## Note on a vector-host epidemic model with spatial structure<sup>[1](#page-0-0)</sup>

Mingxin Wang[2](#page-0-1)

School of Mathematics and Information Science, Henan Polytechnic University, Jiaozuo 454003, China

Abstract. Magal, Webb and Wu [Nonlinearity 31, 5589-5614 (2018)] studied the outbreak of Zika in Rio De Janerio model, and provided complete dynamic properties. In this note we will use a very simple approach to provide a complete proof.

Keywords: Epidemic models; Equilibrium solutions; Global stabilities.

AMS Subject Classification (2020): 35K57; 92D30

### 1 Introduction

The Zika virus has caused significant public health impacts, including congenital microcephaly and neurodevelopmental disorders after pregnancy infection. Suppose that individuals are living in a bounded smooth domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $H_i, V_u$  and  $V_i$  be the densities of infected hosts, uninfected vectors, and infected vectors, respectively. Then the model proposed in [\[1\]](#page-5-0) to study the outbreak of Zika in Rio De Janerio is the following reaction-diffusion system

<span id="page-0-2"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\n\partial_t H_i - \nabla \cdot d_1(x) \nabla H_i = -\rho(x) H_i + \sigma_1(x) H_u(x) V_i, & x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\
\partial_t V_u - \nabla \cdot d_2(x) \nabla V_u = -\sigma_2(x) V_u H_i + \beta(x) (V_u + V_i) - \mu(x) (V_u + V_i) V_u, & x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\
\partial_t V_i - \nabla \cdot d_2(x) \nabla V_i = \sigma_2(x) V_u H_i - \mu(x) (V_u + V_i) V_i, & x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\
\frac{\partial H_i}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \ t > 0, \\
(H_i(\cdot, 0), V_u(\cdot, 0), V_i(\cdot, 0)) = (H_{i0}, V_{u0}, V_{i0}) \in C(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3_+),\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(1)

where  $d_1, d_2 \in C^{1+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$  and  $\rho, \beta, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \mu \in C^{\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$  are strictly positive, and  $H_u \in C^{\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$  is nonnegative and non-trivial. The flux of new infected humans is given by  $\sigma_1(x)H_u(x)V_i(x,t)$  in which  $H_u(x)$  is the density of susceptible population depending on the spatial location x. The initial functions satisfy  $\frac{\partial H_{i0}}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_{u0}}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_{i0}}{\partial n} = 0$  on  $\partial \Omega$ .

The model [\(1\)](#page-0-2) has been thoroughly studied by Magal, Webb and Wu [\[2,](#page-5-1) [3\]](#page-5-2). In [\[2\]](#page-5-1), the authors found the basic reproduction number  $R_0$  and show that  $R_0$  is a threshold parameter: if  $R_0 \leq 1$  the disease free equilibrium is globally stable; if  $R_0 > 1$  the model has a unique globally stable positive equilibrium. In [\[3\]](#page-5-2), it was shown that the basic reproduction number  $R_0$  can be defined as the spectral radius of a product of a local basic reproduction number  $R$  and strongly positive compact linear operators with spectral radii one.

In this note we will use a very simple approach to prove the main results of [\[2\]](#page-5-1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This work was supported by NSFC Grant 12171120.

<span id="page-0-1"></span><span id="page-0-0"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Corresponding author. E-mail: mxwang@hpu.edu.cn

### 2 Existence of positive equilibrium solutions

The equilibrium problem of [\(1\)](#page-0-2) is

$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_1(x)\nabla H_i^* = -\rho(x)H_i^* + \sigma_1(x)H_u(x)V_i^*, & x \in \Omega, \\
-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla V_u^* = -\sigma_2(x)V_u^*H_i^* + \beta(x)(V_u^* + V_i^*) - \mu(x)(V_u^* + V_i^*)V_u^*, & x \in \Omega, \\
-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla V_i^* = \sigma_2(x)V_uH_i - \mu(x)(V_u^* + V_i^*)V_i^*, & x \in \Omega,\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(2)

<span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla V_i = \sigma_2(x)V_u H_i - \mu(x)(V_u + V_i)V_i, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial H_i^*}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_u^*}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_i^*}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega.\n\end{cases}
$$

Let  $\lambda(\beta)$  be the principal eigenvalue of

$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla \phi - \beta(x)\phi = \lambda \phi, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega.\n\end{cases}
$$

If  $\lambda(\beta) \geq 0$ , then  $(0,0,0)$  is the only nonnegative solution of [\(2\)](#page-1-0). In fact, let  $(H_i^*, V_u^*, V_i^*)$  be a nonnegative solution of [\(2\)](#page-1-0) and set  $V_* = V_*^* + V_*^*$  $i^*$ . Then

<span id="page-1-1"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla V_* = \beta(x)V_* - \mu(x)V_*^2, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial V_*}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega.\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(3)

It is well known that [\(3\)](#page-1-1) has no positive solution when  $\lambda(\beta) \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $V_* = 0$ , i.e.,  $V_*^* =$  $V_i^* = 0$ , and then  $H_i^* = 0$  by the first equation of [\(2\)](#page-1-0).

If  $\lambda(\beta) < 0$ , then the problem [\(3\)](#page-1-1) has a unique positive solution  $V_*(x)$  and  $V_*(x)$  is globally asymptotically stable. Thus,  $(0, V_*(x), 0)$  is a nontrivial and nonnegative solution of [\(2\)](#page-1-0). It is easy to see that  $(0, V_*(x), 0)$  is the only possible semi-trivial nonnegative solution of  $(2)$ .

Assume  $\lambda(\beta) < 0$  and let  $V_*(x)$  be the unique positive solution of [\(3\)](#page-1-1). To investigate positive solutions of [\(2\)](#page-1-0) is equivalent to study positive solutions  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$  with  $V_i^* \leq V_*$  of

<span id="page-1-2"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_1(x)\nabla H_i^* = -\rho(x)H_i^* + \sigma_1(x)H_u(x)V_i^*, & x \in \Omega, \\
-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla V_i^* = \sigma_2(x)(V_*(x) - V_i^*)H_i^* - \mu(x)V_*(x)V_i^*, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial H_i^*}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_i^*}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(4)

with  $V_i^* \leq V_*$ . Clearly,  $(0,0)$  is the unique trivial nonnegative solution of [\(4\)](#page-1-2). The linearized eigenvalue problem of  $(4)$  at  $(0, 0)$  is

<span id="page-1-3"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_1(x)\nabla \phi + \rho(x)\phi - \sigma_1(x)H_u(x)\varphi = \lambda \phi, & x \in \Omega, \\
-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla \varphi - \sigma_2(x)V_*(x)\phi + \mu(x)V_*(x)\varphi = \lambda \varphi, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(5)

By the results of [\[4\]](#page-5-3), [\(5\)](#page-1-3) has a unique principle eigenvalue  $\lambda(V_*)$  with eigenfunction  $(\phi, \varphi) : \phi, \varphi > 0$ . Moreover,  $\lambda(V_*)$  has the same sign with  $R_0 - 1$ , where  $R_0$  is given in [\[2\]](#page-5-1).

#### M.X. Wang 3

**Theorem 2.1.** The problem [\(4\)](#page-1-2) has a positive solution  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$  if and only if  $\lambda(V_*) < 0$ . Moreover, the positive solution  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$  of [\(4\)](#page-1-2) is unique and satisfies  $V_i^* < V_*$  when it exists. Therefore, [\(2\)](#page-1-0) has a positive solution  $(H_i^*, V_i^*, V_u)$  if and only if  $\lambda(V_*) < 0$ , and  $(H_i^*, V_i^*, V_u)$  is unique and takes the form  $(H_i^*, V_i^*, V_* - V_i^*$  $\binom{m}{i}$  when it exists.

*Proof.* Step 1: We prove that if [\(4\)](#page-1-2) has a positive solution  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$ , then  $\lambda(V_*) < 0$ . Define

$$
\mathscr{L}\psi = \begin{pmatrix} -\nabla \cdot d_1(x)\nabla \psi_1 + \rho(x)\psi_1, \\ -\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla \psi_2 + \mu(x)V_*(x)\psi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(V_*) & \sigma_1(x)H_u(x) \\ \sigma_2(x)V_*(x) & \lambda(V_*) \end{pmatrix}.
$$

Then L is reversible and  $\mathscr{L}^{-1}$  is a strongly positive compact operator. By  $(5)$ ,  $(\phi, \varphi) = (\mathscr{L}^{-1}A(x))(\phi, \varphi)$ . If  $\lambda(V_*) \geq 0$ , then the operator  $T = \mathcal{L}^{-1}A(x)$  is also a strongly positive compact operator, and  $r(T) = 1$  as  $(\phi, \varphi) = (\mathscr{L}^{-1}A(x))(\phi, \varphi).$ 

As  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$  is a positive solution of [\(4\)](#page-1-2), then we have

$$
\begin{pmatrix} H_i^*, \\ V_i^* \end{pmatrix} = T \begin{pmatrix} H_i^*, \\ V_i^* \end{pmatrix} - \mathscr{L}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(V_*) & 0 \\ \sigma_2(x)V_i^* & \lambda(V_*) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_i^*, \\ V_i^* \end{pmatrix},
$$

and

$$
\mathscr{L}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} \lambda(V_*) & 0 \\ \sigma_2(x)V_iH_i \lambda(V_*) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_i^*, \\ V_i^* \end{pmatrix} \geq \mathscr{L}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sigma_2(x)V_iH_i \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \chi(x) \end{pmatrix},
$$

where  $\chi(x) > 0$ . This is impossible by the conclusion [\[5,](#page-5-4) Theorem 3.2 (iv)].

Step 2: We prove that if  $\lambda(V_*) < 0$ , then [\(4\)](#page-1-2) has at least one positive solution  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$ . Let  $\bar{H}_i^*$  be the unique positive solution of the linear problem

$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_1(x) \nabla \bar{H}_i^* + \rho(x) \bar{H}_i^* = \sigma_1(x) H_u(x) V_*(x), & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial \bar{H}_i^*}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega.\n\end{cases}
$$

Then  $(\bar{H}_{i}^{*}, V_{*})$  is an upper solution of [\(4\)](#page-1-2). Let  $(\phi, \varphi)$  be the positive eigenfunction corresponding to  $\lambda(V_*)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  be a constant. It is easy to verify that  $\varepsilon(\phi, \varphi)$  is a lower solution of [\(4\)](#page-1-2) and  $\varepsilon(\phi, \varphi) \leq (\bar{H}_i^*, V_*)$  provided  $\varepsilon > 0$  is suitable small. By the upper and lower solutions method, [\(4\)](#page-1-2) as at least one positive solution.

Step 3: We shall prove the uniqueness of positive solution of [\(4\)](#page-1-2). Let  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$  be a positive solution of [\(4\)](#page-1-2). Then  $\lambda(V_*)$  < 0 by Step 1. Consider the linear problem

<span id="page-2-0"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla U = \sigma_2(x)(V_*(x) - U)H_i^* - \mu(x)V_*(x)U, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial U}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega.\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(6)

Obviously,  $V_*$  is a strict upper solution of [\(6\)](#page-2-0), and there exists  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  such that  $\varepsilon \varphi \leq V_*$ and  $\varepsilon(\sigma_2 V_* \phi + \lambda(V_*)\varphi) \leq \sigma_2(V_* - \varepsilon \phi)H_i^*$  in  $\Omega$ . Then we can verify that  $\varepsilon \varphi$  is a lower solution of [\(6\)](#page-2-0). Thus [\(6\)](#page-2-0) has a solution  $U : \varepsilon \varphi \leq U < V_*$ . Since  $V_i^*$  $\zeta_i^*$  solves [\(6\)](#page-2-0), we see  $V_i^* = U < V_*$  by the uniqueness. It then follows from the first equation of [\(4\)](#page-1-2) that  $H_i^* < \overline{H}_i^*$ .

Noticing that  $(\bar{H}_i^*, V_*)$  is an upper solution of [\(4\)](#page-1-2). By the monotone iterative method, (4) has a positive solution  $(\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*)$  and  $(H_i^*, V_i^*) \leq (\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*) \leq (\bar{H}_i^*, V_*)$ . We shall prove  $(H_i^*, V_i^*)$  =  $(\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*)$ . Clearly, we can find  $\zeta > 1$  such that  $\zeta(H_i^*, V_i^*) \geq (\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*)$  in  $\Omega$ . Set

$$
\underline{\zeta} = \inf \{\zeta \geq 1 : \zeta(H_i^*, V_i^*) \geq (\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*) \text{ in } \Omega\}.
$$

Then  $\underline{\zeta}$  is well defined,  $\underline{\zeta} \geq 1$  and  $\underline{\zeta}(H_i^*, V_i^*) \geq (\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*)$  in  $\Omega$ . We shall prove  $\underline{\zeta} = 1$ . Assume  $\underline{\zeta} > 1$ . Let  $u = \underline{\zeta}H_i^* - \hat{H}_i^*$  and  $v = \underline{\zeta}V_i^* - \hat{V}_i^*$ . Then  $u, v \ge 0$ , and by the carefully calculations,

$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_1(x)\nabla u + \rho(x)u = \sigma_1(x)H_u(x)v, & x \in \Omega, \\
-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla v + (\sigma_2 H_i^* + \mu(x)V_*)v > \sigma_2(V_* - \hat{V})u, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(7)

It follows that  $u, v > 0$  in  $\Omega$  by the maximum principle. We can find  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $(u, v) \ge$  $\varepsilon(H_i^*, V_i^*)$ , i.e.,  $(\underline{\zeta}-\varepsilon)(H_i^*, V_i^*) \geq (\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*)$  in  $\Omega$ . This is contradicts to the definition of  $\underline{\zeta}$ . Then  $\zeta = 1$ , i.e.,  $(H_i^*, V_i^*) = (\hat{H}_i^*, \hat{V}_i^*)$ . The proof is complete.  $\Box$ 

## 3 Stabilities of nonnegative solutions of [\(2\)](#page-1-0)

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $(H_i, V_u, V_i)$  be the unique positive solution of [\(1\)](#page-0-2). Then the following holds.

(i) If  $\lambda(\beta) < 0$  and  $\lambda(V_*) < 0$ , then

<span id="page-3-0"></span>
$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} (H_i, V_u, V_i) = (H_i^*, V_* - V_i^*, V_i^*) = (H_i^*, V_u^*, V_i^*) \text{ in } [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^3. \tag{8}
$$

(ii) If  $\lambda(\beta) < 0$  and  $\lambda(V_*) \geq 0$ , then

<span id="page-3-1"></span>
$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} (H_i, V_u, V_i) = (0, V_*, 0) \text{ in } [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^3. \tag{9}
$$

(iii) If  $\lambda(\beta) > 0$ , then

$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} (H_i, V_u, V_i) = (0, 0, 0) \text{ in } [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^3.
$$
 (10)

*Proof.* (i) Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\lambda(V_* \pm \varepsilon)$  be the principal eigenvalue of

$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_1(x)\nabla \phi + \rho(x)\phi - \sigma_1(x)H_u(x)\varphi = \lambda \phi, & x \in \Omega, \\
-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla \varphi - \sigma_2(x)(V_*(x) \pm \varepsilon)\phi + \mu(x)(V_*(x) \mp \varepsilon)\varphi = \lambda \varphi, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega.\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(11<sub>±</sub>ε)

As  $\lambda(V_*)$  < 0, there is  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \ll 1$  such that, when  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ ,  $\lambda(V_* \pm \varepsilon) < 0$ , and the problems

$$
\begin{cases}\n-\nabla \cdot d_1(x)\nabla H_i = -\rho(x)H_i + \sigma_1(x)H_u(x)V_i, & x \in \Omega, \\
-\nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla V_i = \sigma_2(x)(V_*(x) \pm \varepsilon - V_i)^+ H_i - \mu(x)(V_*(x) \mp \varepsilon)V_i, & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial H_i}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(12<sub>±</sub>

#### M.X. Wang 5

has a unique positive solution  $(H^*_{i, \pm \varepsilon}, V^*_{i, \pm \varepsilon})$ , and  $V^*_{i, \pm \varepsilon} < V_* \pm \varepsilon$  and

<span id="page-4-2"></span>
$$
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (H_{i, \pm \varepsilon}^*, V_{i, \pm \varepsilon}^*) = (H_i^*, V_i^*) \quad \text{in } [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2. \tag{13}
$$

Let  $(H_i, V_u, V_i)$  be the unique solution of [\(1\)](#page-0-2), and set  $V = V_u + V_i$ . Then V satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}\nV_t - \nabla \cdot d_2(x)\nabla V = \beta(x)V - \mu(x)V^2, & x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\
\frac{\partial V}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \ t > 0, \\
V(x, 0) = V_u(x, 0) + V_i(x, 0) > 0, & x \in \overline{\Omega},\n\end{cases}
$$

and  $\lim_{t\to\infty} V = V_*$  in  $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ . For any given  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ , there exists  $T_{\varepsilon} \gg 1$  such that

<span id="page-4-0"></span>
$$
0 < V_*(x) - \varepsilon \le V(x, t) \le V_*(x) + \varepsilon, \quad \forall \ t \ge T_\varepsilon, \ x \in \overline{\Omega}.\tag{14}
$$

Let  $(\bar{H}_i, \bar{V}_i)$  and  $(\underline{H}_i, \underline{V}_i)$  be the unique positive solutions of

<span id="page-4-3"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\n\partial_t \bar{H}_i - \nabla \cdot d_1(x) \nabla \bar{H}_i = -\rho(x) \bar{H}_i + \sigma_1(x) H_u(x) \bar{V}_i, & x \in \Omega, \ t > T_{\varepsilon}, \\
\partial_t \bar{V}_i - \nabla \cdot d_2(x) \nabla \bar{V}_i = \sigma_2(x) (V_*(x) + \varepsilon - \bar{V}_i)^+ \bar{H}_i - \mu(x) (V_*(x - \varepsilon) \bar{V}_i, & x \in \Omega, \ t > T_{\varepsilon}, \\
\frac{\partial \bar{H}_i}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial \bar{V}_i}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \ t > T_{\varepsilon}, \\
\bar{H}_i(x, T_{\varepsilon}) = k H_{i, +\varepsilon}^*, & \bar{V}_i(x, T_{\varepsilon}) = k V_{i, +\varepsilon}^*, & x \in \bar{\Omega},\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(15)

and

$$
\begin{cases}\n\partial_t \underline{H}_i - \nabla \cdot d_1(x) \nabla \underline{H}_i = -\rho(x) \underline{H}_i + \sigma_1(x) H_u(x) \underline{V}_i, & x \in \Omega, \ t > T_{\varepsilon}, \\
\partial_t \underline{V}_i - \nabla \cdot d_2(x) \nabla \underline{V}_i = \sigma_2(x) (V_*(x) - \varepsilon - \underline{V}_i) \underline{H}_i - \mu(x) (V_*(x) + \varepsilon) \underline{V}_i, & x \in \Omega, \ t > T_{\varepsilon}, \\
\frac{\partial \underline{H}_i}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial \underline{V}_i}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \ t > T_{\varepsilon}, \\
\underline{H}_i(x, T_{\varepsilon}) = \delta \phi_{-\varepsilon}, & x \in \overline{\Omega}, & x \in \overline{\Omega},\n\end{cases}
$$

respectively, where  $(\phi_{-\varepsilon}, \varphi_{-\varepsilon})$  is the positive eigenfunction corresponding to  $\lambda(V_*; -\varepsilon)$ ,  $k \gg 1$  and  $0<\delta\ll 1$  are constants such that

$$
(kH_{i,+\varepsilon}^*, kV_{i,+\varepsilon}^*) \ge (H_i(x,T_{\varepsilon}), V_i(x,T_{\varepsilon})), \quad (\delta\phi_{-\varepsilon}, \delta\varphi_{-\varepsilon}) \le (H_i(x,T_{\varepsilon}), V_i(x,T_{\varepsilon})).
$$

It is clear that  $(kH_{i,+\varepsilon}^*, kV_{i,+\varepsilon}^*)$  is an upper solution of  $(12_{+\varepsilon})$  and  $(\delta\phi_{-\varepsilon}, \delta\varphi_{-\varepsilon})$  is a lower solution of  $(12_{-\varepsilon})$ . Hence,  $(\bar{H}_i, \bar{V}_i) \geq (\underline{H}_i, \underline{V}_i)$ , and  $(\bar{H}_i, \bar{V}_i)$  and  $(\underline{H}_i, \underline{V}_i)$  are decreasing and increasing in t, respectively. Then

<span id="page-4-1"></span>
$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} (\bar{H}_i, \bar{V}_i) = (H_{i, +\varepsilon}^*, V_{i, +\varepsilon}^*), \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} (\underline{H}_i, \underline{V}_i) = (H_{i, -\varepsilon}^*, V_{i, -\varepsilon}^*) \quad \text{in } [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2
$$
\n(16)

by the uniform estimate and compact arguments (cf. [\[6,](#page-5-5) Theorems 2.11, 3.14]).

On the other hand, using [\(14\)](#page-4-0) and the comparison principle we deduce that  $(H_i, V_i)$  satisfies  $(\bar{H}_i, \bar{V}_i) \geq (H_i, V_i) \geq (\underline{H}_i, \underline{V}_i)$  for  $t \geq T_{\varepsilon}$  and  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ . Hence, by [\(16\)](#page-4-1),

$$
(H_{i,-\varepsilon}^*, V_{i,-\varepsilon}^*) \le \liminf_{t \to \infty} (H_i, V_i) \le \limsup_{t \to \infty} (H_i, V_i) \le (H_{i,+\varepsilon}^*, V_{i,+\varepsilon}^*) \quad \text{in} \quad [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2.
$$

This combines with [\(13\)](#page-4-2) gives  $\lim_{t\to\infty}(H_i, V_i) = (H_i^*, V_i^*)$  in  $[C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ . As we have shown that  $\lim_{t\to\infty}(V_u + V_i) = V_*$ , it is to see that [\(8\)](#page-3-0) holds.

(ii) Let  $\lambda(V_* + \varepsilon)$  be the principal eigenvalue of  $(11_{+\varepsilon})$ . If  $\lambda(V_*) > 0$ , then  $\lambda(V_* + \varepsilon) > 0$  when  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . So  $(12_{+\varepsilon})$  has no positive solution. Let  $(\bar{H}_i, \bar{V}_i)$  be the unique positive solution of  $(15)$ with initial data  $\bar{H}_i(x,T_\varepsilon) = C_1, \bar{V}_i(x,T_\varepsilon) = C_2$ , where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are large positive constants, for example,

$$
C_1 \ge \max_{\bar{\Omega}} \max \{ V_*(x) + \varepsilon, H_i(x, T_{\varepsilon}) \}, C_2 \ge \max_{\bar{\Omega}} \max \{ C_1 \sigma_1(x) H_u(x) / \rho(x), V_i(x, T_{\varepsilon}) \}.
$$

Then  $(C_1, C_2)$  is an upper solution of  $(12_{+\varepsilon})$ , and  $(\bar{H}_i, \bar{V}_i)$  is decreasing in t. Similar to the above, limit  $\lim_{t\to\infty}(\bar{H}_i,\bar{V}_i)$  exists and is a nonnegative solution of  $(12_{+\varepsilon})$ . Certainly,  $\lim_{t\to\infty}(\bar{H}_i,\bar{V}_i)$  $(0,0)$  since  $(12_{+\varepsilon})$  has no positive solution. Then, by the comparison principle,  $\lim_{t\to\infty}(H_i,V_i)$  $(0, 0)$ . This together with  $\lim_{t\to\infty}(V_u + V_i) = V_*$  gives  $(9)$ .

If  $\lambda(V_*) = 0$ , then  $\lambda(V_* + \varepsilon) < 0$  and  $(12_{+\varepsilon})$  has a unique positive solution  $(H_{i, +\varepsilon}^*, V_{i, +\varepsilon}^*)$  and  $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}(H_{i,+\varepsilon}^*,V_{i,+\varepsilon}^*) = (0,0)$  in  $[C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$  since [\(4\)](#page-1-2) has no positive solution in the present case. Similar to the above,  $\lim_{t\to\infty} (H_i, V_i) = (0,0)$  and [\(9\)](#page-3-1) holds.

(iii) In such case, [\(3\)](#page-1-1) has no positive solution and  $\lim_{t\to\infty}(V_u+V_i)=0$ . Therefore,  $\lim_{t\to\infty}H_i=$ 0 by the first equation of [\(1\)](#page-0-2). The proof is complete.  $\Box$ 

# <span id="page-5-0"></span>References

- [1] W.E. Fitzgibbon, J.J. Morgan and G.F. Webb, An outbreak vector-host epidemic model with spatial structure: the 2015-2016 Zika outbreak in Rio De Janeiro. Theor. Biol. Med. Modell. 14, 2-17 (2017)
- <span id="page-5-2"></span><span id="page-5-1"></span>[2] P. Magal, G. Webb and Y. Wu, On a vector-host epidemic model with spatial structure. Nonlinearity 31, 5589-5614 (2018)
- <span id="page-5-3"></span>[3] P. Magal, G. Webb and Y. Wu, On the basic reproduction number of reaction-diffusion epidemic models. SIAM J. Appl. Math. 79, 284-304 (2019)
- <span id="page-5-4"></span>[4] G. Sweers, Strong positivity in  $C(\Omega)$  for elliptic systems. Math. Z. 209, 251-271 (1992)
- <span id="page-5-5"></span>[5] H. Amann, Fixed point equations and nonlinear eigenvalue problems in ordered Banach spaces. SIAM Rev. 18, 620-709 (1976)
- [6] M.X. Wang, Nonlinear Second Order Parabolic Equations. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 2021.