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Abstract

A susceptible-infected-susceptible (SIS) model of multiple contagions on multilayer networks is developed to incorporate different spreading channels and disease mutations. The basic reproduction number for this model is estimated analytically. In a special case when considering only compartmental models, we analytically analyze an example of a model with a mutation driven strain persistence characterized by the absence of an epidemic threshold. This model is not related to the network topology and can be observed in both compartmental models and models on networks. The novel multiple-contagion SIS model on a multilayer network could help in the understanding of other spreading phenomena including communicable diseases, cultural characteristics, addictions, or information spread through e-mail messages, web blogs, and computer networks.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Epidemiological models, developed as tools for analyzing the spread and control of infectious diseases, have also been adapted to model the dynamics of contagious entities as diverse as communicable diseases, cultural characteristics (such as religious beliefs, fads or innovations), addictions, or information spread (through rumors, e-mail messages, web blogs, peer-to-peer computer networks, etc). The susceptible-infected-susceptible (SIS) model is one of the simplest and well-studied model for emerging disease outbreaks (like influenza, chlamydia, gonhorrea, etc.) that does not give immunity upon recovery [1–5]. The SIS compartmental model divides the population into two compartments (classes) – susceptible to the infection of the pathogen (often denoted by S) and infected by the pathogen (given the symbol I). The disease is transmitted with a rate $\beta$ while infected individuals become susceptible again with a rate $\gamma$. The dynamics of the infectious class depends on a quantity called basic reproduction number, $R_0$, defined as the number of secondary infections caused by a single infective introduced into a population made up entirely of susceptible individuals over the course of the infection of this single infective. For the SIS model in a well-mixed population, the basic reproduction number is equal to $R_0 = \beta/\gamma$ [6]. By adopting so called quenched mean-field theory [7, 8], the basic reproduction number for the SIS model on networks has been estimated to be equal to

$$R_0 = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\beta}{\gamma} \equiv \frac{\beta_{\text{eff}}}{\gamma}, \quad (1)$$

where $A$ is the adjacency matrix of the network and $\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)$ is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $A$. The network structure, described with (expressed thought) the largest eigenvalue of the network adjacency matrix, is encoded in the effective transmission rate $\beta_{\text{eff}} = \lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\beta$. For the SIS model in homogeneous networks, such as the Erdos-Renyi random networks and random regular graphs, $\lambda_{\text{max}}(A) = \langle k \rangle$. According to Ref. [9], for scale-free networks, $1/\lambda_{\text{max}} = 1/\sqrt{k_{\text{max}}}$ if $\hat{\gamma} > 5/2$, and $1/\lambda_{\text{max}} = \langle k \rangle/\langle k^2 \rangle$ if $2 < \hat{\gamma} < 5/2$, where the degree distribution follows $P(k) \sim k^{-\hat{\gamma}}$.

In the thermodynamic limit when the number of nodes approaches infinity, phase-transition occurs at $R_0 = 1$. If the basic reproduction number falls below the critical value ($R_0 < 1$), the infection dies out. For $R_0 > 1$ there is an epidemic in the population. At the
phase transition, threshold for the transmission rate $\beta$ equals

$$\beta_{cr} = \frac{\gamma}{\lambda_{max}(A)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Note that in Eq. (2) for a fixed value of $\gamma$, large value of $\lambda_{max}(A)$ implies vanishing threshold ($\beta_{cr} \to 0$). In other words, a network structure causes an absence of an epidemic threshold and its associated critical behavior. This phenomenon, which has been extensively studied in [1], will be referred to as a network-driven absence of threshold in epidemic models. For the contact process in random graphs with power law degree distributions, a rigorous proof for the vanishing epidemic threshold was provided in [10].

Models for multiple diseases that co-evolve in a network has recently been gaining attention [11–14]. However, these diseases are often assumed to be mutually exclusive. While such models are usually discussed in the context of epidemics, they are more aptly used in studying belief propagation or product adoption, for example, in modeling competition in politics or competition in a marketplace. The generalization of the SIS model to arbitrary number of multiple contagions, however, has not yet been developed. In this paper we model the spread of multiple contagions on networks. We further assume that each contagion spreads over different spreading channels resulting in a multiple-contagion SIS model on a multilayer network.

A. Literature overview

1. Multiple-contagion compartmental models

Developing models for interacting strains of the same pathogen, such as influenza [15] or dengue [16], or interacting diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria [17], is one of the most theoretically challenging problems in infectious disease epidemiology. The central problem comes from the explosive growth in the number of state variables of the system with the linear increase in the number of strains or pathogens [18].

The spread of multiple diseases can be characterized by various factors such as contact with infected individuals, the interplay between diseases coupled by mutation [19] or cross-immunity [19,22], and coexistence [21] or by the principle of competitive exclusion [23,24] which states that the strain with the largest reproduction number drives other strains into extinction. Epidemiological models that study multiple strains fall into super-infection
models \([25, 27]\) where strains cannot coexist in a host because the most virulent strain takes over, and co-infection models \([26, 28]\) where coexistence is possible. For a discussion on how multiple infections have been modeled in evolutionary epidemiology, as well as co- and super-infection models in the standard setting, the reader is referred to \([25]\). An epi-evolutionary model on a \(n\)-regular network with \(N\) pathogens which are allowed to mutate into each other is propose in \([29]\). Besides spreading dynamics, the model takes into account the evolutionary properties of a parasite by keeping track of the change of the mean value. Authors demonstrate that the coupled dynamics lead to transient phenomena that cannot be described by standard invasion analyses.

Cross-immunity can be defined in at least two ways: one is reduced susceptibility and the other is reduced transmission (less likely to transmit) \([30]\). The biological basis of this is that multiple influenza infections occur during the life of individuals and one’s increased/decreased susceptibility depends on this history. The dimensionality of a history-based system is \(O(2^N)\) (the power set of the pathogens) and multiple methods have been proposed for its reduction, focusing on a symmetrized system \([22, 31]\) or via age-structure by grouping the population into compartments which have seen a strain \(i\) \([32–34]\). The work of \([35]\) focuses on the stability analysis of a model of \(n\)-compartments, each having its own reproductive ratio and endemic threshold. Coexistence has been inspected in \([36]\) when the strains are coupled by mutation.

2. Spreading processes on multilayer networks

Multilayer networks are fundamental for the understanding of dynamical processes on networked systems, including, for example, spreading processes, such as flows (and congestion) in transportation networks \([37, 38]\), and information and disease spreading in social networks \([39, 43]\).

As reviewed in \([44]\), there are two different categories of dynamical processes on multilayer networks: a single dynamical process and mixed (or coupled) dynamics, in which two or more dynamical processes, defined on each layer separately, are coupled together with inter-layer connections between nodes. One of the simplest types of dynamics is a diffusion process. In a random walk, a discrete diffusion process, a walker jumps between nodes. In a multilayer network, the walker switches between layers via an inter-layer edge, resulting
in enriched random-walk dynamics [45–47]. The continuous diffusion process has also been analyzed in multiplex networks [48, 49] and novel phenomenon has been observed: diffusion can be faster in a multiplex network than in any of the layers considered independently. Congestion in multilayer networks has been studied recently [38, 50] for modeling multimodal transportation systems.

Coupled spreading processes on multilayer networks have recently been analyzed, including spreading dynamics of two concurrent diseases in two-layer multiplex networks [42, 51–53] and spread of disease coupled with the spread of information or behavior [39–41, 54, 55]. It was observed that two spreading processes can enhance each other (for example, one disease facilitates infection by the other), or one process can inhibit the spread of the other (for example, a disease can inhibit infection by another disease or the spreading of awareness about a disease can inhibit the spread of the disease).

B. Motivation and our contribution

This paper addresses multiple-contagion SIS model on multilayer networks. So far only multiple-contagion compartmental models have been studied as reviewed in the previous subsection. However, a simple example illustrates that for a system with network structure, neglecting the network structure of the model and working only with the compartment model can lead to completely different results concerning how the infected populations evolve in time. Figure 1 depicts infected populations versus time for two models: two-contagion compartment SIS model and two-contagion SIS model on a two-layer Erdos-Renyi random network. The number of nodes in the network model is equal to the total population number in the compartment model and both models have same parameter values. The detail equations describing the evolution of both compartment and network models are provided in the next sections – this is just an illustration that both models can have different behavior and understanding multiple-contagion models on multilayer networks is the next step in modeling various spreading phenomena.

The main contribution of this work is twofold: (1) a multiple-contagion SIS model on multilayer networks has been developed; and (2) an estimate of the basic reproductive number of the model has been analytically derived. Furthermore, we discuss how the epidemic threshold depends on the network structure. In particular, two classes of the model are
studied in detail. In the first class, contagions do not compete and a node can be infected by an arbitrary number of contagions, while the second class describes competing epidemics on networks implying that each node (agent) can only be infected by a single contagion. In a special case, we analytically analyze an example of a model with a mutation driven strain persistence characterized by the absence of an epidemic threshold. This model is not related to the network topology and can be observed in both compartmental and network models.

II. MODEL DESCRIPTION

We model multiple contagions on multilayer networks with three graphs (see Fig. 2): a multiplex graph, a bipartite graph, and a directed graph. The multiplex graph represents a social network consisting of a set of social actors and sets of dyadic ties. A multiplex graph/network is defined as a collection of a set of nodes $V$, a set $R = \{1, \ldots, d\}$ of relation types, and for each $\alpha \in R$, a set $E_\alpha$ of edges describing the presence or absence of edges of type $\alpha$ between pairs of nodes. The graph $(V, E_\alpha)$ is also called layer; we write $A_\alpha = [a_{ij}^\alpha]$ for the adjacency matrix of this graph. We assume that each layer represents a different spreading channel through which contagions are spread. For example, in etiology, scientists have recognized five major modes of disease transmission: airborne, waterborne, bloodborne,
FIG. 2. (a) Social network as a multiplex graph. A node can be infected by all contagious entities in the set $L$, where $L$ is a subset (including empty set) of the set $H$ of $m$ contagions present in the system. In the figure $m = 4$ and contagions are represented with colored stars. Each layer represents a different spreading channel through which contagions are spread. In the figure, the spreading channels are shown with straight line and curved line. (b) Directed graph showing mutation among contagions. (c) Bipartite graph connecting two sets: the set of contagions and the set of spreading channels indicating channels in which a contagion could be spread.

by direct contact, and through vector (insects or other creatures that carry germs from one species to another). Let the set $H = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ label the $m$ contagions present in the system. For the bipartite graph $G = (R \cup H, E)$, the vertex set $R$ is the set of layers/channels, the vertex set $H$ is the set of contagions, and the set $E$ is the set of edges such that every edge connects a vertex in $R$ to one in $H$. In a classical SIS model, the parameter $\beta$ represents contact or infection rate of a disease. Here $\beta_\alpha^\kappa$ denotes the contact or infection rate of the contagion/disease $\kappa$ through the layer/channel $\alpha$. The bipartite graph can be represented with a weighted adjacency matrix defined with $[\beta_\alpha^\kappa]$. We assume that contagions can be changed/mutated and be transformed between each other. For contagious diseases (also called communicable diseases), scientists have documented that diseases could mutate to become more contagious. This is modeled as a directed graph with an $m \times m$ adjacency matrix $[\mu^{\delta\alpha}]$; $\mu^{\delta\alpha}$ is a rate at which $\delta$ is changed to $\alpha$. In general, we assume that $\mu^{\delta\alpha} \neq \mu^{\alpha\delta}$.

In the classical SIS model, when a single contagion is presented in the system, the node’s state is defined with two variables: the probability that the node $i$ is susceptible $p_{S,i}$ and the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R )</td>
<td>Set of relation types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_\alpha )</td>
<td>Edge set on layer ( \alpha ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_\alpha )</td>
<td>Adjacency matrix of layer ( \alpha ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H )</td>
<td>Contagion set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_\alpha^\kappa )</td>
<td>Infection rate of contagion ( \kappa ) on layer ( \alpha ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu^{\delta_\alpha} )</td>
<td>Mutation rate of contagion ( \delta ) into infection ( \alpha ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma^\alpha )</td>
<td>Healing rate of contagion ( \alpha ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_{L,i}(t) )</td>
<td>Probability node ( i ) is infected by all contagions in ( L ) at time ( t ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p^L = \sum_{i=1}^N p_{L,i} )</td>
<td>Infected population, used in Figure 1, 3, 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_\delta )</td>
<td>Set ( L ) including ( \delta ), excluding ( \alpha ): ( L \setminus {\alpha} \cup {\delta} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_0^\alpha )</td>
<td>Basic reproduction number for contagion ( \alpha ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{cr}^\alpha )</td>
<td>Critical value for ( \beta ) of contagion ( \alpha ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I.** Summary of notation that is used throughout the paper.

The probability that the node \( i \) is infected \( p_{I,i} \). Clearly, these two variables are not independent since \( p_{S,i} + p_{I,i} = 1 \). Here, for \( m \) co-circulating contagions, the number of variables each node has is \( 2^m \), out of which \( 2^m - 1 \) are independent. The power set of \( H \), \( \mathcal{P}(H) \), is the set of all subsets of \( H \), including the empty set and \( H \) itself. Let \( p_{L,i} \) be the probability that the node \( i \) is currently infected (contaminated) by all contagious entities in the set \( L \), \( L \in \mathcal{P}(H) \). Clearly, \( \sum_{L \in \mathcal{P}(H)} p_{L,i} = 1 \). The current contagious set of a node can be changed by one of three mechanisms. The first mechanism is mutation: a contagious entity mutates into another entity. We assume that this mechanism is described with a probability rate: \( \mu^{\delta_\alpha} \) denotes the rate at which \( \delta \) mutates into \( \alpha \in H \). The second mechanism is analogous to the node curing from the contagious entity \( \delta \) and \( \gamma^\delta \) represents the mean recovery rate. The third mechanism is transmission and is analogous to node infecting with a contagion from its neighbors. This mechanism is the only network-induced mechanism resulting in the change of the set \( L \) due to contact with the neighbors and we also refer to it as the contact-induced change mechanism of the set \( L \). This mechanism is described with a quantity \( \beta_{cr}^\alpha \). Table I summarizes all quantities used in the paper. The model reads:

\[
\frac{dp_{\emptyset,i}}{dt} = \sum_{\delta \in H} p_{\delta,i} \gamma^\delta - p_{\emptyset,i} \sum_{\delta \in H} P_1(\emptyset \rightarrow \delta) \tag{3}
\]
FIG. 3. Infected population versus time for deterministic and stochastic (noisy line) two-contagion SIS model on a two-layer Erdos-Renyi random network. The deterministic model is described with equations (3) – (5). The stochastic model is a discrete-time Markov process defined as follows. At time \( t \) an infected node with contagion \( \kappa \) on layer \( \alpha \) can: (1) infect a susceptible neighboring node with probability \( \beta^\kappa \Delta t \), (2) heal with probability \( \gamma^\kappa \Delta t \), and (3) mutate with probability \( \mu^\kappa \Delta t \).

\[
\frac{dp_{L,i}}{dt} = \sum_{\delta \in H_L} p_{L,\delta,i} \left( \gamma^\delta + \sum_{\alpha \in L} \mu^\delta \right) + \sum_{\delta \in H_L} \sum_{\alpha \in L} p_{L,\alpha,i} \mu^\delta \alpha + \sum_{\delta \in L} p_{L,\delta,i} P_i(L \delta \rightarrow L) \\
- p_{L,i} \sum_{\delta \in L} \left( \gamma^\delta + \sum_{\alpha \in H} \mu^\delta \alpha \right) - p_{L,i} \sum_{\delta \in H_L} P_i(L \rightarrow L^\delta),
\]

\[
\frac{dp_{H,i}}{dt} = \sum_{\delta \in H} p_{H,\delta,i} P_i(H \delta \rightarrow H) - p_{H,i} \sum_{\delta \in H} \left( \gamma^\delta + \sum_{\alpha \in H} \mu^\delta \alpha \right)
\]

where \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), \( L \in \mathcal{P}(H) \), \( L \neq \emptyset, H \),

\[
P_i(L \rightarrow L^\delta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\alpha \in R} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}(H)} \left\{ \sum_{\delta \in A} a_{ij}^\alpha \beta^\delta \alpha p_{A,j} \right\}
\]

Figure 3 shows comparison between stochastic and deterministic two-contagion SIS model on two-layer Erdos-Renyi random network. A node in the network can be in either a susceptible state (S) or in one of the three infected states denoted as 1, 2, or 12 (12 means the node is infected both with contagions 1 and 2). The stochastic model is a discrete-time Markov process defined as follows: at time \( t \), an infected node with contagion \( \kappa \in \{1, 2\} \) on layer \( \alpha \in \{1, 2\} \) can infect a susceptible neighboring node with probability \( \beta^\kappa \alpha \Delta t \). Further, an infected node can be cured with probability \( \gamma^\kappa \Delta t \), and can mutate with probability
FIG. 4. State transition diagram. Leftmost state corresponds to the node being susceptible; the node can be infected entering the state $\delta \in H$. Being in $\delta$ it can either heal with rate $\gamma^\delta$, mutate into another infection state $\alpha$ with rate $\mu^\delta\alpha$ or acquire another infection. Center state: node is in the state $L$ (infected by all infections in $L$) from which the node can be cured from an infection $\delta \in L$ (transition from the state $L$ to the state $L_\delta = L \setminus \{\delta\}$); $\alpha \in L$ might mutate into some $\delta \in H_L = H \setminus L$ to reach state $L^\delta\alpha$, and by the contact mechanism it can transition to $L^\eta$ where $\eta \in H_L$. In the final state $H$ only transition to the state $H_\delta$ is possible.

$\mu^\delta \Delta t$. The corresponding continuous-time equations can be derived from this model leading to equations (3) – (5). This derivation is, however, out of scope of the paper; more detail comparison of deterministic and stochastic models will be provided in a forthcoming paper.

What follows is an explanation of equations (3) – (6). The contact mechanism defined in equation (6) goes over all neighbors of node $i$ in all layers. Infection $\delta$ will be transmitted with the corresponding rate $\beta^\delta\alpha$ for a layer/channel $\alpha$ for those neighbors of $i$ which are infected by $\delta$, that is $\delta \in A$ where $A \in P(H)$ is the infection set. Equation (3) – the leftmost state in Figure 4 – captures the dynamics of node $i$ in the susceptible state. The first term on the RHS is the probability that $i$ is infected by infection $\delta$ and heals with rate $\gamma^\delta$ hence transitioning to $\emptyset$. The second term is the probability that node $i$ is susceptible and acquires infection $\delta$ by the contact mechanism. The equation (5) – the rightmost state in Figure 4 – describes the case when the node is infected by all pathogens. The first term is acquiring $\delta$ by the contact mechanism hence transitioning to $H$ and the second is loss of infection $\delta$ which can happen either by healing ($\gamma^\delta$) or by mutation ($\mu^\delta\alpha$). For example let $H = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\delta = 3$. Then $H \xrightarrow{\mu^31} \{1, 2\}$, $H \xrightarrow{\mu^32} \{1, 2\}$, $H \xrightarrow{\gamma^3} \{1, 2\}$. Equation (4) corresponding to the state $L$ in Figure 4 has more complex mechanism. The first term is the probability that node $i$ has $\delta$ in its infection set and loses it either by healing with rate $\gamma^\delta$ or by mutating into $\alpha \in L^\delta$ with rate $\mu^\delta\alpha$. The second term is the probability that $i$ has
\(\delta\) in its infection set but not \(\alpha\) and acquires \(\alpha\) by \(\delta\) mutating to \(\alpha\), and the third term is the probability that \(i\) lacks \(\delta\) and acquires it by the contact mechanism. Loss terms follow the same pattern. For the infection set \(H\) only two events are possible, either infection \(\eta\) is acquired or loses an infection by healing or mutation.

III. PROPERTIES OF THE MODEL

The model is a generalization of the classical SIS model on a single layer network. The equations (4) assume that the population remains constant, i.e., the concentrations satisfy the closure condition \(\sum_{L} p_{L,i}(t) = 1\) for every \(t\) and every \(i\). The equilibrium is obtained in Eq. (4) by setting \(\frac{dp_{L,i}}{dt} = 0\). It is formidable to solve for the equilibrium at an arbitrary number of nodes \(n\) and arbitrary number of contingents/strains \(m\). The total number of variables is \(n(2^m - 1)\). Let \(T^\alpha\) be an \(n \times n\) matrix defined as

\[
T^\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} T_{ij} \end{bmatrix} \quad T_{ij} = \sum_{\delta} a_{ij}^\delta \beta_{\delta}^\alpha.
\]

The basic reproduction number \(R^\alpha_0\) for the model (4) can be estimated analytically (let \(s = \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu^\alpha_\delta - \mu^\delta_\alpha) + \gamma^\alpha\)):

\[
R^\alpha_0 \approx \frac{\beta_{\text{eff}}^\alpha}{\gamma_{\text{eff}}^\alpha} \equiv \begin{cases} 
\frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^\alpha) + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^\delta_\alpha}{\gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^{\alpha\delta}} & s \geq 0 \\
\frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^\alpha) + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^{\alpha\delta} + \gamma^\alpha}{\sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^\delta_\alpha} & s < 0 
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^\alpha)\) is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix \(T^\alpha\).

Proof. By the Hartman-Grobman theorem, the behavior of the system near the equilibrium point (\(\vec{0}\) in our case) is the same as in it’s linearized part. Let \(p_{\alpha,i}\) be very small, namely \(p_{\alpha,i} \approx \epsilon_{\alpha,i}\) where \(\epsilon_{\alpha,i} \ll 1\) and assume mutual independence among the contagions \(p_{L,i} = \prod_{\alpha \in L} p_{\alpha,i}\). Equation (4) takes the following form:

\[
\frac{dp_{\alpha,i}}{dt} = \sum_{\delta \in H} \epsilon_{\delta,i} \mu^\delta_\alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\delta \in R} a_{ij}^\delta \beta_{\delta}^\alpha \epsilon_{\alpha,j} - \epsilon_{\alpha,i} \left( \gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^{\alpha\delta} \right)
\]

Assume \(\epsilon_i = \max_\alpha \epsilon_{\alpha,i}\), then

\[
\frac{dp_{\alpha,i}}{dt} \approx \sum_{\delta \in H} \epsilon_i \mu^\delta_\alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\delta \in R} a_{ij}^\delta \beta_{\delta}^\alpha \epsilon_j - \epsilon_i \left( \gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^{\alpha\delta} \right)
\]
To set-up the eigenvalue problem we introduce the Kronecker-delta ($\delta_{ij}$) symbol,

$$\frac{dp^\alpha}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\delta \in R} a_{ij}^{\delta} \beta_{\delta}^\alpha \epsilon_{j} - \delta_{ij}^\alpha \epsilon_{j} \left( \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) + \gamma_{\alpha} \right) \right)$$

At the equilibrium point $\dot{p}_{\alpha,i} = 0$

$$0 \approx \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\delta \in R} a_{ij}^{\delta} \beta_{\delta}^\alpha - \delta_{ij}^\alpha \left( \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) + \gamma_{\alpha} \right) \right) \epsilon_{j}$$

We firstly solve for equality:

$$\vec{0} = \left( T^{\alpha} - I \left( \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) + \gamma_{\alpha} \right) \right) \vec{\epsilon} \quad (9)$$

If $\sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) + \gamma_{\alpha} \geq 0$ then equation (9) is arranged so that we can take the maximum eigenvalue of $T^{\alpha}$ as its solution:

$$\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^{\alpha}) = \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) + \gamma_{\alpha}$$

$$\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^{\alpha}) + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha} = \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{i}^{\alpha} + \gamma_{\alpha}$$

From here the basic reproductive number is defined as the ratio:

$$R_{0}^{\alpha} \approx \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^{\alpha}) + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}}{\sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{i}^{\alpha} + \gamma_{\alpha}} \quad (10)$$

If $\sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) + \gamma_{\alpha} < 0$ then we need to negate the scalar values $I$ is multiplied with, yielding:

$$\vec{0} = \left( T^{\alpha} - I \left( - \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) - \gamma_{\alpha} \right) \right) \vec{\epsilon} \quad (11)$$

equation (11) is now set-up:

$$\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^{\alpha}) = - \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu_{i}^{\alpha} - \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha}) - \gamma_{\alpha}$$

$$\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^{\alpha}) + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha} + \gamma_{\alpha} = \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{i}^{\alpha}$$

From here the basic reproductive number is defined as the ratio:

$$R_{0}^{\alpha} \approx \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^{\alpha}) + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{\delta}^{\alpha} + \gamma_{\alpha}}{\sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_{i}^{\alpha}} \quad (12)$$
The equation (7) is a generalization of Eq. (1) and reduces to it for a model with a single channel and a single contingent. Indeed, when \( d = 1 \) and \( m = 1 \), writing \( \beta^\alpha = \beta \), \( \gamma^\alpha = \gamma \), and \( \mu^\alpha = 0 \), Eq. (7) becomes Eq. (1). In deriving (7) we have ignored the dynamic correlations, and therefore, to some extent, Eq. (7) is only an approximation of the correct value. Recently, by explicitly considering the dynamic correlation between directly connected neighbors, the authors of [4, 5] have calculated \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \), Eq. (1), for the SIS process on uncorrelated networks to be equal to

\[
\beta_{\text{eff}} = \left( \langle k^2 \rangle - \langle k \rangle \right) / \langle k \rangle.
\]

Both quantities \( \beta_{\text{eff}}^\alpha \) and \( \gamma_{\text{eff}}^\alpha \) in Eq. (7) have clear physical meaning: \( \beta_{\text{eff}}^\alpha \) is the effective transmission rate of the contingent \( \alpha \) equal to the weighted (taking into consideration network structure) infection rate from all channels plus mutations \( \mu^\delta \) from \( \delta \) to \( \alpha \). Similarly, \( \gamma_{\text{eff}}^\alpha \) represents the effective recovery rate and equals to the sum of recovery rate \( \gamma^\alpha \) and mutations \( \mu^\alpha \) from \( \alpha \) to \( \delta \).

The model (4) has another peculiar feature referred to as contagion-driven absence of threshold also known as mutation driven strain persistence. Assume that for a given contagion \( \alpha \) and a channel \( \delta \), the following three conditions hold: (1) \( \exists c > 0 \) such that \( \lambda_{\text{max}}(T^\alpha) > 0 \) for \( 0 < \beta_\delta^\alpha \leq c \), (2) \( \lambda_{\text{max}}(T^\alpha)|_{\beta_\delta^\alpha=0} = 0 \), and (3) \( \gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^\alpha \delta = \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^\delta \). Then the basic reproduction number equals

\[
R^\alpha_0 = 1 + \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}(T^\alpha)}{\gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^\alpha \delta} > 1,
\]

\[
R_0 = \min_{\kappa} R^\kappa_0 = R^\alpha_0|_{\beta_\delta^\alpha=0} = 1
\]

for \( 0 \leq \beta_\delta^\alpha \leq c \). This implies the absence of an epidemic threshold and its associated critical behavior for the contagion \( \alpha \). Above three conditions ensure that contagion-driven absence of threshold can be observed in a model. The first two conditions assume that for a given contagion \( \alpha \) and a channel \( \delta \), the largest eigenvalue of the weighted adjacency matrix \( T^\alpha \) is positive when \( 0 < \beta_\delta^\alpha \leq c \) and is equal to 0 for \( \beta_\delta^\alpha = 0 \). The third condition ensures \( R^\alpha_0 > 1 \) for all \( 0 < \beta_\delta^\alpha \leq c \) and hence absence of threshold. Since this phenomenon is not related to the network structure and should be also observed when the network is absent, we now consider compartmental models. For compartmental models contagion-driven absence of threshold is also called mutation driven strain persistence.
IV. EXACTLY SOLVABLE TWO-CONTINGENT COMPARTMENTAL MODEL

Multiple-contagion compartmental model consists of $2^m$ compartments. Dynamical equations describing the time evolution of the compartmental model are acquired by removing variables that are network dependent. The basic reproduction number derived using the same steps as in the main proof is:

$$R_0^a \approx \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{\delta \in H} \beta_\delta^a + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_\delta^a \delta}{\gamma^a + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_\delta^a \delta + \gamma^a} & s \geq 0 \\ \frac{\sum_{\delta \in H} \beta_\delta^a + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_\delta^a \delta}{\sum_{\delta \in H} \mu_\delta^a} & s < 0 \end{cases}$$

(13)

We now consider exactly solvable model with two contingents and arbitrary number of layers. The basic reproduction number for this model is equal to:

$$R_0 = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{d=1}^d \beta_\delta^1 + \epsilon}{\gamma^1 + \mu^{12}} & a \geq b \\ \frac{\sum_{d=1}^d \beta_\delta^2 + \epsilon}{\gamma^2 + \mu^{21}} & a < b \end{cases}$$

(14)

where $\epsilon$ is a function of $\mu^{12}$ and $\mu^{21}$, $a = \sum_{d=1}^d \beta_\delta^1 - (\gamma^1 + \mu^{12})$, and $b = \sum_{d=1}^d \beta_\delta^2 - (\gamma^2 + \mu^{21})$.

Assume $d = 1$ and let $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ be the largest eigenvalue of the Jacobean matrix of the model evaluated at 0. Set $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 0$ (equivalently $R_0 = 1$); then the critical values of $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$, $\beta_{cr}^1$ and $\beta_{cr}^2$, are related to each other through equation (see Appendix A)

$$\beta_{cr}^2 = \frac{\mu^{12} \mu^{21}}{\beta_{cr}^1 - \gamma^1 - \mu^{12}} + \gamma^2 + \mu^{21}$$

(15)

for $0 \leq \beta_{cr}^1 \leq c_1$ where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant that depends on the parameters $\mu^{12}$, $\mu^{21}$, $\gamma^1$, and $\gamma^2$. Assume now that $\gamma^1 = 0$, then for $\beta_{cr}^1 = 0$ and $\beta_{cr}^2 = \gamma^2$, $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 0$, while for $\beta^1 = 0$ and $\beta^2 > \gamma^2$, $\lambda_{\text{max}} > 0$. Therefore, even when $\beta^1 = 0$, the epidemic state is present in the model (when $\beta^2 > \gamma^2$). This absence of the epidemic threshold is illustrated on the Figure 5. We fix the parameters to $\gamma^1 = 0.8$, $\gamma^2 = 0.2$, $\mu^{12} = 0.3$, $\mu^{21} = 0.2$, and plot $\beta_{cr}^2$ vs $\beta_{cr}^1$ on Fig. 5a. For $\beta_{cr}^1 = 0$, we have $\beta_{cr}^2 = 0.345$. Fig 5b shows that how fractions of infected population evolve in time for $\beta^1 = 0$ and $\beta^2 = 0.352$: From a population of 400 approximately on average 7.142 of the population are infected with infection 2, 1.293 with infection 1, 0.005 with both infections 1 and 2, and 391.56 are susceptible. For any $\beta^2 > \beta_{cr}^2$, the model approaches a fixed point solution different than the origin, although the values of $p^1$, $p^2$, and $p^{12}$ are small (of order of $\beta^2 - \beta_{cr}^2$).
FIG. 5. (a) The largest eigenvalue of the Jacobian matrix of the two-contingent model evaluated at 0 as a function of $\beta^1$ and $\beta^2$; the rest of the parameters are fixed to $\gamma^1 = 0.8$, $\gamma^2 = 0.2$, $\mu^{12} = 0.3$, $\mu^{21} = 0.2$. The curve indicates $\beta^2_{cr}$ as a functions of $\beta^1_{cr}$ given by Eq. (15). (b) Fractions of infected population as a function of time for $\beta^1 = 0$ and $\beta^2 = 0.352$. The parameter $\beta^2$ is chosen such that is slightly larger than the critical value $\beta^2_{cr} = 0.345$.

In the next example, we assume that $d = 2$, $\beta = \beta^1 = \beta^2$, and $\hat{\beta} = \beta^1_2 = \beta^2_1$. Setting $\lambda_{max} = 0$ (equivalently $R_0 = 1$) leads to the following relation between the critical values of $\beta$ and $\hat{\beta}$, $\beta_{cr}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{cr}$ (see Appendix A), $\hat{\beta}_{cr} = \beta_{cr} + c$, for $0 \leq \beta_{cr}^1 \leq c_2$ where $c_2 > 0$ and $c > 0$ are constants that depend on the parameters $\mu^{12}, \mu^{21}, \gamma^1, \text{ and } \gamma^2$. Again the absence of epidemic threshold ($\beta = 0$) is observed while the epidemic state is presented (when $\hat{\beta} > c$). Finally, we remark that in a special case when $\beta^1_\delta = \beta^2_\delta \equiv \beta_\delta$ for all $\delta$ and $\gamma^1 = \gamma^2 \equiv \gamma$, 
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FIG. 6. \( \beta_1 \) vs \( \beta_2 \) and the number of infected individuals with contagion 1 (left) and contagion 2 (right). Plot (a) shows mixing of the prevalence of both pathogens, whereas in plot (b) there is a sharp delineation for the model with competitive exclusion. Both (a) and (b) are created with \( \gamma_1 = 0.2, \gamma_2 = 0.6 \). Mutation rates are \( \mu_{12} = 0.3, \mu_{21} = 0.2 \) for (a) and \( \mu_{12} = \mu_{21} = 0 \) for (b).

The basic reproduction number \( (14) \) reduces to \( R_0 = (\sum \delta \beta_\delta) / \gamma \) for arbitrary values of \( \mu_{12} \) and \( \mu_{21} \). Therefore, in this example, mutation does not influence the basic reproduction number and the corresponding threshold as long as the transmission and recovery rates of two contingents are equal to each other. Moreover, if, in addition, \( \beta_\delta = \beta \) for all \( \delta \), the basic reproduction number reduces to \( R_0 = (d\beta) / \gamma \).
V. COMPETING EPIDEMICS ON NETWORKS

We now consider the case of our coinfection model when each node can be either susceptible or can be infected only by a single contagion, yielding a competition model. We further assume that each contagion can be transmitted through one layer (contagion $\alpha$ transmits on layer $\alpha$), so that $\beta^\alpha \equiv \beta_\delta^\alpha \neq 0$ only when $\delta = \alpha$. Since, in this case $|L| \leq 1$, the model equations (4) become

$$\frac{dp_{\alpha,i}}{dt} = \left(1 - \sum_{\delta \in H} p_{\delta,i}\right) \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^\alpha \beta^\alpha p_{\alpha,j} + \sum_{\delta \in H} p_{\delta,i} \mu^\delta - p_{\alpha,i} (\gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} \mu^\delta)$$

(16)

for $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The model (16) has several properties. First, when $\mu^\alpha = 0$ for all $\alpha$ and $\delta$, and $\gamma^\alpha \neq \gamma^\delta$ for all $\alpha$ and $\delta$ (or $\beta^\alpha \neq \beta^\delta$, for all $\alpha$ and $\delta$), Eq. (16) represents winner-take-all competition model (mechanism). Indeed, as shown in Appendix B, in this case, the only nontrivial equilibrium of the model is a point for which $p_i^\alpha \neq 0$ for given $\alpha$ and all $i$, while for all other values of $\kappa \neq \alpha$, $p_i^\kappa = 0$ for all $i$. An illustration of this property can be seen in Figure 6b, where $\mu^\alpha = 0$, whereas a prevalence of multiple contagions can be seen in Figure 6a for $\mu^\alpha \neq 0$. Second, the critical threshold is equal to:

$$\beta^{\alpha}_{cr} \approx \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} (\mu^\alpha - \mu^\delta)}{\lambda_{max}(A^\alpha)} & s \geq 0 \\ \frac{-\gamma^\alpha + \sum_{\delta \in H} (-\mu^\alpha + \mu^\delta)}{\lambda_{max}(A^\alpha)} & s < 0 \end{cases}$$

(17)

$$\beta_{cr} = \min_{\alpha} \beta^{\alpha}_{cr}$$

(18)

This is a generalization of (2). For symmetric case $\mu^\alpha = \mu^\delta$, (18) reduces to the well-known threshold $\beta_{cr} = \min_{\alpha} \{\gamma^\alpha/\lambda_{max}(A^\alpha)\}$. Figure 7 depicts the number of infected nodes versus $\beta$ in the competing three-contagion model on three-layer network. For the winner-take-all model, $\beta_{cr}$, computed using Eq. (18), is equal to $\beta_{cr} = \min_{\alpha} \beta^{\alpha}_{cr} = \min\{0.008, 0.024, 0.0117\} = 0.008$, which is approximately equal to the value obtained numerically (see Fig. 7a). In the case of Fig 7b, the critical values of $\beta$ for each layer, Eq. (17), are 0.010, 0.030, and 0.004; however, $\beta_{cr}$ obtained numerically is slightly above $\beta_{cr} = 0.004$ computed from (18).
FIG. 7. Competing three-contagion model on three-layer network. The number of infected nodes versus $\beta$. (a) For $\mu^{\alpha \delta} \neq 0$, all three infections are presented in the network. (b) Winner-take-all model: $\mu^{\alpha \delta} = 0$ for all $\alpha, \delta, \gamma^1 = 0.2, \gamma^2 = 0.6$, and $\gamma^3 = 0.3$. Parameter values are: $\gamma^1 = 0.2, \gamma^2 = 0.6$, and $\gamma^3 = 0.3, \mu^{12} = 0.1, \mu^{13} = 0.2, \mu^{21} = 0.12, \mu^{23} = 0.24, \mu^{31} = 0.12, \mu^{32} = 0.12$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have suggested a multiple contagion SIS model on a multilayer network that incorporates different spreading channels and disease mutations. The model is analytically tractable; in particular, the absence of epidemic threshold and critical behavior even for compartmental models could further improve our understanding of epidemic spreading. Therefore, the infections can proliferate on arbitrary networks whatever spreading rates they may have. The results obtained here could have implications in various disciplines including epidemiology, biology, and sociology.
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APPENDIX

A. Two-contagion compartmental SIS model

As an example, we consider 2 contingents (resulting in 4 compartments), $d$ layers, and write $p^0 = p_0$, $p^{(1)} = p_1$, $p^{(2)} = p_2$, and $p^{(1,2)} = p_3$. Then the model equations can be written as:

$$
\dot{p}_0 = p_1 \gamma_1 + p_2 \gamma_2 - p_0 \left[ (p_1 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^1 + (p_2 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^2 \right]
$$

$$
\dot{p}_1 = p_2 \mu_1^{12} + p_3 (\gamma_2 + \mu_1^{21}) + p_0 \left[ (p_1 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^1 \right] - p_1 \left[ \gamma_1 + \mu_1^{12} + (p_2 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^2 \right]
$$

$$
\dot{p}_2 = p_1 \mu_1^{12} + p_3 (\gamma_1 + \mu_1^{12}) + p_0 \left[ (p_2 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^2 \right] - p_2 \left[ \gamma_2 + \mu_2^{11} + (p_1 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^1 \right]
$$

$$
\dot{p}_3 = p_2 (p_1 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^1 + p_1 (p_2 + p_3) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \beta_\alpha^2 - p_3 (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \mu_1^{12} + \mu_1^{21})
$$

Since $p_0(t) + p_1(t) + p_2(t) + p_3(t) = 1$ for all $t$, we keep only $p_1, p_2, p_3$ variables. The Jacobian matrix of the model evaluated at origin is a $3 \times 3$ matrix:

$$
J = \begin{bmatrix}
\sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_\delta^1 - (\gamma_1 + \mu_1^{12}) & \mu_1^{21} & \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_\delta^1 + \gamma_2 + \mu_1^{21} \\
\mu_1^{12} & \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_\delta^2 - (\gamma_1 + \mu_1^{21}) & \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_\delta^2 + \gamma_1 + \mu_1^{12} \\
0 & 0 & -(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \mu_1^{12} + \mu_1^{21})
\end{bmatrix}
$$

One of the eigenvalue is equal to $-(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \mu_1^{12} + \mu_1^{21})$ (and hence is always negative). The other two eigenvalues of the model are the eigenvalues of the matrix $A$ defined as:

$$
A = \begin{bmatrix}
\sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_\delta^1 - (\gamma_2 + \mu_1^{21}) & \mu_1^{21} \\
\mu_1^{12} & \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_\delta^2 - (\gamma_1 + \mu_1^{21})
\end{bmatrix}
$$
The largest eigenvalue of the Jacobian $J$ is, therefore, given by:

$$
\lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{a + b + \sqrt{(a + b)^2 - 4(ab - \mu^{12}\mu^{21})}}{2}
$$

where $a = \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_{\delta}^{1} - (\gamma^{1} + \mu^{12})$ and $b = \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \beta_{\delta}^{2} - (\gamma^{2} + \mu^{21})$. The last equation can be rewritten as

$$
\lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{a + b + \sqrt{(a - b)^2 + 4\mu^{12}\mu^{21}}}{2} = \begin{cases} 
 a + \epsilon & a \geq b \\
 b + \epsilon & a < b
\end{cases},
$$

where $\epsilon$ is a function of $\mu^{12}$ and $\mu^{21}$. Setting $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 0$, the basic reproduction number becomes:

$$
R_0 = \begin{cases} 
 \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \frac{\beta_{\delta} + \epsilon}{\gamma_{\delta}^{1} + \mu^{12}} & a \geq b \\
 \sum_{\delta=1}^{d} \frac{\beta_{\delta} + \epsilon}{\gamma_{\delta}^{2} + \mu^{21}} & a < b.
\end{cases}
$$

We consider two examples. In the first example we assume $d = 1$ and let $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 0$ (equivalently $R_0 = 1$). Then, the critical values of $\beta_{1}^{1}$ and $\beta_{1}^{2}$, $\beta_{cr}$ and $\beta_{cr}^{2}$, are related to each other through equation $ab = \mu^{12}\mu^{21}$, which can be rewritten as

$$
\beta_{cr}^{2} = \frac{\mu^{12}\mu^{21}}{\beta_{cr}^{1} - \gamma^{1} - \mu^{12}} + \gamma^{2} + \mu^{21}
$$

for $0 \leq \beta_{cr}^{1} \leq c_1$ where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant that depends on the parameters $\mu^{12}$, $\mu^{21}$, $\gamma^{1}$, and $\gamma^{2}$.

For the second example, we assume that $d = 2$, and write $\beta = \beta_{1}^{1} = \beta_{2}^{2}$, and $\hat{\beta} = \beta_{2}^{1} = \beta_{1}^{2}$. Setting $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 0$ (equivalently $R_0 = 1$) leads to the following two relations between the critical values of $\beta$ and $\hat{\beta}$, $\beta_{cr}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{cr}$,

$$
(\hat{\beta}_{cr})^2 + \hat{\beta}_{cr}(2\beta_{cr} + c + d) + (\beta_{cr} + c)(\beta_{cr} + d) - \mu^{12}\mu^{21} = 0
$$

$$
(\beta_{cr})^2 + \beta_{cr}(2\beta_{cr} + c + d) + (\hat{\beta}_{cr} + c)(\hat{\beta}_{cr} + d) - \mu^{12}\mu^{21} = 0
$$

which, after some algebra, can be written as $\hat{\beta}_{cr} = \beta_{cr} + c$, for $0 \leq \beta_{cr}^{1} \leq c_2$ where $c_2 > 0$ and $c > 0$ are constants that depend on the parameters $\mu^{12}$, $\mu^{21}$, $\gamma^{1}$, and $\gamma^{2}$.

B. Removing mutation leads to competitive exclusion

Assume $\mu_{\alpha\delta} = 0$ for all $\alpha$ and $\delta$, and $\gamma^{\alpha} \neq \gamma^{\delta}$ for all $\alpha$ and $\delta$ (or $\beta^{\alpha} \neq \beta^{\delta}$, for all $\alpha$ and $\delta$). Let $q_{i}^{\alpha}$ be a fixed point solution for the model

$$
\dot{p}_{i}^{\alpha} = \left(1 - \sum_{\delta=1}^{m} p_{i}^{\delta}(t)\right) \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{\alpha} p_{j}^{\alpha}(t) - p_{i}^{\alpha}(t)\gamma^{\alpha}
$$

(19)
In other words,
\[
\left(1 - \sum_{\delta=1}^{m} q_{\delta}\right) \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{\alpha} q_{j}^{\alpha} - q_{i}^{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha} = 0
\]

Writing \(Q^{\alpha} = [q_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, q_{n}^{\alpha}]^T\), the last equation, after some algebra, can be rewritten as:
\[
\vec{0} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \sum_{\delta=1}^{m} q_{\delta} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 - \sum_{\delta=1}^{m} q_{n} \end{bmatrix} A^{\alpha} \beta^{\alpha} Q^{\alpha} - Q^{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha}
\]

\[
\vec{0} = (Z A^{\alpha} \beta^{\alpha} - \gamma^{\alpha} I) Q^{\alpha}
\]

(20)

Assumption \(Q^{\alpha} \neq 0\) for all \(\alpha\) leads to a contradiction; indeed, in this case, after some algebra, Eq. (20) can be written as \(Z = \frac{\gamma^{\alpha}}{\beta^{\alpha}} (A^{\alpha})^{-1}\). The matrix \(Z\) is a constant matrix and it does not depend on \(\alpha\), while the right-hand side of the last equation takes different values for different \(\alpha\). Therefore, there exists \(\hat{\alpha}\) such that \(Q^{\alpha} = 0\) for all \(\alpha \neq \hat{\alpha}\) and \(ZA^{\hat{\alpha}} \beta^{\hat{\alpha}} = \gamma^{\hat{\alpha}} I\).

For the compartmental model, we have
\[
p^{\alpha} = \left(1 - \sum_{\delta=1}^{m} p^{\delta}(t)\right) \beta^{\alpha} p^{\alpha}(t) - p^{\alpha}(t) \gamma^{\alpha}
\]
\[
0 = \left(1 - \sum_{\delta=1}^{m} q^{\delta}\right) \beta^{\alpha} q^{\alpha} - q^{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha}
\]

Assumption \(p^{\alpha} \neq 0\) for all \(\alpha\) leads to a contradiction \(\sum_{\delta=1}^{m} p^{\delta}(t) = (\beta^{\alpha} - \gamma^{\alpha})/\beta^{\alpha}\). Therefore, there exists \(\hat{\alpha}\) such that \(q^{\alpha} = 0\) for all \(\alpha \neq \hat{\alpha}\) and \(q^{\hat{\alpha}} = 1 - \beta^{\hat{\alpha}}/\gamma^{\hat{\alpha}}\).


