

# Investigating synergies between chemical reaction networks (CRN) and mathematical epidemiology (ME), using the Mathematica package Epid-CRN

Florin Avram<sup>a</sup>, Rim Adenane<sup>b</sup>, Andrei D. Halanay<sup>c</sup>, Matthew D. Johnston<sup>d</sup>

November 20, 2024

<sup>a</sup> Laboratoire de Mathématiques Appliquées, Université de Pau, 64000, Pau, France,

<sup>b</sup> Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Ibn-Tofail University, Kénitra, 14000, Morocco,

<sup>c</sup> Department of mathematics and informatics, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, RO-010014, Romania

<sup>d</sup> Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Lawrence Technological University, Southfield, MI, 48075, USA.

## Abstract

In this essay, we investigate some relations between CRN and ME, and report on several pleasant surprises which we had simply by putting these two topics together.

Firstly, we propose a definition of ME models as a subset of CRN models, as stated in Open Problem (1).

Secondly, we review a fundamental stability result for boundary points, known in ME as the next generation matrix (NGM) method [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08], since it replaces the investigation of the Jacobian by that of a matrix whose origins lie in probability (the theory of branching processes). This important result seems to be little known outside ME; even in ME, it has not been made clear before that the method gets sometimes the right answer, even though the conditions of the NGM theorem [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08] are not all satisfied—see Section 4.5. Thus, beyond the theorem, there is a heuristic approach, the validity conditions for which are not sufficiently understood, as emphasized in the title of Section 4).

Thirdly, we show that some simple CRN models with absolute concentration robustness (ACR), are close qualitatively to simple ME models, in the sense that they have a unique disease free equilibrium fixed point and a unique interior fixed point, and the latter enters the positive domain and becomes stable precisely when

$$R_0 := s_{dfc} \mathcal{R} = \frac{s_{dfc}}{s_e} > 1, \quad (0.1)$$

(where  $s$  denotes the “ACR species see (2.2) for details on the SIRS example, and Section 4 for details on several ACR examples). Thus, for these “ME type models”, a “relay phenomena” takes place: precisely when the DFE loses stability, a new fixed point enters the domain, and takes over.

Last but not least, we offer in the associated GitHub site [https://github.com/adhalanay/epidemiology\\_crns](https://github.com/adhalanay/epidemiology_crns) a Mathematica package, Epid-CRN, which is addressed to researchers of both disciplines, and provide illustrative notebooks, which in particular solve a few minor open ME and CRN problems. Our package may also be used to study easy cases of analogue continuous time Markov chain (CTMC) ME and CRN models, as explained in the Arxiv version.

**Keywords:** SIR-type ODE models; CRN ; fixed points; Hopf and Bogdanov-Takens bifurcations; Routh–Hurwitz–Liénard–Chipart criteria; next generation matrix; stoichiometric matrix; reaction variables; auto-catalytic CRN; rank one decomposition.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction to ME and CRN</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Motivation . . . . .	2
1.2	How to parameterize ME and CRN models? . . . . .	3
1.3	What are ME models? . . . . .	4
1.4	The admissibility conditions for reaction rates . . . . .	5
1.5	A bird’s eye view of CRNT . . . . .	5
1.6	Can CRN software solve ME problems? . . . . .	5
1.7	Contents . . . . .	7

<b>2</b>	<b>Some SIRS-type epidemic models</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Epidemic models are formally CRNs . . . . .	8
2.2	The mass-action SIRS has a unique, rational endemic point when $R_0 > 1$ , which is globally asymptotically stable: SIRS.nb (3,8,3,1) . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>A non-catalytic monomolecular translated SIRS model</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Non-catalytic and auto-catalytic CRNs may be defined based only on the SM and on the functional dependence in the rates . . . . .	10
3.2	The representation as the product of the complex-composition, Laplacian and monomial rates .	11
3.3	An example of “symbolic/structural Hopf bifurcation”: the Capasso-type SIRS model with one functional infection rate: SIRSCap.nb . . . . .	11
<b>4</b>	<b>When does the NGM heuristic obtain the correct local stability domain of the DFE, for CRNs with absolute concentration robustness?</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1	The next generation matrix method and heuristic . . . . .	12
4.2	A bird’s eye view on ACR [SF10, KMD <sup>+</sup> 12, DDG15, Dic16, TJ18, PGH <sup>+</sup> 23, JN24] . . . . .	13
4.3	Examples of Escherichia coli EnvZ-OmpR models, with ACR species Yp, where (0.1) holds . .	14
4.3.1	A (5,4,3,1) subnetwork of EnvZ-OmpR : EnvZ.nb . . . . .	14
4.3.2	A (8,11,6,1) subnetwork of EnvZ-OmpR [CGK20]: EnvZCap.nb . . . . .	17
4.4	The DFE stability domain for the (9,14,7,2) EnvZ-OmpR [SF10, KMD <sup>+</sup> 12, JMP19] does not satisfy (0.1): EnvZJ.nb . . . . .	18
4.5	The (5,6,3,1) IDHKP-IDH system [SF10, JN24]: IDHKP.nb does not satisfy the NGM conditions, but satisfies (0.1) . . . . .	20
4.6	The (4,5,3,2) MAK with ACR [TJ18, (1)] satisfies $R_0 = \frac{S_{dfe}}{s_e}$ : Tonello.nb . . . . .	22
<b>5</b>	<b>A challenge problem: the SIRnS cyclic epidemic model with one susceptible class, one infection class, and <math>n</math> recovered classes</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1	The mass-action SIR1S, where the recovered may also infect, does not admit Hopf bifurcation: SIR1S.nb, SIR1S.jl (3,9,3,2) . . . . .	24
5.1.1	Rational univariate representation (RUR) for SIR1S . . . . .	25
5.1.2	A rational “mixed var-par” parametrization for SIR1S . . . . .	26
5.2	SIR2S without vaccination admits Hopf and double zero bifurcation: SIR2S.nb (4,11,4,3) . . .	26

# 1 Introduction to ME and CRN

## 1.1 Motivation

Chemical reaction networks (CRN) (also called biological interaction networks (BIN) by some authors) and mathematical epidemiology (ME) have shared for long common preoccupations, like the multi-stationarity and stability problems (including that of boundary points, which lead to the famous  $R_0 < 1$  theorem in ME), and the bifurcations problem. Furthermore, all these fields study essentially non-negative ODE’s, and their first historical tool has been checking the **Routh–Hurwitz–Liénard–Chipart criteria**, which unfortunately succeed symbolically only with few variables and parameters.

Trying to develop more efficient methods for specific classes of larger ODE’s, based on their structure, has been a long-standing challenging goal in systems biology research. CRN/BIN researchers have developed remarkable tools, which include the Horn-Jackson-Feinberg and Petri/Volpert/DSR graphs, the “deficiency”, the “conservations” and “positive fluxes” of the **stoichiometric matrix**, the **robust Lyapunov functions** (RLF), etc. (robust means here that the determination of the fixed point(s) is not necessary for defining the Lyapunov functions, since these are expressed in terms of the “**reaction variables**”, i.e. the nonlinear functions appearing in the RHS of the ODE, whose nullity defines the fixed points).

**Are there CRN and ME methods which might be useful in the “sister science”?** The answer to this natural question was not at all obvious, since some important features in CRN examples, like zero deficiency (ZD) may probably never occur in ME (this is a consequence of the global attractor conjecture), and others, like weak-reversibility, seem also impossible (this is an open question, whose answer depends on how we define ME models; our proposed definition is stated in Open Problem (1)). The first positive answers to the question in the title of this paragraph were given in the recent paper Vassena & al [VAA]:

1. One remarkable recent result of [Vas23, Vas24], which states that **any auto-catalytic CRN will admit unstable equilibria (increasing thus the chance of Hopf bifurcations), if all the reaction rates are “rich enough”**, for example Michaelis-Menten (MM), lead in ME to [VAA, Thm 3.1]. The latter may be stated as: “Consider any epidemiological system in which there exists an “ $S \rightarrow I$  infection reaction” with “admissible rate”  $R_1(s, i)$ , and an “ $I \rightarrow \dots$  treatment reaction” with “admissible rate”  $R_2(i)$ , where admissible is defined in the original papers, and also here below, in Remark 10. Then, the “symbolic Jacobian”, in which  $R_1, R_2$  are not specified (but the sign of their derivatives is specified, via admissibility), may always have purely imaginary eigenvalues if  $R_1, R_2$  are “rich” in the sense of [Vas23, Vas24] (for example, Michaelis-Menten).

Briefly, all epidemic models admit “symbolic bifurcations”, provided their rate functions have enough parameters; it is only the restriction to mass action that may prevent the occurrence of Hopf bifurcations.

Note that this result had been observed empirically in many particular three compartment SIR-type models, but the fact that the number of compartments and the exact architecture of the model are irrelevant, was not understood.

Note also that since in ME it does not make much sense to replace linear rates by Michaelis-Menten, the result in [VAA], which only assumes the “relevant” rates to be rich, required a careful reexamination of the method of [Vas23, Vas24].

2. A second CRN result exploited in [VAA] was the **Inheritance of oscillation in chemical reaction networks** of [Ban18], which gives conditions for Hopf bifurcations to be inherited by models, given that they exist in a sub-model where some parameters are 0. This allowed establishing the existence of Hopf bifurcations for the mass-action ME model (using their existence in the case of no demography, already established by Hethcote and Van den Driesche [HSVDD81]).
3. In the opposite direction, we show below that the next generation matrix method of [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08], may be applied to find conditions for the stability of fixed boundary points of interesting CRN models.

## 1.2 How to parameterize ME and CRN models?

For the second question formulated in the title of this section, how to parameterize ME models, there are three natural choices.

1. The parametrization used traditionally for ODE models in ME is as a pair (RHS, var), where RHS denotes the set of formulas for the derivatives, and var are the variables whose rates of change we study. This parametrization is well geared for solving symbolic bifurcation problems for small size models. It ignores though the “network” (or graph) structure revealed by the following two parametrizations.
2. Chemical reactions networks research suggests that a model should be defined by a triple  $(\Gamma, \mathbf{R}, x)$ , associated to the decomposition

$$x' = RHS = \Gamma \cdot \mathbf{R}(x) \quad (1.1)$$

- (a) where  $x$  denotes the variables
- (b)  $\Gamma$  is the “stoichiometric matrix” (SM), whose columns represent directions in which several species/-compartments change simultaneously,
- (c)  $\mathbf{R}(x)$  is the vector of rates of change associated to each direction, also known as kinetics.

For example, here is the triple  $(\Gamma, \mathbf{R}, x)$  of the simplest SIRS ODE:


$$x' = \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ i' \\ r' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta si \\ \gamma i \\ \gamma_r r \\ \gamma_s s \end{pmatrix} := \Gamma \mathbf{R}(x) \quad (1.2)$$

(with  $\lambda = \mu = \delta = 0$  as compared to (2.1) below, for ease of display).

The rates  $R(x)$  must satisfy admissibility conditions – see Definition 2 below.

This parametrization is geared for studying “robust questions” like for example the existence of “robust Lyapunov functions” which depend only on the “reaction variables  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{R}(x)$ ” [Bla95, ARA14].

3. Yet a third parametrization used in CRN is to enter for each column of  $\Gamma$ /“reaction” its traditional “mass-action” CRN representation as a pair “(input  $\rightarrow$  output)”, in the style



(this reaction represents in SIR recovery after being infected), each reaction being a directed pair consisting of the “source complex”, and a “product complex” see definition below.

**Definition 1.** A mass-action CRN is defined by a triple  $\{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R}$  are the set of species, complexes and reactions respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} &= \{S_1, \dots, S_i, \dots, S_{|\mathcal{S}|}\} \\ \mathcal{C} &= \{y_1, \dots, y_\alpha, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{C}|} : y_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\} \\ \mathcal{R} &= \{y_\alpha \xrightarrow{k_{y_\alpha \rightarrow y_\beta} \cdot x^{y_\alpha}} y_\beta : k_{y_\alpha \rightarrow y_\beta} \geq 0\},\end{aligned}$$

where Roman letters  $(i, j)$  and Greek letters  $(\alpha, \beta)$  are used to denote species and complex indices, respectively, and  $x = \{s_1, \dots, s_i, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{S}|}\}$  denotes the vector of unknowns. A complex is a multi-set of species, and is denoted by the column vector  $y_\alpha$  representing the stoichiometry/direction of the multi-set.

**Example 1.** The SIRS ODE (1.2) is induced by the reactions:



From this representation, one may construct the stoichiometric/directions matrix  $\Gamma$ , by associating to each reaction a column given by  $y_\beta - y_\alpha$ , and also recover the derivatives of the variables collected in RHS, in the first representation.

In this example,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} &= \{S, I, R\}, x = (s, i, r), \\ \mathcal{C} &= \{y_1 = (1, 1, 0), y_2 = (0, 2, 0), y_3 = (1, 0, 0), y_4 = (0, 1, 0), y_5 = (0, 0, 1)\} \\ \mathcal{R} &= \{y_1 \xrightarrow{\beta x^{y_1} = \beta s i} y_2, y_4 \xrightarrow{\gamma_i i} y_5, \dots\},\end{aligned}$$

**Remark 1.** The last three reactions of (1.3) are self-explanatory, but not the first; this one is a consequence of adopting the mass-action representation of our ODE, which requires that the linear coefficients multiplying  $S, I$  on the LHS of (1.3) equal the exponents of  $s, i$  in the rate of the reaction.

**Remark 2.** A variant of the last representation is to provide a “sources matrix”, which gathers the coefficients of all the LHS of the reactions, and a “products matrix”, which gathers the coefficients of all the RHS of the reactions, This is used typically in the Matlab and python packages (for example, those listed in Section 1.6).

We prefer using the Mathematica package Reaction Networks [TNP18], which provides in one command, “ReactionsData”, many important network characteristics like the stoichiometric matrix, the RHS (associated to mass action), the Feinberg-Horn-Jackson (FHJ) graph on the complexes, the Petri/ Volpert/DSR complexes-reactions bipartite digraph, etc.

### 1.3 What are ME models?

Note first that a definition of ME models is still lacking. One might want to ask for essential non-negativity, but for a counterexample see [MdCR23]. We might also want to rule out types of reactions absent in all epidemiological models, like simultaneous degradations (deaths), written by chemists in the form “A”+”B” $\rightarrow$ 0, and “two from one reactions”, like “C” $\rightarrow$ ”A”+”B”. It seems premature now to speculate on this question; however, as a wide digression, we conjecture that

**Open Problem 1.** A definition of mass-action ME models should identify an appropriate subclass of the class of chemical reaction networks, possibly the subclass including only transfers (monomolecular reactions), and bimolecular reactions of the types  $S + E \rightarrow 2E, S + I \rightarrow I + E$ , as encountered in SEIR.

## 1.4 The admissibility conditions for reaction rates

**Definition 2.** A BIN/CRN is an ODE admitting a (non-unique) representation with rates satisfying the following **admissibility restrictions** [DARJS24]:

1.  $R_i(x)$  is  $C^1$  (continuously differentiable).

2.

$$\frac{\partial R_i(x)}{\partial x_j} \begin{cases} \geq 0 & \text{if } x_j \text{ is a reactant} \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } x_j \text{ is a product} \\ = 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$\frac{\partial R_i(x)}{\partial x_j} \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if } x_j \text{ is a reactant and all the reactants are present} \\ < 0 & \text{if } x_j \text{ is a product and all the products are present} \end{cases}$$

3.

$$R_i(x) \begin{cases} \geq 0 & \text{if not all products are present} \\ \leq 0 & \text{if not all reactants are present (which rules out mass-action and} \\ & \text{non-catalytic BINs, for example)} \end{cases}$$

## 1.5 A bird’s eye view of CRNT

CRNT might be divided in three directions:

1. The study of mass-action kinetics (MAK), like SIRS, with further examples provided throughout the paper. These may further be divided in non-catalytic and auto-catalytic.
2. The study of generalized mass-action kinetics (GMAK).
3. The “robust” study of non-catalytic CRNs, which generalizes mass-action kinetics by replacing the non-linear interactions with arbitrary admissible functions – see Remark 10. One studies then “robust stability and non-oscillation” – see for example [Efi12, ARA15, AARAS20, AARS21, AR23].

While not directly applicable in ME, which concerns auto-catalytic CRNs, mentioning this sub-field is unavoidable in a paper on computational tools, (in the ArXiv version), due to their powerful algorithmic tools encapsulated in LEARN.

## 1.6 Can CRN software solve ME problems?

In this essay, we argued the case that ME researchers could profit from mastering the unifying language of biological interaction networks (BIN), or, under its more traditional name, chemical reaction networks (CRN) theory. This language is not used in ME, despite the fact that ME and BIN/CRN problems are practically indistinguishable mathematically at first sight. As a result, ME researchers cannot profit from the wealth of powerful CRN software, like for example

1. The collaborative package CoNtRoL (accessed on 6 August 2015) [DBMP14, JPD16] <https://reaction-networks.net/wiki/CoNtRoL>;
2. The Mathematica packages ReactionKinetics [TNP18], MathCRN (accessed on 29 April 2016) <https://gitlab.com/csb.ethz/MathCrn> and [reaction-networks.m https://vcp.med.harvard.edu/software.html#crnt](https://vcp.med.harvard.edu/software.html#crnt);
3. Feinberg’s Chemical Reaction networks toolbox <https://cbe.osu.edu/chemical-reaction-network-theory#toolbox>;
4. The Julia package Catalyst.jl [LMI<sup>+</sup>23];
5. The Macaulay package ReactionNetworks.m2 <https://macaulay2.com/doc/Macaulay2/share/doc/Macaulay2/ReactionNetworks/html/index.html>;
6. The Matlab package LEARN [ARA15, AARAS20, AR23] <https://github.com/malirdwi/LEARN>;

7. The Matlab packages `TowardZ` and `CASTANET` for network translation, a topic initiated by Johnston [Joh14, TJ18, JMP19, HLJK22]), implemented by Hong et al. <https://github.com/Mathbiomed/TOWARDZ> and <https://github.com/Mathbiomed/CASTANET>;
8. The Python packages [Ton18, Ton] and <https://github.com/materialsproject/reaction-network>.

See also [https://reaction-networks.net/wiki/Mathematics\\_of\\_Reaction\\_Networks](https://reaction-networks.net/wiki/Mathematics_of_Reaction_Networks) for further resources.

It is interesting to reflect on the reason for the disparity between the strong computerization of CRN and its absence in ME for similarly looking problems. One reason is that ME strives towards complete analysis of small-dimension models (but see the 31 reactions model of [BO23] for an exception), while CRN researchers study larger models but settle for partial answers (concerning, say, multistationarity and the existence of ACR) and avoid often difficult issues like the presence of Hopf and Bogdanov–Takens bifurcations, or chaos.

Since ME models are formally CRNs, one can find out in two seconds what a CRN package like `CoNtRoL` has to say about the simplest SIRS model:  $S + I \rightarrow 2I, I \rightarrow R \rightarrow S$ . We receive lots of information; however, this does not intersect a lot with what is considered important in ME about SIR, which is:

1. It admits only rational fixed points (which can be addressed via any symbolic computer algebra system, without the need for special tools).
2. It has only one interior fixed point if the crucial parameter  $R_0$  determining the stability of the unique boundary fixed point is fixed to be bigger than 1. The issue of possible “phase transition constraints” on certain parameters does not seem to have been studied in CRN, where boundary fixed points have not been considered of much interest.
3. The “endemic” interior fixed point previously mentioned is globally asymptotically stable.

It may be seen from the answers provided by `CoNtRoL` that the questions asked in ME and CRN are “parallel, but not identical”.

Our paper has two motivations.

1. The first is to improve the communication between ME and CRN/BIN, by informing the two communities about the work of the other.

For example, we bring to the attention of both communities open problems concerning a recent SIR-type model  $SIR_nS$  [AGPV24, VAA], which has  $n + 2$  compartments.

2. A second motivation is creating a package and disseminating example notebooks, whose tweaking might help solving new problems, as has long been standard in fields like scientific computation and statistics.

It seems fair to say that until now, not enough effort has been invested in supporting ME papers by scientific computing tools, despite the fact that a large number of ME papers are dedicated to topics which are computational in essence (like computing stability and bifurcation conditions). For example, until our recent paper [AABJ23] and the package `Epid-CRN`, it was impossible to find a symbolic script which computes the famous epidemiology stability threshold  $R_0$ .

We are introducing here the first version of our Mathematica computer package, `Epid-CRN`, which integrates methods from both communities, and we accompany the paper by several pedagogic notebooks, dealing mostly with classic examples from the literature. The novelty are not the examples in themselves, but the fact that the solution is structured in a way which strives to be independent of example, up to minor modifications. Of course, the limits of our symbolic package are much lower than those of numeric packages; despite that, we hope our package will have at least a pedagogical value.

Let us clarify here that the packages above already achieve several of our goals. However, they are mainly geared to the CRN community, and we hope that our package might serve ME researchers as a bridge towards using CRN packages. Furthermore, we hope to integrate methods not always available in older packages, for example concerning injectivity [CF05, BP16], monotonicity [ADLS10, dFWF17], and persistence [ADLS07].

## 1.7 Contents

Since this essay is in part a notebook accompanied manual for solving ME and CRN problems, one issue we encountered was ordering the problems by their complexity. For that, we found useful the CRN classification of complexity in [BB23a], according to  $(n_{Species}, n_{Reactions}, rank)$ , but we added at the end the deficiency.

**Definition 3.** *The deficiency of a CRN is defined to be the number of complexes  $|C|$  minus the rank of the stoichiometric matrix, and minus the number of components in the Feinberg-Horn-Jackson graph (for further information on the deficiency theorems and CRN's in general, see for example the tutorials [Gun03, Ang09, YC18, Cox18a]).*

We start in section 2 with some simple versions of the SIR model, included with the purpose of disseminating the basics of ME. Section 2.2 provides a notebook for a mass-action three species, eight reactions SIRS model, where the application of a Routh Hurwitz -type criterion for the unique positive endemic point is straightforward, and rules out Hopf bifurcations. The notebook for section 3.3 offers an example with Hopf bifurcation for a SIRS model with one functional rate  $f(i)$ , in terms of the values  $f(i), f'(i)$  at the endemic point. The example may be realized by choosing a Michaelis-Menten type  $f(i)$ .

Section 3 takes a short detour through the world of non-catalytic CRNs, exemplified by a "monomolecular translated SIRS model". This draws attention to the fact that while epidemic models are auto-catalytic, they have non-catalytic relatives which might turn out useful in analyzing them.

In section 4 we turn to studying the stability of CRN models displaying absolute concentration robustness (ACR)– see Definition 7, via the next generation matrix (NGM) method.

The initiation to ME models continues in section 5, where we recall a challenging mass-action model SIRnS with  $n + 2$  compartments, first introduced in [AGPV24], and further analyzed in [VAA]. We resolve in section 5.1 one outstanding question, concerning the existence of Hopf bifurcation for SIR1S (with  $n=1$ ).

## 2 Some SIRS-type epidemic models

We start by providing a simple SIRS model, which includes however several "non-classic" interesting interactions, like loss of immunity and vaccination.




Figure 1: Illustration of the interaction between the classes of *Susceptible*, *Infectious* and *Recovered* individuals in the SIR model  $\begin{pmatrix} s' \\ i' \\ r' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda - \beta si - (\gamma_s + \mu)s + \gamma_r r \\ i[\beta s - (\gamma_i + \mu + \delta)] \\ \gamma_i i - (\gamma_r + \mu)r + \gamma_s s \end{pmatrix}$ . Boxes represent compartments, and arrows indicate the flow between compartments.

**Definition 4.** *a) For an essentially nonnegative ODE defined on the nonnegative cone which admits some boundary fixed point  $X_b$ , let  $X = (x, y)$  be the partition of the coordinates into the support  $y = \{j : X_j > 0\}$  and the set  $x$  of coordinates which become 0 at  $X = X_b$ . The coordinates  $y$  are also called resident in ME, and the coordinates  $x$  are called invading/infection. The equations for  $x'$  are called infection equations (note, for polynomial systems, that they may be written as  $x' = A(x)x$ ).*

*b) We define the new infection terms to be all the nonlinear terms in the infection equations which are also positive.*

c) The new infection matrix  $F$  is the matrix containing **all** the new infection terms, and the matrix  $V$  is defined by  $j_I = F - V$ , where  $j_I$  is the derivative of the infection equations with respect to the infection variables.

d)  $R_0$  of the ODE at  $X_b$  is the spectral radius (and Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue) of the matrix  $K = FV^{-1}$ , i.e.

$$R_0 = R_0(F, V) = \lambda_{PF}(K) = \lambda_{PF}(FV^{-1}).$$

**Example 2.** The example in figure 1 admits one boundary point,  $X_{dfe} = \left( s_{dfe} = \frac{\lambda(\mu+\gamma_r)}{\mu(\mu+\gamma_r+\gamma_s)}, 0, r_{dfe} = \frac{\lambda\gamma_s}{\mu(\mu+\gamma_r+\gamma_s)} \right)$ , the new infection term is  $F = s_{dfe}\beta$ , and the derivative of the infection equation  $i'$  with respect to the infection variable  $i$  yields  $V = \mu + \delta + \gamma_i$ . Thus,  $K = s_{dfe}\beta \frac{1}{\mu+\gamma_i+\delta} := R_0$ .

**Remark 3.** The result of [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08] is that the inequality  $R_0(F, V) < 1$  determines correctly the domain of stability of  $X_b$ , provided a series of conditions are satisfied. They do not provide a unique choice of  $F, V$ , and indeed several choices satisfying their conditions  $F, V$  may be possible. the word “all new infection terms”.

However, it was observed in many examples and hence conjectured in [AABJ23] that the “all” choice satisfies always the conditions of [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08]. Since our point of view here is algorithmic, like in [AABJ23], we make the time-saving choice of  $F, V$  proposed in that paper. Note that it is an open problem to provide a counterexample where the “all” choice doesn’t satisfy the conditions of [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08].

Finally, note that the unique choice made in definition 4 b),c) is not strictly necessary, since different expressions for  $R_0$ ’s may lead to the same domain of stability.

## 2.1 Epidemic models are formally CRNs

Here is a three species, eight “directions/reactions” CRN representations of the SIRS from Figure 1:

$$x' = \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ i' \\ r' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \\ \beta s i \\ \gamma_i i \\ \gamma_r r \\ \gamma_s s \\ \mu s \\ (\mu + \delta) i \\ \mu r \end{pmatrix} = \Gamma \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2.1)$$

Here  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$  is the vector of rates of change in each direction, for example  $\lambda$  acts on  $s$  only, and  $\Gamma$ , the “directions/stoichiometric matrix”, has columns which give the respective directions in which each rate acts. Identifying the stoichiometric matrix allows computing CRN theoretical quantities like the deficiency (a measure of the complexity), which is 1, the conservations space (i.e. the maximal non-negative cone included in the kernel/nullspace to the left), and the elementary generators (i.e. a basis for non-negative vectors which are orthogonal to  $\Gamma$  from the right).

**Remark 4.** We can also represent the model via its eight reactions  $RN = \{0 \rightarrow "S", "S" + "I" \rightarrow 2"I", "I" \rightarrow "R", "R" \rightarrow "S", "S" \rightarrow "R", "S" \rightarrow 0, "I" \rightarrow 0, "R" \rightarrow 0\}$  (note the second reaction, which makes the model **explicitly/one step autocatalytic**, since  $I$  appears on both sides of the reaction, and renders results which assert that bifurcations exist a priori if the kinetics is “rich enough” (for example Michaelis-Menten) to be expected [Vas23, Vas24]).

The “Feinberg-Horn-Jackson” graph having the complexes as vertices and reactions as edges is displayed in the following figure:






Figure 2: The FHJ graph of the “SIRS network” with 8 reactions and the deficiency  $\delta = 6 - 2 - 3 = 1$ . The 0 node represents the exterior.

## 2.2 The mass-action SIRS has a unique, rational endemic point when $R_0 > 1$ , which is globally asymptotically stable: SIRS.nb (3,8,3,1)

We recall here the fact that SIRS has a quite simple dynamic landscape:

1. One boundary disease free equilibrium (DFE) fixed point

$$(s_{dfe} = \frac{\lambda(\mu + \gamma_r)}{\mu(\mu + \gamma_r + \gamma_s)}, 0, r_{dfe} = \frac{\lambda\gamma_s}{\mu(\mu + \gamma_r + \gamma_s)}).$$

**Remark 5.** The stability condition of the DFE may be expressed as the product

$$R_0 := s_{dfe} \frac{\beta}{\gamma_i + \mu_i} := s_{dfe} \mathcal{R} < 1,$$

where  $\mathcal{R}$  is a measure of the “number of infections produced by one infectious individual”. In general,  $R_0$  is the spectral radius of the “next generation matrix” [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08].

2. One rational endemic point given by

$$EE = \left( \frac{\gamma_i + \mu_i}{\beta} := \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}, \frac{\mu(\gamma_i + \mu_i)(\mu + \gamma_r + \gamma_s)(R_0 - 1)}{\beta\gamma_i\mu + \beta\mu_i(\mu + \gamma_r)}, \frac{\beta\gamma_i\lambda - (\gamma_i + \mu_i)(\gamma_i\mu - \mu_i\gamma_s)}{\beta\gamma_i\mu + \beta\mu_i(\mu + \gamma_r)} \right),$$

where  $\mu_i = \delta + \mu$ . The existence of just one rational endemic point is discovered here by `Solve[RHS==0, var]` (in cases where the execution “hangs”, we will know that the fixed points are not all rational, and a different approach, a rational univariate representation (RUR) may be used).

**Remark 6.** As is often the case in simple ME models, the  $i$  component of the endemic fixed point becomes positive and stable precisely when

$$R_0 = s_{dfe} \mathcal{R} = \frac{s_{dfe}}{s_e} > 1, \tag{2.2}$$

and at  $R_0 = 1$  it equals the DFE. Thus, we have here a “relay phenomena”: precisely when the DFE loses stability, a new fixed point enters the domain, and takes over.

3. The local stability of the endemic fixed point when  $R_0 > 1$  is checked via Routh-Hurwitz criterion in only 1sec when  $\gamma_s = 0$ ; the same computation took 64sec when  $\gamma_s > 0$  –See [SIRS.nb].
4. Global asymptotic stability of the EE when it exists was established in [BM18, AVCP19].

**Remark 7.** There exist probably no ME models with deficiency zero (in the weakly reversible case, they would be counterexamples to the global attractor conjecture, and for the weakly reversible case see [Fei87, Remark 6.1.B]).

**Open Problem 2.** Analyze the stability of SIRS using deficiency one theory.

### 3 A non-catalytic monomolecular translated SIRS model

As noted in Remark 4, the presence of "S" + "I" → 2"I" in the reactions representation makes the model **explicitly autocatalytic**, since *I* appears on both sides of the reaction. We turn now to a variant of SIRS which is non-catalytic.

**Example 3** (A non-catalytic reversible monomolecular model with deficiency zero). Consider now a "monomolecular version", obtained by "simplifying/translating" the second reaction "S"+"I"→ 2 "I" to "S"→ "I" [Joh14].




Figure 3: The "monomolecular SIRS" has one linkage class, is weakly reversible (WR), and has zero deficiency (ZD)  $4-3-1=0$ .

This process has a unique globally attractive fixed point, which is positive for all values of the parameters. In fact, this is conjectured to hold always for the class of weakly reversible, zero deficiency (WR-ZD) CRNs by the so-called "Global Attractor Conjecture" [HJ72, CF05, CF06], and is proved to hold "robustly", for any admissible rate  $r_1(s)$  in [DARJS24, Sec.6,Exa 1] (however, this simplified model does not make sense epidemiologically).

**Remark 8.** This example reveals one possible interest of the CRN-ME collaboration. ME models display often multi-stability and oscillations (which are always proved by example dependent methods). On the other hand, they have typically "WR-ZD cousins", obtained by translation, which are super well-behaved, and which may be obtained by off shelf software (involving sometimes Linear Programming) [HHKK23].

It is conceivable that the well-behaved cousins can help in reaching interesting conclusions for their more complex relatives, but this remains to be seen.

#### 3.1 Non-catalytic and auto-catalytic CRNs may be defined based only on the SM and on the functional dependence in the rates

**Remark 9.** The definition of catalyticity below, due to A. Angeli, E.Sontag and collaborators, depart from the traditional one, which involves decomposing the SM as the difference of an output SM and an input SM.

**Definition 5.** The pattern of signs in  $\Gamma$  may be used to define a partition of each column  $\Gamma_i$  into

1. the **products** of the reaction, corresponding to positive entries, and
2. **reactants**, corresponding to negative entries.

**Definition 6. A.** A CRN (see Definition 2) is **non-catalytic** iff the variables of all the reaction rates  $R_j$  are precisely the reactants, i.e. the species  $i$  such that  $\Gamma_{ij} < 0$ .

**B.** A CRN is **auto-catalytic** if it is not non-catalytic, i.e. iff there exists some reaction rate  $R_j$  whose arguments include some species  $i$  such that  $\Gamma_{ij} > 0$ .

**Remark 10.** For a non-catalytic, or reactant-dependent BIN/CRN, the rates must satisfy

- A1.**  $R_j(x)$  is continuously differentiable,  $j = 1, \dots, n_r$ ;
- A2.** if  $\Gamma_{ij} < 0$ , then  $x_i = 0$  implies  $R_j(x) = 0$ ;
- A3.**  $\partial R_j / \partial x_i(x) \geq 0$  if  $\Gamma_{ij} < 0$  and  $\partial R_j / \partial x_i(x) \equiv 0$  if  $\Gamma_{ij} \geq 0$ ;
- A4.** The inequality in A3 holds strictly for all positive concentrations, i.e when  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ .

### 3.2 The representation as the product of the complex-composition, Laplacian and monomial rates

We provide now one more representation used in CRNT, which applies only in the case of mass action kinetics (MAK) (or, slightly modified, for generalized mass action kinetics (GMAK)).

$$x' = \Gamma \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{I}_a)(\mathbf{I}_k \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{Y}}) = \mathbf{Y} \mathcal{L} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{Y}}. \quad (3.1)$$

Here  $Y$  is a  $n_S \times n_C$  matrix whose columns specify the composition of the “complexes” (i.e. the vectors representing the left and right hand side of each equation),  $I_a$  is the  $n_C \times n_R$  incidence matrix of the Feinberg-Horn-Jackson graph on the complexes, whose edges correspond to the reactions,  $x^Y$  is the  $n_C \times 1$  vector of exponents of the inputs of each reaction, completed by 1 for the complexes which are not inputs, and  $I_k$  is an  $n_R \times n_C$  “outgoing coincidence matrix” containing all the reaction constants, whose  $(r, c)$ -th element equals  $k_r$  if the  $c$ -th complex is the input complex for the  $j$ -th reaction, and zero otherwise.

It follows that  $\mathcal{L} = I_a I_k$  is a  $n_C \times n_C$  “Laplacian matrix” with non-positive diagonal elements and nonnegative off-diagonal elements, whose all column sums are zero. This matrix intervenes in the study of “complex-balanced equilibria” and Wegscheider conditions—see for example [GES05, VdSRJ15] for further details.

**Remark 11.** *Let us draw attention now to three advantages of decomposing RHS as in (2.1):*

1. *The representation (2.1) suggests that the investigation of CRN ODE’s may be split in two parts: “structural elements” depending only on  $\Gamma$ , and on the variables of each component of  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$ , and “parametric elements” reflected in the specific structure of  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$  (polynomial, or Michaelis-Menten, or Hill kinetics, etc). This opened up the fruitful investigation of “robust questions” which are independent of the specific kinetics, like for example “robust stability”, the question of whether the Jacobian of the RHS is a stable matrix independently of parametric kinetics.*
2. *The problem of describing the fixed points becomes essentially trivial when passing to “reaction coordinates” defined by  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots)$ . Indeed, on one hand,  $\mathbf{z}$  must belong to the null-space of  $\Gamma$ , and on the other hand  $\mathbf{z}$  must be nonnegative, which means simply that it is a non-negative combination of the extreme rays of the cone obtained by intersecting the null-space with the non-negative cone. Now finding this cone is very easy for a computer algebra system (CAS): it simply requires adding the non-negativity constraint when solving  $\Gamma \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}$  for  $\mathbf{z}$ . At least, this problem is very easy when  $\Gamma$  is numeric, which can always be ensured.*
3. *When the stoichiometric matrix contains only 1,  $-1, 0$  it represents the incidence matrix of an associated directed bipartite Petri/Volpert graph connecting the set of species with that of reactions. The intuitive graph representation helps, and ended up in inspiring some of the robust Lyapunov function algorithms in LEARN, which search for functions of the form  $V(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}))$ .*

### 3.3 An example of “symbolic/structural Hopf bifurcation”: the Capasso-type SIRS model with one functional infection rate: SIRSCap.nb

We have seen in the previous section that the mass-action SIRS-type epidemic model does not admit Hopf bifurcations. Here, we show that replacing mass-action kinetics with more general nonlinear interactions gives rise to the possibility of purely imaginary eigenvalues crossings (recall that this is always true with two functional rates, infection and treatment [VAA, Thm 3.1]). Furthermore, an example may be detected simply by Mathematica’s command FindInstance.

The Capasso-type SIR model [CS78] we consider is:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ i' \\ r' \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & -1 & -\mu - \gamma_s & 0 & \gamma_r \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -\gamma - \mu_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_s & \gamma & -\mu - \gamma_r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ isf(i) \\ s \\ i \\ r \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda - isf(i) - s(\mu + \gamma_s) + r\gamma_r \\ isf(i) - i(\gamma + \mu_i) \\ \gamma i - r(\mu + \gamma_r) + s\gamma_s \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The flux balance (fixed point) equations – see SIRSCap.nb – impose three conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda = \frac{if(i)(\gamma\mu + \mu_i(\mu + \gamma_r)) + \mu(\gamma + \mu_i)(\mu + \gamma_r + \gamma_s)}{f(i)(\mu + \gamma_r)} \\ s = \frac{\gamma + \mu_i}{f(i)} \\ r = \frac{\gamma if(i) + \gamma_s(\gamma + \mu_i)}{f(i)(\mu + \gamma_r)} \end{cases}$$

The Hopf condition

$$H_3 := co_2co_3 - co_1co_4 = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $co_i$  are the coefficients on the characteristic polynomial of the Jacobian at equilibrium (with  $\lambda, s, r$  eliminated):

$$jac = \begin{pmatrix} -if(i) - \mu - \gamma_s & -\gamma + \frac{if'(i)(-\gamma - \mu_i)}{f(i)} - \mu_i & \gamma_r \\ if(i) & \frac{if'(i)(\gamma + \mu_i)}{f(i)} & 0 \\ \gamma_s & \gamma & -\mu - \gamma_r \end{pmatrix}$$

imposes an extra condition on  $f'(i)$ . Finally, looking for an example with FindInstance which satisfies also the positivity conditions yields

$$\begin{aligned} i = 1, \gamma = 2, \gamma_r = 1, \gamma_s = \frac{1}{2}, \mu = \frac{1}{128}, \mu_i = 1, f(i) = \frac{7}{32} \\ \implies \lambda = \frac{4247}{3612}, s = \frac{96}{7}, r = \frac{7936}{903}, f'(i) = \frac{7}{291} \left( \frac{7179}{2048} - \frac{\sqrt{72187889}}{4096} \right) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

As a check, the resulting Jacobian has eigenvalues  $-1.26227, 0.415878I, -0.415878I$ .

As for parametric conditions on  $f(i), f'(i)$ , they can often be satisfied with enough parameters [Vas23]. For example, the instance above with Michaelis-Menten— infection rate  $f(i) = \frac{\beta}{1 + \epsilon i}$ , yields

$$\beta = \frac{24(\sqrt{72187889} + 51606)}{3815893}, \epsilon = \frac{768\sqrt{72187889} + 12922157}{26711251}$$

**Remark 12.** *The success reported in this example hides the fact that the Mathematica execution time is quite sensitive to the parametrization. For example, using  $sf[i]$  instead of  $isf[i]$  in the parametrization of rates greatly increases the execution time.*

## 4 When does the NGM heuristic obtain the correct local stability domain of the DFE, for CRNs with absolute concentration robustness?

### 4.1 The next generation matrix method and heuristic

In this section we comment on the computation of the stability domain of the DFE, via the fascinating next generation matrix (NGM) method [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08], called this way since it replaces the investigation of the Jacobian by that of a matrix whose origins lie in probability (the theory of branching processes). The NGM method is based on the projection of the Jacobian on the subset of infection variables, and is justified by conditions which may be found in [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08]. These seem to be satisfied in all ME models with polynomial rates, but not in the ACR example of Section 4.5. Therefore, we will state here a “NGM heuristic”, which may hold under wider conditions than those of [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08] (for example in cases where condition [VdDW08, (A 4)] is not satisfied), remaining to be investigated. Note the NGM theorem has been designed to cover ODE models with very general rate functions, but with no assumptions on the algebraic structure; polynomial rate functions, and particular algebraic structures which might increase its domain of applicability have not been investigated. Our NGM heuristic consists of the following steps:

1. Write the infection equations (corresponding to variables which may converge to 0) in the form

$$\vec{i}' = M\vec{i} \quad (4.1)$$

2. Split  $M$  into part of “new infections”  $F$  containing all (or a subset of) the non-constant terms with positive sign [AABJ23], and the rest, denoted by  $-V$ , which satisfy that the elements of the matrix  $V^{-1}$

are all positive (these are related to “expected dwell times”, of associated CTMC models [HK19, AAB24]). Use the associated decomposition

$$\vec{i}' = M = (F - V)\vec{i} \quad (4.2)$$

to replace the study of the spectrum of Jacobian  $M$  (with respect to the infection variables) by that of the “next generation matrix” defined by

$$K = F.V^{-1}. \quad (4.3)$$

3. Determine the spectral radius of  $K$ , the so called basic reproduction number  $R_0$ .

**Remark 13.** *The first step is suggested by the well-known fact that infection variables are fast compared to the others, so the non-infection variables may be taken as fixed and their equations ignored, asymptotically.*

*The second step, focusing on all positive sign interactions, is justified by an empirical observation made in [AABJ23]. We recall that the original NGM was obtained via a decomposition which was not specified uniquely, leaving the final choice of  $R_0$  to the latitude of an “expert epidemiologist”, a situation which is maybe not ideal. We proposed in [AABJ23] to complement the classical NGM method by the unique specification of  $F$  described above, and shown that this produced reasonable answers in all the examples we investigated.*

*In connection to the third step, we mention another empirical observation, that the characteristic polynomial of the matrix  $K$  has typically more 0 eigenvalues than the characteristic polynomial of the Jacobian of the infection equations, which explains the popularity of NGM.*

*In fact, the overwhelming majority of ME papers study models where all the eigenvalues of  $K$  but one are 0. This entails a rational formula and an “epidemiologic/probabilistic interpretation” for  $R_0$ , a fact which is quite popular, for historical reasons. Furthermore, in this case one can apply a simple  $R_0$  formula due to [ABvdD<sup>+</sup>07]—see also [AAB<sup>+</sup>23].*

*Two other cases where  $R_0$  has an interpretation are those where the characteristic polynomial of  $K$  fully factors into linear terms (this is obtained in multi-strain models), and those where after removing the 0 eigenvalues, the characteristic polynomial is a quadratic symmetric polynomial. The latter case, where  $R_0$  is a square root, is encountered below in Section 4.6.*

*Let us mention also that in Section 4.4 we encounter “a non-interpretable  $R_0$ ”, which satisfies an irreducible cubic equation.*

The “NGM heuristic” has also a “shortcut rank-one NGM method”, which consists of using a rank one “new infections” matrix. These obtain sometimes the correct stability domain of the DFE, raising an open question (among many others):

**Open Problem 3.** *Provide sufficient conditions for the NGM heuristic and the shortcut rank-one NGM method to obtain the correct stability domain of the DFE.*

## 4.2 A bird’s eye view on ACR [SF10, KMD<sup>+</sup>12, DDG15, Dic16, TJ18, PGH<sup>+</sup>23, JN24]

A well-studied class of CRNs which frequently have boundary steady states are those with absolute concentration robustness.


**Definition 7.** *A mass action system  $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R}, k)$  is said to have:*

1. *a robust ratio between complexes  $y$  and  $y'$  if the ratio  $\mathbf{x}^y/\mathbf{x}^{y'}$  takes the same value at every positive steady state  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ .*
2. *absolute concentration robustness in species  $A$  if  $x_A$  takes the same value at every positive steady state  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ . The value  $x_A$  is called the ACR value of  $X_A$ .*

Note that  $x_A$  is independent of the conservation constants and of the initial conditions, but this value does depend on the reaction constants  $k$ , and that if two complexes  $y$  and  $y'$  have a robust ratio and differ only in a single species  $A$ , then ACR is guaranteed for  $x_A$  [SF10].

ACR was first rigorously studied by Shinar and Feinberg [SF10] (interestingly, the simplest example they discuss is the ME model with no demography known as SI, which they call “toy model”). Recently, their sufficient conditions have been extended in [JN24].

**Example 4.** *The mathematical epidemiology model SI, called “toy model” in [SF10], is:*



*This system has exactly one positive steady state  $(k_2/k_1, N_0 - k_2/k_1)$ , where  $N_0$  is the initial total population, and hence the network has ACR in the first species  $S$ .*

The first sufficient conditions for ACR, due to Shinar and Feinberg [SF10], have been restated in [TJ18] as follows:

**Proposition 1.** Consider a mass action system  $\mathcal{M}$ .

1. If  $\mathcal{M}$  has a deficiency of zero and is weakly reversible, then it has a robust ratio in each pair of complexes  $y$  and  $y'$  belonging to a common linkage class.
2. If  $\mathcal{M}$  has a deficiency of one and admits a positive steady state, then  $\mathcal{M}$  has a robust ratio in every pair of nonterminal complexes  $y$  and  $y'$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ .

ACR has also been analyzed using methods from computational algebraic geometry [KNS24, KMD<sup>+</sup>12, PEF22, PGH<sup>+</sup>23] (see also [GHRS16, CDSS09] for related works). This is natural, in view of the fact that the ACR property is related to the ideal of the positive steady state locus [KMD<sup>+</sup>12].

**Proposition 2** (ACR and ideals). A mass-action system  $(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$  has ACR in species  $X_i$  if and only if  $x_i - \alpha$ , for some  $\alpha > 0$ , is in the ideal of the positive steady state locus of  $(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$ .

Conservative ACR systems have always boundary steady states, owing to the following result.

**Theorem 1.** If a biochemical system admits: 1) an ACR species  $Y$ , with ACR value  $y^*$ , and 2) a positive conservation law, then it must have a unique fixed point  $x^*$  on the boundary of the positive orthant, of minimal support, whose support includes the species  $Y$ .

**Proof:** Let  $X_j$  denote the ACR species and  $x_j^*$  denote the ACR value. Since the system has a positive conservation law, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i x_i = x_{tot} \in \mathcal{R}_+, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $c_i > 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . At the positive steady state we can rearrange this to

$$0 < \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^n c_i x_i = x_{tot} - c_j x_j^* < 0$$

which is a contradiction if  $x_{tot}$  is chosen sufficiently small, satisfying  $x_{tot} - c_j x_j^* < 0$ . Consequently, there is no positive steady state for such values of  $x_{tot}$ . Since the invariant space is a subset of the intersection of (4.4) with the positive orthant, it is compact and therefore must contain a steady state. It follows that this steady state must be on the boundary of the positive orthant.

### 4.3 Examples of Escherichia coli EnvZ-OmpR models, with ACR species $Y_p$ , where (0.1) holds

#### 4.3.1 A (5,4,3,1) subnetwork of EnvZ-OmpR : EnvZ.nb

This section considers a simplified EnvZ-OmpR system represented in fig. 4 with stoichiometric matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

rank 3, deficiency  $1 = 7 - 3 - 3$ .




Figure 4: The FHJ graph of the “EnvZ-OmpR network” with 4 reactions and the deficiency  $\delta = 7 - 3 - 3 = 1$ .

The corresponding system of ordinary differential equations is:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} X \\ X_t \\ X_p \\ Y \\ Y_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 X + k_3 X_p Y \\ k_1 X - k_2 X_t \\ k_2 X_t - k_3 X_p Y \\ -k_3 X_p Y + k_4 X_t Y_p \\ k_3 X_p Y - k_4 X_t Y_p \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.5)$$

(to simplify the notation, we have abbreviated, as customary, EnvZ by  $X$ , and OmpR by  $Y$ ). This example satisfies the sufficient [SF10] ACR conditions, since it has deficiency one, and two non-terminal complexes  $X_t, X_t + Y_p$  (see fig. 4), which differ in the single species  $Y_p$  (which must therefore be the ACR species).

1. Our first step is the determination of the flux cone, generated here by  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , and of the conservation laws  $x_{tot} = X + X_t + X_p, y_{tot} = Y + Y_p$ , (total EnvZ and total OmpR, respectively). Both are found using our script “cons”, which simply solves the linear kernel equations under non-negativity constraints on the variables.
2. The second step is trying to get information on the non-negative fixed points. In simple examples like the ones discussed in this paper, `Solve[RHS==0,var]` (the imperfect, quicker version of Reduce) finds quickly all the steady states. In this example, it finds two boundary ones, with two common invading components  $X = X_t = 0$ . Under this condition, the steady points must still have  $X_p Y = 0$ . The first possibility is incompatible with the positivity of the first conservation, and the second,  $Y = 0$ , yields the DFE

$$X = X_t = 0 = Y, X_p = x_{tot}, Y_p = y_{tot},$$

with resident species set  $\{X_p, Y_p\}$ .

**Remark 14.** *When Solve doesn't finish in reasonable time, it can be replaced by a search for boundary points, which are in fact typically easier to find (even when interior points aren't).*

Solve identifies here also a third fixed point with all coordinates positive, parametrized by  $x^*, x_p^*$ , satisfying:

$$x_t^* = \frac{k_1 x^*}{k_2}, y^* = \frac{k_1 x^*}{k_3 x_p^*}, y_p^* = \frac{k_2}{k_4} \leq y_{tot},$$

the last component  $y_p^*$  being the ACR species. Note the last natural inequality, which turns out here to imply both uniqueness of the interior point within each invariant set, parametrized by  $x_{tot}, y_{tot}$ , (so, finally, this is an example of trivial ACR), and stability, as shown next.

3. The next step is trying to apply the NGM theorem (and even when it does not apply, we get useful information by applying it formally – examples below for further remarks).

The NGM approach projects first the ODE on a group of “infectious/invading” species, selected among the species which are zero at a boundary steady state (they are the ones which will increase/invade, if an outbreak occurs).

Here, the set of all infectious species is  $\{X, X_t, Y\}$  (see first step), and the RHS of the infection equations is

$$RHS_i = \begin{pmatrix} k_3 Y X_p - k_1 X \\ k_1 X - k_2 X_t \\ k_4 Y_p X_t - k_3 Y X_p \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{V} := \begin{pmatrix} k_3 Y X_p \\ 0 \\ k_4 Y_p X_t \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} k_1 X \\ k_2 X_t - k_1 X \\ k_3 Y X_p \end{pmatrix}$$

Here,  $RHS_i$  has been split into the part of “new infections”  $\mathcal{F}$  containing all the interactions with positive sign [AABJ23], and the rest, denoted by  $-\mathcal{V}$ , with the purpose of replacing the study of the spectrum of Jacobian  $J_i$  (3) by that of the “next generation matrix” (4.7).

Since the sum of the rows of  $\mathcal{V}$ ,  $k_2 X_t + k_3 Y X_p$  is unconditionally positive, and the other conditions of [VdDW02, VdDW08] also apply, we may apply the NGM theorem.

The derivative of  $RHS_i$  with respect to the infection variables is:

$$J_i = \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 & 0 & k_3 X_p \\ k_1 & -k_2 & 0 \\ 0 & k_4 Y_p & -k_3 X_p \end{pmatrix} = F - V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & k_3 X_p \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_4 Y_p & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} k_1 & 0 & 0 \\ -k_1 & k_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_3 X_p \end{pmatrix} \implies \quad (4.6)$$

$$K = FV^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{k_4 y_{tot}}{k_2} & \frac{k_4 y_{tot}}{k_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.7)$$

where the resident species  $X_p, Y_p$  are evaluated at the “disease-free state” (with  $X = X_t = Y = 0$ ), i.e.  $X_p = x_{tot}, Y_p = y_{tot}$  (this is implemented in our script NGM).

4. The next step consists in attempting to factor the characteristic polynomial of  $K$ , and in removing “stable factors” (i.e. factors which may not have eigenvalues with positive real part). It seems, at least for the ACR models satisfying the [SF10] conditions discussed in this chapter, that the characteristic polynomial of  $K$  factors more often than that of  $J_i$ .

In our current example, the 3rd degree characteristic polynomial of  $K$  is  $ch(u) = u(k_2 u^2 - k_4 Y_p)$ . After removing the factor  $u$ , the remaining second degree polynomial has symmetric roots, the positive one being

$$R_0 = \sqrt{\frac{k_4 y_{tot}}{k_2}} = \sqrt{\frac{y_{tot}}{y_p^*}}.$$

Finally, the condition  $R_0 > 1$  under which the stability of the boundary disease-free steady state is lost is precisely

$$y_{tot} > \frac{k_2}{k_4} = y_p^* \quad (4.8)$$

**Remark 15.** When the characteristic polynomial has higher degree, we may also apply, alternatively, the RH criteria to the shifted polynomial  $p(x) = ch(x+1)$ . In our current example, the shifted second degree polynomial is  $k_2 x^2 + 2k_2 x + k_2 - k_4 Y_p$ , and RH recovers the condition  $k_2 - k_4 Y_p \geq 0$ . The computational advantage of this approach is that the single condition  $R_0 \leq 1$ , with  $R_0$  which may be the root of a high order polynomial, may be replaced by several RH conditions. These may be simpler sometimes, as will be illustrated in the examples below.

**Remark 16.** Here,  $R_0$  may be obtained also using the Jacobian  $J_i$  (whose characteristic polynomial does not factor). Indeed, the non-zero roots  $\lambda$  of this characteristic polynomial turn out to satisfy

$$(\lambda/k_1 + 1)(\lambda/k_2 + 1)(\lambda/(k_3 X_p) + 1) = k_4 Y_p/k_2,$$

and an eye inspection (or Mathematica) checks that a crossing of 0 by  $\lambda$  occurs iff  $R_0 = 1$ ; however, the computation which uses the NGM matrix  $K$  is easier, possibly due to the larger number of 0’s, as compared to using the reduced Jacobian  $J_i$ , which does not factor.

**Remark 17.** The stability of the endemic point (when it exists) may also be quickly checked, via:

---

```
Reduce[Append[Join[ct, Thread[co > 0]], H3=co_2 co_3-co_1 co_4 > 0]]
```

---

where  $ct$  denote all the positivity conditions (parameters and variables),  $co$  denote the coefficients of the Jacobian reduced to three dimensions by dividing by  $\lambda^2$ , and  $H3$  is the third Hurwitz determinant.

In conclusion, we have shown that for the simplified *EnvZ-OmpR* that a typical scenario for ME models [DHM90, VdDW02, VdDW08] holds: for  $R_0 < 1 \Leftrightarrow y_{tot} < y_p^*$  the DFE is locally stable, and for  $R_0 \geq 1 \Leftrightarrow y_{tot} \geq y_p^*$ , the second endemic point enters the positivity domain and takes over the “stability relay” from the DFE.



### 4.3.2 A (8,11,6,1) subnetwork of EnvZ-OmpR [CGK20]: EnvZCap.nb

We present here a subnetwork of the EnvZ-OmpR model, which was studied by [CGK20], and which is obtained by ignoring the last line in the more general EnvZ-OmpR model studied in [SF10, KMD<sup>+</sup>12] (see also (4.14) below):




Figure 5: The FHJ graph of the “(8,11,6,1) subnetwork of EnvZ-OmpR ” with 11 reactions and the deficiency  $\delta = 10 - 3 - 6 = 1$ .

**Remark 18.** A) As in section 4.3, we interpret *EnvZ* as  $X$ , and *OmpR* as  $Y$ . Note that alternations of capital and small letters following each other, like in  $XdYp$ , will denote from now on a single variable, while the same juxtaposition, but using sub-indices, will denote a product  $X_d Y_p = X_d * Y_p$ .

B) The conditions of [SF10] identify  $OmpR = Y_p$  as an ACR species.

Ordering the species (and the complexes) according to their appearance order yields the ODE:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} X_d \\ X \\ X_t \\ X_p \\ Y \\ XpY \\ Y_p \\ XdYp \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} -X_d(k_9 Y_p + k_1) + k_2 X + (k_{10} + k_{11}) XdYp \\ k_1 X_d + k_4 X_t - X(k_2 + k_3) + k_8 XpY \\ k_3 X - (k_4 + k_5) X_t \\ -k_6 Y X_p + k_5 X_t + k_7 XpY \\ -k_6 Y X_p + k_{11} XdYp + k_7 XpY \\ k_6 Y X_p - (k_7 + k_8) XpY \\ -k_9 X_d Y_p + k_{10} XdYp + k_8 XpY \\ k_9 X_d Y_p - (k_{10} + k_{11}) XdYp \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.9) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ k_6 Y X_p \\ 0 \\ k_9 X_d Y_p \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} k_9 X_d Y_p + k_1 X_d - k_2 X - (k_{10} + k_{11}) XdYp \\ -k_1 X_d - k_4 X_t + (k_2 + k_3) X - k_8 XpY \\ (k_4 + k_5) X_t - k_3 X \\ k_6 Y X_p - k_5 X_t - k_7 XpY \\ k_6 Y X_p - k_{11} XdYp - k_7 XpY \\ (k_8 + k_7) XpY \\ k_9 X_d Y_p - k_{10} XdYp - k_8 XpY \\ (k_{10} + k_{11}) XdYp \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.10) \end{aligned}$$

The system (4.9) admits the following DFE:

$$(X = 0, X_d = 0, X_t = 0, Y = 0, XpY = 0, XdYp = 0).$$

After removing the fourth and seventh row in  $\mathcal{V}$ , which correspond to resident variables, we find that the sum of the rows in

$$\mathcal{V} = \begin{pmatrix} k_9 X_d Y_p + k_1 X_d - k_2 X - (k_{10} + k_{11}) XdYp \\ -k_1 X_d - k_4 X_t + (k_2 + k_3) X - k_8 XpY \\ (k_4 + k_5) X_t - k_3 X \\ k_6 Y X_p - k_{11} XdYp - k_7 XpY \\ (k_8 + k_7) XpY \\ (k_{10} + k_{11}) XdYp \end{pmatrix},$$

given by  $k_9 X_d Y_p + k_5 X_t + k_6 Y X_p$  is unconditionally positive, and we may apply the NGM theorem.

1. It can be checked that, for that example,  $rank(\Gamma) = 6$  and the deficiency is  $\delta = m - rank(\Gamma) - \ell = 10 - 6 - 3 = 1$ . The CRN is conservative, and the conservations are generated by:

$$\{X_d + X_p + X_t + X + XdYp + XpY, Y_p + XdYp + XpY + Y\} \quad (4.11)$$

(corresponding to the fact that the total mass of the chemical species containing some form of EnvZ is conserved, as well as the total mass of the chemical species containing some form of OmpR). The cone of positive fluxes has dimension 4.

2. Mathematica yields the following rational parametrization (RAP) parametrized by  $X_d, X_p$ , which is computed using `Solve[RHS==0]` without specifying the “var”:

$$\begin{cases} X = \frac{k_1 X_d}{k_2}, X_t = \frac{k_1 k_3 X_d}{k_2 (k_4 + k_5)}, \\ Y = \frac{k_1 k_3 k_5 (k_7 + k_8) X_d}{k_2 (k_4 + k_5) k_6 k_8 X_p}, X_p Y = \frac{k_1 k_3 k_5 X_d}{k_2 (k_4 + k_5) k_8}, \\ Y_p^* = \frac{k_1 (k_{10} + k_{11}) k_3 k_5}{k_{11} k_2 (k_4 + k_5) k_9}, X_d Y_p = \frac{k_1 k_3 k_5 X_d}{k_{11} k_2 (k_4 + k_5)} \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

3. The NGM approach, applied to the 6D projection on the DFE coordinates, yields 4 eigenvalues equal to 0, and two satisfying a quadratic equation (again, the characteristic polynomial of  $K$  factors, while that of  $J_i$  doesn't). After shifting the polynomial, as explained in point 4. of the previous section, we obtain a polynomial whose free coefficient at the DFE is

$$co_1 = k_8 (k_1 (k_{10} + k_{11}) k_3 k_5 - k_{11} k_2 (k_4 + k_5) k_9 y_{tot}),$$


and the other two coefficients are positive.

In conclusion, the stability domain of the DFE, obtained from  $co_1 > 0$ , is:

$$y_{tot} \leq \frac{k_1 (k_{10} + k_{11}) k_3 k_5}{k_{11} k_2 (k_4 + k_5) k_9} \Leftrightarrow R_0 := \frac{y_{tot}}{Y_p^*} \leq 1. \quad (4.13)$$

#### 4.4 The DFE stability domain for the (9,14,7,2) EnvZ-OmpR [SF10, KMD<sup>+</sup>12, JMP19] does not satisfy (0.1): EnvZJ.nb

The original EnvZ-OmpR first studied in [SF10] was subsequently simplified in [JMP19, Ex 18]:



The corresponding system of ordinary differential equations is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} X_d \\ X \\ X_t \\ X_p \\ Y \\ X_p Y \\ Y_p \\ X_d Y_p \\ X_t Y_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -k_9 X_d Y_p - k_1 X_d + k_2 X + (k_{10} + k_{11}) X_d Y_p \\ k_1 X_d - (k_2 + k_3) X + k_4 X_t + k_8 X_p Y \\ k_3 X - (k_4 + k_5) X_t - k_1 2 X_t Y_p + (k_{13} + k_{14}) X_t Y_p \\ -k_6 X_p Y + k_5 X_t + k_7 X_p Y \\ -k_6 X_p Y + k_{11} X_d Y_p + k_{14} X_t Y_p + k_7 X_p Y \\ k_6 X_p Y - (k_7 + k_8) X_p Y \\ -k_{12} X_t Y_p - k_9 X_d Y_p + k_{10} X_d Y_p + k_{13} X_t Y_p + k_8 X_p Y \\ k_9 X_d Y_p - (k_{10} + k_{11}) X_d Y_p \\ k_{12} X_t Y_p - (k_{13} + k_{14}) X_t Y_p \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.15)$$

1. **The conservation laws** are  $X_d + X + X_t + X_p + X_p Y + X_d Y_p + X_t Y_p = x_{tot}$  (total EnvZ) and  $Y + X_p Y + Y_p + X_d Y_p + X_t Y_p = y_{tot}$  (total OmpR).
2. the non-negative fixed points. Mathematica's command `Reduce` takes lots of time here, but `Solve[RHS==0,var]` (the imperfect, quicker version) finds immediately three steady states. One is the

following RAP in terms of  $X_t, X_p$ :

$$\begin{cases} X_d = \frac{k_2(k_4+k_5)}{k_1 k_3} X_t, X = \frac{(k_4+k_5)}{k_3} X_t, \\ Y = \frac{k_5(k_7+k_8)}{k_6 k_8} \frac{X_t}{X_p}, XpY = \frac{k_5}{k_8} X_t, \\ Y_p = \frac{k_1(k_{10}+k_{11})(k_{13}+k_{14})k_3 k_5}{k_1 k_3 (k_{10}+k_{11})k_{12}k_{14}+k_2(k_4+k_5)k_9 k_{11}(k_{13}+k_{14})}, \\ XdYp = \frac{(k_{13}+k_{14})k_2 k_5 (k_4+k_5)k_9}{k_1 k_3 (k_{10}+k_{11})k_{12}k_{14}+k_2(k_4+k_5)k_9 k_{11}(k_{13}+k_{14})} X_t, \\ XtYp = \frac{k_1(k_{10}+k_{11})k_{12}k_3 k_5}{k_1 k_3 (k_{10}+k_{11})k_{12}k_{14}+k_2(k_4+k_5)k_9 k_{11}(k_{13}+k_{14})} X_t \end{cases}, \quad (4.16)$$

which identifies again  $Y_p$  as the ACR species.

There are also two boundary fixed points, with six common invading components  $X_d = X = X_t = XpY = XdYp = XtYp = 0$ . Under this condition, the steady points must still have  $XpY = 0$ . The first possibility is incompatible with the positivity of the conservations, and the second,  $Y = 0$ , yields the DFE/invasion species set

$$\{X_d = 0, X = 0, X_t = 0, X_p = x_{tot}, \\ Y = 0, XpY = 0, Y_p = y_{tot}, XdYp = 0, XtYp = 0\}$$

and resident species set  $\{X_p, Y_p\}$ .

3. The next step is to resolve the stability of the DFE by the ‘‘all positive interactions NGM approach’’. Here, the ‘‘invading NGM matrix’’ is of dimension 7, with 4 zero eigenvalues. The stability reduces thus to the problem of ensuring that all the three roots of a cubic factor  $ch(r) = 0$  have real parts less than one. Shifting the origin by  $p(x) = ch(x + 1) = x^3 + c_3x^2 + c_2x + c_1$  reduces this to the RH problem

$$c_1 \geq 0, c_2 \geq 0, c_2c_3 - c_1 \geq 0,$$

which interestingly, depends on the species  $Y_p$  only. Here

- (a) The free coefficient is nonnegative precisely when

$$y_{tot} \leq y_p^* = \frac{k_1(k_{10}+k_{11})(k_{13}+k_{14})k_3 k_5}{k_1 k_3 (k_{10}+k_{11})k_{12}k_{14}+k_2(k_4+k_5)k_9 k_{11}(k_{13}+k_{14})} \quad (4.17)$$

- (b) The second coefficient is nonnegative when  $y_l \leq Y_p \leq y_u$ , where  $y_l, y_u$  are quite complicated, and involve square roots.
- (c)  $H_3 = c_2c_3 - c_1 \geq 0$  is of order 4 in  $Y_p$ , so solving with respect to this variable is impossible. However,  $H_3$  is linear in certain other variables, for example in  $k_{13}$ , which is hence removable. Now the simplified second coefficient, rather complicated, may be written as  $\frac{n2}{(k_{10}+k_{11})d2}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} n2 = & -((k_{10}+k_{11})k_3 k_1^2(k_8 k_{12} Y_p + k_5(k_7+2k_8))) \\ & + k_2 k_8 k_9 k_1 Y_p (k_{11} k_{12} Y_p - (k_{10}+k_{11})(k_4+k_5)) + k_2(k_4+k_5)k_8 k_9^2 (-k_{11}) Y_p^2 \\ d2 = & k_3 k_1^2 (k_8 k_{12} Y_p + k_5(k_7+2k_8)) + \\ & k_9 k_1 Y_p (-k_{12} k_2 k_7 Y_p + 2k_3(k_8 k_{12} Y_p + k_5 k_7 + 2k_5 k_8) + k_2(k_4+k_5)k_8) + \\ & k_9^2 Y_p^2 ((k_2+k_3)k_8 k_{12} Y_p + (k_3 k_5 + k_2(k_4+k_5))(k_7+2k_8)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the simplified positivity condition for the second coefficient along the manifold  $H_3 = 0$ , very complicated, illustrates the fact that the stability domain  $R_0$  of the DFE may be arbitrarily complicated when expressed in terms of the model parameters.

We offer next, as an alternative to the ‘‘maximal rank  $F$ ’’ method, which leads to a stability domain with a complicated boundary, a ‘‘rank one  $F$ ’’ method. This approach yielded the same result in the example of Section 4.3, but here it yields only the condition for positivity of the first coefficient of the characteristic polynomial from the maximal rank  $F$ . We conjecture therefore that the rank one shortcut adopted below yields only part of the boundary of the stability domain (see also Open question 1).

**Remark 19.** By only considering reaction 12, which produces the “infected” species  $XtYp$ , as “new infection”, we decompose the gradient as

$$\begin{aligned}
Gr &= \begin{pmatrix} -k_9 Y_p - k_1 & k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & k_{10} + k_{11} & 0 \\ k_1 & -k_2 - k_3 & k_4 & 0 & k_8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_3 & -k_{12} Y_p - k_4 - k_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & k_{13} + k_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_6 X_p & k_7 & k_{11} & k_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & k_6 X_p & -k_7 - k_8 & 0 & 0 \\ k_9 Y_p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_{10} - k_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_{12} Y_p & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_{13} - k_{14} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_{12} Y_p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
&\quad - \begin{pmatrix} k_9 Y_p + k_1 & -k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_{10} - k_{11} & 0 \\ -k_1 & k_2 + k_3 & -k_4 & 0 & -k_8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -k_3 & k_{12} Y_p + k_4 + k_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_{13} - k_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & k_6 X_p & -k_7 & -k_{11} & -k_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_6 X_p & k_7 + k_8 & 0 & 0 \\ -k_9 Y_p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & k_{10} + k_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & k_{13} + k_{14} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

The NGM matrix  $K = FV^{-1}$  only has one nonzero eigenvalue which yields the basic reproduction number:

$$R_0 = \frac{k_{12}((-k_2 k_9 (k_{13} + k_{14}) y_{tot} + k_1 k_3 (k_{13} + 2k_{14})) k_{11} + k_1 k_3 k_{10} (k_{13} + 2k_{14}) y_{tot})}{((-y_{tot}^2 k_2 k_9 k_{12} + (k_1 k_{12} k_3 - k_9 (k_4 + k_5) k_2) y_{tot} + k_1 k_3 k_5) k_{11} + k_1 k_3 k_{10} (y_{tot} k_{12} + k_5) (k_{13} + k_{14}))},$$

and solving  $R_0 > 1$  for  $y_{tot}$  gives

$$y_{tot} > y_p^*,$$


the complimentary of (4.17), which is precisely the condition under which the positive ACR steady state exists. It follows that the boundary steady state loses stability the conservation law  $y_{tot}$  crosses through the ACR value of  $Y_p$ .

This example shows that not all rank-one shortcuts provide the correct stability conditions for the DFE (or at least, the answer they provide does not confirm that provided by the “all positive interactions NGM method”). However, since the full Routh-Hurwitz analysis for stability is often time consuming, or impossible, the “rank one NGM shortcut” seems worthwhile, even if it yields only part of the boundary of the DFE stability domain.

**Open Problem 4.** It has been observed in [AABJ23] and before that sometimes selecting only a subset of the infection/invasive species leaves  $R_0$  unchanged, while reducing the computations. Understanding when an “ $R_0$  sufficient minimal infection set”, different from the total infection set, exists, is an open problem, which might be related to the concept of siphons of the associated Petri net [ADLS07].

#### 4.5 The (5,6,3,1) IDHKP-IDH system [SF10, JN24]: IDHKP.nb does not satisfy the NGM conditions, but satisfies (0.1)

The following (5,6,3,1) network



was introduced in [SF10], as an example of network satisfying the sufficient ACR conditions of having deficiency one, and two non-terminal complexes  $(C_1, S_2 + C_1)$ , (the terminal complexes above are  $(S_2 + C_0, S_1 + C_1)$ , which differ in a single species).

Denote the state vector by  $x = [C_0, S_1, C_1, S_2, C_2]^T$ . The corresponding ODE can be written as:

$$\dot{x} = \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} C_0 \\ S_1 \\ C_1 \\ S_2 \\ C_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k_1 C_0 S_1 \\ C_1 k_2 \\ C_1 k_3 \\ C_1 k_4 S_2 \\ C_2 k_5 \\ C_2 k_6 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{cases} C_1 (k_2 + k_3) - k_1 C_0 S_1 \\ C_2 k_6 - k_1 C_0 S_1 + C_1 k_2 \\ C_2 (k_5 + k_6) + k_1 C_0 S_1 - C_1 (k_4 S_2 + k_2 + k_3) \\ C_2 k_5 + C_1 (k_3 - k_4 S_2) \\ C_1 k_4 S_2 - C_2 (k_5 + k_6) \end{cases} \quad (4.19)$$

1. The two conservation laws

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_0 + C_2 + C_1 \\ 2C_2 + C_1 + S_1 + S_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{tot} \\ s_{tot} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.20)$$

imply that the network admits a conservation with all coefficients positive.

2. Here again, `Solve[RHS==0,var]` finds quickly all the steady states, which include the following rational parametrization:

$$\begin{cases} S_1 = \frac{k_2 + k_3}{k_1} \frac{C_1}{C_0} \\ S_2 = \frac{k_3(k_5 + k_6)}{k_4 k_6} \\ C_2 = \frac{k_3}{k_6} C_1. \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

Note the second component identifies the ACR species (in agreement with the [SF10] criterion), with ACR value  $s_2^* = \frac{k_3(k_5 + k_6)}{k_4 k_6}$ .

This ODE has also one ‘‘DFE’’ fixed point

$$S_1 = 0, S_2 = s_{tot}, C_1 = 0, C_2 = 0, C_0 = c_{tot}. \quad (4.22)$$

Indeed, setting  $C_1 = C_2 = 0 \implies S_1 = 0$  or  $C_0 = 0$ ; the second case is impossible by the first equation in (4.20), and the first case yields the DFE. Therefore, the resident species are  $\{C_0, S_2\}$  and the infectious species are  $\{S_1, C_1, C_2\}$ .

3. Next, we turn to the NGM approach, which starts by splitting the RHS of the differential equations for the infectious species  $S_1, C_1, C_2$  as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} -C_0 k_1 S_1 + C_1 k_2 + C_2 k_6 \\ C_0 k_1 S_1 - C_1 (k_4 S_2 + k_2 + k_3) + C_2 (k_5 + k_6) \\ C_1 k_4 S_2 - C_2 (k_5 + k_6) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{V} \\ := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ C_0 k_1 S_1 \\ C_1 k_4 S_2 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} C_0 k_1 S_1 - C_1 k_2 - C_2 k_6 \\ C_1 (k_4 S_2 + k_2 + k_3) - C_2 (k_5 + k_6) \\ C_2 (k_5 + k_6) \end{pmatrix}$$

(the ‘‘new infections’’ part  $\mathcal{F}$  contains only nonlinear, positive interactions, and  $\mathcal{V}$  must have nonnegative sum, which is not satisfied here, since the sum is  $-C_2 k_6$ ).

4. We turn therefore to classic stability analysis. The characteristic polynomial of the full Jacobian factors out  $u^2$ . The resulting third order polynomial (note that we have reduced the dimension without using the NGM theorem) further simplifies at the DFE to a polynomial for which only the first coefficient may change sign, and this happens at  $s_2^* = s_{tot}$ .

5. Despite the fact that in this example the condition (A4) of the NGM theorem [VdDW08] isn’t satisfied, we have used the ‘‘NGM heuristic’’, which gets here the correct stability domain of the DFE. Decomposing

the Jacobian of the infection equations with respect to the infection variables as

$$Gr = \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 C_0 & k_2 & k_6 \\ k_1 C_0 & -k_4 S_2 - k_2 - k_3 & k_5 + k_6 \\ 0 & k_4 S_2 & -k_5 - k_6 \end{pmatrix} = F - V,$$

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ k_1 C_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_4 S_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, -V = \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 C_0 & k_2 & k_6 \\ 0 & -k_4 S_2 - k_2 - k_3 & k_5 + k_6 \\ 0 & 0 & -k_5 - k_6 \end{pmatrix}$$

yields a next generation matrix with one zero eigenvalue and one complicated  $R_0$  given by a quadratic formula. Reducing  $R_0 < 1$  may be done by Mathematica; alternatively, the substitution  $u \rightarrow x + 1$  yields a second order polynomial where only the free coefficient  $k_3(k_5 + k_6) - k_4 k_6 s_{tot}$  may change sign, and the RH criterion yields that stability of the DFE occurs when

$$\frac{k_3(k_5 + k_6)}{k_4 k_6} > s_{tot} \quad (4.23)$$

i.e. when the ACR value is outside the domain. Note that this of the form satisfies (0.1).

6. It may be shown further by CAS analysis that, besides the DFE, each conservation class may contain a second fixed point “EE”, satisfying (4.21), which has all coordinates positive, when

$$\frac{k_3(k_5 + k_6)}{k_4 k_6} \leq s_{tot}, \quad (4.24)$$

which is precisely the complement of the condition (4.23), and that the non-boundary steady state is stable whenever it exists.


**Conjecture 1.** *We conjecture that the EE is globally asymptotically stable when (4.24) holds.*

Note that the problem of global dynamical properties of ACR networks, called **dynamic ACR**, was only recently studied in [JC23], for two reactions and two species.

#### 4.6 The (4,5,3,2) MAK with ACR [TJ18, (1)] satisfies $R_0 = \frac{s_{dfe}}{s_e}$ : Tonello.nb

We end this section by mentioning one idea which seems very important, in particular for the non-reversible models of ME. The reader may have noticed that one idea of CRNT, the embedding of the Feinberg-Horn-Jackson into Euclidean space, does not seem fully exploited in classical CRNT, since it was not clear how moving the graph vertices around, and allowing them to collide, will affect the results. This implicit question has been now addressed in the theory of network translation, initiated by Johnston [Joh14, TJ18, JMP19, HLJK22], which examines among other things how network translation affects the Feinberg-Horn-Jackson graph structure.

Network translation of a MAK to a ZD-WR GMAK helps understanding, among other things, rational parametrizations related to the matrix tree theorem (see for example [Cox18b]) which appear in certain MAKs. Consider the MAK [TJ18, (1)]



with stoichiometric matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

Ordering the species (and the complexes) according to their appearance order yields the ODE:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \\ C \\ D \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -k_5 A + k_3 C + k_4 D \\ -A(k_1 B + k_2 B - k_5) \\ k_1 AB - k_3 C \\ k_2 AB - k_4 D \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.26)$$

1. It can be checked that  $\text{rank}(\Gamma) = 3$ , the deficiency is  $\delta = n_C - \text{rank}(\Gamma) - \ell = 7 - 3 - 2 = 2$ , the CRN has the conservation  $A + B + C + D$ , and that the cone of positive fluxes has dimension 2.
2. Mathematica finds two fixed points

$$\begin{cases} A = 0, B = n_{tot}, C = 0, D = 0 \\ B^* = \frac{k_5}{k_1+k_2}, C = \frac{k_1 k_5}{(k_1+k_2)k_3} A, D = \frac{k_2 k_5}{(k_1+k_2)k_4} A \end{cases}, \quad (4.27)$$

which suggests that the matrix tree theorem might be at work. The second solution under the extra constraint  $A + B + C + D = n_{tot}$ ,

$$\begin{cases} A = ((k_1 + k_2) n_{tot} - k_5) \frac{k_3 k_4}{k_1 k_4 (k_3 + k_5) + k_2 k_3 (k_4 + k_5)}, B^* = \frac{k_5}{k_1 + k_2} \\ C = ((k_1 + k_2) n_{tot} - k_5) \frac{k_1 k_4 k_5}{(k_1 + k_2)(k_1 k_4 (k_3 + k_5) + k_2 k_3 (k_4 + k_5))} \\ D = ((k_1 + k_2) n_{tot} - k_5) \frac{k_2 k_3 k_5}{(k_1 + k_2)(k_1 k_4 (k_3 + k_5) + k_2 k_3 (k_4 + k_5))} \end{cases}$$

is positive iff  $n_{tot} > B^*$ .

Let's consider the following decomposition of the infectious equations in (4.26) (produced by our NGM script from Epid-CRN):

$$\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{V} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ k_1 AB \\ k_2 AB \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} k_5 A - k_3 C - k_4 D \\ k_3 C \\ k_4 D \end{pmatrix}$$

The condition [VdDW08, (A4)] is satisfied since  $\sum \mathcal{V} = k_5 A > 0$  (and all the other conditions are satisfied as well). Now

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ Bk_1 & 0 & 0 \\ Bk_2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, V = \begin{pmatrix} k_5 & -k_3 & -k_4 \\ 0 & k_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_4 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{Bk_1}{k_5} & \frac{Bk_1}{k_5} & \frac{Bk_1}{k_5} \\ \frac{Bk_2}{k_5} & \frac{Bk_2}{k_5} & \frac{Bk_2}{k_5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The cubic characteristic polynomial of  $K$  is  $\text{ch}(u) = \frac{u^2(n_{tot}(k_1+k_2)-k_5u)}{k_5}$ . After removing the factor  $u^2$ , the remaining first order polynomial has one positive root  $\frac{n_{tot}}{B^*}$  implying that the DFE is stable iff  $R_0 := \frac{n_{tot}}{B^*} \leq 1$ . Also, the Jacobian at the EE reveals that it is always stable, when  $R_0 > 1$ .

## 5 A challenge problem: the SIRnS cyclic epidemic model with one susceptible class, one infection class, and $n$ recovered classes

In this section, we present the SIRnS epidemic model for the evolution of susceptibles, infectives and recovered with several stages  $s, i, r_1, \dots, r_n$ , among a population which increases by a constant birth (or immigration) rate  $\lambda$ , and decreases via natural deaths only:

$$\begin{cases} s' = \lambda - \beta si - \mu s - \gamma_s s + \gamma_n r_n \\ i' = i(\beta s + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k r_k - \gamma - \mu i) \\ r_1' = \gamma i - r_1(\beta_1 i + \gamma_1 + \mu_1) \\ \vdots \\ r_k' = \gamma_{k-1} r_{k-1} - r_k(\beta_k i + \gamma_k + \mu_k), k = 2, \dots, n-1 \\ r_n' = \gamma_{n-1} r_{n-1} - r_n(\beta_n i + \gamma_n + \mu_n) + \gamma_s s \end{cases}. \quad (5.1)$$

**Remark 20.** When  $n = 1$  and  $\beta_1 = 0$ , SIRnS reduces to the SIRS model, and when  $n = 1$  and  $\beta_1 = \gamma_1 = 0$ , it reduces to the SIR model.

It is easy to show that the unique boundary point is:  $s_{dfe} = \frac{\lambda}{\mu + \gamma_s}, i = r_1 = r_2 = \dots = r_n = 0, R_0 = s_{dfe} \frac{\beta}{\gamma + \mu}$ .

**Remark 21.** When  $\mu = \mu_1 \dots \mu_n$ , let  $N = N_t = s + i + \sum_{k=1}^n r_k$ , and note that  $N' = \lambda - \mu N$  (all the other terms cancel), and that  $N_0 = \frac{\lambda}{\mu} \implies N_t = \frac{\lambda}{\mu}, \forall t \geq 0$ ; in this case, dimension reduction is possible using  $s + i + \sum_{k=1}^n r_k = \frac{\lambda}{\mu}$ , if so desired.

**Assumption:** Epidemiological considerations advocate imposing the following constraints on the constants  $\beta_k$

$$0 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq \dots \leq \beta_n \leq \beta. \quad (5.2)$$

To conform to the classic interpretation of recovered being fully non-infective, we may assume also  $\beta_1 = 0$ .

**Remark 22.** *There is no known virus for which (5.2) doesn't hold. Nevertheless, the case of "perverse viruses" (maybe with the opposite inequalities holding) deserves to be studied as well.*

**Remark 23.** *The model (5.1) above is motivated by several papers of Hethcote, starting with [HSVDD81, (4.1)], where the case  $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_n = 0, \gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_n, \lambda = \mu = \mu_1 \dots \mu_n = 0$  was considered. The stochastic version of this is a SIRS model without demography (this is not essential), in which the loss of immunity period is Erlang distributed. Variations of the model have also been studied in the context of enzyme kinetics, under the name of Glass-Kauffman model [Swi85, Zas95].*

Subsequently, [AGPV24] proposed introducing the parameters  $\beta_k \geq 0$ , which take into account the fact that during the "Erlang stages of transition from  $i$  to  $s$  there should be a gradual immunity loss, and increase of infectiousness; this renders the problem considerably more challenging, for example the uniqueness of the endemic fixed point may be lost (open problem).

One interesting aspect of the [HSVDD81] model, where the endemic point is unique, is the existence of Hopf bifurcations, for  $n \geq 3$  [HSVDD81, pg. 7], which is quite unusual for models which have a unique rational endemic point.

The model (5.1) above is considerably more sophisticated than [HSVDD81, (4.1)]. Despite that, [VAA] established the existence of Hopf and zero eigenvalue bifurcations for this model, using the inheritance theorem of CRNT. Also, the possible multi-stationarity was circumvented, by using a Jacobian parametrization in the style of Clarke [Cla88].

**Remark 24.** *From the point of view of CRNT, we have a bimolecular model of type  $(n+2, 2(n+1)+1, n+2)$ , using the terminology of [BB23b], who classified all mass action networks of type  $(3,4,3)$  for the presence of Hopf bifurcations. So, our model is considerably harder, and only choosing all  $\beta_i = 0$ , when the model is of type  $(n+2, n+3, n+2)$  gets us closer to the setup of [BB23b] (the particular case  $n = 1$  was completely elucidated in that paper, and some results for the case  $(n, n+1, n)$  were obtained as well).*

## 5.1 The mass-action SIR1S, where the recovered may also infect, does not admit Hopf bifurcation: SIR1S.nb, SIR1S.jl (3,9,3,2)

We discuss now the particular case  $n = 1$  of the SIR $n$ S model [AGPV24, VAA], with a stoichiometric matrix involving 9 reactions:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ i' \\ r' \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \\ \beta i s \\ i r \beta_r \\ \gamma i \\ r \gamma_r \\ s \gamma_s \\ \mu s \\ i \mu \\ \mu r \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -\beta s i + \lambda + r \gamma_r - s \gamma_s - \mu s \\ i(-\gamma - \mu + r \beta_r + \beta s) \\ i(\gamma - r \beta_r) - r(\mu + \gamma_r) + s \gamma_s \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

It has one parameter  $\beta_r > 0$ , the rate at which the (partly) recovered can still infect, which was not present in SIRS, and we have also added another often used parameter  $\gamma_s$ , which seems not to affect the essence of the results, but does affect execution times.

The normal situation is  $\beta_r < \beta$ , but the opposite may happen for "perverse viruses".

The deficiency is 2, more than for SIRS.

**Remark 25.** *We can also represent the model via its reactions  $RN = \{0 \rightarrow "S", "S" + "I" \rightarrow 2"I", "I" + "R" \rightarrow 2"I", "I" \rightarrow "R", "R" \rightarrow "S", "S" \rightarrow "R", "S" \rightarrow 0, "I" \rightarrow 0, "R" \rightarrow 0\}$ .*



Notice that, leaving aside the usual input and output reactions, we have only two types of reactions: infections like  $"S" + "I" \rightarrow 2 "I"$ , and transfers like  $"I" \rightarrow "R"$ . The maximum possible number of reactions after this restriction is  $2 + 6 = 8$ . Note that in CRN, [BB23b, Lem 3.4] have found 6486 non-equivalent, non-equivalent bimolecular (3,4,3) models, and proved the presence of non-degenerate Hopf bifurcations in 86 of them [BB23b, Thm 5.2].

The SIR1S without demography is a (3,5,3) model, and we show below that it does not have Hopf bifurcation. An open question, in the style of [BB23b], is:

**Open Problem 5.** Does the extended SIR1S of type (3,8,3), where we have added all the possible linear transfers (which may all be interpreted epidemiologically, and have in fact appeared individually in the literature), admit Hopf bifurcation?

A more ambitious open question is:

**Open Problem 6.** Identify which SEIR-type models admit Hopf bifurcation, where we define SEIR-type to mean CRN bimolecular models with 4 species and maximal rank, and only reactions of transfer and of infections of the types  $S + E \rightarrow 2E$ ,  $S + I \rightarrow I + E$ .

The DFE of SIR1S is the same as for SIRS, but  $R_0$  is more complicated, due to the new "infection path" via the recovered.

$$R_0 = s_{dfe} \frac{\beta}{\gamma + \mu} + r_{dfe} \frac{\beta_r}{\gamma + \mu}$$

Note both the DFE and  $R_0$  simplify considerably when  $\gamma_s = 0$ .

### 5.1.1 Rational univariate representation (RUR) for SIR1S

Via Groebner elimination implemented in our RUR script, we find that (as often is the case)  $s, r$  have rational expressions in terms of  $i$ , with positive coefficients. The respective formulas are:

$$s = \frac{i\mu\beta_r + (\gamma + \mu)(\mu + \gamma_r)}{\beta i\beta_r + \beta(\mu + \gamma_r) + \beta_r\gamma_s}, r = \frac{\beta\gamma i + (\gamma + \mu)\gamma_s}{\beta i\beta_r + \beta(\mu + \gamma_r) + \beta_r\gamma_s}. \quad (5.4)$$

These substitutions allow replacing the fixed point system by an equivalent rational univariate representation (RUR) scalar polynomial equation in  $i$ . After dividing by  $i$ , the endemic point satisfies a quadratic equation:

$$0 = P(i) = a_2 i^2 + a_1 i + a_0, \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} a_2 = \mu\beta\beta_r > 0 \\ a_1 = \beta\mu(\gamma + \gamma_r) - \beta\lambda\beta_r + \mu^2(\beta + \beta_r) + \mu\beta_r\gamma_s \\ a_0 = (\mu + \gamma_r)(\mu(\gamma + \mu) - \beta\lambda) + \gamma_s(\mu(\gamma + \mu) - \lambda\beta_r) = \mu(\gamma + \mu) \\ (\gamma_r + \gamma_s + \mu)(1 - R_0). \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

Analyzing the sign of the coefficients, we find that there may be two endemic points. More precisely

1. If  $R_0 > 1$ , there is precisely one positive endemic point, which turns out to be always stable.
2. If  $R_0 < 1 \Leftrightarrow a_0 > 0$ , unlike SIRS, there may be two positive endemic points, provided  $\beta \geq \beta_D$  (where  $\beta_D$  is the largest root of the discriminant),  $\beta \leq \beta_r$ , and the following further conditions hold:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda\beta_r\gamma > \mu(\gamma + \mu)(\gamma + \mu + \gamma_r) \\ \gamma_s < \gamma_{s,M} := \frac{\mu(\mu + \gamma_r)[\mu(\mu + \gamma)(\mu + \gamma + \gamma_r) - \gamma\lambda\beta_r]}{\mu^4 + \mu^2(\gamma(\gamma + \gamma_r) - \lambda\beta_r) - 2\gamma\lambda\mu\beta_r + \lambda^2\beta_r^2 + \mu^3(2\gamma + \gamma_r)} \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

The conditions above were obtained in 130 secs by

---

`Reduce[Append[cp,dis>=0&\&a0>0&\&a1<0&\&beta<beta_r],beta$]//FullSimplify`

---

where  $cp$  are the positivity conditions, and  $dis$  is the discriminant of  $P(i)$ . It may be checked that under the first condition in (5.7), which restricts  $\mu$  to be small, the denominator of  $\gamma_{s,M}$  is always negative, and hence  $\gamma_{s,M}$  is positive.

**Remark 26.** The discriminant of the polynomial (5.5) (provided in the Mathematica file), is a second order polynomial in all the variables except  $\mu$  (which appears with exponent 4), and hence no parameter may be rationally explicitized.

### 5.1.2 A rational “mixed var-par” parametrization for SIR1S

Since further eliminating  $i$  gives rise to lengthy computations, we have explored in the Mathematica file an alternative: a rational parametrization obtained by completing (5.4) with a solution of  $P(i) = 0$  with respect to some parameter

$$\lambda \rightarrow \frac{\mu (\beta i^2 \beta_r + \beta i (\gamma + \mu + \gamma_r) + i \beta_r (\mu + \gamma_s) + (\gamma + \mu) (\mu + \gamma_r + \gamma_s))}{\beta i \beta_r + \beta (\mu + \gamma_r) + \beta_r \gamma_s}$$

(this includes  $i$ ).

Under this parametrization, it is possible to solve  $H3 = 0$  (where  $H3$  is defined in (3.3)), yielding also  $\gamma$  as a rational function, displayed only in the case  $\gamma_s = 0$ , to improve readability,

$$\gamma = \frac{((i\beta + \mu)(i\beta_r + \gamma_r + \mu)(i\beta_r + \gamma_r + 2\mu))}{(i(\beta_r - \beta)(\gamma_r + \mu))},$$

which is always positive when  $\beta_r > \beta$ .

Finally, under this further substitution, the first two coefficients of the characteristic polynomial turn out to be  $\{-\mu^2 (i(\beta + \beta_r) + 2\mu + \gamma_r + \gamma_s), -\mu^2\}$ , hence always negative, while the third is positive.

At this point, we know that for  $R_0 > 1$ , Hopf bifurcation is impossible for the unique endemic point. It is then natural to ask:

**Open Problem 7.** *For  $R_0 > 1$ , is the unique endemic point of SIR1S globally asymptotically stable?*

### 5.2 SIR2S without vaccination admits Hopf and double zero bifurcation: SIR2S.nb (4,11,4,3)

This process is similar, but harder than SIR1S (for example it’s deficiency is 3), and it becomes crucial to perform the Mathematica computations in a convenient order, to avoid kernel crashes because of excessive execution time.

1. The first cell finds there are four fixed points, identifies the DFE, and shows that the characteristic polynomial of the Jacobian at the DFE has 4 linear factors, but only one eigenvalue which may be positive. Next, we obtain a rational approximation of the interior fixed points, (similar to that for SIR1S), by solving  $s, r_1, r_2$  with respect to  $i$  and completing the set of variables  $s, r_1, r_2$  by one parameter which may be solved linearly from the RHS, in this case  $\lambda$ . Finally, we replace  $\lambda$  in the list of parameters by  $i$  (which satisfies a third degree polynomial). This way, we have circumvented the multi-stationarity problem. Under the new parametrization of the fixed points, everything is explicit, including the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of Jacobian at an endemic point, under rational approximation. We also test the unconditional positivity of the coefficients, i.e. whether they are sums of positive terms only. Here, we find that they may change sign. Since they are exceedingly long, we use the “OnlyP” function defined in our Epid-CRN package, to detect the presence of minuses in the (simplified) expressions.
2. The second cell solves in 0.67sec the conditions  $co1=0, co2=0$  for double zero bifurcation on  $\beta, \gamma$  (which are the variables of smallest degree). There are two solutions. Both of them are too long to be displayed in the paper, and from now on we start to focus on the case  $\gamma_2 = 0$ , (in ME this would be called SIR2), not for SIR2S. It is found that the positivity of one of the solutions is incompatible with the other positivity conditions on  $i$ , and the parameters. This takes 45.09sec when  $\gamma_2 = 0$ , and more than three hours otherwise. From now on, only the case  $\gamma_2 = 0$  is pursued.
3. The third cell finds the conditions (5.8) in the theorem below.
4. The fourth cell computes the Hurwicz determinant  $H_4$ , and discovers it has two factors, both of which have sign changes.  
Both of these two factors turns out to be 0 under the double zero condition, and hence candidate for Hopf bifurcation, in 347.78sec, and 16.85min, respectively.
5. The fifth cell attempts to find even simpler particular cases for which we have double zero bifurcation, but this turns out impossible.

The above suggests the following:

**Open Problem 8.** 1. For any  $\gamma_1 > 0, \mu > 0, i > 0$  the model *SIR2*, with  $\gamma_2 = 0$ , admits endemic equilibria with Jacobian having a double zero, where  $\lambda, \beta, \gamma$  are rational functions of the other parameters and  $i$ , provided certain rational equalities and inequalities, necessary for the positivity of  $\beta, \gamma$  and provided only in *SIR2S.nb*, are satisfied.

For example, when  $\gamma_2 = 0$ , the necessary inequalities mentioned above, which ensure the positivity of  $\beta, \gamma$ , are

$$\beta_2 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 + \frac{\gamma_1 \mu + \beta_2 i \mu + \mu^2}{\beta_2 i^2}. \quad (5.8)$$

2. On the double zero manifold of part 1., the Hurwitz determinant  $H_4$  is doubly identically 0, suggesting a degenerate Hopf bifurcation occurs.

Establish the existence of Hopf and Bogdanov-Takens bifurcation for *SIR2S*, and prove that the Hopf manifold  $H_4 = 0$  has a double contact with the BT manifold  $co_1 = 0 = co_2$ , for *SIR2S*, with  $\gamma_2 = 0$ .

**Open Problem 9.** The multi-stationarity and multi-stability of *SIRnS* are open problems, for  $n > 2$ .

## Declarations

**Funding:** MDJ is supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. DMS-2213390.

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

**Acknowledgements:** We thank Murad Banaji, Damian Clancy, Andrei Halanay, Daniel Lichtblau, Janos Toth, Nicola Vassena and James Watmough for useful advice.

## References

- [AAB<sup>+</sup>23] Florin Avram, Rim Adenane, Lasko Basnarkov, Gianluca Bianchin, Dan Goreac, and Andrei Halanay, *An age of infection kernel, an  $\mathcal{R}$  formula, and further results for Arino–Brauer A, B matrix epidemic models with varying populations, waning immunity, and disease and vaccination fatalities*, *Mathematics* **11** (2023), no. 6, 1307.
- [AAB24] Florin Avram, Rim Adenane, and Lasko Basnarkov, *Some probabilistic interpretations related to the next-generation matrix theory: A review with examples*, *Mathematics* **12** (2024), no. 15, 2425.
- [AABJ23] Florin Avram, Rim Adenane, Lasko Basnarkov, and Matthew D Johnston, *Algorithmic approach for a unique definition of the next-generation matrix*, *Mathematics* **12** (2023), no. 1, 27.
- [AARAS20] M Ali Al-Radhawi, David Angeli, and Eduardo D Sontag, *A computational framework for a lyapunov-enabled analysis of biochemical reaction networks*, *PLoS computational biology* **16** (2020), no. 2, e1007681.
- [AARS21] David Angeli, Muhammad Ali Al-Radhawi, and Eduardo D Sontag, *A robust lyapunov criterion for nonoscillatory behaviors in biological interaction networks*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **67** (2021), no. 7, 3305–3320.
- [ABvdD<sup>+</sup>07] Julien Arino, Fred Brauer, Pauline van den Driessche, James Watmough, and Jianhong Wu, *A final size relation for epidemic models*, *Mathematical Biosciences & Engineering* **4** (2007), no. 2, 159.
- [ADLS07] David Angeli, Patrick De Leenheer, and Eduardo D Sontag, *A petri net approach to the study of persistence in chemical reaction networks*, *Mathematical biosciences* **210** (2007), no. 2, 598–618.
- [ADLS10] David Angeli, Patrick De Leenheer, and Eduardo Sontag, *Graph-theoretic characterizations of monotonicity of chemical networks in reaction coordinates*, *Journal of mathematical biology* **61** (2010), 581–616.
- [AGPV24] Carlos Andreu, Gilberto Gonzalez-Parra, and Rafael Villanueva, *A new mathematical modeling approach: coupling seasonality and immunity in influenza epidemiological dynamics*.

- [Ang09] David Angeli, *A tutorial on chemical reaction networks dynamics*, 2009 European Control Conference (ECC), IEEE, 2009, pp. 649–657.
- [AR23] M Ali Al-Radhawi, *Graphical characterizations of robust stability in biological interaction networks*, Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems **35** (2023), no. 3, 585–617.
- [ARA14] M Ali Al-Radhawi and David Angeli, *Robust lyapunov functions for complex reaction networks: An uncertain system framework*, 53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, IEEE, 2014, pp. 3101–3106.
- [ARA15] Muhammad Ali Al-Radhawi and David Angeli, *New approach to the stability of chemical reaction networks: Piecewise linear in rates lyapunov functions*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **61** (2015), no. 1, 76–89.
- [AVCP19] Eric J Avila-Vales and Ángel G Cervantes-Pérez, *Global stability for sirs epidemic models with general incidence rate and transfer from infectious to susceptible*, Boletín de la Sociedad Matemática Mexicana **25** (2019), 637–658.
- [Ban18] Murad Banaji, *Inheritance of oscillation in chemical reaction networks*, Applied Mathematics and Computation **325** (2018), 191–209.
- [BB23a] Murad Banaji and Balázs Boros, *The smallest bimolecular mass action reaction networks admitting Andronov–Hopf bifurcation*, Nonlinearity **36** (2023), no. 2, 1398.
- [BB23b] ———, *The smallest bimolecular mass action reaction networks admitting andronov–hopf bifurcation*, Nonlinearity **36** (2023), no. 2, 1398.
- [Bla95] Franco Blanchini, *Nonquadratic lyapunov functions for robust control*, Automatica **31** (1995), no. 3, 451–461.
- [BM18] Yuzhen Bai and Xiaoqing Mu, *Global asymptotic stability of a generalized sirs epidemic model with transfer from infectious to susceptible*, J. Appl. Anal. Comput **8** (2018), no. 2, 402–412.
- [BO23] Lorena C Bulhosa and Juliane F Oliveira, *Vaccination in a two-strain model with cross-immunity and antibody-dependent enhancement*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02263 (2023).
- [BP16] Murad Banaji and Casian Pantea, *Some results on injectivity and multistationarity in chemical reaction networks*, SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems **15** (2016), no. 2, 807–869.
- [CDSS09] Gheorghe Craciun, Alicia Dickenstein, Anne Shiu, and Bernd Sturmfels, *Toric dynamical systems*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **44** (2009), no. 11, 1551–1565.
- [CF05] Gheorghe Craciun and Martin Feinberg, *Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks: I. the injectivity property*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics **65** (2005), no. 5, 1526–1546.
- [CF06] ———, *Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks: Ii. the species-reaction graph*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics **66** (2006), no. 4, 1321–1338.
- [CGK20] Daniele Cappelletti, Ankit Gupta, and Mustafa Khammash, *A hidden integral structure endows absolute concentration robust systems with resilience to dynamical concentration disturbances*, Journal of the Royal Society Interface **17** (2020), no. 171, 20200437.
- [Cla88] Bruce L Clarke, *Stoichiometric network analysis*, Cell biophysics **12** (1988), 237–253.
- [Cox18a] David A Cox, *Lecture guide available at <https://faculty.tcu.edu/gfriedman/cbms2018/LectureGuide.pdf>*, 2018.
- [Cox18b] ———, *Lecture slides available at [https://faculty.tcu.edu/gfriedman/cbms2018/Lecture\\_slides.pdf](https://faculty.tcu.edu/gfriedman/cbms2018/Lecture_slides.pdf)*, 2018.
- [CS78] Vincenzo Capasso and Gabriella Serio, *A generalization of the kermack-mckendrick deterministic epidemic model*, Mathematical biosciences **42** (1978), no. 1-2, 43–61.

- [DARJS24] Alon Duvall, M Ali Al-Radhawi, Dhruv D Jatkar, and Eduardo Sontag, *Interplay between contractivity and monotonicity for reaction networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18734 (2024).
- [DBMP14] Pete Donnell, Murad Banaji, Anca Marginean, and Casian Pantea, *Control: an open source framework for the analysis of chemical reaction networks*, *Bioinformatics* **30** (2014), no. 11, 1633–1634.
- [DDG15] Joseph P Dexter, Tathagata Dasgupta, and Jeremy Gunawardena, *Invariants reveal multiple forms of robustness in bifunctional enzyme systems*, *Integrative Biology* **7** (2015), no. 8, 883–894.
- [dFWF17] Michael Marcondes de Freitas, Carsten Wiuf, and Elisenda Feliu, *Intermediates and generic convergence to equilibria*, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **79** (2017), 1662–1686.
- [DHM90] Odo Diekmann, Johan Andre Peter Heesterbeek, and Johan AJ Metz, *On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio  $r_0$  in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous populations*, *Journal of mathematical biology* **28** (1990), no. 4, 365–382.
- [Dic16] Alicia Dickenstein, *Biochemical reaction networks: an invitation for algebraic geometers*, *Mathematical congress of the Americas*, vol. 656, *Contemp. Math*, 2016, pp. 65–83.
- [Efi12] Denis Efimov, *Global lyapunov analysis of multistable nonlinear systems*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **50** (2012), no. 5, 3132–3154.
- [Fei87] Martin Feinberg, *Chemical reaction network structure and the stability of complex isothermal reactors—I. The deficiency zero and deficiency one theorems*, *Chemical Engineering Science* **42** (1987), no. 10, 2229–2268.
- [GES05] Karin Gatermann, Markus Eiswirth, and Anke Senses, *Toric ideals and graph theory to analyze hopf bifurcations in mass-action systems*, *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **40** (2005), no. 6, 1361–1382.
- [GHR16] Elizabeth Gross, Heather A Harrington, Zvi Rosen, and Bernd Sturmfels, *Algebraic systems biology: a case study for the *wnt* pathway*, *Bulletin of mathematical biology* **78** (2016), 21–51.
- [Gun03] Jeremy Gunawardena, *Chemical reaction network theory for in-silico biologists*, Notes available for download at <http://vcp.med.harvard.edu/papers/crnt.pdf> **5** (2003).
- [HHKK23] Hyukpyo Hong, Bryan S Hernandez, Jinsu Kim, and Jae Kyoung Kim, *Computational translation framework identifies biochemical reaction networks with special topologies and their long-term dynamics*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **83** (2023), no. 3, 1025–1048.
- [HJ72] Fritz Horn and Roy Jackson, *General mass-action kinetics*, *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis* **47** (1972), 81–116.
- [HK19] Paul J Hurtado and Adam S Kiro Singh, *Generalizations of the ‘linear chain trick’: incorporating more flexible dwell time distributions into mean field ode models*, *Journal of mathematical biology* **79** (2019), no. 5, 1831–1883.
- [HLJK22] Bryan S Hernandez, Patrick Vincent N Lubenia, Matthew D Johnston, and Jae Kyoung Kim, *A framework for deriving analytic long-term behavior of biochemical reaction networks*, *bioRxiv* (2022), 2022–12.
- [HSVDD81] Herbert W Hethcote, Harlan W Stech, and Pauline Van Den Driessche, *Nonlinear oscillations in epidemic models*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **40** (1981), no. 1, 1–9.
- [JC23] Badal Joshi and Gheorghe Craciun, *Reaction network motifs for static and dynamic absolute concentration robustness*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* **22** (2023), no. 2, 501–526.
- [JMP19] Matthew D Johnston, Stefan Müller, and Casian Pantea, *A deficiency-based approach to parametrizing positive equilibria of biochemical reaction systems*, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **81** (2019), 1143–1172.

- [JN24] Badal Joshi and Tung D Nguyen, *Bifunctional enzyme provides absolute concentration robustness in multisite covalent modification networks*, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **88** (2024), no. 3, 36.
- [Joh14] Matthew D Johnston, *Translated chemical reaction networks*, *Bulletin of mathematical biology* **76** (2014), 1081–1116.
- [JPD16] Matthew D Johnston, Casian Pantea, and Pete Donnell, *A computational approach to persistence, permanence, and endotacticity of biochemical reaction systems*, *Journal of mathematical biology* **72** (2016), 467–498.
- [KMD<sup>+</sup>12] Robert L Karp, Mercedes Pérez Millán, Tathagata Dasgupta, Alicia Dickenstein, and Jeremy Gunawardena, *Complex-linear invariants of biochemical networks*, *Journal of theoretical biology* **311** (2012), 130–138.
- [KNS24] Nidhi Kaihnsa, Tung Nguyen, and Anne Shiu, *Absolute concentration robustness and multistationarity in reaction networks: Conditions for coexistence*, *European Journal of Applied Mathematics* (2024), 1–35.
- [LMI<sup>+</sup>23] Torkel E. Loman, Yingbo Ma, Vasily Ilin, Shashi Gowda, Niklas Korsbo, Nikhil Yewale, Chris Rackauckas, and Samuel A. Isaacson, *Catalyst: Fast and flexible modeling of reaction networks*, *PLOS Computational Biology* **19** (2023), no. 10, 1–19.
- [MdCR23] Joao PS Mauricio de Carvalho and Alexandre A Rodrigues, *Sir model with vaccination: bifurcation analysis*, *Qualitative theory of dynamical systems* **22** (2023), no. 3, 105.
- [PEF22] Beatriz Pascual-Escudero and Elisenda Feliu, *Local and global robustness at steady state*, *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences* **45** (2022), no. 1, 359–382.
- [PGH<sup>+</sup>23] Luis David García Puente, Elizabeth Gross, Heather A Harrington, Matthew Johnston, Nicolette Meshkat, Mercedes Pérez Millán, and Anne Shiu, *Absolute concentration robustness: Algebra and geometry*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00078 (2023).
- [SF10] Guy Shinar and Martin Feinberg, *Structural sources of robustness in biochemical reaction networks*, *Science* **327** (2010), no. 5971, 1389–1391.
- [Swi85] KE Swick, *Some reducible models of age dependent dynamics*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **45** (1985), no. 2, 256–267.
- [TJ18] Elisa Tonello and Matthew D Johnston, *Network translation and steady-state properties of chemical reaction systems*, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **80** (2018), 2306–2337.
- [TNP18] János Tóth, Attila László Nagy, and Dávid Papp, *Reaction kinetics: exercises, programs and theorems*, Springer, 2018.
- [Ton] Elisa Tonello, *Crnpy: a python library for the analysis of chemical reaction networks*. 2016.
- [Ton18] ———, *Graph properties of biological interaction networks*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Nottingham, 2018.
- [VAA] Nicola Vassena, Florin Avram, and Rim Adenane, *Finding bifurcations in mathematical epidemiology via reaction network methods*.
- [Vas23] Nicola Vassena, *Symbolic hunt of instabilities and bifurcations in reaction networks*, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-B* (2023), 0–0.
- [Vas24] *Unstable cores are the source of instability in chemical reaction networks*, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **480** (2024), no. 2285, 20230694.
- [VdDW02] Pauline Van den Driessche and James Watmough, *Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission*, *Mathematical biosciences* **180** (2002), no. 1-2, 29–48.

- [VdDW08] P Van den Driessche and James Watmough, *Further notes on the basic reproduction number*, *Mathematical epidemiology*, Springer, 2008, pp. 159–178.
- [VdSRJ15] Arjan Van der Schaft, Shodhan Rao, and Bayu Jayawardhana, *Complex and detailed balancing of chemical reaction networks revisited*, *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry* **53** (2015), 1445–1458.
- [YC18] Polly Y Yu and Gheorghe Craciun, *Mathematical analysis of chemical reaction systems*, *Israel Journal of Chemistry* **58** (2018), no. 6-7, 733–741.
- [Zas95] Boris Zaslavsky, *Stability of hopf bifurcation in quasi-linear models*, *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications* **192** (1995), no. 1, 294–311.