

SIMULATING THE EFFECTS OF WANING IMMUNITY USING A MULTI-COMPARTMENT EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODEL

SHOSHANA ELGART

ABSTRACT. We construct an epidemiological model that mimics the effect of waning immunity by dividing the total susceptible population into subgroups (compartments) with different rates of infection. As time progresses and immune memory erodes, an individual in a given susceptible compartment can transition to a different compartment. We then study the effectiveness of different vaccination methods (by vaccinating different susceptible compartments) within this model. Our results highlight the fact that the conditions at which a disease becomes extinct are considerably sensitive to the immunological mechanisms of immunity and vaccination, and emphasize the need for efficiency in vaccination schemes.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

1.1. Introduction. The purpose of this work is to introduce and analyze a simple epidemiological model that depicts waning immunity boosted by an optimized immunization scheme. While for many infectious diseases the level of immunity gained after recovery or after a single immunization does not wane with time, there exist numerous diseases, ranging from pertussis to likely COVID-19, that do not possess this feature. (The analysis of other human coronaviruses [13] and confirmed, though still rare, cases of reinfection indicate that COVID-19 disease immunity is liable to be temporary. In addition, newer data [11] argues that the immunity gained from the commonly-used Pfizer vaccine wanes relatively rapidly as well.)

Our system belongs to a class of mean-field compartmental epidemiological models at whose root lies the classic SIR (susceptible-infected-recovered) model. This model was introduced and first studied by Kermack and McKendrick in 1927, laying a foundation for the field of mathematical epidemiology and playing a crucial role in later advances, as many of the statistical depictions of infectious diseases are constructed along the same principles as the SIR model. We will now proceed to describe the SIR model and refer the interested reader to a recent text [5] for a description of the model's extensive variations and other developments.

The SIR model divides a population affected or soon to be affected by an epidemic into three compartments, or groups, that consist of susceptible (S), infectious (I), and recovered (R) individuals. As the epidemic continues, the size of these groups varies as individuals contract the disease and recover, thus moving between compartments. This variation in compartment size over time is represented through a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs).

The movement of individuals between compartments can be described as follows:

- (i) When a susceptible and an infectious individual come into contact, the susceptible individual can contract the disease, moving to the compartment I . The rate at which susceptible individuals fall ill is known as the force of infection. In models chosen to have density-dependent transmission, such as the one in this text, the force of infection is the product of the disease's transmission rate and the number of infectious individuals, and is in turn multiplied by the number of susceptible individuals to represent movement in the direction of the infectious compartment (as a greater number of both susceptible and infectious individuals results in more transmission of the disease). The transmission rate is henceforth denoted by β .

- (ii) An individual is said to recover at a certain rate r , where $\frac{1}{r}$ is the average amount of time spent infectious. The rate at which individuals leaves the infectious compartment and enter the recovered compartment is thus rI .

The no-demography SIR model can thus be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta SI; \\ \frac{dI}{dt} &= \beta SI - rI; \\ \frac{dR}{dt} &= rI,\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

The sole equilibrium, or steady-state, solution for this system is a disease-free equilibrium (DFE) corresponding to a population in which the disease is not present and given by

$$(S^*, I^*, R^*) = (1, 0, 0)$$

(where the asterisk denotes an equilibrium solution and we assume that the values of S , I , and R are fractions of the total population, so that $S + R + I = 1$. Introducing demography into the above model gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS}{dt} &= \mu - \beta SI - \mu S; \\ \frac{dI}{dt} &= \beta SI - rI - \mu I; \\ \frac{dR}{dt} &= rI - \mu R,\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

In addition to possessing a DFE, this system also possesses an endemic equilibrium, equivalent to a population with a constant level of disease that cannot be eradicated without changing the conditions to which the system is subject (i.e., the structure of the model). Setting the left side of each equation to 0 and solving the resulting equations gives the endemic equilibrium.

The asymptotic stability of that equilibrium can be determined by either considering the linearized version of the system (its Jacobian matrix evaluated at the equilibrium), which yields local stability, or by determining a Lyapunov function that indicates global stability. The stability of the DFE is usually encoded in a parameter-dependent quantity R_0 , the basic reproduction number, which exceeds 1 when the DFE is unstable and falls below 1 if the DFE is (locally) asymptotically stable. As a result, reducing the R_0 to the point where it is below 1 for both the SIR model and its relatively close relatives causes the number of infected individuals in the population to steadily decrease until the entire population is disease-free.

We can now outline our model (see (3) and (4) below for the corresponding model equations). The primary idea behind our depiction of waning immunity involves splitting the S compartment in the SIR model into (sub)compartments S_0, S_1, \dots, S_n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where each S_k is characterized by a different level of susceptibility to the disease and thus subject to a different transmission rate β_k . This is done in order to best depict the gradual and progressive loss of immunity realistic for many diseases. While there could be many factors that can affect the immunity of a susceptible individual and the probability of the latter contracting the disease, on the mean-field level immunity levels depend only on the time elapsed between the moment of recovery or immunization and present time. To simplify our analysis, we will assume that the infection rates of just recovered and freshly immunized individuals are the same and will place both categories into the most-immune S_0 compartment.

As time progresses and immune memory erodes, an individual in a given susceptible compartment S_k will move to the adjacent compartment S_{k+1} for $k < n$ at the rate δ . We note that, by construction, the transmission rates satisfy the relations $\beta_0 \leq \beta_1 \leq \dots \leq \beta_n$. In addition, we make the common assumption that birth and death rates coincide for all compartments and will denote both by μ .

Finally, we investigate the effect of the immunization schemes where only members of a single S_k compartment (with k equal to an integer between 0 and n) are immunized, or transferred to S_0 , at the rate ω . The individuals vaccinated in these schemes are therefore those who have reached a fixed level of immune memory as a result of waning immunity from either the disease or the vaccine. If k is small relative to n , intervals between successive vaccinations are brief, which diminishes supplies and may in a practical sense be impossible for the general population. On the other hand, allowing for k to grow relatively large means that susceptible individuals awaiting immunization become over time more and more susceptible to the virus, increasing their likelihood of contracting an infection. Thus, a central question in this paper has to do with determining the optimal choice for k , which results in a booster vaccination scheme that both allows R_0 to fall below 1 and enables a longer period between successive immunizations.

Notation. – We will use the following parameters (all rates below are in units days⁻¹):

- δ : The approximate rate of waning immunity, where $\frac{1}{\delta}$ is the amount of time needed to pass from compartment S_m , where $0 \leq m < n$, to compartment S_{m+1} ;
- β_i : The transmission rate, or likelihood of contracting the disease, for the compartment S_i ;
- r : The recovery rate for infected individuals;
- μ : The birth and death rate, presumed to be equal;
- ω : The vaccination rate, for a preselected compartment S_k .

Further notation and assumptions:

- As the disease is not present in the population at the DFE, we write that $I^* = 0$.
- As in the SIR model described above, we assume that $\sum_i S_i + I = 1$.
- We likewise assume in the following two models that newborns are born into the fully susceptible compartment S_n (this is not the case for a variation of these models modified to take into account passive immunity in neonates, see 1.3).

We are now ready to formulate our systems of equations.

Case $k < n$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_0}{dt} &= \omega S_k - \delta S_0 + rI - \beta_0 I S_0 - \mu S_0; \\
\frac{dS_i}{dt} &= \delta(S_{i-1} - S_i) - \beta_i I S_i - \mu S_i, \quad i \neq \{0, k, n\}; \\
\frac{dS_k}{dt} &= -\omega S_k + \delta(S_{k-1} - S_k) - \beta_k I S_k - \mu S_k; \\
\frac{dS_n}{dt} &= \mu + \delta S_{n-1} - \beta_n I S_n - \mu S_n; \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= I \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i - rI - \mu I.
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Case $k = n$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_0}{dt} &= \omega S_n - \delta S_0 + rI - \beta_0 I S_0 - \mu S_0; \\
\frac{dS_i}{dt} &= \delta(S_{i-1} - S_i) - \beta_i I S_i - \mu S_i, \quad i \neq \{0, n\}; \\
\frac{dS_n}{dt} &= \mu - \omega S_n + \delta S_{n-1} - \beta_n I S_n - \mu S_n; \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= I \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i - rI - \mu I.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

1.2. Main results. Our first result concerns the infection-free dynamics obtained from (3) and (4) by setting I equal to 0. In this section, we essentially check that the model is capable of simulating reasonably well the intended effect of waning immunity (i.e., members of S_i compartment for each $i < n$ gradually drift into the S_n compartment as time progresses).




FIGURE 1. Symbolic representation of (4)

Theorem 1.1. *For infection-free dynamics without vaccination (i.e., $I = \omega = 0$) the systems (3) and (4) coincide. A unique equilibrium is given by $S_i^* = 0$ for $i \neq n$, $S_n^* = 1$, and the system decays (towards the equilibrium) exponentially fast for any initial state.*

Our next result concerns the stability/instability of the DFE for systems (3) and (4).

Theorem 1.2. (i) *The DFE for (3) is ω -independent. Moreover, it is stable if $\beta_n < r + \mu$ and unstable if $\beta_n > r + \mu$.*

(ii) *The DFE for (4) is ω -dependent. Moreover, it is asymptotically stable if $\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* < r + \mu$ and unstable if $\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* > r + \mu$. (If $\beta_n < r + \mu$, then the DFE is stable.)*

As we mention in Remark 3.1, the stability condition for the DFE is consistent with the instability condition for the endemic equilibrium and vice versa. The DFE is thus stable when $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$ and otherwise unstable for sufficiently small values of δ .

Furthermore, the threshold for DFE stability decreases as ω increases, with $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ yielding an asymptotically stable DFE provided

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \beta_i \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta + \mu} \right)^i \frac{\mu}{\nu(\delta + \mu)} < r + \mu.$$

For $\delta \ll 1$ this reduces to the condition $\beta_0 < r + \mu$ (cf. with $\beta_n < r + \mu$ for Part (i)).

Our next pair of assertions establish the conditions for the existence and uniqueness of the endemic equilibrium for the systems (3) and (4), respectively.

Theorem 1.3. *If $r + \mu > \beta_n$, then (3) has no realistic (positive) endemic equilibrium. If $r + \mu \leq \beta_n$, then there is exactly one endemic equilibria for δ sufficiently small. The value for I^* has to lie in the intervals \tilde{J}_2 described in Lemma 4.1 below, with $\omega = 0$.*

Theorem 1.4. *If*

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu,$$

there (4) has no realistic endemic equilibrium. If

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu,$$

then there is exactly one endemic equilibria for δ sufficiently small. The value for I^ has to lie in the intervals $J_{1,2}$ described in Lemma 4.1 below.*

Our final pair of results is concerned with the stability/instability of the endemic equilibrium for systems (3) and (4).

Theorem 1.5. *The endemic equilibrium for (4) is not only unique, but also asymptotically stable for*

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu,$$

provided δ is sufficiently small.

Theorem 1.6. *The endemic equilibrium for (3) is asymptotically stable for $\mu + r < \beta_n$, provided δ is sufficiently small.*

To summarize, in the regime of a small δ :

(i) For the first immunization scheme, (3):

- The DFE is ω -independent and asymptotically stable for $\beta_n < r + \mu$ and is unstable for $\beta_n > r + \mu$;
- A single realistic endemic equilibrium is present if $\beta_n > r + \mu$, and it is asymptotically stable (i.e., the disease persists). If $\beta_n < r + \mu$, no endemic equilibrium exists;
- As a result, the basic reproduction number R_0 is equal to $\frac{\beta_n}{r + \mu}$ regardless of whether we immunize the compartment $k < n$ (i.e., independent of the value of ω) or not. The implication is that this scheme is not an effective choice for vaccination.

(ii) For the second immunization scheme, (4):

- The DFE is ω -dependent and asymptotically stable for

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$$

and unstable for $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$ when δ is small;

- A single realistic endemic equilibrium is present if

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu,$$

and it is asymptotically stable. If

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu,$$

no endemic equilibrium exists;

- As a result, the basic reproduction number R_0 is equal to $\frac{(\beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu)}{(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r)}$. In particular, R_0 decreases as ω increases (i.e., a rapid enough vaccination rate under this scheme could bring about the stability of the DFE, making this vaccination strategy considerably more efficient within this framework).

1.3. Maternal immunity of neonates. A simple modification in our models allows us to take into account the initial maternal immunity of neonates if present. Specifically, let us assume that a newborn's initial immune memory coincides with that of the newborn's mother due to the mother's antibodies, derived either from vaccination or from recovery, passively acquired by infants before birth. This type of immunological behavior is expected to hold for most diseases, including COVID-19 (see [10] and [17]). To incorporate this into the model, we initially assign newborns to the compartment of their mothers. Newborns then leave these compartments as maternal immunity wanes over the first year of a newborn's life and, barring infection or similar negative circumstance, move into the fully-susceptible compartment S_n (as infants who lack maternal antibodies have no immunity to infectious disease).

Since we allow for neighboring compartments S_i, S_{i+1} to potentially have the same transmission rate, i.e., β_i could be equal to β_{i+1} , splitting compartments further if necessary we can construct a set of compartments such that without loss of generality that the rate at which newborns move into S_n is δ . Letting b be the fraction of newborns in the population, we can assume that each compartment, including I , contains the same fraction b of newborns.

Let us note that for $\mu \ll 1$ (which typically holds), $b \approx \mu \cdot 1\text{day}$. This follows from the approximation $e^x - 1 \approx x$ for small x and the fact that the number of new people in the population after a single day divided by the size of the population (the fraction of newborns) is equal to $e^{\mu \cdot 1\text{day}} - 1$.

We also assume that a healthy newborn with an infected mother is placed into the S_n compartment and that newborns are not vaccinated (consistent with COVID-19 vaccines, as an example). This is depicted by introducing the term $\delta b I$, representing the number of babies born to members of the infected compartment, who are transferred from the I compartment to the S_n . Let us now show the corresponding analogue of (3) in this case:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_0}{dt} &= \omega(1-b)S_k - \delta(1-b)S_0 + rI - \beta_0 I S_0 - \delta b S_0; \\ \frac{dS_i}{dt} &= \delta(1-b)(S_{i-1} - S_i) - \delta b S_i - \beta_i I S_i, \quad i \neq \{0, k, n\}; \\ \frac{dS_k}{dt} &= -\omega(1-b)S_k + \delta(1-b)(S_{k-1} - S_k) - \delta b S_k - \beta_k I S_k; \\ \frac{dS_n}{dt} &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta b S_i + \delta b I + \delta(1-b)S_{n-1} - \beta_n I S_n; \\ \frac{dI}{dt} &= I \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i - \delta b I - rI.\end{aligned}$$

Simplifying and using the conservation law $I + \sum_{i=0}^n S_i \equiv 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_0}{dt} &= \tilde{\omega}S_k - \tilde{\delta}S_0 + rI - \beta_0 I S_0 - \tilde{\mu}S_0; \\ \frac{dS_i}{dt} &= \tilde{\delta}(S_{i-1} - S_i) - \beta_i I S_i - \tilde{\mu}S_i, \quad i \neq \{0, k, n\}; \\ \frac{dS_k}{dt} &= -\tilde{\omega}S_k + \tilde{\delta}(S_{k-1} - S_k) - \beta_k I S_k - \tilde{\mu}S_k; \\ \frac{dS_n}{dt} &= \tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\delta}S_{n-1} - \beta_n I S_n - \tilde{\mu}S_n; \\ \frac{dI}{dt} &= I \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i - rI - \tilde{\mu}I,\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

where $\tilde{\omega} = \omega(1-b)$, $\tilde{\delta} = \delta(1-b)$, and $\tilde{\mu} = \delta b$.

As $b \in [0, 1]$, this simplification alters only the rates μ , δ , and ω , and does not change either the structure of the system or the qualitative results obtained upon analyzing it. As a result, we see that the new system (5) in fact coincides with (3) up to a change of parameters. Therefore, we reduce the analysis of the modified model to the one stated previously. The same considerations show that the corresponding modification of the scheme (4) is reduced back to (4) after the same change of parameters.

1.4. Relation to past works. There have been numerous works with the aim of illustrating and analyzing the impact of waning immunity and immune-boosting vaccination schemes on the prevalence of an infectious disease in a population. We mention several of the texts most relevant to the current paper below.

From a purely structural point of view, one of the first descriptions of truly many-compartmental (with " n " compartments) models in epidemiology occurred in [15], which subdivides the standard SI model into " n_1 " compartments based on the various stages of a vector-borne disease in a host.

One of the models conceptually closest to ours is [2], a variation of the classical SIR model which uses both ODE and PDE equations to depict the decaying and boosting of immunity in a population differentiated by susceptibility level. Here, this differentiation occurs on a continuous spectrum ranging from minimal to maximal immunity, and does not involve the use of more sub-compartments as in our model. This work then uses combinations of several analytical methods to find the location and determine the stability of the DFE.

Another model comparatively similar to that in this paper was introduced in [4]. This model is immuno-epidemiological, depicting the individual within-host dynamics of an infectious disease in addition to the dynamics of the population itself. It breaks down the compartments of the standard SEIR immunological model so as to differentiate between the varying degrees of immune memory of the individuals in each compartment. Individuals move throughout the distinct sub-compartments of each compartment as their immunity wanes or is boosted by vaccination in addition to moving between compartments. In order to analyze the above model, the authors used primarily numerical techniques, which yield, among other results, the likelihood of recurring cycles of epidemics over a long period of time.

A further example of a text that, as below, relies to an extent upon analytical techniques is [6], where waning immunity and vaccination schemes for pertussis are modeled using five susceptible compartments ranging from no immunity to full immunity, with age dynamics also taken into consideration. In particular, the authors find the location of the unique endemic equilibrium using consequent iterations of linear maps, and supplement other forms of rigorous analysis with a numerical simulation.

In addition, several prior works use many-compartmental models analytically in descriptions of spatially non-homogeneous epidemiological dynamics, e.g. in [1, 8, 9]. The idea in these papers is to represent the non-homogeneous population as consisting of homogeneous patches of SEIR (susceptible-exposed-infectious-recovered) individuals with a quadratic interaction between pairs of patches. Mathematically, such systems are conveniently described using graph theoretical language, with vertices representing patches. A pair of patches is then connected by an edge if they interact. The results in [1, 8, 9] establish the uniqueness of the endemic equilibrium in such systems under the assumption that the graph in question is strongly connected (this condition translates to an assumption of irreducibility on the underlying interaction matrix). One can further endow such systems with age dynamics, see e.g., [19].

Let us remark that, since the majority of nonlinear epidemiological model systems become linear when the interaction between healthy and infected individuals is removed, finding the location and determining the local stability of a system's DFE - where the population has no infectious individuals - is a linear problem that can usually be solved by purely matrix analytical methods. On the other hand, the fact that the original system being considered is non-linear means that determining the precise locations of endemic equilibria (or even showing their existence) is in general a much harder problem that cannot always be solved in closed form when the number of non-linearly interacting compartments exceeds two. Such complexity is reiterated in [2], whose otherwise very effective integration-based approach cannot be applied to the endemic equilibrium.

In general, waning immunity is a continuous process that, in the mean field approximation, is most naturally modeled by non-linear PDEs. Analyzing the detailed dynamical properties of these nonlinear systems is a difficult problem that, as far as we are aware, has only been studied numerically in the overwhelming majority of papers. (As mentioned above, most analytical works using such an approximation of waning immunity only study the dynamical structure of the DFE, which is essentially a linear problem.)

In this work, we discretize the continuous process of waning immunity to reduce the analysis to one of an arbitrarily large system of ODEs. The resulting model is more amenable to analytic techniques, specifically perturbation theory, which is then used to rigorously study the properties of the system. This in turn allows us to obtain a number of results pertaining to the local asymptotic stability of equilibria, as well as to their existence and uniqueness.

1.5. Paper's organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we discuss the infection-free dynamics of our system. Section 3 is concerned with the DFE and its stability. The existence and uniqueness results for the endemic equilibria are described in Section 4, and Section 5 is devoted to the endemic equilibria's stability.

2. INFECTION-FREE WANING IMMUNITY DYNAMICS

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 1.1. The infection-free waning immunity dynamics is described by the solution of the initial value problem (IVP):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS_0}{dt} &= -\delta S_0 - \mu S_0; \\
 \frac{dS_i}{dt} &= \delta(S_{i-1} - S_i) - \mu S_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}; \\
 \frac{dS_n}{dt} &= \mu + \delta S_{n-1} - \mu S_n; \\
 S_i(0) &= s_i, \quad \sum_i s_i = 1, s_i \geq 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\delta > 0$ describes the rate at which individuals move from compartment to compartment (we assume here that the only transition allowed is the transition $S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$, and that the rate of this transition does not depend on i). The parameter μ describes the demographics (i.e., the birth/death rates, which we assume to be identical here). Let us note that the total population $S(t) := \sum_{i=0}^n S_i(t)$ is preserved under this dynamics, and the non-negativity of the initial data $\{s_i\}$ ensures that $S_i(t)$ remains non-negative for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The solution of (6) can be obtained explicitly since the dynamics of the above system is linear. Specifically, denoting $\vec{S}(t) := (S_0(t), \dots, S_n(t))^T$, $\vec{S}_o := (s_0, \dots, s_n)^T$, and $e_n := (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T$, we have

$$\vec{S}(t) = \exp(Vt) \vec{S}_o + \mu \exp(Vt) \int_0^t \exp(-Vs) e_n ds, \tag{7}$$

where V is the associated Jacobian matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \delta & \eta & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta & \eta & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \eta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \delta & -\mu \end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta := -\delta - \mu.$$

Since V is a lower triangular matrix, its eigenvalues are its diagonal entries, i.e., its spectrum $\sigma(V) = \{-\delta - \mu, -\mu\}$. In particular, the asymptotic behavior of $\exp(Vt)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ is completely determined by the largest, simple eigenvalue $-\mu$ that has the eigenprojection

$$P_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

in a sense that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\kappa t} \|(e^{\mu t} \exp(Vt) - P_\mu)\| = 0, \tag{8}$$

for any $\kappa < \delta$. Using (7), $(\mathbf{1} - P_\mu) P_\mu = 0$, and $P_\mu \exp(Vt) = e^{-\mu t} P_\mu$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \vec{S}(t) - e_n &= P_\mu (\vec{S}(t) - e_n) + (\mathbf{1} - P_\mu) (\vec{S}(t) - e_n) \\
 &= e^{-\mu t} P_\mu \vec{S}_o - e^{-\mu t} e_n + (\mathbf{1} - P_\mu) \exp(Vt) \vec{S}_o.
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Hence, decomposing

$$(\mathbf{1} - P_\mu) \exp(Vt) \vec{S}_o = e^{-\mu t} (\mathbf{1} - P_\mu) (e^{\mu t} \exp(Vt) - P_\mu) \vec{S}_o$$

and using (8) and $\|\mathbb{1} - P_\mu\| = \sqrt{n+1}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\| e^{\kappa t} \left(\vec{S}(t) - e_n \right) \right\| &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-(\mu-\kappa)t} \\ &\times \left(\left\| P_\mu \vec{S}_o \right\| + 1 + \sqrt{n+1} \left\| e^{\mu t} \exp(Vt) - P_\mu \right\| \left\| \vec{S}_o \right\| \right) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for $\kappa < \mu$. This is expected, since e_n is a unique equilibrium for (6). We also see from (10) that the decay to the equilibrium occurs exponentially fast. \square

3. DISEASE-FREE EQUILIBRIA AND ITS STABILITY FOR SYSTEMS (3) AND (4)

3.1. Disease-free equilibria. If $k < n$, the DFE for (3) is given by

$$I^* = 0, \quad S_i^* = \begin{cases} 0, & i < n, \\ 1, & i = n, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

We note that the DFE here does not depend on the value of the vaccination parameter ω . In addition, as we shall see later, the R_0 for this system exhibits the same behavior.

The DFE for (4) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_0^* &= \frac{\omega}{\delta + \mu} S_n^*; \\ S_i^* &= \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta + \mu} \right)^i S_0^* = \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta + \mu} \right)^i \frac{\omega}{\delta + \mu} S_n^*, \quad i \neq \{0, n\}; \\ S_n^* &= \frac{\mu + \delta S_{n-1}^*}{\omega + \mu} = \frac{\mu}{\omega + \mu} + \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta + \mu} \right)^n \frac{\omega}{\omega + \mu} S_n^*. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The last equation allows us to find S_n^* (and hence all other S_i^*):

$$S_n^* = \frac{\mu}{\nu(\omega + \mu)}, \quad \nu := 1 - \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta + \mu} \right)^n \frac{\omega}{\omega + \mu}.$$

We note that in this case the DFE does depend on ω , a fact that we will occasionally stress by writing $S_i^*(\omega)$ instead of S_i^* . In particular, when $\omega = 0$ (no vaccine), $S_i^*(0)$ coincides with the solution (11), and in the other extreme case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} S_i^*(\omega) &= \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta + \mu} \right)^i \frac{\mu}{\nu(\delta + \mu)}, \quad i < n; \\ \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} S_n^*(\omega) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

When $\delta = 0$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} S_0^*(\omega) &= \frac{\omega}{\omega + \mu}; \\ S_i^*(\omega) &= 0, \quad i < n; \\ S_n^*(\omega) &= \frac{\mu}{\omega + \mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In particular, we see that, for $\delta = 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* = \frac{\omega \beta_0 + \mu \beta_n}{\omega + \mu}. \quad (15)$$

We can deduce from the above that:

Remark 3.1. For δ sufficiently close to 0 ($\delta \ll 1$), if $\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* < r + \mu$, then $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0 \omega + \beta_n \mu$. If $\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* > r + \mu$, then we have $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0 \omega + \beta_n \mu$.

This shows the consistency between the DFE's stability and the endemic equilibrium's instability (and the other way around) in (4), where the linear stability analysis for these particular conditions will be shown in the sections below.

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Let $\eta = -\delta - \mu$. We first observe that the Jacobian V for (4) is given by

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \eta - \beta_0 I & 0 & \dots & \omega & r - \beta_0 S_0 \\ \delta & \eta - \beta_1 I & \dots & 0 & -\beta_1 S_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu - \omega - \beta_n I & -\beta_n S_n \\ \beta_0 I & \beta_1 I & \dots & \beta_n I & -r - \mu + \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

For the DFE, this matrix is reduced to

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 0 & \dots & \omega & r - \beta_0 S_0^* \\ \delta & \eta & \dots & 0 & -\beta_1 S_1^* \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu - \omega & -\beta_n S_n^* \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -r - \mu + \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

We first use Laplace expansion of the determinant by the last row to evaluate the characteristic polynomial $p(z) = \det(V - z\mathbb{1})$ of V . This gives

$$p(z) = \left(-r - \mu + \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* - z \right) \det \begin{pmatrix} \eta - z & 0 & \dots & \omega \\ \delta & \eta - z & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu - \omega - z \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

Hence it suffices to estimate the location of the spectrum of the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 0 & \dots & \omega \\ \delta & \eta & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu - \omega \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

To this end, we use the Geršgorin circle theorem. Let $D_r(a)$ denote a closed disc in the complex plane centered at $a \in \mathbb{C}$ that has radius r . Then the Geršgorin discs for an $n \times n$ matrix M are defined as $\{D_{r_i}(M_{ii})\}_{i=1}^n$ with the radii $r_i = \sum_{j \neq i} |M_{ij}|$. The Geršgorin circle theorem [3] stipulates that the spectrum $\sigma(M)$ of M is located in the union of these discs, $\sigma(M) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n D_{r_i}(M_{ii})$. For the matrix M in (18), we have $M_{ii} = -\delta - \mu$ for $i < n$ and $M_{nn} = -\mu - \omega$, while $r_i = \delta$ for $i < n$ and $r_n = \omega$. In particular, $\cup_{i=1}^n D_{r_i}(M_{ii})$ is contained in the left half plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(z) \leq -\mu\}$. Hence the Geršgorin circle theorem implies that all but one eigenvalues of V have real part $\leq -\mu$. On the other hand, the remaining eigenvalue of V is $-r - \mu + \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^*$ (as can be seen from the expression for $p(z)$ in (17)), and the first statement of the theorem follows in this case by Hartman-Grobman theorem (see e.g., [18, Theorem 9.9]).

To show that the DFE is stable when $\beta_n < r + \mu$, we note that if $\beta_0 < \dots < \beta_n < r + \mu$, then

$$-r - \mu + \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* \leq -r - \mu + \beta_n \sum_{i=0}^n S_i^* = \beta_n - r - \mu < 0.$$

Furthermore, the threshold for the stability of the DFE, namely $T := \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^*$, monotonically decreases as ω increases. To this end, we express T as a function of $\xi := \frac{\omega}{\omega + \mu}$. Denoting $\sigma := \frac{\delta}{\delta + \mu}$ and using $\omega = \frac{\mu\xi}{1-\xi}$, we compute

$$T = \frac{A\xi}{1 - \sigma^n \xi} + \frac{\beta_n (1 - \xi)}{1 - \sigma^n \xi},$$

with

$$A = \frac{\mu}{(\delta + \mu)} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \beta_i \sigma^i.$$

Rearranging, we get

$$T = B + \frac{(A - \beta_n)\sigma^{-n} + \beta_n}{1 - \sigma^n \xi}, \quad (19)$$

where B is ξ -independent. Using $\beta_0 \leq \dots \leq \beta_n$, we can estimate

$$(A - \beta_n)\sigma^{-n} + \beta_n \leq \left(\frac{\mu}{\delta + \mu} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sigma^i - 1 \right) \sigma^{-n} \beta_n + \beta_n = 0,$$

so the numerator in (19) is non-positive (and is in fact strictly negative if $\beta_0 < \beta_n$). Since ξ is monotone increasing in ω , we deduce that $1 - \sigma^n \xi$ is monotone decreasing, which in turn implies that T is monotone decreasing in ω , as claimed.

The stability analysis for (3) is similar. We first compute the Jacobian V for (3), given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \eta - \beta_0 I & 0 & \dots & 0 & \omega & \dots & 0 & r - \beta_0 S_0 \\ \delta & \eta - \beta_1 I & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -\beta_1 S_1 \\ 0 & \delta & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -\beta_2 S_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \delta & \eta - \omega - \beta_k I & \dots & 0 & -\beta_k S_k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu - \beta_n I & -\beta_n S_n \\ \beta_0 I & \beta_1 I & \dots & \beta_{k-1} I & \beta_k I & \dots & \beta_n I & -r - \mu + B \end{pmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

where $B = \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i$. For the DFE, it reduces to

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \omega & \dots & 0 & r \\ \delta & \eta & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta & \eta & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \delta & \eta - \omega & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu & -\beta_n \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \beta_n - r - \mu \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now use Laplace expansion by the last row to evaluate the characteristic polynomial $p(z) = \det(V - z\mathbf{1})$. This gives

$$p(z) = (\beta_n - r - \mu - z) \det \begin{pmatrix} \eta - z & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \omega & \dots & 0 \\ \delta & \eta - z & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \delta & \eta - z & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \delta & \eta - \omega - z & \dots & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu - z \end{pmatrix}$$

Hence it suffices to estimate the location of the spectrum of the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \omega & \dots & 0 \\ \delta & \eta & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \delta & \eta & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \delta & \eta - \omega & \dots & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the Geršgorin circle theorem again, we see that each eigenvalue of M is located in the left half-plane and thus has negative real part. Since the remaining eigenvalue for V is given by $\beta_n - r - \mu$ (as we can see from $p(z)$), the result follows in this case from standard linear stability analysis. \square

4. ENDEMIC EQUILIBRIA FOR SYSTEMS (3) AND (4)

4.1. Existence of the endemic equilibria.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} I^* + \sum_{i=0}^n S_i^* &= 1; \\ \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* &= r + \mu \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

for any equilibrium with $I^* \neq 0$ (where we use the conservation law $I(t) + \sum_{i=0}^n S_i(t) \equiv 1$ in the first equality).

We next express the vector $\vec{S}^* := (S_0^*, \dots, S_n^*)^T$ in terms of I^* by writing

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \omega S_n^* - \delta S_0^* + r I^* - \beta_0 I^* S_0^* - \mu S_0^*; \\ 0 &= \delta(S_{i-1}^* - S_i^*) - \beta_i I^* S_i^* - \mu S_i^*, \quad i \neq \{0, n\}; \\ 0 &= \mu - \omega S_n^* + \delta S_{n-1}^* - \beta_n I^* S_n^* - \mu S_n^* \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

as $\vec{R} = A_\delta \vec{S}^*$, where $\vec{R} = (r I^*, 0, \dots, 0, \mu)^T$ and the $n \times n$ matrix A_δ is given by

$$A_\delta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_0 I^* - \eta & 0 & \dots & -\omega \\ -\delta & \beta_1 I^* - \eta & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \mu + \omega + \beta_n I^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta = -\delta - \mu. \tag{23}$$

In particular, if A_δ is invertible (which as we will show is true for small values of δ), we get $\vec{S}^* = A_\delta^{-1} \vec{R}$. Let $\vec{B} = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_n)^T$, then (21) yields

$$r + \mu = \vec{B} \cdot \vec{S}^* = \vec{B} \cdot (A_\delta^{-1} \vec{R}) =: F_\delta(I^*). \tag{24}$$

We rewrite the latter equation as

$$r + \mu - F_0(I^*) = F_\delta(I^*) - F_0(I^*). \tag{25}$$

The idea now is to show that

$$|F_\delta(I^*) - F_0(I^*)| \leq K\delta \tag{26}$$

for some δ independent constant K , for sufficiently small values of δ . This would imply that I^* has to satisfy the inequality

$$|r + \mu - F_0(I^*)| \leq K\delta, \tag{27}$$

which will allow to determine the location of I^* within $\sqrt{\delta}$ precision using Pólya's theorem on polynomials. We then will show that the uniqueness of the corresponding solution.

We now proceed by showing the details of these steps. To get (26) we will be using the following estimates [7, Lemma 7.18]:

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_\delta^{-1}\| &\leq \frac{\|A_0^{-1}\|}{1 - \|A_\delta - A_0\| \|A_0^{-1}\|}; \\ \|A_\delta^{-1} - A_0^{-1}\| &\leq \|A_\delta - A_0\| \frac{\|A_0^{-1}\|^2}{1 - \|A_\delta - A_0\| \|A_0^{-1}\|}, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

provided $\|A_\delta - A_0\| \|A_0^{-1}\| < 1$. In our case,

$$A_\delta - A_0 = \delta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

and thus

$$\|A_\delta - A_0\| \leq 2\delta, \quad (30)$$

where we used the Schur test, [16, §2, Theorem I]

$$\|M\| \leq \sqrt{\|M\|_1 \|M\|_\infty}, \quad (31)$$

where $\|M\|_1$ is the matrix 1-norm of an $n \times n$ matrix M , given by

$$\|M\|_1 = \max_j \sum_{i=1}^n |M_{ij}|,$$

and $\|M\|_\infty$ is the matrix ∞ -norm of an $n \times n$ matrix M , given by

$$\|M\|_\infty = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^n |M_{ij}|,$$

see, e.g., [3].

On the other hand, we can evaluate A_0^{-1} explicitly:

$$A_0^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (\beta_0 I^* + \mu)^{-1} & 0 & \dots & \omega (\beta_0 I^* + \mu)^{-1} (\mu + \omega + \beta_n I^*)^{-1} \\ 0 & (\beta_1 I + \mu)^{-1} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & (\mu + \omega + \beta_n I^*)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

Using (31) and $\beta_0 < \beta_n$, we can bound

$$\|A_0^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\beta_0 I^* + \mu}. \quad (33)$$

Hence $\|A_\delta - A_0\| \|A_0^{-1}\| < 1/2$ for δ sufficiently small, and we can bound the right hand side of the second inequality in (28) by $\hat{K}\delta$ for some δ -independent constant \hat{K} , using (30) and (32).

Combining these bounds, we get

$$|F_\delta(I^*) - F_0(I^*)| \leq \|\vec{B}\| \|A_\delta^{-1} - A_0^{-1}\| \|\vec{R}\| \leq \frac{8\delta\sqrt{n+1}\beta_n(r+\mu)}{(\beta_0 I^* + \mu)^2} \quad (34)$$

and (26) follows. We now state the implications of the bound (27).

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a constant C such that for δ sufficiently small, a set of possible values I^* for endemic equilibria in (4) is contained in the union of two intervals*

$$J_1 = [y_1 - C\sqrt{\delta}, y_1 + C\sqrt{\delta}], \quad J_2 = [y_2 - C\sqrt{\delta}, y_2 + C\sqrt{\delta}] \quad (35)$$

where $y_{1,2}$ are roots of the equation

$$1 + \frac{r}{\beta_0 x + \mu} - \frac{\beta_n}{\beta_n x + \mu + \omega} - \frac{\omega\beta_0}{(\beta_0 x + \mu)(\beta_n x + \mu + \omega)} = 0. \quad (36)$$

In particular, if this equation has no real roots or no roots in $[0, 1]$, then for δ small enough we don't have endemic equilibria. This is the case for

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu.$$

If $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$, then there is exactly one root y_2 in $[0, 1]$ (with $y_2 = 0$ for $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) = \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$).

Proof: We first note that F_0 can be evaluated explicitly, namely

$$F_0(I^*) = \vec{B} \cdot \left(A_0^{-1} \vec{R} \right) = \frac{\omega\mu\beta_0}{(\beta_0 I^* + \mu)(\beta_n I^* + \mu + \omega)} + \frac{r\beta_0 I^*}{\beta_0 I^* + \mu} + \frac{\mu\beta_n}{\beta_n I^* + \mu + \omega}, \quad (37)$$

using (32). Thus, after simplifications,

$$r + \mu - F_0(x) = \mu + \frac{r\mu}{\beta_0 x + \mu} - \frac{\mu\beta_n}{\beta_n x + \mu + \omega} - \frac{\omega\mu\beta_0}{(\beta_0 x + \mu)(\beta_n x + \mu + \omega)}. \quad (38)$$

Taking the common denominator yields

$$r + \mu - F_0(x) = Q(x) \frac{\mu\beta_0\beta_n}{(\beta_0 x + \mu)(\beta_n x + \mu + \omega)}, \quad Q(x) = x^2 + ax + b, \quad (39)$$

with

$$a = \frac{\beta_0(\mu + \omega) + \beta_n(\mu + r - \beta_0)}{\beta_0\beta_n}, \quad b = \frac{(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) - (\beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu)}{\beta_0\beta_n}. \quad (40)$$

Hence (27) can be rewritten as

$$|Q(I^*)| \leq \tilde{C}\delta(\beta_0 I^* + \mu)(\beta_n I^* + \mu + \omega), \quad (41)$$

and since $I^* \in [0, 1]$, we deduce that if I^* satisfies (41), then it also satisfies

$$|Q(I^*)| \leq \tilde{C}\delta \max_{x \in [0, 1]} (\beta_0 x + \mu)(\beta_n x + \mu + \omega) = \hat{C}\delta \quad (42)$$

as well. It means that, if \mathcal{B} denotes the set

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ x \in [0, 1] : |Q(x)| \leq \hat{C}\delta \right\}, \quad (43)$$

then any solution I^* of (22) is contained in \mathcal{B} .

Since $Q(x)$ is a continuous function, we know that \mathcal{B} is the union of disjoint closed interval(s) and that $Q(x)$ assumes the values $\pm\hat{C}\delta$ at the endpoints of these intervals. There are at most two intervals $\tilde{J}_{1,2}$ such that $\mathcal{B} = \tilde{J}_1 \cup \tilde{J}_2$, since a quadratic polynomial Q can assume any value at most twice.

Next we want to estimate the size (namely, the Lebesgue measure) of the set \mathcal{B} . To this end we use Pólya's theorem [14]: If P is a monic polynomial of degree n , then

$$m(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |P(x)| \leq \epsilon\}) \leq 4 \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)^{1/n}, \quad \epsilon > 0, \quad (44)$$

where $m(\cdot)$ stands for the Lebesgue measure of a set here.

This allows us to bound a measure of the set \mathcal{B} defined in (43), namely ($n = 2$ and with the choice $\epsilon = \hat{C}\delta$)

$$m(\mathcal{B}) \leq 2\sqrt{2\hat{C}\delta}. \quad (45)$$

If $Q(x)$ does not have real roots then $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$ for δ sufficiently small, so there could not be an endemic equilibrium. If roots $y_{1,2}$ of $Q(x)$ - that is, roots of (36) are real,

$$y_i : Q(y_i) = 0, \quad y_1 \leq y_2, \quad (46)$$

then they are contained in \mathcal{B} , and it consists of at most two intervals. Moreover, we can deduce from symmetry considerations that in this case $\mathcal{B} \subset J_1 \cup J_2$, where

$$J_1 = \left[y_1 - \sqrt{2\delta\hat{C}}, y_1 + \sqrt{2\delta\hat{C}} \right], \quad J_2 = \left[y_2 - \sqrt{2\delta\hat{C}}, y_2 + \sqrt{2\delta\hat{C}} \right]. \quad (47)$$

This implies that the solutions of (22) for $I^* \in (0, 1]$ have to satisfy

$$I^* \in (J_1 \cup J_2) \cap [0, 1]. \quad (48)$$

Hence if $y_1 < 0$, we see that $I^* \in J_2$, and if $y_1 > 1$, we infer that there are no endemic equilibria for δ sufficiently small. This establishes (35).

We now analyze the conditions under which (36) has roots in $[0, 1]$. First, evaluating the left hand side of (36) for $x = 0$, we get

$$\frac{(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) - (\beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu)}{\mu(\mu + \omega)},$$

so the lhs is negative for $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$ at this value for x . On the other hand, evaluating the lhs for $x = 1$, we get

$$\frac{\mu(\mu + \omega + \beta_0) + r(\mu + \omega + \beta_n)}{(\beta_0 + \mu)(\beta_n + \mu + \omega)} > 0.$$

This implies by the intermediate value theorem that there must be a root y for (36) if

$$(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) < \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu.$$

Moreover, upon taking the common denominator in (36) we get a quadratic polynomial in the numerator (a multiple of Q with a positive leading coefficient), which is negative at 0 and is positive at 1. This in fact implies that there is only one root y_2 in $(0, 1)$, with the second root strictly negative in this case.

If $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$, the coefficients a, b in (40) are positive. For b it follows directly from (40), while for a it follows from the observation that $(\omega + \mu)(\mu + r) > \beta_0\omega + \beta_n\mu$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{\beta_0\omega}{\omega + \mu} + \frac{\beta_n\mu}{\omega + \mu} < \mu + r,$$

and the inequality

$$\beta_0 < \frac{\beta_0\omega}{\omega + \mu} + \frac{\beta_n\mu}{\omega + \mu}.$$

These relations imply that $\beta_0 < \mu + r$ and the positivity of a is now clear.

Since a, b are both positive, we deduce that Q (and thus (36) as well) has no roots in $[0, 1]$ in this case. \square

The next assertion shows the uniqueness of the corresponding solution, completing the proof of the theorem.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $y_{1,2}$ and C be as in Lemma 4.1, and let $J_{1,2}$ be the intervals in that lemma.*

Assume that $J_i \subset (0, 1]$ for some (or both) value of $i = 1, 2$. Then, for δ sufficiently small there exists a unique endemic equilibrium with $I^ \in J_i$, provided $|y_1 - y_2| \geq \delta^{1/3}$.*

\square

Proof of Lemma 4.2: The starting point is (25). After taking the common denominator on the right hand side (cf. (39)) and using the fact that $y_{1,2}$ in the proof of the previous lemma are roots of the resulting numerator, we arrive at the identity

$$\frac{\beta_0\beta_n\mu(I^* - y_1)(I^* - y_2)}{(\beta_0I^* + \mu)(\beta_nI^* + \mu + \omega)} = F_\delta(I^*) - F_0(I^*). \quad (49)$$

Suppose that the interval \tilde{J}_1 satisfies the assumptions of the lemma (the argument for \tilde{J}_2 will be identical). We then bring the above equation into the form

$$I^* - y_1 = \tilde{G}(I^*), \quad (50)$$

where

$$\tilde{G}(x) = \frac{(\beta_0x + \mu)(\beta_nx + \mu + \omega)}{\beta_0\beta_n\mu(x - y_2)} (F_\delta(x) - F_0(x)). \quad (51)$$

Let $u = x - y_1$ and let G be a function given by $G(u) = \tilde{G}(u + y_1)$, then (50) reduces to

$$u = G(u). \quad (52)$$

We claim that

- (a) The interval $S := \tilde{J}_1 - y_1$ is invariant under G , i.e., $G(S) \subset S$;
- (b) G is a contraction on S , i.e., $|G(u) - G(v)| \leq \alpha |u - v|$ for $u, v \in S$ and $\alpha < 1$.

The items (a) and (b) imply that the Banach fixed-point theorem is applicable in this context and so the solution u^* of (52) exists and is unique in S , and the original assertion follows. To establish (a), we note that, since $|y_1 - y_2| \geq \delta^{1/3}$ by our assumption, for $x \in \tilde{J}$ we have, with some $D > 0$,

$$\left| \tilde{G}(x) \right| \leq \max_{x \in [0,1]} \frac{(\beta_0 x + \mu)(\beta_n x + \mu + \omega)}{2\beta_0 \beta_n \mu \delta^{1/3}} \max_{x \in [0,1]} |F_\delta(x) - F_0(x)| \leq D\delta^{2/3} \quad (53)$$

by (34), for δ sufficiently small. Since

$$S = \left[-C\sqrt{\delta}, C\sqrt{\delta} \right] \supset \left[-D\delta^{2/3}, D\delta^{2/3} \right],$$

we see that (a) holds for such δ .

To check (b), we bound the derivative G' on S , using the product rule. We first compute (see (24))

$$\partial_x (F_\delta(x) - F_0(x)) = \vec{B} \cdot \partial_x (A_\delta^{-1} - A_0^{-1}) \vec{R} + \vec{B} \cdot (A_\delta^{-1} - A_0^{-1}) \partial_x \vec{R}. \quad (54)$$

Next, we note that $\partial_x \vec{R} = r e_1$, where $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$, and since we have the resolvent identity

$$A_\delta^{-1} - A_0^{-1} = A_\delta^{-1} (A_0 - A_\delta) A_0^{-1},$$

and $A_0 - A_\delta$ is x -independent (see (29)), we get

$$\partial_x (A_\delta^{-1} - A_0^{-1}) = (\partial_x A_\delta^{-1}) (A_0 - A_\delta) A_0^{-1} + A_\delta^{-1} (A_0 - A_\delta) (\partial_x A_0^{-1}). \quad (55)$$

To bound the right hand side, we use the relations

$$(\partial_x A_\delta^{-1}) = -A_\delta^{-1} (\partial_x A_\delta) A_\delta^{-1}, \quad (\partial_x A_0^{-1}) = -A_0^{-1} (\partial_x A_0) A_0^{-1}$$

that can be seen from differentiating the identities $A_\delta^{-1} A_\delta = I_n$ and $A_0^{-1} A_0 = I_n$. We also have (see (23))

$$\partial_x A_0 = \partial_x A_\delta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \beta_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (56)$$

Finally, we use (28), (30), (33), (55), and (56) to obtain the bound

$$\left\| \partial_x (A_\delta^{-1} - A_0^{-1}) \right\| \leq K\delta$$

for some δ -independent constant K .

Using this observation in (54), we deduce the estimate

$$\max_{x \in [0,1]} |\partial_x (F_\delta(x) - F_0(x))| \leq \hat{K}\delta \quad (57)$$

for some $\hat{K} > 0$. Thus, using (34) as well,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u \in S} |G'(u)| &\leq \hat{K}\delta \max_{u \in S} \left| \frac{(\beta_0(u + y_1) + \mu)(\beta_n(u + y_1) + \mu + \omega)}{\beta_0 \beta_n \mu (u + y_1 - y_2)} \right| \\ &\quad + \check{K}\delta \max_{u \in S} \left| \partial_u \frac{(\beta_0(u + y_1) + \mu)(\beta_n(u + y_1) + \mu + \omega)}{\beta_0 \beta_n \mu (u + y_1 - y_2)} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

for some $\check{K} > 0$. Since

$$\max_{u \in S} \left| \frac{1}{u + y_1 - y_2} \right| \leq 2\delta^{-1/3}$$

for δ sufficiently small, after taking the derivative on the right hand side of the previous equation, we obtain the bound

$$\max_{u \in S} |G'(u)| \leq \tilde{K}\delta^{1/3} \quad (58)$$

for some $\tilde{K} > 0$. Hence by the fundamental theorem of calculus,

$$|G(u) - G(v)| \leq \alpha |u - v| \text{ for all } u, v \in S, \quad \alpha = \tilde{K}\delta^{1/3}, \quad (59)$$

and so we have established (b) as well, and the solution for I^* exists and is unique. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The argument is very similar (in fact easier) to the one used in the proof of Theorem 1.4 and thus we omit most details. The first place where the differences occur is in the matrix A_δ , which instead of (23) is now of the form

$$A_\delta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_0 I^* - \eta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -\omega & \dots & 0 \\ -\delta & \beta_1 I^* - \eta & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & -\delta & \beta_2 I^* - \eta & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -\delta & \beta_k I^* - \eta + \omega & \dots & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & \beta_n I^* + \mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (60)$$

This gives the following expression for A_0^{-1} (compare with (32)):

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_0^{-1} & 0 & \dots & \omega T_0^{-1} (\mu + \omega + \beta_k I^*)^{-1} & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & T_1^{-1} & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & (\mu + \omega + \beta_k I^*)^{-1} & \dots & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & T_n^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (61)$$

where $T_k := \beta_k I^* + \mu$. It follows that F_0 (cf. (37)) is now given by

$$F_0(I^*) = \vec{B} \cdot (A_0^{-1} \vec{R}) = \frac{r \beta_0 I^*}{\beta_0 I^* + \mu} + \frac{\mu \beta_n}{\beta_n I^* + \mu}, \quad (62)$$

and in particular is ω -independent (as opposed to the expression in (37)), and coincides with the one in (37) for $\omega = 0$ there. The rest of the analysis is essentially identical to the one carried out in the proof of Theorem 1.4, for $\omega = 0$. \square

5. LINEAR STABILITY ANALYSIS FOR ENDEMIC EQUILIBRIA

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We begin with the case when $\delta = 0$. Here $S_i^* = 0$ for $i \neq 0, n$ for $\delta = 0$. Hence the Jacobian matrix V in (16) reduces to

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu - \beta_0 I^* & 0 & \dots & \omega & r - \beta_0 S_o^* \\ 0 & -\mu - \beta_1 I^* & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mu - \omega - \beta_n I^* & -\beta_n S_n^* \\ \beta_0 I^* & \beta_1 I^* & \dots & \beta_n I^* & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where we have used (21).

Hence we can evaluate $p(z) = \det(V - z\mathbb{1})$ by the second row, the resulting minor by the second row, etc., to get that $p(z)$ is equal to

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (-\mu - \beta_i I^* - z) \cdot \det \begin{pmatrix} -\mu - \beta_0 I^* - z & \omega & r - \beta_0 S_o^* \\ 0 & -\mu - \omega - \beta_n I^* - z & -\beta_n S_n^* \\ \beta_0 I^* & \beta_n I^* & -z \end{pmatrix}.$$

The sum of all three columns in the above matrix is equal to $(-\mu - z)(1 \ 1 \ 1)$. Hence the determinant above coincides with

$$(-\mu - z) \det \begin{pmatrix} -\mu - \beta_0 I^* - z & \omega & r - \beta_0 S_o^* \\ 0 & -\mu - \omega - \beta_n I^* - z & -\beta_n S_n^* \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now compute

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} -\mu - \beta_0 I^* - z & \omega & r - \beta_0 S_o^* \\ 0 & -\mu - \omega - \beta_n I^* - z & -\beta_n S_n^* \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = z^2 + a(\omega)z + b(\omega),$$

where, using (21),

$$a(\omega) = \omega + (r - \beta_0 S_o^* - \beta_n S_n^* + \mu) + (\beta_0 I^* + \mu + \beta_n I^*) = \omega + (\mu + \beta_0 I^* + \beta_n I^*),$$

$$\begin{aligned} b(\omega) &= (\mu + \beta_0 I^* + r - \beta_0 S_o^* - \beta_n S_n^*)\omega + \\ &\quad (\mu + \beta_n I^*)(\mu + \beta_0 I^* + r - \beta_0 S_o^*) - (\mu + \beta_0 I^*)\beta_n S_n^* \\ &= \beta_0 I^* \omega + (\mu + \beta_n I^*)(\beta_0 I^* + \beta_n S_n^*) - (\mu + \beta_0 I^*)\beta_n S_n^*. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mu + \beta_0 I^* + \beta_n I^* > 0$. On the other hand, as $\beta_n > \beta_0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu + \beta_n I^*)(\beta_0 I^* + \beta_n S_n^*) - (\mu + \beta_0 I^*)\beta_n S_n^* \\ > (\mu + \beta_n I^*)\beta_n S_n^* - (\mu + \beta_0 I^*)\beta_n S_n^* \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\omega \geq 0$, we deduce that the roots of $z^2 + a(\omega)z + b(\omega)$ have negative real parts for all values of $\omega \geq 0$. Hence, by the standard perturbation theory (see, e.g., [12]), the eigenvalues of V have negative real parts for δ sufficiently small and the endemic equilibrium is asymptotically stable by the Hartman-Grobman theorem (see e.g., [18, Theorem 9.9]). The assertion now follows from Theorem 1.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6: We begin, as before, with the case when $\delta = 0$. Here

$$\begin{aligned} S_0^* &= \frac{rI^*}{\beta_0 I^* + \mu}; \\ S_i^* &= 0, \quad 1 < i < n; \\ S_n^* &= \frac{\mu}{\beta_n I^* + \mu}; \\ \mu + r &= \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i S_i^* = \frac{\beta_n \mu}{\beta_n I^* + \mu} + \frac{\beta_0 r I^*}{\beta_0 I^* + \mu}. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Hence it follows from the last equation that I^* is a solution of $\mu + r = F_0(I^*)$ we considered in (62). As we already shown, the solution is unique for $\mu + r < \beta_n$.

The Jacobian matrix V in (20) reduces to

$$\begin{pmatrix} -T_0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \omega & \dots & 0 & r - \beta_0 S_o^* \\ 0 & -T_1 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -\omega - T_k & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & -T_n & -\beta_n S_n^* \\ \beta_0 I^* & \beta_1 I & \dots & \beta_{k-1} I^* & \beta_k I^* & \dots & \beta_n I^* & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where we again used the shorthand $T_k := \beta_k I^* + \mu$. The rest of the argument is nearly identical to the one in Theorem 1.5, with

$$p(z) = (-\mu - z)(-\omega - \mu - \beta_k I^* - z)(z^2 + a(0)z + b(0)) \prod_{i \neq \{k, n\}} (-\mu - \beta_i I^* - z).$$

The assertion now follows from Theorem 1.3. \square

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we develop a rigorous perturbative approach to analytically bound the locations for the equilibria of an infectious disease model system and determine the system's stability at these equilibria, which in turn enables us to determine the latter's dynamics. This approach proves essential in determining the existence and uniqueness of a realistic endemic equilibrium, and works effectively when the rate at which immunity wanes is relatively small. The nonlinearity of the (assumed to be large) number of compartments in our system and those of similar structure greatly complicate analyzing endemic equilibria, meaning that methods such as ours developed to solve the system in question considerably extend the range of models that can be analytically studied. Furthermore, the perturbation theory utilized is sufficiently versatile and robust to be applicable to a more general setting than the one used in this work, whose primary goal is to demonstrate the method's efficiency. Our results show in particular that only one of the vaccination schemes depicted is effective in combating the spread of infectious disease. We expect that this method in general will break down when the rate of waning immunity becomes large (in particular, there is no reason to expect that in such a regime the endemic equilibrium is in fact unique).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am really grateful to Dr. Lauren Childs for originally suggesting the problem, as well as for her very helpful discussions and comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arino, J., Davis, J. R., Hartley, D., et al., (2005). A multi-species epidemic model with spatial dynamics. *Math. Med. Biol.*, (22), 129–142.
- [2] Barbarossa, M. and Röst, (2015). G. Immuno-epidemiology of a population structured by immune status: a mathematical study of waning immunity and immune system boosting. *Journal of mathematical biology* 71.6 (2015): 1737-1770.
- [3] Horn, R.A., and Johnson, C.R. (1985). *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Heffernan, J., and Keeling, M. (2009). Implications of vaccination and waning immunity. *Proc. R. Soc. B.*, 276 (1664), 2071–2080.
- [5] Martcheva, M. (2015). *An introduction to mathematical epidemiology* (Vol. 61), New York: Springer.
- [6] Carlsson, R.M., Childs, L.M., Feng, Z., Glasser, J.W., Heffernan, J.M., Li, J., and Röst, G. (2020). Modeling the waning and boosting of immunity from infection or vaccination. *J. Theor. Biol.* (497), 110265.
- [7] Dym, H. (2007). *Linear Algebra in Action*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics (Vol. 78), American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- [8] Guo, H., Li, M., and Shuai, Z. (2006). Global stability of the endemic equilibrium of multigroup SIR epidemic models, *Canadian Appl. Math. Quart.* (14), 259–284.
- [9] Guo, H., Li, M., and Shuai, Z. (2008). A graph-theoretic approach to the method of global Lyapunov functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, (136), 2793–2802.
- [10] Gray, K.J., Bordt, E.A., Atyeo, C., Deriso, E., Akinwunmi, B., Young, N., Baez, A.M., Shook, L.L., Cvrk, D., James, K., and De Guzman, R. (2021). Coronavirus disease 2019 vaccine response in pregnant and lactating women: a cohort study. *Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.*
- [11] Haas, E. J., et al. (2021). Impact and effectiveness of mRNA BNT162b2 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 infections and COVID-19 cases, hospitalisations, and deaths following a nationwide vaccination campaign in Israel: an observational study using national surveillance data. *The Lancet* 397.10287: 1819-1829.
- [12] Kato, T. (2013). *Perturbation theory for linear operators* (Vol. 132), Springer Science & Business Media.
- [13] Lavine, J., Bjornstad, O. and Rustom, A. Immunological characteristics govern the transition of COVID-19 to endemicity. *Science* 371.6530 (2021): 741-745.
- [14] Pólya, G. (1928). Beitrag zur Verallgemeinerung des Verzerrungssatzes auf mehrfach zusammenhängende Gebiete (in German). *Sitzungsberichte Akad. Wiss. Berlin*, 228–232.
- [15] Saporu, F. W. O. (1987). On the solution of compartmental processes and their use in modelling stages of infection of a disease with reference to Onchocerciasis. *Journal of applied probability* 24.2: 293-303.
- [16] Schur, I. (1911). Bemerkungen zur Theorie der beschränkten Bilinearformen mit unendlich vielen Veränderlichen (in German). *Journ. für reine und angew. Math.*, 140.
- [17] Song, D., et al. (2021). Passive and active immunity in infants born to mothers with SARS-CoV-2 infection during pregnancy: Prospective cohort study. medRxiv.

- [18] Teschl, G. (2012). Ordinary Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems. Providence: American Mathematical Society.
- [19] Zhou, L., Wang, Y., Xiao, Y., and Li, M. Y. (2019) Global dynamics of a discrete age-structured SIR epidemic model with applications to measles vaccination strategies, Math. Biosci. (308), 27–37

BLACKSBURG HIGH SCHOOL, BLACKSBURG, VA 24060, USA
Email address: `shosha.elgart@gmail.com`