

Steady-state analysis of networked epidemic models

Sei Zhen Khong^a, Lanlan Su^b

^a*Independent researcher*

^b*Department of Automatic Control and Systems Engineering, University of Sheffield.*

Abstract

Compartmental epidemic models with dynamics that evolve over a graph network have gained considerable importance in recent years but analysis of these models is in general difficult due to their complexity. In this paper, we develop two positive feedback frameworks that are applicable to the study of steady-state values in a wide range of compartmental epidemic models, including both group and networked processes. In the case of a group (resp. networked) model, we show that the convergence limit of the susceptible proportion of the population (resp. the susceptible proportion in at least one of the subgroups) is upper bounded by the reciprocal of the basic reproduction number (BRN) of the model. The BRN, when it is greater than unity, thus demonstrates the level of penetration into a subpopulation by the disease. Both non-strict and strict bounds on the convergence limits are derived and shown to correspond to substantially distinct scenarios in the epidemic processes, one in the presence of the endemic state and another without. Formulae for calculating the limits are provided in the latter case. We apply the developed framework to examining various group and networked epidemic models commonly seen in the literature to verify the validity of our conclusions.

Key words: Positive systems, epidemic models, convergence limits, nonlinear feedback systems

1 Introduction

Compartmental models are often applied to the study of infectious diseases in epidemiology and have enjoyed various successes [21, 22, 24, 36]. These models may be used to predict and analyse the spread of the diseases and potentially form the foundation on which public health interventional control strategies are based. Epidemic models are inherently nonlinear systems, and can be significantly complex to analyse especially if they are intended to capture more than a few compartmental features over directed networks of interacting groups or agents. Detailed stability analysis of compartmental models in epidemiology is often restricted to the study of two or three compartments using mathematical tools such as fixed-point theorems, Lyapunov methods, and differential geometry [12, 18, 20, 34].

Numerous uses of the theory of positive systems in the study of epidemic models have been reported in the literature. Some of them are targeted at a particular type of model, such as the networked susceptible-infected-susceptible (SIS) models in [9, 15], the group SIDARTHE models in [11], and a networked SAIR model in [30]. Others, including [33], are applicable to general epidemic

models. In particular, a precise definition of the basic reproduction number (BRN) is presented in [33] for a general compartmental disease transmission model, and its graphical interpretation and computation are provided in [7, 29].

This paper develops two positive feedback system frameworks for the steady-state analysis of a broad range of group (i.e. homogeneous mixing) and networked (i.e. heterogeneous mixing) epidemic models. Importantly, we show that the BRN quantifies the ‘level’ of penetration of the disease into at least one subgroup of the population. To be specific, we consider two considerably distinct scenarios in epidemiology. The first predicates on the convergence of the susceptible population to the same limit for (almost) all initial conditions, and involves marginally stable closed-loop dynamics that approximate the steady-state behaviour in the epidemic models, whereby the existence of the endemic state is covered. This is applicable, for instance, to susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) models with vital birth and death dynamics. The main result is a non-strict bound on the steady-state value of the susceptible proportion of the population in a subgroup in the network in terms of the reciprocal of the BRN. We note that in this paper we do not establish convergence in complicated epidemic models with unique endemic equilibria — this is an ongoing investigation in the literature. Instead, for these mod-

Email addresses: szkhongwork@gmail.com (Sei Zhen Khong), lanlan.su@sheffield.ac.uk (Lanlan Su).

els we assume convergence, and provide bounds on the steady-state values of certain subpopulations in terms of the BRNs.

The second positive feedback system framework we develop allows for convergence to a limit that varies with the initial conditions, and involves exponentially stable closed-loop dynamics for which there is no endemic state, as in the case of SIR processes without vital dynamics. The main results are a strict bound on the steady-state value of the susceptible proportion of the population in a subgroup and formulae for computing the steady-state values of certain compartments in the epidemic models.

The results in this paper are derived based on positive systems theory [1, 32]. The recent decade has seen many developments of positive systems theory. They include robust and scalable control of positive systems [3, 6, 13, 16, 17, 27], the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma [26, 31], as well as optimal control of positive systems [4, 5, 8]. The rich theory on positive systems has made compartmental models in epidemiology, which are intrinsically positive systems in that all variables stay positively invariant over time, amenable to analysis and control via positive systems methods.

The paper has the following structure. First, the notation used throughout the paper is defined in the next section, alongside with the provision of important preliminary results. The problem to be investigated is formulated in Section 3 and the main results on the convergence limit bounds in positive feedback systems are derived in Section 4. The latter are then applied to analysing group epidemic models in Section 5 and networked models in Section 6. These sections are furnished with several numerical examples that serve to affirm the validity of our main results. We note here that the developed frameworks are applicable to the study of other, possibly more complicated, epidemic models, but we have only included a few of the commonly encountered ones in these sections for illustration purposes. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Section 7.

2 Notation and preliminaries

2.1 Matrix theory

Denote by $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+, j\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}_+, \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-,$ and $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ the reals, the nonnegative reals, the imaginary axis, the complex plane, the open right-half complex plane, the closed left-half complex plane, and the closed right-half complex plane, respectively. Let $|\cdot|$ denote the Euclidean norm. The real part and imaginary part of $s \in \mathbb{C}$ are denoted by $\text{Re}(s)$ and $\text{Im}(s)$, respectively. The (i, j) th element of a matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is denoted by m_{ij} , and we write $M = [m_{ij}]$. Given an $M \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$), $M^* \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ (resp. $M^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$) denotes its complex conjugate transpose (resp. transpose). When $m = n$, denote by $\lambda(M)$ and $\rho(M)$ the spectrum and

spectral radius of M , respectively. Denote by $\lambda_i(M)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ the eigenvalues of M . Given a vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\text{diag}(v) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ denotes the diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are v_1, \dots, v_n . I_n denotes the identity matrix of dimensions $n \times n$, and $\mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the column vector of all ones.

Given matrices $M, N \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we write $M \geq N$ if $m_{ij} \geq n_{ij}$ for all i and j , $M > N$ if $M \geq N$ and $M \neq N$, and $M \gg N$ if $m_{ij} > n_{ij}$ for all i and j . M is called a nonnegative matrix if $M \geq 0$, and positive if $M \gg 0$. Given $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $v \gg 0$ and $w \gg 0$, let $\frac{v}{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote $(\frac{v}{w})_i = \frac{v_i}{w_i}$ and $\log(v) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $\log(v)_i = \log v_i$. A square $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be Metzler if $m_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, i.e. all its off-diagonal elements are nonnegative. M is said to be Hurwitz if every eigenvalue of M has strictly negative real part, i.e. $\text{Re}(\lambda_i(M)) < 0$ for every $\lambda_i(M) \in \lambda(M)$.

An $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be *irreducible* if there exists no permutation matrix P such that $PMP^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} E & F \\ 0 & G \end{bmatrix}$, where E and G are nontrivial square matrices, i.e. they are of dimensions greater than 0. The following result from [1, Corollary 2.1.5] is important for subsequent developments.

Lemma 1 (i) If $0 \leq M \leq N$, then $\rho(M) \leq \rho(N)$;
(ii) If $0 \leq M < N$ and $M + N$ is irreducible, then $\rho(M) < \rho(N)$.

2.2 Graph theory

A directed graph, or digraph, is a pair $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, J\}$ is the set of nodes and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ is the set of edges such that $e_k = (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ if node i is connected to node j , i.e. node i is a neighbour of node j . A graph is undirected if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ then $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$. A (directed) path on \mathcal{G} is an ordered set of distinct vertices $\{n_0, n_1, \dots, n_N\}$ such that $(n_i, n_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$. A digraph is said to be *strongly connected* if there is a path in each direction between each pair of nodes of the graph. Given a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, one may associate with it a digraph \mathcal{G}_M — the graph has n nodes labeled $1, \dots, n$ and there is an edge connecting node i to node j if and only if $m_{ji} \neq 0$. Then M is irreducible if and only if its associated graph \mathcal{G}_M is strongly connected [1, Theorem 2.2.7].

2.3 Systems theory

Let \mathbf{R} denote the set of proper real-rational transfer functions and \mathbf{RH}_∞ its subset of elements having no poles in the closed right-half complex plane $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$. For a linear time-invariant (LTI) system G , we denote its transfer function representation by \hat{G} . For $\hat{G} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$, let $\|\hat{G}\|_\infty$ denote its \mathbf{H}_∞ norm, i.e., $\|\hat{G}\|_\infty = \sup_{\text{Re}(s) > 0} \bar{\sigma}(\hat{G}(s)) < \infty$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ denotes the largest singular value.

A nonlinear system described by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t), u(t)), & x(0) &= x_0 \\ y(t) &= h(x(t), u(t)),\end{aligned}$$

where $f(x, u)$ and $h(x, u)$ are locally Lipschitz in (x, u) , is said to be internally positive if $x(0) \geq 0$ and $u(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, then $x(t) \geq 0$ and $y(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. An example of an internally positive system is an LTI system G with state-space realisation

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), & x(0) &= x_0 \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + Du(t),\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is Metzler, $B \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}_+^{p \times n}$, and $D \in \mathbb{R}_+^{p \times m}$ are nonnegative matrices; see [10]. The pair (A, B) is said to be stabilisable if there exists F such that $A + BF$ is Hurwitz. On the other hand, the pair (C, A) is said to be detectable if there exists L such that $A + LC$ is Hurwitz; see [35, Chapter 3]. Obviously, when A is Hurwitz, (A, B, C) is stabilisable and detectable. In general, when (A, B, C) is stabilisable and detectable, $\hat{G}(s) := C(sI - A)^{-1}B + D \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$ if and only if A is Hurwitz. Likewise, the poles of \hat{G} lie in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ if and only if $\lambda(A) \subset \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.

The following important result will be used repeatedly in subsequent developments.

Lemma 2 *Consider an internally positive LTI system described by (1) with Hurwitz A and $D = 0$. Given $K \geq 0$, it holds that $(I - K\hat{G})^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$ if and only if $\rho(K\hat{G}(0)) < 1$.*

PROOF. Sufficiency follows from [32, Theorem 3(i)]. For necessity, note that $(I - KG)^{-1} = w \mapsto u$ may be described by the LTI state-space model

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= (A + BKC)x(t) + Bw(t) \\ u(t) &= KCx(t) + w(t),\end{aligned}$$

which is internally positive. Suppose to the contrary that $\rho(K\hat{G}(0)) \geq 1$. By [32, Theorem 3(ii) and (iii)], this then implies that $(I - K\hat{G})^{-1} \notin \mathbf{RH}_\infty$.

3 Problem formulation

Let the nonlinear system Δ be an internally positive system described by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{s}(t) &= f(s(t), v(t)), & s(0) &= s_0 \\ z(t) &= M_1 \text{diag}(s(t)) M_2 v(t),\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

where $f(s, v)$ is locally Lipschitz in (s, v) , $s(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$, $M_1 > 0$, and $M_2 > 0$. Next, denote by G an internally positive LTI system




Figure 1. The feedback system $[G, \Delta]$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), & x(0) &= x_0 \\ y(t) &= Cx(t),\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is Metzler and Hurwitz, $B > 0$ and $C > 0$ are nonzero nonnegative matrices. Consider the positive feedback interconnection of G and the internally positive system Δ in (2) in which

$$v = y, \quad u = z.\tag{4}$$

We write the resultant feedback system modeled by (2), (3), and (4) as $[G, \Delta]$, which is depicted in Figure 1. In real applications, one may not initialise the system at arbitrary initial conditions but only those that are of significance. Let \mathcal{S} denote the set of initial conditions $(s(0), x(0))$ of interest.

The objective of this paper is as follows. Suppose for all $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t)$ exists. Find the limit or an upper bound on the limit in the case where $s(t)$ is a scalar, and an upper bound on an entry of $s(t)$ otherwise. We achieve the objective above in the next section using mathematical tools from positive systems theory.

When applied to epidemic models, the $s(t)$ above is taken to denote the proportions of the populations in different groups that are susceptible to a contagious disease. An upper bound on an element in $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t)$ then indicates the level of penetration of the disease into the population in the corresponding group.

4 Positive feedback systems

4.1 Non-strict bound on equilibrium

First, a couple of assumptions are stated.

Assumption 3 *If $f(\bar{x}, \bar{u}) = 0$, then for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, it holds that $u \neq \bar{u}$ and $|u - \bar{u}| < \epsilon$ imply $f(\bar{x}, u) \neq 0$.*

Assumption 4 *If $(s, x) \in \mathcal{S}$, then for all $z > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that $(s, \tau z) \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Theorem 5 *Consider the feedback system $[G, \Delta]$ described by (2), (3), and (4). Suppose Assumptions 3 and 4 hold, $-M_2 C A^{-1} B M_1$ is irreducible, and for all initial conditions $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{S}$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t) = \bar{s}$. Then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ such that*

$$\bar{s}_i \leq \frac{1}{\rho(M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1)} = \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)}.$$

Moreover, if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = \bar{x} > 0$, then there exists i such that $\bar{s}_i < \frac{1}{\rho(M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1)}$ if and only if there exists $j \neq i$ such that $\bar{s}_j > \frac{1}{\rho(M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1)}$. In other words, if $n_s = 1$, then $\bar{s} = \frac{1}{\rho(M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1)}$.

PROOF. As $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t) = \bar{s}$, it must hold that $f(\bar{s}, v(t)) = f(\bar{s}, y(t)) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which implies by Assumption 3 that $y(t) \rightarrow \bar{y}$ for some \bar{y} , whereby $x(t) \rightarrow \bar{x}$ for some \bar{x} because (C, A) is detectable.

Since $s(t) \rightarrow \bar{s}$, it follows that for sufficiently large $T > 0$, by approximating Δ by the constant gain

$$\tilde{\Delta} = v \mapsto z : z(t) = M_1 \text{diag}(\bar{s}) M_2 v(t) =: K v(t)$$

for $t \geq T$, the closed-loop system $[G, \tilde{\Delta}]$ described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = (A + BKC)x(t) \quad (5)$$

is a close approximation of the dynamics in $[G, \Delta]$ for $t \geq T$. The fact that $x(t) \rightarrow \bar{x}$ then implies that $\lambda(A + BKC) \subset \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.

To see this, suppose $\lambda(A + BKC) \cap \mathbb{C}_+ \neq \emptyset$. Since $A + BKC$ is Metzler, we can write it as $A + BKC = M - bI$ for some $b > 0$ and $M \geq 0$. By the Krein-Rutman theorem for nonnegative matrices [1, Theorem 2.1.1], there then exists $z > 0$ such that $(A + BKC)z = (M - bI)z = \kappa z$ for some $\kappa > 0$. Since $(\bar{s}, \tau z) \in \mathcal{S}$ for some $\tau > 0$ by Assumption 4, setting $(s(0), x(0)) = (\bar{s}, \tau z) \in \mathcal{S}$ in (2), (3), and (4) then yields that $|x(t)| \rightarrow \infty$ in (5), leading to a contradiction to $x(t) \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Therefore, it must hold that

$$\lambda(A + BKC) \subset \bar{\mathbb{C}}_- \quad (6)$$

Notice that (6) implies $\lambda(A - \alpha I + BKC) \subset \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ for all $\alpha > 0$. Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= (A - \alpha I + BKC)x(t) + Bw(t) \\ u(t) &= KCx(t) + w(t), \end{aligned}$$

which describes the closed-loop system $(I - \tilde{\Delta}G_\alpha)^{-1} = w \mapsto u$, where $\hat{G}_\alpha(s) := C(sI - (A - \alpha I))^{-1}B$. Evidently, the LTI system above is internally positive. Since $A - \alpha I + BKC$ is Hurwitz, it follows that $(I - \tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}_\alpha(s))^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$. From Lemma 2, $(I - \tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}_\alpha(s))^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$ if and only if

$$\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}_\alpha(0)) < 1. \quad (7)$$

By continuity, as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, we have $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) \leq 1$, where $\hat{G}(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B$.

Recall from [1, Theorem 6.2.3] [27, Proposition 1] that the Metzler matrix A is Hurwitz if and only if $-A^{-1} \geq 0$. Thus, $-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1 \geq 0$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) &= \rho(-M_1 \text{diag}(\bar{s}) M_2 C A^{-1} B) \\ &= \rho(-\text{diag}(\bar{s}) M_2 C A^{-1} B M_1). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

If $\bar{s} = \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)} \mathbf{1}_{n_s}$, then clearly $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) = 1$. By hypothesis, $-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1 \geq 0$ is irreducible. Since $\text{diag}(\bar{s}) \geq 0$, it follows that $\text{diag}(\bar{s}) - M_2CA^{-1}BM_1$ is irreducible [1, Corollary 2.1.10(a)]. Therefore, by Lemma 1(ii), if $\bar{s} > \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)} \mathbf{1}_{n_s}$, then $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) > 1$. In other words, $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) \leq 1$ implies that there exists i such that

$$\bar{s}_i \leq \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)}. \quad (9)$$

This completes the proof for the first claim. For the second claim, note that $x(t) \rightarrow \bar{x} > 0$ in (5) implies that $0 \in \lambda(A + BKC)$. Since $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) \leq 1$ holds as shown above, $0 \in \lambda(A + BKC)$ only if $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) = 1$. To see this, observe that $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) < 1$ would imply that $(I - \tilde{\Delta}\hat{G})^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$ by Lemma 2, where $(I - \tilde{\Delta}\hat{G})^{-1}$ is the internally positive LTI system described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= (A + BKC)x(t) + Bw(t) \\ u(t) &= KCx(t) + w(t). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

This would in turn imply that $A + BKC$ is Hurwitz because $(A + BKC, B, KC)$ is stabilisable and detectable, which follows from the fact that A is Hurwitz. This leads to a contradiction.

By the same reasoning leading to $\bar{s} > \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)} \mathbf{1}_{n_s}$ implies $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) > 1$ above, it may be shown similarly that $\bar{s} < \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)} \mathbf{1}_{n_s}$ implies $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) < 1$. Therefore, since $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) = 1$, it holds that there exists i such that $\bar{s}_i < \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)}$ if and only if there exists $j \neq i$ such that $\bar{s}_j > \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)}$, as required.

The following result is of independent interest and significance. It shows that $\rho(\text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1) \leq 1$ in the proof of Theorem 5 is necessary and sufficient for the eigenvalues of the state matrix $A + BKC$ of the approximating LTI closed-loop system $(I - \tilde{\Delta}\hat{G})^{-1} = w \mapsto u$ described by (10) to lie in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.

Theorem 6 Suppose $-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1$ is irreducible. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1) \\ = \rho(-\text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2CA^{-1}BM_1) \leq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

if and only if $\lambda(A + BKC) \subset \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$, where $K := M_1 \text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2$. Furthermore, (11) holds with equality if and only if $\lambda(A + BKC) \subset \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ and $0 \in \lambda(A + BKC)$.

PROOF. We only show the first part of the theorem since the second part may be proven similarly. To be specific, sufficiency may be established as in the proof of Theorem 5, starting from (6) and leading to the conclusion in (7). To show necessity, note that by Lemma 2, $\rho(K\hat{G}(0)) \leq 1$ implies that $(I - \alpha K\hat{G})^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. It thus follows from continuity that the poles of $(I - K\hat{G})^{-1}$ lie in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. Recall that a state-space realisation of $(I - K\hat{G})^{-1}$ is given by (10). Because A is Hurwitz, $(A + BKC, B)$ is stabilisable and $(KC, A + BKC)$ is detectable. Altogether, this means $\lambda(A + BKC) \subset \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. Noting that (11) is equivalent to $\rho(K\hat{G}(0)) \leq 1$ then completes the proof.

4.2 Strict bound on equilibrium

The next result, Theorem 9, shows that if Assumption 7 is used in lieu of Assumption 3, and Assumption 4 is strengthened to Assumption 8 below, then the bound in Theorem 5 holds with \leq replaced by $<$ even when the irreducibility assumption is dropped and the steady-state value varies with initial conditions. It is applicable to general multi-input-multi-output (MIMO) systems and a generalisation of [11, Proposition 2], which was developed for a specific single-input-single-output (SISO) system called the SIDARTHE model.

Assumption 7 If $\bar{x} \neq 0$ and $f(\bar{x}, \bar{u}) = 0$, then $\bar{u} = 0$.

Assumption 8 If $(s, x) \in \mathcal{S}$, then for all $z > 0$, $(s, \tau z) \in \mathcal{S}$ for sufficiently small $\tau > 0$.

Theorem 9 Consider the feedback system $[G, \Delta]$ described by (2), (3), and (4). Suppose Assumptions 7 and 8 hold, and for all initial conditions $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{S}$, $\bar{s}(s(0), x(0)) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t)$ is well defined and continuous in $x(0)$. Then $x(t) \rightarrow 0$ and there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{s}_i(s(0), x(0)) &< \frac{1}{\rho(M_2 \hat{G}(0) M_1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2 C A^{-1} B M_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

PROOF. Given $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{S}$, since $\bar{s}(s(0), x(0))$ exists, it must hold that

$$f(\bar{s}(s(0), x(0)), v(t)) = f(\bar{s}(s(0), x(0)), y(t)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, if $\bar{s}(s(0), x(0)) > 0$, then this implies by Assumption 7 that $y(t) \rightarrow 0$. Since (C, A) is detectable, it follows that $x(t) \rightarrow 0$. For sufficiently large $T > 0$, by approximating Δ by the constant gain




Figure 2. The feedback system $[G, \tilde{\Delta}]$

$$\tilde{\Delta} = v \mapsto z : z(t) = M_1 \text{diag}(\bar{s}(s(0), x(0))) M_2 v(t) =: K v(t)$$

for $t \geq T$, the closed-loop system $[G, \tilde{\Delta}]$ described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = (A + BKC)x(t) \quad (13)$$

is a close approximation of the dynamics in $[G, \Delta]$ for $t \geq T$. Note that if $\bar{s}(s(0), x(0)) = 0$, then trivially $K = 0$ and $A + BKC = A$ is Hurwitz, in which case $x(t) \rightarrow 0$.

Thus, consider $\bar{s}(s(0), x(0)) > 0$. Since $A + BKC$ is Metzler, the fact that $x(t) \rightarrow 0$ then implies that $A + BKC$ is Hurwitz. To see this, suppose $\lambda(A + BKC) \cap \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+ \neq \emptyset$. Write $A + BKC = M - bI$ for some $b > 0$ and $M \geq 0$. By the Krein-Rutman theorem for nonnegative matrices [1, Theorem 2.1.1], there then exists $z > 0$ such that $(A + BKC)z = (M - bI)z = \kappa z$ for some $\kappa \geq 0$. By Assumption 8, $(\bar{s}, \tau z) \in \mathcal{S}$ for sufficiently small $\tau > 0$. Setting $(s(0), x(0)) = (\bar{s}, \tau z) \in \mathcal{S}$ in (2), (3), and (4) for a sufficiently small $\tau > 0$ and exploiting continuity of \bar{s} in $x(0)$ then yields in (13) a sufficiently small perturbation on K and either $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = \tau z > 0$ (if $\kappa = 0$) or $|x(t)| \rightarrow \infty$ (if $\kappa > 0$). This leads to a contradiction to $x(t) \rightarrow 0$. As such, $A + BKC$ must be Hurwitz, whereby $x(t) \rightarrow 0$.

Now, define

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= (A + BKC)x(t) + Bw(t) \\ u(t) &= KCx(t) + w(t), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which is internally positive and describes the closed-loop system in Figure 2, i.e., $(I - \tilde{\Delta}G)^{-1} = w \mapsto u$.

Hurwitzness of $A + BKC$ implies that $(I - \tilde{\Delta}\hat{G})^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$, where $\hat{G}(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B$. By Lemma 2, $(I - \tilde{\Delta}\hat{G})^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$ if and only if $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) < 1$.

Recalling (8), if $\bar{s} = \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2 C A^{-1} B M_1)} \mathbf{1}_{n_s}$, then clearly $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) = 1$. Furthermore, by Lemma 1(i), if $\bar{s} \geq \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2 C A^{-1} B M_1)} \mathbf{1}_{n_s}$, then $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) \geq 1$. Hence, $\rho(\tilde{\Delta}\hat{G}(0)) < 1$ implies that there exists i such that $\bar{s}_i < \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2 C A^{-1} B M_1)}$, as claimed.

Remark 10 A crucial difference between Theorems 5 and 9 is that the limit \bar{s} in the former is the same for all initial conditions in \mathcal{S} , whereas in the latter, the

limit $\bar{s}(s(0), x(0))$ is dependent on the initial conditions $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{I}$.

The following result is a counterpart to Theorem 6. It shows that $\rho(\text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1) < 1$ in the proof of Theorem 9 is necessary and sufficient for the internal stability of the approximating LTI closed-loop system $(I - \hat{\Delta}G)^{-1}$ described by (14). The result is a MIMO generalisation of the SISO result in [11, Proposition 1].

Theorem 11 *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2\hat{G}(0)M_1) \\ = \rho(-\text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2CA^{-1}BM_1) < 1 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

if and only if $A + BKC$ is Hurwitz, where $K := M_1\text{diag}(\bar{s})M_2$.

PROOF. Note that because A is Hurwitz, $(A + BKC, B)$ is stabilisable and $(KC, A + BKC)$ is detectable. As such, $(I - \hat{\Delta}G)^{-1}$ with state-space realisation given in (14) is an element of \mathbf{RH}_∞ if and only if $A + BKC$ is Hurwitz. Since the LTI system in (14) is internally positive, it follows by Lemma 2 that $(I - K\hat{G})^{-1} \in \mathbf{RH}_\infty$ if and only if $\rho(K\hat{G}(0)) < 1$. Noting that (15) is equivalent to $\rho(K\hat{G}(0)) < 1$ then completes the proof.

4.3 Equilibria for specific models

The subsequent result shows that if f in (2) takes a specific form, then a characterisation of the equilibrium may be obtained. It may be applied to general MIMO systems and is a generalisation of [11, Proposition 3], which targets a specific SISO system.

Theorem 12 *Consider the feedback system $[G, \Delta]$ described by (2), (3), and (4). Suppose Assumptions 7 and 8 hold, $M_1 = I$, $f(s, v) = -\text{diag}(s)M_2v$, and for $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{I}$, $s(0) \gg 0$, it holds $s(t) \gg 0, \forall t \geq 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t) = \bar{s} \gg 0$. Then \bar{s} satisfies*

$$M_2CA^{-1}x(0) = \log(\text{diag}(s(0))^{-1}\bar{s}) + M_2CA^{-1}B(\bar{s} - s(0)).$$

Furthermore, if $\dot{r}(t) = Mx(t)$ for some $M > 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r(t) = \bar{r}$, then \bar{r} satisfies

$$-MA^{-1}x(0) = \bar{r} - r(0) - MA^{-1}B(\bar{s} - s(0)).$$

PROOF. First, by the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 9, the existence of $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t)$ implies that $x(t) \rightarrow 0$. By hypothesis, $\dot{s}(t) = -\text{diag}(s(t))M_2v(t)$, whereby $\frac{d}{dt} \log(s(t)) = \text{diag}(s(t))^{-1}\dot{s}(t) = -M_2v(t)$. Since $u(t) = z(t) = \text{diag}(s(t))M_2v(t)$, it follows that $u(t) = -\dot{s}(t)$. From (2), (3), and (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \dot{x}(t) dt &= x(\infty) - x(0) = -x(0) \\ &= A \int_0^\infty x(t) dt + B \int_0^\infty u(t) dt \\ &= A \int_0^\infty x(t) dt - B \int_0^\infty \dot{s}(t) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Premultiplying the equation above by $-M_2CA^{-1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} M_2CA^{-1}x(0) \\ = -M_2 \int_0^\infty v(t) dt + M_2CA^{-1}B \int_0^\infty \dot{s}(t) dt \\ = \int_0^\infty \frac{d}{dt} \log(s(t)) dt + M_2CA^{-1}B \int_0^\infty \dot{s}(t) dt \\ = \log(\text{diag}(s(0))^{-1}\bar{s}) + M_2CA^{-1}B(\bar{s} - s(0)). \end{aligned}$$

Consider now $\dot{r}(t) = Mx(t)$. Premultiplying (16) by MA^{-1} yields that $-MA^{-1}x(0) = \int_0^\infty \dot{r}(t) dt - MA^{-1}B \int_0^\infty \dot{s}(t) dt = \bar{r} - r(0) - MA^{-1}B(\bar{s} - s(0))$, as required.

4.4 Application to epidemic models

The feedback system modeled by (2), (3), and (4) can be applied to various group and epidemic models by taking $s_i(t)$ as the proportion of a susceptible population and $x_i(t)$ the proportion of a population that belongs to disease compartments, where there are N populations in total and $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. By substituting the output of (2) into (3), one obtains

$$\dot{x} = Ax + BM_1\text{diag}(s(t))M_2Cx(t).$$

Linearising the model around the disease-free equilibrium $s^* = [1, \dots, 1]^T$, $x^* = 0$ then yields $\dot{x} = Ax + BM_1M_2Cx(t)$. Under certain assumptions, [33, Theorem. 2] shows that with $R_0 := \rho(BM_1M_2CA^{-1})$, the disease-free equilibrium of the epidemic model is locally asymptotically stable if $R_0 < 1$ and unstable if $R_0 > 1$; see also [2]. Notice that

$$\frac{1}{R_0} = \frac{1}{\rho(BM_1M_2CA^{-1})} = \frac{1}{\rho(-M_2CA^{-1}BM_1)},$$

which is the derived upper bound on the steady-state value of $s(t)$ in Theorems 5 and 9. The value R_0 is of significant importance in the study of convergence to equilibria in epidemic models, and is known as the *basic reproduction number* (BRN) R_0 . It captures the average spreadability of communicable diseases and is considered a fundamental threshold in epidemiology. More specifically, it represents the expected number of secondary infections arising from an infected individual, i.e. the average number of persons to which an infected person can pass the disease.

Of particular interest is the case where $R_0 > 1$, i.e. the disease-free equilibrium is unstable. Under considerably different circumstances, each of Theorem 5 and Theorem 9 provides an upper bound on an entry in $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t)$ in the form of $\frac{1}{R_0}$. This indicates the level of penetration of the disease into at least one subpopulation. Furthermore, Theorem 5 allows for $x(t)$ to converge to a nonzero value, which in epidemiology corresponds to the endemic state. On the contrary, when the suppositions of Theorem 9 are satisfied, it must hold that $x(t) \rightarrow 0$, meaning that there is no endemic state, i.e. the entire population that has caught the disease has either recovered or succumbed to the disease.

5 Group epidemic models

In this section and the next, we apply the main results developed in the previous section to the analysis of the steady-state values of the spread dynamics in epidemic models. The include both group and networked models of compartmental form found in the literature. The present section focuses on group models, whereas the next section is dedicated to studying networked models.

It is noteworthy that we do not establish convergence in the epidemic models studied in this and the next sections. The susceptible populations in some of the models under study are bound to converge due to the monotone convergence theorem, while for some others convergence has been established in the literature. For the more complicated models for which convergence analysis of endemic equilibria has not been completed, we simply assume convergence and apply our results to obtain bounds on the susceptible subpopulation. While convergence in these models have not been formally established, it has been observed in simulations, including those provided in this paper.

5.1 SIS models

The SIS model introduced in [14] is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{S}(t) &= -\beta S(t)I(t) + \gamma I(t) \\ \dot{I}(t) &= \beta S(t)I(t) - \gamma I(t),\end{aligned}$$

where $S(t)$ denotes the proportion of the population that is susceptible to a disease at time t , I the proportion that is infected, $\beta > 0$ the rate of infection, or the contact between susceptible and infected compartments of the population, and $\gamma > 0$ the rate of healing or recovery of the infected populace. The entire population is normalised to 1. Note that if $S(0) + I(0) = 1$, then $S(t) + I(t) = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$ because $\dot{S}(t) + \dot{I}(t) = 0$, i.e. the total mass of the population is preserved over time. Thus, the set of initial conditions of interest is $\mathcal{S} := \{(S, I) : S \geq 0, I > 0, S + I = 1\}$, which satisfies Assumption 4.

It is well known [14] that the BRN for an SIS model is $R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$, i.e. the ratio of the infection rate to recovery rate. When $R_0 \leq 1$, the disease-free state ($S = 1, I = 0$) is a globally asymptotically stable equilibrium. On the other hand, when $R_0 > 1$, the endemic state ($S = \frac{\gamma}{\beta}, I = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta}$) is almost globally asymptotically stable, with convergence guaranteed for all initial conditions $S(0) + I(0) = 1$ except when $I(0) = 0$. Define LTI system G as in (3) with $x(t) := I(t)$, $A := -\gamma$, $B := \beta$, $C := 1$, and nonlinear system Δ as in (2) with $s(t) := S(t)$, $f(s, v) := -\beta sv + \gamma v$, which satisfies Assumption 3, and $M_1 = M_2 := 1$. Suppose $S(t) = s(t) \rightarrow \bar{s}$ for all $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{S}$, then Theorem 5 says that $\bar{s} \leq \frac{1}{\hat{G}(0)} = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} = \frac{1}{R_0}$, which is aligned with known knowledge on the SIS model. In particular, when $R_0 > 1$, $\bar{s} \leq \frac{1}{R_0} = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} < 1$, and hence $I(t) \rightarrow \bar{I} \geq 1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta} > 0$. Thus, by Theorem 5, we have $S(t) \rightarrow \frac{\gamma}{\beta}$, which corresponds to the endemic state. A further inspection reveals that as $S(t) = s(t) \rightarrow \bar{s}$, it holds that $\bar{s} = \frac{\gamma}{\beta}$ or $I(t) \rightarrow 0$. In the former case, the LTI system $[G, \hat{\Delta}]$ as described by (10) is given by $\dot{I}(t) = \beta w(t)$, which is an integrator and has a marginally stable mode at 0. In the latter case, the LTI system $[G, \tilde{\Delta}]$ as described by (10) is given by $\dot{I}(t) = (A + BKC)I(t) + \beta w(t) = (-\gamma + \beta)I(t) + \beta w(t)$, whereby $\lambda(A + BKC) = -\gamma + \beta \leq 0$. These are consistent with Theorem 6.

5.2 SIR models

The SIR model introduced in [14] is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{S}(t) &= -\beta S(t)I(t) \\ \dot{I}(t) &= \beta S(t)I(t) - \gamma I(t) \\ \dot{R}(t) &= \gamma I(t),\end{aligned}$$

where $S(t)$ denotes the proportion of the population that is susceptible at time t , $I(t)$ the proportion that is infected, $R(t)$ the proportion that is removed or has recovered with immunity, β the infection rate, γ the recovery rate, and $S(0) + I(0) + R(0) = 1$. Define LTI system G as in (3) with $x(t) := I(t)$, $A := -\gamma$, $B := 1$, $C := 1$, and nonlinear system Δ as in (2) with $s(t) := S(t)$, $f(s, v) := -\beta sv$, which satisfies Assumption 7, and $M_1 := 1$, $M_2 := \beta$. The set of initial conditions of interest is $\mathcal{S} := \{(S, I) : S \geq 0, I > 0, S + I \leq 1\}$, which satisfies Assumption 8.

Observe that $S(t)$ is monotonically nonincreasing and bounded from below, so it converges as per the monotone convergence theorem [28]. Suppose $S(t) \rightarrow \bar{s} > 0$, whose continuity in $x(0)$ follows from Theorem 12, then Theorem 9 states that $\bar{s} < \frac{1}{M_2 \hat{G}(0)} = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} = \frac{1}{R_0}$, in which case $R_0 := M_2 \hat{G}(0) = \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$. Moreover, Theorem 12 may be applied to find \bar{s} and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} R(t)$. This is consistent with the existing result [12, Theorem 2.1]. It is noteworthy that the dynamics in R are not part of the feedback loop involving S and I . Also observe that the LTI




Figure 3. Example of group SIR models: the trajectories of $S(t)$ under various initial conditions

system $[G, \hat{\Delta}]$ as described by (13) is given by $\dot{I}(t) = (\beta\bar{s} - \gamma)I(t)$, where $\beta\bar{s} - \gamma < 0$ is Hurwitz. This agrees with Theorem 11.

Example 13 Suppose $\beta = 0.3$ and $\gamma = 0.2$, and let the initial conditions be chosen randomly in $\{(S, I, R) : S \geq 0, I > 0, R \geq 0, S + I = 1\}$. It follows that $R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma} = 1.5 > 1$. The trajectories for $S(t)$ under different initial conditions are shown in Figure 3, which shows $\bar{s} < \frac{1}{R_0}$.

The SIRS model with vital dynamics (balanced births and deaths) [12, Section 2.4] is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{S}(t) &= \mu - \mu S(t) - \beta S(t)I(t) + \delta R(t) \\ \dot{I}(t) &= \beta S(t)I(t) - \gamma I(t) - \mu I(t) \\ \dot{R}(t) &= \gamma I(t) - \mu R(t) - \delta R(t),\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

where $\delta \geq 0$ is the rate at which immunity recedes following recovery and there is an inflow of newborns into the susceptible compartment at rate $\mu > 0$ and deaths in all the compartments at rates μS , μI , and μR respectively. Define LTI system G as in (3) with $x(t) := [I(t), R(t)]$, $A := \begin{bmatrix} -(\gamma+\mu) & 0 \\ \gamma & -(\delta+\mu) \end{bmatrix}$, $B := \begin{bmatrix} \beta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $C := I$, and nonlinear system Δ as in (2) with $s(t) := S(t)$, $f(s, v) := \mu - \mu s + [-\beta s \delta]v$, which satisfies Assumption 3, and $M_1 := 1$, $M_2 := [1 \ 0]$. The set of initial conditions of interest is $\mathcal{S} := \{(S, I, R) : S \geq 0, I \geq 0, R \geq 0, S + I + R = 1\}$, which satisfies Assumption 4. Global asymptotic stability of the equilibrium of the SIR model with vital dynamics (where $\delta = 0$) has been shown in [12, Theorem 2.2] Suppose $S(t) \rightarrow \bar{s}$ for all $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{S}$ in (17), Theorem 5 then states that $\bar{s} \leq \frac{1}{M_2 \hat{G}(0)} = \frac{\gamma+\mu}{\beta} = \frac{1}{R_0}$, where $R_0 := M_2 \hat{G}(0) = \frac{\beta}{\gamma+\mu}$. In particular, when $R_0 > 1$, $\bar{s} < 1$. From (17), this implies that $I(t) \rightarrow \bar{I} > 0$. Thus, by Theorem 5, $\bar{s} = \frac{\gamma+\mu}{\beta}$, whereby $\bar{I} = \frac{(\delta+\mu)(\beta-\gamma-\mu)}{\beta(\delta+\gamma+\mu)}$, corresponding to the endemic state. This is consistent with the existing result [12, Theorem 2.2], where δ is taken to be 0.

Example 14 Suppose $\beta = 0.3$, $\gamma = 0.2$, $\delta = 0.1$ and $\mu = 0.001$, and let the initial conditions be chosen ran-




Figure 4. Example of group SIR models with vital dynamics: the trajectories of $S(t)$ and $I(t)$ under various initial conditions

domly in $\{(S, I, R) : S \geq 0, I > 0, R \geq 0, S + I = 1\}$. It follows from the above results that $\bar{s} = \frac{\gamma+\mu}{\beta} = 0.67$ and $\bar{I} = \frac{(\delta+\mu)(\beta-\gamma-\mu)}{\beta(\delta+\gamma+\mu)} = 0.11$. The trajectories for $S(t)$ and $I(t)$ for different initial conditions are shown in Figure 4. It shows that $S(t)$ converges to the same value, \bar{s} , and $I(t)$ converges to \bar{I} under various initial conditions.

6 Networked epidemic models

Networked models capture the scenario where numerous groups or nodes are interconnected via a contact graph or interconnection network, defined by an adjacency matrix $W = [w_{ij}]$. Each $w_{ij} \geq 0$ quantifies the strength of the connection from node j to node i . Similarly to the group epidemic models, each group/node in a network is made up of different compartments (susceptible, infected etc.) in a networked compartmental model. It is worth noting that convergence analysis of networked epidemic models has not been completed in the literature to the authors' best knowledge, except for the SIS model and those that are straightforwardly guaranteed by the monotone convergence theorem.

The *basic reproduction number* (BRN) R_0 is a recurring threshold of interest in networked models, as is the case of group models. The difference in this section from the last is that the BRN is given by the spectral radius of a nonnegative matrix here.

6.1 SEIR models

Suppose there are N nodes. Let $s_i(t)$, $e_i(t)$, $p_i(t)$, and $r_i(t)$ denote the proportions of population that are susceptible, exposed, infected, and removed, respectively, at time t and at node $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. The networked SEIR model [22, Section 3.3] is described by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{s}(t) &= -\text{diag}(s(t))[\text{diag}(\beta_E)W e(t) + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W p(t)] \\ \dot{e}(t) &= \text{diag}(s(t))[\text{diag}(\beta_E)W e(t) + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W p(t)] \\ &\quad - \text{diag}(\sigma)e(t) \\ \dot{p}(t) &= \text{diag}(\sigma)e(t) - \text{diag}(\gamma)p(t) \\ \dot{r}(t) &= \text{diag}(\gamma)p(t),\end{aligned}$$

where σ denotes the transition rate from exposed to infected, β_E and β_I represent the transmission rates




Figure 5. A contact graph and its adjacent matrix

between susceptible and exposed, and susceptible and infected, respectively. Define LTI system G as in (3) with $x(t) := [e(t)^T, p(t)^T]^T$, $A := \begin{bmatrix} -\text{diag}(\sigma) & 0 \\ \text{diag}(\sigma) & -\text{diag}(\gamma) \end{bmatrix}$, $B := [I]$, $C := I$, and nonlinear system Δ as in (2) with $f(s, v) := -\text{diag}(s) [\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\beta_I)W] v$, which satisfies Assumption 7, and $M_1 = I$, $M_2 = [\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\beta_I)W]$. The set of initial conditions of interest is $\mathcal{S} := \{(s, e, p) : s \geq 0, e \geq 0, p \geq 0, s + p + e \leq 1_{n_s}, e + p > 0\}$, which satisfies Assumption 8. Observe that each entry in $s(t)$ is monotonically nonincreasing and bounded from below, so by the monotone convergence theorem it converges. Suppose $s(t) \rightarrow \bar{s} \gg 0$, whose continuity in $x(0)$ follows from Theorem 12, then Theorem 9 says that there exists i such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{s}_i &< \frac{1}{\rho(M_2 \hat{G}(0))} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho(\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\sigma)^{-1} + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W \text{diag}(\gamma)^{-1})} \\ &=: \frac{1}{R_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 12 is applicable here for evaluating \bar{s} , $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} p(t)$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r(t)$.

Example 15 Consider a network consisting of 5 nodes depicted in Figure 5. with $\beta_E = [0.2 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.05]^T$, $\beta_I = 0.2 \cdot [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$, $\sigma = 0.1 \cdot [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$ and $\gamma = [0.3 \ 0.2 \ 0.1 \ 0.2 \ 0.1]^T$. It follows that $R_0 = \rho(\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\sigma)^{-1} + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W \text{diag}(\gamma)^{-1}) = 3.6987 > 1$. Suppose the epidemic is initiated by a minority of the population in Node 5 being exposed to the disease, and the initial condition is given by $s(0) = [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0.9999]^T$, $e(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.0001]^T$, $p(0) = r(0) = 0$. The trajectory of each component in $s(t)$ is shown in Figure 6, all of which converge to some value below $\frac{1}{R_0}$.

The networked SEIR model with vital dynamics is described by




Figure 6. Example of networked SEIR models: the trajectory of $s(t)$




Figure 7. Example of networked SEIR models with vital dynamics: the trajectory of $s(t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s}(t) &= \mu - \text{diag}(\mu)(s(t)) \\ &\quad - \text{diag}(s(t))[\text{diag}(\beta_E)W e(t) + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W p(t)] \\ \dot{e}(t) &= \text{diag}(s(t))[\text{diag}(\beta_E)W e(t) + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W p(t)] \\ &\quad - \text{diag}(\sigma)e(t) - \text{diag}(\mu)e(t) \\ \dot{p}(t) &= \text{diag}(\sigma)e(t) - \text{diag}(\gamma)p(t) - \text{diag}(\mu)p(t) \\ \dot{r}(t) &= \text{diag}(\gamma)p(t) - \text{diag}(\mu)r(t). \end{aligned}$$

Define LTI system G as in (3) with $x(t) := [e(t)^T, p(t)^T]^T$, $A := \begin{bmatrix} -\text{diag}(\sigma + \mu) & 0 \\ \text{diag}(\sigma) & -\text{diag}(\gamma + \mu) \end{bmatrix}$, $B := [I]$, $C := I$, and nonlinear system Δ as in (2) with $f(s, v) := \mu - \text{diag}(\mu)s - \text{diag}(s) [\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\beta_I)W] v$, which satisfies Assumption 3, and $M_1 = I$, $M_2 = [\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\beta_I)W]$. Suppose $s(t) \rightarrow \bar{s}$ for all $(s(0), x(0)) \in \mathcal{S}$, then Theorem 5 says that there exists i such that $\bar{s}_i \leq \frac{1}{\rho(M_2 \hat{G}(0))} = \frac{1}{R_0}$, where $R_0 := \rho(\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\sigma + \mu)^{-1} + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W \text{diag}(\sigma) \text{diag}(\sigma + \mu)^{-1} \text{diag}(\gamma + \mu)^{-1})$.

Example 16 Consider again Example 15 but with vital dynamics and let $\mu = 0.001 \cdot [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$. It follows that $R_0 = \rho(\text{diag}(\beta_E)W \text{diag}(\sigma + \mu)^{-1} + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W \text{diag}(\sigma) \text{diag}(\sigma + \mu)^{-1} \text{diag}(\gamma + \mu)^{-1}) = 3.6482 > 1$. It can be verified by simulation that all initial conditions in \mathcal{S} will lead to the same \bar{s} . Let the initial condition be given also by $s(0) = [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0.9999]^T$, $e(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.0001]^T$, $p(0) = r(0) = 0$. The trajectory of each component in $s(t)$ is shown in Figure 7. In particular, observe that $\bar{s}_1 < \frac{1}{R_0}$.

6.2 SAIR models

The networked SAIR model [22, Section 3.3] is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{s}(t) &= -\text{diag}(\beta_A)\text{diag}(s(t))Wa(t) \\
&\quad - \text{diag}(\beta_I)\text{diag}(s(t))Wp(t) \\
\dot{a}(t) &= \text{diag}(\beta_A)Q\text{diag}(s(t))Wa(t) \\
&\quad + \text{diag}(\beta_I)Q\text{diag}(s(t))Wp(t) - \text{diag}(\sigma + \kappa)a(t) \\
\dot{p}(t) &= \text{diag}(\beta_A)(I - Q)\text{diag}(s(t))Wa(t) \\
&\quad + \text{diag}(\beta_I)(I - Q)\text{diag}(s(t))Wp(t) \\
&\quad + \text{diag}(\sigma)a(t) - \text{diag}(\gamma + \nu)p(t) \\
\dot{r}(t) &= \text{diag}(\kappa)a(t) + \text{diag}(\gamma)p(t) \\
\dot{d}(t) &= \text{diag}(\nu)p(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $a(t)$ represents the proportion of the population at time t that has caught the disease but is asymptomatic, $d(t)$ the proportion that is deceased, β_A and β_I the infection rates between susceptible and asymptomatic-infected, and susceptible and infected-symptomatic individuals respectively, and σ the progression rate from asymptomatic a to symptomatic infected p , κ and γ the recovery rates for a and p , respectively, ν the progression rate from infected p to deceased d , and q and $1 - q$ the probabilities or proportions of susceptible individuals transitioning from s to a and p respectively, and $Q = \text{diag}(q)$.

Define LTI system G as in (3) with $x(t) := [a(t)^T, p(t)^T]^T$, $A := \begin{bmatrix} -\text{diag}(\sigma + \kappa) & 0 \\ \text{diag}(\sigma) & -\text{diag}(\gamma + \nu) \end{bmatrix}$, $B := \begin{bmatrix} Q \\ I - Q \end{bmatrix}$, $C := I$, and nonlinear system Δ as in (2) with $f(s, v) := -\text{diag}(s) [\text{diag}(\beta_A)W \text{diag}(\beta_I)W] v$, which satisfies Assumption 7, and $M_1 = I$, $M_2 := [\text{diag}(\beta_A)W \text{diag}(\beta_I)W]$. The set of initial conditions of interest is $\mathcal{S} := \{(s, a, p) : s \geq 0, a \geq 0, p \geq 0, s + a + p \leq 1_{n_s}, a + p > 0\}$, which satisfies Assumption 8. Observe that every entry in $s(t)$ is monotonically nonincreasing and bounded from below, whereby it converges by the monotone convergence theorem. Suppose $s(t) \rightarrow \bar{s} \gg 0$, whose continuity in $x(0)$ follows from Theorem 12, Theorem 9 then states that there exists i such that $\bar{s}_i < \frac{1}{\rho(M_2 \bar{G}(0))} = \frac{1}{R_0}$, in which

$$\begin{aligned}
R_0 &:= \rho(\text{diag}(\beta_A)W \text{diag}(\kappa + \sigma)^{-1}Q \\
&\quad + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W \text{diag}(\sigma) \text{diag}(\gamma + \nu)^{-1} \text{diag}(\kappa + \sigma)^{-1}Q \\
&\quad + \text{diag}(\beta_I)W \text{diag}(\gamma + \nu)^{-1}(I - Q)).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that Theorem 12 is applicable here for computing \bar{s} , $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r(t)$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d(t)$.

Example 17 Consider the same network in Figure 5 with $\beta_A = [0.2 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.05]^T$, $\beta_I = 0.1 \cdot [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$, $q = 0.1 \cdot [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$, $\sigma = 0.3 \cdot [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$, $\gamma = \kappa = [0.2 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.05]^T$ and $\nu = 0.001 \cdot [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$. It follows from the preceding result that $R_0 = 1.9488 > 1$. Suppose the epidemic is initiated by a minority of the population in Node 5 being asymptomatic-infected, and the initial condition is given by $s(0) = [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0.99]^T$, $a(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.01]^T$, $p(0) = r(0) = d(0) = 0$. As shown in Figure 8, \bar{s}_5 is less than $\frac{1}{R_0}$.




Figure 8. Example of networked SAIR models: the trajectory of $s(t)$

7 Conclusion

We developed two positive feedback system frameworks for the steady-state analysis of epidemic models and showed that the reciprocal of the basic reproduction number quantifies the level of penetration into at least one subgroup in a networked epidemic model. Two significantly different scenarios involving the existence and nonexistence of the endemic state were considered, and they were shown to correspond to distinct dynamics in the positive feedback system. In the case where there is no endemic state, formulae for computing the convergence limits in the epidemic models were also provided. Various illustrative examples on different compartmental epidemic models were studied and simulated to validate our results.

Interesting future research directions include investigating with similar approaches the discrete-time models [23], the control aspects in epidemic models [21, 25, 34], and the competitive propagation of more than one virus [19]. Furthermore, one may investigate the effects of the changes in the networks and infection/recovery rates on the BRNs. These changes may arise from public health policies on quarantine, isolation, social distancing, mask mandates, and/or vaccinations.

References

- [1] A. Berman and R.J. Plemmons. *Nonnegative matrices in the mathematical sciences*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1994.
- [2] F. Brauer and C. Castillo-Chavez. *Mathematical Models in Population Biology and Epidemiology*. Springer, 2012.
- [3] C. Briat. Robust stability and stabilization of uncertain linear positive systems via integral linear constraints: L_1 -gain and L_∞ -gain characterization. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 23:1932–1954, 2013.
- [4] P. Colaneri, R. Middleton, and F. Blanchini. Optimal control of a class of positive Markovian bilinear systems. *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid systems*, 21:155–170, 2016.
- [5] P. Colaneri, R. Middleton, Z. Chen, D. Caporale, and F. Blanchini. Convexity of the cost functional in an optimal control problem for a class of positive switched systems. *Automatica*, 4(50):1227–1234, 2014.
- [6] M. Colombino and R. Smith. A convex characterization of robust stability for positive and positively dominated linear systems. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 61(7):1965–1971, 2015.

- [7] T. de Camino-Beck, M. A. Lewis, and P. van den Driessche. A graph-theoretic method for the basic reproduction number in continuous time epidemiological models. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 59:503–516, 2009.
- [8] N. Dhingra, M. Colombino, and M. Jovanović. Structured decentralized control of positive systems with applications to combination drug therapy and leader selection in directed networks. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 6(1):352–362, 2018.
- [9] A. Fall, A. Iggidr, G. Sallet, and J. J. Tewa. Epidemiological models and Lyapunov functions. *Mathematical modelling of natural phenomena*, 2(1):62–68, 2007.
- [10] L. Farina and S. Rinaldi. *Positive linear systems, theory and applications*. Wiley, 2000.
- [11] G. Giordano, F. Blanchini, R. Bruno, P. Colaneri, A. Di Filippo, A. Di Matteo, and M.G. Colaneri. Modelling the COVID-19 epidemic and implementation of population-wide interventions in Italy. *Nature Medicine*, 26(6):855–860, 2020.
- [12] H. W. Hethcote. The mathematics of infectious diseases. *SIAM Review*, 42(4):599–653, 2000.
- [13] C.-Y. Kao and S. Z. Khong. Robust stability of positive monotone feedback interconnections. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 64(2):569–581, 2018.
- [14] W.O. Kermack and A.G. McKendrick. Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics. II — the problem of endemicity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A*, 138(834):55–83, 1932.
- [15] A. Khanafer, T. Başar, and B. Ghahesifad. Stability of epidemic models over directed graphs: a positive system approach. *Automatica*, 74:126–134, 2016.
- [16] S. Z. Khong, C. Briat, and A. Rantzer. Positive systems analysis via integral linear constraints. In *Proc. 54th IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, Osaka, Japan, 2015.
- [17] S. Z. Khong and A. Rantzer. Diagonal Lyapunov functions for positive linear time-varying systems. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 5269–5274, Las Vegas, USA, 2016.
- [18] A. Lajmanovich and J. A. Yorke. A deterministic model for gonorrhoea in a nonhomogenous population. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 28(3–4):221–236, 1976.
- [19] J. Liu, P. E. Paré, A. Nedić, C. Y. Tang, C. L. Beck, and T. Başar. Analysis and control of a continuous-time bi-virus model. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 64(12):4891–4906, 2019.
- [20] W. Mei, S. Mohagheni, S. Zampieri, and F. Bullo. On the dynamics of deterministic epidemic propagation over networks. *Annual reviews in Control*, 44:116–128, 2017.
- [21] C. Nowzari, V. M. Preciado, and G. J. Pappas. Analysis and control of epidemics: A survey of spreading processes on complex networks. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 36(1):26–46, 2016.
- [22] P. E. Paré, C. L. Beck, and T. Başar. Modeling, estimation, and analysis of epidemics over networks: An overview. *Annual Review in Control*, 50:345–360, 2020.
- [23] P. E. Paré, J. Liu, C. L. Beck, B. E. Kirwan, and T. Başar. Analysis, estimation, and validation of discrete-time epidemic processes. *IEEE Control Systems Technology*, 28(1):79–93, 2019.
- [24] R. Pastor-Satorras, C. Castellano, P. Van Mieghem, and A. Vespignani. Epidemic processes in complex networks. *Annual Reviews of Computational Physics*, 87:925–979, 2015.
- [25] E. Ramírez-Llanos and S. Martínez. A distributed dynamics for virus-spread control. *Automatica*, 76:41–48, 2017.
- [26] A. Rantzer. On the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma for positive systems. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 61(5):1346–1349, 2015.
- [27] A. Rantzer. Scalable control of positive systems. *European Journal of Control*, 24:72–80, 2015.
- [28] W. Rudin. *Principles of mathematical analysis*, volume 3. McGraw-hill New York, 1976.
- [29] A. Sisk and N. Fefferman. A network theoretic method for the basic reproductive number for infectious diseases. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 13:2503–2515, 2022.
- [30] L. Stella, A. P. Martínez, D. Bauso, and P. Colaneri. The role of asymptotic infections in the covid-19 epidemic via complex networks and stability analysis. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 60(2):119–144, 2022.
- [31] T. Tanaka and C. Langbort. The bounded real lemma for internally positive systems and H-infinity structured static state feedback. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 56(9):2218–2223, 2011.
- [32] T. Tanaka, C. Langbort, and V. Ugrinovskii. DC-dominant property of cone-preserving transfer functions. *Systems and Control Letters*, 62:699–707, 2013.
- [33] P. van den Driessche and J. Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 180(1–2):29–48, 2002.
- [34] M. Ye, J. Liu, B. D. O. Anderson, and M. Cao. Applications of the Poincaré–Hopf theorem: Epidemic models and Lotka–Volterra systems. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 67(4):1609–1624, 2021.
- [35] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover. *Robust and Optimal Control*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1996.
- [36] L. Zino and M. Cao. Analysis, prediction, and control of epidemics: A survey from scalar to dynamic network models. *IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine*, 21(4):4–23, 2021.