

Population heterogeneity in vaccine coverage impacts epidemic thresholds and bifurcation dynamics

Alina Glaubitz* and Feng Fu*†

Abstract. Population heterogeneity, especially in individuals' contact networks, plays an important role in transmission dynamics of infectious diseases. For vaccine-preventable diseases, outstanding issues like vaccine hesitancy and availability of vaccines further lead to nonuniform coverage among groups, not to mention the efficacy of vaccines and the mixing pattern varying from one group to another. As the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic transitions to endemicity, it is of interest and significance to understand the impact of aforementioned population heterogeneity on the emergence and persistence of epidemics. Here we analyze epidemic thresholds and characterize bifurcation dynamics by accounting for heterogeneity caused by group-dependent characteristics, including vaccination rate and efficacy as well as disease transmissibility. Our analysis shows that increases in the difference in vaccination coverage among groups can render multiple equilibria of disease burden to exist even if the overall basic reproductive ratio is below one (also known as backward bifurcation). The presence of other heterogeneity factors such as differences in vaccine efficacy, transmission, mixing pattern, and group size can each exhibit subtle impacts on bifurcation. We find that heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy can undermine the condition for backward bifurcations whereas homophily tends to aggravate disease endemicity. Our results have practical implications for improving public health efforts by addressing the role of population heterogeneity in the spread and control of diseases.

Key words. Public health, infectious disease dynamics, bistability, epidemic control

1. Introduction. Resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases, especially the surprising comeback of measles, highlights the importance of addressing pockets of unvaccinated groups or communities with low vaccination rates in order to improve disease control efforts [1]. While the phrase “the pandemics of unvaccinated” has been dominating the civil discourse of the current COVID-19 mass vaccination campaign [2], it is imperative for public health stakeholders to understand the impact of population heterogeneity in various forms on the spread and control of diseases. Doing so will be key to the success of one health initiative given the increasingly connected nature of both local and global populations [3].

Concerning the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic [4] as well as other epidemics [5, 6, 7], prior studies have considered heterogeneity in various aspects, including individuals' network of contacts [8] and vaccine uptake [9]. Furthermore, different vaccines appear to have different efficacies [10] and even for people taking the same vaccine, different levels of anti-bodies after vaccination suggest heterogeneity in vaccine efficacies between individuals and in particular between different age groups [11, 12, 13].

In the context of nonmedical exemptions to school immunization requirements, mask-wearing behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic as well as other COVID-19 measures [14, 15, 16], it appears that homophily, i. e. the tendency for people to seek out or be attracted to those who are similar and share similar opinions [17, 18], drives social interactions within

*Department of Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA (alina.glaubitz.gr@dartmouth.edu, feng.fu@dartmouth.edu)

†Department of Biomedical Data Science, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Lebanon, NH 03756, USA

and between groups and thus influences the spread of infectious diseases [19, 20, 21, 22, 15].

Ever since [23] first introduced the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model, compartmental models of this kind have been used as a quantitative means to understand the spread of infectious diseases in populations. One defining characteristic of these models is the basic reproductive ratio (R_0) [24]. R_0 is an epidemic threshold parameter that determines whether one index case or a few initial infected individuals can seed the affected population and cause a disease outbreak. In particular, R_0 measures how many secondary infections arise as the result of the introduction of one infectious individual in a totally susceptible population. Relating this parameter R_0 to common epidemic models that have a constant influx of susceptibles, for $R_0 < 1$ there exists one stable disease-free equilibrium. For $R_0 = 1$ a bifurcation occurs and for $R_0 > 1$ there exists the unstable disease-free equilibrium as well as a globally stable endemic equilibrium [25, 26]. This epidemic threshold means not only that an outbreak occurs and the disease becomes endemic when $R_0 > 1$, but also that to eradicate an endemic disease from a population, we need $R_0 < 1$. This dynamical behavior is called forward bifurcation.

One assumption made in commonly used SIR models is that the population is homogeneous (i.e., well-mixing). However, as discussed before, this is not necessarily the case for real-world scenarios. When heterogeneity is introduced in compartmental models, R_0 becomes a weighted average of the spreading capacities across different groups in the population. As a consequence, this can change the predictive character of R_0 . While the effective $R_0 > 1$ can still tell us whether the disease can invade and cause an outbreak, it may be insufficient for the condition $R_0 < 1$ to eradicate an endemic disease from the population. This phenomenon is called backward bifurcation, in which one stable and one unstable endemic equilibrium co-exist for $R_0 < 1$. A variety of mechanisms have been found that introduce backward bifurcation since its first discovery. They include imperfect vaccines and education about prevention over limited treatment availability, non-linear incidence rate, non-constant contact rates, partial protection against reinfection, and varying transmission rates to imperfect lockdowns [45, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 46, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44]. Backward bifurcation has also been found in models for HIV/Aids, Malaria, combination models for HIV/Aids and Malaria, H1N1, Dengue, tuberculosis, and COVID-19 [43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 35, 34, 50].

Built on these prior results, our present study aims to understand the combined effect that population heterogeneity and homophily have on the spread and control of infectious diseases. In particular, we consider imperfect vaccines using a SIRV model that has multiple groups. We introduce and also vary the level of, heterogeneity between groups and homophily within groups. Similar to the one-group scenario discussed by [51], we show that imperfect vaccination is responsible for causing backward bifurcations (by finding endemic equilibria). Importantly, we find that population heterogeneity in the vaccine coverage can greatly induce backward bifurcations, i. e. it can cause the emergence of endemic equilibria for $R_0 < 1$ under a wide range of model parameters. Further subtleties in heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility can further impact conditions for backward bifurcations. Moreover, we show how homophily increases the basic reproductive ratio and can cause the emergence of endemic equilibria in a population that is not well-mixing.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section (2) introduces the specific SIRV model that we are studying by accounting for group-dependent heterogeneity of our concern. Section (3) presents our analytical findings. In Subsection (3.1) we derive and obtain the

equilibria of the model as the roots of a polynomial of degree 4, and in Subsection (3.2) we discuss how heterogeneity in vaccination rate, transmission rate, and vaccine efficacy influence the model's epidemic thresholds and bifurcation dynamics. Then, in Subsection (3.3) we present numerical results regarding the effect of homophily. Finally, in Section (4) we discuss our results and the potential implications of our findings.

2. Model. Without loss of generality, we use a compartmental model where the population is divided into two groups $\{1, 2\}$ with relative sizes P_1 and P_2 respectively such that $P_1 + P_2 = 1$. Extending this model to multiple (more than two) groups is straightforward, and we confirm qualitatively similar results. Within each group, we assume well-mixing. Each individual is either susceptible and unvaccinated (S), vaccinated (V), infected (I), or removed (R). The transmission rate is $\beta_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$ for (unvaccinated) susceptible individuals in encounters with infected, while vaccinated from group i get infected with rate $\beta_i(1 - \varepsilon_i), j \in \{1, 2\}$. Infected are removed after being infected for time $1/\gamma$. After time $1/\nu$, people from the removed compartment become susceptible again. After time $1/\psi$, people lose their partial immunity gained through vaccination and move from the vaccinated to the susceptible compartment. Further, people in the vaccinated compartment get vaccinated with rate $\phi_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$. In particular, we introduce heterogeneity between the two groups in the following ways:

- (i) Vaccination rates $\phi_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$. People get vaccinated faster in one group than in the other (leading to higher coverage in equilibrium).
- (ii) Vaccine efficacies $\varepsilon_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$. The vaccine has different efficacies in each of the groups.
- (iii) Susceptibility rates $\beta_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$. Individuals from group i are infected with the disease with rate β_i when unvaccinated, while they are infected with rate $\beta_i(1 - \varepsilon_i)$ when vaccinated.

The mixing pattern for contact rates within each population group is given by $C_{1,1} = C_{2,2}$ and between the groups by $P_2C_{1,2} = P_1C_{2,1}$, where $C_{1,1} \geq C_{2,1}$. Accordingly, the infectious disease dynamics are given by

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{S}_i &= \mu P_i + \nu R_i - S_i \beta_i (C_{i,1} I_1 + C_{i,2} I_2) - (\phi_i + \mu) S_i + \psi V_i \\ \dot{V}_i &= -V_i (1 - \varepsilon_i) \beta_i (C_{i,1} I_1 + C_{i,2} I_2) + \phi_i S_i - (\psi + \mu) V_i \\ \dot{I}_i &= (S_i + (1 - \varepsilon_i) V_i) \beta_i (C_{i,1} I_1 + C_{i,2} I_2) - (\gamma + \mu) I_i \\ \dot{R}_i &= \gamma I_i - (\nu + \mu) R_i \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$ with initial condition $S_i(0) = S_i^0, V_i(0) = V_i^0, I_i(0) = I_i^0, R_i(0) = P_i - (S_i^0 + V_i^0 + I_i^0)$.

A schematic of this model is given in Figure 1.

In what follows, we show that the model above exhibits backward bifurcations under certain conditions and we are able to find an explicit formula for its equilibria for simpler cases. We find that heterogeneity and homophily can cause a qualitative change in the model's dynamical behavior. In particular, heterogeneity in vaccine coverage can cause backward bifurcations when a corresponding homogeneous population does not exhibit backward bifurcations at all.

Heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility can also impact the conditions for




Figure 1: Schematic of the model. Here, we consider two groups to account for heterogeneity between the groups in the vaccine coverage, the vaccine efficacy, and the susceptibility to infection.

backward bifurcations, and in the presence of vaccine coverage heterogeneity, subtleties of heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility can further change these conditions. Moreover, homophily increases the basic reproductive ratio R_0 and can cause a disease to become endemic.

We detail our analysis and present comparative results regarding these findings as below.

3. Results.

3.1. Conditions for backward bifurcation. We computationally analyze the bifurcation dynamics of the full model with respect to varying model parameters and investigate their impact on the conditions for backward bifurcation. To obtain analytical intuitions, here we make a simplifying assumption: the population has two groups of equal size and is fully well-mixing, i. e. $C_{i,j} = 1$ for $i, j = 1, 2$, which serves as a base case for comparisons with our general results.

We compute the basic reproductive ratio in this scenario via the next-generation method as described by [24]. Following the notation of this paper, we define the rate with which new infections arise in each compartment $F_j, j \in \{1, 2\}$, and the rate with which infections are transferred between compartments as $V_j, j \in \{1, 2\}$. Further, we define

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial I_j} \end{bmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial I_j} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the basic reproductive ratio is given by

$$R_0 = \max \lambda(FV^{-1}) = \text{largest eigenvalue of } FV^{-1}.$$

In particular, we obtain

$$R_0 = \frac{1}{\gamma + \mu} \left(\beta_1 P_1 \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \varepsilon_1)\phi_1}{\psi + \mu + \phi_1} + \beta_2 P_2 \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \varepsilon_2)\phi_2}{\psi + \mu + \phi_2} \right).$$

The equilibria are given by the solutions of

$$(3.1) \quad \dot{S}_i = \dot{V}_i = \dot{I}_i = \dot{R}_i = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The disease-free equilibrium (DFE)

$$(3.2) \quad (S_1^{\text{DFE}}, V_1^{\text{DFE}}, 0, 0, S_2^{\text{DFE}}, V_2^{\text{DFE}}, 0, 0),$$

where

$$S_i^{\text{DFE}} = \frac{\psi + \mu}{\psi + \phi_i + \mu} P_i, \quad V_i^{\text{DFE}} = \frac{\phi_i}{\psi + \phi_i + \mu} P_i,$$

exists for any parameters $\psi, \phi_1, \phi_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$. Moreover, we might get an endemic equilibrium for $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)/2 > \gamma + \mu$, which means that in a population without vaccination the disease becomes endemic. We find a solution for these equilibria by solving (3.1) for $I = I_1 + I_2$. In the equilibrium, $(\nu + \mu)R_i = \gamma I_i$ as well as $V_i = P_i - S_i - \left(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu}\right) I_i$. This then implies that

$$S_i = \frac{(P_i - (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu})I_i)((1 - \varepsilon_i)I + \psi + \mu)}{(1 - \varepsilon_i)I + \phi_i + \psi + \mu}.$$

Hence,

$$I_i = \frac{\beta_i(\varepsilon_i P_i(\beta_i(1 - \varepsilon_i)I + \psi + \mu) + (1 - \varepsilon_i)P_i(\phi_i + \beta_i(1 - \varepsilon_i)I + \psi + \mu))}{(\beta_i(1 - \varepsilon_i)I + \psi + \mu)(\gamma + \mu + (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu})\beta_i I) + \phi_i(\gamma + \mu + (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu})(1 - \varepsilon_i)\beta_i I)}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} I &= I_1 + I_2 \\ &= \frac{\beta_1(\varepsilon_1 P_1(\beta_1(1 - \varepsilon_1)I + \psi + \mu) + (1 - \varepsilon_1)P_1(\phi_1 + \beta_1(1 - \varepsilon_1)I + \psi + \mu))}{(\beta_1(1 - \varepsilon_1)I + \psi + \mu)(\gamma + \mu + (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu})\beta_1 I) + \phi_1(\gamma + \mu + (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu})(1 - \varepsilon_1)\beta_1 I)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_2(\varepsilon_2 P_2(\beta_2(1 - \varepsilon_2)I + \psi + \mu) + (1 - \varepsilon_2)P_2(\phi_2 + \beta_2(1 - \varepsilon_2)I + \psi + \mu))}{(\beta_2(1 - \varepsilon_2)I + \psi + \mu)(\gamma + \mu + (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu})\beta_2 I) + \phi_2(\gamma + \mu + (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\nu + \mu})(1 - \varepsilon_2)\beta_2 I)}. \end{aligned}$$

This equation only depends on one variable: I , and its solutions are given by $I = 0$ as well as the roots of the polynomial $P(I)$

$$(3.3) \quad 0 = P(I) = aI^4 + bI^3 + cI^2 + dI + e,$$

where a, b, c, d, e depend on the parameters of the model. [52] provides us with exact solutions for the force of infection I and we can then solve for I_1 and I_2 . Note here that our approach can be used to find the equilibria in a model with any number of groups as the roots of a polynomial of degree that is twice the number of groups.

Since (3.3) is a polynomial of degree 4, it has four roots that are either real or complex. We note that this might lead to up to four solutions. However, we could only find up to two reasonable solutions. For small $R_0 \ll 1$, the roots are all complex, and the discriminant

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = & 256a^3e^3 - 192a^2bde^2 - 128a^2c^2e^2 + 144a^2cd^2e - 27a^2d^4 + 144ab^2ce^2 \\ & - 6ab^2d^2e - 80abc^2de + 18abcd^3 + 16ac^4e4ac^3d^2 - 27b^4e^2 + 18b^3cde \\ & - 4b^3d^3 - 4b^2c^3e + b^2c^2d^2 \end{aligned}$$

is positive, and we have two complex conjugate solutions. As R_0 increases, a bifurcation occurs, at the point where the discriminant is zero, and one complex conjugate root becomes a double real root. This real root might either be positive or negative. If it is negative, we see the classical forward bifurcation. In this case, $R_0 < 1$ implies no endemic equilibrium, $R_0 > 1$ means that there is one endemic equilibrium. However, if the double root is positive, we can instead observe a backward bifurcation. Then, we have two endemic equilibria for $R_{BB} < R_0 < 1$ for some $1 > R_{BB} > 0$ where R_{BB} is the lower critical threshold of basic reproductive ratio above which the system exhibits backward bifurcation. The larger one of these two roots is stable while the smaller one is unstable. This behavior is similar to the one-group scenario as described by [51]. An illustration of bifurcation dynamics can be found in Figure 2. Moreover, this behavior is similar to the two-group SIS model from [30] where the stability properties of the model have been investigated and the existence of an even number of equilibria was proven.

3.2. Population heterogeneity and backward bifurcation. Let us turn to understand the effect of population heterogeneity on the proportion of infected people at equilibrium. Depending on the type of, as well as the level of, population heterogeneity, we observe different behaviors. Most interestingly, heterogeneity in vaccine coverage (differences in vaccine uptake rates) can cause the emergence of endemic equilibria (see Figure 3). Here, we see that for increasing values of heterogeneity δ_ϕ (defined as the absolute difference between the two groups) two endemic equilibria emerge, while no endemic equilibria exist in a homogeneous population.

Further, in this model, heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility can impact the conditions for backward bifurcations. A demonstration of their impacts can be found in Figure 4. Here, we see that on their own, both heterogeneity in susceptibility δ_β (transmission rate) and vaccine efficacy δ_ϵ can prevent the existence of endemic equilibria.

However, if we introduce heterogeneity not only in vaccine efficacy or susceptibility but also in vaccine coverage simultaneously, subtleties in their exact compositions can drastically impact the model's behavior. We can see an illustration of their subtle impacts in Figure 5 and 6, respectively. In Figure 5, both parameters are elevated in the same group. Here, vaccine coverage heterogeneity alone destabilizes the system Figure 5(a). However, introducing further heterogeneity in susceptibility Figure 5 (b) and vaccine efficacy Figure 5 (c), stabilizes




Figure 2: Backward bifurcation in the presence of an imperfect vaccine and population heterogeneity in vaccine coverage. The Mathematica method Solve was used to solve the polynomial $P(I)$ in Eq. (3.3).




Figure 3: Heterogeneity in vaccine coverage causes backward bifurcations. (a) When the two groups have the same vaccination rate, no backward bifurcation occurs. (b), (c) As the groups become increasingly heterogeneous, we can see the emergence of backward bifurcations. Parameters here are $\gamma = 0.05, \psi = 0.002, \phi = 0.04, \nu = 1/30, \varepsilon = 0.725$ and β is varying.

the system. However, if we elevate one parameter in each group (Figure 6), heterogeneity in susceptibility destabilizes the system Figure 6(b), while heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy stabilizes the behavior Figure 6 (c).

We emphasize here that for these results, relative group size matters. An example of such group size effect can be seen in Figure 7. Here, we see that both stabilizing, as well as destabilizing effects, depend on the relative group size and the type of population heterogeneity. Figure 7 (a) shows only for intermediate relative group size can heterogeneity in vaccine




Figure 4: Heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility can impact the conditions for backward bifurcations. Parameters here are $\gamma = 0.05$, $\varepsilon = 0.85$, $\nu = 1/60$, $\psi = 0.001$, $\phi = 0.05$.




Figure 5: In the presence of vaccine coverage heterogeneity, subtleties of heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility can impact the conditions for backward bifurcations. Here, both parameters are elevated in one group. Parameters here are $\gamma = 0.05$, $\varepsilon = 0.85$, $\nu = 1/60$, $\psi = 0.001$, $\phi = 0.05$.

coverage induce a backward bifurcation. In contrast, Figure 7 (b) shows how heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy cannot cause forward bifurcations for intermediate relative group size.

3.3. Impact of homophily. Finally, we want to study the effect of homophily on equilibrium disease burden in our model. To this end, we resort to numerical simulations instead of analytical solutions.

We want to understand how the dynamical behavior of the model changes in the presence of homophily, that is, individuals prefer to interact with similar others. Thus we do not necessarily have $C_{i,i} = C_{i,j} = 1$ but rather $C_{i,i} > 1 > C_{i,j}$. For the sake of comparison and also to keep the effective R_0 constant, we assume that $C_{1,1} + C_{1,2} = C_{2,2} + C_{2,1} = 2$. It has been found by [53] as well as [54] that the presence of homophily can either decrease or increase the proportion of people that get infected in SIR models. In this work, we focus on how the occurrence of endemic equilibria depends on the level of homophily instead. We begin




Figure 6: In the presence of vaccine coverage heterogeneity, subtleties of heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility can impact the conditions for backward bifurcations. Here, only one parameter is elevated in each group. Parameters here are $\gamma = 0.05, \epsilon = 0.85, \nu = 1/60, \psi = 0.001, \phi = 0.05$.




Figure 7: Relative group size matters. The stabilizing and destabilizing effects of vaccine coverage and vaccine efficacy heterogeneity are critically dependent on the composition of the two groups. Parameters are (a) $\beta = 0.5, \gamma = 0.05, \nu = 1/30, \psi = 1/(5 * 365), \phi_1 = 0.1, \phi_2 = 0.2, \epsilon = 0.9$, (b) $\beta = 0.6, \gamma = 0.05, \nu = 1/30, \psi = 1/(5 * 365), \phi = 0.15, \epsilon_1 = 0.65, \epsilon_2 = 0.95$, respectively (c) $\beta_1 = 0.4, \beta_2 = 0.6, \gamma = 0.05, \nu = 1/30, \psi = 1/(5 * 365), \phi = 0.15, \epsilon = 0.9$.

by looking at the basic reproductive ratio R_0 , which here is given by

$$R_0 = \frac{1}{2(\gamma + \mu)} C_{1,1} \left(\beta_1 P_1 \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \epsilon_1)\phi_1}{\psi + \mu + \phi_1} + \beta_2 P_2 \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \epsilon_2)\phi_2}{\psi + \mu + \phi_2} + \left(\left(\beta_1 P_1 \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \epsilon_1)\phi_1}{\psi + \mu + \phi_1} + \beta_2 P_2 \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \epsilon_2)\phi_2}{\psi + \mu + \phi_2} \right)^2 - 4\beta_1\beta_2 P_1 P_2 \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \epsilon_1)\phi_1}{\psi + \mu + \phi_1} \frac{\psi + \mu + (1 - \epsilon_2)\phi_2}{\psi + \mu + \phi_2} \left(1 - \frac{C_{1,2}^2}{C_{1,1}^2} \right) \right)^{1/2} \right).$$




Figure 8: Homophily in heterogeneous populations can cause the emergence of endemic equilibria. We observe a backward bifurcation when increasing homophily in the presence of heterogeneity in vaccine coverage in (a) as compared to a forward bifurcation in the presence of heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy in (b) and in transmission rate in (c). Parameters are Effect of (a) $\beta = 0.14, \gamma = 0.05, \varepsilon = 0.7, \nu = 1/30, \psi = 1/(5 * 365), \phi = 0.105, \delta_\phi = 0.095$, (b) $\beta = 0.18, \gamma = 0.1, \varepsilon = 0.55, \nu = 1/50, \psi = 1/100, \phi = 0.1, \delta_\varepsilon = 0.35$, and (c) $\beta = 0.125, \gamma = 0.05, \varepsilon = 0.65, \nu = 1/300, \psi = 1/300, \phi = 0.1, \delta_\beta = 0.05$. We use the Matlab method ode23, which is an implementation of the Bogacki-Shampine method—an explicit Runge–Kutta (2,3) pair, to get these results.

Hence, R_0 is increasing in $C_{1,1}$, i. e. contact within groups, and homophily might significantly impact whether a disease can spread within a population and become endemic. This can be intuitively explained as follows. Typically we have $R_0 > 1$ in one of the groups, while $R_0 < 1$ in the other group. Thus in the fully well-mixing scenario, the latter group prevents an outbreak from happening. As people interact more with people within their group, the disease can break out and persist within the group with larger R_0 , also affecting the group that has smaller R_0 because of their intergroup interactions.

This observation applies to all types of heterogeneity we investigated. For a fully well-mixing population, a small number of people that are infected do not lead to an outbreak, and the only equilibrium is the disease-free equilibrium. As people prefer to interact with people in the same group more, within group R_0 passes the threshold $R_0 = 1$ and the disease might become endemic. Note that we might observe both, a forward or backward bifurcation (see Figure 8). Interestingly, the chosen model parameters can cause a backward bifurcation in the corresponding well-mixed, homogeneous population. This backward bifurcation is preserved by the presence of heterogeneity in vaccine uptake (Figure 8a). However, heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy (Figure 8b) or transmission rate (Figure 8c) introduces a forward bifurcation instead.

4. Discussion & Conclusion. It has been shown that the presence of heterogeneity in a population of susceptibles, e. g. through vaccination can cause the emergence of backward bifurcations (see e. g. [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 46]). However, the effect by introducing further heterogeneity among groups on this backward bifurcation still has to be

understood fully. In this work, we examine the effect of additional heterogeneity on the spread and control of infectious disease dynamics by introducing groups with different vaccine coverage, vaccine efficacy, and susceptibility. We find an explicit formula for the equilibria of the simplified two-group SIRV model. Particularly, heterogeneity in vaccine coverage can greatly induce endemic equilibria and backward bifurcations. Heterogeneity in vaccine efficacy and susceptibility each can have additional subtle effects on this dynamical behavior.

Another common assumption in some prior models is well-mixing. This work stresses how substantially homophily can affect the dynamics of endemic diseases. When we relax the well-mixing assumption and assume that people prefer to interact with others from the same group, the resulting R_0 increases and might cause the disease to become endemic. [19, 20, 21, 22, 15] have found that people that are skeptical of vaccination appear to prefer interacting with each other. In this work, we find that homophily in groups with different vaccine coverage (through different vaccine uptake rates) can cause a disease to become endemic along with backward bifurcation in the presence of imperfect vaccines. On the other hand, the presence of homophily for groups with different vaccine efficacies or susceptibilities appears not to exhibit the backward bifurcation behavior for the same model parameters considered, while still causing the disease to become endemic. This result emphasizes that homophily is an important factor in models for causing disease endemicity that should be further investigated.

To summarize, we analyze the joint effect of population heterogeneity and homophily in an endemic disease model with two groups. Interestingly, heterogeneity in vaccine coverage can induce backward bifurcations, while the presence of homophily has a profound effect on the bifurcation dynamics and can also facilitate the emergence of endemic equilibria. As the world embraces COVID-19 as an endemic disease, mass vaccination remains a major intervention to manage the disease. However, vaccination coverage is hugely heterogeneous across nations and regions and even across local communities. In light of this, our modeling results emphasize the importance of population heterogeneity and homophily and will have practical implications in the spread and control of infectious diseases in the post-pandemic era.

Competing interests. We have no competing interests to declare.

Acknowledgement. F.F. is grateful for support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (award no. OPP1217336), the NIH COBRE Program (grant no.1P20GM130454), the Neukom CompX Faculty Grant, the Dartmouth Faculty Startup Fund, and the Walter & Constance Burke Research Initiation Award.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bloom, Barry R and Marcuse, Edgar and Mnookin, Seth. Addressing vaccine hesitancy. *Science*. Volume 344, 6182, 339–339, 2014.
- [2] Bor, Alexander and Jørgensen, Frederik and Petersen, Michael Bang. Discriminatory Attitudes Against the Unvaccinated During a Global Pandemic. *Nature*. 1–3, 2022.
- [3] Rubin, Carol and Myers, Tanya and Stokes, William and Dunham, Bernadette and Harris, Stic and Lautner, Beth and Anelli, Joseph. Review of institute of medicine and national research council recommendations for one health initiative. *Emerging infectious diseases*. Volume 19, 12, 1913, 2013.
- [4] Vespignani, Alessandro and Tian, Huaiyu and Dye, Christopher et al. Modelling covid-19. *Nature Reviews Physics*. Volume 2, Number 6, 279–281, 2020.

- [5] Royce, Katherine and Fu, Feng. Mathematically modeling spillovers of an emerging infectious zoonosis with an intermediate host. *PloS one*. 2020; 15(8):e0237780.
- [6] Glaubitz, Alina and Fu, Feng. Oscillatory dynamics in the dilemma of social distancing. *Proceedings of the royal society A*. 2020; 476(2234):20200686.
- [7] Alexandra Teslya, Hendrik Nunner, Vincent Buskens, Mirjam E Kretzschmar, The effect of competition between health opinions on epidemic dynamics, *PNAS Nexus*, Volume 1, Issue 5, November 2022, pgac260, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgac260>
- [8] May, Robert M and Lloyd, Alun L. Infection dynamics on scale-free networks. *Physical Review E*, Volume 64, Issue 6, 066112, 2001.
- [9] Wang, Zhen and Bauch, Chris T and Bhattacharyya, Samit and d’Onofrio, Alberto and Manfredi, Piero and Perc, Matjaž and Perra, Nicola and Salathé, Marcel and Zhao, Dawei. Statistical physics of vaccination. *Physics Reports*. 2016; 664:1–113.
- [10] <https://www.healthdata.org/covid/covid-19-vaccine-efficacy-summary>, accessed on 02/16/2022
- [11] Antia A, Ahmed H, Handel A, Carlson NE, Amanna IJ, Antia R, Slifka M. Heterogeneity and longevity of antibody memory to viruses and vaccines. *PLoS Biol*. 2018 Aug 10;16(8):e2006601. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2006601. PMID: 30096134; PMCID: PMC6105026.
- [12] Collier, D.A., Ferreira, I.A.T.M., Kotagiri, P. et al. Age-related immune response heterogeneity to SARS-CoV-2 vaccine BNT162b2. *Nature* 596, 417–422 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03739-1>
- [13] Chen, Xingru and Fu, Feng. Imperfect vaccine and hysteresis. *Proceedings of the royal society B*. 2019; 286(1894):20182406.
- [14] Kadelka, Claus and McCombs, Audrey. Effect of homophily and correlation of beliefs on COVID-19 and general infectious disease outbreaks. *PLOS ONE*. 2021. 16:1–20. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0260973
- [15] John W Glasser and Zhilan Feng and Saad B Omer and Philip J Smith and Lance E Rodewald. The effect of heterogeneity in uptake of the measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine on the potential for outbreaks of measles: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2016; 16(5):599–605. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(16\)00004-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(16)00004-9).
- [16] Fefferman, Nina H. and Silk, Matthew J. and Pasquale, Dana K. and Moody, James. Homophily in risk and behavior complicate understanding the COVID-19 epidemic curve. 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.16.21253708. accessed at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/03/20/2021.03.16.21253708>.
- [17] McPherson, Miller and Smith-Lovin, Lynn and Cook, James M. Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual review of sociology*. 2001; 415–444.
- [18] Fu, Feng and Nowak, Martin A and Christakis, Nicholas A and Fowler, James H. The evolution of homophily. *Scientific reports*. 2012; 2(1):1–6.
- [19] Salathé, Marcel and Bonhoeffer, Sebastian. The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*. 2008; 5(29):1505–1508.
- [20] May T, Silverman RD. ‘Clustering of exemptions’ as a collective action threat to herd immunity. *Vaccine*. 2003;21(11-12):1048–1051. pmid:12559778
- [21] Omer SB, Enger KS, Moulton LH, Halsey NA, Stokley S, Salmon DA. Geographic clustering of nonmedical exemptions to school immunization requirements and associations with geographic clustering of pertussis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2008;168(12):1389–1396. pmid:18922998
- [22] <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view>, accessed on 09/10/2021, at 10:15 am.
- [23] Kermack William Ogilvy and McKendrick A. G. 1927 A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*115700–721.
- [24] Heffernan J.M, Smith R.J and Wahl L.M. 2005 Perspectives on the basic reproductive ratio. *J. R. Soc. Interface* 2, 281–293.
- [25] Hethcote, Herbert W. The Mathematics of Infectious Diseases. *SIAM Review*. 2000; 42(4):599–653. doi: 10.1137/S0036144500371907.
- [26] Li, Michael Y. and Hal Smith and Liancheng Wang. Global dynamics of an seir epidemic model with vertical transmission. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*. 2001; 62,58–69. doi: 10.1137/s0036139999359860.
- [27] K.P. Hadeler and C. Castillo-Chavez. A core group model for disease transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 1995; 128(1):41–55. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564\(94\)00066-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564(94)00066-9).
- [28] K.P. Hadeler and P. Van den Driessche. Backward bifurcation in epidemic control. *Mathematical Bio-*

- sciences. 1997; 146(1):15-35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564\(97\)00027-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564(97)00027-8).
- [29] Fred Brauer. Backward bifurcations in simple vaccination models. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*. 2004; 298(2):418-431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2004.05.045>.
- [30] Christopher M. Kribs-Zaleta and Jorge X. Velasco-Hernández. A simple vaccination model with multiple endemic states. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 2000; 164(2):183-201. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564\(00\)00003-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564(00)00003-1).
- [31] Jing Hui and Deming Zhu. Global stability and periodicity on SIS epidemic models with backward bifurcation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*. 2005; 50(8):1271-1290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2005.06.003>.
- [32] Christopher M. Kribs-Zaleta and Maia Martcheva. Vaccination strategies and backward bifurcation in an age-since-infection structured model. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 2002; 177-178:317-332. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564\(01\)00099-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564(01)00099-2).
- [33] K. Nudee and S. Chinviriyasit and W. Chinviriyasit. The effect of backward bifurcation in controlling measles transmission by vaccination. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*. 2019; 123:400-412. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2019.04.026>.
- [34] S.M. Garba and A.B. Gumel and M.R. Abu Bakar. Backward bifurcations in dengue transmission dynamics. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 2008; 215(1):11-25. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2008.05.002>
- [35] Sharomi O, Podder CN, Gumel AB, Mahmud SM, Rubinstein E. Modelling the transmission dynamics and control of the novel 2009 swine influenza (H1N1) pandemic. *Bull Math Biol*. 2011 Mar;73(3):515-48. doi: 10.1007/s11538-010-9538-z. Epub 2010 Apr 9. PMID: 20379852.
- [36] P. van den Driessche and James Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 2002; 180(1):29-48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564\(02\)00108-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564(02)00108-6).
- [37] Xu Zhang and Xianning Liu. Backward bifurcation of an epidemic model with saturated treatment function. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*. 2008; 348(1):433-443. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2008.07.042>.
- [38] Wendi Wang. Backward bifurcation of an epidemic model with treatment. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 2006; 201(1):58-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2005.12.022>.
- [39] Buonomo, B., Lacitignola, D. On the dynamics of an SEIR epidemic model with a convex incidence rate. *Ricerche mat.* 57, 261–281 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11587-008-0039-4>
- [40] Buonomo B. and Lacitignola D. (2011) “On the backward bifurcation of a vaccination model with nonlinear incidence”, *Nonlinear Analysis: Modelling and Control*, 16(1), pp. 30-46. doi: 10.15388/NA.16.1.14113
- [41] van den Driessche, P., Watmough, J. A simple SIS epidemic model with a backward bifurcation. *J Math Biol* 40, 525–540 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002850000032>
- [42] Greenhalgh, David and Diekmann, Odo & De Jong, Mart. (2000). Subcritical endemic steady states in mathematical models for animal infections with incomplete immunity. *Mathematical biosciences*. 165. 1-25. 10.1016/S0025-5564(00)00012-2.
- [43] Z. Feng, C. Castillo-Chavez, F. Capurro A model for tuberculosis with exogenous reinfection. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, 57 (2000), pp. 235-247
- [44] C. Castillo-Chavez and K. Cooke and W. Huang and S.A. Levin. Results on the dynamics for models for the sexual transmission of the human immunodeficiency virus. *Applied Mathematics Letters*. 1989; 2(4):327-331. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0893-9659\(89\)90080-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0893-9659(89)90080-3).
- [45] Nadim SS, Chattopadhyay J. Occurrence of backward bifurcation and prediction of disease transmission with imperfect lockdown: A case study on COVID-19. *Chaos Solitons Fractals*. 2020;140:110163. doi:10.1016/j.chaos.2020.110163
- [46] A.B. Gumel. Causes of backward bifurcations in some epidemiological models. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*. 2012; 395(1):355-365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2012.04.077>.
- [47] Huang, WenZhang and Cooke, Kenneth L. and Castillo-Chavez, Carlos. Stability and Bifurcation for a Multiple-Group Model for the Dynamics of HIV/AIDS Transmission. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*. 1992; 52(3):835-854. doi:10.1137/0152047.
- [48] Roop-O, Pariyaporn, Chinviriyasit, Wirawan and Chinviriyasit, Sttapat. (2015). The effect of incidence function in backward bifurcation for malaria model with temporary immunity. *Mathematical biosciences*. 265. 10.1016/j.mbs.2015.04.008.

-
- [49] Mukandavire Z, Gumel AB, Garira W, Tchuenche JM. Mathematical analysis of a model for HIV-malaria co-infection. *Math Biosci Eng.* 2009 Apr;6(2):333-62. doi: 10.3934/mbe.2009.6.333. PMID: 19364156.
 - [50] Asatryan, Ani and Wodarz, Dominik and Komarova, Natalia L. New virus dynamics in the presence of multiple infection. *Journal of Theoretical Biology.* Volume 377, 98–109, 2015.
 - [51] Arino J., Connell McCluskey C., and van den Driessche P. 2003 Global Results for an Epidemic Model with Vaccination That Exhibits Backward Bifurcation. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **64**, 260–76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4096039>.
 - [52] Auckly, D. 2003 Solving the Quartic with a Pencil. *The American Mathematical Monthly* **114** 10.1080/00029890.2007.11920389.
 - [53] Burgio, Giulio et al. “Homophily impacts the success of vaccine roll-outs.” (2021).
 - [54] Takayuki Hiraoka, Abbas K. Rizi, Mikko Kivelä, Jari Saramäki. Herd Immunity and Epidemic Size in Networks with Vaccination Homophily. 2021.