Final-size solutions for SIRI models with vaccination

Maria A. Gutierrez[a,*], Julia R. Gog[a,†]
[a]Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge

*mag84@cam.ac.uk (corresponding author), †jrg20@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

In the classic SIR model, infection gives full immunity against any possible reinfection. However, for many important epidemiological situations, immunity is only partial and reinfection is possible. Though these models are mathematically more complex, we are able to find expressions for the epidemic final size. We also generalise these expressions to include vaccination, with a fraction of the population vaccinated before the epidemic, where vaccinees are less susceptible to primary infections than unvaccinated hosts.

Partial immunity can be interpreted at the population level as providing either full or no protection to each host, in some proportion (all-or-none immunity). In this scenario, we give analytical expressions (mathematically similar to the SIR final-size) for the cumulative primary infections and the cumulative reinfections in unvaccinated and vaccinated hosts. Alternatively, partial immunity can be interpreted as providing homogeneous imperfect protection to each host (leaky immunity). For this other scenario, we again obtain an implicit equation for the final epidemic size. We breakdown, in terms of the final size, the number of infections in hosts with or without prior immunity, as well as the number of primary infections and reinfections. Under the leaky immunity assumption, we find a form of reinfection threshold. If the relative host susceptibility to reinfection is above this threshold (which is the inverse of the pathogen's basic reproduction number), transmission rates are high enough to support an endemic disease. Below the reinfection threshold, epidemics are transient. In the all-or-none model, epidemics are always transient.

Keywords: compartmental models, epidemic model, final-size solution, partial immunity, reinfection threshold, vaccination

Statements and Declarations: We declare we have no competing interests. There are no supporting data.

Acknowledgements: MAG was supported by the Gates Cambridge Trust (grant OPP1144 from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation).

1 Introduction

The classic SIR epidemic model, first analysed in [31], includes the simplifying assumption that infection confers total immunity [20]. However, many pathogens do not provide complete immunity: reinfection is possible [8]. Moreover, there is some evidence of sequential infections with the same strain in both Influenza A [26] and SARS-CoV-2 [33], although waning immunity may play an important role here. The Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant provides especially low protection against reinfection [29]. Reinfections can be key in shaping the epidemic dynamics of some pathogens, such as SARS-CoV-2 [22]. As a rule of thumb, epidemics will be prolonged if reinfection is possible. Furthermore, some pathogens become endemic due to the lack or loss of protection against reinfection [14].

Deterministic compartmental models are widely used in epidemiology to study the spread of infectious diseases [20]. A key advantage of these simple ODE models is that they allow direct access to the "final size" of an epidemic: the cumulative number of infections in the host population. Final-size expressions allow more complex phenomena to be explored; for example, the evolution of a disease across multiple seasons [1, 3] or the evolutionary pressure acting on a pathogen over a single epidemic wave [17]. An expression for the final size of a classical SIR epidemic can be derived in terms of the Lambert W function [24], and this final-size solution can be generalised in various ways [10, 17, 25].

A common relaxation of the full immunity assumption is that infection induces full but temporary immunity [20]. The biological mechanism here could be loss of immunity, or the antigenic evolution of the circulating pathogen [2, 28]. These SIRS-type models do not usually have final-size solutions because the epidemic does not burn out. Instead, a positive endemic equilibrium is possible because waning of immunity replenishes the pool of susceptible individuals, offering a dynamic balance to susceptible depletion through infection [20].

In this paper, we instead consider the alternative assumption of lifelong but imperfect immunity: infection offers some protection against further infections, but reinfection is still possible. These "SIRI"-type epidemic dynamics often show a transient epidemic. We obtain analytic final-size expressions for the total infections over the course of the epidemic, split into primary infections and reinfections. This is also extended to vaccination, and then the final size is further disaggregated by host vaccination status. We consider two interpretations of the "partial" nature of immunity: "all-or-none" and "leaky" immunity [13].

2 General modelling assumptions

We use deterministic compartmental models to find the cumulative number of infections during an epidemic wave. We assume a single strain of an infectious disease and a well-mixed population of constant size, with no births or deaths. We choose time units to make the recovery rate one, which we assume is the same for all hosts (regardless of immune status). We consider an epidemic that is unmitigated, apart from the use of vaccines. We assume that a proportion c of the population is vaccinated before the epidemic. We consider only vaccines that provide partial but lifelong immunity (explained below), so vaccinated individuals may still become infected. Up to this point, these assumptions follow those in [17].

We assume that both infection- and vaccine-induced immunity reduce host susceptibility but not necessarily at the same rates, similarly to the "partial immune protection" model of [14]. We use θ_S to denote the relative susceptibility of vaccinees: $\theta_S = 1$ means no protection against infection. Analogously, we use ϕ_S for the relative susceptibility of recovered hosts ($\phi_S = 1$ means no protection against reinfection). Thus, unless $\phi_S = 0$, reinfections are possible, in contrast to [17] where

recovered individuals are fully protected. We assume that prior immunity does not change host infectiousness.

3 Model with all-or-none immunity

3.1 Model description

For the all-or-none model assumption, the relative susceptibility factors (θ_S and ϕ_S) are interpreted as all-or-none immunity (also termed "polarised" or "all-or-nothing" immunity) [11, 13, 18]. With all-or-none vaccine-induced immunity, a proportion $1-\theta_S$ of the vaccinated individuals become fully protected against the disease. The remaining θ_S vaccinated individuals are still fully susceptible to the disease. Similarly, after infection, an individual becomes fully immune with probability $1-\phi_S$ or returns to the susceptible compartment with probability ϕ_S. Section 4 instead uses leaky immunity, as in [14] and other "SIRI"-type (Susceptible-Infected-Recovered-Infected) models (e.g., [27]).

We refer to the vaccinated and unvaccinated with the subscripts U and V. We use the superscript † for individuals who have been infected before. The compartments of the model are thus $S_U, S_U^\dagger, S_V, S_V^\dagger$, the proportions of the population fully susceptible to the disease, and I_U, I_V, the infected proportions. R_0 is the basic reproduction number and c is the vaccinated proportion of the population. The ODE model is

$$\dot{S}_* = -S_*\lambda(t) \tag{1}$$

$$\dot{S}_*^\dagger = -S_*^\dagger\lambda(t) + \phi_S I_* \tag{2}$$

$$\dot{I}_* = (S_* + S_*^\dagger)\lambda(t) - I_* \tag{3}$$

for each of $* = U, V$ and $\lambda(t) = R_0(I_U + I_V)$ is the force of infection and the dots denote differentiation with respect to time. We assume that all unvaccinated individuals are initially susceptible, except for a few infections that initiate the outbreak. Similarly, we assume that a proportion θ_S of those vaccinated is fully susceptible from the start of the outbreak (as in the all-or-none models of [17]). Therefore, the initial conditions are

$$S_U(0) = 1-c \qquad S_V(0) = c\theta_S \qquad S_U^\dagger(0) = S_V^\dagger(0) = 0 \qquad I_U(0) = \epsilon_U \ll 1 \qquad I_V(0) = \epsilon_V \ll 1 \tag{4}$$

where $\epsilon_U, \epsilon_V \geq 0$ represent the infected hosts that initiate the outbreak (at least one of ϵ_U, ϵ_V is positive). The final-size calculation (Section 3.2) later sets these infinitesimal proportions of the population to zero, as in the standard approach to final-size calculations [20].

3.2 Final-size calculation

The vaccinated and unvaccinated populations are subject to the same epidemic dynamics (1)-(3), so they stay locked in proportion to each other (as per Appendix A.1 of [17]), according to the initial conditions (4):

$$(S_V, S_V^\dagger, I_V) = \frac{c\theta_S}{1-c}(S_U, S_U^\dagger, I_U). \tag{5}$$

We define new variables $(S, S^\dagger, I) = (1-c)^{-1}(S_U, S_U^\dagger, I_U)$ and use (5) to obtain

$$\dot{S} = -S\lambda \qquad S(0) = 1 \tag{6}$$

$$\dot{S}^\dagger = -S^\dagger\lambda + \phi_S R_e^{-1}\lambda \qquad S^\dagger(0) = 0 \tag{7}$$

$$\dot{I} = R_e(S + S^\dagger)I - I \qquad 0 < I(0) = \epsilon \ll 1 \tag{8}$$

where $\lambda = R_e I$ and $R_e = R_0[1-c(1-\theta_S)]$ is the initial effective reproduction number. If the vaccination coverage is above its critical value $c_h = (1 - R_0^{-1})/(1 - \theta_S)$, the effective reproduction number is less than one ($R_e < 1$). Therefore, herd immunity prevents an outbreak for a vaccination coverage above this threshold ($c > c_h$): the prevalence decreases exponentially. If, instead, the vaccination coverage is below the threshold ($c < c_h$), the epidemic grows. To obtain the final size of the epidemic, we aim to express I in terms of S only. Using the chain rule,

$$\frac{dS^\dagger}{dS} = \frac{\dot{S}^\dagger}{\dot{S}} = -\frac{\phi_S}{R_e S} + \frac{S^\dagger}{S}. \tag{9}$$

Therefore, $\frac{d}{dS}(S^\dagger/S) = -\phi_S/R_e S^2$, which we integrate using the initial conditions $S^\dagger = 0$ and $S = 1$ at $t = 0$. Hence, $S^\dagger/S = \phi_S(1/S - 1)/R_e$ and thus

$$S^\dagger = \phi_S R_e^{-1}(1 - S). \tag{10}$$

As expected, $S^\dagger$ in (10) is a decreasing function of S, because S (a proxy for the proportion of hosts who have never been infected) continuously decreases throughout the epidemic while $S^\dagger$ (recovered hosts) increases. Using (10), the ODE for $I(t)$ in (8) becomes

$$\dot{I} = (R_e - \phi_S)IS - (1 - \phi_S)I. \tag{11}$$

By comparison with the standard SIR equations, the ODE (11) suggests that $r = (R_e - \phi_S)/(1 - \phi_S)$ may determine the epidemic dynamics here in a similar way to how the basic reproduction number $R_0 = \beta/\gamma$ affects the SIR dynamics: Section 3.3 discusses this analogy further. To calculate the final epidemic size, we use (11) and (6):

$$\frac{dI}{dS} = \frac{\dot{I}}{\dot{S}} = -\left(1 - \frac{\phi_S}{R_e}\right) + \frac{1 - \phi_S}{R_e S}. \tag{12}$$

Using the initial conditions $I = 0$ and $S = 1$ at $t = 0$, we obtain

$$I = \left(1 - \frac{\phi_S}{R_e}\right)(1 - S) + \frac{1 - \phi_S}{R_e}\log S. \tag{13}$$

To find the final size $S^\infty := \lim_{t\to\infty} S(t) < 1$, we take $t \to \infty$, and set $\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) = 0$:

$$S^\infty = 1 - \frac{1 - \phi_S}{R_e - \phi_S}\log\frac{1}{S^\infty} = -\frac{1}{r}W[-re^{-r}] \tag{14}$$

where W is the Lambert W function [24] and $r > 1$ is as above. The cumulative number of primary infections in the unvaccinated is $C_U = (1 - c - \lim_{t\to\infty} S_U)$. By definition $S_U = (1 - c)S$, hence $C_U = (1 - c)(1 - S^\infty) = (1 - c)\,(1 + W[-re^{-r}]/r)$. The cumulative reinfections in the unvaccinated are

$$C_U^\dagger = (1 - c)\int_0^\infty S^\dagger \lambda dt = (1 - c)\int_{S^\infty}^1 \frac{S^\dagger}{S} dS \tag{15}$$

which we integrate using (10) and (14), so that $C_U^\dagger = (1 - c)\frac{\phi_S}{R_e}(r - 1)\,(1 + W[-re^{-r}]/r)$.

3.3 Final-size results

For vaccination coverages below the herd-immunity threshold ($c < c_h$), the calculations above show that the cumulative primary infections in unvaccinated individuals are

$$C_U = (1 - c)\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}W\left[-re^{-r}\right]\right) \text{ with } r = \frac{R_e(c) - \phi_S}{1 - \phi_S} > 1 \tag{16}$$

where W is the Lambert W function [24] and $0 \leq \phi_S < 1$. The proportions (5) imply that the cumulative primary infections in vaccinated individuals are $C_V = c\theta_S C_U/(1-c)$. If past infections do not protect at all against future infections ($\phi_S = 1$), the final-size calculation (16) is not valid (because $r = \infty$). Instead, with $\phi_S = 1$, we have an SIS model [20]. For $r \in (1, \infty)$, the factor $f(r) = (1 + W\left[-re^{-r}\right]/r)$ in (16) is the final size of a standard SIR epidemic with initial reproduction number r [24]. Therefore, even though R_e is the actual initial effective reproduction number, r plays a more important role here with reinfections ($\phi_S > 0$), as the ODE (11) suggests. Without reinfections ($\phi_S = 0$), r is just R_e.

As the relative susceptibility of recovered hosts ϕ_S increases from zero, transmission increases: $r > R_e$ monotonically increases with increasing ϕ_S. Therefore, with reinfections ($\phi_S > 0$) there are more primary infections C_U, C_V than without reinfections ($\phi_S = 0$). Both C_U and C_V monotonically increase with increasing ϕ_S, because a higher ϕ_S requires more infections in the population to build herd immunity (which overturns the epidemic).

We have also shown above that the cumulative reinfections in unvaccinated hosts are

$$C_U^\dagger = \frac{\phi_S}{R_e}(r-1)(1-c)\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}W\left[-re^{-r}\right]\right) \tag{17}$$

for $c < c_h$. Using (5), $C_V^\dagger = c\theta_S C_U^\dagger/(1-c)$ are the reinfections in vaccinated individuals. Unsurprisingly both $C_U^\dagger$ and $C_V^\dagger$ are increasing functions of ϕ_S (lower protection against reinfection means there are more reinfections).

The final-size expressions (16) and (17) show that the ratio of reinfections to primary infections is

$$\frac{C_*^\dagger}{C_*} = \frac{\phi_S}{R_e}(r-1) = (1 - R_e^{-1})\frac{\phi_S}{1-\phi_S} \tag{18}$$

for both the unvaccinated ($* = U$) and vaccinated ($* = V$) subpopulations. This ratio (18) can take any positive value as ϕ_S varies from zero (full protection against reinfection) to one (no protection). In particular, if the protection against reinfection is low ($\phi_S \approx 1$), there may be more reinfections than primary infections. Interestingly, this ratio of secondary to primary infections decreases as the vaccination coverage c increases. In other words, with more vaccinated individuals, a higher proportion of the total infections are primary infections. The disease has fewer opportunities to reinfect hosts, because a higher vaccination coverage means that the final epidemic size is smaller.

$$C_U + C_U^\dagger + C_V + C_V^\dagger = \left(1 + (1 - R_e^{-1})\frac{\phi_S}{1-\phi_S}\right)(1 - c(1-\theta_S))\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}W\left[-re^{-r}\right]\right) \tag{19}$$

are the total infections.

Final-size results without vaccination

Setting $c = 0$ gives the final-size results in the absence of vaccination. Assuming $R_0 > 1$, the cumulative primary infections are

$$C_U = \left(1 + \frac{1}{r_0}W\left[-r_0 e^{-r_0}\right]\right) \text{ with } r_0 = \frac{R_0 - \phi_S}{1-\phi_S} > 1. \tag{20}$$

Similarly, the total reinfections are

$$C_U^\dagger = \frac{\phi_S}{R_0}(r_0 - 1)\left(1 + \frac{1}{r_0}W\left[-r_0 e^{-r_0}\right]\right) \tag{21}$$

and the total infections are

$$C_U + C_U^\dagger = \left(1 + (1 - R_0^{-1})\frac{\phi_S}{1-\phi_S}\right)\left(1 + \frac{1}{r_0}W\left[-r_0 e^{-r_0}\right]\right). \tag{22}$$

4 Model with leaky immunity

4.1 Model description

We modify the all-or-none model above to instead account for "leaky" immunity. In this scenario, both infection- and vaccine-induced immunity partially protect against infection, reducing individual host susceptibility but not fully preventing future infections. All hosts with partial immunity can become infected, though at lower rates than those with no immunity. Vaccinees who have never been infected have relative susceptibility $\theta_S \in [0,1]$. Recovered hosts have relative susceptibility $\phi_S \in [0,1]$, regardless of vaccination status: we make this simplifying assumption for tractability. Biologically, we expect $\phi_S \leq \theta_S$ so that infection does not increase the susceptibility of vaccinated hosts. With these assumptions, the model becomes

$$\dot{S}_U = -S_U\lambda(t) \qquad \dot{S}_V = -\theta_S S_V \lambda(t) \tag{23}$$

$$\dot{S}_U^\dagger = -\phi_S S_U^\dagger \lambda(t) + I_U \qquad \dot{S}_V^\dagger = -\phi_S S_V^\dagger \lambda(t) + I_V \tag{24}$$

$$\dot{I}_U = (S_U + \phi_S S_U^\dagger)\lambda(t) - I_U \qquad \dot{I}_V = (\theta_S S_V + \phi_S S_V^\dagger)\lambda(t) - I_V \tag{25}$$

where $\lambda = R_0(I_U + I_V)$ is the force of infection (as before). Initially, all vaccinees are susceptible to infection. Hence, $(S_U, S_U^\dagger, I_U) = (1-c, 0, \epsilon_U)$ and $(S_V, S_V^\dagger, I_V) = (c, 0, \epsilon_V)$ at $t = 0$ (again with $0 \leq \epsilon_U, \epsilon_V \ll 1$ and $\epsilon_U + \epsilon_V > 0$). The initial effective reproduction number is now $R_e = R_0(1 - c(1-\theta_S))$, as before. Hence, the epidemic outbreak grows for vaccination coverages c below the herd-immunity threshold $c_h = (1 - R_0^{-1})/(1-\theta_S)$.

4.2 Final-size equation

To derive the final size of the epidemic, the force of infection λ is expressed in terms of the number of susceptibles. Substituting for $S_U^\dagger = 1 - c - S_U - I_U$ and $S_V^\dagger = c - S_V - I_V$ in $\dot{\lambda} = \lambda R_0[S_U + \phi_S S_U^\dagger + \theta_S S_V + \phi_S S_V^\dagger] - \lambda$:

$$\dot{\lambda} = \lambda R_0[S_U(1-\phi_S) + S_V(\theta_S - \phi_S) + (\phi_S(1-c) + \phi_S c) - (\phi_S I_U + \phi_S I_V)] - \lambda. \tag{26}$$

We want to express $\dot{\lambda}$ purely in terms of λ and S_U to obtain an implicit final-size equation. We eliminate S_V from (26) using

$$S_V = c\left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S} \tag{27}$$

which follows from (23) and the initial conditions above. The relation (27) is as in Appendix A.2 of [17]. Substituting (27) in (26):

$$\dot{\lambda} = \lambda R_0\left[S_U(1-\phi_S) + c\left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S}(\theta_S - \phi_S) + \phi_S - \phi_S R_0^{-1}\lambda\right] - \lambda. \tag{28}$$

Using the chain rule and (28),

$$\frac{d\lambda}{dS_U} = \frac{\dot{\lambda}}{\dot{S}_U} = -R_0(1-\phi_S) - R_0 c(\theta_S - \phi_S)\frac{S_U^{\theta_S - 1}}{(1-c)^{\theta_S}} + S_U^{-1}(1 - R_0\phi_S) + \phi_S\frac{\lambda}{S_U}. \tag{29}$$

We solve (29) to find λ as a function of S_U:

$$\frac{d}{dS_U}[S_U^{-\phi_S}\lambda] = S_U^{-\phi_S}\left[\frac{d\lambda}{dS_U} - \phi_S\frac{\lambda}{S_U}\right] \tag{30}$$

$$= S_U^{-\phi_S}\left[-R_0(1-\phi_S) - R_0 c(\theta_S - \phi_S)\frac{S_U^{\theta_S-1}}{(1-c)^{\theta_S}} + S_U^{-1}(1 - R_0\phi_S)\right]. \tag{31}$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda - KR_0 S_U^{\phi_S} = -R_0 i_{\{\phi_S \neq 1\}} S_U - R_0 c \left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S} i_{\{\phi_S \neq \theta_S\}} - (\phi_S^{-1} - R_0) i_{\{\phi_S \neq 0\}} - i_{\{\phi_S = 0\}} \log \frac{1-c}{S_U}. \tag{32}$$

where $i_{\{Y\}}$ is the indicator function (equal to one if the statement Y is true, and zero otherwise) and K is a constant of integration, set by the initial conditions $\lambda(0) = 0$ and $S_U(0) = 1 - c$:

$$K = (1-c)^{-\phi_S} \left[(1-c) i_{\{\phi_S \neq 1\}} + c i_{\{\phi_S \neq \theta_S\}} + \left(R_0^{-1} \phi_S^{-1} - 1\right) i_{\{\phi_S \neq 0\}}\right]. \tag{33}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda = R_0 \Bigg[& \left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\phi_S} \left[(1-c) i_{\{\phi_S \neq 1\}} + c i_{\{\phi_S \neq \theta_S\}} + \left(R_0^{-1} \phi_S^{-1} - 1\right) i_{\{\phi_S \neq 0\}}\right] - i_{\{\phi_S \neq 1\}} S_U \\
& - c \left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S} i_{\{\phi_S \neq \theta_S\}} - (R_0^{-1} \phi_S^{-1} - 1) i_{\{\phi_S \neq 0\}} \Bigg] - i_{\{\phi_S = 0\}} \log \frac{1-c}{S_U} \qquad (34) \\
= R_0 \Bigg[& \left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\phi_S} - S_U - c \left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S} + \left(\left(\frac{S_U}{1-c}\right)^{\phi_S} - 1\right) \left(\frac{1}{R_0 \phi_S} - 1\right) i_{\{\phi_S \neq 0\}} \Bigg] \\
& - i_{\{\phi_S = 0\}} \log \frac{1-c}{S_U}. \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $\lim_{t \to \infty} \lambda(t) = 0$ in (35) gives an implicit equation for the final size $S_U^\infty = \lim_{t \to \infty} S_U(t) < 1 - c$. If $\phi_S = 0$, reinfections are impossible. Thus, with $\phi_S = 0$ we would obtain the final-size equation (43) of [17], here with $\theta_I = 1$. For $\phi_S > 0$, the final-size equation is

$$S_U^\infty = (R_0 \phi_S)^{-1} \left(\frac{S_U^\infty}{1-c}\right)^{\phi_S} - c \left(\frac{S_U^\infty}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S} - \left[(R_0 \phi_S)^{-1} - 1\right]. \tag{36}$$

We show below that (36) has a solution $S_U^\infty < 1 - c$ for $R_0 \phi_S < 1$. If $R_0 \phi_S > 1$, the epidemic reaches a stable endemic equilibrium—so $R_0 = 1/\phi_S$ is a "reinfection threshold" [14, 15]—in which all hosts have been infected before ($S_U = 0 = S_V$). In contrast, the all-or-none model does not have an endemic equilibrium (the last paragraph of Section 5 discusses this important difference). Here we are interested in a transient epidemic with both primary infections and reinfections, so henceforth we assume $R_0 \phi_S < 1$.

Existence and uniqueness of final-size solution

The initial condition $S_U(0) = 1 - c$ for the susceptible size before the outbreak solves (36). We now prove that (36) also has a solution $S_U^\infty \in (0, 1-c)$, provided that $R_0 < 1/\phi_S$ (see previous paragraph) and that the vaccination coverage is below the threshold for herd immunity ($c < c_h = (1 - R_0^{-1})/(1 - \theta_S)$). We define $F(x) = (R_0 \phi_S)^{-1} (x/(1-c))^{\phi_S} - c\,(x/(1-c))^{\theta_S} - [(R_0 \phi_S)^{-1} - 1]$ so that $x = S_U^\infty$ is a fixed point of $F(x) = x$. We also define $g(x) = F(x) - x$, so that $g(1-c) = 0$ and

$$\frac{dg}{dx}(1-c) = g'(1-c) = \frac{R_0^{-1} - c\theta_S}{1-c} - 1. \tag{37}$$

Using $c < c_h = (1 - R_0^{-1})/(1 - \theta_S)$, it follows that $g'(1-c) < 0$. Since $g(1-c) = 0$, we can pick $L > 0$ such that $g(1 - c - \eta) > 0$ for all $\eta \in (0, L]$. Moreover, $g(0) = -[(R_0 \phi_S)^{-1} - 1] < 0$. By the intermediate value theorem (applied to $g(x)$, which is a continuous function of x), there exists a

solution $S_U^\infty \in (0, 1-c-L)$ to $g(S_U^\infty) = 0 \iff F(S_U^\infty) = S_U^\infty$, the final-size equation (36). To prove the uniqueness of S_U^∞, we use the mean value theorem. If $x_1 = F(x_1) < x_2 = F(x_2)$, then there exists $x_* \in (x_1, x_2)$ such that $F'(x_*) = (F(x_1) - F(x_2))/(x_1 - x_2) = 1$. For $x_* > 0$, $F'(x_*) = 1$ is equivalent to

$$(1-c)\left(\frac{x_*}{1-c}\right)^{1-\phi_S} + c\theta_S\left(\frac{x_*}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S-\phi_S} = R_0^{-1}. \tag{38}$$

Since $\theta_S \geq \theta_S^\dagger = \phi_S$, both exponents in (38) are non-negative. Therefore, the left-hand side of (38) monotonically increases with increasing x_*: from zero at $x_* = 0$ (or if $\theta_S = \phi_S$, from $c\phi_S \leq \phi_S < 1/R_0$), to $(1-c) + c\theta_S > R_0^{-1}$ at $x_* = 1-c$. Hence, (38) has only one solution $x_* \in (0, 1-c)$. Thus, $F(x)$ has at most two fixed points $x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1-c]$. Since $1-c$ is a fixed point, we must have $x_2 = 1-c$, so $x_1 = S_U^\infty = F(S_U^\infty) < 1-c$ is unique.

4.3 Final-size results

For $R_0\phi_S < 1$, the final number of unvaccinated individuals who never become infected is the solution $S_U^\infty < 1-c$ of (36). The cumulative primary infections are $C_U = 1-c-S_U^\infty$ (in the unvaccinated) and $C_V = c - S_V^\infty$ (in the vaccinated), with $S_V^\infty = c\,(S_U^\infty/(1-c))^{\theta_S}$ following from (27). Therefore, the total primary infections are

$$C_U + C_V = ((1-c) - S_U^\infty) + c\left[1 - \left(\frac{S_U^\infty}{1-c}\right)^{\theta_S}\right] = \frac{1}{R_0\phi_S}\left[1 - \left(\frac{S_U^\infty}{1-c}\right)^{\phi_S}\right]. \tag{39}$$

The total infections are

$$C_U + C_U^\dagger + C_V + C_V^\dagger = \int_0^\infty (S_U + \phi_S S_U^\dagger + \theta_S S_V + \phi_S S_V^\dagger)\lambda dt = \int_0^\infty R_0^{-1}\lambda dt = \frac{1}{R_0}\log\frac{1-c}{S_U^\infty} \tag{40}$$

so the cumulative infections in hosts with prior immunity are

$$C_U^\dagger + C_V + C_V^\dagger = \frac{1}{R_0}\log\frac{1-c}{S_U^\infty} - C_U = \frac{1}{R_0}\log\frac{1-c}{S_U^\infty} - ((1-c) - S_U^\infty). \tag{41}$$

and—subtracting (39) from (40)—the cumulative reinfections are

$$C_U^\dagger + C_V^\dagger = \frac{1}{R_0}\log\frac{1-c}{S_U^\infty} - \frac{1}{R_0\phi_S}\left[1 - \left(\frac{S_U^\infty}{1-c}\right)^{\phi_S}\right]. \tag{42}$$

We have not been able to find expressions for $C_U^\dagger$ and $C_V^\dagger$ alone.

Final-size results without vaccination

Setting $c = 0$ simplifies the final-size equation (36), which is valid for $R_0\phi_S < 1$, to

$$S_U^\infty = (R_0\phi_S)^{-1}\,(S_U^\infty)^{\phi_S} - \left[(R_0\phi_S)^{-1} - 1\right]. \tag{43}$$

Thus, the cumulative primary infections are $C_U = 1 - S_U^\infty$, where S_U^∞ is the solution $S_U^\infty < 1$ of (43). Similarly, the total infections are

$$C_U + C_U^\dagger = \frac{1}{R_0}\log\frac{1}{S_U^\infty} \tag{44}$$

and the total reinfections are

$$C_U^\dagger = \frac{1}{R_0}\log\frac{1}{S_U^\infty} - (1 - S_U^\infty). \tag{45}$$

5 Discussion

In Section 3, we have studied an epidemic model including reinfections, in which immunity (from both infection and vaccination) is "all-or-none" [18]. The all-or-none immunity assumption facilitates the mathematical analysis, because there are inherently still only two immune states in the model (fully immune or fully susceptible). While this form of immunity has been used to consider partial cross immunity between distinct antigenic strains [9, 23], we are not aware of other models purely of reinfection that consider this all-or-none form.

The assumption that immunity against reinfection is "leaky" has been considered in other models before [12, 14, 15, 27]. Since we include vaccination, the model in Section 4 is most similar to the model for "partial immune protection and vaccination" of [14], but there are two key differences. First, because we do not model the birth-and-death dynamics of the population, we do not consider vaccination at birth. Instead, we capture the vaccination coverage of the population through the initial conditions of an epidemic (as in Section 3). Second, we assume the same susceptibility to reinfection for all hosts, regardless of vaccination status. We assume that this susceptibility to reinfection is not higher than the susceptibility of vaccinees who have never been infected. In contrast, [14] assumes that vaccinees always have the same susceptibility, regardless of whether they have been infected before or not, and that this susceptibility is lower than that of recovered uninfected individuals. Thus [14] considers vaccines that protect against infections at least as much as infection-induced immunity, while Section 4 considers vaccines that protect no more than infection-induced immunity.

As in [14], we find a "reinfection threshold" (RT) for R_0, separating two qualitatively different epidemiological scenarios. However, the RT in Section 4 is always determined by the relative susceptibility to reinfection ϕ_S: unlike the RT of [14], the RT here does not depend on the relative susceptibility of vaccinees. Moreover, in [14], the RT only separates two quantitative regimes for the same endemic equilibrium, so it is not a bifurcation point of the dynamical system [4]. In contrast, the RT here is a bifurcation point as it separates a transient epidemic wave ($R_0 < 1/\phi_S$) from an endemic equilibrium ($R_0 > 1/\phi_S$). The endemic state occurs if the infection-induced protection against reinfection is low relative to the transmission rate ($\phi_S > R_0^{-1}$). In this endemic equilibrium state, all hosts have previously been infected. Since this endemic state does not arise in the all-or-none model, this work highlights the importance of the mode in which immunity acts (leaky or all-or-none, although reality is likely somewhere between these two extremes [13]).

The two models (all-or-none and leaky) are the same for the first time a host is re-challenged with infection after recovery, but differ in subsequent challenges. On the one hand, a population with leaky immunity always has the potential to be infected further under sufficient force of infection (each individual host, upon sufficient exposure to the pathogen, could be infected infinitely many times). On the other hand, the all-or-none form means a limit to the capacity for reinfection, with eventually all hosts fully immune under a sustained force of infection. This dynamic difference is entirely analogous to the case of partial cross-immunity between strains: sustained oscillations are possible with the leaky form under certain parameters, but never with the all-or-none form [7]. The parallel in this work is that the epidemic is always transient under reinfection with all-or-none immunity but can be sustained for leaky immunity.

Both epidemic models above group together all infectious hosts with the same vaccination status, regardless of how many times (if any) they have been infected before. This assumption is needed to limit the number of model compartments. Some of the implicit assumptions are that there are no differences between (i) host infectiousness during primary infections and reinfections, (ii) the infectious period during primary infections and reinfections, or (iii) the immunity induced by primary infections and reinfections. Point (i) means that we ignore both infection-induced and vaccine-induced reduction in host infectiousness. Point (ii) means that we assume that infection-induced immunity does

not shorten future infection, matching the analogous assumption for vaccine-induced immunity. This assumption is likely simplifying from reality: hosts clear SARS-CoV-2 faster during reinfections [21]. While the exact implications for infectivity are unclear, prior immunity is likely to have some effect on the duration of infectivity. Point (iii) implies that we ignore immune imprinting and, more generally, the accumulation of immunity from multiple infections. Hence, at the beginning of each reinfection, the immune status of each host is the same, irrespective of whether it is the first or a later reinfection.

Moreover, we do not account for hybrid immunity [6]. In the model with leaky immunity, the susceptibility to reinfection is independent of the host's vaccination status. In other words, the vaccine-induced immunity does not protect recovered hosts, only the infection-induced immunity does. For the model with all-or-none immunity, there is a similar underlying assumption. If a host is infected, the probability of acquiring (full) protection against reinfection does not depend on their vaccination status. This assumption is also needed to obtain an analytical final-size expression (if vaccinees had a lower probability of becoming susceptible to reinfection, (5) would not hold). Neglecting hybrid immunity means that the results here underestimate the effects of vaccination in reducing the number of infections.

Finally, both models allow reinfections immediately after recovery from infection. There is some evidence suggesting that hosts may experience two infections in short succession with the same strain of Influenza A [26] and SARS-CoV-2 [33]. However, most reinfections likely occur due to a combination of antigenic escape [19, 34] and waning immunity [5]. We do not model waning immunity explicitly because we intended to focus on the dynamics of reinfection. Similarly, sequential reinfections (i.e., without waning of immunity) of the same strain are also possible in other models studying the evolution of Influenza A [12, 16] and SARS-CoV-2 [30, 32].

In this paper we have obtained final-size solutions of SIRI-type epidemic models with partial infection-induced immunity, which leads to reinfections. These models also include partial vaccine-induced protection against (primary) infections for a fraction of the population that has been vaccinated before the outbreak. Assuming all-or-none immunity, we obtain analytic final-size solutions in terms of the Lambert W function. These solutions have a similar mathematical structure to the final-size solution of the standard SIR model, but account for partial infection-induced immunity. Assuming instead leaky immunity, we find implicit solutions for the final epidemic size. These solutions (for a transient epidemic) are only valid if the susceptibility to reinfection is relatively low. If instead the susceptibility to reinfection is above a reinfection threshold, the system reaches an endemic state (similar to an SIS model). These results could help predict the epidemiological impact of disease that only induce partial protection in recovered hosts. For example, our final-size solutions quantify the reduction in the cumulative infections that would occur if a fraction of the population was vaccinated (prior to the outbreak). This reduction varies depending on the intrinsic transmissibility of the pathogen and the relative susceptibilities of vaccinees and recovered hosts.

References

[1] Andreasen, V. "Dynamics of annual influenza A epidemics with immuno-selection". *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 46.6 (2003), 504–536.

[2] Andreasen, V. and Gog, J. R. "Pease (1987): The evolutionary epidemiology of influenza A". *Theoretical Population Biology*. Fifty years of Theoretical Population Biology 133 (2020), 29–32.

[3] Boni, M. F., Gog, J. R., Andreasen, V., and Christiansen, F. B. "Influenza drift and epidemic size: the race between generating and escaping immunity". *Theoretical Population Biology* 65.2 (2004), 179–191.

[4] Breban, R. and Blower, S. "The reinfection threshold does not exist". *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 235.2 (2005), 151–152.

[5] Bull, J. J., Koelle, K., and Antia, R. "Waning immunity drives respiratory virus evolution and reinfection". *Evolution, Medicine, and Public Health* (2025), eoaf002.

[6] Crotty, S. "Hybrid immunity". *Science* 372.6549 (2021), 1392–1393.

[7] Dawes, J. and Gog, J. “The onset of oscillatory dynamics in models of multiple disease strains”. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 45.6 (2002), 471–510.

[8] Finlay, B. B. and McFadden, G. “Anti-Immunology: Evasion of the Host Immune System by Bacterial and Viral Pathogens”. *Cell* 124.4 (2006), 767–782.

[9] Gog, J. R. and Grenfell, B. T. “Dynamics and selection of many-strain pathogens”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99.26 (2002), 17209–17214.

[10] Gog, J. R. and Hollingsworth, T. D. “Epidemic interventions: insights from classic results”. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 376.1829 (2021), 20200263.

[11] Gog, J. R. and Swinton, J. “A status-based approach to multiple strain dynamics”. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 44.2 (2002), 169–184.

[12] Gökaydin, D., Oliveira-Martins, J. B., Gordo, I., and Gomes, M. G. M. “The reinfection threshold regulates pathogen diversity: the case of influenza”. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 4.12 (2007), 137–142.

[13] Gomes, M. G. M., Lipsitch, M., Wargo, A. R., Kurath, G., Rebelo, C., Medley, G. F., and Coutinho, A. “A Missing Dimension in Measures of Vaccination Impacts”. *PLOS Pathogens* 10.3 (2014), e1003849.

[14] Gomes, M. G. M., White, L. J., and Medley, G. F. “Infection, reinfection, and vaccination under suboptimal immune protection: epidemiological perspectives”. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 228.4 (2004), 539–549.

[15] Gomes, M. G. M., White, L. J., and Medley, G. F. “The reinfection threshold”. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 236.1 (2005), 111–113.

[16] Gordo, I., Gomes, M. G. M., Reis, D. G., and Campos, P. R. A. “Genetic Diversity in the SIR Model of Pathogen Evolution”. *PLOS One* 4.3 (2009), e4876.

[17] Gutierrez, M. A. and Gog, J. R. “The importance of vaccinated individuals to population-level evolution of pathogens”. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 567 (2023), 111493.

[18] Halloran, M. E., Longini Jr., I. M., and Struchiner, C. J. “Design and Interpretation of Vaccine Field Studies”. *Epidemiologic Reviews* 21.1 (1999), 73–88.

[19] Jong, J. C. de, Rimmelzwaan, G. F., Fouchier, R. A. M., and Osterhaus, A. D. M. E. “Influenza Virus: a Master of Metamorphosis”. *Journal of Infection* 40.3 (2000), 218–228.

[20] Keeling, M. J. and Rohani, P. *Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals*. Princenton University Press, 2007.

[21] Kissler, S. M., Hay, J. A., Fauver, J. R., Mack, C., Tai, C. G., Anderson, D. J., Ho, D. D., Grubaugh, N. D., and Grad, Y. H. “Viral kinetics of sequential SARS-CoV-2 infections”. *Nature Communications* 14.1 (2023), 6206.

[22] Kissler, S. M., Tedijanto, C., Goldstein, E., Grad, Y. H., and Lipsitch, M. “Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period”. *Science* 368.6493 (2020), 860–868.

[23] Kucharski, A. J., Andreasen, V., and Gog, J. R. “Capturing the dynamics of pathogens with many strains”. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 72.1 (2016), 1–24.

[24] Lehtonen, J. “The Lambert W function in ecological and evolutionary models”. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 7.9 (2016), 1110–1118.

[25] Ma, J. and Earn, D. J. D. “Generality of the Final Size Formula for an Epidemic of a Newly Invading Infectious Disease”. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 68.3 (2006), 679–702.

[26] Memoli, M. J., Han, A., Walters, K.-A., Czajkowski, L., Reed, S., Athota, R., Angela Rosas, L., Cervantes-Medina, A., Park, J.-K., Morens, D. M., Kash, J. C., and Taubenberger, J. K. “Influenza A Reinfection in Sequential Human Challenge: Implications for Protective Immunity and “Universal” Vaccine Development”. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 70.5 (2020), 748–753.

[27] Moreira, H. N. and Yuquan, W. “Global Stability in an $S \to I \to R \to I$ Model”. *SIAM Review* 39.3 (1997), 496–502.

[28] Pease, C. M. “An evolutionary epidemiological mechanism, with applications to type a influenza”. *Theoretical Population Biology* 31.3 (1987), 422–452.

[29] Powell, A. A., Kirsebom, F., Stowe, J., Ramsay, M. E., Lopez-Bernal, J., Andrews, N., and Ladhani, S. N. “Protection against symptomatic infection with delta (B.1.617.2) and omicron (B.1.1.529) BA.1 and BA.2 SARS-CoV-2 variants after previous infection and vaccination in adolescents in England, August, 2021–March, 2022: a national, observational, test-negative, case-control study”. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 23.4 (2023), 435–444.

[30] Rella, S. A., Kulikova, Y. A., Minnegalieva, A. R., and Kondrashov, F. A. “Complex vaccination strategies prevent the emergence of vaccine resistance”. *Evolution* 78.10 (2024), 1722–1738.

[31] Ross, R. and Hudson, H. P. “An application of the theory of probabilities to the study of a priori pathometry.—Part III”. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character* 93.650 (1917), 225–240.

[32] Saad-Roy, C. M., White, A., and Boots, M. “The evolution of post-infection mortality”. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 291.2035 (2024), 20241854.

[33] Tillett, R. L., Sevinsky, J. R., Hartley, P. D., Kerwin, H., Crawford, N., Gorzalski, A., Laverdure, C., Verma, S. C., Rossetto, C. C., Jackson, D., Farrell, M. J., Hooser, S. V., and Pandori, M. “Genomic evidence for reinfection with SARS-CoV-2: a case study”. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 21.1 (2021), 52–58.

[34] Yewdell, J. W. “Antigenic drift: Understanding COVID-19”. *Immunity* 54.12 (2021), 2681–2687.