Mathematical Model of Disease Transmission and Control: Incorporating Age and Deprivation Decile

Gbeminiyi J. Oyedele[1,4,*], **Oluwarimi J. Idowu**[3,+], **and Michael J. Tildesley**[1,2,+]

[1]University of Warwick, Institute for global and Pandemic Planning, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK
[2]University of Warwick, School of Life Sciences and Mathematics Institute, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK
[3]University of Benin, Department of Mathematics, Benin, P.M.B. 1154, Nigeria
[4]University of Warwick, Warwick Medical School, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK
[*]gbeminiyi.oyedele@warwick.ac.uk
[+]these authors contributed equally to this work

ABSTRACT

The epidemic of COVID-19 has opened a significant interest in developing mathematical models that could incorporate more complexities into the dynamics of disease transmission and control. This study aims to perform a rigorous mathematical analysis on incorporating the effects of age mixing and deprivation decile into an epidemic model of infectious diseases using deterministic models. We consider a mathematical model consisting of nine compartments: susceptible, exposed, asymptomatic, unreported and untested, tested and awaiting test results, positively tested symptomatic and hospitalised, recovered, and dead. The basic reproduction number was estimated using the next generation matrix approach. The analysis shows that the most deprived group in the population demonstrated disproportionately higher number of infections compared with the least deprived groups, and this was consistent across the deprivation spectrum. Our work suggests that in order to effectively control disease, support should be given to those individuals with higher levels of deprivation in order to improve uptake of intervention measures in those groups to reduce the burden of disease.

Keywords: Coronavirus disease, Mathematical Modeling, Sensitivity analysis, Basic reproduction number.

Introduction

Transmission and control of COVID-19 disease has been studied extensively using mathematical models since the SARS-CoV-2 virus first emerged in late 2019[1,2,3]. Modellers over the years have collaborated with policymakers to proffer solutions to critical issues associated with disease outbreaks that cause public health emergencies. Mathematical models address several critical questions, including the projected final size of the outbreak, the estimated number of individuals that will be infected, the timing to the peak of infection, and the best optimal method to control spread of disease.[4,5,6,7]. This makes models used to study infectious disease a vital tools in epidemiological studies[8]. A well-defined model can be used to forecast the anticipated numbers of infections, death, and hospitalisations during an epidemic. Nevertheless, the outbreak of COVID-19 has opened a significant interest in developing robust mathematical models that could incorporate more complexities into the dynamics of disease transmission and control.

Daniel Bernoulli used mathematical models first in the 18th century with a focus to encourage policymakers on the need to adopt universal inoculation[9]. His findings laid a good foundation for the study of mathematical modelling of infectious disease[10]. Modern mathematical modelling commenced in the 20th century as shown in the findings of[11,12,13].[13] in his paper focused on establishing models that could reduce mosquito populations to a certain threshold so that malaria could be eradicated. However, the work of[11,12] played a role in becoming the premise of mathematical modelling of infectious diseases today with the formation of the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model. However, the SIR model, notwithstanding its ability to describe the patterns of infectious disease spread, is limited by its inability to study the incubation period. Over the years, this type of model has evolved to be able to incorporate more realistic scenarios that can more accurately capture the dynamics of infectious diseases.

Age-structure has been widely used in infectious disease models, basically to ascertain the differences of different age groups to disease susceptibility and patterns of contact[14,15,16],[17]. However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, there are substantial evidences indicating age-related disparities in susceptibility, severity, and mortality,[16,18,19].[16] found individuals under 20 are less susceptible, while[18] observed lower infection fatality in age group 5-9 compared to older groups. An age-structured model by[20]

estimates the "country-specific" basic reproduction number ($R0$). The study indicates that age and contact structures are crucial in COVID-19 transmission, with countries having older populations experiencing a faster spread of the disease. The COVID-19 pandemic did not affect all individuals and communities equally. It was likely that individuals living in overcrowded conditions[21] and/or employed in high-contact service occupations[22] were likely to be at a higher risk of infection, potentially increasing the burden of COVID-19 for socioeconomically disadvantaged communities. Socioeconomic and healthcare inequalities, may have also have fuelled a coronavirus disease spread among the minority or disadvantaged groups. Therefore, a mathematical model is essential to examine factors influencing disproportionate disease outcomes across deprivation deciles during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Few studies have incorporated different layers of sociodemographic or socioeconomic groups and age into mathematical model of infectious diseases[23][24][25][26][27]. [27] used a stochastic infectious disease model which incorporate age and depriovation decile using the 2019 English Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). Our study aims to perform a rigorous mathematical analysis on incorporating the effects of age mixing and deprivation deciles into an epidemic model of COVID-19 using a deterministic modelling framework.

Mathematical Model and Analysis

We consider an extended SEIR mathematical model of infectious diseases, segregated into age $i : i = 1, \cdots, 21$ and deprivation decile $n : n = 1, 2, \cdots, 10$. In the mathematical model presented, $S, E, A, J, Q, I, H, R, D$ represents different health states or compartment which are susceptible, exposed, asymptomatic, unreported/untest, awaiting result, positively tested, hospitalised, recovered, and fatally ill respectively. Therefore, S_i^n is the number of susceptible individual of age group i and deprivation decile n. Essentially, the model segments individuals based on both age and socioeconomic factors (as indicated by deprivation decile) to better understand and predict disease dynamics within these compartments. The total population by age and deprivation decile is defined as:

$$N_i^n = S_i^n + E_i^n + A_i^n + J_i^n + Qi^n + I_i^n + H_i^n + D_i^n + R_i^n \tag{1}$$

Infectious individuals come into contact with susceptible individuals at a rate β_i^n, which is a function of social mixing, age mixing, differential susceptibility, and infectivity by age, and relative transmission. These individuals become exposed to infection, and progress to either the asymptomatic, unreported symptomatic, or reported symptomatic compartment A_i^n, J_i^n,or Q_i^n respectively. In the Q_i^n compartment, we assumed that all individuals are tested at rate $\pi(t)$ and stay in the compartment for an average period $\frac{1}{\psi}$ *days* until they obtain their test results. In this study, we took the assumption that testing rest is a function of time, because at the onset of an epidemic, the testing rate will be lower compared to later when testing was more readily available available[28]. Hence, the “testing parameter " $\pi(t)$ was defined using the Generalised Richards Model (GRM) (extended logistic function)[29].

Model Equations

$$\frac{dS_i^n}{dt} = -(\beta)_{n,i}(t)\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n} + \varepsilon R_i^n \tag{2a}$$

$$\frac{dE_i^n}{dt} = (\beta)_{n,i}(t)\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n} - \pi(t)E_i^n - (1-\pi(t))\,\rho E_i^n - (1-\pi(t))\,\theta E_i^n \tag{2b}$$

$$\frac{dA_i^n}{dt} = (1-\pi(t))\,\rho E_i^n - \gamma A_i^n \tag{2c}$$

$$\frac{dJ_i^n}{dt} = (1-\pi(t))\theta E_i^n - \delta_i J_i^n - \gamma J_i^n \tag{2d}$$

$$\frac{dQ_i^n}{dt} = \pi(t)E_i^n - \frac{1}{\Psi}pQ_i^n - \frac{1}{\Psi}(1-p)\gamma Q_i^n \tag{2e}$$

$$\frac{dI_i^n}{dt} = \frac{1}{\Psi}pQ_i^n - \delta_i I_i^n - \gamma I_i^n \tag{2f}$$

$$\frac{dH_i^n}{dt} = \delta_i J_i^n + \delta_i I_i^n - \gamma H_i^n - d_i H_i^n \tag{2g}$$

$$\frac{dR_i^n}{dt} = \left(I_i^n + A_i^n + \frac{1}{\Psi}(1-p)Q_i^n + J_i^n + H_i^n\right)\gamma - \varepsilon R_i^n \tag{2h}$$

$$\frac{dD_i^n}{dt} = d_i H_i^n, \tag{2i}$$

and $\theta = 1 - \rho$.
In equation 2, $\beta_{n,i}$ is a matrix of size $n \times i$, (size 10 by 21 in this analysis). The matrix is derived from the force of infection, which is the mixing within and between deprivation decile and age,given as:

$$(\beta)_{n,i}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \left(\mathbf{J}_{k,j} + \iota \mathbf{Q}_{k,j} + \iota \mathbf{I}_{k,j} + \mathbf{A}_{k,j} \right) \tag{3}$$

$\lambda_{n,k}$ is a block matrix of size $n \times k$ where $n, k = 1, 2, \cdots, 10$. The element inside the block matrix $\lambda_{n,k}$ is of size $i \times j$, where $i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, 21$. Each of the classes contributing to disease transmission $\mathbf{J}_{k,j}, \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}, \mathbf{I}_{k,j,\text{ and }}, \mathbf{A}_{k,j}$ are matrix of size $k \times j$. In the equation 3, we defined

$$\lambda_{n,k} = \hat{q} \left(\mathbf{W} \odot \mathbf{C} \right), \tag{4}$$

$\mathbf{C}$ is the age contact mixing matrix from the[30] study,$\hat{q}$ is the relative transmission rate, and derived the social interaction by deprivation decile using the method by[31], defined as:

$$w_{n,m} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon \nu_n \nu_m}{D} + \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\nu_n \delta_{n,m}}{N_n} \right) \tag{5}$$

where $(\delta_{n,m} : m = m \; is \; 1, \; \& \; n \neq m \; is \; 0)$, $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$, and ν_n is the average number of contacts by each sociodemographic group, n, m in this case are the deprivation deciles, N_n is the total population of each decile in England. $D = \Sigma_{n=1} \nu_n N_n$ is the total number of contacts per unit time made by all people in the population. $(\mathbf{W} \odot \mathbf{C_{p^m}})$ is a Kronecker product of two matrices, which results in a block matrix.

Parameter	Description	Value & Source
$c_{i,j}$	contact matrix by age	[30]
ι	Modification factor by which confirmed and reported individuals can transmit infection. We used the modification factor for asymptomatic infectious from literature.	0.27[32]
ρ	Proportion of population that are asymptomatic	0.6
p	Sensitivity of test, which we used as the probability of testing positive to test	0.7826[33]
Ψ	The average number of days for test result to be reported	$1/3 \; days^{-1}$ (assumed)
q	Relative infection rate	1.5 (assumed)
γ	recovery rate	$1/14 \; days^{-1}$[33]
δ_i	The rate at which symptomatic or positive tested quarantine individual become so sick and require hospital care. This varies by age.	[32]
d_i	The rate at which hospitalised individual become fatally sick. This varies by age	[32]
ε	probability of wanning immunity	$2/100 \; days^{-1}$[34]
a_i	Infectivity by age	[32]
h_i	susceptibility by age	[32]

Table 1. Parameter description and values

Model Analysis

Positivity of solutions

1. Positivity

Theorem 1

Let $\Omega = (S_i^n, E_i^n, A_i^n, J_i^n, Q_i^n, I_i^n, H_i^n, R_i^n, D_i^n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^9 : N \leq N_0 : S_i^n(0) \geq 0 : E_i^n(0) \geq 0 : A_i^n(0) \geq 0 : J_i^n(0) \geq 0 : Q_i^n(0) \geq 0 : I_i^n(0) \geq 0 : H_i^n($

Therefore, the solution $S_i^n(t), E_i^n(t), A_i^n(t), J_i^n(t), Q_i^n(t), I_i^n(t), H_i^n(t), R_i^n(t), and D_i^n(t)$ *of the model 2 remain positive.* $\forall t > 0$.

Using the initial conditions $S_i^n(0) \geq 0, E_i^n(0) \geq 0, A_i^n(0) \geq 0, J_i^n(0) \geq 0, Q_i^n(0) \geq 0, I_i^n(0) \geq 0, H_i^n(0) \geq 0, R_i^n(0) \geq 0, D_i^n(0) \geq 0$, we will discuss the positivity of the system 2.

From equation 2a; Let

$$H = \frac{\beta_{n,i}}{N_i^n} \tag{6}$$

The equation 2a can now be written as:

$$\frac{dS_i^n}{dt} + HS_i^n = \varepsilon R \tag{7}$$

The integrating factor of equation 7 is given as:

$$\mathbf{IF} = e^{\int H ds}$$

multiply the IF by equation 7;

$$e^{\int_0^t H ds} \frac{dS_i^n}{dt} + e^{\int_0^t H ds} HS_i^n = \varepsilon R_i^n \cdot e^{\int_0^t H ds} \tag{8}$$

Fom equation 8, we observed that the L.H.S is the derivative of the IF multiplied by S_i^n. Hence we can write equation 8 as:

$$\frac{d}{dt}[e^{\int_0^t H ds} S_i^n] = \varepsilon R_i^n \cdot e^{\int_0^t H ds} \tag{9}$$

Take the derivative of both side:

$$\int_0^t \frac{d}{dt}\left(S_i^n(u) e^{\int_0^u H ds} S\right) du = \int_0^t \varepsilon R(u) \cdot e^{\int_0^u H ds} du$$

$\implies S(t) e^{\int_0^t H ds} - S_i^n(0) = \int_0^t \varepsilon R_i^n(u) \cdot e^{\int_0^u H ds} du$, thus, re-arranging futher will give us:

$$S_i^n(t) = S_i^n(0) \cdot e^{-\int_0^t H ds} + \int_0^t \varepsilon R_i^n(u) \cdot e^{\int_u^t H ds} du \tag{10}$$

Since we know from the initial condition that $S_i^{n]\geq 0}$ that mean $S_i^n(0) \cdot e^{-\int_0^t H ds} > 0$ and also all parameters are positive (that is $\varepsilon > 0$, hence $\int_0^t \varepsilon R_i^n(u) \cdot e^{\int_u^t H ds} du > 0$. Therefore, we can conclude that S_i^n is positive for all $t > 0$. The same is true for $E_i^n(0) \geq 0, A_i^n(0) \geq 0, J_i^n(0) \geq 0, Q_i^n(0) \geq 0, I_i^n(0) \geq 0, H_i^n(0) \geq 0, R_i^n(0) \geq 0,$ and $D_i^n(0) \geq 0$

2. Boundedness

   Since we assume that the population is closed, with no growth (that is no births or natural deaths), we expect the total population to remain constant over time. This means that:

$$S_i^n(t) + E_i^n(t) + A_i^n(t) + J_i^n(t) + Q_i^n(t) + I_i^n(t) + H_i^n(t) + R_i^n(t) + D_i^n(t) = N_i^n(0) \tag{11}$$

   This implies that the total population N_i^n by age and deprivation decile is conserved.

Disease-free equilibrium and Basic reproduction number

The basic reproduction number is the average number of secondary individuals produced by one index case in a completely susceptible population. Taking into account the system of equations 2a - 2i, and the total population in equation **??**; at disease-free equilibrium $E_i^n = A_i^n = J_i^n = Q_i^n = I_i^n = H_i^n = D_i^n = R_i^n = 0$, and $S_i^n = N_i^n$. In this study, we solve for R_0 using the next generation matrix approach, then we find the dominant eigenvalue of matrix $(-\mathbf{T}\Sigma^{-1})$. We divide the system into disease transmission ($\mathbf{T}$), and disease transition (Σ^{-1}), such that:

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \left(\mathbf{J}_{k,j} + \iota \mathbf{Q}_{k,j} + \iota \mathbf{I}_{k,j} + \mathbf{A}_{k,j}\right) \frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} -\pi(t)E_i^n - (1-\pi(t))\,\rho E_i^n - (1-\pi(t))\,\theta E_i^n \\ (1-\pi(t))\,\rho E_i^n - \gamma A_i^n \\ (1-\pi(t))\theta E_i^n - \delta_i J_i^n - \gamma J_i^n \\ \pi(t)E_i^n - \frac{1}{\Psi} p Q_i^n - \frac{1}{\Psi}(i-p)\gamma Q_i^n \\ \frac{1}{\Psi} p Q_i^n - \delta_i I_i^n - \gamma I_i^n \end{bmatrix}$$

The Jacobian of the two systems at the disease-free equilibrium and for $\theta = 1-\rho$. is calculated as:

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda & \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda & \sum_{k=1}^{n} \iota\lambda & \sum_{k=1}^{n} \iota\lambda \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -(1-\pi)\rho & \gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\pi\rho + \pi + \rho - 1 & 0 & \delta_i + \gamma & 0 & 0 \\ -\pi & 0 & 0 & \frac{p+\gamma-p\gamma}{\psi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{p}{\psi} & \delta_i + \gamma \end{bmatrix}$$

The inverse of $\mathbf{E}$ is given as:

$$\mathbf{E^{-1}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{(1-\pi)\rho}{\gamma} & \frac{1}{\gamma} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{(1-\pi)(1-\rho)}{(\delta_i-\gamma)} & 0 & \frac{1}{(\delta_i+\gamma)} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\pi\psi}{p+(1-p)} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\psi}{p+(1-p)} & 0 \\ \frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p))(\delta_i+\gamma)} & 0 & 0 & \frac{p}{(p+(1-p))(\delta_i+\gamma)} & \frac{1}{\delta_i+\gamma} \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence the basic reproduction number R_0 is:

$$R_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \left(\frac{(1-\pi)\rho}{\gamma} + \frac{(1-\pi)(1-\rho)}{(\delta_i+\gamma)} + i\left(\frac{\pi\psi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)} + \frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)(\delta_i+\gamma)} \right) \right) \tag{12}$$

Stability of Disease-free equilibrium

1. local stability

Theorem 2 *The disease -free equilibrium of the system 2 is locally asymptotically stable (L.A.S) if $R_0 < 1$, and unstable if $R_0 > 1$.*

To show the local stability of our model, we linearise the system by finding the Jacobian :

$$
\mathrm{J} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & (1-\pi)\rho & -\gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & (1-\pi)(1-\rho) & 0 & -(\delta_i+\gamma) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \pi & 0 & 0 & -\frac{(p+(1-p)\gamma)}{\psi} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{p}{\psi} & -(\delta_i+\gamma) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & j & 0 & \delta_i & -(d_i+\gamma) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \gamma & \gamma & \frac{(1-p)\gamma}{\psi} & \gamma & \gamma & -\varepsilon- & 0 \\
a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & d_i & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

The characteristic equation is then given as:

$$
\begin{vmatrix}
-\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon & 0 \\
0 & -1-\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & (1-\pi)\rho & -\gamma-\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & (1-\pi)(1-\rho) & 0 & -(\delta_i+\gamma)-\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \pi & 0 & 0 & -\frac{(p+(1-p)\gamma)}{\psi}-\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{p}{\psi} & -(\delta_i+\gamma)-\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & j & 0 & \delta_i & -(d_i+\gamma)-\lambda & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \gamma & \gamma & \frac{(1-p)\gamma}{\psi} & \gamma & \gamma & -\varepsilon-\lambda & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & d_i & 0 & -\lambda
\end{vmatrix}
$$

Therefore, $p(\lambda) = \lambda^2(\varepsilon+\lambda)(\gamma+\lambda)((\delta_i+\gamma)+\lambda)^2(\frac{(p+(1-p)\gamma)}{\psi}+\lambda)(\lambda+1)(\lambda+(d_i+\gamma)) = 0$. Since all the eigenvalues are clearly non-positive, the disease-free equilibrium is locally asymptotically stable.

2. Global stability

Theorem 3 *The model 2 is globally asymptomatically stable at disease-free euilibibruim whenever $R_0 < 1$.*

We approach this proof using the method in[35,36].
Consider a Lyapunov function V of the form:

$$
V(t,E,A,J,Q,I) = aE_i^n + bA_i^n + cJ_i^n + dQ_i^n + eI_i^n \tag{13}
$$

The derivative of equation 13 is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dV}{dt} = a\Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}\left(\mathbf{J}_{k,j} + \iota\mathbf{Q}_{k,j} + \iota\mathbf{I}_{k,j} + \mathbf{A}_{k,j}\right)\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n} - \\
((1-\pi)\rho + (1-\pi)(1-\rho) + \pi)E_i^n \\
+b\left[(1-\pi)\rho E_i^n - \gamma A_i^n\right] \\
+c\left[(1-\pi)(1-\rho)E_i^n - (\delta_i+\gamma)J_i^n\right] + d\left[\pi E_i^n - \frac{(p+(1-p))\gamma}{\psi}Q_i^n\right] \\
+e\left[\frac{p}{\psi}Q_i^n - (\delta_i+\gamma)I_i^n\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Re-arranging such that like-terms are collected together,

$$\frac{dV}{dt} \leq [b(1-\pi)\rho + c(1-\pi)(1-\rho) + d\pi - a]E_i^n$$
$$+\left(a\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n} - b\gamma\right)A_i^n + \left(a\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n} - c(\delta_i+\gamma)\right)J_i^n$$
$$+a\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n}\iota + e\frac{p}{\psi} - d(\frac{(p+(1-p))\gamma}{\psi}\right)Q_i^n$$
$$+\left(a\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n} - e(\delta_i+\gamma)\right)I_i^n$$

substituting $a=1; b=\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{\gamma}; c=\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{(\delta_i+\gamma)}; d=\frac{\iota\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)}\left[\psi+\frac{p}{(\delta_i+\gamma)}\right]; e=\frac{\psi}{p(\delta_i+\gamma)}$, into equation **??** and $S_i^n = N_i^n$ at disease-free equilibrium
we have:

$$\frac{dV}{dt} \leq (R_0-1)E_i^n + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left[\iota + \frac{1}{(\delta_i+\gamma)} - (1+\frac{p}{(\delta_i+\gamma)})\right]Q_i^n$$
$$+\left[\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}\iota - \frac{\psi}{p(\delta_i+\gamma)}\right]I_i^n \tag{14}$$

Hence, $\frac{dV}{dt} leq (R_0-1)E_i^n$. It is important to note that $\frac{dV}{dt}=0$ only at the disease-free equilibrium. From the Lasalle's invariance principle it follows that all solutions of the model equation 2 converge to the disease-free equilibrium as $t\to\infty$ whenever $R_0<1$. The disease-free equilibrium is Globally asymptotically stable when ever $R_0<1$.

Endemic Equilibrium

We calculated the endemic equilibrium by equating model 2 to zero, then we get $E_1 = (S_i^{n*}, E_i^{n*}, A_i^{n*}, J_i^{n*}, Q_i^{n*}, I_i^{n*}, H_i^{n*}, R_i^{n*}, D_i^{n*})$, such that:

$$S_i^{n*} = \frac{\varepsilon R_i^{n*}}{H^{**}} \tag{15a}$$
$$E_i^{n*} = H^{**}S_i^{n*} \tag{15b}$$
$$A_i^{n*} = \frac{(1-\pi)\rho E_i^{n*}}{\gamma} \tag{15c}$$
$$J_i^{n*} = \frac{(1-\pi)\theta E_i^{n*}}{(\delta_i+\gamma)} \tag{15d}$$
$$Q_i^{n*} = \frac{\psi\pi E_i^{n*}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma} \tag{15e}$$
$$I_i^{n*} = \frac{pQ_i^{n*}}{\psi(\delta_i+\gamma)} \tag{15f}$$
$$H_i^{n*} = \frac{\delta_i}{(\delta_i+d_i)(\delta_i+\gamma)}\left[(1-\pi)\theta + \frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma}\right]E_i^{n*} \tag{15g}$$
$$R_i^{n*} = \frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}\left[I_i^{n*} + A_i^{n*} + \frac{(1-p)}{\psi}Q_i^{n*} + J_i^{n*} + H_i^{n*}\right] \tag{15h}$$

From equation 6, we defined:

$$H^{**} = H = \sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}\left(\mathbf{J}_{k,j} + \iota\mathbf{Q}_{k,j} + \iota\mathbf{I}_{k,j} + \mathbf{A}_{k,j}\right). \tag{16}$$

At the endemic equilibrium, we know that $H_i^{n*} \geq 0$ and all our parameters are positive, such that $d_i \neq 0$. We can conclude that D_i^{n*} is dependent on H_i^{n*}.

Uniqueness of endemic equilibrium point

Theorem 4 *An endemic equilibrium is unique iff $R_0 > 0$.*

If we re-write equation 15c to 15h in terms of 15b we have:

$$A_i^{n*} = \frac{(1-\pi)\rho H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{\gamma} \tag{17a}$$

$$J_i^{n*} = \frac{(1-\pi)\theta H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(\delta_i+\gamma)} \tag{17b}$$

$$Q_i^{n*} = \frac{\psi\pi H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma} \tag{17c}$$

$$I_i^{n*} = \frac{p\pi H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma(\delta_i+\gamma)} \tag{17d}$$

$$H_i^{n*} = \frac{\delta_i}{(\delta_i+d_i)(\delta_i+\gamma)}\left[(1-\pi)\theta + \frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma}\right] H^{**} S_i^{n*} \tag{17e}$$

Substituting $A_i^{n*}, J_i^{n*}, Q_i^{n*}, I_i^{n*}, H_i^{n*}$ equations (17a - 17e) into (15h), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} R_i^{n*} = \frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}\Bigg(&\frac{(1-\pi)\rho H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{\gamma} + \frac{p\pi H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma(\delta_i+\gamma)} \\ &+ \frac{(1-p)}{\psi}\frac{\psi\pi H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma} \\ &+ \frac{(1-\pi)\theta H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(\delta_i+\gamma)} + \nu_1 H^{**} S_i^{n*}\Bigg) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $\nu_1 = \frac{\delta_i}{(\delta_i+d_i)(\delta_i+\gamma)}\left[(1-\pi)\theta + \frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma}\right]$

From equation (16) it implies that

$$H^{**} N_i^{n*} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}\left(\mathbf{J}_{k,j}^* + \iota\mathbf{Q}_{k,j}^* + \iota\mathbf{I}_{k,j}^* + \mathbf{A}_{k,j}^*\right). \tag{19}$$

which implies that:

$$\begin{aligned} H^{**} P_2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}\Bigg(&\frac{(1-\pi)\theta H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(\delta_i+\gamma)} + \iota\frac{\psi\pi H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma} + \iota\frac{p\pi H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{(p+(1-p)\gamma(\delta_i+\gamma)} \\ &+ \frac{(1-\pi)\rho H^{**} S_i^{n*}}{\gamma}\Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

P_2 is derived from $N_i^{n*} = S_i^{n*} + E_i^{n*} + A_i^{n*} + J_i^{n*} + Q_i^{n*} + I_i^{n*} + H_i^{n*} + R_i^{n*} + D_i^{n*}$
Dividing both side of equation (20) by $H^{**} S_i^{n*}$, we have:

$$1 + P_3 H^{**} = R_0 \tag{21}$$

Solving for H^{**} in equation (21),

$$H^{**} = \frac{R_0 - 1}{P_3} \tag{22}$$

P_3 is defined as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
1+\frac{(1-\pi)\rho}{\gamma}+\frac{(1-\pi)\theta H^{**}}{(\delta_i+\gamma)}+\frac{\psi\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma} \\
+\frac{p}{\psi(\delta_i+\gamma)} \\
+\frac{\delta_i}{(\delta_i+d_i)(\delta_i+\gamma)}\left[(1-\pi)\theta+\frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma}\right] \\
+\nu_2 H^{**}+K
\end{aligned}
\tag{23}
$$

where $k=d_i\nu_1$ and $\nu_2=\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{(1-\pi)\rho}{\gamma}+\frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma(\delta_i+\gamma)}+\frac{(1-p)}{\psi}\frac{\psi\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma}+\frac{(1-\pi)\theta}{(\delta_i+\gamma)}+\nu_1\right)$

Therefore, $H^{**}>0,\ \ iff\ \ R_0>1$. Hence, there exists a unique endemic equilibrium.

Global Stability of Endemic Equilibrium

Theorem 5 *If $R_0>1$, the endemic equilibrium of model 2 is Globally Asymptotically Stable (G.A.S) in Ω.*

We therefore define a Lyapunov function of the form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L=\left(S_i^n-S_i^{n*}-S_i^{n*}\log\frac{S_i^n}{S_i^{n*}}\right)+\left(E_i^n-E_i^{n*}-E_i^{n*}\log\frac{E_i^n}{E_i^{n*}}\right)+\left(A_i^n-A_i^{n*}-A_i^{n*}\log\frac{A_i^n}{A_i^{n*}}\right) \\
+\left(J_i^n-J_i^{n*}-J_i^{n*}\log\frac{J_i^n}{J_i^{n*}}\right)+\left(Q_i^n-Q_i^{n*}-Q_i^{n*}\log\frac{Q_i^n}{Q_i^{n*}}\right) \\
+\left(I_i^n-I_i^{n*}-I_i^{n*}\log\frac{I_i^n}{I_i^{n*}}\right)+\left(H_i^n-H_i^{n*}-H_i^{n*}\log\frac{H_i^n}{H_i^{n*}}\right) \\
+\left(R_i^n-R_i^{n*}-R_i^{n*}\log\frac{R_i^n}{R_i^{n*}}\right)+\left(D_i^n-D_i^{n*}-D_i^{n*}\log\frac{D_i^n}{D_i^{n*}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the derivative of L we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dL}{dt}=\left(\frac{S_i^n-S_i^{n*}}{S_i^n}\right)\frac{dS_i^n}{dt}+\left(\frac{E_i^n-E_i^{n*}}{E_i^n}\right)\frac{dE_i^n}{dt}+\left(\frac{A_i^n-A_i^{n*}}{A_i^n}\right)\frac{dA_i^n}{dt} \\
+\left(\frac{J_i^n-J_i^{n*}}{J_i^n}\right)\frac{dJ_i^n}{dt}+\left(\frac{Q_i^n-Q_i^{n*}}{Q_i^n}\right)\frac{dQ_i^n}{dt} \\
+\left(\frac{I_i^n-I_i^{n*}}{I_i^n}\right)\frac{dI_i^n}{dt}+\left(\frac{H_i^n-H_i^{n*}}{H_i^n}\right)\frac{dH_i^n}{dt} \\
+\left(\frac{R_i^n-R_i^{n*}}{R_i^n}\right)\frac{dR_i^n}{dt}+\left(\frac{D_i^n-D_i^{n*}}{D_i^n}\right)\frac{dD_i^n}{dt}
\end{aligned}
\tag{24}
$$

Substituting the value of the derivatives into equation (24):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dL}{dt}=\left(\frac{S_i^n-S_i^{n*}}{S_i^n}\right)\left[-(\beta)_{n,i}(t)\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n}+\varepsilon R_i^n\right]+\left(\frac{E_i^n-E_i^{n*}}{E_i^n}\right)\left[(\beta)_{n,i}(t)\frac{S_i^n}{N_i^n}-E_i^n\right] \\
+\left(\frac{A_i^n-A_i^{n*}}{A_i^n}\right)[(1-\pi(t))\rho E_i^n-\gamma A_i^n]+\left(\frac{J_i^n-J_i^{n*}}{J_i^n}\right)[(1-\pi(t))\theta E_i^n-\delta_i J_i^n-\gamma J_i^n] \\
+\left(\frac{Q_i^n-Q_i^{n*}}{Q_i^n}\right)\left[\pi(t)E_i^n-\frac{1}{\Psi}pQ_i^n-\frac{1}{\Psi}(1-p)\gamma Q_i^n\right] \\
\left(\frac{I_i^n-I_i^{n*}}{I_i^n}\right)\left[\frac{1}{\Psi}pQ_i^n-\delta_i I_i^n-\gamma I_i^n\right]+\left(\frac{H_i^n-H_i^{n*}}{H_i^n}\right)[\delta_i J_i^n+\delta_i I_i^n-\gamma H_i^n-d_i H_i^n] \\
\left(\frac{R_i^n-R_i^{n*}}{R_i^n}\right)\left[\left(I_i^n+A_i^n+\frac{1}{\Psi}(1-p)Q_i^n+J_i^n+H_i^n\right)\gamma-\varepsilon R_i^n\right] \\
+\left(\frac{D_i^n-D_i^{n*}}{D_i^n}\right)d_i H_i^n
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting the value of $(\beta)_{n,i}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dL}{dt} = \left(\frac{S_i^n - S_i^{n*}}{S_i^n}\right) \Bigg[& -\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(J_i^n - J_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) - \iota \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) \\
& -\iota \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(I_i^n - I_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(A_i^n - A_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) + \varepsilon(R_i^n - R_i^{n*}) \Bigg] \\
& + \left(\frac{E_i^n - E_i^{n*}}{E_i^n}\right) \Bigg[\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(J_i^n - J_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) + \iota \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) \\
& + \iota \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(I_i^n - I_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) + \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}(A_i^n - A_i^{n*})(S_i^n - S_i^{n*}) - (E_i^n - E_i^n) \Bigg] \\
& + \left(\frac{A_i^n - A_i^{n*}}{A_i^n}\right)[(1-\pi(t))\rho E_i^n - \gamma A_i^n] + \left(\frac{J_i^n - J_i^{n*}}{J_i^n}\right)[(1-\pi(t))\theta E_i^n - \delta_i J_i^n - \gamma J_i^n] \\
& + \left(\frac{Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*}}{Q_i^n}\right)\left[\pi(t)E_i^n - \frac{1}{\Psi}pQ_i^n - \frac{1}{\Psi}(1-p)\gamma Q_i^n\right] \\
& \left(\frac{I_i^n - I_i^{n*}}{I_i^n}\right)\left[\frac{1}{\Psi}pQ_i^n - \delta_i I_i^n - \gamma I_i^n\right] + \left(\frac{H_i^n - H_i^{n*}}{H_i^n}\right)[\delta_i J_i^n + \delta_i I_i^n - \gamma H_i^n - d_i H_i^n] \\
& \left(\frac{R_i^n - R_i^{n*}}{R_i^n}\right)\left[\left(I_i^n + A_i^n + \frac{1}{\Psi}(1-p)Q_i^n + J_i^n + H_i^n\right)\gamma - \varepsilon R_i^n\right] \\
& + \left(\frac{D_i^n - D_i^{n*}}{D_i^n}\right) d_i H_i^n
\end{aligned}
\tag{25}
$$

After some algebra, it is possible to split the equation (25) into positive and negative parts.

1. Positive terms

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dL^+}{dt} = & \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}J_i^{n*} + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}Q_i^{n*} + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}I_i^{n*} + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}A_i^{n*} \\
& + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})^2}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}\pi\rho + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})^2}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}\pi\theta + \frac{(Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*})^2}{Q_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}\frac{\gamma p}{\psi} + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})}{S_i^n}\varepsilon R_i^n \\
& + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}J_i^n S_i^n + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}J_i^{n*} S_i^{n*} + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}I_i^n S_i^n + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}I_i^{n*} S_i^{n*} \\
& + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}Q_i^n S_i^n + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}Q_i^{n*} S_i^{n*} + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}A_i^n S_i^n + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}A_i^{n*} S_i^{n*} \\
& + \frac{(A_i^n - A_i^{n*})}{A_i^n}\rho E_i^n + \frac{(A_i^n - A_i^{n*})}{A_i^n}\rho\pi E_i^{n*} + \frac{(J_i^n - J_i^{n*})}{J_i^n}\theta E_i^n + \frac{(J_i^n - J_i^{n*})}{J_i^n}\pi\theta E_i^{n*} + \frac{(Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*})}{Q_i^n}\pi E_i^n + \frac{(I_i^n - I_i^{n*})}{I_i^n}\frac{1}{\psi}pQ_i^n + \frac{(H_i^n - H_i^{n*})}{H_i^n}\delta_i J_i^n \\
& + \frac{(H_i^n - H_i^{n*})}{H_i^n}\delta_i I_i^n + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\gamma I_i^n + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\gamma A_i^n + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\frac{\gamma}{\psi}\iota Q_i^n + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\frac{\gamma}{\psi}pQ_i^{n*} + \frac{(D_i^n - D_i^{n*})}{D_i^n}d_i H_i^n
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Negative terms

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dL^-}{dt} = -\Bigg(& \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}J_i^n + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}Q_i^n + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}I_i^n + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})^2}{S_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}A_i^n \\
& + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})^2}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}\rho + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})^2}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}\theta + \frac{(A_i^n - A_i^{n*})^2}{A_i^n}\gamma + \frac{(J_i^n - J_i^{n*})^2}{J_i^n}\delta_i \\
& + \frac{(Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*})^2}{Q_i^n}\frac{p}{\psi} + \frac{(Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*})^2}{Q_i^n}\frac{\gamma}{\psi} + \frac{(I_i^n - I_i^{n*})^2}{I_i^n}\delta_i + \frac{(I_i^n - I_i^{n*})^2}{I_i^n}\gamma + \frac{(H_i^n - H_i^{n*})^2}{H_i^n}\gamma + \frac{(H_i^n - H_i^{n*})^2}{H_i^n}d_i + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})^2}{R_i^n}\varepsilon \\
& + \frac{(S_i^n - S_i^{n*})}{S_i^n}\varepsilon R_i^{n*} + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}J_i^n S_i^{n*} + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}J_i^{n*} S_i^n + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}I_i^n S_i^{n*} \\
& + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}I_i^{n*} S_i^n + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}Q_i^n S_i^{n*} + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}Q_i^{n*} S_i^n \\
& + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}A_i^n S_i^{n*} + \frac{(E_i^n - E_i^{n*})}{E_i^n}\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}}{N_i^n}A_i^{n*} S_i^n + \frac{(A_i^n - A_i^{n*})}{A_i^n}\rho E_i^{n*} + \frac{(A_i^n - A_i^{n*})}{A_i^n}\rho\pi E_i^n \\
& + \frac{(J_i^n - J_i^{n*})}{J_i^n}\theta E_i^{n*} + \frac{(J_i^n - J_i^{n*})}{J_i^n}\pi\theta E_i^n + \frac{(Q_i^n - Q_i^{n*})}{Q_i^n}\pi E_i^{n*} + \frac{(I_i^n - I_i^{n*})}{I_i^n}\frac{1}{\psi}pQ_i^{n*} + \frac{(H_i^n - H_i^{n*})}{H_i^n}\delta_i J_i^{n*} + \frac{(H_i^n - H_i^{n*})}{H_i^n}\delta_i I_i^{n*}\Bigg) \\
& + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\gamma I_i^{n*} + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\gamma A_i^{n*} + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\frac{\gamma}{\psi}\iota Q_i^{n*} + \frac{(R_i^n - R_i^{n*})}{R_i^n}\frac{\gamma}{\psi}pQ_i^n + \frac{(D_i^n - D_i^{n*})}{D_i^n}d_i H_i^{n*}\Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let equation **??** be **A** and equation **??** be B, if $\mathbf{A} < \mathbf{B}$, then $\frac{dL}{dt} \leq 0$, and $\frac{dL}{dt} = 0, iff(S_i^n = S_i^{n*}, E_i^n = E_i^{n*}, A_i^n = A_i^{n*}, J_i^n = J_i^{n*}, Q_i^n = Q_i^{n*}, I_i^n = I_i^{n*}, H_i^n = H_i^{n*}, R_i^n = R_i^{n*}, D_i^n = D_i^{n*})$. Therefore the largest compact invariant set $[S_i^{n*}, E_i^{n*}, A_i^{n*}, J_i^{n*}, Q_i^{n*}, I_i^{n*}, H_i^{n*}, R_i^{n*}, D_i^{n*}] \in \Omega$. Hence by the LaSalle's invariance principle, the endemic equilibrium is globally asymptomatically stable in Ω if $\mathbf{A} < \mathbf{B}$

Sensitivity Analysis

To analytically study how uncertainty in model output can be predicted by uncertainty in model input, we will use sensitivity analysis. The normalized sensitivity index for each parameter X within R_0 defined as $S_X^{R_0} = \frac{\partial R_0}{\partial X} \times \frac{X}{R_0}$. This indicates that parameters with a high sensitivity index are more influential on the $R0$ value than those with a low sensitivity index. Here the sign of the index informs us if the parameter influences $R0$ positively or negatively.

1. Sensitivity index for λ:

$$S_\lambda^{R_0} = 1 > 0$$

2. Sensitivity index for γ:

$$S_\gamma^{R_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}\left(-\frac{(1-\pi)\rho}{\gamma^2} - \frac{(1-\pi)(1-\rho)}{(\delta_i+\gamma)^2} + i\left(-\frac{(1-p)\pi\psi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)^2} - \frac{p(1-p)\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)^2(\delta_i+\gamma)} - \frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)(\delta_i+\gamma)^2}\right)\right) \times \frac{\gamma}{R_0} < 0$$

This is because all terms involving γ are negative.

3. Sensitivity index for ρ:

$$S_\rho^{R_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_{n,k}\left(\frac{(1-\pi)}{\gamma} - \frac{(1-\pi)}{\delta_i+\gamma}\right) \times \frac{\rho}{R_0} > 0$$

Observing the two terms in the bracket, $\frac{1}{\gamma} > \frac{1}{(\delta_1+\gamma)}$. Hence, the sensitivity index is positive.

4. Sensitivity index for δ_i:

$$S_{\delta_i}^{R_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \left(-\frac{(1-\pi)(1-\rho)}{(\delta_i+\gamma)^2} - \iota \left(\frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)(\delta_i+\gamma)^2} \right) \right) \times \frac{\delta_i}{R_0} < 0$$

5. Sensitivity index for π:

$$S_{\pi}^{R_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \left(-\frac{\rho}{\gamma} - \frac{(1-\rho)}{\delta_i+\gamma} + \iota \left(\frac{\psi}{p+(1-p)\gamma} + \frac{p}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)(\delta_i+\gamma)} \right) \right) \times \frac{\pi}{R_0}$$

The first two terms in the bracket involving π are negative, but the last two terms are positive. This make the behaviour of π depend on the values of $\psi, p, \rho,$ and $, \iota$.
If $p = 0$, and $0 < \iota < 1$: the negative terms will dominate and the sensitivity index of π will be negative if and only if $0 < \rho < 1$.
If $p = 1$: π will be negative if and only if $\left(\frac{\psi}{p+(1-p)\gamma} + \frac{p}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)(\delta_i+\gamma)} \right) < \left(\frac{\rho}{\gamma} + \frac{(1-\rho)}{\delta_i+\gamma} \right)$.
However, we will determine the sign of π numerically.

6. Sensitivity index for ψ:

$$S_{\psi}^{R_0} = i \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \frac{\pi}{p+(1-p)\gamma} \times \frac{\psi}{R_0} > 0$$

7. Sensitivity index for p:

$$S_{p}^{R_0} = i \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \left(-\frac{\pi\psi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)^2} + \frac{\pi(1-\gamma)}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)^2(\delta_i+\gamma)} \right) \times \frac{p}{R_0}$$

8. Sensitivity index for ι:

$$S_{\iota}^{R_0} = \frac{\iota}{R_0} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_{n,k} \left(\frac{\pi\psi}{p+(1-p)\gamma} + \frac{p\pi}{(p+(1-p)\gamma)(\delta_i+\gamma)} \right) > 0$$

Referring to Table 1, we seek to numerically analyse the sensitivity index associated with the parameters relating to R_0.

Parameter	Sensitivity Index
λ	1
ρ	1.38
p	$-8.59e^{-7}$
π	$-9.11e^{-6}$
ψ	$1.41e^{-6}$
γ	-1.71
δ_i	-0.62
ι	$1.51e^{-6}$

Table 2. Sensitivity index of parameters relating to R_0.



Figure 1. Sensitivity indices of model parameter



Figure 2. Implementing a form of control to observe how contact rate influences the value of $R0$. at an uncontrolled mixing, we have the $R0$ at a rate where transmission of disease is high.

Numerical Analysis

The numerical analysis of this study was done using MATLAB ode45. The parameters for the simulation are presented in table 1. The values of the parameters were mostly taken from existing literatures, except where otherwise stated as assumed. We calculated the sensitivity index analytically and numerically, and the numerical simulations were done using the defined parameter. The basic reproduction number was also simulated numerically, and we obtained the value of $R_0 = 3.34$. We checked the impact of reduced contact mixing in the population to observe how that would influence the value of $R0$. The value was reduced to 0.67, which implies that to reduce the transmission capacity of the disease, the social mixing within the population needs to be reduced.



Figure 3. recovery rate impact on $R0$



Figure 4. Increasing testing rate or capacity to test could be benefical in reducing the value of $R0$

Discussion and Conclusion

This study considered a mathematical model consisting of nine compartments: susceptible, exposed, asymptomatic, unreported and untested symptomatic, tested and awaiting test results, positively tested symptomatic, hospitalised, recovered and dead. We presented results for the local and global stability of the disease-free, and the global stability of endemic equilibrium. The basic reproduction number was estimated using the next generation matrix approach. The expression of R_0 in equation 12 needs to be interpreted with care, as the expression should in fact be interpreted as the next-generation matrix of individuals in age and social groups at the disease-free equilibrium. This is because $\lambda_{n,k}$ is a function of mixing between deprivation decile and age group: meaning it is a block matrix. To get the R_0 estimate for the whole system, it will be required to calculate the maximum eigenvalue of the block matrix. The figure 5 presented demonstrated the dynamics of the system at $R_0 > 1$. The infection group will eventually reach it peak and dies out even in the absence of intervention. The results also show that the most deprived group in the population demonstrated a disproportionately higher number of infections compared to the least deprived group, and this was consistent across the deprivation spectrum.

In our analysis 2, a contact rate $\lambda_{n,k} = 1$ and a sensitivity index of 1 indicates that it is directly proportional to R_0. This is plausible as the more people that interact, the higher transmission potential of the population. The proportion of asymptomatic individuals in the population will significantly increase R_0 due to its high and positive sensitivity index. It is important to



Figure 5. Top left panel The daily number of infections by deprivation decile, **Top right panel** the number of reported cases, **Bottom right panel** the number of hospitalised individuals, **Bottom left panel** the number of daily deaths.

note that this parameter is scaled directly by the test rate $\pi(t)$. This implies that as the testing capacity increases, it is likely that more asymptomatic individuals will be detected by testing and will not be able to spread infection. This is based on the assumption that asymptomatic individuals spread the infection freely within the population, with no mitigating factors to lower the transmission rate for those without symptoms. Another parameter directly influenced by the testing rate $\pi(t)$ is ψ. This is because there can not be a waiting period for a test result if there is no testing at $\pi(t=0)$ which is at the disease-free equilibrium. The recovery rate γ has a Sensitivity index of -1.71. This implies that the recovery rate significantly reduces R_0 which means that a faster recovery leads to a smaller R_0. The sensitivity index for δ_i indicates that a higher rate of hospitalisation slightly reduces R_0, probably by removing infectious individuals from circulation. This could also be due to the model assumption that those hospitalised can either recover or die from the infection. The modification factor ι almost has no effect on R_0.

Our work suggests that to effectively control a disease like COVID-19, the transmission rate, recovery rate and testing rate need to be closely monitored in order to bring the burden of disease down. This is in line with literature which agree that if the contact rate can be significantly reduced, hospital treatment can be improved, and testing capacity can be increased in a timely manner, so that the disease can be controlled.

References

1. Sameni, R. Mathematical modeling of epidemic diseases; a case study of the covid-19 coronavirus, DOI: 10.48550/arxiv.2003.11371 (2020).

2. Keeling, M. J. *et al.* Fitting to the uk covid-19 outbreak, short-term forecasts and estimating the reproductive number, DOI: 10.1101/2020.08.04.20163782 (2020).
3. Keeling, M. J. *et al.* Predictions of covid-19 dynamics in the uk: Short-term forecasting and analysis of potential exit strategies. *Int. Soc. for Comput. Biol.* **17**, e1008619–e1008619, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008619 (2021).
4. Hollingsworth, T. D. Controlling infectious disease outbreaks: Lessons from mathematical modelling. *Palgrave Macmillan* **30**, 328–341, DOI: 10.1057/jphp.2009.13 (2009).
5. Feng, Z. *et al.* Timely identification of optimal control strategies for emerging infectious diseases. *Elsevier BV* **259**, 165–171, DOI: 10.1016/j.jtbi.2009.03.006 (2009).
6. Keeling, M. J. & Danon, L. Mathematical modelling of infectious diseases. *Br. Med. Bull.* **92**, 33–42, DOI: 10.1093/bmb/ldp038 (2009). https://academic.oup.com/bmb/article-pdf/92/1/33/954051/ldp038.pdf.
7. Keeling, M. J. & Rohani, P. Modeling infectious diseases in humans and animals, DOI: 10.2307/j.ctvcm4gk0 (2011).
8. Grassly, N. C. & Fraser, C. Mathematical models of infectious disease transmission. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **6**, 477–487 (2008).
9. Bacaër, N. Daniel bernoulli, d'alembert and the inoculation of smallpox (1760), DOI: 10.1007/978-0-85729-115-8_4 (2011).
10. Bernoulli, D. & Blower, S. An attempt at a new analysis of the mortality caused by smallpox and of the advantages of inoculation to prevent it. *Wiley* **14**, 275–288, DOI: 10.1002/rmv.443 (2004).
11. Kermack, W. O. & McKendrick, A. G. Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics. ii. —the problem of endemicity. *Royal Soc.* **138**, 55–83, DOI: 10.1098/rspa.1932.0171 (1932).
12. Kermack, W. O. & McKendrick, A. G. Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics iv. analysis of experimental epidemics of the virus disease mouse ectromelia. *Camb. Univ. Press.* **37**, 172–187, DOI: 10.1017/s0022172400034902 (1937).
13. Ross, R. S. The mathematics of malaria. *BMJ* **1**, 1023–1023, DOI: 10.1136/bmj.1.2626.1023 (1911).
14. Hoppensteadt, F. C. An age dependent epidemic model. *Elsevier BV* **297**, 325–333, DOI: 10.1016/0016-0032(74)90037-4 (1974).
15. Kumar, M. & Abbas, S. Age-structured sir model for the spread of infectious diseases through indirect contacts. *Mediterr. J. Math.* **19**, 14 (2022).
16. Davies, N. G. *et al.* Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of covid-19 epidemics. *Nat. medicine* **26**, 1205–1211 (2020).
17. Pellis, L., Cauchemez, S., Ferguson, N. M. & Fraser, C. Systematic selection between age and household structure for models aimed at emerging epidemic predictions. *Nat. communications* **11**, 906 (2020).
18. O'Driscoll, M. *et al.* Age-specific mortality and immunity patterns of sars-cov-2. *Nat. Portfolio* **590**, 140–145, DOI: 10.1038/s41586-020-2918-0 (2020).
19. Spi-m-o: Statement on population segmentation by age group (2020).
20. Hilton, J. & Keeling, M. J. Estimation of country-level basic reproductive ratios for novel coronavirus (sars-cov-2/covid-19) using synthetic contact matrices. *PLoS computational biology* **16**, e1008031 (2020).
21. House, T. & Keeling, M. J. Household structure and infectious disease transmission. *Epidemiol. & Infect.* **137**, 654–661 (2009).
22. Koh, D. Occupational risks for covid-19 infection (2020).
23. Hilton, J. & Keeling, M. J. Incorporating household structure and demography into models of endemic disease. *Royal Soc.* **16**, 20190317–20190317, DOI: 10.1098/rsif.2019.0317 (2019).
24. Manna, A., Koltai, J. & Karsai, M. Social inequalities that matter for contact patterns, vaccination, and the spread of epidemics, DOI: 10.48550/arxiv.2307.04865 (2023).
25. Manna, A., Dall'Amico, L., Tizzoni, M., Karsai, M. & Perra, N. Generalized contact matrices for epidemic modeling, DOI: 10.48550/arxiv.2306.17250 (2023).
26. Munday, J. D., van Hoek, A. J., Edmunds, W. J. & Atkins, K. E. Quantifying the impact of social groups and vaccination on inequalities in infectious diseases using a mathematical model. *BioMed Cent.* **16**, DOI: 10.1186/s12916-018-1152-1 (2018).

27. Hale, A. C., Read, J. M. & Jewell, C. Modelling the impact of social mixing and behaviour on infectious disease transmission: application to sars-cov-2, DOI: 10.48550/arxiv.2211.02371 (2022).

28. Hale, A. C., Read, J. M. & Jewell, C. P. Modelling the impact of social mixing and behaviour on infectious disease transmission: application to sars-cov-2. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.02371* (2022).

29. Wu, K., Darcet, D., Wang, Q. & Sornette, D. Generalized logistic growth modeling of the covid-19 outbreak: comparing the dynamics in the 29 provinces in china and in the rest of the world. *Nonlinear dynamics* **101**, 1561–1581 (2020).

30. Mossong, J. *et al.* Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS medicine* **5**, e74 (2008).

31. Hethcote, H. W. Modeling heterogeneous mixing in infectious disease dynamics. *Model. for infectious human diseases: their structure relation to data* **215**, 238 (1996).

32. Keeling, M. J. *et al.* Precautionary breaks: Planned, limited duration circuit breaks to control the prevalence of sars-cov2 and the burden of covid-19 disease. *Epidemics* **37**, 100526 (2021).

33. Muller, K. & Muller, P. A. Mathematical modelling of the spread of covid-19 on a university campus. *Infect. Dis. Model.* **6**, 1025–1045 (2021).

34. Anggriani, N. & Beay, L. K. Modeling of covid-19 spread with self-isolation at home and hospitalized classes. *Results Phys.* **36**, 105378 (2022).

35. Yusuf, T. T. On global stability of disease-free equilibrium in epidemiological models. *Eur. J. Math. Stat.* **2**, 37–42 (2021).

36. Wodajo, F. A., Gebru, D. M. & Alemneh, H. T. Mathematical model analysis of effective intervention strategies on transmission dynamics of hepatitis b virus. *Sci. Reports* **13**, 8737 (2023).

Acknowledgements

This research work is supported by IGPP (Institute for Global and Pandemic Planning) University of Warwick.

Additional information

Competing interests The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.