

Finite horizon optimal control of reaction-diffusion SIV epidemic system with stochastic environment

Zong Wang*

School of Science, Qingdao University of Technology, Qingdao, 266520, P.R. China

Abstract

This contribution mainly focuses on the finite horizon optimal control problems of a susceptible-infected-vaccinated(SIV) epidemic system governed by reaction-diffusion equations and Markov switching. Stochastic dynamic programming is employed to find the optimal vaccination effort and economic return for a stochastic reaction diffusion SIV epidemic model. To achieve this, a key step is to show the existence and uniqueness of invariant measure for the model. Then, we obtained the necessary and sufficient conditions for the near-optimal control. Furthermore, we give an algorithm to approximate the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation. Finally, some numerical simulations are presented to confirm our analytic results.

Keywords: Stochastic SIV epidemic model; Reaction diffusion; Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation; Invariant measure; Markov chain.

1. Introduction

Recent research has revealed that epidemic models incorporating reaction-diffusion mechanisms are increasingly being used to depict the dynamics of epidemics in spatially heterogeneous contexts [1–3]. In real-world scenarios, the spread of infectious diseases is profoundly influenced by spatial heterogeneity. In the field of epidemiology, there is a growing body of evidence indicating that spatial diffusion and individual mobility play crucial roles in the dissemination of infectious diseases [5, 6]. For example, Feng et al. [5] explored the stability of a stochastic epidemic model that includes diffusion. Similarly, M. Sepveda and M. Bendahmane [6] examined the convergence of a finite volume scheme for nonlocal reaction-diffusion epidemic systems. To our knowledge, studies focusing on optimal control problems in SIV epidemic models governed by partial differential equations are scarce. Hence, investigating the dynamics of epidemic models that incorporate reaction-diffusion is of exceptional importance.

Optimal control strategies are crucial for the study of different diseases issues, which can lead to the effective control of specific infectious disease [7]. Mathematically, the optimal control is obtained by solving the state equation and the adjoint equation or the HJB equation [8]. It is well known that it is difficult to find the analytical solution to the HJB equation due to the partial differential equation. Therefore, it is necessary to find the successive approximation method for the finite horizon optimal control problem of the stochastic epidemic system.

Email address: wangzong@qut.edu.cn (Zong Wang*)

* Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

To effectively curb the development of the infectious disease, vaccination and isolation of confirmed individuals are the most common control measures. As we all known, vaccination is one of the most effective prevention measure against many diseases such as measles, polio, pertussis and influenza [9–11]. For example, Wei et al. [9] studied the vaccine induces antibodies to H1N1 and prevents the spread of the disease. Utazi and Tatem [10] give the precise mapping reveals gaps in global measles vaccination coverage. However, little research has been done on the control, vaccination and treatment of infectious diseases.

In this paper, we give the approximation method for the finite horizon optimal control problem of the stochastic epidemic system and we also give the necessary and sufficient conditions for the near optimal solution of SIV model were given from the perspective of the minimum cost of disease control and the minimum number of infected persons. The main contributions and challenges of this paper are as follows:

- It is more difficult to investigate the reaction-diffusion, Markov switching, stochastic SIV epidemic model because the corresponding the epidemic system involve Markov term Λ_t in (2.5). To over this difficulty, the method of steps and the generalized Gronwall inequality are used simultaneously to derive the invariant measure criterion of the system.
- Finite horizon optimal control and the algorithm to approximate the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation for our novel stochastic SIV model with Markov switching, vaccination and saturated treatment are given;

The remaining part of the paper is so organized as: Section 2 give the preliminaries and introduce of stochastic partial differential equation SIV epidemic model; Section 3 prove the existence and uniqueness of invariant measures; Section 4, institution of sufficient conditions and necessary conditions for near-optimal control; Section 5 analyze the optimal control and numerical algorithm; Some numerical experiments are carried out in Section 6; Finally, we make a brief conclusion in Section 7.

2. Model and Preliminaries

2.1. Model

A stochastic susceptible-infected-vaccinated(SIV) model was put forward by Zhang et al. [29] as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dS(t) = ((1-p)b + \alpha I(t) - (\mu + u_1(t))S(t) - \beta S(t)I(t)) dt - \sigma S(t)I(t)dB_1(t), \\ dI(t) = \left(\beta S(t)I(t) + (1-e)\beta V(t)I(t) - (\mu + \alpha)I(t) - \frac{mu_2(t)I(t)}{1 + \eta I(t)} \right) dt \\ \quad + \sigma S(t)I(t)dB_2(t) + (1-e)\sigma V(t)I(t)dB_4(t), \\ dV(t) = \left(pb + u_1(t)S(t) - \mu V(t) - (1-e)\beta V(t)I(t) + \frac{mu_2(t)I(t)}{1 + \eta I(t)} \right) dt \\ \quad - (1-e)\sigma V(t)I(t)dB_3(t). \end{array} \right. \quad (2.1)$$

List of parameters, variables, and their meanings in model.

p : The proportion of population that get vaccinated immediately after birth

$u_1(t)$: Vaccinated rate; $u_2(t)$: Treatment rate

β : Per capita transmission coefficient

μ : Per capita natural death rate / birth rate

α : Per capita recovery rate; e : The degree of effectiveness of vaccination

σ : The intensities of the white noise

$S(t)$: Susceptible proportion in the total population

$I(t)$: Infected proportion in the total population

$V(t)$: Vaccinated proportion in the total population.

As we know, the factors including birth, death, and so on in epidemic systems are spatially heterogeneous [6]. To study the impact of spatial distribution and movements of individuals on the spread of diseases, we need to establish partial differential equation (PDE) SIV epidemic models, it can exhibit spatial patterns of the diseases [14]. Let Laplacian operator $\Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial S^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial I^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial V^2}$, the stochastic SIV model with spatial diffusion can present as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dS(x, t) = \left(D_1(x)\Delta S + (1 - p(x))b(x) + \alpha(x)I(x, t) - (\mu(x) + u_1(x, t))S(x, t) \right. \\ \quad \left. - \beta(x)S(x, t)I(x, t) \right) dt - \sigma(x)S(x, t)I(x, t)dB_1(t), \\ dI(x, t) = \left(D_2(x)\Delta I + \beta(x)S(x, t)I(x, t) + (1 - e)\beta(x)V(x, t) \right. \\ \quad \left. I(x, t) - (\mu(x) + \alpha(x))I(x, t) - \frac{m(x)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x)I(x, t)} \right) dt \\ \quad + \sigma(x)S(x, t)I(x, t)dB_2(t) + (1 - e)\sigma(x)V(x, t)I(x, t)dB_4(t), \\ dV(x, t) = \left(D_3(x)\Delta V + p(x)b(x) + u_1(x, t)S(x, t) - \mu(x)V(x, t) \right. \\ \quad \left. - (1 - e)\beta(x)V(x, t)I(x, t) + \frac{m(x)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x)I(x, t)} \right) dt \\ \quad \left. - (1 - e)\sigma(x)V(x, t)I(x, t)dB_3(t), \right. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.2)$$

with $(x, t) \in \Gamma_T = (0, T) \times \Gamma$. The boundary conditions

$$\frac{\partial S(x, t)}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial I(x, t)}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial V(x, t)}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad (x, t) \in \sum = (0, T) \times \partial\Gamma, \quad (2.3)$$

where ν is the unit normal vector on $\partial\Gamma$. The initial boundary conditions are

$$S(0, x) = S_0(x) > 0, \quad I(0, x) = I_0(x) > 0, \quad V(0, x) = V_0(x) > 0, \quad x \in \Gamma. \quad (2.4)$$

where m is the cure rate, η in the treatment function measures the extent of delayed treatment given to infected people. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded nonempty closed set. The control $u(x, t) \in U$ is called admissible, if it is an \mathcal{F}_t -adapted process with values in U . The set of all admissible controls is denoted by \mathcal{U}_{ad} . In this optimal problem, we assume a restriction on the control variable such that $0 \leq u_1(x, t) \leq 1$, because it is impossible for all susceptible individuals to be vaccinated at one time. $u_2(x, t) = 0$ represents no treatment, and $u_2(x, t) = 1$ represents totally effective treatment.

Additionally, due to the sudden change of temperature, virus and other factors, the SIV epidemic system may experience abrupt changes in their parameters [30]. Continuous time Markov chain is widely used to characterize this kind of environmental noise in epidemic models [19, 20]. Therefore, it is reasonable to

consider the SIV epidemic model with Markovian switching

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dS(x, t) = \left(D_1(x)\Delta S(x, t) + (1 - p(x, \Lambda_t))b(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) \right. \\ \quad \left. + u_1(x, t))S(x, t) - \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)I(x, t) \right) dt - \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)I(x, t)dB_1(t), \\ dI(x, t) = \left(D_2(x)\Delta I(x, t) + \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)I(x, t) + (1 - e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t) \right. \\ \quad \left. - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t))I(x, t) - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} \right) dt \\ \quad + \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)I(x, t)dB_2(t) + (1 - e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t)dB_4(t), \\ dV(x, t) = \left(D_3(x)\Delta V(x, t) + p(x, \Lambda_t)b(x, \Lambda_t) + u_1(x, t)S(x, t) - \mu(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) \right. \\ \quad \left. - (1 - e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t) + \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} \right) dt \\ \quad - (1 - e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t)dB_3(t). \end{array} \right. \quad (2.5)$$

To simplify equations, we represent $X(x, t) := (S(x, t), I(x, t), V(x, t))^\top$, $u(x, t) := (u_1(x, t), u_2(x, t))^\top$. The objective function

$$J(0, X(x, t); u(x, t)) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \int_\Gamma L(x, t, X(x, t), u(x, t)) dx dt + \int_\Gamma h(X(x, T)) dx \right), \quad (2.6)$$

where $X(x, t) = \{X(x, t) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is the solution of model (2.5) on the filtered space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$. For any $u(x, t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, model (2.5) has a unique \mathcal{F}_t -adapted solution $X(x, t)$ and $(X(x, t), u(x, t))$ is called an admissible pair. The control problem is to find an admissible control which minimizes or nearly minimizes the objective function $J(0, x_0; u(\cdot))$ over all $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$. The admissible control set is defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, T] = \{u : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \mid u \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-adapted, and } \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_\Omega |u|^2 dx ds < \infty\}. \quad (2.7)$$

The objective function $J(0, x_0; u(\cdot))$ represent a function that $t = 0, X(x, t) = x_0$ with control variable $u(\cdot)$. The value function is as follows:

$$V(0, x_0) = \min_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}} J(0, x_0; u(\cdot)).$$

Our goal is to minimize the total number of the infected and susceptible individuals by using minimal control efforts. Let the objective function in this paper is

$$\begin{aligned} & J(0, X(x, t); u(x, t)) \\ &= \int_0^T \int_\Gamma \left(A_1 S(x, t) + A_2 I(x, t) + \frac{1}{2}(\tau_1 u_1^2(x, t) + \tau_2 u_2^2(x, t)) \right) dx dt + \int_\Gamma h(X(x, T)) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

here, the positive constants τ_1, τ_2 and A_1, A_2 represent weights.

Remark 2.1. In this paper, we will work on a specific cost function of the form

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, t, X(x, t); u(x, t)) &= A_1 S(x, t) + A_2 I(x, t) + \frac{1}{2}(\tau_1 u_1^2(x, t) + \tau_2 u_2^2(x, t)), \\ h(X(x, T)) &= (0, I(x, T), 0), \end{aligned}$$

where A_1, A_2 and τ_1, τ_2 are the weighting factors, representing the cost per unit time of the components $S(x, t), I(x, t), u_1^2, u_2^2$, respectively. In particular, $A_2 I(x, t)$ is the cost that infected individuals creates for

the society due to lost working hours and standard medical care, not including the vaccinated u_1 and treatment u_2 , while $\tau_1 u_1^2$ is the cost of vaccination and $\tau_2 u_2^2$ is the cost of treating infected individuals. We assume that the cost is proportional to the number of infected individuals, and the cost per each patient depends quadratically on the treatment effort u_2 , which means that it is marginally increasing in u_2 .

2.2. Preliminaries

Let $K = H^1(\Gamma) \equiv \{\varphi | \varphi \in L^2(\Gamma), \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \in L^2(\Gamma), i = 1, 2, 3.\}$ Then $K' = H^{-1}(\Gamma)$ is the space of K . We denote by $|\cdot|$ and $\|\cdot\|$ the norms in K and K' , respectively, by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the duality product between K, K' and by (\cdot, \cdot) the scalar product in K . Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space with $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ the natural filtration generated by the Brownian motion $B(t)$, which means $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{B(s); 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ augmented with all \mathbb{P} -null sets of \mathcal{F}_0 . In the paper, $C > 0$ represents different positive constants. $\Lambda_t, t > 0$, be a right-continuous Markov chain on the probability space taking values in a finite state $\mathbb{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ for some positive integer $N < \infty$. In order to prove the existence and uniqueness of the underlying invariant measure, we prepare the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. ([15]) *Let $N < \infty$ and assume further that $\sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i \rho_i < 0$, where μ_i is the stationary distribution of Markov chain $\{\Lambda_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. Then (1) $\eta_p > 0$ if $\max_{i \in \mathbb{S}} \rho_i \leq 0$; (2) $\eta_p > 0$ for $p < \max_{i \in \mathbb{S}, \rho_i > 0} \{-2q_{ii}/\rho_i\}$ if $\max_{i \in \mathbb{S}} \rho_i > 0$.*

The generator of $\{\Lambda_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is specified by $Q = (q_{ij})_{N \times N}$, such that for a sufficiently small Δ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{t+\Delta} = j | \Lambda_t = i) = \begin{cases} q_{ij}\Delta + o(\Delta), & i \neq j, \\ 1 + q_{ii}\Delta + o(\Delta), & i = j, \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

where $\Delta > 0$, $o(\Delta)$ satisfies $\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{o(\Delta)}{\Delta} = 0$. Here q_{ij} is the transition rate from i to j satisfying $q_{ii} = -\sum_{i \neq j} q_{ij}$. We assume that the Markov chain $\{\Lambda_t\}$ defined on the probability space above is independent of the standard Brownian motion $\{B(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ and the Q matrix is irreducible and conservative. Therefore, the Markov chain $\{\Lambda_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ has a unique stationary distribution $\pi := (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N)$ which can be determined by solving the linear equation

$$\pi Q = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i = \mathbf{1} \quad \text{with} \quad \pi_i > \mathbf{0}.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}(H_3 \times \mathbb{S})$ stand for the family of all probability measures on $H_3 \times \mathbb{S}$. For $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)^* \in H_3$, $\xi \gg \mathbf{0}$ means each component $\xi_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

We replace $((S(x, t), I(x, t), V(x, t)), \Lambda_t)$ with $((S(x, t)^{s_1, i}, I(x, t)^{i_1, i}, V(x, t)^{v_1, i}), \Lambda_t^i)$, especially the initial value

$$((S^0, I^0, V^0), \Lambda_0) = ((s_1, i_1, v_1), i).$$

For any $p \in (0, 1]$, we set $s := (s_1, i_1, v_1)$ and define a metric on $H_3 \times \mathbb{S}$ as follows

$$d_p((s, i), (\bar{s}, \bar{i})) := \int_{H_3} \sum_{k=1}^3 |s_k - \bar{s}_k|^p + \chi_{\{i \neq \bar{i}\}}, \quad (s, i), (\bar{s}, \bar{i}) \in H_3 \times \mathbb{S},$$

where χ_A denotes the indicator function of the set A , and $\bar{s} := (\bar{s}_1, \bar{i}_1, \bar{v}_1)$ is different initial value. For $p \in (0, 1]$, we define the Wassertein distance between $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(H_3 \times \mathbb{S})$ and $\nu' \in \mathcal{P}(H_3 \times \mathbb{S})$ by

$$W_p(\nu, \nu') = \inf \mathbb{E}d_p(X_k, X_{k'}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all pairs of random variables $X_k, X_{k'}$ on $H_3 \times \mathbb{S}$ with respective laws ν, ν' . Let $\mathbb{P}_t((s_1, i_1, v_1), i; \cdot)$ be the transition probability kernel of the pair $((S(x, t)^{s_1, i}, I(x, t)^{i_1, i}, V(x, t)^{v_1, i}), \Lambda_t^i)$, a time homogeneous Markov process (see [15]). Recall that $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(H_3 \times \mathbb{S})$ is called an invariant measure of $((S(x, t)^{s_1, i}, I(x, t)^{i_1, i}, V(x, t)^{v_1, i}), \Lambda_t^i)$ if

$$\pi(A \times \{i\}) = \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{H_3} \mathbb{P}_t((s_1, i_1, v_1), j; A \times \{i\}) \pi(d(s_1, i_1, v_1) \times \{j\}), t \geq 0, A \in H_3, i \in \mathbb{S}, \quad (2.10)$$

holds. For any $p > 0$, let

$$\text{diag}(\rho) \triangleq \text{diag}(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N), \quad Q_p \triangleq Q + \frac{p}{2} \text{diag}(\rho), \quad \eta_p \triangleq -\max_{\gamma} \text{Re}\gamma, \quad (2.11)$$

where ρ_i is introduced in the assumptions and $\gamma \in \text{spec}(Q_p)$, $\text{spec}(Q_p)$ denotes the spectrum of Q_p (i.e., the multi-set of its eigenvalues). $\text{Re}\gamma$ is the real part of γ and $\text{diag}(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N)$ denotes the diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are ρ_1, \dots, ρ_N , respectively.

3. Existence and uniqueness of invariant measures

One of the most important problems in applying stochastic analysis is the question of the existence and uniqueness of invariant measures for specific processes. In this section, we mainly prove the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure for the exact solution. Thus one can expect that processes with invariant measures exhibit some kind of stability. If Lemma 2.1 hold, the system (2.5) is said to be attractive ‘‘in average’’.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $N < \infty$ and $\max_{i \in \mathbb{S}} \rho_i > 0$, then the exact solution of system (2.5) admits a unique invariant measure $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(H_3 \times \mathbb{S})$.*

Proof. The key point of proof is to divide the whole proof into two parts of existence and uniqueness.

(I) Existence of invariant measure. Let $((S_t^{s_1, i}, I_t^{i_1, i}, V_t^{v_1, i}), \Lambda_t^i)$ be the exact solution of system (2.5) with $((s_1, i_1, v_1), i)$ as initial value, where $((s_1, i_1, v_1), i) \in H_3 \times \mathbb{S}$. A simple application of the Feynman-Kac formula show that let $Q_{p,t} = e^{tQ_p}$, where Q_p is given in (2.11). Then, the spectral radius $\text{Ria}(Q_{p,t})$ (i.e., $\text{Ria}(Q_{p,t}) = \sup_{\lambda \in \text{spec}(Q_{p,t})} |\lambda|$) of $Q_{p,t}$ equals to $e^{-\eta_p t}$. Since all coefficients of $Q_{p,t}$ are positive, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem yields that $-\eta_p$ is a simple eigenvalue of Q_p , all other eigenvalues have a strictly smaller real part. Note that the eigenvector of $Q_{p,t}$ corresponding to $e^{-\eta_p t}$ is also an eigenvector of Q_p corresponding to $-\eta_p$. According to Perron-Frobenius theorem, for Q_p it can be found that there is a positive eigenvector $\xi^{(p)} = (\xi_1^{(p)}, \dots, \xi_N^{(p)}) \gg \mathbf{0}$ (where $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{H}$ is a zero vector) corresponding to the eigenvalue $-\eta_p$, and $\xi^{(p)} \gg \mathbf{0}$ means that each component $\xi_i^{(p)} > 0$. Let

$$p_0 = 1 \wedge \min_{i \in \mathbb{S}, \rho_i > 0} \{-2q_{ii}/\rho_i\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $1 \wedge \min_{i \in \mathbb{S}, \rho_i > 0} \{-2q_{ii}/\rho_i\} := \min\{1, \min_{i \in \mathbb{S}, \rho_i > 0} \{-2q_{ii}/\rho_i\}\}$. Combined with [Lemma 2.1](#), we can get

$$Q_p \xi_i^{(p)} = -\eta_p \xi_i^{(p)} \ll \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.2)$$

In order to investigate the existence and uniqueness of invariant measure for exact solution, we need to prove the boundedness of exact solution for system (2.5). In other words, we need to prove whether the following inequality holds

$$\mathbb{E}(1 + |S_t^{s_1, i}|^p + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^p + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^p) \leq C.$$

First, using the Itô formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\eta_p t} \mathbb{E}((1 + |S_t^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_t^i}^{(p)}) \\ = & (1 + |s_1|^2 + |i_1|^2 + |v_1|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \xi_i^p + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta_p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \eta_p \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} + (Q \xi^{(p)})(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \right\} d\epsilon \\ & + \frac{p}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta_p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} \left\{ 2 \langle S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}, D_1(x) \Delta S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} + (1 - p(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)) b(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \right. \\ & - (\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + u_1(x, t)) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} - \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + 2 \langle I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}, D_2(x) \Delta I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \\ & - (\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} - \frac{m(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) u_2(x, t) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}}{1 + \eta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}} \rangle + 2 \langle V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}, D_3(x) \Delta V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} + p(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) b(\Lambda_t) + u_1(x, t) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} - \mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} \\ & - (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + u_1(x, t) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} + \frac{m(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) u_2(x, t) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}}{1 + \eta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}} \rangle \left. \right\} d\epsilon + \frac{p}{2} \int_0^t e^{\eta_p \epsilon} \mathbb{E} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \\ & \times \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} \left\{ (p-2)(1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{-1} \left(\|S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 + \|I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} (\sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 + \|V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\|\sigma(\Lambda_t) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 + \|(\sigma(\Lambda_t) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i})\|^2 + \|(1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 \right) \right\} d\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Using $p(p-2)/2 < 0$, due to $p \in (0, p_0)$, and combining with the following inequality,

$$\int_0^t \int_\Omega D_1(x) \Delta S_\epsilon S_\epsilon dx d\epsilon = - \int_0^t \int_\Omega D_1(x) \nabla S_\epsilon \nabla S_\epsilon dx d\epsilon \leq -D_0 \int_0^t \|S_\epsilon\|^2 d\epsilon, \quad (3.3)$$

by similar methods, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_\Omega D_2(x) \Delta I_\epsilon I_\epsilon dx d\epsilon & \leq -D_0 \int_0^t \|I_\epsilon\|^2 d\epsilon, \\ \int_0^t \int_\Omega D_3(x) \Delta V_\epsilon V_\epsilon dx d\epsilon & \leq -D_0 \int_0^t \|V_\epsilon\|^2 d\epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where $0 \leq D_0 \leq D_i(x, t) < \infty$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, (D_0 is a constant).

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\eta_p t} \mathbb{E}((1 + |S_t^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_t^i}^{(p)}) \\ \leq & (1 + |s_1|^2 + |i_1|^2 + |v_1|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \xi_i^p + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta_p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \eta_p \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} + (Q \xi^{(p)})(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \right\} d\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{p}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} \left\{ 2 \langle S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}, (1 - p(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)) b(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \right. \\
& - (\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + u_1(x, t)) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} - \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \rangle + 2 \langle I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}, \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \\
& - (\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} - \frac{m(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) u_2(x, t) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}}{1 + \eta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}} \rangle + 2 \langle V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}, p(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) b(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + u_1(x, t) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} - \mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} \\
& - (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + \frac{m(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) u_2(x, t) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}}{1 + \eta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}} \rangle \left. \right\} d\epsilon + \frac{p}{2} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} \mathbb{E} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 \\
& + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \times \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} \left\{ (p - 2) (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{-1} \left(\|S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 \right. \right. \\
& + \|I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \sigma S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 + \|V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 \left. \right) \\
& + \left(\|\sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 + \|(\sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i})\|^2 + \|(1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}\|^2 \right) \left. \right\} d\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, based on the inequality $2ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} b^2$, $\varepsilon > 0$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\eta p t} \mathbb{E} ((1 + |S_t^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_t^i}^{(p)}) \\
& \leq (1 + |s_1|^2 + |i_1|^2 + |v_1|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \xi_{\Lambda_0^i}^{(p)} + \frac{p}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \left\{ (\epsilon \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)) \epsilon \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{\epsilon} - 2(\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + u_1) |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon(1 + \eta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i})} \right. \\
& - 2(\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)) |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + (u_1 \epsilon + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + u_1 \epsilon + m(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) u_2 \epsilon - 2\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)) |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2 + \frac{2}{\epsilon} |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 \\
& + \frac{2}{\epsilon} |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2 \left. \right\} \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} d\epsilon + \frac{p}{2} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} \mathbb{E} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \left(\| \sigma S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \|^2 \right. \\
& + \| (\sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) S_\epsilon^{s_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} + (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}) \|^2 + \| (1 - e) \sigma(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) V_\epsilon^{v_1, i} I_\epsilon^{i_1, i} \|^2 \left. \right) \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} d\epsilon \\
& + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \eta p \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} + (Q\xi^{(P)})(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \right\} d\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

According to $(|a| + |b|)^r \leq 2^{r-1} (|a|^r + |b|^r)$, $r \geq 1$, $\forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we can further estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\eta p t} \mathbb{E} ((1 + |S_t^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_t^i}^{(p)}) \\
& \leq c(1 + |s_1|^p + |i_1|^p + |v_1|^p) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \eta p \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} + (Q\xi^{(P)})(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \right\} d\epsilon \\
& + \frac{p}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \frac{C_1 |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + \tau_1 |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2}{(1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)} \right\} d\epsilon \\
& + \frac{p}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \frac{\tau_2 |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2 + C_4 |u_\epsilon|^2}{(1 + |S_\epsilon^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1, i}|^2)} \right\} d\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 := (\epsilon \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon} - 2(\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + u_1))$, $\tau_1 := (\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon(1 + \eta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{i_1, i})} - 2(\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)))$ and $\tau_2 := (u_1 \epsilon + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + u_1 \epsilon + m(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) u_2 \epsilon - 2\mu)$, $C_4 := \varepsilon_2 + c$ are different constants.

Finally, by Gronwall's lemma, we can get the result

$$e^{\eta p t} \mathbb{E} ((1 + |S_t^{s_1, i}|^2 + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^2 + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_t^i}^{(p)}) \leq C e^{CT}, \quad (3.5)$$

and further estimates can be obtained as follows

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} (|S_t^{s_1, i}|^p + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^p + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^p) \leq C. \quad (3.6)$$

For any $t > 0$, we can define a probability measure

$$\chi_t(A) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathbb{P}_\epsilon(s, i; A) d\epsilon, \quad A \in (H_3 \times \mathbb{S}).$$

Then, let $Y_t^{s,i} := (S_t^{s_1,i}, I_t^{i_1,i}, V_t^{v_1,i})$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, by Eq.(3.6) and Chebyshev's inequality, there exists an $r > 0$ sufficiently large such that

$$\chi_t(K_r \times \mathbb{S}) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathbb{P}_\epsilon(s, i; K_r \times \mathbb{S}) d\epsilon \geq 1 - \frac{\sup_{t \geq 0} (\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{s,i}|^p)}{r^p} \geq 1 - \epsilon. \quad (3.7)$$

Hence, χ_t is tight since the compact embedding $V \Subset H$, then $K_r = \{s \in H_3; |s| \leq r\}$ is a compact subset of H_3 for each $i \in \mathbb{S}$. Combined with the Fellerian property of transition seimgroup for $\mathbb{P}_t(s, i; \cdot)$ and according to Krylov-Bogoliubov theorem (see [16]), $((S_t^{s_1,i}, I_t^{i_1,i}, V_t^{v_1,i}), \Lambda_t^i)$ has an invariant measure. Next, we prove the uniqueness of the invariant measure for $((S_t^{s_1,i}, I_t^{i_1,i}, V_t^{v_1,i}), \Lambda_t^i)$.

(II) Uniqueness of invariant measure. First, let $((S_t^{s_1,i}, I_t^{i_1,i}, V_t^{v_1,i}), \Lambda_t^i)$ and $((S_t^{\bar{s}_1,i}, I_t^{\bar{i}_1,i}, V_t^{\bar{v}_1,i}), \Lambda_t^i)$ be the solutions of the system (2.5) satisfying the initial values $((s_1, i_1, v_1), i)$ and $((\bar{s}_1, \bar{i}_1, \bar{v}_1), i)$, respectively. Under assumption conditions (H1)-(H2), we take $\forall \epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and use Itô's formula, combined with Eq.(3.4), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\eta p t} \mathbb{E}((\epsilon + |S_t^{s_1,i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + |I_t^{i_1,i} - I_t^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + |V_t^{v_1,i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_t^i}^{(p)}) \\ & \leq (\epsilon + |s_1 - \bar{s}_1|^2 + |i_1 - \bar{i}_1|^2 + |v_1 - \bar{v}_1|^2)^{p/2} \xi_i^{(p)} + \frac{p}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (\epsilon + |S_\epsilon^{s_1,i} - S_\epsilon^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 \\ & \quad + |I_\epsilon^{i_1,i} - I_\epsilon^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - V_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2)^{p/2-1} \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} \times \left\{ [\epsilon \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon} - 2(\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) + u_1)] \right. \\ & \quad \times |S_\epsilon^{s_1,i} - S_\epsilon^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon(1 + \eta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) I_\epsilon^{s_1,i})} - 2(\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \alpha(\Lambda_\epsilon^i))] |I_\epsilon^{i_1,i} - I_\epsilon^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + [u_1 \epsilon + (1 - e) \beta(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) \epsilon + u_1 \epsilon + m(\Lambda_\epsilon^i) u_2 \epsilon \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 2\mu(\Lambda_\epsilon^i)] |V_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - V_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2 + \varepsilon_2 |u_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - u_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2 \right\} d\epsilon \\ & \leq (\epsilon + |s_1 - \bar{s}_1|^2 + |i_1 - \bar{i}_1|^2 + |v_1 - \bar{v}_1|^2)^{p/2} \xi_i^{(p)} \\ & \quad + \frac{p}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (\epsilon + |S_\epsilon^{s_1,i} - S_\epsilon^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1,i} - I_\epsilon^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - V_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} \\ & \quad \times \left\{ \frac{C_1 |S_\epsilon^{s_1,i} - S_\epsilon^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + \tau_1 |I_\epsilon^{i_1,i} - I_\epsilon^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + \tau_2 |V_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - V_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2 + \varepsilon_2 |u_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - u_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2}{\epsilon + |S_\epsilon^{s_1,i} - S_\epsilon^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1,i} - I_\epsilon^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - V_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2} \right\} d\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where C_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ have been explained before. In addition, using (3.5), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\eta p t} \mathbb{E}((\epsilon + |S_t^{s_1,i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + |I_t^{i_1,i} - I_t^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + |V_t^{v_1,i} - V(x, t)^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_t^i}^{(p)}) \\ & \leq (\epsilon + |s_1 - \bar{s}_1|^2 + |i_1 - \bar{i}_1|^2 + |v_1 - \bar{v}_1|^2)^{p/2} \xi_i^{(p)} \\ & \quad + \frac{p}{2} C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{\eta p \epsilon} (\epsilon + |S_\epsilon^{s_1,i} - S_\epsilon^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1,i} - I_\epsilon^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - V_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2)^{p/2} \xi_{\Lambda_\epsilon^i}^{(p)} \\ & \quad \times \left\{ 1 - \epsilon (\epsilon + |S_\epsilon^{s_1,i} - S_\epsilon^{\bar{s}_1,i}|^2 + |I_\epsilon^{i_1,i} - I_\epsilon^{\bar{i}_1,i}|^2 + |V_\epsilon^{v_1,i} - V_\epsilon^{\bar{v}_1,i}|^2)^{-1} \right\} d\epsilon \\ & \leq (\epsilon + |s_1 - \bar{s}_1|^2 + |i_1 - \bar{i}_1|^2 + |v_1 - \bar{v}_1|^2)^{p/2} \xi_i^{(p)} + C \epsilon^{p/2} e^{\eta p t}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have the following result

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, i}|^p + |I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, i}|^p + |V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, i}|^p) \\ & \leq C(|s_1 - \bar{s}_1|^p + |i_1 - \bar{i}_1|^p + |v_1 - \bar{v}_1|^p)e^{-\eta_p t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Define the stopping time

$$\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \Lambda_t^i = \Lambda_t^j\}.$$

According to the definition of \mathbb{S} and irreducibility of Q , there exists $\theta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau > t) \leq e^{-\theta t}, \quad t > 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Due to $p \in (0, p_0)$, and choose $q > 1$ such that $0 < pq < p_0$, where p_0 is introduced in Eq.(3.1). It follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p + |I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^p + |V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p) \\ & = \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau > t/2\}}) + \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}}) + \mathbb{E}(|I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau > t/2\}}) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}(|I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}}) + \mathbb{E}(|V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau > t/2\}}) + \mathbb{E}(|V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}}) \\ & \leq (\mathbb{E}|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^{pq} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau > t/2\}})^{1/q} (\mathbb{P}(\tau > t/2))^{1/p} + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}} \mathbb{E}|S_{t-\tau}^{s_1, i, \Lambda_\tau^i} - S_{t-\tau}^{\bar{s}_1, j, \Lambda_\tau^j}|^p) \\ & \quad + (\mathbb{E}|I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^{pq} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau > t/2\}})^{1/q} (\mathbb{P}(\tau > t/2))^{1/p} + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}} \mathbb{E}|I_{t-\tau}^{i_1, i, \Lambda_\tau^i} - I_{t-\tau}^{\bar{i}_1, j, \Lambda_\tau^j}|^p) \\ & \quad + (\mathbb{E}|V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^{pq} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau > t/2\}})^{1/q} (\mathbb{P}(\tau > t/2))^{1/p} + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}} \mathbb{E}|V_{t-\tau}^{v_1, i, \Lambda_\tau^i} - V_{t-\tau}^{\bar{v}_1, j, \Lambda_\tau^j}|^p). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Applying the result of Eq.(3.10), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p + |I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^p + |V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p) \\ & \leq e^{-\frac{q-1}{2q}\theta t} (\mathbb{E}|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^{pq})^{\frac{1}{q}} + C\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}} e^{-\eta_p(t-\tau)} \mathbb{E}|S_\tau^{s_1, i} - S_\tau^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p) \\ & \quad + e^{-\frac{q-1}{2q}\theta t} (\mathbb{E}|I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^{pq})^{\frac{1}{q}} + C\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}} e^{-\eta_p(t-\tau)} \mathbb{E}|I_\tau^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_\tau^{i_1, j}|^p) \\ & \quad + e^{-\frac{q-1}{2q}\theta t} (\mathbb{E}|V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^{pq})^{\frac{1}{q}} + C\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq t/2\}} e^{-\eta_p(t-\tau)} \mathbb{E}|V_s^{v_1, i} - V_s^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p) \\ & \leq e^{-\frac{q-1}{2q}\theta t} (\mathbb{E}|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^{pq})^{\frac{1}{q}} + C e^{-\frac{\eta_p}{2}t} \mathbb{E}|S_\tau^{s_1, i} - S_\tau^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p + e^{-\frac{q-1}{2q}\theta t} (\mathbb{E}|I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^{pq})^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \quad + C e^{-\frac{\eta_p}{2}t} \mathbb{E}|I_\tau^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_\tau^{i_1, j}|^p + e^{-\frac{q-1}{2q}\theta t} (\mathbb{E}|V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^{pq})^{1/q} + C e^{-\frac{\eta_p}{2}t} \mathbb{E}|V_s^{v_1, i} - V_s^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p \\ & \leq C(1 + |s_1|^p + |\bar{s}_1|^p + |i_1|^p + |\bar{i}_1|^p + |v_1|^p + |\bar{v}_1|^p)e^{-\sigma t}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where $\sigma := \frac{(q-1)\theta}{2q} \wedge \frac{\eta_p}{2}$, and in the last step, it follows from Eq.(3.6) and Eq.(3.9) such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i}|^{pq} + |I_t^{i_1, i}|^{pq} + |V_t^{v_1, i}|^{pq}) \leq C,$$

and

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^{pq} + |I_t^{\bar{i}_1, j}|^{pq} + |V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^{pq}) \leq C.$$

Thus, we also have assertion

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p + |I_t^{i_1, i} - \bar{I}_t^{i_1, j}|^p + |V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p) = 0.$$

By virtue of Eq.(3.10)

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_t^i \neq \Lambda_t^j) = \mathbb{P}(\tau > t) \leq e^{-\theta t} \quad t > 0. \quad (3.13)$$

Next, according to Eq.(3.12) and Eq.(3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} & W_p(\delta_{((s_1, i_1, i_1), i)} \mathbb{P}_t, \delta_{((\bar{s}_1, \bar{i}_1, \bar{v}_1), j)} \mathbb{P}_t) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}(|S_t^{s_1, i} - S_t^{\bar{s}_1, j}|^p + |I_t^{i_1, i} - I_t^{\bar{i}_1, j}|^p + |V_t^{v_1, i} - V_t^{\bar{v}_1, j}|^p) + \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_t^i \neq \Lambda_t^j) \\ & \leq C(1 + |s_1|^p + |\bar{s}_1|^p + |i_1|^p + |\bar{i}_1|^p + |v_1|^p + |\bar{v}_1|^p)e^{-\sigma t} + e^{-\theta t} \\ & \leq Ce^{-\sigma^* t}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where $\sigma^* := \sigma \wedge \theta$. Assume $\pi, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(H_3 \times \mathbb{S})$ are invariant measures of $((S_t^{s_1, i}, I_t^{i_1, i}, V_t^{v_1, i}), \Lambda_t^i)$, it follows from Eq.(3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} & W_p(\pi, \nu) = W_p(\pi \mathbb{P}_t, \nu \mathbb{P}_t) \\ & \leq \sum_{i, j=1}^N \int_{H_3 \times \mathbb{S}} \int_{H_3 \times \mathbb{S}} \pi(d(s_1, i_1, v_1) \times \{i\}) \nu(d(\bar{s}_1, \bar{i}_1, \bar{v}_1) \times \{j\}) W_p(\delta_{((s_1, i_1, v_1), i)} P_t, \delta_{((\bar{s}_1, \bar{i}_1, \bar{v}_1), j)} P_t). \end{aligned}$$

When $t \rightarrow \infty$, we find $W_p(\pi, \nu) \rightarrow 0$. Hence, uniqueness of invariant measure follows immediately. The proof of [Theorem 3.1](#) has been completed. \square

4. Necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimal controls

In this section, we will introduce two lemmas at first, then we will obtain the necessary condition for the near-optimal control of the model (2.5).

4.1. Some priori estimates of the susceptible, infected and vaccinated

Lemma 4.1. *We assume $|\Gamma| = 1$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, the solution $(S(t), I(t), V(t), \Lambda_t)$ of (2.5) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\Gamma} (S(x, t) + I(x, t) + V(x, t)) dx = N, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (4.1)$$

where $N := \int_{\Gamma} (S_0(x) + I_0(x) + V_0(x)) dx$.

Proof. First, we define the linear operator $J : L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as following

$$\forall u \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^3), Ju := \int_{\Gamma} u(x) dx.$$

By the properties of e^{tA_i} , we have

$$\forall u \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^3), J(e^{tA_i} u - u) = 0, \quad Ju = J e^{tA_i} u, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Moreover, for any $u \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^3), u \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Γ , we define $\|u\|_1 = Ju$. On the other hand, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) + I(t) + V(t) &= e^{tA_1} S_0 + e^{tA_2} I_0 + e^{tA_3} V_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A_1} S(s) I(s) dB_1(s) \\ &+ \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A_2} S(s) I(s) dB_2(s) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A_2} V(s) I(s) dB_4(s) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A_3} V(s) I(s) dB_3(s). \end{aligned}$$

Then, applying to the operator J to both sides and using the properties of stochastic integrals

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(t) + I(t) + V(t)\|_1 &= \|S_0 + I_0 + V_0\|_1 + \int_0^t J(e^{(t-s)A_1} S(s)I(s))dB_1(s) \\ &+ \int_0^t J(e^{(t-s)A_2} S(s)I(s))dB_2(s) + \int_0^t J(e^{(t-s)A_2} V(s)I(s))dB_4(s) + \int_0^t J(e^{(t-s)A_3} V(s)I(s))dB_3(s). \end{aligned}$$

where $J(e^{(t-s)A_1} S(s))$ in the stochastic integral is understood as the process with value in $L(L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^3)$, the space of linear operator from $L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, for any $u \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^3)$ that is defined by

$$J(e^{(t-s)A_1} S(s)I(s))u : \int_{\Gamma} (e^{(t-s)A_1} S(s)I(s))(x)dx,$$

by similar methods for $J(e^{(t-s)A_2} S(s)I(s))$, $J(e^{(t-s)A_2} V(s)I(s))$, and $J(e^{(t-s)A_3} V(s)I(s))$. By taking the expectation to both sides and using the properties of stochastic integral, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|S(t) + I(t) + V(t)\|_1 = \|S_0 + I_0 + V_0\|_1.$$

The proof is completed. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $(D_1, D_2, D_3) := (D_1(x), D_2(x), D_3(x))$, for all $\theta \geq 0$ and $0 < \kappa < 1$ satisfying $\kappa\theta < 1$, and $(u(x, t), u'(x, t)) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, along with the corresponding trajectories $(X(x, t), X'(x, t))$, there exists a constant $C = C(\theta, \kappa)$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} |X_i(x, t) - X'_i(x, t)|^2 dx dt \leq C \sum_{i=1}^2 d(u_i(x, t), u'_i(x, t))^{\kappa\theta}. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. We assume $\theta \geq 1$ and $\forall r > 0$, use the elementary inequality, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq r} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2 dx dt \\ &= 2 \left[\int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} -\mu(x, \Lambda_t) \langle S(x, t) - S'(x, t), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle dx ds - \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} \beta(x, \Lambda_t) I(x, t) \langle S(x, t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - S'(x, t), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle ds + \int_0^t \langle D_1 \Delta(S(x, t) - S'(x, t)), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle dx ds \right] \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} |\sigma(x, \Lambda_t) I(x, t)(S(x, t) - S'(x, t))|^2 dx ds - \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} \langle \sigma(x, \Lambda_t) I(x, t)(S(x, t) - S'(x, t)), S(x, t) \\ &\quad - S'(x, t) \rangle dx dB(t) - \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} \langle u_1(x, t)S(x, t) - u'_1(x, t)S'(x, t), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle dx ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

If $0 < \kappa < 1$, then $\theta \geq 1$, it follows from Cauchy-Schwartz's inequality that

$$\mu(x, \Lambda_t) \langle S(x, t) - S'(x, t), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle \leq C |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2, \quad (4.4)$$

it follows from metric definition that

$$\langle D_1 \Delta(S(x, t) - S'(x, t)), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle ds = D_1 \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} -\|\nabla(S(x, t) - S'(x, t))\|^2 dx ds, \quad (4.5)$$

similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle u_1(x, t)S(x, t) - u'_1(x, t)S'(x, t), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle \\
&= \langle u_1(x, t)S(x, t) - u_1(x, t)S'(x, t), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle (u(x, t)S'(x, t) - u'(x, t)S'(x, t))|_{\mathcal{X}_{u(x, t) \neq u'(x, t)}}, S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle \\
&\leq C(|S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2 + (|u'_1(x, t) - u_1(x, t)|^2 + |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2)|_{\mathcal{X}_{u(x, t) \neq u'(x, t)}}) \\
&\leq C(|S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2 + d(u(x, t), u'(x, t))).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Because I is bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup \left[\int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} \langle \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)(S(x, t) - S'(x, t)), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle dx dB(t) \right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} [\sup (|S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} \|\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)(S(x, t) - S'(x, t))\|_2^2 dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} [\sup |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2 + \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} \|S(x, t) - S'(x, t)\|_2^2 dx dt],
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) \langle S(x, t) - S'(x, t), S(x, t) - S'(x, t) \rangle \leq C(\|S(x, t) - S'(x, t)\|_2^2), \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2 \leq Cd(u(x, t) - u'(x, t))^\kappa, \tag{4.9}$$

combined with the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^\theta &\leq (\mathbb{E}|^{\frac{2-\theta}{2-\theta}})^{\frac{2-\theta}{2}} (\mathbb{E}(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^\theta)^{\frac{2}{\theta}})^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \\
&\leq (\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |S(x, t) - S'(x, t)|^2)^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \leq Cd(u(x, t), u'(x, t))^{\frac{\kappa\theta}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Similarly, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq r} |I(x, t) - I'(x, t)|^\theta &\leq Cd(u(x, t), u'(x, t))^{\frac{\kappa\theta}{2}}, \\
\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq r} |V(x, t) - V'(x, t)|^\theta &\leq Cd(u(x, t), u'(x, t))^{\frac{\kappa\theta}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

The proof is completed. \square

Next, we will draw into the adjoint equation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
dp_1(x, t) &= -A_1 + \left(-(\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + u_1(x, t))S(x, t) + \beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) \right) p_1(x, t) + D_1 \Delta p_1(x, t) \\
&\quad + \beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)p_2(x, t) + u_1(x, t)p_3(x, t) - \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)q_1(x, t) \\
&\quad + \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)q_2(x, t) + q_1(x, t)dB(t), \\
dp_2(x, t) &= -A_2 + (\alpha(x, \Lambda_t) - \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t))p_1(x, t) + \left(\beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) + (1 - e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)) - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)}{(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))^2} \right) p_2(x, t) + D_2 \Delta p_2(x, t)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left((1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)}{(1+\eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))^2} \right) p_3(x, t) - \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)q_1(x, t) \\
& + (\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t))q_2(x, t) - (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)q_3(x, t) + q_2(x, t)dB(t), \\
dp_3(x, t) = & (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)p_2(x, t) - \left(\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) \right) p_3(x, t) \\
& + D_3\Delta p_3(x, t) + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)q_2(x, t) - (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)q_3(x, t) + q_3(x, t)dB(t), \\
p_i(x, T) = & h_{X_i}(X(x, T)), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\
p_i(x, t) = & 0, \quad x \in \partial\Gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.3. For all $0 < \kappa < 1$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ satisfying $(1 + \kappa)\theta < 2$, and $u(x, t), u'(x, t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, along with the corresponding trajectories $(X(x, t), X'(x, t))$, and the solution $(p(x), q(x, t)), (p'(x, t), q'(x, t))$ of corresponding adjoint equation (4.12), there exists a constant $C = C(\kappa, \theta) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} |p_i(x, t) - p'_i(x, t)|^\theta dx dt + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} |q_i(x, t) - q'_i(x, t)|^\theta dx dt \\
& \leq C \sum_{i=1}^2 d(u_i(x, t), u'_i(x, t))^{\frac{\kappa\theta}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{p}_i(x, t) \equiv p_i(x, t) - p'_i(x, t)$, $\widehat{q}_j(x, t) \equiv q_j(x, t) - q'_j(x, t)$ ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$). From the adjoint equation (4.12), we have

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
d\widehat{p}_1(x, t) = & - \left[A_1 - \left(\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + u_1(x, t) + \beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) \right) \widehat{p}_1(x, t) + D_1\Delta\widehat{p}_1(x, t) + \beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)\widehat{p}_2(x, t) \right. \\
& \left. + u_1(x, t)\widehat{p}_3(x, t) - \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)\widehat{q}_1(x, t) + \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)\widehat{q}_2(x, t) + \widehat{f}_1(x, t) \right] dt + \widehat{q}_1(x, t)dB(t), \\
d\widehat{p}_2(x, t) = & - \left[A_2 + (\alpha(x, \Lambda_t) - \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t))\widehat{p}_1(x, t) + \left(\beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) - (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)) - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} \right) \widehat{p}_2(x, t) + D_2\Delta\widehat{p}_2(x, t) - \left((1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} \right) \widehat{p}_3(x, t) - \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)\widehat{q}_1(x, t) + (\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) \right. \\
& \left. + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t))\widehat{q}_2(x, t) - ((1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t))\widehat{q}_3(x, t) + \widehat{f}_2(x, t) \right] dt + \widehat{q}_2(x, t)dB(t), \\
d\widehat{p}_3(x, t) = & - \left[((1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\widehat{p}_2(x, t) - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\widehat{p}_3(x, t) + D_3\Delta\widehat{p}_3(x, t) \right] dt \\
& + ((1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\widehat{q}_2(x, t) + ((1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\widehat{q}_3(x, t) + \widehat{f}_3(x, t) + \widehat{q}_3(x, t)dB(t).
\end{aligned} \right.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{f}_1(x, t) = & \beta(x, \Lambda_t)(I(x, t) - I'(x, t))(p'_2(x, t) - p'_1(x, t)) + \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)(I(x, t) - I'(x, t))(q'_2(x, t) - q'_1(x, t)), \\
\widehat{f}_2(x, t) = & \beta(x, \Lambda_t)(S(x, t) - S'(x, t))(p'_2(x, t) - p'_1(x, t)) + (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)(V(x, t) - V'(x, t))(p'_3(x, t) - p'_2(x, t)) \\
& + m(x, \Lambda_t)x \left(\frac{u_2(x, t)}{(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))^2} - \frac{u'_2(x, t)}{(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I'(x, t))^2} \right) (p'_3(x, t) - p'_2(x, t)) + \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)(S(x, t) \\
& - S'(x, t))(q'_2(x, t) - q'_1(x, t)) + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)(V(x, t) - V'(x, t))(q'_3(x, t) - q'_2(x, t)), \\
\widehat{f}_3(x, t) = & (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)(I(x, t) - I'(x, t))(p'_2(x, t) - p'_3(x, t)) + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)(I(x, t) - I'(x, t))(q'_2(x, t) - q'_3(x, t)).
\end{aligned}$$

We assume the solution of the following stochastic differential equation is $\phi(x, t) := (\phi_1(x, t), \phi_2(x, t), \phi_3(x, t))^\top$,

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
d\phi_1(x, t) &= \left[(\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + u_1(x, t) + \beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\phi_1(x, t) + D_1\Delta\phi_1(x, t) + (\alpha(x, \Lambda_t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t))\phi_2(x, t) + |\widehat{p}_1(x, t)|^{\theta-1} \text{sgn}(\widehat{p}_1(x, t)) \right] dt - \left[(\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\phi_1(x, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t))\phi_2(x, t) + |\widehat{q}_1(x, t)|^{\theta-1} \text{sgn}(\widehat{q}_1(x, t)) \right] dB(t), \\
d\phi_2(x, t) &= \left[\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)\phi_1(x, t) \left(\beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) - (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} \right) \phi_2(x, t) + D_2\Delta\phi_2 + (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)\phi_3(x, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |\widehat{p}_2(x, t)|^{\theta(x, t)-1} \text{sgn}(\widehat{p}_2(x, t)) \right] dt + \left[\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)\phi_3(x, t) + (\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t))\phi_2(x, t) + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)\phi_3(x, t) + |\widehat{q}_2|^{\theta-1} \text{sgn}(\widehat{q}_2(x, t)) \right] dB(t), \\
d\phi_3(x, t) &= \left[u_1\phi_1(x, t) - \left((1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} \right) \phi_2(x, t) - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + (1- \right. \\
&\quad \left. e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\phi_3(x, t) + D_3\Delta\phi_3(x, t) + |\widehat{p}_3(x, t)|^{\theta-1} \text{sgn}(\widehat{p}_3(x, t)) \right] dt - \left(((1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t) \times \right. \\
&\quad \left. V(x, t))\phi_1(x, t) + ((1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\phi_2(x, t) + ((1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))\phi_2(x, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |\widehat{q}_3(x, t)|^{\theta-1} \text{sgn}(\widehat{q}_3(x, t)) \right) dB(t),
\end{aligned} \right.$$

where $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ is a symbolic function.

Lemma 4.4. For any $\theta \geq 0$ and $u(x, t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |S(x, t)|^\theta \leq C, \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I(x, t)|^\theta \leq C, \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |V(x, t)|^\theta \leq C, \quad (4.14)$$

where C is a constant that depends only on θ .

Proof. Using Itô's formula for $|S(x, t)|^\theta + |I(x, t)|^\theta + |V(x, t)|^\theta$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& |S(x, t)|^\theta + |I(x, t)|^\theta + |V(x, t)|^\theta \\
& \leq |S(x, 0)|^\theta + |I(x, 0)|^\theta + |V(x, 0)|^\theta + \int_0^t \int_\Gamma \left(\theta |S(x, t)|^{\theta-1} (1-p(x, \Lambda_t))b(x, \Lambda_t) + \theta |S(x, t)|^{\theta-1} \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) \right. \\
& \quad - \theta |S(x, t)|^\theta (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + u_1(x, t)) - \theta |S(x, t)|^\theta \beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) + \theta |S(x, t)|^{\theta-2} D_1 \|\nabla S(x, t)\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \theta (\theta - 1) |S(x, t)|^\theta \sigma^2(x, \Lambda_t)I^2(x, t) + \theta |I(x, t)|^\theta \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) + \theta |I(x, t)|^\theta (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) \\
& \quad - \theta |I(x, t)|^\theta (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)) + \theta |I(x, t)|^{\theta-2} D_2 \|\Delta I(x, t)\|^2 - \theta |I(x, t)|^\theta \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \theta (\theta - 1) |I(x, t)|^\theta \sigma^2(x, \Lambda_t)S^2(x, t) + \frac{1}{2} \theta (\theta - 1) |I(x, t)|^\theta (1-e)^2 V^2(x, t) + \theta |V(x, t)|^{\theta-1} p(x, \Lambda_t)b(x, \Lambda_t) \\
& \quad + \theta |V(x, t)|^{\theta-1} u_1(x, t)S(x, t) - \theta |V(x, t)|^\theta \mu(x, \Lambda_t) - \theta |V(x, t)|^\theta (1-e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) + \theta |V(x, t)|^{\theta-2} D_3 \|\nabla V(x, t)\|^2 \\
& \quad + \theta |V(x, t)|^{\theta-1} \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} + \frac{1}{2} \theta (\theta - 1) |V(x, t)|^\theta (1-e)^2 I^2(x, t) \Big) dx dt - (\theta |S(x, t)|^\theta \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) \\
& \quad - \theta |I(x, t)|^\theta (\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t)) + \theta |V(x, t)|^\theta (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)) dB(t) \\
& \leq |S(x, 0)|^\theta + |I(x, 0)|^\theta + |V(x, 0)|^\theta + C \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^t \int_\Gamma (|S(x, s)|^\theta + |I(x, s)|^\theta + |V(x, s)|^\theta) dx ds \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_\Gamma (\theta |S(x, t)|^\theta \sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) - \theta |I(x, t)|^\theta (\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) \\
& \quad + (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t)) + \theta |V(x, t)|^\theta (1-e)\sigma(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)) dx dB(x, t).
\end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

We take the upper bound and the expectation of (4.15), by the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, existence a constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} (\theta |S(x, t)|^\theta \sigma(x, \Lambda_t) I(x, t) - \theta |I(x, t)|^\theta (\sigma(x, \Lambda_t) S(x, t) \\
& + (1 - e) \sigma(x, \Lambda_t) V(x, t) I(x, t)) + \theta |V(x, t)|^\theta (1 - e) \sigma(x, \Lambda_t) I(x, t)) dx dB(x, t) \\
& = \theta \sigma(x, \Lambda_t) (|S(x, t)|^\theta I(x, t) + |I(x, t)|^\theta S(x, t)) + \theta (1 - e) \sigma(x, \Lambda_t) (|I(x, t)|^\theta V(x, t) - |V(x, t)|^\theta I(x, t)) \\
& \leq C [|S(x, t)|^\theta + |I(x, t)|^\theta + |V(x, t)|^\theta],
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (|S(x, t)|^\theta + |I(x, t)|^\theta + |V(x, t)|^\theta) & \leq 2\mathbb{E}(|S(x, 0)|^\theta + |I(x, 0)|^\theta + |V(x, 0)|^\theta) \\
& + C \mathbb{E} \sup \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma} (|S(x, s)|^\theta + |I(x, s)|^\theta + |V(x, s)|^\theta) dx ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

An application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (|S(x, t)|^\theta + |I(x, t)|^\theta + |V(x, t)|^\theta) \\
& \leq (\mathbb{E} 1^{\frac{2}{2-\theta}})^{1-\frac{\theta}{2}} (\mathbb{E} (\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (|S(x, t)|^\theta + |I(x, t)|^\theta + |V(x, t)|^\theta))^{\frac{\theta}{2}})^{\frac{\theta}{2}} ds \\
& \leq (\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (|S(x, t)|^2 + |I(x, t)|^2 + |V(x, t)|^2)^{\frac{\theta}{2}}) \leq C.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Similarly, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I(x, t)|^\theta \leq C, \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |V(x, t)|^\theta \leq C,$$

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.5. For any $u(x, t), u'(x, t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} |p_i(x, t)|^2 dx dt + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} |q_i(x, t)|^2 dx dt \leq C, \tag{4.19}$$

where C is a constant.

We define a metric on the admissible control domain $\mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, T]$ as follows:

$$d(u(x, t), u'(x, t)) = \mathbb{E}[\text{mes}\{x \times t \in \Gamma \times [0; T] : u(x, t) \neq u'(x, t)\}] \quad \forall u(x, t), u'(x, t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}, \tag{4.20}$$

where mes represents Lebesgue measure. Since U is closed, it can be shown that \mathcal{U}_{ad} is a complete metric space under d .

According to the definition of L and Lemma 4.5, the above equation admits a unique solution. Combining with the above two estimates, the desired result then holds immediately. \square

4.2. Necessary conditions for near-optimal controls

Theorem 4.1. Let $(p^\varepsilon(x, t), q^\varepsilon(x, t))$ is the solution of the adjoint equation (4.12) under the control $u^\varepsilon(x, t)$. Then, there exists a constant C such that for any $\theta \in [0, 1)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and any ε -optimal pair $(X^\varepsilon(x, t), u^\varepsilon(x, t))$, it holds that

$$\min_{u(x,t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_\Gamma \left([u_1(x, t) - u_1^\varepsilon(x, t)] S^\varepsilon(x, t) (p_3^\varepsilon(x, t) - p_1^\varepsilon(x, t)) + \frac{1}{2} (\tau_1 [u_1(x, t) - u_1^\varepsilon(x, t)]^2) \right) dx dt \geq -C\varepsilon^{\frac{\theta}{3}}.$$

and

$$\min_{u(x,t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_\Gamma \left(\frac{m(x, \Lambda_t) [u_2(x, t) - u_2^\varepsilon(x, t)] I^\varepsilon(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t) I^\varepsilon(x, t)} (p_3^\varepsilon(x, t) - p_2^\varepsilon(x, t)) - \frac{1}{2} (\tau_2 [u_2(x, t) - u_2^\varepsilon(x, t)]^2) \right) dx dt \geq -C\varepsilon^{\frac{\theta}{3}}.$$

Proof. The crucial step of the proof is to indicate that $H_{u(x,t)}(x, t, X^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon(x, t), p^\varepsilon(x, t), q^\varepsilon(x, t))$ is very small and use ε to estimate it. The proof process is similar to [15], so we omit the details. This completes the proof. \square

4.3. Sufficient conditions for near-optimal controls

We define the Hamiltonian function $H(x, t, X(x, t), u(x, t), p(x), q(x, t)) : \Gamma \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathcal{U}_{ad} \times \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$H(x, t, X(x, t), u(x, t), p(x), q(x, t)) = f^\top(X(x, t), u(x, t))p(x) + \sigma_*^\top(X(x, t))q(x, t) + L(X(x, t), u(x, t)), \quad (4.21)$$

with

$$f(X(x, t), u(x, t)) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(X(x, t), u(x, t)) \\ f_2(X(x, t), u(x, t)) \\ f_3(X(x, t), u(x, t)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_*(X(x, t)) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{14}(X(x, t)) \\ \sigma_{24}(X(x, t)) \\ \sigma_{34}(X(x, t)) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $f_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$ and $\sigma_{i4} (i = 1, 2, 3)$ are defined in (2.5), and $L(X(x, t), u(x, t))$ is defined in (2.8).

Theorem 4.2. Let $(X^\varepsilon(x, t), u^\varepsilon(x, t))$ be an admissible pair and $(p^\varepsilon(x, t), q^\varepsilon(x, t))$ be the solutions of adjoint equation (4.12) corresponding to $(X^\varepsilon(x, t), u^\varepsilon(x, t))$. Assume $H(x, t, X(x, t), u(x, t), p(x), q(x, t))$ is convex, a.s. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, it follows that

$$\varepsilon \geq \sup_{u^\varepsilon(x,t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0,T]} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_\Gamma \left([u_1^\varepsilon(x, t) - u_1(x, t)] S^\varepsilon(x, t) (p_3^\varepsilon(x, t) - p_1^\varepsilon(x, t)) + \frac{1}{2} (\tau_1 [u_1^\varepsilon(x, t) - u_1(x, t)]^2) \right) dx dt,$$

and

$$\varepsilon \geq \sup_{u^\varepsilon(x,t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0,T]} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_\Gamma \left(\frac{m(x, \Lambda_t) [u_2^\varepsilon(x, t) - u_2(x, t)] I^\varepsilon(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t) I^\varepsilon(x, t)} (p_3^\varepsilon(x, t) - p_2^\varepsilon(x, t)) - \frac{1}{2} (\tau_2 [u_2^\varepsilon(x, t) - u_2(x, t)]^2) \right) dx dt,$$

then

$$J(0, x_0; u^\varepsilon(x, t)) \leq \inf_{u(x,t) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0,T]} J(0, x_0; u(x, t)) + C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. From the definition of \tilde{d} of Lemma 4.5, according to Holder's inequality and reference [2], we can obtain the conclusion. \square

5. Optimal control and Numerical Algorithm

In this section, we study the optimal control of the stochastic SIV epidemic system, and then give the numerical approximation algorithm for the finite horizon optimal control problem of the stochastic epidemic system.

5.1. Optimal control

Since u_1, u_2 are function of the state and time, the easiest approach to the calculation of (u_1, u_2, V^*) is via the Bellman equation of continuous-time dynamic programming. Let $(p_1, p_2, p_3) := (V_{1x}, V_{2x}, V_{3x})$ and $(P_1, P_2, P_3) := (V_{1xx}, V_{2xx}, V_{3xx})$. Thus, the following Lyapunov equation (LE) is obtained.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = & V_t + p_1[D_1(x)\Delta S(x, t) + (1 - p(x, \Lambda_t))b(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) - \mu(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t) \\
& - \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)I(x, t)] + p_2[D_2(x)\Delta I(x, t) + \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)I(x, t) \\
& + (1 - e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)V(x, t) - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t))I(x, t)] \\
& + p_3[D_3(x)\Delta V(x, t) + p(x, \Lambda_t)b(x, \Lambda_t) - \mu(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) \\
& - (1 - e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)V(x, t)] + \frac{1}{2}[P_1\sigma^2(x, \Lambda_t)S^2(x, t) + P_2\sigma^2(x, \Lambda_t)I^2(x, t) \\
& + P_3\sigma^2(x, \Lambda_t)V^2(x, t)] + A_1S(x, t) + A_2I(x, t) + S^*(x, t) + I^*(x, t),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$S^*(x, t) = p_3(x, t)u_1(x, t)S(x, t) - p_1(x, t)u_1(x, t)S(x, t) + \tau_1u_1^2(x, t), \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$I^*(x, t) = p_3(x, t)\frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} - p_2(x, t)\frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} + \tau_2u_2^2(x, t), \tag{5.3}$$

the regular control given as

$$u_1(x, t) = \frac{p_1(x, t) - p_3(x, t)}{2\tau_1}S(x, t), \quad u_2(x, t) = \frac{(p_2(x, t) - p_3(x, t))m(x, \Lambda_t)}{2\tau_2(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))}I(x, t). \tag{5.4}$$

the optimal given as

$$u_1^*(x, t) = \begin{cases} u_1^{\max}, & u_1^{\max} \leq u_1(x, t), \\ u_1(x, t), & u_1^{\min} \leq u_1(x, t) \leq u_1^{\max}, \\ u_1^{\min}, & u_1(x, t) \leq u_1^{\min}, \end{cases} \quad u_2^*(x, t) = \begin{cases} u_2^{\max}, & u_2^{\max} \leq u_2(x, t), \\ u_2(x, t), & u_2^{\min} \leq u_2(x, t) \leq u_2^{\max}, \\ u_2^{\min}, & u_2(x, t) \leq u_2^{\min}. \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

Furthermore, according to the ideas in Lenhart and Workman, the optimal control $u^*(x, t)$, which minimizes the objective function $J(0, X(x, t); u(x, t))$ is present as

$$u_1^*(x, t) = \max\{0, \min\{1, \frac{S(x, t)}{2\tau_1}(p_1(x, t) - p_3(x, t))\}\},$$

and

$$u_2^*(x, t) = \max\{0, \min\{1, \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)}{2\tau_2(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))}(p_2(x, t) - p_3(x, t))\}\},$$

where $(p_1(x, t), p_2(x, t), p_3(x, t))$ is the solution of system (4.12).

5.2. Approximation of HJB equation

It is well known that it is difficult to find the analytical solution to the HJB equation due to the partial differential equation. Therefore, it is necessary to find the successive approximation method for the finite horizon optimal control problem of the stochastic epidemic system. In this section, we assume that the spaces are homogeneous. For simplify, we set $(S, I, V) := (S(x, t), I(x, t), V(x, t))$, respectively. In order to give the online learning algorithm, we first give the Lemma.

Lemma 5.1. Assume $(u_1^{(i+1)}, u_2^{(i+1)})$ are the admissible control of the epidemic system, $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the solution to the Lyapunov equation $LE(V^{(i)}, u^{(i)}) = 0$ with the boundary conditions $V^{(i)}(0, t) = 0$, $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t_f), t) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$, then

(1) $u_1^{(i+1)} = -(2\tau_1)^{-1}S^\top(x, t)(V_{1\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)})$, and $u_2^{(i+1)} = -[2\tau_2(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))]^{-1}I^\top(x, t)m(x, \Lambda_t)(V_{2\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)})$ is an admissible control.

Moreover, if $V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the solution to the Lyapunov equation $LE(V^{(i+1)}, u^{(i+1)}) = 0$ with the boundary conditions $V^{(i+1)}(0, t) = 0$, $V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}(t_f), t) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$, then

(2) $V^*(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

Proof. For the second part of Lemma 5.1, we should consider the properties of time-dependence and two parts of function $V(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t \in [t_0, t_f]$. We start the state \mathbf{x} and go along the trajectories $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f_i + g_i u^{(i+1)} + \sigma_{i4} \dot{B}$, ($i = 1, 2, 3$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) - V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \int_t^{t_f} d(V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, s) - V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, s)) \\ &= \int_t^{t_f} (V_{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{\mathbf{x}}^{(i+1)})^T dx + (V_s^{(i)} - V_s^{(i+1)}) ds \\ &= \int_t^{t_f} [(V_{1\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{1\mathbf{x}}^{(i+1)})^T (f_1 - S(x, t)u_1^{(i+1)} + \sigma_{14}\dot{B}) + (V_{2\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{2\mathbf{x}}^{(i+1)})^T (f_2 - \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)u_2^{(i+1)}}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} + \sigma_{24}\dot{B}) \\ &\quad + (V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i+1)})^T (f_3 + S(x, t)u_1^{(i+1)} + \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)u_2^{(i+1)}}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} + \sigma_{34}\dot{B})] + (V_s^{(i)} - V_s^{(i+1)}) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= (1 - p(x, \Lambda_t))b(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) - \beta(x, \Lambda_t))S(x, t)I(x, t), \\ f_2 &= \beta(x, \Lambda_t)S(x, t)I(x, t) + (1 - e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t) - (\mu(x, \Lambda_t) + \alpha(x, \Lambda_t))I(x, t), \\ f_3 &= p(x, \Lambda_t)b(x, \Lambda_t) - \mu(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t) - (1 - e)\beta(x, \Lambda_t)V(x, t)I(x, t). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Based on LEs (5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) - V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ &= \int_t^{t_f} ((u_1^{(i+1)T} \tau_1 u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1^{(i)T} \tau_1 u_1^{(i)}) + (u_2^{(i+1)T} \tau_2 u_2^{(i+1)} - u_2^{(i)T} \tau_2 u_2^{(i)}) \\ &\quad + (V_{1\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T})S(x, t)(u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1^{(i)}) + (V_{2\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T}) \frac{m(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)}{1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t)} (u_2^{(i+1)} - u_2^{(i)}) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

according to update control policy

$$u_1^{(i+1)} = -(2\tau_1)^{-1}S^T(x, t)(V_{1\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}), \text{ and } u_2^{(i+1)} = -[2\tau_2(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))]^{-1}I^T(x, t)(V_{2\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}), \quad (5.9)$$

then,

$$(V_{1\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T})S(x, t) = -2\tau_1 u_1^{(i+1)}, \text{ and } (V_{2\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)T})[(1 + \eta(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t))]^{-1}m(x, \Lambda_t)I(x, t) = -2\tau_2 u_2^{(i+1)}, \quad (5.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) - V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t) \\
&= \int_t^{t_f} [(u^{(i+1)T} \tau_1 u^{(i+1)} - u^{(i)T} \tau_1 u^{(i)}) + (u^{(i+1)T} \tau_2 u^{(i+1)} - u^{(i)T} \tau_2 u^{(i)}) \\
&\quad - 2\tau_1 u_1^{(i+1)}(u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1^{(i)}) - 2\tau_2 u_2^{(i+1)}(u_2^{(i+1)} - u_2^{(i)})] ds \\
&= - \int_t^{t_f} [(u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1^{(i)})^T \tau_1 (u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1^{(i)}) + (u_2^{(i+1)} - u_2^{(i)})^T \tau_2 (u_2^{(i+1)} - u_2^{(i)})] ds \leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Therefore, $V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. By the definition of $V^*(x, t)$, we have

$$V^*(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq V^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t), \tag{5.12}$$

by the monotone bounded convergence theorem, we can conclude that $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ converges to $V^{(\infty)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. In addition, $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is bounded below by $V^*(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $V^*(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the unique optimal value function. Hence, we have $V^{(\infty)}(\mathbf{x}, t) = V^*(\mathbf{x}, t)$. That is to say, $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ converges uniformly to $V^*(\mathbf{x}, t)$, which is the solution to the HJB equation. \square

In practice, the accurate system dynamics are usually unavailable due to the complicated and large scale manufacturing techniques. In order to overcome the difficulty, we need to design an off-model learning algorithm.

Algorithm. Online off-policy integral reinforcement learning (IRL) algorithm

Step 1. Select an initial admissible control policy $u^{(0)}$ and time step δ . Let i_{\max} be prefixed according to t_f and δ . Let $i = 0$.

Step 2. Solving the following time-varying integral LE for $V^{(i)}$ and $u^{(i+1)}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t - \delta), t - \delta) &= 2 \int_{t-\delta}^t [u^{(i+1)\delta} \tau_1 (u - u^{(i)}) + u^{(i+1)\delta} \tau_1 (u - u^{(i)})] ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t-\delta}^t (A_1 S(x, t) + A_2 I(x, t) + u_1^{(i)} \tau_1 u_1^{(i)} + u_2^{(i)} \tau_2 u_2^{(i)}) ds + V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, t)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

with $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t_f), t_f) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$.

Step 3. If $i < i_{\max}$, let $i = i + 1$ and go to **Step 2**; else stop and output the approximate optimal value $V^{(i)}$ as the optimal value function V^* .

Here we derive the online off-policy IRL algorithm for optimal control of SIV epidemic system. Firstly, we rewrite the system (2.5) as

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
dS(x, t) &= \left(D_1(x) \Delta S(x, t) + (1-p)b + \alpha I(x, t) - \mu S(x, t) - \beta S(x, t) I(x, t) - (u_1(x, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - u_1^{(i)}(x, t)) S(x, t) - u_1^{(i)}(x, t) S(x, t) \right) dt - \sigma S(x, t) I(t) dB_1(x, t), \\
dI(x, t) &= \left(D_2(x) \Delta I(x, t) + \beta S(x, t) I(x, t) + (1-e) \beta I(x, t) V(x, t) - (\mu + \alpha) I(x, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{m(u_2(x, t) - u_2^{(i)}(x, t)) I(x, t)}{1 + \eta I(x, t)} - \frac{m u_2^{(i)}(x, t) I(x, t)}{1 + \eta I(x, t)} \right) dt \\
&\quad + \sigma S(t) I(t) dB_2(t) + \sigma I(t) V(t) dB_4(x, t),
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{5.14}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dV(x, t) = \left(D_3(x)\Delta V(x, t) + pb + (u_1(x, t) - u_1^{(i)}(x, t))S(x, t) - u_1^{(i)}(x, t)S(x, t) - \mu V(x, t) \right. \\ \quad \left. - (1 - e)\beta I(x, t)V(x, t) + \frac{m(u_2(x, t) - u_2^{(i)}(x, t))I(x, t)}{1 + \eta I(x, t)} \right. \\ \quad \left. - \frac{mu_2^{(i)}I(x, t)}{1 + \eta I(x, t)} \right) dt - \sigma I(x, t)V(x, t)dB_3(x, t), \\ S(0, x) = S_0(x), \quad I(0, (x, t)) = I_0(x), \quad V(0, x) = V_0(x). \end{array} \right.$$

Let us consider $V^{(i)}$, which is the solution to the Lyapunov equation $LE(V^{(i)}, u^{(i)}) = 0$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & V_t^{(i)} + p_1^i [D_1(x)\Delta S(x, t) + (1 - p)b + \alpha I(x, t) - \mu S(x, t) - \beta S(x, t)I(x, t)] \\ & + p_2^{(i)} [D_2(x)\Delta I(x, t) + \beta S(x, t)I(x, t) + (1 - e)\beta I(x, t)V(x, t) - (\mu + \alpha)I(x, t)] \\ & + p_3^{(i)} [D_3(x)\Delta V(x, t) + pb - \mu V(x, t) - (1 - e)\beta I(x, t)V(x, t)] \\ & + \frac{1}{2} [P_1^{(i)} \sigma^2 S^2(x, t)I^2(x, t) + P_2^{(i)} (\sigma^2 S^2(x, t)I^2(x, t) + \sigma^2 I^2(x, t)V^2(x, t)) + P_3^{(i)} \sigma^2 I^2(x, t)V^2(x, t)] \\ & + A_1 S(x, t) + A_2 I(x, t) + p_3^{(i)} u_1^i S(x, t) - p_1^i u_1^i S(x, t) + \tau_1 u_1^2 + p_3 \frac{mu_2 I}{1 + \eta I(x, t)} - p_2 \frac{mu_2 I(x, t)}{1 + \eta I(x, t)} + \tau_2 u_2^2 \\ & + (p_3^{(i)} - p_1^{(i)})(u_1 - u_1^{(i)})S(x, t) + \tau_1(u_1^2 - u_1^{2(i)}) + (p_3^{(i)} - p_2^{(i)}) \frac{m(u_2 - u_2^{(i)})I(x, t)}{1 + \eta I(x, t)} + \tau_2(u_2^2 - u_2^{2(i)}), \end{aligned}$$

Since $V^{(i)}$ is the solution to the Lyapunov equation (5.1), we have

$$\dot{V}^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t), t) = -A_1 S(x, t) - A_2 I(x, t) - u_1^{(i)T} \tau_1 u_1^{(i)} - u_2^{(i)T} \tau_2 u_2^{(i)} + V_x^{(i)T} g(u - u^{(i)}). \quad (5.15)$$

Integrating the both sides of equation (5.15), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t), t) - V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t - \delta), t - \delta) \\ & = \int_{t-\delta}^t (V_x^{(i)T} g(u - u^{(i)}) - A_1 S(x, t) - A_2 I(x, t) - u_1^{(i)T} \tau_1 u_1^{(i)} - u_2^{(i)T} \tau_2 u_2^{(i)}) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Lemma 5.2. *Solving the $(V^{(i)}, u^{(i+1)})$ of LEs (5.13) is equivalent to finding the solution to the following equations $LE(V^{(i)}, u^{(i)}) = 0$ and $u_1^{(i+1)} = -(2c_2)^{-1} S^T(x, t)(V_{1\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)})$, and $u_2^{(i+1)} = -[2c_3(1 + \eta I)]^{-1} I^T(x, t)(V_{2\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} - V_{3\mathbf{x}}^{(i)})$, with $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t_f), t_f) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$.*

Proof. We prove the Eq. (5.13) has unique solution. This can be completed by contradiction. First, we suppose that there exists another solution (V_1, u_1', u_2')

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(\mathbf{x}(t - \delta), t - \delta) = & 2 \int_{t-\delta}^t [u_1'^T \tau_1 (u_1 - u_1^{(i)}) + u_2'^T \tau_2 (u_2 - u_2^{(i)})] ds \\ & + \int_{t-\delta}^t (A_1 S(x, t) + A_2 I(x, t) + u_1^{(i)T} \tau_1 u_1^{(i)} + u_2^{(i)T} \tau_2 u_2^{(i)}) ds + V_1(\mathbf{x}(t), t). \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

with $V_1(\mathbf{x}(t_f), t_f) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$. Let us subtract (5.17) from (5.13), yields

$$\begin{aligned} & V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t - \delta), t - \delta) - V_1(\mathbf{x}(t - \delta), t - \delta) \\ & = 2 \int_{t-\delta}^t (u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1')^T \tau_1 (u_1 - u_1^{(i)}) ds + V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t), t) - V_1(\mathbf{x}(t), t). \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Thus, we select $u = u^{(i)}$, $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t_f), t_f) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$ and $V_1(\mathbf{x}(t_f), t_f) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$. Then we have $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}(t), t) = V_1(\mathbf{x}(t), t)$, $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$. It is enough to show that

$$\int_{t-\delta}^t (u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1')^T \tau_1 (u_1 - u_1^{(i)}) ds = 0, \quad (5.19)$$

Dividing T and taking limit for the both sides of Eq. (5.19), it follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_{t-\delta}^t (u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1')^T \tau_1 (u_1 - u_1^{(i)}) ds}{\delta} = 0, \quad (5.20)$$

that is $(u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1')^T \tau_1 (u_1 - u_1^{(i)}) = 0$ for all u . Let $(u_1 - u_1^{(i)}) = (u_1^{(i+1)} - u_1')$. Then, we can get $u_1^{(i+1)} = u_1'$. This completes the proof. \square

6. Numerical examples

Applying Milstein's method, we have the corresponding equation of state equation (2.5) and adjoint equation (4.12) as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_{i+1} = S_i + \left((1 - p(\Lambda_t))b(\Lambda_t) + \alpha(\Lambda_t)I_i - \mu(\Lambda_t)S_i - \beta(\Lambda_t)S_i I_i - u_1 S_i + D_1 \Delta S_i \right) \Delta t \\ \quad - \sigma(\Lambda_t)S_i I_i \sqrt{\Delta t} \zeta_i - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(\Lambda_t)S_i I_i^2 (\zeta_i^2 - 1) \Delta t, \\ I_{i+1} = I_i + \left[\beta(\Lambda_t)S_i I_i + (1 - e)\beta(\Lambda_t)V_i I_i - (\mu(\Lambda_t) + \alpha(\Lambda_t))I_i - \frac{m(\Lambda_t)u_2 I_i}{1 + \eta(\Lambda_t)I_i} + D_2 \Delta I_i \right] \Delta t \\ \quad + \sigma(\Lambda_t)S_i I_i \sqrt{\Delta t} \zeta_i + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(\Lambda_t)S_i^2 I_i (\zeta_i^2 - 1) \Delta t + (1 - e)\sigma(\Lambda_t)V_i I_i \sqrt{\Delta t} \zeta_i + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(\Lambda_t)V_i^2 I_i (\zeta_i^2 - 1) \Delta t, \\ V_{i+1} = V_i + \left[p(\Lambda_t)b(\Lambda_t) - \mu(\Lambda_t)V_i - (1 - e)\beta(\Lambda_t)V_i I_i + u_1 S_i + \frac{m(\Lambda_t)u_2 I_i}{1 + \eta(\Lambda_t)I_i} + D_3 \Delta V_i \right] \Delta t \\ \quad - (1 - e)\sigma(\Lambda_t)V_i I_i \sqrt{\Delta t} \zeta_i - \frac{1}{2} (1 - e)^2 \sigma^2(\Lambda_t)V_i I_i^2 (\zeta_i^2 - 1) \Delta t, \\ p_{1i} = p_{1i+1} - \left[\left((\mu(\Lambda_t) + u_1)S_{i+1} + \beta(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} \right) p_{1i+1} + D_1 \Delta p_{1i+1} + \beta(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} p_{2i+1} \right. \\ \quad \left. + u_1 p_{3i+1} - \sigma(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} q_{1i+1} + \sigma(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} q_{2i+1} \right] \Delta t - q_{1i+1} \sqrt{\Delta t} \zeta_{i+1} - \frac{q_{1i+1}^2}{2} (\zeta_{i+1}^2 - 1) \Delta t, \\ p_{2i} = p_{2i+1} - \left[(\alpha(\Lambda_t) - \beta(\Lambda_t)S_{i+1}) p_{1i+1} + \left(\beta(\Lambda_t)S_{i+1} + (1 - e)\beta(\Lambda_t)V_{i+1} - (\mu(\Lambda_t) \right. \right. \\ \quad \left. \left. + \alpha(\Lambda_t)) - \frac{m(\Lambda_t)u_2(x, t)}{(1 + \eta(\Lambda_t)I)^2} \right) p_{2i+1} + D_2 \Delta p_{2i+1} - \left((1 - e)\beta(\Lambda_t)V_{i+1} - \frac{m(\Lambda_t)u_2}{(1 + \eta(\Lambda_t)I)^2} \right) p_{3i+1} \right. \\ \quad \left. - \sigma(\Lambda_t)S_{i+1} q_{1i+1} + (\sigma(\Lambda_t)S_{i+1} + (1 - e)\sigma(\Lambda_t)V_{i+1}) q_{2i+1} - (1 - e)\sigma(\Lambda_t)V_{i+1} q_{3i+1} \right] \Delta t \\ \quad - q_{2i+1} \sqrt{\Delta t} \zeta_{i+1} - \frac{q_{2i+1}^2}{2} (\zeta_{i+1}^2 - 1) \Delta t, \\ p_{3i} = p_{3i+1} + \left[(1 - e)\beta(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} p_{2i+1} - \left(\mu(\Lambda_t) + (1 - e)\beta(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} \right) p_{3i+1} + D_3 \Delta p_{3i+1} \right. \\ \quad \left. + (1 - e)\sigma(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} q_{2i+1} - (1 - e)\sigma(\Lambda_t)I_{i+1} q_{3i+1} \right] \Delta t, \end{array} \right.$$

where ζ_i^2 ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) are not interdependent Gaussian random variables $N(0, 1)$. At below, we will present numerical simulation of the SIV model, let us assume that the Markov chain $\xi(t)$ is on the state space

$\mathbb{S} = \{1, 2\}$ with the transition probability $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} -5.5 & 5.5 \\ 8 & -8 \end{pmatrix}$ and the following setting:

When $\xi(t) = 1$,

$$p(1) = 0.5\text{year}^{-1}, b(1) = 4.0\text{year}^{-1}, \beta(1) = 0.02\text{year}^{-1}, \mu(1) = 0.04\text{year}^{-1}, \eta(1) = 1.03\text{year}^{-1}, m(1) = 0.01\text{year}^{-1}, \alpha(1) = 0.001\text{year}^{-1}, \alpha(1) = 0.8\text{year}^{-1}, \sigma(1) = 0.035\text{year}^{-1};$$

When $\xi(t) = 2$,

$$p(2) = 0.6\text{year}^{-1}, b(2) = 5.0\text{year}^{-1}, \beta(2) = 0.04\text{year}^{-1}, \mu(2) = 0.05\text{year}^{-1}, \eta(2) = 1.05\text{year}^{-1}, m(2) = 0.02\text{year}^{-1}, \alpha(2) = 0.002\text{year}^{-1}, \alpha(2) = 0.9\text{year}^{-1}, \sigma(2) = 0.036\text{year}^{-1}.$$

6.1. The invariant measure




Figure 1: Density plots (a)-(c) based on 10 000 stochastic simulations for group susceptible, infected and vaccinated at time $t = 25, 28$ and 30 . Here we choose $\beta = 0.2$, $\sigma = 0.05$. The simulations confirm the existence of the unique ergodic invariant measure for system (4.12).

In Fig 1, we simulate the density kernels of solutions (2.5) with three groups namely (S, I, V) . In the simulation, the density kernels are based on 10 000 sample paths. Comparing these density kernels, we can see that the density plot of each group at different time t for $t = 160, 180, 200$ stay almost the same. Therefore, we can conclude that the simulations strongly indicate the existence of the unique ergodic invariant measure for the system (2.5). In Fig 2, we simulate the density kernels of solutions (2.5) with three groups namely (S, I, V) with and without control.




Figure 2: Density plots (a)-(c) based on 10 000 stochastic simulations for group susceptible, infected and vaccinated with and without control. Here we choose $\beta = 0.2$, $\sigma = 0.05$. The simulations confirm the existence of the unique ergodic invariant measure for system (4.12).

6.2. Finite horizon optimal control

In Fig 3, the three solution curves represent susceptible and infected individuals at different intervals of time with Markov switching. The application of vaccination and treatment control give rise to the number of individuals vaccinated. In Fig 4, the three solution curves represent adjoint equations corresponding to the state equations (2.5) at different intervals of time with Markov switching. Fig 5 gives the optimal control u_1 and u_2 , and also give the value function of the stochastic SIV epidemic system with Markov switching.




Figure 3: The path of $S(x, t), I(x, t)$ for the stochastic SIV model (2.5) with initial $S_0 = 0.6, I_0 = 0.1, V_0 = 1.0$.




Figure 4: The path of $p_1(x, t), p_2(x, t)$ and $p_3(x, t)$ of the adjoint equations (4.12).




Figure 5: The path of $u_1(x, t), u_2(x, t)$.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we establish a new spatial diffusion stochastic SIV epidemic model with Markov chain in a stochastic environment. Based on the Perron-Frobenius theorem, we investigate the criterion on the existence and uniqueness of invariant measure for the exact solution. And we also derive a set of necessary conditions for near-optimal controls. Based on Lyapunov equation, an online off-strategy IRL algorithm for optimal control of SIV epidemic systems is derived. The existence of an invariant measure for a stochastic SIV epidemic model with Markov switching has been studied. Finally, we present a numerical simulation of the optimal control problem, which shows that different control strategies are needed at different times to minimize the objective function. The uniqueness of invariant measure of stochastic SIV epidemic model with Markov switching is verified by numerical examples.

Nevertheless, some mathematical details need to be carefully worked out. The results, in turn, will be of interest to people working on real data. One could work with stochastic partial differential equation models driven by Lévy noise.

Data Availability Statement

The manuscript has no associated data.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

References

- [1] H.L. Xiang, B. Liu. Solving the inverse problem of an SIS epidemic reaction diffusion model by optimal control methods, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 70 (5) (2015) 805-819.
- [2] G. Dhariwal, Jngel, Ansgar, N. Zamponi. Global martingale solutions for a stochastic population cross-diffusion system, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 2019, 129(01):3792–3820.
- [3] G. Yin, C. Zhu. *Hybrid switching diffusion: Properties and Applications*. Springer, 2010.
- [4] G. Yin, X. Mao, K. Yin. Numerical approximation of invariant measures for hybrid diffusion systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2005, 50(07):934–946.
- [5] Feng R, Wang W, Li Z. Stability analysis of an epidemic model with diffusion and stochastic perturbation, *Communications in Nonlinear Science & Numerical Simulation*, 2012, 17(6):2551-2563.
- [6] M Sepulveda, Bendahmane M. Convergence of a finite volume scheme for nonlocal reaction diffusion systems modelling an epidemic disease, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B (DCDS-B)*, 2012, 11(4):823-853.

- [7] Piraveenan M, Sawleshwarkar S, Walsh M, et al. Optimal governance and implementation of vaccination programmes to contain the COVID-19 pandemic, *Royal Society Open Science*, 2021, 8(6):210429.
- [8] Hanson F B, Ryan D. Optimal harvesting with both population and price dynamics, *Mathematical Biosciences*, 1998, 148(2):129.
- [9] Wei C J, Boyington J C, Mctamney P M, et al. Induction of Broadly Neutralizing H1N1 Influenza Antibodies by Vaccination, *Science*, 2010, 329(5995):1060-1064.
- [10] Utazi C E, Tatem A J. Precise mapping reveals gaps in global measles vaccination coverage, *Nature*, 2020, 589(7842).
- [11] Anderson R, May R. Directly transmitted infections diseases: control by vaccination, *Science*, 1982, 215(4536):1053-1060.
- [12] W. O. Kermack, A. G. Mckendrick. A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, **53** (1991), 89–118.
- [13] D. Kirschner, S. Lenhart, S. Serbin. Optimal control of the chemotherapy of HIV, *J. Math. Biol.* 35 (7) (1997) 775-792.
- [14] Song, Pengfei, Y. Lou, and Y. Xiao. A spatial SEIRS reaction-diffusion model in heterogeneous environment, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 267(9) (2019) 5084–5114.
- [15] E. Jung, S. Lenhart, Z. Feng. Optimal control of treatments in a two-strain tuberculosis model, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 2 (4) (2002) 473-482.
- [16] H. Chang, A. Astolfi. Control of HIV infection dynamics, *IEEE Control Syst.* 28 (2) (2008) 28-39.
- [17] L. Sunmi, C. Gerardo. Exploring optimal control strategies in seasonally varying flulike epidemics, *J. Theoret. Biol.* 412(2017) 36-47.
- [18] D. Xu, X. Xu, Y. Xie, C. Yang. Optimal control of an SIVRS epidemic spreading model with virus variation based on complex networks, *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.* 48 (2017) 200-210.
- [19] Jiang, Daqing, Alsaedi, et al. Stationary distribution of stochastic SIS epidemic model with vaccination under regime switching, *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 59 (2016) 87-93.
- [20] Li D, Liu S , Cui J. Threshold dynamics and ergodicity of an SIRS epidemic model with Markovian switching, *JDE*, 2017, 263. DOI:10.1016/j.jde.2017.08.066.
- [21] S. Kim, J. Lee, E. Jung. Mathematical model of transmission dynamics and optimal control strategies 2009 A/H1N1 influenza in the Republic of Korea, *J. Theoret. Biol.* 412 (2017) 74-85.
- [22] P.L.P. Ana, J.S. Cristiana, F.M. Delfim. An epidemic model for cholera with optimal control treatment, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 318 (2017) 168-180.
- [23] D.G. Paolo, L. Daniela. Optimal control of SIR epidemic model with state dependent switching cost index, *Biomed. Signal Process. Control* 31 (2017) 377-380.

- [24] T.K. Kar, A. Batabyal. Stability analysis and optimal control of an SIR epidemic model with vaccination, *Biosystem* 104 (2011) 127-135.
- [25] R. Casagrandi, L. Bolzoni, S.A. Levin. The SIRC model and influenza A, *Math. Biosci.* 200 (2006) 152-169.
- [26] J. Bao, J. Shao, C. Yuan. Approximation of invariant measures for regime-switching diffusions, *Potential Analysis*, 44 (2016), 707-727.
- [27] G. Da Prato, J. Zabczyk. Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [28] Y. Zou, X. Yan. Optimal and sub-optimal quarantine and isolation control in SARS epidemic, *J. Math. Comput. Model.* 47 (2008) 235-245.
- [29] Zhang X, Jiang D, Alsaedi A, et al. Stationary distribution of stochastic sis epidemic model with vaccination under regime switching, *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 2016, 59:87–93.
- [30] X. Mao, C. Yuan. Stochastic differential equations with Markovian switching. Imperial College Press, 2006.
- [31] J Y. Yang, F Q. Zhang, X Y. Wang. SIV epidemic models with age of infection, *International Journal of Biomathematics*, 2(01) 2009, 61–67.
- [32] R H. Li, F. Tian, X L. Hu, et al. The stochastic SIV epidemic model with varying coefficient and time delay[J]. *Mathematica Applicata*, 2016.