + \frac{\delta \beta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*)} \right) \times \tag{17} \\
& \quad \times \left(1 + \frac{3c\delta\eta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{2,k}^*, 0, z_{2,k}^* - \delta)} \right) \\
& \leq (1 + \delta B)^\lambda \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \left(\frac{1 + \beta_k x_{1,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*)} + \delta A \right) \\
& \leq (1 + \delta B)^\lambda \left(\prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k x_{1,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*)} + \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda+1} \binom{\lambda+1}{j} \delta^j C^{\lambda+1-j} A^j \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$A = \frac{\beta^u}{1 + c^\ell + \eta^\ell (g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*))^\ell}, \quad B = \frac{2c\eta^u}{1 + c^\ell + \eta^\ell (g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{2,k}^* - \delta))^\ell}$$

and

$$C = \frac{1 + \beta^u (x_1^*)^u}{1 + c^\ell + \eta^\ell (g(x_{1,k}^*, 0, z_{1,k}^*))^\ell}.$$

By (17), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_2^*, z_2^*) \leq (1 + \delta B)^\lambda \left(\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_1^*, z_1^*) + \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda+1} \binom{\lambda+1}{j} \delta^j C^{\lambda+1-j} A^j \right).$$

By the arbitrariness of $\delta > 0$, we conclude that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_2^*, z_2^*) \leq \mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_1^*, z_1^*)$ and, interchanging the roles of (x_1^*, z_1^*) and (x_2^*, z_2^*) it is immediate that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_2^*, z_2^*) \geq \mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_1^*, z_1^*)$. Thus $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_2^*, z_2^*) = \mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, x_1^*, z_1^*)$.

Now write $\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda, s, y)$ for the number in (16) corresponding to the solutions $s = (s_n^*)$ of (5) with $s_0 > 0$ and $y = (y_n^*)$ of (8) with $y_0 > 0$.

Let again $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small. Additionally, let $s_1^* = (s_{1,n}^*)$ and $s_2^* = (s_{2,n}^*)$ be distinct solutions of (5) and $y_1^* = (y_{1,n}^*)$ and $y_2^* = (y_{2,n}^*)$ be distinct solutions of (8). By iv) in Lemma 1 and iv) in Lemma 2, we have

$$s_{1,k}^* - \delta \leq s_{2,k}^* \leq s_{2,k}^* + \delta \quad \text{and} \quad y_{1,k}^* - \delta \leq y_{2,k}^* \leq y_{1,k}^* + \delta$$

for $k \geq N$ sufficiently large. There is $c > 0$ such that

$$|g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*) - g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{2,k}^* - \delta)| \leq c|y_{1,k}^* - y_{2,k}^* + \delta| \leq 2c\delta$$

and

$$|g(s_{2,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*) - g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*)| \leq c|s_{2,k}^* - s_{1,k}^*| \leq c\delta.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{2,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{2,k}^*, 0, y_{2,k}^*)} \\
& \leq \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{1,k+1}^* + \delta \beta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{2,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^* - \delta)} \\
& \leq \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{1,k+1}^* + \delta \beta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*)} \frac{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*)}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{2,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^* - \delta)} \\
& \leq \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \left(\frac{1 + \beta_k s_{1,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*)} + \frac{\delta \beta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*)} \right) \times \\
& \quad \times \left(1 + \frac{3c\delta\eta_k}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{2,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^* - \delta)} \right) \\
& \leq (1 + \delta B)^\lambda \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \left(\frac{1 + \beta_k s_{1,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*)} + \delta A \right) \\
& \leq (1 + \delta B)^\lambda \left(\prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{1,k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*)} + \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda+1} \binom{\lambda+1}{j} \delta^j C^{\lambda+1-j} A^j \right), \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq N$, where

$$A = \frac{\beta^u}{1 + c^\ell + \eta^\ell (g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*))^\ell}, \quad B = \frac{2c\eta^u}{1 + c^\ell + \eta^\ell (g(s_{2,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^* - \delta))^\ell}$$

and

$$C = \frac{1 + \beta^u (s_1^*)^u}{1 + c^\ell + \eta^\ell (g(s_{1,k}^*, 0, y_{1,k}^*))^\ell}.$$

By (18), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_2^*, y_2^*) \leq (1 + \delta B)^\lambda \left(\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_1^*, y_1^*) + \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda+1} \binom{\lambda+1}{j} \delta^j C^{\lambda+1-j} A^j \right)$$

By the arbitrariness of $\varepsilon > 0$, we conclude that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_2^*, y_2^*) \leq \mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_1^*, y_1^*)$ and, interchanging the roles of (s_1^*, y_1^*) and (s_2^*, y_2^*) it is immediate that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_2^*, y_2^*) \geq \mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_1^*, y_1^*)$. Thus $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_2^*, y_2^*) = \mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda, s_1^*, y_1^*)$.

The result is proved. \square

3. EXTINCTION AND STRONG PERSISTENCE

In this section we establish our main results on extinction and persistence. To obtain our result on extinction we must make some additional assumptions on the function g . In spite of this, it is easy to see that the usual growth rates still fulfill these assumptions.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $g(S + I, 0, P) \leq g(S, I, P)$. If there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) < 1$ then the infectives (I_n) go to extinction in system (2). Furthermore, if $a \equiv 0$ and $g(S, I, P) = g_0(S, I)P$, any disease-free solution $(s_n^*, 0, y_n^*)$ of (2), where (s_n^*) is a solution of (5) and (y_n^*) is a solution of (8), is globally asymptotically attractive.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{R}^u(\lambda) < 1$, given $\delta_1 > 0$ sufficiently small, there are $\delta_0 > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k(s_{k+1}^* + \delta)}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_k^* + \delta, 0, y_k^* - \delta)} < 1 - \delta_1, \quad (19)$$

for $n \geq N$ and all positive $\delta \leq \delta_0$. Let $N_n = S_n + I_n$. Since $\mu_n \leq c_n$, by the first two equations in (2), we conclude that

$$N_{n+1} - N_n \leq \Lambda_n - \mu_n N_{n+1} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad N_{n+1} \leq \frac{\Lambda_n}{1 + \mu_n} + \frac{N_n}{1 + \mu_n}$$

and thus $S_n, I_n \leq N_n \leq s_n$, where (s_n) is any solution of (5) with $s_0 = S_0$. By iv) in Lemma 1 we have $|s_n - s_n^*| \leq \delta_0$ for sufficiently large n , say $n \geq N_1 \geq N$. Thus

$$S_n, I_n \leq S_n + I_n = N_n \leq s_n \leq s_n^* + \delta_0,$$

for $n \geq N_1$.

By the third equation in (2), we conclude that

$$P_{n+1} - P_n \geq (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad P_{n+1} \geq \frac{r_n P_n + P_n}{1 + b_n P_n}$$

and thus $P_n \geq y_n$, where (y_n) is any solution of (5) with $y_0 = P_0$. By iv) in Lemma 2 we have $|y_n - y_n^*| \leq \delta_0$ for sufficiently large n , say $n \geq N_2 \geq N_1$. Thus

$$P_n \geq y_n \geq y_n^* - \delta_0,$$

for $n \geq N_2$. Using our hypothesis, by the second equation in (2) and (19),

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n+1} &= \frac{\beta_n S_{n+1} I_n + I_n}{1 + \eta_n g(S_n, I_n, P_n) + c_n} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_n S_{n+1} I_n + I_n}{1 + \eta_n g(S_n + I_n, 0, P_n) + c_n} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_n (s_{n+1}^* + \delta_0) + 1}{1 + c_n + \eta_n g(s_n^* + \delta_0, 0, y_n^* - \delta_0)} I_n \\ &< (1 - \delta_1) I_{n-\lambda-1} \\ &< \dots < (1 - \delta_1)^{\lfloor n/(\lambda+1) \rfloor} I_{n - \lfloor n/(\lambda+1) \rfloor (\lambda+1)} \\ &\leq d \left((1 - \delta_1)^{1/(\lambda+1)} \right)^n, \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq N_2$, where $d = \max_{j=0, \dots, \lambda} I_j$. We conclude that $I_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and we have extinction of the infectives.

Assume now that $a \equiv 0$ and $g(S, I, P) = g_0(S, I)P$, let $((S_n, I_n, P_n))$ be any solution of (2) and consider the sequence $((s_n^*, 0, y_n^*))$, where (s_n^*) is a solution of (5) and (y_n^*) is a solution of (8).

Since $I_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, given $\delta > 0$ there is $T \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $I_n < \delta$ for $n \geq T$. Letting $U_n = S_n - s_n^*$, we have, by the first equation in (2),

$$U_{n+1} - U_n = -\mu_n U_{n+1} - \beta_n S_{n+1} I_n,$$

for $n \geq T$. Thus, by iv) in Lemma 1 and by Lemma 3, we have

$$-\beta^u L \delta < (1 + \mu_n) U_{n+1} - U_n < 0$$

for n sufficiently large.

We get, for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{n+1} &> -\frac{\beta^u L \delta}{1 + \mu_n} + \frac{1}{1 + \mu_n} U_n \\
&> -\frac{\beta^u L \delta}{1 + \mu_n} + \frac{1}{1 + \mu_n} \left(-\frac{\beta^u K \delta}{1 + \mu_{n-1}} + \frac{1}{1 + \mu_{n-1}} U_{n-1} \right) \\
&> \dots \\
&> \left(\prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_m} \right) U_0 - \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} (\beta^u L \delta)^{m+1} \left(\prod_{k=m}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_k} \right) \\
&> \left(\prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_m} \right) U_0 - \delta \beta^u L \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} K \theta^{n-m} \\
&> \left(\prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_m} \right) U_0 - \frac{\beta^u L K \theta}{1 - \theta} \delta \\
&> -\frac{\beta^u L K \theta}{1 - \theta} \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$U_{n+1} < \frac{1}{1 + \mu_n} U_n < \left(\prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_m} \right) U_0.$$

Since

$$\prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{1 + \mu_m} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

given $\delta > 0$, we have $|U_{n+1}| < M\delta$, where $M = \beta^u L K \theta / (1 - \theta)$, for sufficiently large n . We conclude that $|U_n| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and thus

$$S_n \rightarrow s_n^* \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (20)$$

By the third equation in (2), we have, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{n+1} - P_n &= (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n + \theta_n \eta_n g_0(S_n, I_n) P_n I_{n+1} \\
&\leq (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n + \theta_n \eta_n g_0(S_n + I_n, 0) P_n I_{n+1} \\
&\leq (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n + \theta_n \eta_n g_0(s_n^* + 2\delta, 0) P_n \delta
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n \leq P_{n+1} - P_n \leq (r_n + \theta^u \eta^u g_0(s_n^* + 2\delta, 0) \delta - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n.$$

We conclude that

$$\frac{r_n P_n + P_n}{1 + b_n P_n} \leq P_{n+1} \leq \frac{(r_n + \theta^u \eta^u g_0(s_n^* + 2\delta, 0) \delta) P_n + P_n}{1 + b_n P_n}.$$

By v) in Lemma 2, we have $|P_n - y_n^*| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. The result follows since $(S_n, I_n, P_n) \rightarrow (s_n^*, 0, y_n^*)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. \square

Theorem 2. *If there is a constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) > 1$ then the infectives (I_n) are strong persistent in system (2).*

Proof. Assume that there is a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{R}^\ell(\lambda) > 1$. Then, there is a function ψ such that, for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small we have

$$\prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k(x_{k+1}^* - \delta_0)}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_k^* - \delta_0, 0, z_k^* + \delta_0)} > 1 + \psi(\delta), \quad (21)$$

with $\psi(\delta) > 0$ for all $\delta > 0$ and $\psi(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Let $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and (S_n, I_n, P_n) be a solution of (2) with $I_n > 0$ for all $n \geq N_1$. We will use a contradiction argument to prove that there is $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} I_n > \varepsilon_1. \quad (22)$$

We may assume that $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ is sufficiently small so that H8) and H9) hold for ε_1 . Assuming that (22) does not hold, there is $N_2 \geq N_1$ such that $I_n < \varepsilon_1$ for all $n \geq N_2$. By the first and third equation in (2), we conclude that

$$\begin{cases} S_{n+1} - S_n \leq \Lambda_n - \mu_n S_{n+1} - a_n f(S_{n+1}, \varepsilon_1, P_n) P_n \\ P_{n+1} - P_n \leq (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n + \gamma_n a_n f(S_{n+1}, 0, P_n) P_n + \theta_n \eta_n g(S_n, 0, P_n) P_n \varepsilon_1 \end{cases},$$

for all $n \geq N_2$. Considering system (14) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$, we have $S_n \leq x_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}$ and $P_n \leq z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}$ for sufficiently large n . By H9) we also have, for sufficiently large n ,

$$x_{2,\varepsilon_1,n} \leq x_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}^* + \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n} \leq z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}^* + \varepsilon_1$$

and by the continuity properties in H8) and H9), we have

$$x_{2,\varepsilon_1,n} \leq x_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}^* + \varepsilon_1 \leq x_{2,n}^* + \chi_1(\varepsilon_1) \quad \text{and} \quad z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n} \leq z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}^* + \varepsilon_1 \leq z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}^* + \chi_2(\varepsilon_1),$$

with $\chi_1(\varepsilon_1), \chi_2(\varepsilon_1) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$. Thus, in particular, for sufficiently large n ,

$$S_n \leq x_{2,\varepsilon,n}^* \leq x_{2,n}^* + \chi_1(\varepsilon_1) \quad \text{and} \quad P_n \leq z_{2,\varepsilon,n}^* \leq z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}^* + \chi_2(\varepsilon_1), \quad (23)$$

Again by the first and third equation in (2), we conclude that

$$\begin{cases} S_{n+1} - S_n \geq \Lambda_n - \mu_n S_{n+1} - a_n f(S_{n+1}, 0, P_n) P_n - \beta_n S_{n+1} \varepsilon_1 \\ P_{n+1} - P_n \geq (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n + \gamma_n a_n f(S_{n+1}, \varepsilon_1, P_n) P_n \end{cases},$$

for all $n \geq N_2$.

Consider system (13) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$. We have $S_n \geq x_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}$ and $P_n \geq z_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}$ for sufficiently large n . By H8) we also have, for sufficiently large n ,

$$x_{1,\varepsilon_1,n} \geq x_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}^* - \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad z_{1,\varepsilon_1,n} \geq z_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}^* - \varepsilon_1.$$

and by the continuity properties in H8) and H9), we have

$$x_{1,\varepsilon_1,n} \geq x_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}^* - \varepsilon_1 \geq x_{1,n}^* - \varphi_1(\varepsilon_1) \quad \text{and} \quad z_{1,\varepsilon_1,n} \geq z_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}^* - \varepsilon_1 \geq z_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}^* - \varphi_2(\varepsilon_1),$$

with $\varphi_1(\varepsilon_1), \varphi_2(\varepsilon_1) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$. Thus, in particular, for sufficiently large n ,

$$S_n \geq x_{1,\varepsilon,n} \geq x_{1,n}^* - \varphi_1(\varepsilon_1) \quad \text{and} \quad P_n \geq z_{1,\varepsilon,n} \geq z_{1,n}^* - \varphi_2(\varepsilon_1). \quad (24)$$

From the second equation in (2), (24), (23) and (21), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n+1} &= \frac{\beta_n S_{n+1} I_n + I_n}{1 + \eta_n g(S_n, I_n, P_n) + c_n} \\ &\geq \frac{\beta_n (x_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}^* - \varepsilon_1) + 1}{1 + \eta_n g(x_{1,\varepsilon_1,n}^* - \varepsilon_1, 0, z_{2,\varepsilon_1,n}^* + \varepsilon_1) + c_n} I_n \\ &> (1 + \psi(\varepsilon_1)) I_{n-\lambda-1} \\ &> \dots > (1 + \psi(\varepsilon_1))^{\lfloor n/(\lambda+1) \rfloor} I_{n-\lfloor n/(\lambda+1) \rfloor(\lambda+1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

for all $n \geq N_3$ with $N_3 \geq N_2$. Therefore, by (21) and (25), we conclude that $I_n \rightarrow +\infty$. A contradiction to Lemma 3. We have (22) and the infectives in system (2) are weak persistent.

Using again a contradiction argument, we will prove that we have strong persistence of the infectives. We may assume, with no loss of generality, that there are $\delta, \delta_0 > 0$ such that

$$\prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k(x_{k+1}^* - \delta_0)}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_k^* - \delta_0, 0, z_k^* + \delta_0)} > 1 + \delta, \quad (26)$$

for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $z_0 = (S_0, I_0, P_0)$, denote by $((S_{n,z_0}, I_{n,z_0}, P_{n,z_0}))$ the solution of (2) with $(S_{0,z_0}, I_{0,z_0}, P_{0,z_0}) = (S_0, I_0, P_0)$.

Proceeding by contradiction, if the system is not strong persistent, then there is a sequence of initial values $z_{0,k} = (S_{0,k}, I_{0,k}, P_{0,k})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} I_{n,z_{0,k}} < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{k^2}. \quad (27)$$

From (22) and (26), for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there are sequences $(s_{m,k})$ and $(t_{m,k})$ such that

$$0 < s_{1,k} < t_{1,k} < s_{2,k} < t_{2,k} < \cdots < s_{m,k} < t_{m,k} < \cdots, \quad (28)$$

$$s_{m,k} \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } m \rightarrow +\infty, \quad (29)$$

$$I_{s_{m,k}, z_{0,k}} > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{k}, \quad I_{t_{m,k}, z_{0,k}} < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{k^2}, \quad (30)$$

and

$$\frac{\varepsilon_0}{k^2} \leq I_{n,z_{0,k}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{k}, \quad \text{for all } n \in [s_{m,k}, t_{m,k} - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}. \quad (31)$$

For any $n \in [s_{m,k}, t_{m,k} - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, we have, using (11),

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n+1, z_{0,k}} &= \frac{1 + \beta_n S_{n+1, z_{0,k}}}{1 + c_n + \eta_n g(S_{n, z_{0,k}}, I_{n, z_{0,k}}, P_{n, z_{0,k}})} I_{n, z_{0,k}} \\ &> \frac{1}{1 + c_n + \eta_n g(S_{n, z_{0,k}}, 0, P_{n, z_{0,k}})} I_{n, z_{0,k}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1 + a} I_{n, z_{0,k}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a = c^u + \eta^u g(0, 0, L + \delta) > 0$. Therefore, by (30), we obtain

$$\frac{\varepsilon_0}{k^2} > I_{t_{m,k}, z_{0,k}} \geq \left(\frac{1}{1 + a} \right)^{t_{m,k} - s_{m,k}} I_{s_{m,k}, z_{0,k}} > \left(\frac{1}{1 + a} \right)^{t_{m,k} - s_{m,k}} \frac{\varepsilon_0}{k},$$

and therefore we get

$$t_{m,k} - s_{m,k} > \frac{\ln k}{\ln(1 + a)} \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

We conclude that we can choose $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$t_{m,k} - s_{m,k} > n_1 + \lambda + 1,$$

for all $k \geq k_1$.

Now, for all $k \geq k_1$ and $n \in [s_{m,k} + 1, t_{m,k}] \cap \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} S_{n+1, z_{0,k}} - S_{n, z_{0,k}} &\leq \Lambda_n - \mu_n S_{n+1, z_{0,k}} - a_n f(S_{n+1, z_{0,k}}, P_{n, z_{0,k}}) P_{n, z_{0,k}} \\ P_{n+1, z_{0,k}} - P_{n, z_{0,k}} &\leq (r_n - b_n P_{n+1, z_{0,k}}) P_{n, z_{0,k}} \\ &\quad + \gamma_n a_n f(S_{n+1, z_{0,k}}, P_{n, z_{0,k}}) P_{n, z_{0,k}} + \theta_n \eta_n g(S_{n, z_{0,k}}, I_{n, z_{0,k}}, P_{n, z_{0,k}}) \varepsilon_1 \end{cases},$$

Let (\bar{x}_n, \bar{z}_n) be a solution of (12) with initial condition $\bar{x}_{s_{m,k}+1} = S_{s_{m,k}+1}$ and $\bar{z}_{s_{m,k}+1} = P_{s_{m,k}+1}$. By H8), for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$|S_{n,z_0,k} - x_n^*| \leq |S_{n,z_0,k} - \bar{x}_n| + |\bar{x}_n - x_n^*| < \varepsilon_0/2 + \varepsilon_0/2 = \varepsilon_0$$

for all $n \in [s_{m,k} + 1, t_{m,k}] \cap \mathbb{N}$. In particular

$$S_{n,z_0,k} \geq x_n^* - \varepsilon_0, \quad (32)$$

for all $n \in [s_{m,k} + 1, t_{m,k}] \cap \mathbb{N}$. In a similar way, using H9), we conclude that, for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$P_{n,z_0,k} \leq y_n^* + \varepsilon_0, \quad (33)$$

for all $n \in [s_{m,k} + 1, t_{m,k}] \cap \mathbb{N}$.

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n+1,z_0,k} &= \frac{1 + \beta_n S_{n+1,z_0,k}}{1 + c_n + \eta_n g(S_{n,z_0,k}, I_{n,z_0,k}, P_{n,z_0,k})} I_{n,z_0,k} \\ &\geq \frac{1 + \beta_n (x_n^* - \varepsilon_0)}{1 + c_n + \eta_n g(x_n^* - \varepsilon_0, 0, y_n^* + \varepsilon_0)} I_{n,z_0,k} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

for all $n \in [s_{m,k} + n_1 + 1, t_{m,k}] \cap \mathbb{N}$ and $k \geq n_4$. By (27) and (34) we get

$$\frac{\varepsilon_0}{k^2} > I_{t_{m,k},z_0,k} \geq I_{t_{m,k}-\lambda,z_0,k} \prod_{n=t_{m,k}-\lambda}^{t_{m,k}} \frac{1 + \beta_n (x_n^* - \varepsilon_0)}{1 + c_n + \eta_n g(x_n^* - \varepsilon_0, 0, y_n^* + \varepsilon_0)} I_{n,z_0,k} > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{k^2},$$

a contradiction. Thus we conclude that the infectives are strong persistent and the result follow. \square

4. EXAMPLES

4.1. A model with no predation of uninfected preys. Letting $a \equiv 0$ and $g(x, y, z) = z$ in (2), we obtain the model below that corresponds to the discrete counterpart of the model in [20].

$$\begin{cases} S_{n+1} - S_n = \Lambda_n - \mu_n S_{n+1} - \beta_n S_{n+1} I_n \\ I_{n+1} - I_n = \beta_n S_{n+1} I_n - \eta_n P_n I_{n+1} - c_n I_{n+1} \\ P_{n+1} - P_n = (r_n - b_n P_{n+1}) P_n + \theta_n \eta_n P_n I_{n+1} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

For model (35) we assume conditions H1), H2) and H4). Notice that H3) is trivial, H5) and H6) follow from the discussion on (4) with $a_n = 0$, H7) follows from Lemma 3 and H8) and H9) follow from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, respectively.



For each solution (s_n^*) of (5) with $s_0 > 0$, each solution (y_n^*) of (8) with $y_0 > 0$ and each $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, in this context of no predation (of uninfected preys) we set

$$\mathcal{R}_{NP}^\ell(\lambda) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k y_k^*}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{NP}^u(\lambda) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{k=n}^{n+\lambda} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k y_k^*}.$$

The next theorems correspond to discrete counterparts of the results in [20].

FIGURE 1. Extinction, when $\beta_0 = 0.17$.FIGURE 2. Strong persistence, when $\beta_0 = 0.29$.

Theorem 3. *If there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{NP}^u(\lambda) < 1$ then the infectives (I_n) go to extinction in system (35) and any disease-free solution $((s_n^*, 0, y_n^*))$ of (35), where (s_n^*) is a solution of (5) and (y_n^*) is a solution of (8), is globally asymptotically attractive.*

Theorem 4. *If there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{NP}^\ell(\lambda) > 1$ then the infectives (I_n) are strongly persistent in system (35).*


To do some simulation, we consider the particular solutions $s_n^* = \Lambda/\mu$, $y_n^* = r/b$ and the following particular set of parameters in system (35): $\Lambda_n = 0.3$, $\mu_n = 0.1$, $\beta_n = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi n/5))$, $\eta_n = 0.3(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi n/5))$, $c_n = 0.18$, $r_n = 0.3$, $b_n = 0.2$, $\theta_n = 0.9$. This example is based on a continuous-time example in [10].

When $\beta_0 = 0.17$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{NP}^u(\lambda) \approx 0.89 < 1$ and we conclude that we have the extinction (figure 1). When $\beta_0 = 0.29$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{NP}^\ell(\lambda) \approx 1.24 > 1$ and we conclude that the infectives are strongly persistent (figure 2).

In extinction and uniform strong persistence scenario we considered, respectively, the following initial conditions: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.8, 0.6, 0.1)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.7, 0.2, 0.3)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (2.3, 0.4, 0.7)$; $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.5, 0.1, 0.2)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.7, 0.2, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.3, 0.15, 0.9)$.

4.2. Periodic model. Consider the system (2) and assume that there is $\omega \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Lambda_{n+\omega} = \Lambda_n$, $\mu_{n+\omega} = \mu_n$, $a_{n+\omega} = a_n$, $\beta_{n+\omega} = \beta_n$, $\eta_{n+\omega} = \eta_n$, $c_{n+\omega} = c_n$, $r_{n+\omega} = r_n$, $b_{n+\omega} = b_n$, $\gamma_{n+\omega} = \gamma_n$ and $\theta_{n+\omega} = \theta_n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Conditions H1) to H3) and H5) to H8) are assumed; condition H4) is trivial.

For each solution (s_n^*) of (5) with $s_0 > 0$, each solution (y_n^*) of (8) with $y_0 > 0$ and for each solution $((x_n^*, z_n^*))$ of (13) with $\varepsilon = 0$ and initial conditions $x_0 > 0$ and $z_0 > 0$, and each $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

FIGURE 3. Extinction, when $\beta_0 = 0.17$.

$$\mathcal{R}_{PER}^{\ell} = \prod_{k=1}^{\omega} \frac{1 + \beta_k x_{k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(x_k^*, 0, z_k^*)}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{PER}^u = \prod_{k=1}^{\omega} \frac{1 + \beta_k s_{k+1}^*}{1 + c_k + \eta_k g(s_k^*, 0, y_k^*)}$$

Corollary 1. *If $\mathcal{R}_{PER}^u < 1$ then the infective (I_n) go to extinction in system (2) and any disease-free solution $((s_n^*, 0, y_n^*))$ of (2), where (s_n^*) is a solution of the periodic version of (5) and (y_n^*) is a solution of the periodic version of (8), is globally asymptotically attractive.*

Corollary 2. *If $\mathcal{R}_{PER}^{\ell} > 1$ then the infective (I_n) is strongly persistent in system (2), where (x_n^*) and (z_n^*) are the components of the solution $((x_n^*, z_n^*))$ in the periodic version of (13). Moreover, there exist a periodic orbit of period ω .*

To do some simulation, we consider $f(x, y, z) = x$, $g(x, y, z) = z$, the particular solutions $s_k^* = \Lambda/\mu$, $y_k^* = r/b$ and


$$(x_n^*, z_n^*) = \left(\frac{-K_1 + \sqrt{K_1^2 + 2\Lambda K_2}}{K_2}, -\frac{K_1}{2a} + \frac{1}{2a} \sqrt{K_1^2 + 2\Lambda K_2 + r/b} \right),$$

where $K_1 = \mu + \frac{ar}{b}$ and $K_2 = \frac{2\gamma a^2}{b}$; we also considered the following particular set of parameters, and the exception of β and η we assume that they are all constants: $\Lambda_n = 0.3$, $\mu_n = 0.1$, $a_n = 0.4$, $\beta_n = \beta_0(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi n/5))$, $\eta_n = 0.3(1 + 0.7 \cos(\pi n/5))$, $c_n = 0.18$, $r_n = 0.3$, $b_n = 0.2$, $\gamma_n = 0.1$ and $\theta = 0.9$.

When $\beta_0 = 0.17$, we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{PER}^u \approx 0.44 < 1$ and we conclude that we have the extinction (figure 3). When $\beta_0 = 2.2$, we obtain $\mathcal{R}_{PER}^{\ell}(\lambda) \approx 3.013 > 1$ and we conclude that the infectives are uniformly strong persistent (figure 4).

In extinction and uniform strong persistence scenario we considered, respectively, the following initial conditions: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.8, 0.6, 0.1)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.7, 0.2, 0.3)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (2.3, 0.4, 0.7)$; $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.5, 0.1, 0.2)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.7, 0.2, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.3, 0.15, 0.9)$.

4.3. Autonomous model. Consider the system (2), and assume now that $f(x, y, z) = x$, $g(x, y, z) = z$, $\Lambda_n = \Lambda$, $\mu_n = \mu$, $a_n = a$, $\beta_n = \beta$, $\eta_n = \eta$, $c_n = c$, $r_n = r$, $b_n = b$ and $\gamma_n = \gamma$, $\theta_n = \theta$. Then we obtain following the model:

FIGURE 4. Strong persistence, when $\beta_0 = 2.2$.

$$\begin{cases} S_{n+1} - S_n = \Lambda - \mu S_{n+1} - a S_{n+1} P_n - \beta S_{n+1} I_n \\ I_{n+1} - I_n = \beta S_{n+1} I_n - \eta I_{n+1} P_n - c I_{n+1} \\ P_{n+1} - P_n = (r - b P_{n+1}) P_n + \gamma a S_{n+1} P_n + \theta \eta I_{n+1} P_n \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Conditions H1) to H4) are immediate. Conditions H5) and H6) follow from the discussion on (4). Condition H7) follows from Lemma 3 and H8) and H9) follow from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, respectively.

For each solution (s_n^*) of (5) with $s_0 > 0$, each solution (y_0^*) of (8) with $y_0 > 0$ and each solution $((x_n^*, z_n^*))$ of (13) with $\varepsilon = 0$ and initial conditions $x_0 > 0$ and $z_0 > 0$, and each $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$\mathcal{R}_A^\ell = \frac{1 + \beta \left(\frac{-K_1 + \sqrt{K_1^2 + 2\Lambda K_2}}{K_2} \right)}{1 + c + \eta \left(-\frac{K_1}{2a} + \frac{1}{2a} \sqrt{K_1^2 + 2\Lambda K_2} + r/b \right)}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_A^u = \frac{1 + \beta(\Lambda/\mu)}{1 + c + \eta(r/b)},$$

where $K_1 = \mu + \frac{ar}{b}$ and $K_2 = \frac{2\gamma a^2}{b}$.

Corollary 3. *If $\mathcal{R}_A^u < 1$ then the infective (I_n) in system (36) go to extinction.*

Corollary 4. *If $\mathcal{R}_A^\ell > 1$ then the infective (I_n) in system (36) are strongly persistent.*



To do some simulation, we consider the following particular set of parameters: $\Lambda = 0.3$, $\mu = 0.1$, $a = 0.4$, $\eta = 0.3$, $c = 0.18$, $r = 0.3$, $b = 0.2$, $\gamma = 0.1$ and $\theta = 0.9$.

When $\beta = 0.17$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_A^u \approx 0.93 < 1$ and we conclude that we have the extinction. When $\beta = 2.2$ we obtain $\mathcal{R}_A^\ell(\lambda) \approx 1.14 > 1$ and we conclude that the infectives are strongly persistent.

In uniform strong persistence and extinction scenario we considered, respectively, the following initial conditions: $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.8, 0.6, 0.1)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.7, 0.2, 0.3)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (2.3, 0.4, 0.7)$; $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (1.5, 0.1, 0.2)$, $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.7, 0.2, 0.4)$ and $(S_0, I_0, P_0) = (0.3, 0.15, 0.9)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Bai and R. Xo, Global stability of a delayed eco-epidemiological model with holling type III functional response, Springer Proceedings in mathematics ans Statistics 225 (2018), 119-130.

FIGURE 5. Extinction, when $\beta = 0.17$.FIGURE 6. Strong persistence, when $\beta = 2.2$.

- [2] Chakraborty, K., Das K., Haldar, S., Kar,T.K, A mathematical study of an eco-epidemiological system on disease persistence and extinction perspective, *Appl. Math. and Comput.* 254 (2015), 99-112.
- [3] A. P. Dobson, *The population biology of parasite-induced changes in host behavior*, *Q. Rev. Biol.* 30 (1988), 139-165.
- [4] M. Friend, Avian disease at the Salton Sea, *Hydrobiologia*, 161 (2002), 293-306.
- [5] M. Garrione and C. Rebelo, Persistence in seasonally varying predator-prey systems via the basic reproduction, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* 30 (2016), 73-98.
- [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] Hu, Teng, Jia and Zhang, Complex dynamical behaviors in a discrete eco-epidemiological model with disease in prey, *Adv. Difference Equ.* (2014), 2014:265.
- [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), 23-63.
- [10] Lopo F. de Jesus, C. M. Silva and Helder Vilarinho, An Eco-epidemiological model with general functional response of predator to prey, preprint.
- [11] Lopo F. de Jesus, C. M. Silva and Helder Vilarinho, Periodic orbits for periodic eco-epidemiological systems with infected prey, preprint.
- [12] J. Mateus, A Nonautonomous Discrete Epidemic Model with Isolation, *Int. J. of Difference Equ.*, 11 (2016), 105-121.
- [13] R. E. Mickens, Discretizations of nonlinear differential equations using explicit nonstandard methods, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 110 (1999), 181-185.
- [14] A. S. Purnomo, I. Darti, A. Suryanto, Dynamics of eco-epidemiological model with harvesting, *AIP Conference Proceeding* 1913 (2017), 020018.
- [15] C. Rebelo, A. Margheri, N. Bacaër, Persistence in seasonally forced epidemiological models, *J. Math. Biol.* 64 (6) (2012), 933-949.
- [16] C. M. Silva, Existence of Periodic Solutions for Eco-Epidemic Model with Disease in the Prey, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 53 (2017), 383-397.

- [17] 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.
- [18] W. Wang, X.-Q. Zhao, Threshold dynamics for compartmental epidemic models in periodic environments, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* 20 (3) (2008), 699-717.
- [19] Xiao-Qiang Zhao, *Dynamical Systems in Population Biology*, CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC, 16 (2003), Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [20] Xingge Niu, Tailei Zhang, Zhidong Teng, The asymptotic behavior of a nonautonomous eco-epidemic model with disease in the prey, *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 35 (2011), 457-470.
- [21] Yang Lu, Xia Wang, Shengqiang Liu, A non-autonomous predator-prey model with infected prey, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. B* 23 (2018), 3817-3836.

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`