A generalized ODE susceptible-infectious-susceptible compartmental model with potentially periodic behavior

Scott Greenhalgh[1]*, Anna Dumas[2],

1. Department of Mathematics, Siena College, 515 Loudon Road, Loudonville, NY, 12211

ORCID: 0000-0003-2484-4147

2. Department of Mathematics, Siena College, 515 Loudon Road, Loudonville, NY, 12211

* Corresponding author email: sgreenhalgh@siena.edu

Abstract. Differential equation compartmental models are invaluable tools used to forecast and analyze disease trajectories. Of these models, the subclass dealing only with susceptible and infectious individuals provides a rare and extremely useful example where solutions have a closed-form expression, as represented by the logistic equation. However, the logistic equation is limited in its capacity to describe disease trajectories, as its solutions must monotonically converge to either the disease-free equilibrium or endemic equilibrium, depending on parameters. Unfortunately, many diseases undergo periodic cycles and therefore do not converge to any equilibria. To address this limitation, we developed a generalized susceptible-infectious-susceptible compartmental model capable of describing both periodic and non-periodic disease trajectories built directly from an infectious period distribution. To demonstrate our approach, we apply the model to predict gonorrhea incidence in the US, and illustrate how model parameters affect the behavior of the system. The significance of our work is that we provide a novel susceptible-infected-susceptible model whose solution has a closed-form expression, which could be periodic or non-periodic, depending on model parameterization. Because of this, the work provides disease modelers with a simple means to investigate the potential periodic behavior of many diseases, and thereby aids in ongoing initiatives to curtail recurrent outbreaks.

Keywords: infectious period, duration of infection, gonorrhea, integral equations, differential equations.

MSC 92D30

Statements and Declarations

Competing Interests: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Drs. Troy Day, Emelie Kenney for constructive feedback that greatly improved the work. SG was partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant DMS-2052592.

Funding

SG was partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant DMS-2052592

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the study design. Data collection was performed by Anna Dumas. Model analyses were performed by Scott Greenhalgh and Anna Dumas. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Scott Greenhalgh and Anna Dumas, with revision and editing conducted by Scott Greenhalgh. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

1. Introduction

A rare few ODE compartmental models have solutions that are closed-form expressions. Most view this list as the class of susceptible-infectious (SI) and susceptible-infectious-susceptible (SIS) models, which amount to some form of the logistic growth equation (Nåsell 2011; Martcheva 2015). Less well-known are the infectious-recovered (IR) models (Lloyd 2017), which are akin to exponential growth, and thereby also deserve inclusion. Historically, these simple models have proven to be of great utility in the study of disease dynamics. For instance, SIS models are commonly used as a first means to predict the total number of people that an epidemic will infect, through the use of the associated final size equation (Brauer 2006; Martcheva 2015). They are also used in the framework to estimate the doubling-time of an epidemic (Smirnova et al. 2022) and can be applied to determine the vaccination level required to cause disease burnout (van den Driessche 2017). While IR models may have fewer applications, they are infamously quoted in media and literature (Fansher et al. 2022), as "exponential growth" is synonymous with most pandemics. Consequently, lay audiences and novice disease modelers are far more likely to be familiar with the behavior of IR models, at least in comparison to other model types.

Inarguably, SI, SIS, and IR differential equation models and their applications have inspired many current and future disease modelers. These models have limitations though. For instance, their ability to predict the trajectory of diseases is limited, as all trajectories monotonically converge to an equilibrium. Thus, these models cannot predict any form of recurrent epidemics, such as seasonal influenza, measles, and many sexually transmitted infections, among others. While current extensions of these models can address this issue, they do so at the cost of losing the closed-form expressions that make these elementary models convenient.

Here, we propose a new take on the SIS model. We derive our model starting from the general formulation of SIS models as a system of integral equations (Brauer 2010; Greenhalgh and Rozins 2021) under a general assumption placed on the duration of infection distribution. For particular cases of this class of distributions, we show that our generalized susceptible-infected-susceptible model (gSIS) reduces to the traditional SIS model (Kermack and Mckendrick 1991a, b, c) with constant coefficients, the SI model (when the demographic turnover rate is set to zero), and the IR model, respectively. In addition to these subclasses, we also show that our SIS model is nonautonomous directly because of the assumptions imposed on the duration of infection, and can analogously be viewed as a logistic growth equation with time-varying parameters. While many other works may have tackled similar logistic growth equations (Benardete et al. 2008; Lopez et al. 2010; Hale and Kocak 2012; Mir and Dubeau 2016), we illustrate how to connect the time-varying rates directly to the duration of infection, transmission rate, and demographic turnover rate. To achieve this, we propose that the duration of infection distribution belongs to a particular family of generalized exponential distribution (Bakouch et al. 2018), rather than the classical exponential distribution that is commonly inappropriate for describing the duration of infection (Lloyd 2001b, a; Nguyen and Rohani 2008; Conlan et al. 2010; Krylova and Earn 2013).

As proof of concept, we apply our gSIS model to predict gonorrhea incidence in the US. Gonorrhea is a nationally reportable sexually transmitted disease (2022a, b), which is typically caused by the spread of bacteria during sexual contact (Buder et al. 2019), although mother-to-child transmission is possible.

While medical treatment is available, gonorrhea infection confers little to no immunity (Russell et al. 2020), with re-infection common after subsequent exposures (Fung et al. 2007). However, despite this dynamic of infection, return to susceptibility, and re-infection, trends in gonorrhea infection can appear oscillatory (Tan et al. 2013), rather than convergent to a disease-free or endemic equilibrium, which casts doubt on the applicability of traditional SIS models for predicting disease trends. So, we apply our gSIS model to capture the oscillatory trajectory of gonorrhea in the US, all the while maintaining the convenient properties expected of traditional SIS models.

2. Methods

In what follows, we illustrate a gSIS model, as formulated by a system of ODEs. We derive the model starting from a system of Volterra integral equations, imposing the assumption that the infectious period belongs to a class of generalized exponential distributions. We then proceed to reduce the model to a logistic growth equation with time-varying parameters, illustrate the closed-form solutions for all special parameter values (Table 1), and completely characterize the stability properties of the system, including the potential occurrence of periodic cycles.

2.1 Generalized differential equation compartmental models. Classically, one of the most general forms of compartmental models is those formulated as a system of Volterra integral equations (Kermack and McKendrick 1937; Kermack and Mckendrick 1991a, b, c; Brauer 2008, 2010). For this classical compartmental model, the proportion of susceptible individuals is denoted as s, and the proportion of infected individuals is denoted as i, where the transition between compartments is given by

$$s = 1 - i_0 P(t,0)\exp(-bt) - \int_0^t \beta i(x)s(x)P(t,x)e^{-b(t-x)}\,dx,$$
$$i = i_0 P(t,0)\exp(-bt) + \int_0^t \beta i(x)s(x)P(t,x)e^{-b(t-x)}\,dx. \qquad 2.1$$

where β is the transmission rate, and b is the demographic turnover rate. Together, $P(t,x)e^{-b(t-x)}$ is the kernel of the integral equation, where $P(t,x)$ is a conditional survival function for the duration of infection for the proportion that remains infectious at time t given infection occurred at time x, and $e^{-b(t-x)}$ is a conditional survival function for natural mortality.

From 2.1, one can obtain the traditional differential equation SI model by imposing $P(t,x) = e^{-\gamma(t-x)}$, differentiating 2.1 with respect to t, and then substituting the remaining integral terms with the appropriate multiple of equations from 2.1 respectively.

To obtain the analogous generalized differential equation compartmental model (GDECM), we consider the same integral equation model structure but incorporate the average duration of infection at time t, namely the mean residual waiting-time $m(t)$. Note, that this changes how a disease is quantified in a population. It considers the number of person-days of infection (or proportion of person-day of

infection), rather than the standard quantity of incidence (or proportion of infected). The transition between these compartments is given by

$$s(t)m(t) = m(t) - i_0 m(0)P(t,0)e^{-bt} - \int_0^t \beta i(x)s(x)m(x)P(t,x)e^{-b(t-x)}dx,$$

$$i(t)m(t) = i_0 m(0)P(t,0)e^{-bt} + \int_0^t \beta i(x)s(x)m(x)P(t,x)e^{-b(t-x)}\,dx. \qquad 2.2$$

The distinction of 2.2 in comparison to 2.1 is that it describes both the infected proportion and a time-varying average duration of infection through the product $i(t)m(t)$, yet akin to 2.1, only the currently infected proportion contribute to infection, by means of the term $\beta i(x)$ within the integral, (see (Greenhalgh and Rozins 2021) for further details). Imposing the assumption that $P(t,x) = \exp(-\int_x^t \eta(z)dz)$, it follows that 2.2 reduces to the gSIS model (Greenhalgh and Rozins 2021):

$$s'm + m's = bm + m' - \beta ism - bsm + \eta im,$$

$$i'm + m'i = \beta ism - bim - \eta im,$$

or given the conservation of population, $s + i = 1$, after a slight rearrangement, simply

$$i' = \hat{r}(t)i(1 - \frac{i}{\hat{k}(t)}), \qquad 2.3$$

where $\hat{r}(t) = \beta - b - \eta - \frac{m'}{m}$, and $\hat{k}(t) = \frac{1}{\beta}\hat{r}(t)$.

2.2 The periodic hazard rate and mean residual waiting-time. The hazard rate and mean residual waiting-time functions are constructs often used in survival and reliability analysis to describe the frequency of events and the time remaining in a given state, respectively, after an elapsed period of time (Finkelstein 2008). The hazard rate function also characterizes (Gupta and Bradley 2003; Finkelstein 2008) the mean residual waiting-time through

$$\eta = \frac{m'+1}{m}, \qquad 2.4$$

and is often either non-increasing or non-decreasing (Finkelstein and Esaulova 2001). Recent work, however, illustrates the utility of more flexible functional forms. Specifically, hazard rates with a bathtub (Finkelstein and Esaulova 2001), upside-down bathtub (Sharma et al. 2014), or roller-coaster (Wong and Lindstrom) shape have been applied broadly in various contexts (Gupta and Gupta 2007). Here, we consider hazard rates that are potentially periodic, depending on model parameterization (Bakouch et al. 2018).

To obtain such a rate, we start from the cumulative distribution function (CDF)(Gupta and Langford 1984; Bakouch et al. 2018):

$$F(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2}(w^2 + \rho^2 - \alpha\rho^2 \cos(wt) + \alpha w\rho \sin(wt))e^{-\rho t} = 1 - e^{\int_0^t \eta(z)\, dz},$$

where $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$, $w \geq 0$, $\rho > 0$, and $t \geq 0$. From the CDF, the corresponding survival function and probability density function are

$$\bar{F}(t) = 1 - F(t),$$

and

$$f(t) = \frac{\rho(w^2+\rho^2)}{w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2}(1 - \alpha\cos(wt))e^{-\rho t},$$

respectively.

It follows that the hazard rate is

$$\eta(t) = \frac{f(t)}{\bar{F}(t)} = \frac{m'+1}{m} = \frac{\rho(w^2+\rho^2)(1-\alpha\cos(wt))}{w^2+\rho^2-\alpha\rho^2\cos(wt)+\alpha w\rho\sin(wt)}, \quad 2.5$$

where m is the mean residual waiting-time given by

$$m(t) = \frac{(w^2+\rho^2)^2+\alpha\rho^2(w^2-\rho^2)\cos(wt)+2\alpha\rho^3 w\sin(wt)}{\rho(w^2+\rho^2)(w^2+\rho^2-\alpha\rho^2\cos(wt)+\alpha w\rho\sin(wt))}. \quad 2.6$$

Necessarily, the initial condition on $m(t)$ (Gupta and Bradley 2003) is

$$m(0) = \mu = \frac{(w^2+\rho^2)^2+\alpha\rho^2(w^2-\rho^2)}{\rho(w^2+\rho^2)(w^2+\rho^2-\alpha\rho^2)},$$

where μ is the average infectious period.

Given the definition of $m(t)$, we directly obtain the survival function by (Gupta and Langford 1984; Finkelstein and Vaupel 2009):

$$\bar{F}(t) = \frac{m(0)}{m(t)}\exp\left(-\int_0^t \frac{1}{m(z)}dz\right).$$

In addition, the average recovery rate at time t is

$$\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \frac{1}{m(z)}dz = -\frac{1}{t}\ln\left(\frac{\alpha\rho^2(\rho^2-\omega^2)\cos(\omega t)-2\alpha\rho^3\omega\sin(\omega t)-(\rho^2+\omega^2)^2}{\alpha\rho^2(\rho^2-\omega^2)-(\rho^2+\omega^2)^2}\right) + \rho. \quad 2.7$$

2.3 Model solutions and properties. Under the assumption that $m(t)$ is time-dependent, the system 2.3 corresponds to a Bernoulli equation (Buckley 1953) of the form

$$\frac{di}{dt} + P(t)i = Q(t)i^n,$$

where $n = 2, P(t) =- \beta + b + \eta + \frac{m'}{m} =- \beta + b + \frac{2m'+1}{m}$, $Q(t) =- \beta$. Thus, the nonlinear ODE can be transformed through $i(t) = 1/y(t)$ into the first-order linear non-constant coefficient ODE,

$$\frac{dy}{dt} - P(t)y =- Q(t). \tag{2.8}$$

It follows that the integrating factor of the linear ODE is

$$\hat{\mu}(t) = \exp(\int_0^t \beta - b - \frac{2m'+1}{m}\, dz) = \frac{m(0)^2}{m^2} e^{(\beta-b)t-\int_0^t \frac{1}{m}\, dz} = \frac{m(0)}{m(t)} \bar{F}(t) e^{(\beta-b)t}. \tag{2.9}$$

Solving yields

$$y(t) = \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}(t)} y_0 + \frac{\beta}{\hat{\mu}(t)} \int_0^t \hat{\mu}(x)dx, \tag{2.10}$$

or upon reversing the transformation,

$$i(t) = \frac{\hat{\mu}(t) i_0}{1+\beta i_0 \int_0^t \hat{\mu}(x)dx}. \tag{2.11}$$

Table 1 Summary of model stability conditions and properties.

Growth rate condition	Hazard rate condition	Closed-form expression	Asymptotically stable DFE	Asymptotically stable periodic solution
$\beta = 0$	$\alpha = 0$ or $w = 0$	Yes	Yes	No
$\beta = 0$	$\alpha \neq 0$ and $w \neq 0$	Yes	Yes	No
$\beta - b - \rho < 0$	$\alpha = 0$ or $w = 0$	Yes	Yes	No
$\beta - b - \rho > 0$	$\alpha = 0$ or $w = 0$	Yes	No	No
$\beta - b - \rho = 0$	$\alpha = 0$ or $w = 0$	Yes	Yes	No
$\beta - b - \rho = 0$	$\alpha \neq 0$ and $w \neq 0$	Yes	Yes	No
$\beta - b - \rho < 0$	$\alpha \neq 0$ and $w \neq 0$	Yes	Yes	No
$\beta - b - \rho > 0$	$\alpha \neq 0$ and $w \neq 0$	Yes	No	Yes

We now proceed to illustrate that 2.11 includes SIS, and IR classes of compartmental models, and completely classify its stability behavior. Note, for ease of presentation, we exclude SI models, as their features can be obtained from the class of SIS models when $b = 0$.

2.3.1 The case when $\beta = 0$, and $w = 0$ or $\alpha = 0$. In this case, equation 2.3 reduces to an IR model, as described by an exponential decay. The solution in general is given by

$$i(t) = i_0 \exp(-(b + \rho)t),$$

which decays at the rate $b + \rho$, to the disease-free equilibrium (DFE), $i(t) = i_{DFE} = 0$.

2.3.2 The case when $\beta = 0$, and $w \neq 0$ or $\alpha \neq 0$. Similar to section 2.3.1, this model also reduces to an IR model, but the decay rate is time-dependent. The general solution for this case is

$$i(t) = i_0 \exp(-bt - \int_0^t \frac{2m(z)'+1}{m(z)} dz),$$

which possesses a closed-form expression when $\int_0^t \frac{1}{m(z)} dz$ is integrable. It also follows that solutions decay to the DFE, as both $b > 0$ and $m(t) > 0$.

2.3.3 The case when $\beta - b - \rho \neq 0$, and $w = 0$ or $\alpha = 0$. In this case, the duration of infection distribution reduces to an exponential distribution. When $\beta - b - \rho \neq 0$, with $w = 0$ or $\alpha = 0$, it follows 2.6 that $m(t) = 1/\rho$. So, equation 2.3 reduces to an SIS model, or equivalently a constant coefficient logistic differential equation. Thus, we have that

$$y(t) = y_0 e^{-(\beta-b-\rho)t} + \frac{\beta}{\beta-b-\rho}(1 - e^{-(\beta-b-\rho)t}),$$

which implies that

$$i(t) = \frac{i_0 e^{(\beta-b-\rho)t}}{1+\frac{\beta}{\beta-b-\rho} i_0 (e^{(\beta-b-\rho)t}-1)}. \qquad 2.12$$

The stability of each equilibrium of 2.12 is determined by the sign of $\beta - b - \rho$, or equivalently the basic reproductive number, as calculated through the next-generation approach (Diekmann et al. 2010), given by

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta}{b+\rho}. \qquad 2.13$$

It follows that the DFE is stable when $R_0 < 1$ and the endemic equilibrium is stable when $R_0 > 1$. Note, the stability for $R_0 = 1$ cannot be determined here, as the assumption $\beta - b - \rho \neq 0$ implies $R_0 \neq 1$.

2.3.4 The case when $\beta - b - \rho = 0$, and either $w = 0$ or $\alpha = 0$. Under such conditions, $m = 1/\rho$, and $\hat{\mu}(t) = 1$. It follows that

$$y(t) = y_0 + \beta t = y_0 + (b + \rho)t, \tag{2.14}$$

and thus

$$i(t) = \frac{i_0}{1+(b+\rho)i_0 t}. \tag{2.15}$$

Given that $b + \rho > 0$, it follows that the DFE is stable, as $i(t) \to 0$ when $t \to \infty$.

2.3.5 The case when $\beta - b - \rho = 0, w \neq 0, \alpha \neq 0$. When $\beta - b - \rho = 0$, the solution to 2.3 has a closed-form, as

$$\hat{\mu}(t)|_{\beta-b-\rho=0} = \hat{\mu}_0(t) = \frac{(w^2+\rho^2-\alpha\rho^2\cos(wt)+\alpha\omega\rho\sin(wt))^2(-w^4-\alpha\rho^2w^2-2w^2\rho^2-\rho^4+\alpha\rho^4)}{(w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2)^2(-(w^2+\rho^2)^2-\alpha\rho^2(w^2-\rho^2)\cos(wt)+2\alpha\rho^3 w\sin(wt)-\alpha w^2\rho^2\cos(wt))}.$$

Furthermore, it follows that the integral of $\hat{\mu}_0(t)$ also has a closed-form expression, as for integer $n > 0$ we have that

$$\int_{\frac{(2n-1)\pi}{w}}^{\frac{(2n+1)\pi}{w}} \hat{\mu}_0(x)dx = \frac{2\pi}{w}\frac{(w^2+(1+\alpha)\rho^2)(w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2)^3}{\sqrt{w^2+\rho^2}(w^4+(2+\alpha)w^2\rho^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^4)(w^2+(1-\alpha^2)\rho^2)^{3/2}} =: \psi,$$

and

$$\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{w}} \hat{\mu}_0(x)dx = \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\rho w\alpha}{\sqrt{(w^2+\rho^2)(w^2+(1-\alpha^2)\rho^2)}}\right)\right)\frac{\psi}{2} - \frac{2\alpha\rho(w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2)(w^4-(1-\alpha^2)\rho^4)}{(w^4+(2+\alpha)w^2\rho^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2)(w^2+(1+\alpha)\rho^2)^2(w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2)^2}) =: \psi_0.$$

For $t \in (\frac{(2n-1)\pi}{w}, \frac{(2n+1)\pi}{w})$ the integral of $\hat{\mu}_0(x)$ is

$$\int_{\frac{(2n-1)\pi}{w}}^{t} \hat{\mu}_0(x)dx = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{(w^2+(1+\alpha)\rho^2)\tan(\frac{1}{2}wt)+\rho w\alpha}{\sqrt{(w^2+\rho^2)(w^2+(1-\alpha^2)\rho^2)}}\right) + 1\right)\frac{\psi}{2} + \frac{2\alpha\rho(w^4-(1-\alpha^2)\rho^4)(w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2)^2\cos^2(\frac{1}{2}wt)}{g(t)}$$

$$+ \frac{2\alpha w\rho^2(w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2)^2((2+\alpha)w^2+(1+\alpha)(2-\alpha)\rho^2)\sin(\frac{1}{2}wt)\cos(\frac{1}{2}wt)}{g(t)} =: \Omega(t)$$

where $g(t) = (w^4 + (2 + \alpha)w^2\rho^2 + (1 - \alpha)\rho^4)(w^2 + (1 - \alpha^2)\rho^2)(w^2 + (1 + \alpha)\rho^2)($

$(w^2 + (1 + \alpha)\rho^2 - 2\alpha\rho^2\cos^2(\frac{1}{2}wt)) + 2\alpha w\rho\sin(\frac{1}{2}wt)\cos(\frac{1}{2}wt))$.

Thus, provided $\frac{(2n-1)\pi}{w} < t < \frac{(2n+1)\pi}{w}$, we have that

$$\int_0^t \hat{\mu}_0(x)dx = \psi_0 + (n-1)\psi + \Omega(t).$$

Consequently, it follows that $i(t)$ has a solution represented by a closed-form expression because $\hat{\mu}_0(x)$ and $\int_0^t \hat{\mu}_0(x)dt$ have such a feature. Furthermore, given that $0 < \hat{\mu}_0(t) < \infty$ is periodic, we have that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \int_0^t \hat{\mu}_0(x)dx = \infty$, which causes 2.11 to converge to the DFE.

2.3.6 The case when $\beta - b - \rho \neq 0, w \neq 0, \alpha \neq 0$. For this case in general, the solutions are up to the quadrature of $\hat{\mu}(t)$. To understand the qualitative behavior of i', we first consider the reformulation of 2.3 as a logistic equation with time-varying parameters:

$$(im)' = \hat{r}(t)im(1 - \frac{im}{\hat{k}(t)}), \qquad 2.16$$

where $\hat{r}(t) = \hat{r}(t + \frac{2\pi}{w}) = \beta - b - \eta(t)$ and $\hat{k}(t) = \hat{k}(t + \frac{2\pi}{w}) = \frac{(\beta - b - \eta(t))m(t)}{\beta}$.

To demonstrate the stability properties of 2.16, it suffices to provide conditions so that $\hat{r}(t) > 0$ and $0 < \underline{K} < \hat{k}(t) < \bar{K}$ (Lopez et al. 2010; Hale and Kocak 2012). As $\beta > 0$, $m(t) > 0$, and $m(t) = m(t + \frac{2\pi}{w})$, this problem reduces further to investigating $\hat{r}(t) = \beta - b - \eta(t)$.

The critical points of $\hat{r}(t)$ occur when

$$\frac{d\eta}{dt}\Big|_{t=t^*} = 0 \Leftrightarrow w\sin(wt^*) + \rho\alpha - \rho\cos(wt^*) = 0,$$

Furthermore, from t^*, a local minimum occurs when

$$\frac{d^2\eta}{d^2t}\Big|_{t=t^*} = \frac{\alpha\rho w^3(w^2+\rho^2)}{(w^2+(1-\alpha^2)\rho^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} > 0,$$

and a local maximum when

$$\frac{d^2\eta}{d^2t}\Big|_{t=t^*} = -\frac{\alpha\rho w^3(w^2+\rho^2)}{(w^2+(1-\alpha^2)\rho^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} < 0.$$

It follows that

$$r(t^*) = \beta - b - \rho \pm \frac{\rho w\alpha}{\sqrt{w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2}}.$$

Thus, if

$$\beta - b - \rho - \frac{\rho w \alpha}{\sqrt{w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2}} > 0, \qquad 2.17$$

then 2.16 has two non-negative periodic solutions (Lopez et al. 2010; Hale and Kocak 2012), with one being the DFE. The second periodic solution arises because there exists $\underline{K}=\frac{\beta}{(\beta-b-\rho+\frac{\rho w\alpha}{\sqrt{w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2}})\ \max m(t)}$ > 0, and $\bar{K}=\frac{\beta}{(\beta-b-\rho-\frac{\rho w\alpha}{\sqrt{w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2}})\ \min m(t)} > 0$, so that

1. for $i_0 \in [\underline{K}, \bar{K}]$ then $i(t) \in [\underline{K}, \bar{K}]$,

2. for $i_0 < \underline{K}$ then $i' > 0$, and

3. when $i_0 > \bar{K}$ then $i' < 0$.

To summarize, $[\underline{K}, \bar{K}]$ acts as a trapping region for $i(t)$, and so there exists $i_0 \in [\underline{K}, \bar{K}]$ such that $i(t)$ is periodic. Furthermore, this second periodic solution satisfies the criteria to be asymptotically stable (Hale and Kocak 2012).

To address when $\beta - b - \rho - \frac{\rho w\alpha}{\sqrt{w^2+(1-\alpha)\rho^2}} < 0$, we first assume there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so that $\beta = b + \rho + \epsilon$. It follows from 2.6 and 2.7 that 2.9 is bounded:

$$Le^{\epsilon t} \leq \hat{\mu}(t) \leq Ue^{\epsilon t},$$

where $0 < L \leq U$ are constants.

Thus, given $i_0 > 0$, from 2.11 we have that

$$LB(t) := \frac{i_0 Le^{\epsilon t}}{1+\beta i_0 \int_0^t Ue^{\epsilon x} dx} \leq i(t) \leq \frac{i_0 Ue^{\epsilon t}}{1+\beta i_0 \int_0^t Le^{\epsilon x} dx} =: UB(t).$$

Taking the limit as $t \to \infty$ and applying l'Hôpital's rule, we obtain the bounds

$$0 < \frac{\epsilon L}{(\epsilon+b+\rho)U} \leq \lim_{t\to\infty} i(t) \leq \frac{\epsilon U}{(\epsilon+b+\rho)L}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}LB = \epsilon LB(1 - \frac{(b+\rho+\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\frac{U}{L}LB),$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}UB = \epsilon UB(1 - \frac{(b+\rho+\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\frac{L}{U}UB).$$

Naturally, this implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt}LB \leq \frac{d}{dt}i \leq \frac{d}{dt}UB.$$

As a consequence of these bounds, if $i < \frac{\epsilon L}{(\epsilon+b+\rho)U}$, then $\frac{d}{dt}i > 0$, and if $i > \frac{\epsilon U}{(\epsilon+b+\rho)L}$, then $\frac{d}{dt}i < 0$. Similar to when $r(t)$ is strictly positive, $[\frac{\epsilon L}{(\epsilon+b+\rho)U}, \frac{\epsilon U}{(\epsilon+b+\rho)L}]$ acts as a trapping region. Therefore, provided $\beta - b - \rho > 0$, there exists a second periodic solution, which is asymptotically stable (Supplementary Information).

Next, we consider $\epsilon > 0$ so that $\beta = b + \rho - \epsilon$. It follows once again that constants exist so that

$$\hat{L}e^{-\epsilon t} \leq \hat{\mu}(t) \leq \hat{U}e^{-\epsilon t}.$$

Given these bounds on the integrating factor $\hat{\mu}(t)$, we have that

$$0 \leq i(t) \leq \frac{\hat{U}e^{-\epsilon t}i_0}{1+\beta i_0\int_0^t \hat{L}e^{-\epsilon x}dx}. \qquad 2.18$$

Taking the limit, we have that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\hat{U}e^{-\epsilon t}i_0}{1+\beta i_0\int_0^t \hat{L}e^{-\epsilon x}dx} = 0$, and thus $i(t)$ converges to the DFE.

3. Application of the methodology to gonorrhea in the United States.

To illustrate the utility of our model, we apply it as well as the traditional SIS model to predict gonorrhea incidence in the United States. We consider periodic and non-periodic scenarios of our model (Table 1), estimating parameters by minimizing the least-square error of model predictions with historical data on gonorrhea incidence from 2018-2021, as well as infectious period data from the literature (2022a, b).

From data on the infectious period of gonorrhea (2022a, b), the average duration of infection is $\mu \approx 1.05$ weeks. Using this, we reduce the number of parameters to estimate by imposing that ρ satisfies

$$\mu - \frac{(w^2+\rho^2)^2+\alpha\rho^2(w^2-\rho^2)}{\rho(w^2+\rho^2)(w^2+\rho^2-\alpha\rho^2)} = 0,$$

given μ is the average duration of infection, where w and α are determined by minimizing the least square error between model predictions and gonorrhea incidence data for the gSIS model, or set to zero for the traditional SIS model. Details of additional parameters, including the transmission rate, are available in Table 2.

Given the estimate of model parameters, the (time-varying) average duration of infection varies between 7. 12 days and 7.76 days for the gSIS model, and remains constant at 7.34 days for the SIS model (Figure 1). For both models, we have that the DFE is unstable, as $\tilde{\beta} - \tilde{\rho} - b = 0.023 > 0$ and $\hat{\beta} - \hat{\rho} - b = 0.018 > 0$ for the gSIS and SIS models, respectively. Using the estimated parameters (Table 2), the gSIS and traditional SIS models predict a maximum of 6224 and 7789 new incidences of gonorrhea per week, respectively, over the next 300 weeks (Figure 2). For the gSIS model, the period of the epidemic was estimated as 39.9 weeks, with an amplitude of seasonality of -0.257.

To inform on the merit of our predictions, we calculated Akaike information criteria (AIC) (Lancelot et al. 2002). Briefly, AIC is a mathematical method for comparing how well models fit data, relative to one another, which takes into account model complexity (Symonds and Moussalli 2011). Assuming model solutions are represented by $i(t; \beta, \rho, \alpha, w, i_0)$, we define the new incidence as

$$\lambda(t; N, \beta, \rho, \alpha, w, i_0) = N\beta\, i(t; \beta, \rho, \alpha, w, i_0)(1 - i(t; \beta, \rho, \alpha, w, i_0)),$$

where a subscript of SIS or gSIS is used to distinguish between cases.

It follows for the gSIS and SIS models that $AIC_{gSIS} = 654.8$ and $AIC_{SIS} = 833.7$ (Supplementary Information). Thus, as $AIC_{gSIS} < AIC_{SIS}$, the criterion suggests that gSIS is a more appropriate model for describing the trajectory of gonorrhea.



Fig. 1. The time-varying average duration of infection. Estimate of average duration of infection of gonorrhea infection at time t for a) $1/\rho = 7.429$ days , $\alpha = -0.257$, $\frac{2\pi}{w} = 39.9$ weeks (red solid curve) and b) $1/\rho = 7.4294$ days, $\alpha = w = 0$ (blue dashed curve).



Fig. 2. Model fit and predictions of new gonorrhea infections. The trajectory of new gonorrhea infections based on data (black dotted curve), SI model (red solid curve), and generalized SI model (blue dashed line).

Table 2. Parameters, base values, and sources.

Parameter	Constant	Value
Demographic turnover rate	b	0.024/year
Population size (1000s)	N	
SIS		437.4
gSIS		218.7
Duration of infection (in absence of periodicity)	$1/\rho$	
SIS		1.06 weeks
gSIS		1.05 weeks
Transmission rate	β	
SIS		0.971/week
gSIS		0.966/week
Periodic of the epidemic	$\frac{2\pi}{w}$	
SIS		Undefined
gSIS		39.9 weeks
Magnitude of seasonality	α	
SIS		0
gSIS		-0.257

4. Discussion

We demonstrated a novel take on SIS models motivated by their extension to generalized differential equation compartmental models. For our model, we completely characterized its stability behavior, illustrated its equivalence to two formulations of time-varying logistic growth equations, and demonstrated that all known families of compartmental models that feature solutions with closed-form expressions are special cases. Importantly, this work is also the first to build an SIS compartmental

model with time-varying parameters directly from assumptions placed on the duration of infection distribution, while also extending SIS models to potentially feature periodic behavior.

We illustrated a GDECM with new solutions that were closed-form expressions beyond the well-known SIS, SI, and IR models. While it remains an open question whether more complex models have such convenient properties, the added flexibility of GDECM should provide a means to obtain additional gSIS models with such features. Furthermore, the GDECM framework may even enable the development of the first SIR models with solutions that have a closed-form expression. If such a SIR model exists, it would imply the existence of an additional conservation law beyond the conservation of population, and therefore could, at least in theory, be tested empirically.

An interesting feature of gSIS is that the existence of periodic solutions requires $\beta - \rho - b > 0$, or equivalently $R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\rho + b} > 1$. Typically, for autonomous compartmental models, the existence of periodic solutions (when only one endemic equilibrium exists) requires a specific set of parameter values so that $\beta - \rho - b \approx 0$, at least according to Hopf-bifurcation theory (Stadtländer and K.-H. Stadtländer 2010). As such, the condition required for periodic solutions of gSIS models suggests oscillatory dynamics are far more likely, which is corroborated by observed trends of many disease trajectories that feature reproductive numbers greater than one.

While our work focuses on gSIS models, it provides an important extension to logistic growth equations with time-varying parameters. To date, the majority of analyses of such logistic models require that the time-varying growth parameter is non-negative for periodic solutions to exist. Here, we show that it is possible to weaken this condition to periodic rates that are positive more often than negative. Biologically speaking, such a condition seems plausible, at least for diseases or species that reproduce in low numbers frequently, subject to some form of seasonal fluctuations.

The estimated epidemic period of 39.9 weeks provided by the gSIS model closely mirrors the average duration of a school year of approximately 40 weeks (including weekends and holidays). While this similarity could be a coincidence, the high prevalence of gonorrhea among 15-24 year-olds (2022a), and the known role of the school year in the transmission of other diseases (Keeling et al. 2001; Metcalf et al. 2009), suggests that the length of the school year may play a prominent role in the periodic behavior of gonorrhea.

A further avenue of research is to consider a gSIS multistrain model that features a mixture of distributions with periodic hazard rates. Specifically, with such a model and distribution it may be possible to ascertain fundamental frequencies of transmission and infection directly from the model's solution. Subsequently, it may also be possible to determine whether there could be any resonance between strains (Bacaër and Abdurahman 2008) and how such a thing may contribute to pathogen evolution. Another direction for future work is the merger of gSIS with techniques for predicting the doubling-time of epidemics. While recent work tackles the question of doubling-time for epidemic models in the context of a modified Richards model (Smirnova et al. 2022) (a generalization of logistic growth), it stands to reason that such analysis could be applied to gSIS models, given their formulations as logistic growth equations with time-dependent parameters. Relatedly, the solutions with closed-form expression of gSIS should also provide a means to estimate a final size function, akin to a final size

equation of autonomous SIS models, that could provide details on the number of infected individuals, given only an initial condition and desired time period.

While this work focuses on a modification of differential equation SIS models to include a time-varying average duration of infection, one could also study gSIS models in the context of integral equations. The added flexibility of such a modification to an integral equation description of disease spread may provide a means to tackle open challenges in disease modeling (Lloyd-Smith et al. 2015), such as understanding the endemic equilibrium and defining its stability (Roberts et al. 2015).

Extending SIS models to the framework of GDECM carries with it many of the limitations of differential equation compartmental models, with a homogeneously mixed population likely being the most prominent drawback. Furthermore, the extension of SIS to gSIS still may not be sufficient to accurately represent the transmission dynamics of gonorrhea, as the inclusion of treatment, asymptomatic infection, and treatment resistance classes, among others, may be required to accurately capture transmission dynamics. Another drawback of gSIS, at least relative to SIS, is that it requires more abundant information on the average duration of infection, namely how it varies in time. While this requirement may not greatly inhibit the theoretical development and application of this new class of models, it may preclude its use in more data-intensive disease modeling analyses.

In summary, we demonstrated a new class of compartmental models based on extending a simple SIS model to the framework of GDECM. In accomplishing this, we showed how this simple extension adds the potential for rich dynamics and solutions that have closed-form expressions. Naturally, generalizing compartmental models further will likely only enhance these features and properties, and thereby provide ample avenues for future investigation.

Declarations

Funding: SG was partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant DMS-2052592

Competing Interests: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose

Acknowledgments: The authors wish to thank Drs. Troy Day and Emelie Kenney for constructive feedback that greatly improved the clarity of the work

Data availability statement: The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available in a GITHUB repository (Greenhalgh and Dumas 2022), see doi 10.5281/zenodo.6595905

References

Bacaër N, Abdurahman X (2008) Resonance of the epidemic threshold in a periodic environment. J Math Biol 57:649–673

Bakouch HS, Chesneau C, Leao J (2018) A new lifetime model with a periodic hazard rate and an application. J Stat Comput Simul 88:2048–2065

Benardete DM, Noonburg VW, Pollina B (2008) Qualitative Tools for Studying Periodic Solutions and Bifurcations as Applied to the Periodically Harvested Logistic Equation. Am Math Mon 115:202–219

Brauer F (2006) Some simple epidemic models. Math Biosci Eng 3:1–15

Brauer F (2010) General compartmental epidemic models. Chinese Annals of Mathematics, Series B 31:289–304

Brauer F (2008) Compartmental Models in Epidemiology. Mathematical Epidemiology 19–79

Buckley A (1953) The Bernoulli Differential Equation. The American Mathematical Monthly 60:325

Buder S, Schöfer H, Meyer T, et al (2019) Bacterial sexually transmitted infections. J Dtsch Dermatol Ges 17:287–315

Conlan AJK, Rohani P, Lloyd AL, et al (2010) Resolving the impact of waiting time distributions on the persistence of measles. J R Soc Interface 7:623–640

Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Roberts MG (2010) The construction of next-generation matrices for compartmental epidemic models. J R Soc Interface 7:873–885

Fansher M, Adkins TJ, Lewis RL, et al (2022) How well do ordinary Americans forecast the growth of COVID-19? Mem Cognit. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-022-01288-0

Finkelstein M (2008) Failure Rate Modelling for Reliability and Risk. Springer Science & Business Media

Finkelstein MS, Esaulova V (2001) MODELING A FAILURE RATE FOR A MIXTURE OF DISTRIBUTION FUNCTIONS. Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences 15:383–400

Finkelstein M, Vaupel J (2009) Survival as a Function of Life Expectancy. Demographic Research 21:879–884

Fung M, Scott KC, Kent CK, Klausner JD (2007) Chlamydial and gonococcal reinfection among men: a systematic review of data to evaluate the need for retesting. Sex Transm Infect 83:304–309

Greenhalgh S, Dumas A (2022) mathguypi314/GSISmodel: gSIS model. Zenodo

Greenhalgh S, Rozins C (2021) A generalized differential equation compartmental model of infectious disease transmission. Infect Dis Model 6:1073–1091

Gupta RC, Bradley DM (2003) Representing the mean residual life in terms of the failure rate. Math Comput Model 37:1271–1280

Gupta RC, Gupta RD (2007) Proportional reversed hazard rate model and its applications. J Stat Plan

Inference 137:3525–3536

Gupta RC, Langford ES (1984) On the determination of a distribution by its median residual life function: a functional equation. J Appl Probab 21:120–128

Hale JK, Kocak H (2012) Dynamics and Bifurcations. Springer Science & Business Media

Keeling MJ, Rohani P, Grenfell BT (2001) Seasonally forced disease dynamics explored as switching between attractors. Physica D 148:317–335

Kermack W, Mckendrick A (1991a) Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics—III. Further studies of the problem of endemicity. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology 53:89–118

Kermack W, Mckendrick A (1991b) Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics—I. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology 53:33–55

Kermack W, Mckendrick A (1991c) Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics—II. the problem of endemicity. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology 53:57–87

Kermack WO, McKendrick AG (1937) Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics IV. Analysis of experimental epidemics of the virus disease mouse ectromelia. Journal of Hygiene 37:172–187

Krylova O, Earn DJD (2013) Effects of the infectious period distribution on predicted transitions in childhood disease dynamics. J R Soc Interface 10:20130098

Lancelot R, Lesnoff M, McDermott JJ (2002) Use of Akaike information criteria for model selection and inference. Preventive Veterinary Medicine 55:217–240

Lloyd A (2017) Introduction to Epidemiological Modeling: Basic Models and Their Properties

Lloyd AL (2001a) Realistic distributions of infectious periods in epidemic models: changing patterns of persistence and dynamics. Theor Popul Biol 60:59–71

Lloyd AL (2001b) Destabilization of epidemic models with the inclusion of realistic distributions of infectious periods. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences 268:985–993

Lloyd-Smith JO, Mollison D, Metcalf CJE, et al (2015) Challenges in modelling infectious disease dynamics: preface. Epidemics 10:iii–iv

Lopez RM, Morin BR, Suslov SK (2010) Logistic Models with Time-Dependent Coefficients and Some of Their Applications. arXiv [q-bio.PE]

Martcheva M (2015) An introduction to mathematical epidemiology, 1st edn. Springer, New York, NY

Metcalf CJE, Bjørnstad ON, Grenfell BT, Andreasen V (2009) Seasonality and comparative dynamics of six childhood infections in pre-vaccination Copenhagen. Proc Biol Sci 276:4111–4118

Mir Y, Dubeau F (2016) Linear and logistic models with time dependent coefficients. Electron J Differential Equations 2016:1–17

Nåsell I (2011) Thresholds for the SIS Model. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 171–175

Nguyen HTH, Rohani P (2008) Noise, nonlinearity and seasonality: the epidemics of whooping cough revisited. J R Soc Interface 5:403–413

Roberts M, Andreasen V, Lloyd A, Pellis L (2015) Nine challenges for deterministic epidemic models. Epidemics 10:49–53

Russell MW, Gray-Owen SD, Jerse AE (2020) Editorial: Immunity to Neisseria gonorrhoeae. Front Immunol 0.: https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2020.01375

Sharma VK, Singh SK, Singh U (2014) A new upside-down bathtub shaped hazard rate model for survival data analysis. Appl Math Comput 239:242–253

Smirnova A, Pidgeon B, Chowell G, Zhao Y (2022) The doubling time analysis for modified infectious disease Richards model with applications to COVID-19 pandemic. Math Biosci Eng 19:3242–3268

Stadtländer CTK-H, K.-H. Stadtländer CT (2010) A Biologist's Guide to Mathematical Modeling in Ecology and Evolution by Sarah P. Otto and Troy Day. Journal of Biological Dynamics 4:650–652

Symonds MRE, Moussalli A (2011) A brief guide to model selection, multimodel inference and model averaging in behavioural ecology using Akaike's information criterion. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 65:13–21

Tan NX, Tan GX, Yang L-G, et al (2013) Temporal Trends in Syphilis and Gonorrhea Incidences in Guangdong Province, China. J Infect Dis 209:426–430

van den Driessche P (2017) Reproduction numbers of infectious disease models. Infectious Disease Modelling 2:288–303

Wong KL, Lindstrom DL Off the bathtub onto the roller-coaster curve (electronic equipment failure). 1988. Proceedings., Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium

(2022a) Detailed STD Facts - Gonorrhea. https://www.cdc.gov/std/gonorrhea/stdfact-gonorrhea-detailed.htm. Accessed 12 May 2022

(2022b) National Overview - Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance, 2019. https://www.cdc.gov/std/statistics/2019/overview.htm#Gonorrhea. Accessed 12 May 2022

Supplementary Information

In this appendix, we provide further details on the stability of periodic solutions for our generalized susceptible-infected-susceptible model (gSIS). In addition, we also provide details that demonstrate that the mean residual waiting-time, $m(t)$, is positive and bounded, and outline our calculation of the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC).

S.1. Stability conditions of periodic solutions. Consider the gSIS model, as represented by the time-varying logistic growth equation,

$$i' = \hat{r}(t)i(1 - \frac{i}{\hat{k}(t)}),$$

where $\hat{r}(t) = \beta - b - \frac{2m'+1}{m}$, and $\hat{k}(t) = \frac{1}{\beta}\hat{r}(t)$.

Assuming $i(t)$ is a periodic solution, with period $\frac{2\pi}{w}$, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{i(\frac{2\pi}{w})} = A + \frac{B}{i(0)}, \qquad \text{S1.1}$$

where

$$A = B\int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{w}} \frac{\hat{r}(t)}{\hat{k}(t)}\exp(-\int_0^t \hat{r}(z)dz)dt,$$

and

$$B = \exp(-\int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{w}} \hat{r}(t)dt).$$

Defining $i_n = i(\frac{2\pi n}{w})$, it follows that S1.1 is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{i_{n+1}} = A + \frac{B}{i_n}$$

or

$$i_{n+1} - i_n = (1 - B)i_{n+1}(1 - \frac{A}{1-B}i_n). \qquad \text{S1.2}$$

It follows that S1.2 has two equilibria, $i^* = 0$, which corresponds to the DFE of i', and $\hat{i} = \frac{1-B}{A}$, which corresponds to the periodic solution of i'. Linearizing S1.2 about $\hat{i}$, it follows that $\hat{i}$ is locally stable provided

$$-1 + B < 0.$$

Translating this back to the original system, we have that the periodic solution is locally stable when

S1.3

$$-1 + \exp\left(-\int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{w}} \beta - b - \frac{2m'+1}{m} dt\right) < 0.$$

Noting that $\int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{w}} \frac{m'}{m} dt = \ln(m(\frac{2\pi}{w})) - \ln(m(0)) = 0$, and that $\int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{w}} \frac{1}{m(z)} dz = \frac{2\pi}{w}\rho$ due to the periodicity of $m(t)$, it follows that S1.3 reduces to

$$\beta - b - \rho > 0.$$

S.2 Upper and lower bounds on the mean residual waiting-time. Here we show that the mean residual waiting-time, given by

$$m(t) = \frac{(w^2+\rho^2)^2+\alpha\rho^2(w^2-\rho^2)\cos(wt)+2\alpha\rho^3 w\sin(wt)}{\rho(w^2+\rho^2)(w^2+\rho^2-\alpha\rho^2\cos(wt)+\alpha w\rho\sin(wt))}$$

is positive and bounded.

To begin, we determine the critical points of $m(t)$,

$$m(t^*)' = 0.$$

Recalling the hazard rate $\eta = \frac{m'+1}{m}$, we have that

$$m(t^*)' = \eta(t^*)m(t^*) - 1 = 0.$$

By virtue of η being positive and bounded (Bakouch et al. 2018), it follows that m is the same.

S.3 The calculation of Akaike Information Criteria. Assuming model solutions are represented by $i(t;\beta,\rho,\alpha,w,i_0)$, we define new incidence as

$$\lambda(t;N,\beta,\rho,\alpha,w,i_0) = N\beta\, i(t;\beta,\rho,\alpha,w,i_0)(1 - i(t;\beta,\rho,\alpha,w,i_0)),$$

where a subscript of SIS or gSIS is used to distinguish between cases.

It follows for the SIS model that

$$AIC_{SIS} = M(\ln(2\pi) + 1) + M\ \ln\left(\frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=0}^{M}(\lambda_{SIS}(j;\hat{N},\hat{\beta},\rho,0,0,\hat{i}_0) - i_{new}(j))^2\right) + 2(k_{SIS} + 1) = 833.7$$

where M is the number of data points, $i_{new}(j)$ is the observed new incidence on the jth week, $k_{SIS} = 3$ is the number of estimated parameters, and $\hat{N}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and $\hat{i}_0$ are best estimates of these parameters from the least square minimization procedure.

Similarly, for the gSIS model, it follows that

$$AIC_{gSIS} = M(\ln(2\pi) + 1) + M \ln(\frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=0}^{M}(\lambda_{gSIS}(j; \tilde{N}, \tilde{\beta}, \rho, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{w}, \tilde{i}_0) - i_{new}(j))^2) + 2(k_{gSIS} + 1) = 654.8$$

where $k_{gSIS} = 5$ is the number of parameters estimated, and $\tilde{N}$, $\tilde{\beta}$, $\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{w}$ and $\tilde{i}_0$ are the best estimates of parameters from the least square minimization procedure for the gSIS model.