Epidemic Model with Direct and Indirect Transmission modes and Two Delays

F. Najm[*], R. Yafia[†], M. A. Aziz Alaoui[§], A. Aghriche[¶]

May 13, 2022

Abstract

We propose an epidemic model in which all diseases are transmitted by direct transmission (infectives to susceptibles) and indirect transmission which occurs through shedding of virus by infectives and acquisition by susceptibles. The model takes into account the effect of latency period and time needed for a susceptible to become infective by indirect contact. Under the certain assumptions, the basic reproduction number of the model is identified from the direct and indirect basic reproduction numbers. The main goal is to analyse the asymptotic behaviours, global stability, bifurcation and to detecte the most sensitive parameters. Numerical simulations are carried out to illustrate the theoretical part.

Keywords : Epidemic Model, latence period, DDE, transcritical bifurcation, basic reproduction number R_0.
2020 Mathematics Subject Classification numbers : 34D05; 39B05; 92B05; 34C23; 92-10.

1 Introduction and mathematical model

Infectious diseases are disorders caused by organisms such as bacteria, viruses, fungi or parasites and are serious public health problems for most countries in the world. Examples

[*]Department of Mathematics Faculty of Sciences, Ibn Tofail University, Campus Universitaire, Kenitra, Morocco. mailnajm

[†]Corresponding author: R. Yafia

[‡]Department of Mathematics Faculty of Sciences, Ibn Tofail University, Campus Universitaire, BP 133, Kenitra, Morocco. radouane.yafia@uit.ac.ma

[§]Normandie Univ, France; ULH, LMAH, F-76600 Le Havre; FR-CNRS-3335, ISCN, 25 rue Ph. Lebon, 76600 Le Havre, France. aziz.alaoui@univ-lehavre.fr

[¶]Department of Mathematics Faculty of Sciences, Ibn Tofail University, Campus Universitaire, BP 133, Kenitra, Morocco. aghriche87@gmail.com

of such spreading diseases we cite influenza[16, 36], malaria [17], dengue [18], cholera [25], hantavirus[14], brucellosis [7], foot-and-mouth disease virus [32], infectious canine hepatitis virus [34], childhood diseases measles and rubella [8]. Some of these diseases are spread by organisms outside the host, and are highly important for the epidemiological dynamics and these organisms can be transmitted to the host by an indirect mode From this point of view a significant number of mathematical models suggested an indirect mode of transmission [5]. For diseases transmitted through indirect pathways with the pathogens to survive outside of its host has also been used to play a vital role in the transmission dynamics process of hantavirus [15, 28], cholera[5, 9, 23, 24, 29, 27, 33] and brucellosis [1, 12, 13, 21, 22]. In parallel to this mechanism, we find the direct transmission which postulates that the pathogen is acquired through an infectious contact with an infected individual. Some authors are developed some mathematical models to study the dynamics of infectious diseases by introducing a simple or multi-group mathematical models which involve both direct and indirect transmission. Mukandavire et al.[23, 24] introduced a dynamic model of cholera in Zimbabwe, Eisenberga et al. [9] proposed a cholera model in a patchy environment with water and human movement. In [10, 11, 20, 30, 31, 35] multi-group models have been introduced to describe the transmission dynamics of infectious diseases by using ordinary differential equations. In this paper, we propose an epidemic mathematical model which involve delays of direct and indirect transmissions. The model is given by the following delay differential equations system

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - \beta_s S I_\tau - \beta_W S W_\nu - \mu_s S \\ \frac{dI}{dt} = \beta_s S I_\tau + \beta_W S W_\nu - (\gamma + \mu_I) I \\ \frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma I - \mu_R R \\ \frac{dW}{dt} = \mu_W I - \varepsilon W \\ S(0) = S_0 \geq 0, I(s) = \varphi(s), s \in [-\tau, 0], R(0) = R_0 \geq 0, W(s) = \xi(s), s \in [-\nu, 0] \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where S, I and R are the total number of susceptible, infected and recovered populations respectively. W is the concentration of virus caused by shedding. All parameters of the model are positive and are defined by, Λ is the birth rate parameter of S population, β_s is the transmission rate from I to S, β_W is the transmission rate from W to S, μ_s is the death rate of people S, γ is the recovery rate, μ_I is the death rate of I population, μ_R is the death rate of R population, μ_W is the shedding coefficients from I to W, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ is the lifetime of the virus in W, τ is the latency period, ν is the time needed for a population S to become infected by indirect transmission

As the equation of recovered population R depends only on infected population I, it suffices to study the following reduced system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - \beta_s S I_\tau - \beta_W S W_\nu - \mu_s S \\ \frac{dI}{dt} = \beta_s S I_\tau + \beta_W S W_\nu - (\gamma + \mu_I) I \\ \frac{dW}{dt} = \mu_W I - \varepsilon W \\ S(0) = S_0 \geq 0, I(s) = \varphi(s), s \in [-\tau, 0], W(s) = \xi(s), s \in [-\nu, 0]. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 deals with the positivity, boundedness of solutions and the existence of equilibria. The stability analysis without delays of the corresponding equilibria is established in Section 3 by applying Lyapunov method, we prove also the occurrence of a transcritical bifurcation for some critical value of the basic reproduction number R_0. In Section 4 and 5, we consider the model with one and two delays respectively and we study the stability of equilibrium points. In Section 6 we prove how parameters can affect the basic reproduction number R_0 by sensitivity analysis. Some numerical simulations are given in Section 7 in order to confirm and illustrate our analytical results. We end our paper by a conclusion.

2 Boundedness of solutions and equilibria

For system (1.2) to be biologically meaningful, it is necessary to show the non-negativity and boundedness of solutions.

Proposition 2.1. *The set $\mathbb{R}^3_+$ is positively invariant with respect to system* (1.2) *with* ($\tau = \mu = 0$). *Furthermore, all solutions of* (1.2) *are uniformly bounded in the compact subset.*

$$\Gamma = \left\{ (S, I, W) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ : S + I \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\mu_S},\ W \leq \frac{\mu_W \Lambda}{\varepsilon \mu_S} \right\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. From the first equation of system (1.2), we have

$$S(t) = S(0) \times exp(\int_0^t -\phi(s)ds) + exp(\int_0^t -\phi(s)ds) \times \int_0^t \Lambda \times exp(\int_0^u \phi(l)dl)du.$$

Thus $S(t) > 0$, $\forall t > 0$. To establish that $\forall t > 0$, $I(t) > 0$, $W(t) > 0$ whenever $I(0) > 0$, $W(0) > 0$, the above arguments can not be easily implemented. We then use an alternative trick. We Consider the following sub-equations related to the time evolution of variables

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dI}{dt} = \beta_s SI + \beta_W SW - (\gamma + \mu_I)I \\ \frac{dW}{dt} = \mu_W I - \varepsilon W \\ I(0) > 0, W(0) > 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

$$\dot{X}(t) = AX(t)$$

where $X = \begin{pmatrix} I \\ W \end{pmatrix}$ and $A = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s S - (\gamma + \mu_I) & \beta_W S \\ \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}$.
From the expression of A, its a Metzler matrix and its exponential is positive. Then we deduce the positivity of $I(t)$ and $W(t)$ whenever $I(0) > 0$ and $W(0) > 0$. This proves the positively invariant property of $\mathbb{R}^3_+$ with respect to system (1.2).
Let $N(t) = S(t) + I(t)$, then

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = \Lambda - \mu_S S - (\gamma + \mu_I)I \leq \Lambda - \mu_S N.$$

Hence,

$$\limsup_{t\longrightarrow\infty} N(t) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\mu_S}.$$

This implies that S and I are uniformly bounded in the region Γ. Furthermore, from the bound of I and the last equation of (1.2), it follows that

$$\limsup_{t\longrightarrow\infty} W(t) \leq \frac{\mu_W \Lambda}{\varepsilon \mu_S}.$$

This guarantees the boundedness of W. This completes the proof. □

The equilibrium points of model (1.2) are obtained by solving the algebraic system obtained by cancelling all derivatives of $S(t), I(t)$ and $W(t)$. Thus:

1. The disease free equilibrium (DFE) is: $E_0 = (S_0, 0, 0) = (\frac{\Lambda}{\mu_S}, 0, 0)$.
2. The endemic equilibrium is: $E_1 = (S^*, I^*, W^*)$, with its components given by

$$S^* = \frac{\varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)}{\varepsilon\beta_S + \beta_W \mu_W}, \quad W^* = \frac{\mu_W}{\varepsilon} I^* \quad \text{and} \quad I^* = \frac{\Lambda}{\gamma + \mu_I} - \frac{\varepsilon \mu_S}{\varepsilon\beta_S + \beta_W \mu_W}. \tag{2.3}$$

The endemic equilibrium E_1 lies in the positive orthant if the basic reproduction number R_0 of model (1.2) is greater than 1, it is given by:

$$R_0 = \frac{\Lambda(\varepsilon\beta_S + \beta_W \mu_W)}{\mu_s \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)} = R_{0d} + R_{0I}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $R_{0d} = \dfrac{\Lambda \beta_S}{\mu_s(\gamma + \mu_I)}$ represents secondary infections caused directly by a single infective while $R_{0I} = \frac{\beta_W \mu_W}{\mu_s \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)}$ represents secondary infections caused indirectly through the environmental pathogen .

Proposition 2.2.

- *If $R_0 \leq 1$, the system (1.2) has only the disease free equilibrium $E_0 = (S_0, 0, 0)$.*
- *If $R_0 > 1$, in addition to E_0 the system (1.2) has a unique endemic equilibrium $E_1 = (S^*, I^*, W^*)$ which is positive.*

3 Model without delay

Suppose $\tau = \nu = 0$, system (1.2) is written as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - \beta_s SI - \beta_W SW - \mu_s S \\ \frac{dI}{dt} = \beta_s SI + \beta_W SW - (\gamma + \mu_I) I \\ \frac{dW}{dt} = \mu_W I - \varepsilon W \\ S(0) = S_0 \geq 0,\ I(0) = I_0 \geq 0, W(0) = W_0 \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

3.1 Stability Analysis

The aim of this section is to analyze the stability of the two equilibria E_0 and E_1.

Linearizing system (3.1) around an equilibrium point $E = (S, I, W)$, we get the following jacobian matrix:

$$J_{E=(S,I,W)} = \begin{pmatrix} -\beta_S I - \beta_W W - \mu_S & -\beta_S S & -\beta_W S \\ \beta_S I + \beta_W W & \beta_S S - \gamma - \mu_I & \beta_W S \\ 0 & \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}.$$

Replacing E by E_0 and calculating the characteristic equation, we have

$$\det(\lambda I - J_{E_0}) = (\lambda + \mu_S)(\lambda^2 - Tr(J^{11}_{E_0})\lambda + \det(J^{11}_{E_0})) \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$J^{11}_{E_0} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_S S_0 - \gamma - \mu_I & \beta_W S_0 \\ \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$Tr(J^{11}_{E_0}) = \beta_S S_0 - \gamma - \mu_I - \varepsilon$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \det(J^{11}_{E_0}) &= \varepsilon(-\beta_S S_0 + \gamma + \mu_I) - \mu_W \beta_W S_0 \\ &= \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)(1 - R_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *If $R_0 < 1$, the disease free equilibrium E_0 is asymptotically stable and it becomes unstable if $R_0 > 1$.*

Proof. If $R_0 < 1$, then $Tr(J^{11}_{E_0}) < 0$ and $\det(J^{11}_{E_0}) > 0$, then the characteristic equation (3.2) does not admit a real strictly positive root.
If $R_0 > 1$, then $\det(J^{11}_{E_0}) < 0$. So, the characteristic equation (3.2) has at least one positive root. □

Proposition 3.2. *If $R_0 > 1$, the endemic equilibrium E_1 is asymptotically stable.*

Proof. Let $R_0 > 1$ and we compute the characteristic equation associated to E_1. The Jacobian matrix at E_1 is given by

$$J_{E^*=(S^*,I^*,W^*)} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\Lambda}{S^*} & -\beta_S S^* & -\beta_W S^* \\ (\gamma + \mu_I)\frac{I^*}{S^*} & -\beta_W \frac{S^* W^*}{I^*} & \beta_W S^* \\ 0 & \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}$$

and the characteristic equation associated to E_1 is as follows:

$$P(\lambda) = \lambda^3 + a_2\lambda + a_1\lambda + a_0, \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= \varepsilon + \beta_W \frac{S^* W^*}{I^*} + \frac{\Lambda}{S^*} \\ a_1 &= \frac{\Lambda}{S^*}(\varepsilon + \beta_W \frac{S^* W^*}{I^*}) + \beta_S(\gamma + \mu_I) I^* \\ a_0 &= (\gamma + \mu_I)(\varepsilon \beta_S + \mu_W \beta_W) I^*. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $R_0 > 1$, then the coefficients a_0, a_1 and a_2 are all strictly positive, then the polynomial P does not admit a real strictly positive root. □

Proposition 3.3. *If $R_0 > 1$, the endemic equilibrium E_1 is globally asymptotically stable.*

Proof. Define a Lyapunov functional as follows:

$$V(t) = S(t) - S^* - \int_{S^*}^{S(t)} \frac{S^*}{Z} dZ + I^* \Phi\left(\frac{I(t)}{I^*}\right) + \frac{\beta_W S^* W^*}{\varepsilon} \Phi\left(\frac{W(t)}{W^*}\right), \tag{3.4}$$

where $\Phi(Z) = Z - 1 - \ln Z > 0$, for $Z > 0$. It is obvious that Φ attains its strict global minimum at 1 and $\Phi(1) = 0$. Then $\Phi(Z) > 0$ and the functional V is nonnegative.

For convenience, let $\psi = \psi(t)$ for any $\psi \in \{S, I, W\}$.
Differentiating V with respect to t along the solutions of (3.1), we obtain

$$\dot{V}(t)|_{(3.1)} = \left(1 - \frac{S^*}{S}\right) \frac{dS}{dt} + \left(1 - \frac{I^*}{I}\right) \frac{dI}{dt} + \frac{\beta_W S^*}{\varepsilon} \left(1 - \frac{W^*}{W}\right) \frac{dW}{dt}. \tag{3.5}$$

Using $\Lambda = \mu_S S^* + (\gamma + \mu_I) I^*$ and $\mu_W I^* = \varepsilon W^*$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t)|_{(3.1)} &= \mu_S S^* \left(1 - \tfrac{S}{S^*}\right)\left(1 - \tfrac{S^*}{S}\right) + \beta_S S^* I^* \left(2 - \tfrac{S^*}{S} - \tfrac{S}{S^*}\right) \\ &\quad + \beta_W S^* W^* \left(3 - \tfrac{S^*}{S} - \frac{S W I^*}{S^* W^* I} - \tfrac{W^* I}{W I^*}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t)|_{(3.1)} &= \mu_S S^* \left(1 - \tfrac{S}{S^*}\right)\left(1 - \tfrac{S^*}{S}\right) - \beta_S S^* I^* \left[\Phi\left(\tfrac{S^*}{S}\right) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{S}{S^*}\right)\right] \\ &\quad - \beta_W S^* W^* \left[\Phi\left(\tfrac{S^*}{S}\right) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{W^* I}{W I^*}\right) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{S W I^*}{S^* W^* I}\right)\right] \\ &= \mu_S S^* \left(1 - \tfrac{S}{S^*}\right)\left(1 - \tfrac{S^*}{S}\right) \\ &\quad - \beta_S S^* I^* \left[2\Phi\left(\tfrac{S^*}{S}\right) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{S}{S^*}\right) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{W^* I}{W I^*}\right) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{S W I^*}{S^* W^* I}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Since $\left(1 - \frac{S}{S^*}\right)\left(1 - \frac{S^*}{S}\right) \leq 0$ and $\Phi(Z) \geq 0$ for $Z > 0$, we deduce that $\dot{V}(t)|_{(3.1)} \leq 0$ and the equality occurs at the endemic equilibrium E_1. Consequently, the global asymptotic stability of E_1 follows from LaSalle's invariance principle [19]. □

3.2 Analysis at $R_0 = 1$

In this section, we state and prove the following theorem which characterizes the occurrence of transcritical bifurcation at $R_0 = 1$.

Theorem 3.4. *The disease free equilibrium E_0 changes its stability from stable to unstable at $R_0 = 1$ and system (3.1) exhibits a transcritical bifurcation at bifurcation parameter value $\Lambda = \Lambda^* = \dfrac{\mu_S \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)}{\varepsilon\beta_S + \beta_W \mu_W}$.*

Proof. Linearized matrix of system (3.1) around E_0 at the bifurcation parameter value $\Lambda = \Lambda^* = \dfrac{\mu_S \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)}{\varepsilon\beta_S + \beta_W \mu_W}$ is given by

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu_S & -\beta_S \frac{\Lambda^*}{\mu_S} & -\beta_W \frac{\Lambda^*}{\mu_S} \\ 0 & \beta_S \frac{\Lambda^*}{\mu_S} - \gamma - \mu_I & \beta_W \frac{\Lambda^*}{\mu_S} \\ 0 & \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix J has a simple zero eigenvalue at $R_0 = 1$, (see characteristic equation 3.2) and the others eigenvalues have negative real part. At this stage the linearization techniques fail to conclude the behaviour of system (3.1). Center Manifold Theory is used to study the behaviour of non-hyperbolic equilibrium. Then from Theorem 1 of Castillo-Chavez and Song [3] the bifurcation constants a_1 and b_1 are given by

$$a_1 = \sum_{k,i,j=1}^{n} v_k w_i w_j \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right)_{E_0} \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$b_1 = \sum_{k,i=1}^{n} v_k w_i \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial x_i \partial \Lambda^*} \right)_{E_0}. \tag{3.9}$$

A right eigenvector associated with 0 eigenvalue is $w = \left[\dfrac{-\Lambda^*}{\mu_S} \left(\dfrac{\beta_S \varepsilon + \beta_W \mu_W}{\mu_W} \right), \dfrac{\varepsilon}{\mu_W}, 1 \right]^T$ and the left eigenvector v satisfying $v.w = 1$ is $v = \left[0, \dfrac{\mu_W \mu_S + \Lambda^*(\beta_S \varepsilon + \beta_W \mu_W)}{\varepsilon \mu_S}, \dfrac{-\Lambda^*}{\mu_S} \left(\dfrac{\beta_S \varepsilon + \beta_W \mu_W}{\mu_W} \right) \right]$. Algebraic calculations show that

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} = -\beta_S, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial x_1 \partial x_3} = -\beta_W, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} = \beta_S, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial x_1 \partial x_3} = \beta_W \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial x_1 \partial \Lambda^*} = \frac{\beta_W}{\mu_S}.$$

The rest of the second derivatives appearing in the formula for a_1 in (3.8) and b_1 in (3.9)

are all zero. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= v_2 w_1 w_2 \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2}\right) + v_2 w_1 w_3 \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_3}\right) \\
&= \frac{-\Lambda^*}{\mu_S}\left(\frac{\beta_S\varepsilon + \beta_W\mu_W}{\mu_W}\right)\frac{\mu_W\mu_S + \Lambda^*(\beta_S\varepsilon + \beta_W\mu_W)}{\varepsilon\mu_S}\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta_S}{\mu_W} + \beta_W\right) \\
&= \frac{-\Lambda^*}{\mu_S}\left(\frac{\beta_S\varepsilon + \beta_W\mu_W}{\mu_W}\right)^2\frac{\mu_W\mu_S + \Lambda^*(\beta_S\varepsilon + \beta_W\mu_W)}{\varepsilon\mu_S} < 0. \\
b_1 &= v_2 w_2 \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial x_1 \partial \Lambda^*}\right) \\
&= \frac{\mu_W\mu_S + \Lambda^*(\beta_S\varepsilon + \beta_W\mu_W)}{\varepsilon\mu_S}\frac{\varepsilon\beta_W}{\mu_W\mu_S} > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that at $R_0 = 1$, disease free equilibrium E_0 changes stability from stable to unstable and endemic equilibrium E_1 exists when R_0 crosses the threshold value one. This emphasizes that, the system exhibts transcritical bifurcation at $R_0 = 1$. □

4 Model with one delay τ

We suppose $\tau > 0$ and $\nu = 0$, system (1.1) is written as

$$\begin{cases}
\frac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - \beta_s S I_\tau - \beta_W S W - \mu_s S \\
\frac{dI}{dt} = \beta_s S I_\tau + \beta_W S W - (\gamma + \mu_I) I \\
\frac{dW}{dt} = \mu_W I - \varepsilon W \\
S(0) = S_0 \geq 0, I(s) = \varphi(s), s \in [-\tau, 0], W(0) = W_0 \geq 0.
\end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

4.1 Local stability of disease free equilibrium

Linearizing system (4.1) around the disease free equilibrium $E_0 = (S_0, 0, 0)$, we get

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = L_0 X(t) + L_\tau X(t - \tau),$$

where X is a vector composed by state variables S, I, W and

$$L_0 = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu_S & 0 & -\beta_W S_0 \\ 0 & -(\gamma + \mu_I) & \beta_W S_0 \\ 0 & \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad L_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta_S S_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_S S_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

The associated characteristic equation is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\triangle(\lambda) &= det(\lambda I - L_0 - e^{-\lambda\tau}L_\tau)\\ &= (\lambda+\mu_S)\big[P_0(\lambda)+Q_0(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau}\big]\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

As $\lambda_1 = -\mu_S$ is a root of the characteristic equation, so the study of stability of E_0 is reduced to the study of the roots of equation

$$P_0(\lambda) + Q_0(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau} = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}P_0(\lambda) &= \lambda^2 + (\gamma+\mu_I+\varepsilon)\lambda + \varepsilon(\gamma+\mu_I) - \mu_W\beta_W S_0,\\ Q_0(\lambda) &= -\beta_S S_0\lambda - \varepsilon\beta_S S_0.\end{aligned}$$

Define F by $F(y) = |P_0(iy)|^2 - |Q_0(iy)|^2$, (see [6]), then we have

$$F(Y) = Y^2 + b_1 Y + b_0,$$

with $Y = y^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned}b_1 &= (\gamma+\mu_I)^2 + (\beta_S S_0)^2 + \varepsilon^2 + 2\mu_W\beta_W S_0,\\ b_0 &= \big(\varepsilon(\gamma+\mu_I) - \mu_W\beta_W S_0\big)^2 + (\varepsilon\beta_S S_0)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $b_1 > 0, b_2 > 0$, the function F does not admit a real strictly positive root. So there is no change in stability.

Therefore, we summarize the above discussions in the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *The disease free equilibrium E_0 is asymptotically stable for all $\tau > 0$.*

4.2 Local stability of endemic equilibrium

In this section, we study the local asymptotic stability of the endemic equilibrium $E_1 = (S^*, I^*, W^*)$ of system (4.1) considering latency period.

The linearized system of (4.1) around E_1 is given by:

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = J_0 X(t) + J_\tau X(t-\tau),$$

where

$$J_0 = \begin{pmatrix} -\beta_S I^* - \beta_W W^* - \mu_S & 0 & -\beta_W S^* \\ \beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* & -(\gamma+\mu_I) & \beta_W S^* \\ 0 & \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad J_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta_S S^* & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_S S^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The associated characteristic equation to E_1 is as follows

$$P_1(\lambda) + Q_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau} = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(\lambda) &= \lambda^3 + \alpha_2\lambda^2 + \alpha_1\lambda + \alpha_0, \\ Q_1(\lambda) &= c_2\lambda^2 + c_1\lambda + c_0, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 &= \beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S + \gamma + \mu_I + \varepsilon, \\ \alpha_1 &= \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I) - \mu_W\beta_W S^* + (\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S)(\gamma + \mu_I + \varepsilon), \\ \alpha_0 &= \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)(\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S) - \mu_S\mu_W\beta_W S^* \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= -\beta_S S^*, \\ c_1 &= -(\varepsilon + \mu_S)\beta_S S^*, \\ c_0 &= -\varepsilon\beta_S\mu_S S^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since the endemic equilibrium E_1 is asymptotically stable for $\tau = 0$, (proposition (3.2)), by the continuity property, it's still asymptotically stable for small $\tau > 0$ [6, 2]. To obtain the switch of stability, one needs to find a purely imaginary root for some critical value of τ.

Let $i\omega$ ($\omega > 0$) be a root of Eq. (4.2), then we have

$$-i\omega^3 - \alpha_2\omega^2 + i\alpha_1\omega + \alpha_0 - (c_2\omega^2 - ic_1\omega - c_0)(\cos\omega\tau - i\sin\omega\tau) = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Separating the real and imaginary parts, we find

$$\begin{cases} \omega^3 - \alpha_1\omega &= c_1\omega\cos\omega\tau + (c_2\omega^2 - c_0)\sin\omega\tau \\ \alpha_2\omega^2 - \alpha_0 &= -(c_2\omega^2 - c_0)\cos\omega\tau + c_1\omega\sin\omega\tau. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

Adding up the squares of both the equations, we obtain

$$\omega^6 + B_2\omega^4 + B_1\omega^2 + B_0 = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $z = \omega^2$, eq. (4.5) becomes

$$f(z) = z^3 + B_2z^2 + B_1z + B_0 = 0, \tag{4.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 &= \alpha_2^2 - c_2^2 - 2\alpha_1, \\ B_1 &= 2(c_0c_2 - \alpha_0\alpha_2) - (c_1^2 - \alpha_1^2), \\ B_0 &= \alpha_0^2 - c_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let the hypothesis:

$$(H) : B_0 > 0,\ B_2 > 0 \text{ and } B_2B_1 - B_0 > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Proposition 4.2. *If $R_0 > 1$ and (H) is satisfied, then endemic equilibrium E_1 is asymptotically stable for all $\tau > 0$.*

Proof. The proof is deduced from the Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion [4]. □

5 Model with two delays $\tau = \nu > 0$

We consider $\tau = \nu > 0$, the model (1.2) is written as follows

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - \beta_s S I_\tau - \beta_W S W_\tau - \mu_s S \\ \frac{dI}{dt} = \beta_s S I_\tau + \beta_W S W_\tau - (\gamma + \mu_I) I \\ \frac{dW}{dt} = \mu_W I - \varepsilon W \\ S(0) = S_0 \geq 0, I(s) = \varphi(s), W(s) = \xi(s), s \in [-\tau, 0]. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

5.1 Local stability of E_0

Linearising the system (5.1) around the disease free equilibrium E_0, we get

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = M_0 X(t) + M_\tau X(t - \tau),$$

where,

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu_S & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -(\gamma + \mu_I) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta_S S_0 & -\beta_W S_0 \\ 0 & \beta_S S_0 & \beta_W S_0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the corresponding characteristic characteristic equation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} det(\lambda I - M_0 - e^{-\lambda\tau} M_\tau) &= (\lambda + \mu_S)\left[P_2(\lambda) + Q_2(\lambda) e^{-\lambda\tau}\right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Since $\lambda_1 = -\mu_S$ is a root of the characteristic equation, so the study of stability of E_0 is reduced to the study of the roots of

$$P_2(\lambda) + Q_2(\lambda) e^{-\lambda\tau} = 0, \tag{5.3}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} P_2(\lambda) &= \lambda^2 + (\gamma + \mu_I + \varepsilon)\lambda + \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I), \\ Q_2(\lambda) &= -S_0(\beta_S \lambda + \varepsilon \beta_S + \mu_W \beta_W). \end{aligned}$$

Define G by $G(y) = |P_2(iy)|^2 - |Q_2(iy)|^2$ and we have

$$G(Y) = Y^2 + d_1 Y + d_0, \tag{5.4}$$

with $Y = y^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 &= \gamma + \mu_I + \varepsilon + (S_0\beta_S)^2 - 2\varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I), \\ d_0 &= \varepsilon^2(\gamma + \mu_I)^2 - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu_S}\right)^2 (\varepsilon\beta_S + \mu_W\beta_W)^2, \\ &= \varepsilon^2(\gamma + \mu_I)^2(1 - R_0^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, if $R_0 > 1$ then $G(0) = d_0 < 0$. As the function G is continuous and $\lim_{Y\to\infty} G(Y) = +\infty$. Then, equation (5.4) has at least one positive root, denoted by Y_0. Consequently, the characteristic equation (5.2) has a pair of purely imaginary roots $\pm iy_0$. Hence the following result.

Proposition 5.1. *The disease free equilibrium E_0 is stable if $R_0 \leq 1$ and unstable when $R_0 > 1$ for all time delay $\tau > 0$.*

5.2 Local stability of E_1

In this part, we study the local asymptotic stability of the endemic equilibrium E_1 of system (5.1). By linearising system (5.1) at E_1, we get

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = J_0^* X(t) + J_\tau^* X(t-\tau),$$

where

$$J_0^* = \begin{pmatrix} -\beta_S I^* - \beta_W W^* - \mu_S & 0 & 0 \\ \beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* & -(\gamma + \mu_I) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_W & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad J_\tau^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta_S S^* & -\beta_W S^* \\ 0 & \beta_S S^* & \beta_W S^* \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We get the following corresponding characteristic equation

$$(\lambda + \beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S)\big[P^*(\lambda) + Q^*(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau}\big]0. \tag{5.5}$$

Since $\lambda = -(\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S)$ is a root of the characteristic equation, so the study of stability of E_1 is reduced to the study of the roots of

$$P^*(\lambda) + Q^*(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau} = 0, \tag{5.6}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} P^*(\lambda) &= \lambda^3 + \alpha_2^*\lambda^2 + \alpha_1^*\lambda + \alpha_0^*, \\ Q^*(\lambda) &= \delta_2^*\lambda^2 + \delta_1^*\lambda + \delta_0^*. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2^* &= \beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S + \gamma + \mu_I + \varepsilon, \\ \alpha_1^* &= (\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S)(\gamma + \mu_I + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I), \\ \alpha_0^* &= \varepsilon(\gamma + \mu_I)(\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_2 &= -\beta_S S^*, \\
\delta_1 &= -\big(\beta_S S^*(\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S + \varepsilon) + \mu_W \beta_W S^*\big), \\
\delta_0 &= (\varepsilon - 1)\beta_S S^*(\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^*) - \mu_S(\beta_S S^* + \mu_W \beta_W W^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the endemic equilibrium E_1 is asymptotically stable for $\tau = 0$, by the continuity property, it's still asymptotically stable for small $\tau > 0$, (see proposition 3.2). To obtain the switch of stability, one needs to find a purely imaginary root for some critical value of τ.
Let $i\omega$ ($\omega > 0$) be a root of Eq. (5.6), then we have

$$-i\omega^3 - \alpha_2^*\omega^2 + \alpha_1^* i\omega + \alpha_0^* + (-\delta_2\omega^2 + \delta_1 i\omega + \delta_0)(\cos\omega\tau - i\sin\omega\tau) = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Separating the real and imaginary parts, we find

$$\begin{cases} \omega^3 - \alpha_1^*\omega &= \delta_2\omega^2 \sin\omega\tau + \delta_1\omega\cos\omega\tau - \delta_0\sin\omega\tau \\ \alpha_2^*\omega^2 - \alpha_0^* &= -\delta_2 w^2\cos\omega\tau + \delta_0\cos\omega\tau + \delta_1\omega\sin\omega\tau. \end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

Adding up the squares of both the equations, we obtain

$$\omega^6 + A_2^*\omega^4 + A_1^*\omega^2 + A_0^* = 0. \tag{5.9}$$

Let $z = \omega^2$, then equation (5.9) becomes

$$h(z) = z^3 + A_2^* z^2 + A_1^* z + A_0^* = 0, \tag{5.10}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_2^* &= (\alpha_2^*)^2 - 2\alpha_1^*, \\
&= (\beta_S I^* + \beta_W W^* + \mu_S)^2 + (\gamma + \mu_I)^2 + \varepsilon^2, \\
A_1^* &= (\alpha_1^*)^2 - \delta_1^2 - \delta_2^2 + 2(\delta_0\delta_2 - \alpha_0^*\alpha_2^*), \\
A_0^* &= (\alpha_0^*)^2 - \delta_0^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $A_2^* > 0$, let the hypothesis:

$$(H_3) : A_0^* > 0 \text{ and } A_2^* A_1^* - A_0^* > 0. \tag{5.11}$$

Proposition 5.2. *If $R_0 > 1$ and (H_3) is satisfied, then endemic equilibrium E_1 is asymptotically stable for all $\tau = \nu > 0$.*

Proof. The proof is deduced from the Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion [4]. □

6 Sensitivity Analysis

The sensitivity analysis for the endemic threshold (2.4) tells us how important each parameter is to disease transmission. This information is crucial not only for experimental design, but also to data assimilation and reduction of complex models [**?**]. Sensitivity analysis is commonly used to determine the robustness of model predictions to parameters values, since there are usually errors in collected data and presumed parameters values. It is used to discover parameters that have a high impact on the threshold R_0 and should be targeted by intervention strategies. More accurately, sensitivity indices allows us to measure the relative changes in a variable when a parameter changes. For that purpose, we use the normalized forward sensitivity index of a variable with respect to a given parameter, which is defined as the ratio of the relative change in the variable to the relative change in the parameter. If such variable is differentiable with respect to the parameter, then the sensitivity index is defined as follows.

Definition 6.1. *[26] The normalized forward sensitivity index of R_0 , which is differentiable with respect to a given parameter θ, is defined by*

$$\Upsilon_{\theta}^{R_0} = \frac{\partial R_0}{\partial \theta}\frac{\theta}{R_0}.$$

The values of the sensitivity indices for parameters values of Table 2, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Sensitivity of R_0 evaluated for the parameters values given in Table 2

Parameter	Sensitivity index	Index at parameters value
Λ	$+1$	$+1$
β_S	$\dfrac{\varepsilon\beta_S}{\varepsilon\beta_S+\beta_W\mu_W}$	0.7500
β_W	$\dfrac{\mu_W\beta_W}{\varepsilon\beta_S+\beta_W\mu_W}$	0.25
μ_S	-1	-1
γ	$-\dfrac{\gamma}{\gamma+\mu_I}$	-0.1818
μ_I	$-\dfrac{\mu_I}{\gamma+\mu_I}$	-0.8182
μ_W	$\dfrac{\beta_W}{\varepsilon\beta_S+\beta_W\mu_W}$	8.3333
ε	$\dfrac{\varepsilon\beta_S}{\varepsilon\beta_S+\beta_W\mu_W}-\dfrac{\gamma}{\gamma+\mu_I}$	0.5682

Note that the sensitivity index may depend on several parameters of the system, but also can be constant, independent of any parameter. For example, $\Upsilon_{\theta}^{R_0} = +1$ means that

increasing (decreasing) θ by a given percentage increases (decreases) always R_0 by that same percentage. The estimation of a sensitive parameter should be carefully done, since a small perturbation in such parameter leads to relevant quantitative changes. On the other hand, the estimation of a parameter with a rather small value for the sensitivity index does not require as much attention to estimate, because a small perturbation in that parameter leads to small changes.

From Table 1, we conclude that the most sensitive parameters to the basic reproduction number R_0 of model (1.2) are $\Lambda, \beta_S, \mu_S, \mu_I$ and μ_W . In concrete, an increase of the value of β_S by (100%)will increase the basic reproduction number by 75% and this happens, in a similar way, for the parameters Λ and μ_W. In contrast, an increase of the value of μ_I by (100%) will decrease R_0 by 81.82% and this happens, in a similar way, for the parameter μ_S.

7 Numerical simulations

In this section, we aim to provide a numerical simulation to substantiate the theoretical results established in the previous sections by using Matlab Software with the parameters given in table 2. Here, we consider W be a virtual reservoir population that fits to scaling

Table 2: Parameters estimation

parameter	value
Λ	$0 - 0.7$
β_S	0.09
β_W	$0 - 0.7$
μ_S	0.03
γ	0.02
μ_I	0.09
μ_W	0.03
ε	$0 - 0.5$

of the population amounts and that is fitting by the infected (as stated) and decreases over time if no further input occurs.

8 Conclusions

In order to model the importance of the survival of pathogens outside the host, we proposed and investigated a mathematical model that describes the transmission dynamics of infectious diseases, which takes into account the effect of direct and indirect disease

Figure 1: Stability of E_0 and non existence of E_1 for $\tau \geq 0$ and $\nu \geq 0$ (left) and Instability of E_0 and stability of E_1 for $\tau \geq 0$ and $\nu \geq 0$ (right).

transmission and the period of latency. The well-posedness of the proposed model and the stability analysis of equilibria are rigorously studied. More precisely, we have established the existence, uniqueness, non negativity, and boundedness of solutions. By using appropriate Lyapunov functional and linearisation technique, we have proved that the first steady state E_0 is asymptotically stable when $R_0 \leq 1$, which means that the disease dies out in the population. However, when $R_0 > 1$, E_0 becomes unstable and the model has an endemic steady state E_1 which is asymptotically stable (Fig. 1). This leads to the persistence of disease. At $R_0 = 1$ the transcritical bifurcation occurs. In the population when $R_0 > 1$.
The global stability is proved. From the sensitivity part and figures 2, 3, 4 and 5; the best strategy to stop the propagation of the infectious diseases is to decrease the concentration of environmental viruses.

Funding: This research was supported by CNRST (Cov/2020/102).

References

[1] B. Alnseba, B. Chahrazed, M. Pierre, A model for ovine brucellosis incorporating direct and indirect transmission, J. Biol. Dyn. 4 (2010) 2-11.

[2] F.G. Boese, Stability with Respect to the Delay: On a Paper of K. L. Cooke and P. van den Driessche, *Journal of Math. Anal. & App.*, **228(2)** (1998), 293–321.

[3] C. Castillo-Chavez and B. Song, Dynamical Models of Tuberculosis and Their Applications. The reemergence of tuberculosis, *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, Volume 1, Number 2, (2004).



Figure 2: Temporal evolution of S, I and W for different values of Λ. If Λ increases, the number R_0 increases which imply the increasing of the infected population and the virus concentration.

[4] N. G. Chebotarev and N. N. Meiman, The routh-hurwitz problem for polynomials and entire functions. *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov*, (1949).

[5] C.T. Codeço, Endemic and epidemic dynamics of cholera: the role of the aquatic reservoir, BMC Infect. Dis. 1(1) (2001).

[6] K. L. Cooke and P. van den Driessche, On the zeroes of some transcendental equations, *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, **29** (1986), 77–90.

[7] M.J. Corbel, Brucellosis in Humans and Animals, World Health Organization, 2006.

[8] S.F. Dowell, Seasonal variation in host susceptibility and cycles of certain infectious diseases, Emerg. Infect. Dis. 7 (2001) 369–374.

[9] M.C. Eisenberga, Z.S. Shuai, J.H. Tien, P. van den Driessche, A cholera model in a patchy environment with water and human movement, Math. Biosci. 246 (2013) 105–112.

[10] H. Guo, M.Y. Li, Z. Shuai, Global stability of the endemic equilibrium of multigroup SIR epidemic models, Can. Appl. Math. Q. 14 (2006) 259–284.



Figure 3: Temporal evolution of S, I and W for different values of β_W. If β_W increases, the number R_0 increases which imply the increasing of infected population and virus concentration.

[11] H. Guo, M.Y. Li, Z. Shuai, A graph-theoretic approach to the method of global Lyapunov functions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 136 (2008) 2793–2802.

[12] Q. Hou, X.D. Sun, J. Zhang, Y.J. Liu, Y.M. Wang, Z. Jin, Modeling the transmission dynamics of brucellosis in Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, China, Math. Biosci. 242 (2013) 51–58.

[13] Q. Hou, X.D. Sun, Y.M. Wang, B.X. Huang, Z. Jin, Global properties of a general dynamic model for animal diseases: acase study of brucellosis and tuberculosis transmission, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 414 (2014) 424–433.

[14] C.B. Jonsson, L.T.M. Figueiredo, O. Vapalahti, A global perspective on hantavirus ecology, epidemiology, and disease, Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 23(2) (2010) 412.

[15] E.R. Kallio, J. Klingstro, E. Gustafsson, T. Manni, A. Vaheri, H. Henttonen, O. Vapalahti, Å. Lundkvist, Prolonged survival of Puumala hantavirus outside the host: evidence for indirect transmission via the environment, J. Gen. Virol. 87 (2006) 2127–2134.

[16] E. Kenah, D.L. Chao, L. Matrajt, M.E. Halloran, I.M. Longini Jr., The global transmission and control of influenza, PLoS ONE 6(5) (2011) e19515.



Figure 4: Temporal evolution of S, I and W for different values of ϵ. If ϵ increases, the number R_0 decreases which imply the decreasing of infected population and virus concentration.

[17] A. Kiszewski, A. Mellinger, A. Spielman, P. Malaney, S.E. Sachs, J. Sachs, A global index representing the stability of malaria transmission, Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. 70(5) (2004) 486–498.

[18] J.L. Kyle, E. Harris, Global spread and persistence of dengue, Annu. Rev. Microbiol. 62 (2008) 71–92.

[19] J. P. LaSalle, The stability of dynamical systems. *Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia*, Pa., (1976).

[20] M.Y. Li, Z. Shuai, Global-stability problem for coupled systems of differential equations on networks, J. Differential Equations 248 (2010) 1–20.

[21] M.T. Li, G.Q. Sun, Y.F. Wu, J. Zhang, Z. Jin, Transmission dynamics of a multi-group brucellosis model with mixed cross infection in public farm, Appl. Math. Comput. 237 (2014) 582–594.

[22] M.T. Li, G.Q. Sun, J. Zhang, Z. Jin, X.D. Sun, Y.M. Wang, B.X. Huang, Y.H. Zheng, Transmission dynamics and control for a brucellosis model in Hinggan League of Inner Mongolia, China, Math. Biosci. Eng. 11 (2014) 1115–1137.



Figure 5: Temporal evolution of S, I and W for different values of μ_W. If μ_W increases, the number R_0 increases which imply the increasing of infected population and virus concentration.

[23] Z. Mukandavire, S. Liao, J. Wang, H. Gaff, D.L. Smith, J.G. Morris Jr., Estimating the reproductive numbers for the 2008–2009 cholera outbreaks in Zimbabwe, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 108 (2011) 8767–8772.

[24] Z. Mukandavire, D.L. Smith, J.G. Morris Jr., Cholera in Haiti: reproductive numbers and vaccination coverage estimates, Sci. Rep. 3 (2013) 997.

[25] A. Mutreja, D.W. Kim, N.R. Thomson, T.R. Connor, J.H. Lee, S. Kariuki, N.J. Croucher, S.Y. Choi, S.R. Harris, M.Lebens, S.K. Niyogi, E.J. Kim, T. Ramamurthy, J. Chun, J.L.N. Wood, J.D. Clemens, C. Czerkinsky, G.B. Nair, J.Holmgren, J.L. Parkhill, G. Dougan, Evidence for several waves of global transmission in the seventh cholera pandemic, Nature 477 (2011) 462–465.

[26] F.N. Ngoteya and Y. N. Gyekye, Sensitivity Analysis of Parameters in a Competition Model, Appl. Comput. Math., 4(5) (2015), 363–368.

[27] J.J. Paul Tian, J. Wang, Global stability for cholera epidemic models, Math. Biosci. 232 (2011) 31–41.

[28] F. Sauvage, M. Langlais, N.G. Yoccoz, D. Pontier, Modelling hantavirus in fluctuating populations of bank voles: the role of indirect transmission on virus persistence, J. Anim. Ecol. 72 (2003) 1–13.

[29] Z.S. Shuai, P. van den Driessche, Global dynamics of cholera models with differential infectivity, Math. Biosci. 234 (2011) 118–126.

[30] R. Sun, Global stability of the endemic equilibrium of multigroup SIR models with nonlinear incidence, Comput. Math. Appl. 60 (2010) 2286–2291.

[31] R. Sun, J. Shi, Global stability of multigroup epidemic model with group mixing and nonlinear incidence rates, Appl. Math. Comput. 218 (2011) 280–286.

[32] G.R. Thomson, W. Vosloo, A.D.S. Bastos, Foot and mouth disease in wildlife, Virus Res. 91 (2003) 145–161.

[33] J.H. Tien, D.J.D. Earn, Multiple transmission pathways and disease dynamics in a waterborne pathogen model, Bull. Math. Biol. 72 (2010) 1506.

[34] L.W. Woods, Adenoviral diseases, in: E.S. Williams, I.K. Barker (Eds.), Infectious Diseases of Wildlife Mammals, 3rd edn., Manson, London, 2001, pp.202–212.

[35] Z. Yuan, L. Wang, Global stability of epidemiological models with group mixing and nonlinear incidencerates, Nonlinear Anal. RWA 11 (2010) 995–1004.

[36] J. Zhang, Z. Jin, G.Q. Sun, X.D. Sun, Y.M. Wang, B.X. Huang, Determination of original infection source of H7N9 avian influenza by dynamical model, Sci. Rep. 4 (2014).