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#### Abstract

Mathematical model of Zika virus fever (ZIKVF) dynamics was formulated, incorporating control and four medium of the virus transmissions. The model passed through two stages of reformations in order to obtain equilibrium points of the model. We obtained two distinct equilibrium points of the model, the disease free equilibrium (DFE) point and the endemic equilibrium (EE) point respectively.
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## 1. Introduction

Zika virus (ZIKV) derives its name from a forest called zika in Uganda where it was first identified in monkey in 1947, in a female mosquito in 1948 from the same forest and discovered in human in 1952. Zika virus causes zika virus fever (ZIKVF) with no or mild symptoms such as fever, joint pain, red eyes, muscle pain and rash. About $80 \%$ of infected individuals are asymptomatic and the infection caused by zika does not kill. The scientific concern focuses on the effect in humans with temporary paralysis and if transmitted from infected pregnant women to their fetuses then it causes abnormalities to the brain of fetuses which can result into miscarriage or microcephaly [1-2]. The virus lives longer in the semen than in the blood or virginal fluid [3]. The outbreaks of the infection occurred on Yap Island in 2007; in Pacific area in 2013-2014; Cape -Verde in 2015-2016; South and Central America attained pandemic in 2015 -2016; [4].
We reviewed models of the outbreaks of ZIKVF: on Yap Island and French Polynesia of 2013-2014 [5-6]. Co -infection of Dengue, Chikungunya and Zika viruses based on the same vector, zika virus as mosquito borne and sexually transmitted disease are also reviewed [7-9]. Our study improved on the above literatures towards better understanding of the transmission and control of ZIKVF dynamics.
2. Material and Methods

Human population in a non enzootic region is split into female and male population respectively. The partitions of humans into sub -populations are as follow: Total female population is $N_{1}$, Susceptible female compartment is $S_{1}$, Exposed female compartment is $E_{1}$, Symptomatic female compartment is $I_{11}$ Asymptomatic female compartment is $I_{12}$, Removed female compartment is $R_{1}$ and the total population gives $N_{1}=S_{1}+E_{1}+I_{11}+I_{12}+R_{1}$. The males sub -populations are similarly defined and male population gives $N_{2}=S_{2}+E_{2}+I_{21}+I_{22}+R_{2}$, and mosquito population is split into mosquitoes without zika virus $\left(S_{3}\right)$ and mosquitoes with virus ( $I_{3}$ ) and the total population gives $N_{3}=S_{3}+I_{3}$.
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Figure 1: Model graph

### 2.2 Model Equations

$\frac{d S_{1}}{d t}=\theta_{1} \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}-\frac{S_{1}}{N_{1}}\left\{\alpha_{1} \phi_{3} I_{3}+\alpha_{21} \phi_{21} I_{21}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)+\alpha_{22} \phi_{22} I_{22}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)\right\}-\mu_{1} S_{1}$
$\frac{d E_{1}}{d t}=\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}+\frac{S_{1}}{N_{1}}\left\{\alpha_{1} \phi_{3} I_{3}+\alpha_{21} \phi_{21} I_{21}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)+\alpha_{22} \phi_{22} I_{22}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)\right\}-\left(\gamma_{1}+\sigma_{11}+\sigma_{12}+\mu_{1}\right) E_{1}$
$\frac{d I_{11}}{d t}=\sigma_{11} E_{1}-\left(\gamma_{11}+\mu_{1}\right) I_{11}$
$\frac{d I_{12}}{d t}=\sigma_{12} E_{1}-\left(\gamma_{12}+\mu_{1}\right) I_{12}$
$\frac{d R_{1}}{d t}=\left(1-\omega_{1}\right) \Lambda_{1}+\gamma_{1} E_{1}+\gamma_{11} I_{11}+\gamma_{12} I_{12}-\mu_{1} R_{1}$
$\frac{d S_{3}}{d t}=\Lambda_{3}-\frac{S_{3}}{N_{3}}\left(\alpha_{3}^{11} \phi_{11} I_{11}+\alpha_{3}^{12} \phi_{12} I_{12}+\alpha_{3}^{21} \phi_{21} I_{21}+\alpha_{3}^{22} \phi_{22} I_{22}\right)-\left(\mu_{3}+\delta\right) S_{3}$
$\frac{d I_{3}}{d t}=\frac{S_{3}}{N_{3}}\left(\alpha_{3}^{11} \phi_{11} I_{11}+\alpha_{3}^{12} \phi_{12} I_{12}+\alpha_{3}^{21} \phi_{21} I_{21}+\alpha_{3}^{22} \phi_{22} I_{22}\right)-\left(\mu_{3}+\delta\right) S_{3}$
$\frac{d S_{2}}{d t}=\theta_{2} \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}-\frac{S_{2}}{N_{2}}\left\{\alpha_{2} \phi_{3} I_{3}+\alpha_{11} \phi_{11} I_{11}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)+\alpha_{12} \phi_{12} I_{12}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)\right\}-\mu_{2} S_{2}$
$\frac{d E_{2}}{d t}=\left(1-\theta_{2}\right) \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}+\frac{S_{2}}{N_{2}}\left\{\alpha_{2} \phi_{3} I_{3}+\alpha_{11} \phi_{11} I_{11}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)+\alpha_{12} \phi_{12} I_{12}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)\right\}-\left(\gamma_{2}+\sigma_{21}+\sigma_{22}+\mu_{2}\right) E_{2}$
$\frac{d I_{21}}{d t}=\sigma_{21} E_{2}-\left(\gamma_{21}+\mu_{2}\right) I_{21}$
$\frac{d I_{22}}{d t}=\sigma_{22} E_{2}-\left(\gamma_{22}+\mu_{2}\right) I_{22}$
$\frac{d R_{2}}{d t}=\left(1-\omega_{2}\right) \Lambda_{2}+\gamma_{2} E_{2}+\gamma_{21} I_{21}+\gamma_{22} I_{22}-\mu_{2} R_{2}$

Existence of Equilibrium Points of...

Table 1: Parameters of the Model

| Parameter | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\Lambda_{1}$ | Number of recruitment into the population of females |
| $\omega_{1}$ | Proportion of births without microcephaly into the population of females |
| $\left(1-\omega_{1}\right)$ | Proportion of female births with microcephaly |
| $\begin{aligned} & \theta_{1} \\ & \left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Proportion of female susceptible births without microcephaly <br> Proportion of exposed female births without microcephaly |
| $\mu_{1}$ | Natural death rate of females |
| $\Lambda_{2}$ | Number of recruitment into the population of males |
| $\omega_{2}$ | Proportion of male births without microcephaly |
| $\left(1-\omega_{2}\right)$ | Proportion of male births with microcephaly |
| $\theta_{2}$ | Proportion of susceptible male births without microcephaly |
| $\left(1-\theta_{2}\right)$ | Proportion exposed male of births without microcephaly |
| $\mu_{2}$ | Natural death rate of males |
| $\Lambda_{3}$ | Number of recruitment into the population of mosquitoes without ZIKV |
| $\mu_{3}$ | Natural death rate of mosquitoes |
| $\delta$ | Death rate of mosquitoes due to spraying of insecticides |
| $\alpha_{1}$ | Transmission rate of infection through mosquito bite to the susceptible females |
| $\alpha_{2}$ | Transmission rate of infection through mosquito bite to the susceptible males |
| $\alpha_{21}$ | Transmission rate of infection through sex from symptomatic infectious males to susceptible females |
| $\alpha_{22}$ | Transmission rate of infection through sex from asymptomatic infectious males to susceptible females |
| $\alpha_{11}$ | Transmission rate of infection through sex from symptomatic infectious females to susceptible males |
| $\alpha_{12}$ | Transmission rate of infection through sex from asymptomatic infectious females to susceptible males |
| $\alpha_{3}^{11}$ | Transmission rate of ZIKV from symptomatic infectious females to mosquitoes without virus through mosquito bite |
| $\alpha_{3}^{11}$ | Transmission rate of ZIKV from symptomatic infectious females to mosquitoes without virus through mosquito bite |
| $\alpha_{3}^{12}$ | Transmission rate of ZIKV from asymptomatic infectious females to mosquitoes without virus through mosquitoes bite |
| $\alpha_{3}^{21}$ | Transmission rate of ZIKV from symptomatic infectious males to mosquitoes without virus through mosquitoes bite |
| $\alpha_{3}^{22}$ | Transmission rate of ZIKV from asymptomatic infectious males to mosquitoes without virus through mosquitoes bite |


| $\sigma_{11}$ | Progression rate of exposed females to the symptomatic infectious compartment |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\sigma_{12}$ | Progression rate of exposed females to the asymptomatic infectious compartment |
| $\sigma_{21}$ | Progression rate of exposed males to the symptomatic infectious compartment |
| $\sigma_{22}$ | Progression rate of exposed males to the asymptomatic infectious compartment |
| $\gamma_{1}$ | Rate of recovery from the compartment of exposed females to the removed compartment |
| $\gamma_{2}$ | Rate of recovery from the compartment of exposed males to the removed compartment |
| $\gamma_{11}$ | Rate of recovery from the compartment of symptomatic, infectious, females to the removed compartment |
| $\gamma_{12}$ | Rate of recovery from the compartment of asymptomatic, infectious, females to the removed compartment |
| $\gamma_{21}$ | Rate of recovery from the compartment of symptomatic, infectious, males to the removed compartment |
| $\gamma_{22}$ | Rate of recovery from the compartment of asymptomatic, infectious, males to the removed compartment |
| $\phi_{3}$ | Is measuring the reduction in effectiveness of mosquito activities in transmitting ZIKV by creating non <br> conducive environment for the mosquitoes through the use of air conditioner |
| $\phi_{11}$ | Is measuring the reduction in effectiveness of sexual transmission through adherence to the preventive <br> instructions |
| $\phi_{12}$ | Is measuring the reduction in effectiveness of sexual transmission through adherence to the preventive instructions |
| $\phi_{21}$ | Is measuring the reduction in effectiveness of sexual transmission through adherence to the preventive instructions |
| $\phi_{22}$ | Is measuring the reduction in effectiveness of sexual transmission through adherence to the preventive instructions |
| $\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right)$ | Reflects the impact of condom usage which is enhanced by public campaign (efficacy and compliance) on sexual <br> transmission where $0<\epsilon_{c}, \tau_{c}<1$ |

### 2.3 First Model Reformation

To reform the model we assumed the following:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{c}
\beta_{1}=\alpha_{1} \phi_{3}, \beta_{2}=\alpha_{21} \phi_{21}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right), \beta_{3}=\alpha_{22} \phi_{22}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right), \beta_{4}=\alpha_{3}^{11} \phi_{11}, \beta_{5}=\alpha_{3}^{12} \phi_{12}, k_{6}=\gamma_{21}+\mu_{2} \\
\beta_{6}=\alpha_{3}^{21} \phi_{21}, \beta_{7}=\alpha_{3}^{22} \phi_{22}, \beta_{8}=\alpha_{2} \phi_{3}, \beta_{9}=\alpha_{11} \phi_{11}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right), \beta_{10}=\alpha_{12} \phi_{12}\left(1-\epsilon_{c} \tau_{c}\right), k_{7}=\gamma_{22}+\mu_{2}  \tag{2.13}\\
k_{1}=\gamma_{1}+\sigma_{11}+\sigma_{12}+\mu_{1}, k_{2}=\gamma_{11}+\mu_{1}, k_{3}=\gamma_{12}+\mu_{1}, k_{4}=\mu_{3}+\delta, k_{5}=\gamma_{2}+\sigma_{21}+\sigma_{22}+\mu_{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Equations (2.1) to (2.12) become

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d S_{1}}{d t} & =\theta_{1} \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}-\frac{S_{1}}{N_{1}}\left\{\beta_{1} I_{3}+\beta_{2} I_{21}+\beta_{3} I_{22}\right\}-\mu_{1} S_{1}  \tag{2.14}\\
\frac{d E_{1}}{d t} & =\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}+\frac{S_{1}}{N_{1}}\left\{\beta_{1} I_{3}+\beta_{2} I_{21}+\beta_{3} I_{22}\right\}-k_{1} E_{1}  \tag{2.15}\\
\frac{d I_{11}}{d t} & =\sigma_{11} E_{1}-k_{2} I_{11}  \tag{2.16}\\
\frac{d I_{12}}{d t} & =\sigma_{12} E_{1}-k_{3} I_{12}  \tag{2.17}\\
\frac{d R_{1}}{d t} & =\left(1-\omega_{1}\right) \Lambda_{1}+\gamma_{1} E_{1}+\gamma_{11} I_{11}+\gamma_{12} I_{12}-\mu_{1} R_{1} \tag{2.18}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d S_{3}}{d t}=\Lambda_{3}-\frac{S_{3}}{N_{3}}\left(\beta_{4} I_{11}+\beta_{5} I_{12}+\beta_{6} I_{21}+\beta_{7} I_{22}\right)-k_{4} S_{3}  \tag{2.19}\\
& \frac{d I_{3}}{d t}=\frac{S_{3}}{N_{3}}\left(\beta_{4} I_{11}+\beta_{5} I_{12}+\beta_{6} I_{21}+\beta_{7} I_{22}\right)-k_{4} I_{3}  \tag{2.20}\\
& \frac{d S_{2}}{d t}=\theta_{2} \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}-\frac{S_{2}}{N_{2}}\left\{\beta_{8} I_{3}+\beta_{9} I_{11}+\beta_{10} I_{12}\right\}-\mu_{2} S_{2}  \tag{2.21}\\
& \frac{d E_{2}}{d t}=\left(1-\theta_{2}\right) \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}+\frac{S_{2}}{N_{2}}\left\{\beta_{8} I_{3}+\beta_{9} I_{11}+\beta_{10} I_{12}\right\}-k_{5} E_{2}  \tag{2.22}\\
& \frac{d I_{21}}{d t}=\sigma_{21} E_{2}-k_{6} I_{21}  \tag{2.23}\\
& \frac{d I_{22}}{d t}=\sigma_{22} E_{2}-k_{7} I_{21}  \tag{2.24}\\
& \frac{d R_{2}}{d t}=\left(1-\omega_{2}\right) \Lambda_{2}+\gamma_{2} E_{2}+\sigma_{21} I_{21}+\sigma_{22} I_{22}-\mu_{2} R_{2} \tag{2.25}
\end{align*}
$$

3 Results and Discussion
3.1 Equilibrium States of the Model

At equilibrium
$\frac{d S_{1}}{d t}=\frac{d E_{1}}{d t}=\frac{d I_{11}}{d t}=\frac{d I_{12}}{d t}=\frac{d R_{1}}{d t}=\frac{d S_{3}}{d t}=\frac{d I_{3}}{d t}=\frac{d S_{2}}{d t}=\frac{d E_{2}}{d t}=\frac{d I_{21}}{d t}=\frac{d I_{22}}{d t}=\frac{d R_{2}}{d t}=0$
If $\left(S_{1}{ }^{*}, E_{1}^{*}, I_{11}{ }^{*}, I_{12}{ }^{*}, R_{1}{ }^{*}, S_{3}{ }^{*}, I_{3}{ }^{*}, S_{2}{ }^{*}, E_{2}{ }^{*}, I_{21}{ }^{*}, I_{22}{ }^{*}, R_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$ be the equilibrium points and let
$C_{1}=\frac{S_{1}^{*}}{N_{1}^{*}}, C_{2}=\frac{S_{2}^{*}}{N_{2}^{*}}, C_{3}=\frac{S_{3}^{*}}{N_{3}^{*}}, k_{8}=\gamma_{1}+\sigma_{1}+\mu_{1}, k_{9}=\gamma_{R_{1}}+\mu_{1}, k_{10}=\gamma_{2}+\sigma_{2}+\mu_{2}, k_{11}=\gamma_{R_{2}}+\mu_{2}, I_{1}^{*}=I_{11}^{*}+I_{12}^{*}, I_{2}^{*}=I_{21}^{*}+I_{22}^{*}$ then at equilibrium points, we obtain the following equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \theta_{1} \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}-C_{1}\left(\beta_{1} I_{3}^{*}+\beta_{21} I_{2}^{*}\right)-\mu_{1} S_{1}^{*}=0  \tag{2.27}\\
& \left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}+C_{1}\left(\beta_{1} I_{3}^{*}+\beta_{21} I_{2}^{*}\right)-k_{8} E_{1}^{*}=0  \tag{2.28}\\
& \sigma_{1} E_{1}^{*}-k_{9} I_{1}^{*}=0  \tag{2.29}\\
& \left(1-\omega_{1}\right) \Lambda_{1}+\gamma_{1} E_{1}^{*}+\gamma_{R_{1}} I_{1}^{*}-\mu_{1} R_{1}^{*}=0  \tag{2.30}\\
& \Lambda_{3}-C_{3}\left(\beta_{13} I_{1}^{*}+\beta_{23} I_{2}^{*}\right)-k_{4} S_{3}^{*}=0  \tag{2.31}\\
& C_{3}\left(\beta_{13} I_{1}^{*}+\beta_{23} I_{2}^{*}\right)-k_{4} I_{3}^{*}=0  \tag{2.32}\\
& \theta_{2} \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}-C_{2}\left(\beta_{8} I_{3}^{*}+\beta_{12} I_{1}^{*}\right)-\mu_{2} S_{2}^{*}=0  \tag{2.33}\\
& \left(1-\theta_{2}\right) \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}+C_{2}\left(\beta_{8} I_{3}^{*}+\beta_{12} I_{1}^{*}\right)-k_{10} E_{2}^{*}=0  \tag{2.34}\\
& \sigma_{2} E_{2}^{*}-k_{11} I_{2}^{*}=0  \tag{2.35}\\
& \left(1-\omega_{2}\right) \Lambda_{2}+\gamma_{2} E_{2}^{*}+\gamma_{R_{2}} I_{2}^{*}-\mu_{2} R_{2}^{*}=0 \tag{2.36}
\end{align*}
$$

From equation (2.29) $\quad E_{1}^{*}=\frac{k_{9}}{\sigma_{1}} I_{1}^{*}$
From equation (2.35) $\quad E_{2}^{*}=\frac{k_{11}}{\sigma_{2}} I_{2}^{*}$
From equation (2.32) we obtain $I_{3}^{*}=\frac{C_{3} \beta_{13}}{k_{4}} I_{1}+\frac{C_{3} \beta_{23}}{k_{4}} I_{2}$
Put equation (2.29) in equation (2.28) and simplify we then obtain
$I_{3}^{*}=\frac{k_{8} k_{9}}{C_{1} \beta_{1} \sigma_{1}} I_{1}-\frac{\beta_{21}}{\beta_{1}} I_{2}-\frac{\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}}{C_{1} \beta_{1}}$
Put equation (2.35) in equation (2.34) and simplify we then obtain
$I_{3}^{*}=\frac{k_{10} k_{11}}{C_{2} \beta_{8} \sigma_{2}} I_{2}-\frac{\beta_{12}}{\beta_{8}} I_{1}-\frac{\left(1-\theta_{2}\right) \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}}{C_{2} \beta_{8}}$
Equate equation (2.39) and equation (2.40) then simplifying gives
$I_{1}^{*}=\frac{\left(C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{23}+k_{4} \beta_{21}\right) C_{1} \sigma_{1}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}} I_{2}^{*}+\frac{\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1} \sigma_{1} k_{4}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}}$
Equate equation (2.39) and equation (2.41) then simplifying gives
$I_{1}^{*}=\frac{k_{4} k_{10} k_{11}-C_{2} C_{3} \beta_{8} \beta_{23} \sigma_{2}}{\left(C_{3} \beta_{8} \beta_{13}+k_{4} \beta_{12}\right) C_{2} \sigma_{2}} I_{2}^{*}+\frac{\left(1-\theta_{2}\right) \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2} k_{4}}{\left(C_{3} \beta_{8} \beta_{13}+k_{4} \beta_{12}\right) C_{2}}$
Equating equation (2.42) and equation (2.43) implies
$I_{2}^{*}=\frac{\left[k_{4}\left(1-\theta_{2}\right) \sigma_{2} \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}\left(k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}\right)+C_{2} k_{4}\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1} \sigma_{1} \sigma_{2}\left(C_{3} \beta_{8} \beta_{13}+k_{4} \beta_{12}\right)\right]}{\left[\left(k_{4} k_{10} k_{11}-C_{2} C_{3} \beta_{8} \beta_{23} \sigma_{2}\right)\left(k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}\right)-C_{1} C_{2} \sigma_{1} \sigma_{2}\left(C_{3} \beta_{8} \beta_{13}+k_{4} \beta_{12}\right)\left(C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{23}+k_{4} \beta_{21}\right)\right]}$
(2.44) implies $I_{2}^{*}=\frac{a}{b}$ where a equals the numerator and $b$ equals the denominator of (2.44), that is
$I_{2}^{*}=\frac{a}{b}$
If $\xi$ proportion of $I_{2}^{*}$ gives $I_{21}^{*}$ then $(1-\xi)$ proportion of $I_{2}^{*}$ results in $I_{22}^{*}$, imply
$I_{21}^{*}=\frac{a \xi}{b}$
$I_{22}^{*}=\frac{a(1-\xi)}{b}$
Put (2.45) in (2.43) implies $I_{1}^{*}=\frac{\left(C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{23}+k_{4} \beta_{21}\right) C_{1} \sigma_{1}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}} \frac{a}{b}+\frac{\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1} \sigma_{1} k_{4}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}}$
Let $\quad I_{1}^{*}=d$
If $\rho$ proportion of $I_{1}^{*}$ gives $I_{11}^{*}$ then $(1-\rho)$ proportion of $I_{1}^{*}$ results in $I_{12}^{*}$, imply
$I_{11}^{*}=\rho d$
$I_{12}^{*}=(1-\rho) d$
Put $I_{1}^{*}$ in (2.37) gives $E_{1}^{*}=\frac{k_{9}}{\sigma_{1}}\left\{\frac{\left(C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{23}+k_{4} \beta_{21}\right) C_{1} \sigma_{1}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}} \frac{a}{b}+\frac{\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1} \sigma_{1} k_{4}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}}\right\}$
Let $\quad E_{1}^{*}=e$
Put $I_{2}^{*}$ in (2.38) gives $\quad E_{2}^{*}=\frac{k_{11}}{\sigma_{2}} \frac{a}{b}$
Substitute for $I_{1}^{*}$ and $I_{2}^{*}$ in (2.39) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{3}^{*}=\frac{C_{3} \beta_{13}}{k_{4}}\left\{\frac{\left(C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{23}+k_{4} \beta_{21}\right) C_{1} \sigma_{1}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}} \frac{a}{b}+\frac{\left(1-\theta_{1}\right) \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1} \sigma_{1} k_{4}}{k_{4} k_{8} k_{9}-C_{1} C_{3} \beta_{1} \beta_{13} \sigma_{1}}\right\}+\frac{a C_{3} \beta_{23}}{b k_{4}} \tag{2.55}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\quad I_{3}^{*}=f$
Substitute for $I_{3}^{*}$ and $I_{2}^{*}$ in (2.27) and simplifying gives
$S_{1}^{*}=\frac{\theta_{1} \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}}{\mu_{1}}-\frac{C_{1}}{\mu_{1}}\left(\beta_{1} f+\beta_{21} \frac{a}{b}\right)$
Substitute for $E_{1}^{*}$ and $I_{1}^{*}$ in (2.30) and simplifying gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{1}^{*}=\frac{\left(1-\omega_{1}\right) \Lambda_{1}+\gamma_{1} e+\gamma_{R_{1}} d}{\mu_{1}} \tag{2.58}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substitute for $I_{1}^{*}$ and $I_{2}^{*}$ in (2.31) and simplifying gives
$S_{3}^{*}=\frac{\Lambda_{3}-C_{3}\left(\beta_{13} d+\beta_{23} \frac{a}{b}\right)}{k_{4}}$
Substitute for $I_{1}^{*}$ and $I_{3}^{*}$ in (2.33) and simplifying gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{2}^{*}=\frac{\theta_{2} \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}}{\mu_{2}}-\frac{C_{2}}{\mu_{2}}\left(\beta_{8} f+\beta_{12} d\right) \tag{2.60}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substitute for $E_{2}^{*}$ and $I_{2}^{*}$ in (2.36) and simplifying gives
$R_{2}^{*}=\frac{\left(1-\omega_{2}\right) \Lambda_{2}}{\mu_{2}}+\frac{a \gamma_{2}}{b \sigma_{2} \mu_{2}}\left(k_{11}+\sigma_{2} \gamma_{R_{2}}\right)$
From (2.43), if $\sigma_{1}=\sigma_{2}=0$ then $I_{2}^{*}=0$ implies

$$
\begin{gather*}
I_{11}^{*}=I_{12}^{*}=I_{21}^{*}=I_{22}^{*}=I_{3}^{*}=R_{1}^{*}=R_{2}^{*}=0  \tag{2.62}\\
S_{1}^{*}=\frac{\theta_{1} \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}}{\mu_{1}}, S_{3}^{*}=\frac{\Lambda_{3}}{k_{4}}=\frac{\Lambda_{3}}{\mu_{3}+\delta}, S_{2}^{*}=\frac{\theta_{2} \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}}{\mu_{2}}
\end{gather*}
$$

## 4. Conclusion

We obtained two points at the equilibrium of the model, which are the disease free equilibrium point (DFE) and endemic equilibrium (EE) point. The points are; (i) when
$I_{11}^{*}=I_{12}^{*}=I_{21}^{*}=I_{22}^{*}=I_{3}^{*}=R_{1}^{*}=R_{2}^{*}=0$ gives (2.63) (ii) when $I_{11}^{*} \neq I_{12}^{*} \neq I_{21}^{*} \neq I_{22}^{*} \neq I_{3}^{*} \neq R_{1}^{*} \neq R_{2}^{*} \neq 0$ gives (2.64)
$\varepsilon_{0}=\left(S_{1}^{*}, E_{1}^{*}, I_{11}{ }^{*}, I_{12}{ }^{*}, R_{1}{ }^{*}, S_{3}{ }^{*}, I_{3}{ }^{*}, S_{2}{ }^{*}, E_{2}{ }^{*}, I_{21}{ }^{*}, I_{22}{ }^{*}, R_{2}{ }^{*}\right)=\left(\frac{\theta_{1} \omega_{1} \Lambda_{1}}{\mu_{1}}, 0,0,0,0, \frac{\Lambda_{3}}{\mu_{3}+\delta}, 0, \frac{\theta_{2} \omega_{2} \Lambda_{2}}{\mu_{2}}, 0,0,0,0\right)$
The endemic equilibrium (EE) point is obtained when $\sigma_{1} \neq 0 \neq \sigma_{2}$ and $I_{2}^{*} \neq 0$ as
$\varepsilon_{E}=\left(S_{1}^{* *}, E_{1}^{* *}, I_{11}^{* *}, I_{12}^{* *}, R_{1}^{* *}, S_{3}^{* *}, I_{3}^{* *}, S_{2}^{* *}, E_{2}^{* *}, I_{21}{ }^{* *}, I_{22}{ }^{* * *}, R_{2}^{* *}\right)=\left(S_{1}^{*}, E_{1}^{*}, I_{11}{ }^{*}, I_{12}{ }^{*}, R_{1}{ }^{*}, S_{3}{ }^{*}, I_{3}{ }^{*}, S_{2}{ }^{*}, E_{2}{ }^{*}, I_{21}{ }^{*}, I_{22}{ }^{*}, R_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$
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