Mathematical Analysis of a Zika Model with reservoirs and Human Movement

Kifah Al-Magrashi¹, Fatma Al-Musalhi², Ibrahim M. Elmojtaba¹, Nasser Al-Salti^{3*}

1 Department of Mathematics, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman

2 Center for Preparatory Studies, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman

3 Department of Applied Mathematics and Science, National University of Science and Technology, Muscat, Oman

* alsalti@nu.edu.om

Abstract

A mathematical model for Zika virus is proposed describing the spread of the disease in three interacting populations, namely, human, vector (mosquitoes) and non-human primate (monkeys) inhabiting forests area. Human movement between rural and forest areas has been also considered. It is assumed that Zika virus spreads within non-human primate population, which in turn acts as a reservoir of infection, and then transmitted to the human population through infected mosquitoes. The proposed model incorporates vertical transmission and direct transmission in all populations. The proposed model has been first normalized. The normalized model has been then fully analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively to investigate the role of the interaction between forest mosquitoes and primates on the ZIKV transmission dynamics. The mathematical analysis includes positivity and boundedness of solutions, derivation of the basic reproduction number R_0 using the next generation matrix method, sensitivity analysis, existence and stability analysis of all equilibria and bifurcation analysis. Finally, numerical simulations have been carried out to illustrate the obtained theoretical results and to demonstrate the effect of some model parameters in the disease transmission dynamics. The results show that the interaction between forest

mosquitoes and primates has a significant impact on the ZIKV transmission dynamics among human population through the fraction of susceptible moving to forest areas. Furthermore, the results highlight that the transmission probabilities are as important as the ratios of population size between vector population and human or primate populations in the disease transmission dynamics.

Introduction

Recently, Zika virus infection has become a perilous danger for the human society [1]. It is a vector borne illness, spreads through the mosquito borne flavi-infection. This infection was first distinguished from rhesus monkeys in 1947 in the Zika forest of Uganda and from people in Nigeria in 1954, yet it did not spread in pestilence structure among the human populace until 2007 [1]. During 2013-2014, the largest epidemic of Zika virus occurred in Polynesia, France [2]. In 2018, the first principal assembled report of the biggest announced Zika outbreak in India [3]. Although, instances of Zika infection have fallen in the Americas, the Zika infection stays an active threat in certain areas of the world.

The infection is basically spread by the bites of Aedes species mosquitoes. Also, different types of transmission routes have been perceived (e.g., sexually and vertically). Generally, Zika infection causes a non-severe disease, i.e., it was characterized by causing mild symptoms like fever, headache, rash, arthralgia and conjunctivitis. However, a few territories recently influenced by the infection are giving troubling data on the all-around referenced possible relationship of neonatal mutations (microcephaly) and Guillian- Barre syndrome (GBS) with Zika Virus (ZIKV). As an outcome, the WHO pronounced a Public Health Emergency of International Concern on the first of February of 2016, featuring the significance of upgrade the actions to decrease the ZIKV infection, especially among pregnant ladies and ladies of childbearing age [4]. The advancement of Zika immunization will require proceeded with center and speculation. Until a Zika antibody is accessible, counteraction endeavors for pregnant ladies incorporate aversion of movement to territories with dynamic Zika transmission, evasion of mosquito bites for those living in or going to zones with Zika transmission, and insurance against sexual transmission [5].

Researchers from different fields are working on understanding the disease transmission dynamics. Mathematical models have been demonstrated as a significant tool to comprehend the disease infection transmission. However, there have been few studies on the role of animals as ZIKV hosts. There are some reports on ZIKV identification in non-human primates which raise the prospect that they could serve as reservoirs. The creation of a sylvatic Zika cycle in the forest of South America is highly likely, according to mathematical models of Zika virus transmission as discussed in [6]. Their model predicts that the inclusion of a quickly reproducing primate or other mammal, that is a competent host for ZIKV, greatly boosts the possibilities of establishing a sylvatic cycle. They suggest that the formation of a ZIKV sylvatic cycle can be supported by a network of as few as 6,000 primates and 10,000 mosquitoes. Furthermore, during the 2011 ZIKV amplification in Kedougou, field researchers revealed that the virus was present in all main land cover classes in the region, but was discovered substantially more frequently in the forest than in other land cover types. Two of the three monkey species found in Kedougou, African green monkeys and Patas monkeys, have previously been found to carry ZIKV. Following that, the virus was discovered in a large swath of tropical Africa using monkey serosurveys and virus isolation from monkeys and many species of sylvatic Aedes. In [7], scientists predict that when monkeys become infected with the sylvatic cycle of Yellow Fever (also a flavivirus) in the Americas, they show overt clinical symptoms and a viremia high enough to transmit virus to mosquito vectors. The virus remained limited to Africa and Asia's tropical areas, infecting monkeys, arboreal mosquitoes, and humans on rare occasions. The majority of primates found to be ZIKV-positive in the wild or in sentinel studies are from the Old World. Humans are more closely linked to Old World primate species, particularly chimps and orangutans, according to phylogenetic study. Hence, the relative risk often increase in diseases that can be transmitted between closely related species. They also discovered that the ZIKV genome sequence in monkeys was identical to the ZIKV circulating in humans in South America, implying that primates sharing the same habitat as humans could serve as ZIKV hosts. In addition, scientists in [8] look into ZIKV infection in wild African monkeys to learn more about its emergence and transmission, and see if there was any signs of active or prior infection. Their findings imply that up to 16% of some nonhuman primate groups were exposed to

ZIKV at some stage.

Researchers in [9] predict that studying ZIKV in Non-Human Primates (NHP) models can provide insight into viral dynamics as well as serve as a valuable tool for testing antiviral medicines and vaccines. Many of the important clinical findings in human Zika infection have been replicated in NHPs, including quick control of acute viremia, early penetration of the central nervous system, and sustained viral shedding and fetal disease in pregnant animals.

Moreover, in [10], a ZIKV mathematical model incorporating human movement between rural areas and nearby forests was presented to investigate the role of human movement in the spread of Zika virus infections in human and vector populations. The vector compartment, based on mosquito species distributions, have been split into rural areas and proximity forest areas. Authors discussed the consequences of an infected person with mild symptoms moving from rural to nearby forest regions in search of work or sustenance. The effect of a susceptible human mobility on the ZIKV transmission has been also considered. The obtained results showed that the human movement from rural areas to forests has a small effect in increasing the infected human and vector populations.

In this paper, we extend our previous work by proposing a mathematical model that includes three interacting populations, namely, human, mosquitoes (vectors) and monkeys (primates). The vector population has been divided into rural and forest mosquitoes. Direct and vertical transmissions routes are proposed in all populations. The proposed model aims to assess the effect of non-human primate (monkeys) inhabiting forests in spread of ZIKV to the nearby rural areas through the mobility of susceptible humans to forest areas and their interaction with contagious forest mosquitoes. This nearby movement can be happen for different reasons like work or food searching. The rest of this paper is organized as follows: model description is given in Section 2. Mathematical Analysis of the proposed model is discussed in Section 3. The Mathematical analysis includes normalization, positivity and boundedness of solution, basic reproduction number, sensitivity analysis of reproduction number, local and global stability of equilibrium states and bifurcation analysis. Numerical simulations of the proposed model are presented in Section 4, which includes examining the effect of some model parameters variations on the disease transmission dynamics.

Finally, all findings are concluded in Section 5.

Model Description

In this section, a model for Zika virus transmission between humans, vectors and primates (monkeys) is proposed. The interactions between these different populations are illustrated in Fig 1. The total human population N_H is assumed to remain constant and is classified into three compartments: susceptible S_h , infected I_h and recovered R_h such that $N_H = S_h + I_h + R_h$. Recovered humans are assumed to have a lifelong immunity [2].

Fig 1. Illustrated figure for the interaction between human, vectors and non human primates populations.

The susceptible humans are assumed to gain the infection through bites of infectious female mosquitoes that live in rural areas I_v as well as by infectious female mosquitoes that live in forest alienated nearby rural areas I_u due to their movement to forest areas. So, we split the vector population according to its living area into: rural population (S_v , I_v) and nearby forest population (S_u , I_u) with constant total vector populations N_V and N_U such that $N_V = S_v + I_v$ and $N_U = S_u + I_u$, where S_v and S_u are the susceptible mosquitoes in rural and nearby forest areas, respectively. Recovery of infected mosquitoes from ZIKV infection is not considered due to its short life span [2]. They are assumed to remain infected for their entire remaining life. [6]. We assume that non-humans primates (reservoirs) are monkeys and are classified into three compartments S_p , I_p and R_p similar to human population with constant total population N_P such that $N_P = S_p + I_p + R_p$. They live only in forest areas and can get infected only by forest infectious mosquitoes. When monkeys become infected, they present overt clinical signs high enough to transmit virus to the mosquito vectors [7]. Monkeys primates recover at a fixed rate [6] and when challenged again with the virus do not get infected [11]. The description of the transmission of the ZIKV infection between these compartments are stated as follows:

- (i) Susceptible humans S_h can get infected with ZIKV via three main routes [12]:
vector transmission by a female mosquito bite, direct transmission via sexual

transmission or blood transfusion, or vertical transmission by being passed from mother to her newborn child. We assume that a fraction ϵ_1 of newborns to infected are affected by Zika. We assume that the Zika-affected newborns enter the infected class. Evidence suggests that this fraction is about $2/3$ [13]. A fraction κ of the susceptible human individuals progresses from rural areas to the nearby forest area for specific reasons such as work or food searching. So, they may get infection from infectious mosquitoes in forest area as well.

(ii) Susceptible rural mosquitoes S_v can only be infected by infectious humans I_h and susceptible forest mosquitoes S_u can only be infected by infectious primates I_p . Vertical transmission ϵ_2, ϵ_3 of the Zika virus in both vector populations are incorporated, respectively. Evidence suggests that Zika virus is transmitted vertically in the mosquito vector [14] and this is the main pathway it survives the colder months.

(iii) Susceptible primates S_p are infected by forest infectious mosquitoes and infectious primates I_p can infect forest susceptible mosquitoes S_u as well. We assume symptomatic and asymptomatic primates equally infectious to mosquitoes and we lump the two classes in one, I_p . A proportion ϵ_4 of primates population can transmit ZIKV infection vertically. Infectious monkeys can also infect other susceptible partner sexually.

Fig 2. Progression diagram of the of the proposed ZIKV model.

The above description is illustrated in Fig 2 and accordingly, the proposed model is given by the following set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
S'_h &= \mu_H N_H - \mu_H \epsilon_1 I_h - \beta_1 \theta_1 I_v \frac{S_h}{N_H} - \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 I_u \frac{S_h}{N_H} - \lambda_1 I_h \frac{S_h}{N_H} - \mu_H S_h \\
I'_h &= \mu_H \epsilon_1 I_h + \beta_1 \theta_1 I_v \frac{S_h}{N_H} + \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 I_u \frac{S_h}{N_H} + \lambda_1 I_h \frac{S_h}{N_H} - (\gamma_1 + \mu_H) I_h \\
R'_h &= \gamma_1 I_h - \mu_H R_h \\
S'_v &= \mu_V N_V - \mu_V \epsilon_2 I_v - \beta_1 \theta_2 S_v \frac{I_h}{N_H} - \mu_V S_v \\
I'_v &= \mu_V \epsilon_2 I_v + \beta_1 \theta_2 S_v \frac{I_h}{N_H} - \mu_V I_v \\
S'_u &= \mu_U N_U - \mu_U \epsilon_3 I_u - \beta_3 \theta_2 S_u \frac{I_p}{N_P} - \mu_U S_u \\
I'_u &= \mu_U \epsilon_3 I_u + \beta_3 \theta_2 S_u \frac{I_p}{N_P} - \mu_U I_u \\
S'_p &= \mu_P N_P - \mu_P \epsilon_4 I_p - \beta_3 \theta_1 S_p \frac{I_u}{N_P} - \lambda_2 S_p \frac{I_p}{N_P} - \mu_P S_p \\
I'_p &= \mu_P \epsilon_4 I_p + \beta_3 \theta_1 S_p \frac{I_u}{N_P} + \lambda_2 S_p \frac{I_p}{N_P} - (\gamma_2 + \mu_P) I_p \\
R'_p &= \gamma_2 I_p - \mu_P R_p
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

subjected to non-negative initial conditions

$$(S_h(0), I_h(0), R_h(0), S_v(0), I_v(0), S_u(0), I_u(0), S_p(0), I_p(0), R_p(0))^T.$$

The parameter values of the model (1) is given in Table 1.

139

Table 1. Description of the constant parameters used in model (1) and its values (per day).

Symbol	Description	Value(Range)	Source
μ_H	Natural death/birth rate of humans	1/(60 * 365)	Assumed
μ_V	Natural death/birth rate of mosquito in rural areas	1/14	[15]
μ_U	Natural death/birth rate of mosquito in forest areas	1/14	[15]
μ_P	Natural death/birth rate of primates	1/(25 * 365)	Assumed
β_1	Biting rate of rural mosquitoes on humans	[0.33-1]	[1]
β_2	Biting rate of forest mosquitoes on humans	[0.33-1]	[1]
β_3	Biting rate of forest mosquitoes on primates	[0.3-0.9]	[6]
θ_1	Transmission probability of an infection from an infectious mosquito	[0.10-0.75]	[16]
θ_2	Transmission probability of an infection to mosquito	[0.30-0.75]	[16]
λ_1	Direct (sexual) transmission rate between humans	0.005	Assumed
λ_2	Direct (sexual) transmission rate between primates	0.05	Assumed
γ_1	Recovery rate of humans	1/6	[17]
γ_2	Recovery rate of primates	1/5	[18]
ϵ_1	Probability of vertical transmission in humans	0.67	[13]
ϵ_2	Probability of vertical transmission in rural mosquitoes	0.06	[19]
ϵ_3	Probability of vertical transmission in forest mosquitoes	0.06	[19]
ϵ_4	Probability of vertical transmission in primates	0.6	Assumed
κ	Fraction of susceptible humans moving from rural to forest areas	0.3	Assumed

Model Mathematical Analysis In this section, we first normalize the proposed model 140

(1). Then, we study positivity of solutions and invariant set, the basic reproduction number and its sensitivity analysis. Existence of equilibrium points, their local and global stability and bifurcation analysis are also considered.

Model Normalization

To normalize the proposed model (1), let

$$S_H = \frac{S_h}{N_H}, \quad I_H = \frac{I_h}{N_H}, \quad R_H = \frac{R_h}{N_H}, \quad S_V = \frac{S_v}{N_V}, \quad I_V = \frac{I_v}{N_V},$$

$$S_U = \frac{S_u}{N_U}, \quad I_U = \frac{I_u}{N_U}, \quad S_P = \frac{S_p}{N_P}, \quad I_P = \frac{I_p}{N_P}, \quad R_P = \frac{R_p}{N_P},$$

such that

$$S_H + I_H + R_H = 1, \quad S_V + I_V = 1, \quad S_U + I_U = 1, \quad S_P + I_P + R_P = 1.$$

Thus, the normalized model is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} S'_H &= \mu_H - \mu_H \epsilon_1 I_H - \beta_1 \theta_1 \alpha_1 I_V S_H - \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U S_H - \lambda_1 I_H S_H - \mu_H S_H \\ I'_H &= \mu_H \epsilon_1 I_H + \beta_1 \theta_1 \alpha_1 I_V S_H + \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U S_H + \lambda_1 I_H S_H - (\gamma_1 + \mu_H) I_H \\ R'_H &= \gamma_1 I_H - \mu_H R_H \\ S'_V &= \mu_V - \mu_V \epsilon_2 I_V - \beta_1 \theta_2 S_V I_H - \mu_V S_V \\ I'_V &= \mu_V \epsilon_2 I_V + \beta_1 \theta_2 S_V I_H - \mu_V I_V \\ S'_U &= \mu_U - \mu_U \epsilon_3 I_U - \beta_3 \theta_2 S_U I_P - \mu_U S_U \\ I'_U &= \mu_U \epsilon_3 I_U + \beta_3 \theta_2 S_U I_P - \mu_U I_U \\ S'_P &= \mu_P - \mu_P \epsilon_4 I_P - \beta_3 \theta_1 \alpha_3 S_P I_U - \lambda_2 S_P I_P - \mu_P S_P \\ I'_P &= \mu_P \epsilon_4 I_P + \beta_3 \theta_1 \alpha_3 S_P I_U + \lambda_2 S_P I_P - (\gamma_2 + \mu_P) I_P \\ R'_P &= \gamma_2 I_P - \mu_P R_P \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha_1 = \frac{N_V}{N_H}$, $\alpha_2 = \frac{N_U}{N_H}$ and $\alpha_3 = \frac{N_U}{N_P}$ with non negative initial condition

$$X(0) := (S_H(0), I_H(0), R_H(0), S_V(0), I_V(0), S_U(0), I_U(0), S_P(0), I_P(0), R_P(0))^T.$$

Positivity of Solutions and Positively Invariant Set

The positivity and boundedness of the state variables are demonstrated in the following theorem :

Theorem 1 *The solution*

$$X(t) = (S_H(t), I_H(t), R_H(t), S_V(t), I_V(t), S_U(t), I_U(t), S_P(t), I_P(t), R_P(t))^T$$

of system (2) with non-negative initial condition $X(0)$ remains positive for all time $t > 0$ in a positively invariant closed set

$$\Omega := \{X(t) \in R_+^{10} : 0 \leq S_H(t), I_H(t), R_H(t), S_V(t), I_V(t), S_U(t), I_U(t), S_P(t), I_P(t), R_P(t) \leq 1\}.$$

proof

Assume that the system (2) has non-negative initial condition $X(0)$. Let

$\tau = \sup\{t > 0; X(t) > 0\}$. Then, S'_H can be written as

$$S'_H = \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)I_H + \mu_H\epsilon_1R_H - m_1S_H - \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)S_H, \quad (3)$$

where, $m_1 = \beta_1\theta_1\alpha_1I_V + \kappa\beta_2\theta_1\alpha_2I_U + \lambda_1I_H > 0$. It follows that

$$S'_H + [\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + m_1]S_H = \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \mu_H\epsilon_1R_H,$$

then integrating both sides over $(0, \tau)$, we get

$$S_H(\tau) = \left[S_H(0) + \mu_H \int_0^\tau ((1 - \epsilon_1) + \epsilon_1 R_H(t)) e^{\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)t + \int_0^t m_1(w)dw} dt \right] \times e^{-(\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)\tau + \int_0^\tau m_1(w)dw)}.$$

Clearly, $S_H(\tau)$ is positive since $S_H(0) \geq 0$. Similar calculations can be done for I'_H and

R'_H , we get

$$I_H(\tau) = \left[I_H(0) + \left(\int_0^\tau \beta_1 \theta_1 \alpha_1 I_V(t) + \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U(t) \right) e^{(\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1-\epsilon_1))t - \int_0^t \lambda S_H(u) du} dt \right] \\ \times e^{-(\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1-\epsilon_1))\tau + \int_0^\tau \lambda S_H(u) du} > 0,$$

and

$$R_H(\tau) = \left[R_H(0) + \left(\gamma_1 \int_0^\tau I_H(t) e^{\mu_H t} dt \right) \right] e^{-\mu_H \tau} > 0,$$

since initial conditions are non-negative. Similarly, one can show that the remaining

components of $X(t)$ are positive at τ . Using continuity of solution and $X(0) \geq 0$, we

conclude that τ can not be supremum and hence, solution will remain positive for all

$t > 0$.

Now, assume that $\Psi(t) = (\Psi_1(t), \Psi_2(t), \Psi_3(t), \Psi_4(t))^T$, where,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1(t) \\ \Psi_2(t) \\ \Psi_3(t) \\ \Psi_4(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S_H(t) + I_H(t) + R_H(t) \\ S_V(t) + I_V(t) \\ S_U(t) + I_U(t) \\ S_P(t) + I_P(t) + R_P(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

then, we have

$$\Psi'(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_H - \mu_H \Psi_1(t) \\ \mu_V - \mu_V \Psi_2(t) \\ \mu_U - \mu_U \Psi_3(t) \\ \mu_P - \mu_P \Psi_4(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, solving for each component, we get :

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1(t) \\ \Psi_2(t) \\ \Psi_3(t) \\ \Psi_4(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - (1 - \Psi_1(0)) e^{-\mu_H t} \\ 1 - (1 - \Psi_2(0)) e^{-\mu_V t} \\ 1 - (1 - \Psi_3(0)) e^{-\mu_U t} \\ 1 - (1 - \Psi_4(0)) e^{-\mu_P t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

where $\Psi_1(0) = S_H(0) + I_H(0) + R_H(0)$, $\Psi_2(0) = S_V(0) + I_V(0)$, $\Psi_3(0) = S_U(0) + I_U(0)$,

and $\Psi_4(0) = S_P(0) + I_P(0) + R_P(0)$. It is straight forward to say that

$$\Psi_i(t) \leq 1 \quad \text{if} \quad \Psi_i(0) \leq 1, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

Thus, the set Ω is positively invariant set since $0 \leq \Psi(t) \leq 1$. Moreover, if $\Psi(0) > 1$ then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) = 1$ and therefore the set Ω is a globally attractive set.

The Basic Reproduction Number

The model (2) has three different types of equilibria: disease free equilibrium ($DFE : \mathcal{Z}^0$), axial equilibrium ($AE : \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$), describes an endemic in populations living in rural area only and endemic equilibrium ($EE : \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$), describes an endemic in both forest and rural areas. The endemic and axial equilibria will be discussed later.

The disease free equilibrium always exists and is given by

$$\mathcal{Z}^0 := (S_H^0, 0, 0, S_V^0, 0, S_U^0, 0, S_P^0, 0, 0),$$

where, $S_H^0 = S_V^0 = S_U^0 = S_P^0 = 1$. The threshold quantity $\mathcal{R}_0$ is defined as the average number of secondary infections generated by one case in a completely susceptible population. It is calculated by well known Next Generation Method [20]. The Jacobian of the transmission matrix is:

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \alpha_1 \beta_1 \theta_1 & \kappa \alpha_2 \beta_2 \theta_1 & 0 \\ \beta_1 \theta_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta_3 \theta_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \beta_3 \theta_1 & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and Jacobian of the transition matrix is

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \gamma_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \gamma_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

then, the next generation matrix ΣQ^{-1} is

$$\Sigma Q^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_H(1-\epsilon_1) + \gamma_1} & \frac{\alpha_1\beta_1\theta_1}{\mu_V(1-\epsilon_2)} & \frac{\kappa\alpha_2\beta_2\theta_1}{\mu_U(1-\epsilon_3)} & 0 \\ \frac{\beta_1\theta_2}{\mu_H(1-\epsilon_1) + \gamma_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\beta_3\theta_2}{\mu_P(1-\epsilon_4) + \gamma_2} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\alpha_3\beta_3\theta_1}{\mu_U(1-\epsilon_3)} & \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_P(1-\epsilon_4) + \gamma_2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The basic reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0$ is the spectral radius of ΣQ^{-1} which can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{R}_0 := \max \{ \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left[R_{HH} + \sqrt{R_{HH}^2 + 4R_{HV}} \right], \quad \mathcal{R}_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[R_{PP} + \sqrt{R_{PP}^2 + 4R_{PU}} \right] \quad (5)$$

$$\text{with } \mathcal{R}_{HH} = \frac{\lambda_1}{\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1-\epsilon_1)}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{HV} = \frac{\alpha_1\beta_1^2\theta_1\theta_2}{\mu_V(1-\epsilon_2)[\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1-\epsilon_1)]}, \quad (5)$$

$$\text{and } \mathcal{R}_{PP} = \frac{\lambda_2}{\gamma_2 + \mu_P(1-\epsilon_4)}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{PU} = \frac{\alpha_3\beta_3^2\theta_1\theta_2}{\mu_U(1-\epsilon_3)[\gamma_2 + \mu_P(1-\epsilon_4)]}. \quad (5)$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{R}_{HH}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{PP}$ represent the transmission due to interaction between human population and between primates population, respectively. $\mathcal{R}_{HV}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{PU}$ represent the transmission due to interaction between human and vector in rural areas and interaction between primates and vector in forest areas, respectively. Moreover, the disease threshold occurs at $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1$ which implies either

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = 1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV} = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{R}_2 = 1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU} = 1.$$

Also, it can be easily proven that the disease infection will die out at $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$ which implies that $\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV} < 1$ and $\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU} < 1$. This will happen by reducing all routes of transmission, $\mathcal{R}_{HH}$, $\mathcal{R}_{HV}$, $\mathcal{R}_{PP}$, and $\mathcal{R}_{PU}$. However, the disease infection persists in all populations when $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$, whenever $\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV} > 1$ and $\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU} > 1$.

Sensitivity Analysis of the Basic Reproduction Number.

In this section, sensitivity analysis of the basic reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0$ is discussed. It allows us to determine the parameters which have significant impact on threshold ratio

$\mathcal{R}_0$ of model (2), i.e., a small change in a highly sensitive parameter leads to a high quantitative variation in $\mathcal{R}_0$ and may produce qualitatively different results. Such parameters must deserve the attention of management and control strategies. Here, the normalized forward sensitivity index method (elasticity index) [21] is used and it is defined as the ratio of the relative change of $\mathcal{R}_0$ with respect to relative variation in a parameter ℓ as follows

$$\Upsilon_{\ell}^{\mathcal{R}_0} = \frac{\ell}{\mathcal{R}_0} \times \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}_0}{\partial \ell}. \quad (6)$$

Since $\mathcal{R}_0 := \max \{\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2\}$, the sensitivity analysis of $\mathcal{R}_0$ with respect to each of its parameter will be evaluated via the sensitivities of each of $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ such that

$$\Upsilon_{\ell_1}^{\mathcal{R}_1} = \frac{\ell_1}{\mathcal{R}_1} \times \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}_1}{\partial \ell_1}, \quad \Upsilon_{\ell_2}^{\mathcal{R}_2} = \frac{\ell_2}{\mathcal{R}_2} \times \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}_2}{\partial \ell_2}, \quad (7)$$

where ℓ_1, ℓ_2 denotes the parameter related to $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$, respectively. Using the explicit expression of the basic reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0$ (5) with the base line values of parameters listed in Table 1, the estimated values of the sensitivities indices at $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$ are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Sensitivity indices of $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$.

$\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2 > 1$			$\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1 > 1$		
Parameter(ℓ_1)	Sign	$\Upsilon_{\ell_1}^{\mathcal{R}_{01}}$	Parameter(ℓ_2)	Sign	$\Upsilon_{\ell_2}^{\mathcal{R}_{02}}$
β_1	+	0.9889	β_3	+	0.8775
λ_1	+	0.0111	λ_2	+	0.1224
γ_1	-	0.5055	γ_2	-	0.5611
α_1	+	0.4944	α_3	+	0.4387
μ_H	-	0.4513e-4	μ_P	-	0.0001234
μ_V	-	0.4944	μ_U	-	0.4387
ϵ_1	+	0.9164e-4	ϵ_4	+	0.0001851
ϵ_2	+	0.0315	ϵ_3	+	0.0280
θ_1	+	0.4343	θ_1	+	0.4387
θ_2	+	0.4343	θ_2	+	0.4387

The sensitivity indices are interpreted with regard to their magnitudes and signs. The basic reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0$ increases (decreases) with the increase (decrease) in those parameters that have positive sensitivity indices. Conversely, it increases (decreases) with the decrease (increase) in those parameters that have negative sensitivity indices. Moreover, the magnitude of sensitivity indices represents the relative

importance of those parameters that drive the transmission mechanism of the disease. 209

Clearly, when $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1$ the most efficacious parameters is the biting rate of rural 210

mosquitoes on humans β_1 , which has a strong positive impact on the value of $\mathcal{R}_0$. While 211

the most efficacious parameter when $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2$ is the biting rate of the forest mosquitoes 212

on primates β_3 . Furthermore, the results highlight that the transmission probabilities θ_1 , 213

θ_2 are as important as the ratios of population size α_1 , α_3 , in the disease transmission 214

dynamics. Obviously, increasing the transmission probabilities will lead to an increase 215

in $\mathcal{R}_0$. There are many factors affecting the transmission probabilities such as the ZIKV 216

dose in the blood-meal as shown in [22], where authors have demonstrated that 217

increasing ZIKV dose in the blood-meal significantly increases the probability of 218

mosquitoes becoming infected, and consequently disseminating virus and becoming 219

infectious. On the other hand, the recovery rate of humans γ_1 and the recovery rate of 220

primates γ_2 have the most negative sensitive indices. Also, the short life span of 221

mosquitoes will reduce the spread of the disease and hence decrease in $\mathcal{R}_0$. Thus, for 222

controlling Zika virus, it is suggested to control the mosquito population and prevent 223

their breeding near houses in rural area. 224

Local Stability of the DFE 225

Here, we discuss the local stability of the disease free equilibrium $\mathcal{Z}^0$ by finding the 226

eigenvalues of the linearized system. The result is given in the following theorem: 227

Theorem 2 *The DFE, given by $\mathcal{Z}^0$, of the model (2) is locally asymptotically stable if 228*

$R_0 < 1$. *Otherwise, it is unstable. 229*

proof 230

First, let us introduce the following:

$$\delta_1 = \lambda_1 - [\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)], \quad \delta_2 = \lambda_2 - [\gamma_2 + \mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4)].$$

Then, the linearized matrix of the system (2) at the disease free equilibrium $\mathcal{Z}^0$ is 231

$J_{\mathcal{Z}^0} =$ 232

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\mu_H & -(\mu_H \epsilon_1 + \lambda_1) & 0 & 0 & -\alpha_1 \beta_1 \theta_1 & 0 & -\kappa \alpha_2 \beta_2 \theta_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_1 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_1 \beta_1 \theta_1 & 0 & \kappa \alpha_2 \beta_2 \theta_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_1 & -\mu_H & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\beta_1 \theta_2 & 0 & -\mu_V & -\mu_V \epsilon_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_1 \theta_2 & 0 & 0 & -\mu_V (1 - \epsilon_2) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mu_U & -\mu_U \epsilon_3 & 0 & -\beta_3 \theta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3) & 0 & \beta_3 \theta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\alpha_3 \beta_3 \theta_1 & -\mu_P & -(\mu_P \epsilon_4 + \lambda_2) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \beta_3 \theta_1 & 0 & \delta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_2 & -\mu_P \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly, the above system has six negative eigenvalues which are:

$$-\mu_H, -\mu_H, -\mu_V, -\mu_U, -\mu_P, -\mu_P.$$

The remaining eigenvalues satisfy the characteristic equation $P(\lambda) = 0$, which is given 233
by 234

$$P(\lambda) := \lambda^4 + p_1 \lambda^3 + p_2 \lambda^2 + p_3 \lambda + p_4, \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) + [\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \gamma_1](1 - \mathcal{R}_{HH})]^2 [\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) + [\mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \gamma_2](1 - \mathcal{R}_{PP})]^2 \\
 & \{ \mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)[\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \gamma_1][1 - (\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV})] + \mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3)[\mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \gamma_2] \\
 & \times [1 - (\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU})] \} + [\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) + [\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \gamma_1](1 - \mathcal{R}_{HH})] [\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) + \\
 & [\mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \gamma_2](1 - \mathcal{R}_{PP})] \times \{ [\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)[\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \gamma_1][1 - (\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV})] \\
 & + \mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3)[\mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \gamma_2][1 - (\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU})] \}^2 + [\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) + [\mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \gamma_2] \\
 & \times (1 - \mathcal{R}_{PP})]^2 \mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)[\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \gamma_1][1 - (\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV})] + [\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) + \\
 & [\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \gamma_1](1 - \mathcal{R}_{HH})]^2 \mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3)[\mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \gamma_2][1 - (\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU})] \}. \\
 & \text{Clearly, } p_1 p_2 - p_3 > 0 \text{ and } p_1 p_2 p_3 - p_3^2 - p_1^2 p_4 > 0 \text{ if and only if}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV} < 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU} < 1.$$

Hence, the eigenvalues of characteristic equation $p(\lambda) = 0$ have negative real parts
whenever $R_0 < 1$, which implies that the DFE ($\mathcal{Z}^0$) is locally asymptotically stable.

Global Stability of the DFE

The global stability of the DFE ($\mathcal{Z}^0$) will ensure that the disease is eliminated under all
initial conditions. In this regard, we state the following theorem:

Theorem 3 *The disease free equilibrium, given by $\mathcal{Z}^0$ of the model (2) is globally
asymptotically stable if $R_0 < 1$.*

proof

The proof is based on using Castillo-Chavez theorem [24]. Let $X(t)$ and $Y(t)$
compartments describe the uninfected and infected classes of system (2), respectively:

$$X(t) = \begin{bmatrix} S_H(t) \\ R_H(t) \\ S_V(t) \\ S_U(t) \\ S_P(t) \\ R_P(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y(t) = \begin{bmatrix} I_H(t) \\ I_V(t) \\ I_U(t) \\ I_P(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, system (2) can be written as :

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = F(X, Y), \quad \frac{dY}{dt} = G(X, Y); \quad G(X, 0) = 0,$$

where F and G are the corresponding right hand sides in system (2).

According to Castillo-Chavez theorem, in order to guarantee the global asymptotic stability of the DFE ($\mathcal{Z}^0$), the following two conditions (H1) and (H2) must be satisfied:

- (H1) $X^0 = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)^T$ is globally asymptotically stable for $\frac{dX}{dt} = F(X, 0)$.
- (H2) $\hat{G} \geq 0$, where $\hat{G}(X, Y) = AY - G(X, Y)$ and $A = D_Y G(X^0, 0)$ is an Metzler matrix $\forall (X, Y) \in \Omega$.

First to check (H1), we have

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = F(X, 0) = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu_H S_H + \mu_H \\ -\mu_H R_H \\ -\mu_V S_V + \mu_V \\ -\mu_U S_U + \mu_U \\ -\mu_P S_P + \mu_P \\ -\mu_P R_P \end{bmatrix},$$

then, the behavior of each compartment can be obtained by solving the above system of ODEs and hence, we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_H \\ R_H \\ S_V \\ S_U \\ S_P \\ R_P \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + S_H(0)e^{-\mu_H t} \\ R_H(0)e^{-\mu_H t} \\ 1 + S_V(0)e^{-\mu_V t} \\ 1 + S_U(0)e^{-\mu_U t} \\ 1 + S_P(0)e^{-\mu_P t} \\ R_P(0)e^{-\mu_P t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X(t) = X^0$, i.e, the first condition is satisfied. Next, we check the second condition (H2) by finding $A = D_Y G(X^0, 0)$:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1) + \lambda_1 - \gamma_1 & \beta_1\theta_1\alpha_1 & \kappa\beta_2\theta_1\alpha_2 & 0 \\ \beta_1\theta_2 & -\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) & \beta_3\theta_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_3\beta_3\theta_1 & -\mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4) + \lambda_2 - \gamma_1 \end{bmatrix},$$

then, we compute $\hat{G}(X, Y) = AY - G(X, Y)$:

$$\hat{G} = \begin{bmatrix} (\alpha_1\beta_1\theta_1I_V + \kappa\alpha_2\beta_2\theta_1I_U + \lambda_1I_H)(1 - S_H) \\ \beta_1\theta_2I_H(1 - S_V) \\ \beta_3\theta_2I_P(1 - S_U) \\ (\alpha_3\beta_3\theta_1I_U + \lambda_2I_P)(1 - S_P) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\hat{G} \geq 0, \forall (X, Y) \in \Omega$ since $0 \leq (S_H, S_V, S_U, S_P) \leq 1$. Thus, (H2) is satisfied.

Hence, $\mathcal{Z}^0$ is globally asymptotically stable, provided that $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$.

Existence of Endemic Equilibria

In this section, result related to the existence of axial and endemic equilibria is stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 4 *The model (2) poses two endemic equilibrium points :*

- (i) *a unique Axial equilibrium (AE) given by $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$, exists if $\mathcal{R}_1 > 1$,*
- (ii) *a full Endemic equilibrium (EE) given by $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$, exists if $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$.*

proof

Let $\mathcal{Z}^* := (S_H^*, I_H^*, R_H^*, S_V^*, I_V^*, S_U^*, I_U^*)$ be the expected endemic equilibrium of the model (2). By solving

$S'_H = 0, R'_H = 0, S'_V = 0, I'_V = 0, S'_U = 0, I'_U = 0, S'_P = 0, R'_P = 0$, we get

$$S_H^* = \frac{\mu_H - (\mu_H + \gamma_1)I_H^*}{\mu_H}, \quad R_H^* = \frac{\gamma_1 I_H^*}{\mu_H}, \quad S_V^* = \frac{\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)}{\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) + \beta_1 \theta_2 I_H^*},$$

$$I_V^* = \frac{\beta_1 \theta_2 I_H^*}{\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) + \beta_1 \theta_2 I_H^*}, \quad S_U^* = \frac{\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3)}{\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) + \beta_3 \theta_2 I_P^*}, \quad I_U^* = \frac{\beta_3 \theta_2 I_P^*}{\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) + \beta_3 \theta_2 I_P^*}$$

$$S_P^* = \frac{\mu_P - (\mu_P + \gamma_2)I_P^*}{\mu_P}, \quad R_P^* = \frac{\gamma_2 I_P^*}{\mu_P},$$

then by solving $I'_H = 0$ and using the expression of S_H^* , we get:

$$\beta_1 \alpha_1 \theta_1 I_V^* + \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U^* = \frac{\mu_H [\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)] I_H^* - \lambda_1 [\mu_H - (\mu_H + \gamma_1) I_H^*] I_H^*}{\mu_H - (\mu_H + \gamma_1) I_H^*}. \quad (9)$$

Substitution of I_V^* and I_U^* into equation (9) leads to the following equation in terms of

I_H^* and I_P^* :

$$\frac{\beta_3 \theta_2 I_P^*}{\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) + \beta_3 \theta_2 I_P^*} = \frac{a_1 I_H^{*3} + a_2 I_H^{*2} + a_3 I_H^*}{b_1 I_H^{*2} + b_2 I_H^* + b_3}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= \beta_1 \lambda_1 \theta_2 (\mu_H + \gamma_1), \\ a_2 &= \mu_V (\mu_H + \gamma_1) (1 - \epsilon_2) (\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)) [\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV}] \\ &\quad + \mu_H \beta_1 \theta_2 (\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)) [1 - \mathcal{R}_{HH}], \\ a_3 &= \mu_V \mu_H (1 - \epsilon_2) (\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)) [1 - (\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV})], \\ b_1 &= -\beta_1 \beta_2 \theta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 (\mu_H + \gamma_1), \\ b_2 &= \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 [\beta_1 \theta_2 \mu_H - \mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)(\mu_H + \gamma_1)], \\ b_3 &= \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 \mu_V \mu_H (1 - \epsilon_2). \end{aligned}$$

Solving $I'_P = 0$ and using expressions of S_P^* and I_U^* gives the following cubic equation:

$$c_1 I_P^{*3} + c_2 I_P^{*2} + c_3 I_P^* = 0, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \beta_3 \lambda_2 \theta_2 \mu_H (\gamma_2 + \mu_P), \\ c_2 &= \beta_3^2 \theta_1 \theta_2 \alpha_3 \mu_H [\gamma_2 + \mu_P] + \lambda_2 \mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3) (\gamma_2 + \mu_P) + \beta_3 \theta_2 \mu_P [\gamma_2 + \mu_P (1 - \epsilon_4)] \\ &\quad [1 - \mathcal{R}_{PP}], \\ c_3 &= \mu_P \mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3) [\gamma_2 + \mu_P (1 - \epsilon_4)] [1 - (\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU})]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from equation (11), we have the following two cases:

(i) if $I_P^* = 0$, then equation (10) becomes a cubic equation in terms of I_H^* :

$$a_1 I_H^{*3} + a_2 I_H^{*2} + a_3 I_H^* = 0. \quad (12)$$

From the above equation, we have either $I_H^* = 0$ which gives the DFE or we get the quadratic equation:

$$a_1 I_H^{*2} + a_2 I_H^* + a_3 = 0. \quad (13)$$

Clearly, $a_1 > 0$ and $a_3 < 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV} > 1$, which implies $\mathcal{R}_1 > 1$. Thus, according to the Descartes's Sign Rule [25], equation (13) has a unique positive root. Moreover, since $I_P^* = 0$, we have

$$S_U^* = 1, \quad I_U^* = 0, \quad S_P^* = 1, \quad R_P^* = 0.$$

Hence, we have a unique AE, which is given by

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(1)} = (S_H^*, I_H^*, R_H^*, S_V^*, I_V^*, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0),$$

where, I_H^* satisfies equation (13).

(ii) If $I_P \neq 0$, then solving equation (11) yields

$$c_1 I_P^{*2} + c_2 I_P^* + c_3 = 0, \quad (14)$$

which has a unique positive root I_P^* if $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$, since $c_1 > 0$ and $c_3 < 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU} > 1$.

Now, using the above result that I_P^* is the unique positive root of (14), equation (10)

can be written terms of I_H^* only:

$$d_1 I_H^{*3} + d_2 I_H^{*2} + d_3 I_H^* + d_4 = 0, \quad (15)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 &= a_1 [\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) + \kappa\beta_2\beta_3\alpha_2\theta_1\theta_2^2 I_P^*], \\ d_2 &= [\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3) - \kappa\beta_2\beta_3^2\alpha_2\theta_1\theta_2^2 I_P^*] [\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)] [\mu_V(\gamma_1 + \mu_H)(\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV}) \\ &\quad + \beta_1\theta_2\mu_H(1 - \mathcal{R}_{HH})] + \beta_2\beta_3\theta_1\theta_2^2\alpha_2 I_P^*, \\ d_3 &= \mu_V\mu_H\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_2)(1 - \epsilon_3)(1 - \beta_2\beta_3^2\theta_2 I_P^*\mathcal{R}_{HV}) [\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)]^2 \\ &\quad [1 - (\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV})] + \kappa\beta_2\beta_3\alpha_2\theta_1\theta_2 I_P^*\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)(\mu_H + \gamma_1), \\ d_4 &= -\kappa\beta_2\beta_3\alpha_2\theta_1\theta_2\mu_H\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2) I_P^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, applying Descartes's Sign Rule, provided that I_P^* is positive if $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$, $d_1 > 0$ and $d_4 < 0$, we have the following possibilities for the existence of positive roots of equation (15):

- (I) a unique positive root, if $d_2 > 0$ and $d_3 < 0$ or both d_2 and d_3 have the same sign.
- (II) three positive roots, if $d_2 < 0$ and $d_3 > 0$.

Thus, EE exists if $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$ and can be written as

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(2)} = (S_H^*, I_H^*, R_H^*, S_V^*, I_V^*, S_U^*, I_U^*, S_P^*, I_P^*, R_P^*),$$

where, I_P^* and I_H^* can be computed using equations (14) and (15), respectively.

Bifurcation and Local Stability Analysis

Emergence or disappearance of new stable points causing a changes in stability of a system as a parameter changes is defined as bifurcation. In this section, we discuss the bifurcation of system (2) numerically and theoretically. All figures in this section is sketched using Matcont program [26].

Here, we take the transmission probability from an infectious mosquito, θ_1 , as a

bifurcation parameter for which there are two possible bifurcations values,

$$\theta_1^* = \frac{\mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)[\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)](1 - \mathcal{R}_{HH})}{\beta_1^2 \theta_2 \alpha_1} = \frac{\delta_H}{\beta_1^2 \theta_2 \alpha_1}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{HH} < 1, \quad (16)$$

and

$$\check{\theta}_1 = \frac{\mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3)[\gamma_2 + \mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4)](1 - \mathcal{R}_{PP})}{\beta_3^2 \theta_2 \alpha_3} = \frac{\delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \theta_2 \alpha_3}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{PP} < 1, \quad (17)$$

corresponding to $\mathcal{R}_1 = 1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2 = 1$, respectively, where

$$\delta_H = \mu_V(1 - \epsilon_2)[\gamma_1 + \mu_H(1 - \epsilon_1)](1 - \mathcal{R}_{HH}) \text{ and}$$

$$\delta_P = \mu_U(1 - \epsilon_3)[\gamma_2 + \mu_P(1 - \epsilon_4)](1 - \mathcal{R}_{PP}).$$

Clearly, θ_2 is the only common parameter between θ_1^* and $\check{\theta}_1$. So, fixing the values of other parameters, θ_1^* and $\check{\theta}_1$ will attain their maximum values of one when

$$\theta_2 = \frac{\delta_H}{\beta_1^2 \alpha_1} = \theta_{2_H} \text{ and } \theta_2 = \frac{\delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \alpha_3} = \theta_{2_P},$$

respectively, and their minimum values are obtained when $\theta_2 = 1$. Hence, the feasibility of the bifurcation values θ_1^* and $\check{\theta}_1$ depends on the value of θ_2 . In particular, if the value of θ_2 is taking to be less than θ_{2_H} and θ_{2_P} , then both bifurcation values will be greater than one and thus no bifurcation will take place. The bifurcation of the system (2) will now be examined numerically for the following two cases:

(a) $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$ (b) $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$ with θ_1 as a bifurcation parameter, taking different values of θ_2 and fixing the values of all other parameters. The bifurcation diagrams are illustrated in Figures 3 - 5.

Fig 3. Forward bifurcation at the DFE with $\theta_{2_H} < \theta_2 = 0.05 < \theta_{2_P}$ for the case $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$.

Fig 4. Double forward bifurcation at the DFE and AE, respectively, with $\theta_{2_H} < \theta_{2_P} < \theta_2 = 0.1$ for the case $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$.

Fig 5. Forward bifurcation at the DFE with $\theta_{2_P} < \theta_{2_H} < \theta_2 = 0.07$ for the case $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$.

In Figures 3 and 4, we assume that $\beta_1 = 0.35, \beta_2 = 0.32, \beta_3 = 0.3, \lambda_1 = 0.1$, and $\lambda_2 = 0.0025$ such that $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$. For these choices, we have $\theta_{2_H} = 0.0188$ and

$\theta_{2P} = 0.0578$. Choosing $\theta_2 < \theta_{2H}$, $\mathcal{R}_0$ will be less than unity for all values of θ_1 and hence the DFE is stable and no bifurcation will take place. Here, both θ_1^* and $\check{\theta}_1$ are not feasible. For example, when $\theta_2 = 0.01$, the critical values are $\theta_1^* = 1.88$ and $\check{\theta}_1 = 5.78$. The bifurcation diagram for the case $0.0188 < \theta_2 < 0.0578$ is illustrated in Fig 3. Here, the transmission probability of infection to mosquitoes is taken to be $\theta_2 = 0.05$ and the corresponding critical values are $\theta_1^* = 0.3761$ and $\check{\theta}_1 = 1.1554$, which is not feasible. Clearly, the system undergoes forward bifurcation when θ_1 passes through the critical value θ_1^* as shown in the Figure. Furthermore, when θ_2 is taken to be 0.1, which is greater than both θ_{2H} and θ_{2P} , the critical values are $\theta_1^* = 0.1880$ and $\check{\theta}_1 = 0.5777$. In this case, the system has double forward bifurcation when θ_1 passes through these two critical values as shown in Fig 4. The system undergoes forward bifurcation at the DFE as θ_1 passes through θ_1^* and at the AE as θ_1 passes through $\check{\theta}_1$.

For the case $R_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$, we choose $\beta_1 = 0.35, \beta_2 = 0.32, \beta_3 = 0.3, \lambda_1 = 0.0025$, and $\lambda_2 = 0.1$, the corresponding values of θ_{2P} and θ_{2H} are 0.0293 and 0.0450, respectively. Similar to the previous case, the feasibility of the critical values of θ_1 depends on the value of the θ_2 and its relation to θ_{2H} and θ_{2P} . For illustration, we choose $\theta_2 = 0.07$ and the bifurcation diagram for this case is illustrated in Fig 5. The figure shows that the system has forward bifurcation at the DFE when θ_1 passes through $\check{\theta}_1 = 0.4180$ and that the EE once exists, it remains stable. Moreover, unstable AE exists when the system passes through the second critical value $\theta_1^* = 0.6427$ and hence there is no bifurcation at θ_1^* .

Next, the bifurcation result will be summarized in the following theorem and it will be confirmed using Sotomayor theorem as described in [27].

Theorem 5 *The following holds:*

- (i) *If $\mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$, then model (2) undergoes transcritical bifurcation at the DFE, given by Z^0 , when the parameter θ_1 passes through the bifurcation value $\check{\theta}_1$.*
- (ii) *If $\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$, then model (2) undergoes transcritical bifurcation at the DFE, given by Z^0 , when the parameter θ_1 passes through the bifurcation value θ_1^* and at the AE, given by $Z^{(1)}$, when the parameter θ_1 passes through the bifurcation value $\check{\theta}_1$.*

proof We begin with the proof of part (i). Define the right hand side of system (2)

as $Y(Z, t)$ such that

$$Z = (S_H, I_H, R_H, S_V, I_V, S_U, I_U, S_P, I_P, R_P)^T.$$

At $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 = 1$ and $\mathcal{R}_1 < 1$, choose θ_1 as a bifurcation parameter as define in (17). 354

The linearization matrix of system (2) around the DFE, $\mathcal{Z}^0$ and when $\theta_1 = \check{\theta}_1$ is 355

$$D_Z Y =$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\mu_H & -(\mu_H \epsilon_1 + \lambda_1) & 0 & 0 & \frac{-\alpha_1 \beta_1 \delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \alpha_3 \theta_2} & 0 & \frac{-\kappa \beta_2 \alpha_2 \delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \alpha_3 \theta_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-\delta_H}{\mu_V (1 - \epsilon_2)} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\alpha_1 \beta_1 \delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \alpha_3 \theta_2} & 0 & \frac{\kappa \beta_2 \alpha_2 \delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \alpha_3 \theta_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_1 & -\mu_H & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\beta_1 \theta_2 & 0 & -\mu_V & -\mu_V \epsilon_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_1 \theta_2 & 0 & 0 & -\mu_V (1 - \epsilon_2) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mu_U & -\mu_U \epsilon_3 & 0 & -\beta_3 \theta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3) & 0 & \beta_3 \theta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{-\delta_P}{\beta_3 \theta_2} & -\mu_P & -\mu_P \epsilon_4 - \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\delta_P}{\beta_3 \theta_2} & 0 & \frac{\delta_P}{\mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_2 & -\mu_P \end{bmatrix}.$$

One can easily check that the above matrix has a simple zero eigenvalue. 357

Then, the nonzero right eigenvector $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_7, v_8, v_9, v_{10})^T$ and the 358

nonzero left eigenvector $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5, w_6, w_7, w_8, w_9, w_{10})^T$ associated with 359

zero eigenvalue of $D_Z Y$ are 360

$$v = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\mu_V (\gamma_1 + \mu_H) (1 - \epsilon_2)}{\beta_1 \theta_2 \mu_H} v_5 \\ \frac{\mu_V (1 - \epsilon_2)}{\beta_1 \theta_2} v_5 \\ \frac{\gamma_1 \mu_V (1 - \epsilon_2)}{\beta_1 \theta_2 \mu_H} v_5 \\ -v_5 \\ v_5 \\ Q \\ -\frac{Q}{\kappa \beta_1 \beta_2 \alpha_2 \delta_P} v_5 \\ \frac{Q}{\kappa \beta_1 \beta_2 \alpha_2 \delta_P} v_5 \\ -\frac{\mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3) (\gamma_2 + \mu_P) Q}{\kappa \beta_1 \beta_2 \beta_3 \theta_2 \mu_P \delta_P} v_5 \\ -\frac{\mu_P}{(\gamma_2 + \mu_P) Q} v_8 \\ -\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_2 + \mu_P} v_8 \end{bmatrix}, \quad w = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{\delta_P}{\beta_3 \theta_2 \mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3)} w_9 \\ 0 \\ w_9 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $Q = \alpha_3 \beta_3^2 \delta_H - \alpha_1 \beta_1^2 \delta_P$. To check the first condition of Sotomayor theorem, we
 find the derivative of Y with respect to θ_1 at $\mathcal{Z}^0$ and $\theta_1 = \check{\theta}_1$, we get
 $Y_{\theta_1}(\check{\theta}_1, \mathcal{Z}^0) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T$. This implies

$$w^T Y_{\theta_1}(\check{\theta}_1, \mathcal{Z}^0) = 0, \quad (18)$$

and hence first condition is satisfied. Next, we compute the Jacobian of $Y_{\theta_1}(Z)$ at $\mathcal{Z}^0$
 and $\theta_1 = \check{\theta}_1$ and we obtain

$$DY_{\theta_1}(\check{\theta}_1, \mathcal{Z}^0) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\alpha_1 \beta_1 & 0 & -\kappa \alpha_2 \beta_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_1 \beta_1 & 0 & \kappa \alpha_2 \beta_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\alpha_3 \beta_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \beta_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, we calculate

$$w^T DY_{\theta_1}(\check{\theta}_1, \mathcal{Z}^0)v = \alpha_3 \beta_3 w_9 v_7 \neq 0, \quad (19)$$

therefore, the second condition is satisfied.

Since D^2 represents the matrix of partial derivatives of each components of DY with
 respect to each component of $Y(Z)$, we get

$$D^2Y(\check{\theta}_1, \mathcal{Z}^0)(v, v) = \begin{bmatrix} -3[\beta_2\kappa\alpha_2\theta_1v_7 + \beta_1\theta_1\alpha_1v_5 + \lambda_1v_2]v_1 \\ 3[\beta_2\kappa\alpha_2\theta_1v_7 + \beta_1\theta_1\alpha_1v_5 + \lambda_1v_2]v_1 \\ 0 \\ -4\beta_1\theta_2v_4v_2 \\ 4\beta_1\theta_2v_2v_4 \\ -3\beta_3\theta_2v_6v_9 \\ 3\beta_3\theta_2v_6v_9 \\ -[4\beta_3\theta_1\alpha_3v_7 + 3\lambda_2v_9]v_8 \\ [4\beta_3\theta_1\alpha_3v_7 + 3\lambda_2v_9]v_8 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, the third condition is satisfied by showing that

$$w^T[D^2Y(\check{\theta}_1, \mathcal{Z}^0)(v, v)] = \frac{-2Q^2w_9v_5^2}{\beta_1^2\beta_2^2\beta_3\alpha_2^2\theta_2\kappa^2\delta_P} \left[1 + \frac{\mu_U(1-\epsilon_3)(\gamma_2 + \mu_P)}{\beta_3\theta_2\mu_P} \right] \neq 0. \quad (20)$$

Hence, according to Sotomayor theorem, the results in (18), (19) and (20) implies that as the parameter θ_1 passes through the bifurcation value $\check{\theta}_1$ defined in (17), the system (2) experiences a transcritical bifurcation at $\mathcal{Z}^0$ as shown on the figure above.

For the proof of part (ii), one can repeat the same procedure as we did for part (i). Choose θ_1^* as a bifurcation parameter defined in (16). The left and right eigenvectors are

$$w = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\frac{Qw_9}{\kappa\beta_2\beta_3\alpha_2\delta_H} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -\frac{Qw_9}{\kappa\beta_1\beta_2\beta_3\alpha_2\theta_2\mu_V(1-\epsilon_2)} \\ 0 \\ \frac{\delta_Pw_9}{\beta_3\theta_2\mu_U(1-\epsilon_3)} \\ 0 \\ w_9 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{-\mu_V(1-\epsilon_2)(\gamma_1 + \mu_H)v_5}{\beta_1\theta_2\mu_H} \\ \frac{\mu_V(1-\epsilon_2)v_5}{\beta_1\theta_2} \\ \frac{\gamma_1\mu_V(1-\epsilon_2)v_5}{\beta_1\theta_2\mu_H} \\ -v_5 \\ v_5 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively. The conditions of Sotomayor Theorem hold as follows:

$$w^T DY_{\theta_1}(\theta_1^*, \mathcal{Z}^0)v = \alpha_1 \beta_1 w_2 v_5 \neq 0, \quad (21)$$

and

$$w^T [D^2 Y(\theta_1^*, \mathcal{Z}^0)(v, v)] = \frac{2Qw_9v_5^2}{\beta_1\beta_2\beta_3\kappa\alpha_2\theta_2} \left[1 + \frac{\mu_V(1-\epsilon_2)(\gamma_1 + \mu_H)}{\beta_1\theta_2\mu_H} \right] \neq 0. \quad (22)$$

Hence, the system (2) undergoes transcritical bifurcation at the DFE when the parameter θ_1 passes through the bifurcation value $\theta_1 = \theta_1^*$. Finally, proofing the bifurcation at the AE when θ_1 passes through the bifurcation value $\theta_1 = \check{\theta}_1$ can be done in a similar way.

The local stability of endemic equilibria $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$ can be established from the above calculations and Theorem 4 in [15] such that a and b are given by

$$a = \frac{1}{2} w^T [D^2 Y(\mathcal{Z}^0, \mu^*)(v, v)] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n w_i v_j v_k \frac{\partial^2 Y_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(\mathcal{Z}^0, \mu^*),$$

$$b = w^T DY_{\mu}(\mathcal{Z}^0, \mu^*)v = \sum_{i,j=1}^n w_i v_j \frac{\partial^2 Y_i}{\partial x_j \partial \mu}(\mathcal{Z}^0, \mu^*).$$

where μ^* is the bifurcation parameter and the result is given in the following theorem:

Theorem 6 *The following results hold:*

(i) *Let a and b defined in (20) and (19) at $\theta_1 = \check{\theta}_1$ and $b \neq 0$ ($w_9 > 0$ and $v_5 > 0$).*

Then, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that the AE, given by $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$, is locally asymptotically stable near $\mathcal{Z}^0$ if $a < 0$ for $0 < \theta_1 < \varepsilon_1$.

(ii) *Let a and b defined in (22) and (21) at $\theta_1 = \theta_1^*$ and $b \neq 0$ ($w_9 < 0$ and*

$v_5 > 0$). Then, there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that the EE, given by $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$, is locally asymptotically stable near $\mathcal{Z}^0$ if $a < 0$ for $0 < \theta_1 < \varepsilon_2$.

The bifurcation and stability results for the case $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$ can be summarized as follows, taking θ_1 as a bifurcation parameter and provided that the two critical values θ_1^* and $\check{\theta}_1$ are feasible:

(i) When the transmission probability from an infectious mosquito is small

$\theta_1 < \theta_1^* < \check{\theta}_1$ ($\mathcal{R}_2 < \mathcal{R}_1 < 1$), then the number of infected will decrease and

eventually the disease will disappear from both areas. This implies that the DFE is stable.

(ii) When $\theta_1 = \theta_1^* < \check{\theta}_1$ ($\mathcal{R}_2 < \mathcal{R}_1 = 1$), the system undergoes forward bifurcation at the DFE as θ_1 pass through bifurcation value θ_1^* .

(iii) When $\theta_1^* < \theta_1 < \check{\theta}_1$ ($\mathcal{R}_2 < 1 < \mathcal{R}_1$), the endemic will persists only in rural area and will die out from forest area. Hence, the AE is stable, while the DFE is unstable.

(iv) When $\theta_1^* < \theta_1 = \check{\theta}_1$ ($1 = \mathcal{R}_2 < \mathcal{R}_1$), the system undergoes forward bifurcation at the AE as θ_1 pass through bifurcation value $\check{\theta}_1$.

(v) When the transmission probability from an infectious mosquito is high $\theta_1^* < \check{\theta}_1 < \theta_1$ ($\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2 > 1$), the disease will persist in both rural and forest areas and hence the EE is stable, while both the DFE and AE are unstable.

Also, we summarize the bifurcation and stability results for the case $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$ as follows:

(I) When $\theta_1 < \check{\theta}_1 < \theta_1^*$ ($\mathcal{R}_1 < \mathcal{R}_2 < 1$), then the disease will die out from both areas and hence the DFE is stable.

(II) When $\theta_1 = \check{\theta}_1 < \theta_1^*$ ($\mathcal{R}_1 < \mathcal{R}_2 = 1$), the system undergoes forward bifurcation at DFE as θ_1 pass through bifurcation value $\check{\theta}_1$.

(III) When $\check{\theta}_1 < \theta_1 < \theta_1^*$ ($\mathcal{R}_1 < 1 < \mathcal{R}_2$), the endemic will persist in both areas and hence the EE is stable, while the DFE is unstable.

(IV) When $\check{\theta}_1 < \theta_1 = \theta_1^*$ ($\mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1 = 1$), unstable AE exists as the system passes through θ_1^* .

(V) When $\check{\theta}_1 < \theta_1^* < \theta_1$ ($\mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1 > 1$), the EE remains stable and both the AE and DFE remain unstable.

Remark 1 One can choose θ_2 as a bifurcation parameter with the following critical values:

$$\theta_2^* = \frac{\delta_H}{\beta_1^2 \theta_1 \alpha_1}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{HH} < 1,$$

which corresponds to $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 = 1, \mathcal{R}_2 < 1$ and

$$\check{\theta}_2 = \frac{\delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \theta_1 \alpha_3}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{PP} < 1,$$

which corresponds to $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 = 1, \mathcal{R}_1 < 1$ and get similar results with the feasibility of the two critical values depending on θ_1 .

From the above discussion, we note that the stability and bifurcation results depend on both transmission probability parameters θ_1 and θ_2 . Hence, one may also study the combined effect of θ_1 and θ_2 . So, let us introduce a new parameter Θ defined as $\Theta = \theta_1 \theta_2$ with two critical values $\Theta^* = \frac{\delta_H}{\beta_1^2 \alpha_1}$ and $\check{\Theta} = \frac{\delta_P}{\beta_3^2 \alpha_3}$. The stability region based on combined effect of θ_1 and θ_2 for the case $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$ is shown in Fig 6. From the figure, the stability and bifurcation results can be outlined as follows:

- (i) When $\Theta < \Theta^* < \check{\Theta}$ ($\mathcal{R}_2 < \mathcal{R}_1 < 1$), the DFE is the only stable point. Thus, the disease will die out from both rural and forest areas.
- (ii) The system undergoes a forward bifurcation at the DFE when Θ passes through critical value Θ^* .
- (iii) When $\Theta^* < \Theta < \check{\Theta}$ ($\mathcal{R}_2 < 1 < \mathcal{R}_1$), then the AE is the only stable point. Thus, the disease will persist in rural area and it will disappear from the forest area.
- (iv) The system undergoes forward bifurcation at the AE when Θ passes through critical value $\check{\Theta}$.
- (v) When $\Theta^* < \check{\Theta} < \Theta$ ($\mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2 > 1$), the EE is the only stable point. Hence, the disease will persist in both rural and forest areas.

Fig 6. Stability region when $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1$

The stability region of combined effect of θ_1 and θ_2 for the case $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$ is given in Fig 7. The stability and bifurcation results based on combined effect Θ for this case can be outlined as follows:

- (I) When $\Theta < \check{\Theta} < \Theta^*$ ($\mathcal{R}_1 < \mathcal{R}_2 < 1$), the DFE is the only stable point and the disease will die out from both areas.

(II) The system undergoes forward bifurcation at the DFE when Θ passes through critical value $\check{\Theta}$.

(III) When $\check{\Theta} < \Theta < \Theta^*$ or $\check{\Theta} < \Theta^* < \Theta$, the EE is the only stable point. In other words, if $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$, the disease will persist in both areas.

Fig 7. Stability region when $R_0 = \mathcal{R}_2$.

Global Stability of Axial Equilibrium $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$

In this section, we derive the global stability of the AE. The derivation is based on finding a suitable Lyapunov function and using the LaSalle's invariance principle. We begin by considering the Lyapunov function as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(t) := \mathcal{L}_1(t) + \mathcal{L}_2(t),$$

such that

$$\mathcal{L}_1(t) := \omega_1 I_U(t) + \omega_2 I_P(t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2(t) &:= \omega_3 \left(S_H(t) - S_H^* - S_H^* \log \frac{S_H(t)}{S_H^*} \right) + \omega_4 \left(I_H(t) - I_H^* - I_H^* \log \frac{I_H(t)}{I_H^*} \right) \\ &\quad + \omega_5 \left(S_V(t) - S_V^* - S_V^* \log \frac{S_V(t)}{S_V^*} \right) + \omega_6 \left(I_V(t) - I_V^* - I_V^* \log \frac{I_V(t)}{I_V^*} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating $\mathcal{L}(t)$ with respect to t yields:

$$\mathcal{L}'(t) = \mathcal{L}'_1(t) + \mathcal{L}'_2(t),$$

such that

$$\mathcal{L}'_1(t) = \omega_1 I'_U(t) + \omega_2 I'_P(t),$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}'_2(t) = \omega_3 \left(\frac{S_H - S_H^*}{S_H} \right) S'_H + \omega_4 \left(\frac{I_H - I_H^*}{I_H} \right) I'_H + \omega_5 \left(\frac{S_V - S_V^*}{S_V} \right) S'_V + \omega_6 \left(\frac{I_V - I_V^*}{I_V} \right) I'_V.$$

Substitution of I'_U and I'_P from system (2) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}'_1(t) &= \omega_1 [\mu_U \epsilon_3 I_U + \beta_3 \theta_2 S_U I_P - \mu_U I_U] + \\ \omega_2 [\mu_P \epsilon_4 I_P + \beta_3 \theta_1 \alpha_3 S_P I_U + \lambda_2 S_P I_P - (\gamma_2 + \mu_P) I_P], \\ \text{using } S_U &= 1 - I_U \text{ and } S_P = 1 - I_P - R_P \text{ yields}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}L'_1(t) &= [\omega_1 \beta_3 \theta_2 + \omega_2 (\lambda_2 - \gamma_2 - \mu_P (1 - \epsilon_4))] I_P + [\omega_2 \beta_3 \theta_1 \alpha_3 - \omega_1 \mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3)] I_U \\ &\quad - [\omega_1 \beta_3 \theta_2 + \omega_2 \beta_3 \theta_1 \alpha_3] I_P I_U - \omega_2 \lambda_2 I_P^2 - \omega_2 [\lambda_2 I_P + \beta_3 \alpha_3 \theta_1 I_U] R_P.\end{aligned}$$

Next, choosing $\omega_2 = 1$ and $\omega_1 = \frac{\beta_3 \theta_1 \alpha_3}{\mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3)}$ gives

$$\mathcal{L}'_1(t) = -m + (\gamma_2 + \mu_P (1 - \epsilon_4)) [(\mathcal{R}_{PU} + \mathcal{R}_{PP}) - 1] I_P,$$

$$\text{such that } m = \left[\beta_3 \theta_1 \alpha_3 \left(\frac{\beta_3 \theta_2}{\mu_U (1 - \epsilon_3)} + 1 \right) I_P I_U + \lambda_2 I_P^2 + (\lambda_2 I_P + \beta_3 \alpha_3 \theta_1 I_U) R_P \right].$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{L}'_1(t)$ is negative definite when $\mathcal{R}_2 < 1$.

Moreover, substituting for S'_H , I'_H , S'_V , and I'_V from system (2) into $\mathcal{L}'_2(t)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}'_2(t) &= \omega_3 \left(\frac{S_H - S_H^*}{S_H} \right) [\mu_H - \mu_H \epsilon_1 I_H - \beta_1 \theta_1 \alpha_1 I_V S_H - \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U S_H - \lambda_1 I_H S_H \\ &\quad - \mu_H S_H] + \omega_4 \left(\frac{I_H - I_H^*}{I_H} \right) [\mu_H \epsilon_1 I_H + (\beta_1 \theta_1 \alpha_1 I_V S_H + \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U S_H + \lambda_1 I_H S_H) \\ &\quad - (\gamma_1 + \mu_H) I_H] + \omega_5 \left(\frac{S_V - S_V^*}{S_V} \right) [\mu_V (1 - S_V) - \mu_V \epsilon_2 I_V - \beta_1 \theta_2 S_V I_H] \\ &\quad + \omega_6 \left(\frac{I_V - I_V^*}{I_V} \right) [\beta_1 \theta_2 S_V I_H - \mu_V (1 - \epsilon_2) I_V].\end{aligned}$$

Now, let

$$\phi_1 = \mu_H \epsilon_1 I_H + (\beta_1 \theta_1 \alpha_1 I_V + \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U + \lambda_1 I_H) S_H$$

and

$$\phi_2 = \mu_V \epsilon_2 I_V + \beta_1 \theta_2 S_V I_H$$

and choose

$$\omega_3 = \omega_4 = \mu_V \epsilon_2 I_V^* + \beta_1 \theta_2 S_V^* I_H^*$$

and

$$\omega_5 = \omega_6 = \mu_H \epsilon_1 I_H^* + (\beta_1 \theta_1 \alpha_1 I_V^* + \kappa \beta_2 \theta_1 \alpha_2 I_U^* + \lambda_1 I_H^*) S_H^*,$$

then, using the fact that $S'_H = 0$, $I'_H = 0$, $S'_V = 0$, $I'_V = 0$ at the AE, we can write the

following:

$$\mu_H = \omega_6 + \mu_H S_H^*, \quad (\gamma_1 + \mu_H) I_H^* = \omega_6, \quad \mu_U = \omega_4 + \mu_U S_U^*.$$

Using the above relations to rewrite $\mathcal{L}'_2(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}'_2(t) &= \omega_4 \left(1 - \frac{S_H^*}{S_H}\right) [\omega_6 - \mu_H (S_H - S_H^*) - \phi_1] + \omega_4 \left(1 - \frac{I_H^*}{I_H}\right) \left[\phi_1 - \frac{\omega_6}{I_H^*} I_H\right] \\ &\quad + \omega_6 \left(1 - \frac{S_V^*}{S_V}\right) [\omega_4 - \mu_V (S_V - S_V^*) - \phi_2] + \omega_6 \left(1 - \frac{I_V^*}{I_V}\right) \left[\phi_2 - \frac{\omega_4}{I_V^*} I_V\right] \\ &= -\frac{\omega_4 \mu_H}{S_H} (S_H - S_H^*)^2 - \frac{\omega_6 \mu_V}{S_V} (S_V - S_V^*)^2 + \omega_4 \phi_1 \frac{S_H^*}{S_H} \left(1 - \frac{I_H^* S_H}{I_H S_H^*}\right) \\ &\quad + \omega_6 \phi_2 \frac{S_V^*}{S_V} \left(1 - \frac{I_V^* S_V}{I_V S_V^*}\right) + \omega_4 \omega_6 \left[4 - \left(\frac{S_H^*}{S_H} + \frac{I_H}{I_H^*} + \frac{S_V^*}{S_V} + \frac{I_V}{I_V^*}\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{L}'_2(t) \leq 0$ under the conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{S_H^*}{S_H} + \frac{I_H}{I_H^*} + \frac{S_V^*}{S_V} + \frac{I_V}{I_V^*} &\geq 4, \\ \frac{I_H^* S_H}{I_H S_H^*} &\geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{I_V^* S_V}{I_V S_V^*} \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Thus, we can deduce that $\mathcal{L}'(t) < 0$ if $\mathcal{R}_2 < 1$ and conditions in (23) are hold provided

that $\mathcal{R}_1 > 1$ which is required for existence of AE as discussed earlier. Note that

$\mathcal{L}'(t) = 0$ if $S_H = S_H^*$, $I_H = I_H^*$, $S_V = S_V^*$, $I_V = I_V^*$ and

$I_U = I_P = R_P = 0$ ($R_P = 0, I_P = 0$ or $R_P = 0, I_U = 0$). Therefore, the AE is the

largest invariant set in $\{X(t) \in \Omega, \mathcal{L}'(t) = 0\}$. Utilizing LaSalle's invariance

principle [28], the AE is an attractive point in Ω and hence, all solutions of system (2)

converge to $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$. The global attractivity and local stability of the AE implies that the

AE is globally asymptotically stable provided that the above conditions are satisfied.

This result is summarized in the following theorem:

Theorem 7 *The AE, given by $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$, is globally asymptotically stable if $\mathcal{R}_2 < 1$, $\mathcal{R}_1 > 1$ and conditions in (23) are hold.*

Numerical Analysis

In this section, numerical simulations are carried out to demonstrate the obtained theoretical results of ZIKV model (2) and to study the effect of some model parameters in the disease transmission dynamics. We use the base line value of the parameters as listed in Table 1 and appropriate initial conditions. The population size ratio parameters are assumed to be $\alpha_1 = 2$, $\alpha_2 = 3$, and $\alpha_3 = 2.5$.

Asymptotic Behavior of the Model

The asymptotic behavior of the model is graphically verified by plotting the solution curve of human and primates populations for the same choice of initial point. Fig 8 shows that the disease is disappeared from all populations when the basic reproduction number is less than unity. Moreover, when the basic reproduction number is greater than unity, the disease either persists in rural area only as illustrated in Fig 9 or persists in both areas after exhibiting oscillatory behavior as illustrated in Fig 10.

Fig 8. Simulation of the model (2) at $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 = 0.8715$ and $\mathcal{R}_2 = 0.7813$ for humans and primates populations, respectively.

Fig 9. Simulation of the model (2) at $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 = 1.1938$ and $\mathcal{R}_2 = 0.9417$ for humans and primates populations, respectively.

Fig 10. Simulation of the model (2) at $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 = 1.3384$ and $\mathcal{R}_2 = 1.3010$ for humans and primates populations, respectively.

Effect of the Fraction of Susceptible Humans Moving from Rural to Forest Areas

Here, we investigate the effect of varying the fraction of susceptible humans moving from rural to forest areas κ into the number of infected human as shown in Fig 11. It can be seen that increasing the values of this rate leads to an increase in number of infected human population. On the other hand, reducing this rate has the effect of not only reducing the maximum number of infected human, but also delaying the time it takes to reach the maximum number of infection, i.e., it will have the effect of flattening the curve of infected human population. As a result, it is suggested to avoid traveling to

forest area which has active virus transmission. The movement rate of humans to such areas should be targeted by control strategies in order to eliminate the ZIKV outbreak.

Fig 11. Number of infected humans for different values of κ .

Effect of Varying Biting Rates

The effect of varying the values of biting rate of rural mosquitoes on humans β_1 , biting rate of forest mosquitoes on humans β_2 and biting rate of forest mosquitoes on primates β_3 on the number of infected humans are shown in Fig 12. Clearly, the biting rate of rural mosquitoes on humans β_1 has the highest impact on the disease transmission among the other biting rates β_2 and β_3 which confirm the theoretical results of sensitivity analysis. Obviously, increasing the values of these rates will increase the number of infected human and reducing their values has the effect of flattening the curve of infected human population. The blue curve in the three graphs in Fig 12 corresponds to the case when $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0.3$.

Now, comparing the effect of β_2 and β_3 , one could easily see from Fig 12 that the indirect impact of β_3 on infected humans is higher than the direct impact of β_2 , which is expected since the infectious primates is considered to be the only source of infection for forest mosquitoes and hence the higher the biting rate on primates the more they become infectious to human even with fixed biting rate on human. On the other hand, fixing the biting rate on primates at low values, taken here to be $\beta_3 = 0.3$, the forest mosquitoes will have less impact on infected human even with increasing biting rate on human. This shows that interaction between forest mosquitoes and primates, represented here through β_3 , has a significant impact on the spread of ZIKV among human population when humans travel to forest areas from some reasons. Therefore, as mention previously, control strategies should impose restrictions on travel to affected forest areas of ZIKV in order to control the spread of the disease among the human population.

Fig 12. Number of infected humans for different values of β_1 (Top), β_2 (Middle) and β_3 (Bottom).

Combined Effect of Transmission Probabilities

Here, we present the effect of transmission probabilities of infection from and to mosquitoes, θ_1 and θ_2 , respectively. Their effect on human and primate populations is illustrated in Figures 13-14. We vary both θ_1 and θ_2 and fix the values of all other parameters for the two cases (a) $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$ and (b) $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$. The values of θ_1 and θ_2 are chosen based on the critical values of their product $\Theta = \theta_1\theta_2$. Fig 13 illustrates their effect for the case (a) with critical values $\Theta^* = 0.0188$ and $\check{\Theta} = 0.0578$. It can be seen that when the combined transmission probability is small, ($\Theta = 0.01 < \Theta^* < \check{\Theta}$), both human and primate populations converge to the DFE and hence the disease dies out from both rural areas and forest areas. When ($\Theta^* < \Theta = 0.0375 < \check{\Theta}$), the human population reaches the endemic steady state after exhibiting oscillations in the susceptible human population, while the primate population goes to the disease free steady state. This agrees with the obtained stability and bifurcation results, i.e., the system converges to the stable AE for this case. Hence, the disease will persist in rural area and will disappear from forest area. For higher combined transmission probability $\Theta^* < \check{\Theta} < \Theta = 0.1$, both populations reach the endemic steady state after exhibiting oscillation in the susceptible populations. Hence, the disease will persist in both areas. Fig 14 is devoted for case (b) with the critical

Fig 13. Combined effect of θ_1 and θ_2 on human and primates populations for the case (a) $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$.

Fig 14. Combined effect of θ_1 and θ_2 on human and primate populations for case (b) $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$.

values of Θ are $\check{\Theta} = 0.0293$ and $\Theta^* = 0.0449$. When $\Theta = 0.01 < \check{\Theta} < \Theta^*$, the system reaches the stable DFE. However, if the combined transmission probability is $\check{\Theta} < \Theta = 0.0375 < \Theta^*$ or $\check{\Theta} < \Theta^* < \Theta = 0.1$, the system reaches the stable EE after exhibiting oscillation behavior as shown in Fig 14. Reaching a stable AE is not feasible in this case which is consistent with bifurcation results since the system undergoes forward bifurcation only as Θ passes through critical value $\check{\Theta}$.

Conclusion

A mathematical model of ZIKV illness including direct and vertical transmission of human, mosquito vectors and monkey primates has been proposed. Human movement from rural area to forest area has been also considered. The model was studied and fully analyzed to investigate the impact of primates and human mobility from rural area to forest area in the spread of ZIKV. The boundedness of the invariant region and the positivity of the solution were discussed. The basic reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_0$ was computed and expressed in terms of two terms $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$, where $\mathcal{R}_1$ represents the transmission due to the interaction within human population $\mathcal{R}_{HH}$ and the interaction between humans and vectors in rural areas $\mathcal{R}_{HV}$, whereas $\mathcal{R}_2$ represents the transmission due to the interaction within primate population $\mathcal{R}_{PP}$ and the interaction between primates and vectors in forest areas $\mathcal{R}_{PU}$. The disease threshold occurs either whenever $\mathcal{R}_{HH} + \mathcal{R}_{HV} = 1$ if $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 = 1$ or whenever $\mathcal{R}_{PP} + \mathcal{R}_{PU} = 1$ if $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 = 1$. The proposed model were found to have three equilibria: a disease free equilibrium (DFE), which always exists, an axial equilibrium (AE) exists when $\mathcal{R}_1 > 1$ and it describes an endemic in populations living in rural area only and a full endemic equilibrium (EE) describing an endemic in both forest and rural areas, which exists when $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$. Then, sensitivity analysis of $\mathcal{R}_0$ was carried out, which revealed that $\mathcal{R}_0$ is sensitive to practically all model parameters, either positively or negatively. However, the most positive influential parameters are the biting rate of rural mosquitoes on humans and the biting rate of rural mosquitoes on primates, while the recovery rate of humans has the most negative impact. The sensitivity analysis results also showed that the transmission probabilities from and to mosquitoes, θ_1 and θ_2 , respectively, are as important as the ratios of population size between vector and human populations, α_1 , and between vector and primates populations, α_3 , in the disease transmission dynamics. The effect of the transmission probabilities has been further investigated in the bifurcation analysis and through numerical simulation. The bifurcation analysis was investigated analytically and graphically for the case when $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$ and the case when $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$, taking one of the transmission probabilities as a bifurcation parameter. The feasibility of forward bifurcation were found to depend on the values of both transmission probabilities θ_1 and θ_2 . It was observed that if $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_1 > \mathcal{R}_2$, the

proposed model may have a double forward bifurcation at DFE and AE, respectively, while if $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_1$, it may only experience a forward bifurcation at DFE. It was shown that the DFE is globally asymptotically stable whenever $\mathcal{R}_0$ is less than unity, the AE is globally asymptotically stable whenever $\mathcal{R}_1 > 1 > \mathcal{R}_2$ under certain conditions and the EE is locally asymptotically stable whenever $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$ since the direction of the bifurcation was found to be forward. The transmission probabilities were found to play a critical role in the obtained stability results. Finally, Numerical simulations were carried out to demonstrate the obtained theoretical results and to study the effect of some model parameters in the disease transmission dynamics. In particular, it was illustrated that the model converges asymptotically to the DFE whenever $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$, to the AE whenever $\mathcal{R}_1 > 1 > \mathcal{R}_2$ and to the EE after exhibiting oscillatory behavior whenever $\mathcal{R}_2 > 1$. It was also illustrated that the interaction between forest mosquitoes and primates has a significant impact on the ZIKV transmission dynamics among human population and that reducing the fraction of susceptible moving to forest areas has the effect of flattening the curve of infected human population. The critical impact of the combined transmission probabilities from and to mosquitoes in the disease dynamics has been also illustrated numerically. In particular, it was shown that for high transmission probabilities, the disease persists in all populations after exhibiting oscillatory behavior.

References

1. Olawoyin O, Kribs C. Effects of multiple transmission pathways on Zika dynamics. *Infectious Disease Modelling*. 2018; 3: 331-344.
2. Biswas SK, Ghosh U, Sarkar S. Mathematical model of zika virus dynamics with vector control and sensitivity analysis. *Infectious Disease Modelling*. 2020; 5: 23-41.
3. Biswas A, Kodan P, Gupta N, Soneja M, Baruah K, Sharma KK, Meena S. Zika outbreak in India in 2018. *Journal of travel medicine*. 2020; 27(4): taaa001.

4. Saiz JC, Vázquez-Calvo A, Blazquez A B, Merino-Ramos T, Escribano-Romero E, Martin-Acebes M A. Zika virus: the latest newcomer. *Frontiers in microbiology*. 2016; 7: 496.
5. Rasmussen S A, Jamieson D J. Teratogen update: Zika virus and pregnancy. *Birth Defects Res*. 2020; 112(15):1139-1149. doi: 10.1002/bdr2.1781.
6. Althouse B M, Vasilakis N, Sall AA , Diallo M, Weaver S C, Hanley K A. Potential for Zika virus to establish a sylvatic transmission cycle in the Americas. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2016; 10(12): e0005055.
7. Bueno MG, Martinez N, Abdalla L, Duarte dos Santos C N, Chame M. Animals in the Zika virus life cycle: what to expect from megadiverse Latin American countries. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2016;10(12): e0005073.
8. Buechler CR, Bailey AL, Weiler A M, Barry G L, Breitbach ME, Stewart LM, O'Connor D H. Seroprevalence of Zika virus in wild African green monkeys and baboons. *Msphere*. 2017; 2(2): e00392-16.
9. Best K, Guedj J, Madelain V, de Lamballerie X, Lim SY, Osuna CE, Perelson AS. Zika plasma viral dynamics in nonhuman primates provides insights into early infection and antiviral strategies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2017;114(33): 8847-8852.
10. Al-Maqrashy K, Al-Musalhi F, Elmojtaba IM, Al-Salti N. The Impact of Mobility between Rural Areas and Forests on the Spread of Zika. *arXiv preprint arXiv*. 2021; 2108.11331.
11. DM Dudley, MT Aliota, *et al.* A rhesus macaque model of Asian-lineage Zika virus infection. *Nature Communications*. 2016;7 :12204.
12. CDC. Zika: Transmission and Risks. <https://www.cdc.gov/zika/transmission>.
13. P Bonaldo, MC, Nielsen Saine K. Zika virus vertical transmission in children with confirmed antenatal exposure. *Nature communications*. 2020;11(1):1-8.
14. Thangamani, Saravanan and Huang, Jing and Hart, Charles E and Guzman, Hilda and Tesh, Robert B. Vertical Transmission of Zika Virus in *Aedes aegypti*

- Mosquitoes. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2016; 95(5): 1169-1173.
15. Bonyah E, Okosun KO. Mathematical modeling of Zika virus. Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Disease. 2016 ;6(9): 673-679.
16. Maxian O, Neufeld A, Talis EJ, Childs L M, Blackwood JC. Zika virus dynamics: When does sexual transmission matter?. Epidemics. 2017;21: 48-55.
17. Suparit P, Wiratsudakul A, Modchang C. A mathematical model for Zika virus transmission dynamics with a time-dependent mosquito biting rate. Theoretical Biology and Medical Modelling. 2018; 15(1): 11.
18. Althouse BM, Durbin AP, Hanley KA , Halstead SB, Weaver SC, Cummings DA. Viral kinetics of primary dengue virus infection in non-human primates: a systematic review and individual pooled analysis. Virology. 2014;452: 237-246.
19. Lai Z, Zhou T, Liu S, Zhou J, Xu Y, Gu J, Chen XG. Vertical transmission of zika virus in Aedes albopictus. PLoS neglected tropical diseases. 2020;14(10): e0008776.
20. Van den Driessche P, Watmough J. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. Mathematical biosciences. 2002;180(1-2): 29-48.
21. Rodrigues HS, Monteiro MTT, Torres DF. Sensitivity analysis in a dengue epidemiological model. Hindawi. In Conference Papers in Science: (Vol. 2013).
22. Tesla B, Demakovsky LR, Packiam HS, Mordecai EA, Rodriguez AD, Bonds MH, et al. Estimating the effects of variation in viremia on mosquito susceptibility, infectiousness, and R0 of Zika in Aedes aegypti. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2018; 12(8): e0006733.
23. Sambariya D K, Prasad R. Routh stability array method based reduced model of single machine infinite bus with power system stabilizer. In International Conference on Emerging Trends in Electrical, Communication and Information Technologies (ICECIT-2012).2012 Dec; pp.27-34.

24. Chavez CC, Feng Z, Huang W. On the computation of R_0 and its role on global stability. Mathematical Approaches for Emerging and Re-Emerging Infection Diseases: An Introduction. The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and Its Applications. 2002; 125: 31-65.
25. Curtiss D R. Recent extentions of Descartes' rule of signs. Annals of Mathematics. 1918; 251-278.
26. A Dhooge, W Govaerts, YA Kuznetsov, HG Meijer, B Sautois. New features of the software MatCont for bifurcation analysis of dynamical systems. Math Comput Model Dyn Syst. 2008;14:147-175.
27. Perko L. Differential equations and dynamical systems (Vol. 7). Springer Science. Business Media (2013).
28. LaSalle JP. Stability theory for ordinary differential equations. Journal of Differential Equations. 1968; 4(1): 57-65.

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure