PROCEEDINGS — OF — THE ROYAL SOCIETY A | MATHEMATICAL, PHYSICAL & ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Sustained oscillations in an evolutionary epidemiological model of influenza A drift

Pierre Magal and Shigui Ruan

References	**This article cites 38 articles, 9 of which can be accessed free** http://rspa.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/early/2009/12/01/rspa.2009.0435.full.html#ref-list-1
P<P	Published online 3 December 2009 in advance of the print journal.
Subject collections	Articles on similar topics can be found in the following collections mathematical modelling (44 articles) differential equations (34 articles) applied mathematics (125 articles)
Email alerting service	Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right-hand corner of the article or click **here**

Advance online articles have been peer reviewed and accepted for publication but have not yet appeared in the paper journal (edited, typeset versions may be posted when available prior to final publication). Advance online articles are citable and establish publication priority; they are indexed by PubMed from initial publication. Citations to Advance online articles must include the digital object identifier (DOIs) and date of initial publication.

To subscribe to *Proc. R. Soc. A* go to: **http://rspa.royalsocietypublishing.org/subscriptions**

Sustained oscillations in an evolutionary epidemiological model of influenza A drift

By Pierre Magal[1] and Shigui Ruan[2],*

[1] Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux, UMR CNRS 5251 and INRIA sud-ouest Anubis, Université de Bordeaux, 146 rue Léo Saignat, 33076 Bordeaux, France
[2] Department of Mathematics, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124-4250, USA

Understanding the seasonal/periodic reoccurrence of influenza will be very helpful in designing successful vaccine programmes and introducing public-health interventions. However, the reasons for seasonal/periodic influenza epidemics are still not clear, even though various explanations have been proposed. In this paper, we study an age-structured type evolutionary epidemiological model of influenza A drift, in which the susceptible class is continually replenished because the pathogen changes genetically and immunologically from one epidemic to the next, causing previously immune hosts to become susceptible. Applying our recently established centre manifold theory for semi-linear equations with non-dense domain, we show that Hopf bifurcation occurs in the model. This demonstrates that the age-structured type evolutionary epidemiological model of influenza A drift has an intrinsic tendency to oscillate owing to the evolutionary and/or immunological changes of the influenza viruses.

1. Introduction

Influenza viruses are negative-stranded RNA viruses that are divided into three types: A, B and C, based on antigenic differences in nucleoprotein and matrix protein (Earn *et al.* 2002; Schweiger *et al.* 2002; WHO 2009). Influenza A and B are currently associated with human diseases, while influenza C has only subclinical importance (Schweiger *et al.* 2002). Influenza A viruses are further classified into subtypes based on two different spike-like protein components, *haemagglutinin* (HA) and *neuraminidase* (NA), called antigens, on the surface of the virus (WHO 2009). There are 16 different HA subtypes and nine different NA subtypes. H1N1 (the subtype responsible for the 1918 Spanish pandemic) and H3N2 (the strain that caused the 1968 Hong Kong pandemic) are two influenza A subtypes that are important for human (WHO 2009), which, together with influenza B, are included in each year's influenza vaccine (CDC 2009).

*Author for correspondence (ruan@math.miami.edu).

Genes of influenza viruses mutate with high frequency (Buonagurio *et al.* 1986; Fitch *et al.* 1997), which plays an important role in causing reccurent influenza epidemics (Pease 1987). Influenza type A viruses undergo two kinds of changes. *Antigenic drift* is a major process that accumulates point mutations at the antibody sites in the HA protein, leading to the emergence of immunologically distinct strains and enabling the viruses to evade recognition by hosts' antibodies (Schweiger *et al.* 2002; Treanor 2004; Shih *et al.* 2007). The immunologically distinct influenza virus strains can reinfect hosts that are immune to the progenitor influenza strain and reinvade the communities that recently suffered an epidemic of the progenitor strain (Pease 1987). *Antigenic shift* is an abrupt major change resulting in new HA and/or new HA and NA proteins in influenza viruses that infect humans. When shift happens, most people have little or no protection against the new influenza A subtype virus. While influenza viruses are changing by antigenic drift every time, antigenic shift happens only occasionally and causes pandemics (CDC 2009; WHO 2009).

During antigenic drift, point mutations, including substitutions, deletions and insertions produce genetic variation in influenza viruses. These genetic changes encode amino acid changes on the surface proteins that permit the virus to escape neutralization using the antibody generated for previous strains (Cox & Subbarao 2000). It is reported that, for sites involved in antigen determination, amino acid substitutions are more frequent than synonymous substitutions (Ina & Gojobori 1994; Earn *et al.* 2002). Also, an approximately equal number of amino acid substitutions occur in the influenza each year between the immunizing and the challenge virus strains (Pease 1987; Smith *et al.* 2004; Koelle *et al.* 2006).

To study the evolutionary epidemiological mechanism of influenza A drift, Pease (1987) developed an age-structured type model in which the susceptible class is continually replenished, as the pathogen changes genetically and immunologically from one epidemic to the next, causing previously immune hosts to become susceptible. Conditions were derived to show how the equilibrium number of infected hosts, the interepidemic period and the probability that a host becomes reinfected depend on the rate of amino acid substitution in the pathogen, the effect of these substitutions on host immunity, the host size and the recovery rate. However, applied to influenza A, the model only predicted damped oscillations, while the observed oscillations in the incidence of influenza are undamped over a long term (Pease 1987; Dushoff *et al.* 2004; Viboud *et al.* 2006).

Pease's model has been modified and improved by several researchers. For example, Thieme & Yang (2002) reparameterized Pease's model by using recovery age, which is the duration of time that has passed since the moment of recovering from the disease, as a structural variable. They investigated uniform disease persistence and global stability of the endemic equilibrium in their model with variable reinfection rate. Andreasen *et al.* (1996) improved Pease's model by including mutation as a diffusion process in a phenotype space of variants. The existence of travelling waves in this generalized susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) model of influenza A drift was established by Lin *et al.* (2003). Andreasen *et al.* (1997) developed models that describe the dynamics of multiple influenza A strains conferring partial cross-immunity, and showed that such models exhibit sustained oscillations. See also Castillo-Chavez *et al.* (1989), Lin *et al.* (1999), Andreasen (2003), Nuño *et al.* (2005) and the references cited therein for other

multiple-strain influenza models with cross-immunity or immune-selection. Note that Castillo-Chavez *et al.* (1989) observed that sustained oscillations do not seem possible for a single-strain model, even with age-specific mortalities.

Inaba (1998, 2002) modified Pease's model slightly by assuming that the effect of amino acid substitutions on host immunity (the transmission rate) is a monotone increasing function with a finite upper bound, proved the existence and uniqueness of solutions of the model and studied the stability of the endemic steady state by using the semigroup approach. Inaba (2002) further conjectured that, for realistic parameter values, the steady state could be destabilized and lead to a periodic solution via Hopf bifurcation.

The existence of non-trivial periodic solutions in age-structured models has been a very interesting and difficult problem. It is believed that such periodic solutions are induced by Hopf bifurcation; however, there is no general Hopf bifurcation theorem available for age-structured models (Iannelli 1994; Inaba 2002). One of the difficulties is that, rewriting age-structured models as a semilinear equation, the domain of the linear operator may not be dense. Recently, we (Magal & Ruan 2009a) developed the centre manifold theory for semilinear equations with non-dense domain.

In this paper, following the pioneering work of Kermack & McKendrick (1927, 1932, 1933), we first modify the model of Pease (1987) and Inaba (2002) by using the age of infection (instead of the number of amino acid substitutions) as a variable. We then apply the centre manifold theorem in Magal & Ruan (2009a) to study Hopf bifurcation in the age-structured type evolutionary epidemiological model of influenza A drift. The results indicate that sustained oscillations can occur in such models with a single strain (Castillo-Chavez *et al.* 1989) and without the seasonal force (Dushoff *et al.* 2004). Thus, the periodic recurrence of influenza may be a result of the evolutionary and/or immunological changes of the influenza viruses.

2. The model

To model the evolutionary epidemiological mechanism of influenza A drift, Pease (1987) made the following assumptions: (i) there is an approximately linear relation between the probability of reinfection and the number of amino acid substitutions between the immunizing and the challenge virus strains, (ii) only one virus strain circulates in the human population at any one time, and (iii) random drift causes amino acid substitutions to occur in the influenza virus.

Suppose that the total host population size N is a constant. Let $I(t)$ be the number of infected individuals at time t. Let $a \geq 0$ be the time since the last infection, that is, the duration of time since an individual has been susceptible. Assume that the average number of amino acid substitutions is a continuous variable. More precisely, let $k > 0$ be the average number of amino acid substitutions per unit of time (i.e. the mutation rate). Then, the number of substitutions after a period of time a in the susceptible class is given by ka. Let $s(t, a)$ be the density of uninfected hosts (structured with respect to a), so that

$$\int_{a_0}^{a_1} s(t, a) \, \mathrm{d}a = \int_{ka_0}^{ka_1} s(t, k^{-1}l) k^{-1} \, \mathrm{d}l$$

is the number of uninfected hosts that were last infected by a virus which differed by more than ka_0 and less than ka_1 amino acid substitutions from the virus strain prevailing at time t. Here, we consider a modified version of the model considered by Pease (1987) and Inaba (1998, 2002). The model to describe the evolutionary epidemiological model of influenza A drift takes the following form:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \dfrac{\partial s(t,a)}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial s(t,a)}{\partial a} = -\gamma(ka)s(t,a)I(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad a \geq 0, \\[2mm] s(t,0) = \nu I(t), \\[2mm] \dfrac{\mathrm{d}I(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\nu I(t) + I(t)\displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty}\gamma(kl)s(t,l)\,\mathrm{d}l, \\[2mm] s(0,.) = s_0 \in L^1_+(0,+\infty) \text{ and } I(0) = I_0 \geq 0, \end{array}\right\} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\nu > 0$ is the recovery rate of the infected hosts and $\gamma \in L^\infty_+(0,+\infty)$ describes how amino acid substitutions affect the probability of reinfection.

First, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.1. *Assume that $k > 0$, $\nu > 0$, $\gamma \in L^\infty_+(0,+\infty)$ and $\liminf_{a \to +\infty} \gamma(ka) > 0$.*

From now on, we set

$$S(t) := \int_0^{+\infty} s(t,a)\,\mathrm{d}a.$$

In this model, we do not have a disease-free equilibrium. Indeed, we observe that, if $I_0 = 0$, then

$$I(t) = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad s(t,a) = \begin{cases} s_0(a-t), & \text{if } a \geq t, \\ 0, & \text{if } a < t, \end{cases}$$

is a solution of equation (2.1). So we do not obtain an equilibrium solution in the usual sense. Nevertheless, the total number of susceptible individuals remains constant with time, that is, $S(t) = S_0 := \int_0^{+\infty} s_0(a)\,\mathrm{d}a, \forall t \geq 0$. It is clear that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \nu I(t) - I(t)\int_0^{+\infty}\gamma(kl)s(t,l)\,\mathrm{d}l,$$

so $\mathrm{d}[S(t) + I(t)]/\mathrm{d}t = 0$. It follows that $I(t) = N - S(t)$, $\forall t \geq 0$, where N is the total number of individuals in the population. With this, we can rewrite system (2.1) as follows:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \dfrac{\partial s(t,a)}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial s(t,a)}{\partial a} = -\gamma(ka)s(t,a)\left(N - \displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty}s(t,l)\,\mathrm{d}l\right), \quad t \geq 0, \quad a \geq 0, \\[4mm] s(t,0) = \nu\left(N - \displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty}s(t,l)\,\mathrm{d}l\right) \end{array}\right.$$

$$\text{and} \qquad s(0,.) = s_0 \in L^1_+(0,+\infty) \text{ with } \int_0^{+\infty}s_0(l)\,\mathrm{d}l \leq N. \left.\vphantom{\begin{array}{l}\\[10mm]\end{array}}\right\}$$

$$(2.2)$$

In Pease's original article (1987), the function $\gamma(ka)$ is a linear function. To consider such unbounded functions, we must change the state space by introducing the weighted L^1 space in order to discuss the existence of solutions.

Since this is not the goal of this work, we make a simplified assumption that $\gamma(ka)$ is bounded. More precisely, we consider the following step function. Define

$$\rho := \tau/k$$

as the threshold of sensitivity, where τ will be discussed later. We make the following assumption.

Assumption 2.2. *Assume that*

$$\gamma(ka) := \begin{cases} \delta, & \text{if } a \geq \rho, \\ 0, & \text{if } a \in (0, \rho), \end{cases}$$

where $\delta > 0$ and $\rho \geq 0$.

The function $\gamma(ka)$ describes the rate at which individuals become reinfected per average number of amino acid substitution ka. The above construction thus provides a threshold ρ that is the time necessary to be reinfected after one infection. This is also equivalent to assuming that it is necessary to reach a threshold value τ for the average number of amino acid substitutions before reinfection. When the threshold value $\rho = 0$, the function $\gamma(ka)$ becomes a constant δ, and $S(t)$ satisfies the following ordinary differential equation:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = (\nu - \delta S(t))I(t) = (\nu - \delta S(t))(N - S(t)).$$

The following is an easy consequence of the fact that $S(t)$ satisfies the above ordinary differential equation.

Lemma 2.3. *Let assumptions (2.1) and (2.2) be satisfied and assume that $\tau = 0$. Then, there are two cases*

— *if $\nu/\delta \geq N$ and $I(0) = N - S(0) > 0$, then $S(t) \to N$ and $I(t) \to 0$ as $t \to +\infty$ and*
— *if $\nu/\delta < N$, then system (2.1) has a unique equilibrium solution $(\bar{s}(\cdot), \bar{I})$ such that $\bar{S} = \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{s}(a)\,\mathrm{d}a = \nu/\delta$, $\bar{s}(a) = \nu\bar{I}\mathrm{e}^{-\delta\bar{I}a}$ and $\bar{I} = N - \nu/\delta$. Moreover, if $I(0) = N - S(0) > 0$, then $s(t, a) \to \bar{s}(a)$ as $t \to +\infty$ in $L^1(0, +\infty)$. Furthermore, $(\bar{s}(\cdot), \bar{I})$ is globally asymptotically stable for system (2.1) in $M_0 = \{(\varphi, I) \in L^1_+(0, +\infty) \times (0, +\infty) : \int_0^{+\infty} s(l)\,\mathrm{d}l + I = N\}$.*

The above lemma shows that, when $\tau = 0$, if there exists an endemic equilibrium, then it is locally asymptotically stable. Nevertheless, since the system does not depend smoothly on τ, we cannot conclude that, for $\tau > 0$ small enough, the endemic equilibrium $(\bar{s}(\cdot), \bar{I})$ is also asymptotically stable.

From now on, we assume that $\tau > 0$ and make the following change of variable. By considering

$$u(t, a) = \frac{\rho s(\rho t, \rho a)}{N},$$

we obtain

$$\frac{\partial u(t,a)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u(t,a)}{\partial a} = -\rho N \gamma(k\rho a) u(t,a) \left(1 - N^{-1} \int_0^{+\infty} s(\rho t, l)\, \mathrm{d}l\right),$$

$$t \geq 0, \quad a \geq 0,$$

$$u(t,0) = \rho v \left(1 - N^{-1} \int_0^{+\infty} s(\rho t, l)\, \mathrm{d}l\right),$$

and $N^{-1} \int_0^{+\infty} s(\rho t, l)\, \mathrm{d}l = N^{-1} \int_0^{+\infty} s(\rho t, \rho r)\rho\, \mathrm{d}r = \int_0^{+\infty} u(t,s)\, \mathrm{d}s$. Thus, with the above changes of variables, we obtain the following system:

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial u(t,a)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u(t,a)}{\partial a} &= -\rho \delta N \chi(a) u(t,a) \left(1 - \int_0^{+\infty} u(t,l)\, \mathrm{d}l\right), \quad t \geq 0, \quad a \geq 0 \\
u(t,0) &= \rho v \left(1 - \int_0^{+\infty} u(t,l)\, \mathrm{d}l\right), \\
\text{and} \qquad u(0,.) &= u_0(\cdot) \in L^1_+(0,+\infty) \quad \text{with} \int_0^{+\infty} u_0(l)\, \mathrm{d}l \leq 1,
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$\chi(a) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a \geq 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } a \in [0,1). \end{cases}$$

Since the case $\tau = 0$ has been fully described in lemma 2.3, in the sequel we will only consider the case $\tau > 0$. Moreover, by making the above changes of variables, and by replacing the parameters δ and v, respectively, by $\hat\delta = \rho \delta N$ and $\hat v = \rho v$ in system (2.2), we can assume, without loss of generality, that

$$\rho = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad N = 1.$$

3. Preliminary results

The global existence and positivity of solutions follow by considering the system

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial s(t,a)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial s(t,a)}{\partial a} &= -\delta \chi(a) s(t,a) \left(1 - \int_0^{+\infty} s(t,l)\, \mathrm{d}l\right)^+, \quad t \geq 0, \quad a \geq 0, \\
s(t,0) &= v \left(1 - \int_0^{+\infty} s(t,l)\, \mathrm{d}l\right)^+ \\
\text{and} \qquad s(0,.) &= s_0 \in L^1_+(0,+\infty) \quad \text{with} \int_0^{+\infty} s_0(l)\, \mathrm{d}l \leq 1,
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.1}$$

where $x^+ = \max(x, 0)$.

(a) Global existence

In order to give a sense to the solutions of problem (3.1) we will use integrated semigroup theory. We refer to Arendt (1987), Neubrander (1988), Kellermann & Hieber (1989), Thieme (1990*b*, 1997), Arendt *et al.* (2001) and Magal & Ruan (2007, 2009*a,b*) for more detailed results on the subject.

Consider the Banach space $X = \mathbb{R} \times L^1(0, +\infty)$ endowed with the usual product norm $\|\binom{\alpha}{\varphi}\| = |\alpha| + \|\varphi\|_{L^1}$. Consider a linear operator $A : D(A) \subset X \to X$ defined by

$$A \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\varphi(0) \\ -\varphi' \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } D(A) = \{0\} \times W^{1,1}(0, +\infty).$$

Then, $X_0 := \overline{D(A)} = \{0\} \times L^1(0, +\infty)$. Set $X_+ := \mathbb{R}_+ \times L^1_+(0, +\infty)$ and $X_{0+} := X_0 \cap X_+ = \{0\} \times L^1_+(0, +\infty)$. We also consider the nonlinear operator $F : (0, +\infty) \times (0, +\infty) \times \overline{D(A)} \to X$, defined by

$$F \left(\nu, \delta, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \left(1 - \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, \mathrm{d}l \right)^+ \\ -\delta \chi \varphi \left(1 - \int_0^{+\infty} \phi(l) \, \mathrm{d}l \right)^+ \end{pmatrix}.$$

By identifying $s(t, .)$ with $u(t) = \binom{0}{s(t,.)}$, we can rewrite the system as the following abstract Cauchy problem:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}u(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = Au(t) + F(\nu, \delta, u(t)), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0 \text{ and } u(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s_0 \end{pmatrix} \in \overline{D(A)}. \tag{3.2}$$

The global existence and positivity of solutions of equation (3.2) now follow from the results in Thieme (1990a), Magal (2001) and Magal & Ruan (2007, 2009a). See also the results in Inaba (1998, 2002).

Lemma 3.1. *For each $\nu > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists a unique continuous semiflow $\{U(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ on X_{0+}, such that, for each $x \in X_{0+}$, the map $t \to U(t)x$ is an integrated solution of the Cauchy problem (3.2), i.e. $t \to U(t)x$ satisfies, for each $t \geq 0$, that $\int_0^t U(l)x \, \mathrm{d}l \in D(A)$ and*

$$U(t)x = x + A \int_0^t U(l)x \, \mathrm{d}l + \int_0^t F(\nu, \delta, U(t)x) \, \mathrm{d}l.$$

(*b*) *Equilibrium solutions*

Notice that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \left(\nu - \delta \int_1^{+\infty} s(t, l) \, \mathrm{d}l \right) (1 - S(t))^+ \geq (\nu - \delta S(t))(1 - S(t))^+.$$

We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *If $S(0) < 1$, then $S(t) \in [0, 1)$ for $t \geq 0$ and $\liminf_{t \to +\infty} S(t) \geq \min(1, \nu/\delta)$. In particular, if $\nu/\delta \geq 1$, then $\lim_{t \to +\infty} S(t) = 1$.*

If $\binom{0}{\bar{s}(a)} \in X_0$ is an equilibrium solution of the system, we must have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{s} \end{pmatrix} \in D(A) \quad \text{and} \quad A \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{s} \end{pmatrix} + F \left(\nu, \delta, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{s} \end{pmatrix} \right) = 0.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\bar{s}'(a) = -\delta \chi(a)(1 - \bar{S})^+ \bar{s}(a) \text{ for } a \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{s}(0) = \nu(1 - \bar{S})^+,$$

with $\bar{S} = \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{s}(l) \, \mathrm{d}l$. So we must have $\bar{S} < 1$ and obtain

$$\bar{s}(a) = \begin{cases} \nu(1 - \bar{S})\mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-1)}, & \text{if } a \geq 1, \\ \nu(1 - \bar{S}), & \text{if } a \in [0,1]. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

By integrating $\bar{s}(a)$ over $(0, +\infty)$, we obtain $\bar{S} = \nu(1 - \bar{S}) \int_1^{+\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-1)} \, \mathrm{d}a + \nu(1 - \bar{S})$, which implies that $\bar{S} = \nu/\delta + \nu(1 - \bar{S})$. Thus,

$$\bar{S} = \frac{1 + \delta^{-1}}{1 + \nu^{-1}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, $\bar{S} \in (0,1)$ if and only if $\delta > \nu$. Now we can state the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *System (3.1) has an equilibrium if and only if $\delta > \nu$. Moreover, when the equilibrium exists, it is unique and given by equation (3.3).*

4. Linearized equation

Since $\bar{S} \in (0,1)$, the map $x \to F(\nu, \delta, x)$ is differentiable in a neighbourhood of $\binom{0}{\bar{s}}$, and the linearized equation of (3.2) at $\binom{0}{\bar{s}}$ is given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}w(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = Aw(t) + \partial_x F\left(\nu, \delta, \binom{0}{\bar{s}}\right)(w(t)), \quad t \geq 0, \text{ and } w(0) = x \in X_0. \tag{4.1}$$

We may rewrite this as the following PDE:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w(t,a)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial w(t,a)}{\partial a} &= -\delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(a)w(t,a) + \delta\chi(a)\bar{s}(a) \int_0^{+\infty} w(t,l) \, \mathrm{d}l, \\ &\qquad t \geq 0, \quad a \geq 0, \\ w(t,0) &= -\nu \int_0^{+\infty} w(t,l) \, \mathrm{d}l \\ \text{and} \qquad w(0,.) &= \varphi \in L^1(0, +\infty). \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{4.2}$$

(a) Associated linear operator

We consider a linear operator $B : D(B) \subset X \to X$, defined by

$$B\binom{0}{\varphi} = \binom{-\varphi(0)}{-\varphi' - \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi\varphi}, \text{ with } D(B) = D(A),$$

and a bounded linear operator $C : X_0 \to X$, defined by

$$C\binom{0}{\varphi} = \begin{pmatrix} -\nu \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, \mathrm{d}l \\ \delta\chi\bar{s} \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, \mathrm{d}l \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, $A + \partial_x F(\nu, \delta, \binom{0}{\bar{s}}) = B + C$ and the Cauchy problem (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}w(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = (B + C)w(t), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0 \text{ with } w(0) = x \in X_0.$$

By applying the results in Thieme (1990a) or Magal (2001) and Magal & Ruan (2007), we obtain the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *The resolvent set of B contains $(-\delta(1 - \bar{S}), +\infty)$. More precisely, for each $\lambda > -\delta(1 - \bar{S})$,*

$$(\lambda - B)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \psi \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \psi(a) = \mathrm{e}^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \alpha + \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \varphi(s)\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Moreover, B is a Hille–Yosida operator and

$$\|(\lambda - B)^{-n}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^1(0,+\infty))} \leq \frac{M_B}{(\lambda - \omega_B)^{-n}}, \quad \text{for each } \lambda > \omega_B \text{ and each } n \geq 1,$$

with $\omega_B := -\delta(1 - \bar{S})$ and $M_B := (1 + \mathrm{e}^{\delta(1-\bar{S})})$.

Recall that B_0, the part of B in $\overline{D(B)} = X_0$, is defined by

$$B_0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = B \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for each } \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \in D(B_0),$$

and

$$D(B_0) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \in D(B) : B \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \in X_0 \right\}.$$

So, we obtain

$$D(B_0) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \in \{0\} \times W^{1,1}(0, +\infty) : \varphi(0) = 0 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{B}_0 \varphi \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\hat{B}_0 \varphi = -\varphi' - \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi \varphi$ with $D(\hat{B}_0) = \{\varphi \in W^{1,1}(0, +\infty) : \varphi(0) = 0\}$. Since B is a Hille–Yosida operator, it follows that B_0 is the infinitesimal generator of a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators $\{T_{B_0}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ on X_0. More precisely, we have the following result.

Lemma 4.2. *The linear operator B_0 is the infinitesimal generator of a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators $\{T_{B_0}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ on X_0, and for each $t \geq 0$, the linear operator $T_{B_0}(t)$ is defined by*

$$T_{B_0}(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ T_{\hat{B}_0}(t)\varphi \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\{T_{\hat{B}_0}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators on $L^1(0, +\infty)$ and

$$T_{\hat{B}_0}(t(\varphi)(a) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{e}^{-\int_{a-t}^a \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)\,\mathrm{d}l} \varphi(a - t), & \text{if } a > t, \\ 0, & \text{if } a \leq t. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $\|T_{B_0}(t)\| \leq M_B \mathrm{e}^{\omega_B t}, \forall t \geq 0$.

Definition 4.3. Let $L : D(L) \subset X \to X$ be the infinitesimal generator of a linear C_0-semigroup $\{T_L(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ on a Banach space X. Define the *growth bound* $\omega_0(L) \in [-\infty, +\infty)$ of L by

$$\omega_0(L) := \lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{\ln(\|T_L(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)})}{t}.$$

The *essential growth bound* $\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L) \in [-\infty, +\infty)$ of L is defined by

$$\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L) := \lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{\ln(\|T_L(t)\|_{\mathrm{ess}})}{t},$$

where $\|T_L(t)\|_{\mathrm{ess}}$ is the essential norm of $T_L(t)$ defined by

$$\|T_L(t)\|_{\mathrm{ess}} = \kappa(T_L(t)B_X(0,1)).$$

Here, $B_X(0,1) = \{x \in X : \|x\|_X \leq 1\}$, and for each bounded set $B \subset X$,

$$\kappa(B) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : B \text{ can be covered by a finite number of balls of radius } \leq \varepsilon\}$$

is the Kuratovsky measure of non-compactness.

Since $\|T_B(t)\|_{\mathrm{ess}} \leq \|T_B(t)\|$, we deduce that $\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(B) \leq \omega_0(B)$. By using lemma 4.2, we have $\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(B_0) \leq \omega_0(B_0) \leq \omega_B = -\delta(1 - \bar{S})$. Since C is a bounded linear operator, it follows that $B + C : D(B) \subset X \to X$ is a Hille–Yosida operator. Thus, $(B + C)_0$, the part of $(B + C)$ on X_0, is the infinitesimal generator of a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators $\{T_{(B+C)_0}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ on X_0. Moreover, since C is compact, by using the perturbation results in Thieme (1997) and Ducrot *et al.* (2008), it follows that

$$\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}((B + C)_0) \leq \omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(B_0) \leq \omega_0(B_0) \leq -\delta(1 - \bar{S}) < 0. \qquad (4.3)$$

Next, we recall some results of spectral theory. In the following result, the existence of the projector was first proved by Webb (1985, 1987) and the fact that there is a finite number of points of the spectrum was proved by Engel & Nagel (2000).

Theorem 4.4. *Let $L : D(L) \subset X \to X$ be the infinitesimal generator of a linear C_0-semigroup $\{T_L(t)\}$ on a Banach space X. Then,*

$$\omega_0(L) = \max\left(\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L), \max_{\lambda \in \sigma(L) \backslash \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(L)} \mathrm{Re}(\lambda)\right).$$

Assume in addition that $\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L) < \omega_0(L)$. Then, for each $\gamma \in (\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L), \omega_0(L)]$, $\{\lambda \in \sigma(L) : \mathrm{Re}(\lambda) \geq \gamma\} \subset \sigma_p(L)$ is non-empty, finite and contains only poles of the resolvent of L. Moreover, there exists a finite rank bounded linear projector $\Pi : X \to X$ satisfying the following properties: (i) $\Pi(\lambda - L)^{-1} = (\lambda - L)^{-1}\Pi$, $\forall \lambda \in \rho(L)$, (ii) $\sigma(L_{\Pi(X)}) = \{\lambda \in \sigma(L) : \mathrm{Re}(\lambda) \geq \gamma\}$, and (iii) $\sigma(L_{(I-\Pi)(X)}) = \sigma(L) \backslash \sigma(L_{\Pi(X)})$.

In theorem 4.4, the projector Π is the projection on the direct sum of the generalized eigenspaces of L associated to all points $\lambda \in \sigma(L)$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) \geq \gamma$. As a consequence of theorem 4.4, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $L : D(L) \subset X \to X$ be the infinitesimal generator of a linear C_0-semigroup $\{T_L(t)\}$ on a Banach space X, and assume that $\omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L) < \omega_0(L)$.*

Then,

$$\{\lambda \in \sigma(L) : \mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > \omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L)\} \subset \sigma_p(L),$$

and each $\hat{\lambda} \in \{\lambda \in \sigma(L) : \mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > \omega_{0,\mathrm{ess}}(L)\}$ is a pole of the resolvent of L. That is, $\hat{\lambda}$ is isolated in $\sigma(L)$, and there exists an integer $k_0 \geq 1$ (the order of the pole), such that Laurent's expansion of the resolvent takes the following form:

$$(\lambda I - L)^{-1} = \sum_{n=-k_0}^{\infty} (\lambda - \lambda_0)^n B_n^{\lambda_0},$$

where $\{B_n^{\lambda_0}\}$ are bounded linear operators on X, and the above series converges in the norm of operators whenever $|\lambda - \lambda_0|$ is small enough.

(b) Characteristic equation

By using lemma 2.1 in Magal & Ruan (2009a), we know that $\sigma((B + C)_0) = \sigma((B + C))$. By using theorem 4.4, corollary 4.5 and equation (4.3), we deduce that, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{\lambda \in \sigma((B + C)_0) : \mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > -\delta(1 - \bar{S}) + \varepsilon\}$ is either empty or finite. Moreover, we have the following result.

Lemma 4.6. *For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > -\delta(1 - \bar{S})$,*

$$\lambda \in \sigma(B + C) \Leftrightarrow \Delta(\lambda) = 0,$$

where

$$\Delta(\lambda) = 1 + \nu \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)] \, \mathrm{d}l} \, \mathrm{d}a - \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a e^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)] \, \mathrm{d}l} \delta \chi(s) \bar{s}(s) \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}a.$$

Furthermore, if $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > -\delta(1 - \bar{S})$ and $\Delta(\lambda) \neq 0$, then

$$(\lambda I - (B + C))^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha} \\ \hat{\varphi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}$$

is equivalent to

$$\varphi(a) = e^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)] \, \mathrm{d}l} [\Delta(\lambda)^{-1}((1 - C_1)\hat{\alpha} - \nu \hat{I})]$$

$$+ \Delta(\lambda)^{-1} (C_2 \hat{\alpha} + \hat{I}) \int_0^a e^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)] \, \mathrm{d}l} \delta \chi(s) \bar{s}(s) \, \mathrm{d}s$$

$$+ \int_0^a e^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)] \, \mathrm{d}l} \hat{\varphi}(s) \, \mathrm{d}s,$$

where

$$\hat{I} := \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a e^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)] \, \mathrm{d}l} \hat{\varphi}(s) \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}a. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > -\delta(1 - \bar{S})$, since $\lambda I - B$ is invertible, it follows that $\lambda I - (B + C)$ is invertible if and only if $I - C(\lambda I - B)^{-1}$ is invertible and

$$(\lambda I - (B + C))^{-1} = (\lambda - B)^{-1}[I - C(\lambda - B)^{-1}]^{-1}.$$

Note that

$$(I - C(\lambda - B)^{-1}) \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha} \\ \hat{\varphi} \end{pmatrix} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \alpha + \nu \displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty} \psi(l)\,\mathrm{d}l = \hat{\alpha}, \\ \varphi(a) - \delta\chi(a)\bar{s}(a) \displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty} \psi(l)\,\mathrm{d}l = \hat{\varphi}, \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\psi(a) = \mathrm{e}^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \alpha + \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \varphi(s)\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

So we must have

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \psi(a)\,\mathrm{d}a = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l}\,\mathrm{d}a\,\alpha + \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \varphi(s)\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

By using the second equation of system (4.5), we obtain

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \varphi(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a$$

$$= \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \delta\chi(s)\bar{s}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a \int_0^{+\infty} \psi(l)\,\mathrm{d}l$$

$$+ \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \hat{\varphi}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a.$$

Thus, we have

$$I - C_1 \int_0^{+\infty} \psi(l)\,\mathrm{d}l = \hat{I}, \tag{4.6}$$

where

$$I := \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \varphi(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a,$$

$$C_1 := \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l} \delta\chi(a)\bar{s}(a)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a,$$

and $\hat{I}$ is given by equation (4.3). Moreover,

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \psi(a)\,\mathrm{d}a = C_2\alpha + I, \tag{4.7}$$

where $C_2 := \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l}\,\mathrm{d}a$. Combining the first equation of system (4.5) with equations (4.6) and (4.7), we obtain $(1 + \nu C_2)\alpha + \nu I = \hat{\alpha}$ and

$-C_1 C_2 \alpha + (1 - C_1)I = \hat{I}$. So,

$$[(1 - C_1)(1 + \nu C_2) + \nu C_1 C_2]\alpha = (1 - C_1)\hat{\alpha} - \nu \hat{I}$$

and

$$[\nu C_1 C_2 + (1 - C_1)(1 + \nu C_2)]I = C_1 C_2 \hat{\alpha} + (1 + \nu C_2)\hat{I}.$$

The characteristic function is given by

$$\Delta(\lambda) = \nu C_1 C_2 + (1 - C_1)(1 + \nu C_2) = (1 + \nu C_2) - C_1.$$

It follows that

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}[(1 - C_1)\hat{\alpha} - \nu \hat{I}] \quad \text{and} \quad I = \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}[C_1 C_2 \hat{\alpha} + (1 + \nu C_2)\hat{I}]. \qquad (4.8)$$

By using the second equation of (4.5), $\varphi(a) = \delta \chi(a)\bar{s}(a) \int_0^{+\infty} \psi(l) \, dl + \hat{\varphi}$, together with equations (4.7) and (4.8), we obtain

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \psi(a) \, da = C_2 \alpha + I = \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}[C_2(1 - C_1)\hat{\alpha} - \nu C_2 \hat{I} + C_1 C_2 \hat{\alpha} + (1 + \nu C_2)\hat{I}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}(C_2 \hat{\alpha} + \hat{I}).$$

Hence, $\varphi(a) = \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}\delta \chi(a)\bar{s}(a)\left(C_2 \hat{\alpha} + \hat{I}\right) + \hat{\varphi}$. Finally, we deduce that

$$(I - C(\lambda - B)^{-1})^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha} \\ \hat{\varphi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta(\lambda)^{-1}[(1 - C_1)\hat{\alpha} - \nu \hat{I}] \\ \Delta(\lambda)^{-1}\delta \chi(\cdot)\bar{s}(\cdot)(C_2 \hat{\alpha} + \hat{I}) + \hat{\varphi}(\cdot) \end{pmatrix},$$

and the explicit formula for the resolvent of $B + C$ follows by using the explicit formula for the resolvent of B.

Now assume that $\Delta(\lambda) = 0$. It remains to show that $\lambda I - (C + B)$ is not invertible, so it is sufficient to find $\binom{0}{\varphi} \in D(A)$, such that

$$(C + B)\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \varphi' = -[\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi]\varphi + \delta \chi \bar{s} \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, dl, \\ \varphi(0) = -\nu \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, dl, \end{cases}$$

which is, in turn, equivalent to

$$\varphi(a) = -\nu e^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)] \, dl} \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, dl$$

$$+ \int_0^a e^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)] \, dl} \delta \chi(s)\bar{s}(s) \, ds \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, dl.$$

If we fix $\int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(l) \, dl = -C \neq 0$, then we obtain

$$\varphi(a) = \left(\nu e^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)] \, dl} - \int_0^a e^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)] \, dl} \delta \chi(s)\bar{s}(s) \, ds\right) C.$$

Since $\Delta(\lambda) = 0$, we deduce that $\int_0^{+\infty} \varphi(a) \, da = C$. The result follows. ∎

Lemma 4.7. $\Delta(0) = 1 + \nu > 0$. *So* $0 \notin \sigma(B + C)$.

Proof. We have $\Delta(0) = 1 + \nu J_1 - J_2$, with

$$J_1 := \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\int_0^a \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)\,\mathrm{d}l}\,\mathrm{d}a = \int_1^{+\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-1)}\,\mathrm{d}a + 1 = \frac{1}{\delta(1-\bar{S})} + 1$$

and

$$J_2 := \int_0^{+\infty}\int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)\,\mathrm{d}l}\delta\chi(s)\bar{s}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a = \int_1^{+\infty}\int_1^a \mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-s)}\delta\bar{s}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a.$$

But, $\bar{s}(a) = \nu(1-\bar{S})\mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-1)}$ for $a \geq 1$, so we have

$$J_2 = \nu\delta(1-\bar{S})\int_1^{+\infty}\int_1^a \mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-s)}\mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(s-1)}\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a$$

$$= \nu\delta(1-\bar{S})\int_1^{+\infty}(a-1)\mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-1)}\,\mathrm{d}a = \nu\delta(1-\bar{S})\int_0^{+\infty} l\,\mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})l}\,\mathrm{d}l$$

$$= \nu\int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})l}\,\mathrm{d}l = \frac{\nu}{\delta(1-\bar{S})},$$

which implies that $\Delta(0) = 1 + \nu > 0$. This completes the proof.   ■

Lemma 4.8. *For each* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ *with* $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > \delta(1-\bar{S})$ *and* $\lambda \neq 0$, *we have*

$$\Delta(\lambda) := 1 + \nu\left[\frac{\delta(1-\bar{S})}{\lambda[\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})]}\right](1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda}).$$

Proof. We have $\Delta(\lambda) = 1 + \nu I_1 - I_2$, with

$$I_1 := \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\int_0^a[\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l}\,\mathrm{d}a = \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda}\int_1^{+\infty}\mathrm{e}^{-[\lambda+\delta(1-\bar{S})](a-1)}\,\mathrm{d}a + \int_0^1 \mathrm{e}^{-a\lambda}\,\mathrm{d}a$$

$$= \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda}\int_0^{+\infty}\mathrm{e}^{-[\lambda+\delta(1-\bar{S})]a}\,\mathrm{d}a + \frac{1}{\lambda}(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda}) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda}}{[\lambda + \delta(1-\bar{S})]} + \frac{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda}}{\lambda}$$

and

$$I_2 := \int_0^{+\infty}\int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a[\lambda+\delta(1-\bar{S})\chi(l)]\,\mathrm{d}l}\delta\chi(s)\bar{s}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a$$

$$= \int_1^{+\infty}\int_1^a \mathrm{e}^{-[\lambda+\delta(1-\bar{S})](a-s)}\delta\nu(1-\bar{S})\mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(s-1)}\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a$$

$$= \delta\nu(1-\bar{S})\int_1^{+\infty}\mathrm{e}^{-\delta(1-\bar{S})(a-1)}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda a}\int_1^a \mathrm{e}^{\lambda s}\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}a = \frac{\nu}{\delta(1-\bar{S}) + \lambda}.$$

The result thus follows.   ■

The following lemma demonstrates that the purely imaginary eigenvalues of $B + C$ are simple.

Lemma 4.9. *Assume that* $\Delta(\hat{\lambda}) = 0$ *for some* $\hat{\lambda} = \mathrm{i}\omega$ *with* $\omega > 0$. *Then,* $\hat{\lambda}$ *is a simple eigenvalue of* $B + C$.

Proof. Assume that $\hat{\lambda} = i\omega$ with $\omega > 0$ is a solution of $\Delta(\hat{\lambda}) = 0$. Assume first that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta(\hat{\lambda})}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} \neq 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Then, by using the explicit formula for the resolvent of $B + C$ in lemma 4.6, we deduce that the following limit exists:

$$B^{\hat{\lambda}}_{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha} \\ \hat{\varphi} \end{pmatrix} = \lim_{\substack{\lambda \to \hat{\lambda} \\ \lambda \neq \hat{\lambda}}} (\lambda - \hat{\lambda})(\lambda I - (B + C))^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha} \\ \hat{\varphi} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$B^{\hat{\lambda}}_{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha} \\ \hat{\varphi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \Leftrightarrow \varphi = \mathrm{e}^{-\int_0^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\mathrm{d}l} \frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta(\hat{\lambda})}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}^{-1} [(1 - C_1)\hat{\alpha} - \nu \hat{I}]$$

$$+ \frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta(\hat{\lambda})}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}^{-1} (C_2 \hat{\alpha} + \hat{I}) \int_0^a \mathrm{e}^{-\int_s^a [\lambda + \delta(1 - \bar{S})\chi(l)]\mathrm{d}l} \delta\chi(s)\bar{s}(s) \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

So, $\hat{\lambda}$ is a pole of order 1 of the resolvent of $B + C$, and $B^{\hat{\lambda}}_{-1}$, the projector on the generalized eigenspace of $B + C$ associated to $\hat{\lambda}$, has rank 1. It follows that $\hat{\lambda}$ is a simple eigenvalue of $B + C$.

It remains to show equation (4.8). We have that

$$\Delta(\hat{\lambda}) := 1 + \nu \left[\frac{\delta(1 - \bar{S})}{\hat{\lambda}(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}))} \right] (1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\hat{\lambda}}) = 0$$

is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\hat{\lambda}} - 1 = \frac{1}{\nu\delta(1 - \bar{S})} \left[\hat{\lambda} \left(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}) \right) \right]. \tag{4.10}$$

Notice that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta(\hat{\lambda})}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} = \nu\delta(1 - \bar{S}) \left\{ \mathrm{e}^{-\hat{\lambda}} \left[\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}))} \right] - \frac{2\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S})}{\left[\hat{\lambda} \left(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}) \right) \right]^2} (1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\hat{\lambda}}) \right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta(\hat{\lambda})}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{e}^{-\hat{\lambda}}[\hat{\lambda}(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}))] + [2\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S})](\mathrm{e}^{-\hat{\lambda}} - 1) = 0,$$

and by using equation (4.10) we obtain

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\nu\delta(1 - \bar{S})} \left[\hat{\lambda} \left(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}) \right) \right] + 1 \right\} \left[\hat{\lambda} \left(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}) \right) \right]$$

$$+ [2\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S})] \frac{1}{\nu\delta(1 - \bar{S})} \left[\hat{\lambda} \left(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}) \right) \right] = 0,$$

which is equivalent to $[\hat{\lambda}(\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S}))] + \nu\delta(1 - \bar{S}) + [2\hat{\lambda} + \delta(1 - \bar{S})] = 0$. Since $\hat{\lambda} = i\omega$ with $\omega > 0$, we obtain $-\omega^2 + i\omega\delta(1 - \bar{S}) + \nu\delta(1 - \bar{S}) + 2i\omega + \delta(1 - \bar{S}) = 0$, which is impossible since the imaginary part is non-null. ∎

5. Stability

In this section, we investigate the stability of the endemic equilibrium $\bar{s}$. We observe that the linear operator $A + \partial_x F(\nu, \delta, \left(\begin{smallmatrix}0\\s\end{smallmatrix}\right))$ can be decomposed as the sum of a linear operator $\tilde{B} : D(\tilde{B}) \subset X \to X$, defined by

$$\tilde{B}\begin{pmatrix}0\\\varphi\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}-\varphi(0)\\-\varphi' - \delta\chi\varphi\end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with } D(L) = D(A),$$

and a bounded linear operator $\tilde{C} : X_0 \to X$, defined by

$$\tilde{C}\begin{pmatrix}0\\\varphi\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}-\nu\displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty}\varphi(l)\mathrm{d}l\\-\delta\bar{S}\chi\varphi + \delta\chi\bar{s}\displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty}\varphi(l)\mathrm{d}l\end{pmatrix}.$$

That is, we have $A + \partial_x F(\nu, \delta, \left(\begin{smallmatrix}0\\s\end{smallmatrix}\right)) = \tilde{B} + \tilde{C}$. Observe that $\|\hat{C}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0)} \leq 2\delta\bar{S} + \nu$. In order to have the existence of the endemic equilibrium (i.e. $\bar{I} > 0$ or $\bar{S} = 1 - \bar{I} < 1$), we must impose $\delta > \nu$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Then, we have $\delta\bar{S} = \nu\left(\frac{\delta+1}{1+\nu}\right) \to 0$ as $\nu \to 0$. Hence, $\|\tilde{C}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0)} \to 0$ as $\nu \to 0$. Moreover, $\tilde{B}_0$, the part of $\tilde{B}$ on X_0, is the infinitesimal generator of the strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators $\{T_{\tilde{B}_0}(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ on X_0, defined by

$$T_{\tilde{B}_0}(t)\begin{pmatrix}0\\\varphi\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}0\\\hat{T}_{\tilde{B}_0}(t)\varphi\end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\hat{T}_{\tilde{B}_0}(t)(\varphi)(a) = \begin{cases}\exp\left(-\displaystyle\int_{a-t}^a \delta\chi(l)\mathrm{d}l\right)\varphi(a - t), & \text{if } a < t,\\0, & \text{if } a \leq t.\end{cases}$$

Since $\liminf_{a\to+\infty}\delta\chi(a) = \delta > 0$, it follows that $\omega_0(\tilde{B}_0) \leq -\delta$. By using the standard perturbation argument (see Thieme 1990*a* or Magal & Ruan 2009*b*), we obtain the following stability result.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\delta > 0$ be fixed. Then, there exists $\nu_s^- \in (0, \delta)$, such that, for each $\nu \in (0, \nu_s^-)$, the equilibrium $\bar{s}$ is locally asymptotically stable.*

By using a similar argument we also have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that, if $\delta + \nu \leq \varepsilon$, then the equilibrium $\bar{s}$ is locally asymptotically stable.*

Remark 5.3. Now we return to the original system (2.1) and assume that the parameters $\nu > 0$, $\delta > 0$ and $N > 0$ of system (2.1) are fixed such that $\nu/\delta < N$. Then, we can regard $\tau > 0$, defined in assumption 2.2, as a parameter

of system (2.1). By the changes of variables described in §2, it corresponds to some parameters $\hat{\delta} > 0$ and $\hat{v}$ of system (3.1) with $\hat{\delta} = \tau c_1$ and $\hat{v} = \tau c_2$ for some $c_1 > c_2 > 0$. By lemma 5.2, we deduce that, if $\tau > 0$ is small enough, then the endemic equilibrium of the original system (2.1) is stable (see the numerical simulations in §7).

We have $1 - \bar{S} = 1 - (1 + \delta^{-1}/1 + v^{-1}) = (v^{-1} - \delta^{-1}/1 + v^{-1})$. Let $h : [0, \delta] \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$h(v) := \delta(1 - \bar{S}) = \frac{\delta - v}{1 + v}. \tag{5.1}$$

Then, the characteristic equation can be rewritten as $1 + v[h(v)/\lambda(\lambda + h(v))](1 - e^{-\lambda}) = 0$. Since $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > -h(v)$, the characteristic equation is equivalent to

$$\lambda + h(v) = v h(v) \frac{e^{-\lambda} - 1}{\lambda}. \tag{5.2}$$

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$ satisfies the characteristic equation. Then, we have the estimate $|\lambda| \leq 2v + 2h(v)$.*

Proof. From equation (5.2), we have $[\lambda + h(v)]^2 = h(v)\{v(e^{-\lambda} - 1) + [\lambda + h(v)]\}$. So $[(\lambda/h(v)) + 1]^2 = (v/h(v))(e^{-\lambda} - 1) + [(\lambda/h(v)) + 1]$. It follows that $|(\lambda/h(v)) + 1|^2 \leq (v/h(v))(e^{-\mathrm{Re}(\lambda)} + 1) + |(\lambda/h(v)) + 1|$. Since $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$, we obtain that $|(\lambda/h(v)) + 1| \leq (v/h(v))\frac{2}{|(\lambda/h(v))+1|} + 1 \leq (2v/h(v)) + 1$, it follows that $|\lambda + h(v)| \leq 2v + h(v)$ and $|\lambda| \leq |\lambda + h(v)| + |h(v)| \leq 2v + 2h(v)$. This proves the lemma. ∎

Now, we are in the position to state and prove the main result in this section.

Theorem 5.5 (stability). *Let $\delta > 0$ be fixed. Then, there exists $0 < v_s^- < v_s^+ < \delta$, such that, for each $v \in (0, v_s^-) \cup (v_s^+, \delta)$, the equilibrium $\bar{s}$ of system (3.1) is locally asymptotically stable.*

Proof. Assume that there exist two sequences $\{v_n\}$ with $v_n(<\delta) \to \delta$ and $\{\lambda_n\} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_n) \geq 0$ and $\Delta(\lambda_n) = 0$. Then, by lemma 5.4, we have $|\lambda_n| \leq 2v_n + 2h(v_n)$, $\forall n \geq 0$. We can find a converging subsequence $\{\lambda_{n_p}\}$ with $\lambda_{n_p} \to \lambda^*$. By using the characteristic equation, we obtain

$$\lambda_{n_p} + h(v_{n_p}) = v_{n_p} h(v_{n_p}) \frac{e^{-\lambda_{n_p}} - 1}{\lambda_{n_p}}$$

and $\lambda_{n_p} \to 0$. So $\lambda^* = 0$. Notice that

$$\frac{\lambda_{n_p}}{h(v_{n_p})} + 1 = v_{n_p} \frac{e^{-\lambda_{n_p}} - 1}{\lambda_{n_p}},$$

so we obtain $\lim_{p \to +\infty}(\lambda_{n_p}/h(v_{n_p})) = -(1 + \delta)$. Thus, for $p \geq 0$ large enough, we have $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_{n_p}/h(v_{n_p})) < -(1 + \delta/2)$, which implies, for each $p \geq 0$ large enough, that

$$\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_{n_p}) < -\frac{(1 + \delta)h(v_{n_p})}{2} < 0$$

a contradiction. ∎

6. Hopf bifurcation

Recall that $h(v) = (\delta - v/1 + v)$, we have $h'(v) < 0$. So h is strictly decreasing and $h(0) = \delta$ and $h(\delta) = 0$. Thus, $h((0, \delta)) \subset (0, \delta)$. The characteristic equation becomes equivalent to find $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > -h(v)$, such that one of the following is satisfied:

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda} = \frac{\lambda^2}{v h(v)} + \frac{\lambda}{v} + 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda} = \frac{1}{v h(v)} \lambda[\lambda + h(v)] + 1$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v h(v)[\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda} - 1] + h(v)[\lambda + h(v)] = [\lambda + h(v)]^2$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{v}{h(v)}[\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda} - 1] + \left[\frac{\lambda}{h(v)} + 1\right] = \left[\frac{\lambda}{h(v)} + 1\right]^2.$$

(a) Existence of purely imaginary solutions

Assume that $\lambda = \mathrm{i}\omega$, with $\omega > 0$, is a solution of the characteristic equation. We must have

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega} = \frac{-\omega^2}{v h(v)} + \mathrm{i}\frac{\omega}{v} + 1. \tag{6.1}$$

This implies that $1 = |\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega}| = (1 - (\omega^2/v h(v)))^2 + (\omega^2/v^2)$ and $1 = 1 - 2(\omega^2/v h(v)) + (\omega^4/(v h(v))^2) + (\omega^2/v^2)$. So we obtain $\omega^2 = 2v h(v) - h(v)^2 = v h(v)(2 - (h(v)/v))$. Since we look for $\omega > 0$, the above equality is possible only if $(h(v)/v) < 2$. Thus,

$$\omega(v) = v\sqrt{\frac{h(v)}{v}\left(2 - \frac{h(v)}{v}\right)}.$$

As a consequence, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that there exists* $\lambda^* = \mathrm{i}\omega^*$ *for some* $\omega^* > 0$ *and* $\Delta(\lambda^*) = 0$. *Then,*

$$\Delta(\overline{\lambda^*}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^* = v\sqrt{\frac{h(v)}{v}\left(2 - \frac{h(v)}{v}\right)}$$

with $(h(v)/v) < 2$. *Moreover,* $\Delta(\mathrm{i}\omega) \neq 0$, $\forall \omega \neq \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-\omega^*, \omega^*\}$.

By considering the real and the imaginary parts of equation (6.1) with $\omega > 0$, we obtain $(\omega/v) = -\sin(\omega)$ and $(\omega^2/v h(v)) = 1 - \cos(\omega)$. Since $\omega > 0$ and $v > 0$, we must have $\omega \in \bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty}((2k+1)\pi, (2k+2)\pi)$,

$$v = -\frac{\omega}{\sin(\omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad v h(v) = \frac{\omega^2}{1 - \cos(\omega)}. \tag{6.2}$$

The definition (5.1) of $h(v)$ yields

$$\delta = v + \frac{1 + v}{v}\frac{\omega^2}{1 - \cos(\omega)}. \tag{6.3}$$

By using equations (6.2) and (6.3), we obtain a family of curves in the (v, δ)-plane parameterized by $\omega \in \bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty}((2k+1)\pi, (2k+2)\pi)$ (see figure 1).

Figure 1. Bifurcation diagrams. (*a*) A couple of bifurcation curves given by equation (6.3) in the (ν, δ)-plane with small (ν, δ) values. (*b*) A family of bifurcation curves defined by equation (6.3) in the (ν, δ)-plane.

Proposition 6.2. *Assume that $\delta = c\nu$ for some constant $c > 1$. Then, we can find a sequence $\{\nu_n\}$ with $\nu_n \to +\infty$ as $n \to +\infty$, such that, for each ν_n, there exists $\omega_n > 0$ so that $\lambda_n = i\omega_n$ satisfies the characteristic equation*

$$e^{-i\omega_n} = \frac{-\omega_n^2}{\nu_n(\delta_n - \nu_n/1 + \nu_n)} + i\frac{\omega_n}{\nu_n} + 1.$$

Proof. By using equations (6.2) and (6.3) for $\omega \in \bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty}((2k+1)\pi, (2k+2)\pi)$, we have

$$\nu = -\frac{\omega}{\sin(\omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \nu + 2(1+\nu)\nu\frac{\cos(\omega/2)^2}{\sin(\omega/2)^2}.$$

Since, by the assumption, we have $\delta = c\nu$ with $c > 1$, it follows that

$$\nu = -\frac{\omega}{\sin(\omega)} \quad \text{and } \nu = \frac{(c-1)}{2}\tan\left(\frac{\omega}{2}\right)^2 - 1.$$

A simple analysis shows that both curves intersect infinitely many times in $\bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty}((2k+1)\pi, (2k+2)\pi)$. ∎

Remark 6.3. By remark 5.3 and proposition 6.2, we deduce that there is an infinite sequence $\{\tau_n\}$ with $\tau_n(> 0) \to +\infty$, such that the linearized equation of system (3.1) around the endemic equilibrium $\bar{s}$ has some purely imaginary eigenvalues in its spectrum. As a consequence, we deduce that the linearized equation of system (2.1) for the same values τ_n also has some purely imaginary eigenvalues. Therefore, when τ increases, the original system (2.1) may exhibit an infinite number of Hopf bifurcations.

In order to find an infinite number of purely imaginary eigenvalues, we consider the curves in the (ν, δ)-plane of parameters

$$\delta = \nu + \frac{1+\nu}{\nu}\frac{(\nu/c)^2}{1 - \sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)}} \tag{6.4}$$

Figure 2. In this figure, we plot the curve $\delta = \nu + \frac{1+\nu}{\nu} \frac{(\nu/c)^2}{1+\sqrt{1-(1/c^2)}}$ for $c = 1$ in red, for $c = 5$ in blue and the curve $\delta = \nu + \frac{1+\nu}{\nu} \frac{(\nu/c)^2}{1-\sqrt{1-(1/c^2)}}$ for $c = 5$ in green.

for some $c \geq 1$. Taking $\nu = \omega/c$, equations (6.2) and (6.3) become $\sin(\omega) = -1/c$ and $\cos(\omega) = \sqrt{1-(1/c^2)}$ for $\omega \in \bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty}((2k+1)\pi, (2k+2)\pi)$. We have the following lemma (figure 2).

Lemma 6.4. *There is an infinite sequence $\{\omega_n\}$ defined by $\omega_n = \arcsin(-(1/c)) + 2(n+1)\pi$, such that, for $n \geq 0$ if*

$$\nu_n = \frac{\omega_n}{c} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_n = \nu_n + \frac{1+\nu_n}{\nu_n} \frac{(\nu_n/c)^2}{1-\sqrt{1-(1/c^2)}},$$

then $\Delta(i\omega_n) = 0$.

Similarly, for the case

$$\delta = \nu + \frac{1+\nu}{\nu} \frac{(\nu/c)^2}{1+\sqrt{1-(1/c^2)}}, \tag{6.5}$$

we have $\sin(\omega) = -(1/c)$, $\cos(\omega) = -\sqrt{1-(1/c^2)}$ and the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *There is a second sequence $\{\hat{\omega}_n\}$ given by $\hat{\omega}_n = \arcsin(1/c) + \pi + 2n\pi$, such that, for $n \geq 0$ if*

$$\hat{\nu}_n = \frac{\hat{\omega}_n}{c} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\delta}_n = \hat{\nu}_n + \frac{1+\hat{\nu}_n}{\hat{\nu}_n} \frac{(\hat{\nu}_n/c)^2}{1+\sqrt{1-(1/c^2)}},$$

then $\Delta(i\hat{\omega}_n) = 0$.

(b) Transversality condition

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) > -h(\nu)$, the characteristic equation $\Delta(\lambda) = 0$ is equivalent to $\Delta_1(\nu, \lambda) = \lambda[\lambda + h(\nu)] + \nu h(\nu)(1 - e^{-\lambda}) = 0$. Recall the form of $h(\nu)$, by equation (6.4), we have $h(\nu) = \nu \kappa(c)$, where

$$\kappa(c) := \frac{(1/c)^2}{1 - \sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)}} > 0.$$

Hence, $\Delta_1(\nu, \lambda) = \lambda[\lambda + \nu \kappa(c)] + \nu^2 \kappa(c)(1 - e^{-\lambda})$. Moreover, we knew that if $\lambda_n = \omega_n \mathrm{i}$ and $\nu_n = c\omega_n$, then $\Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n) = 0$, and $\sin(\omega_n) = -1/c$ and $\cos(\omega_n) = \sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)} > 0$. So $e^{-\omega_n \mathrm{i}} = \sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)} + \mathrm{i}(1/c)$. Since $\partial \Delta_1(\nu, \lambda)/\partial \lambda = 2\lambda + \nu \kappa(c) + \nu^2 \kappa(c) e^{-\lambda}$, it follows that

$$\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \Leftrightarrow 2\omega_n \mathrm{i} + \nu_n \kappa(c) + \nu_n^2 \kappa(c) \left[\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}} + \mathrm{i}\frac{1}{c} \right] = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \left[\nu_n \kappa(c) + \nu_n^2 \kappa(c)\sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)} \right] + \left[2\omega_n + \nu_n^2 \kappa(c)\frac{1}{c} \right] \mathrm{i} = 0,$$

which is impossible since both the real and the imaginary parts are strictly positive.

Next, we have $\partial \Delta_1(\nu, \lambda)/\partial \nu = \lambda \kappa(c) + 2\nu \kappa(c)[1 - e^{-\lambda}]$. Hence,

$$\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \nu} = \omega_n \mathrm{i}\kappa(c) + 2\nu_n \kappa(c) \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}} - \mathrm{i}\frac{1}{c} \right]$$

$$= 2\nu_n \kappa(c) \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}} \right] + \mathrm{i} \left[\omega_n \kappa(c) - \frac{2\nu\kappa(c)}{c} \right].$$

Now, since $\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)/\partial \lambda \neq 0$, applying the implicit function theorem, we deduce that there exists a C^1 map $\tilde{\lambda}_n : [\nu_n - \varepsilon_n, \nu_n + \varepsilon_n] \to \mathbb{C}$, such that $\tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu_n) = \lambda_n$ and $\Delta_1(\nu, \tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu)) = 0$, $\forall \nu \in [\nu_n - \varepsilon_n, \nu_n + \varepsilon_n]$. Thus, we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu_n)}{\mathrm{d}\nu} = -\frac{(\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)/\partial \nu)}{(\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)/\partial \lambda)} = -\frac{(\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)/\partial \nu)\overline{(\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)/\partial \lambda)}}{|(\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)/\partial \lambda)|^2}.$$

Notice that

$$\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \nu} \overline{\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \lambda}} = \left\{ 2\nu_n \kappa(c) \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}} \right) + \mathrm{i} \left[\omega_n \kappa(c) - \frac{2\nu_n \kappa(c)}{c} \right] \right\}$$

$$\times \left\{ \left[\nu_n \kappa(c) + \nu_n^2 \kappa(c)\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}} \right] - \left[2\omega_n + \nu_n^2 \kappa(c)\frac{1}{c} \right] \mathrm{i} \right\},$$

and it follows from the fact $\nu_n = c\omega_n$ that

$$\left|\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \lambda}\right|^2 \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu_n)}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)$$

$$= -\mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \nu}\overline{\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \lambda}}\right)$$

$$= -2\nu_n\kappa(c)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right)\left[\nu_n\kappa(c) + \nu_n^2\kappa(c)\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right]$$

$$\quad - \left[\omega_n\kappa(c) - \frac{2\nu_n\kappa(c)}{c}\right]\left[2\omega_n + \nu_n^2\kappa(c)\frac{1}{c}\right]$$

$$= -2c\omega_n\kappa(c)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right)\left[c\omega_n\kappa(c) + c^2\omega_n^2\kappa(c)\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right]$$

$$\quad - [\omega_n\kappa(c) - 2\omega_n\kappa(c)][2\omega_n + c\omega_n^2\kappa(c)]$$

$$= -2c^2\omega_n^2\kappa(c)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right)\left[\kappa(c) + c\omega_n\kappa(c)\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right]$$

$$\quad + \omega_n^2\kappa(c)[2 + c\omega_n\kappa(c)].$$

But, $c^2(1 - \sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)})\kappa(c) := 1$ and $\kappa(c) > 0$, so we have

$$\left|\frac{\partial \Delta_1(\nu_n, \lambda_n)}{\partial \lambda}\right|^2 \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu_n)}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right) = -2\omega_n^2\kappa(c)\left[1 + c\omega_n\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right]$$

$$\quad + \omega_n^2\kappa(c)[2 + c\omega_n\kappa(c)]$$

$$= c\omega_n^3\kappa(c)\left[\kappa(c) - 2\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right]$$

$$= c\kappa(c)^2\omega_n^3\left[1 - 2c^2\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right)\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right].$$

Set $y = \sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)} \in [0, 1)$. Then,

$$1 - 2c^2\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}}\right)^2\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{c^2}} = 1 - 2\frac{(1 - y)y}{(1 - y^2)} = 1 - 2\frac{y}{1 + y}.$$

Since the map $y \to 2(y/1 + y)$ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$ and is equal to 1 for $y = 1$, it implies that $\mathrm{Re}(\mathrm{d}\tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu_n)/\mathrm{d}\nu) > 0$.

The above analysis can be summarized as the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Assume that $c \geq 1$, then, for each $n \geq 0$, there exists a C^1 map $\tilde{\lambda}_n : [\nu_n - \varepsilon_n, \nu_n + \varepsilon_n] \to \mathbb{C}$, such that*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu_n) = \lambda_n = \omega_n\mathrm{i}, \quad \Delta_1(\nu, \tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu)) = 0 \; \forall \nu \in [\nu_n - \varepsilon_n, \nu_n + \varepsilon_n] \; and \; \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\lambda}_n(\nu_n)}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right) > 0.$$

For the symmetric case (6.5), we have $h(v) = v\hat{\kappa}(c)$ and $\hat{\Delta}_1(v, \lambda) := \lambda[\lambda + v\hat{\kappa}(c)] + v^2\hat{\kappa}(c)(1 - e^{-\lambda})$, where

$$\hat{\kappa}(c) = \frac{(1/c)^2}{1 + \sqrt{1 - (1/c^2)}} > 0.$$

Similarly, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.7. *Assume that $c \geq 1$, then, for each $n \geq 0$, there exists a C^1 map $\lambda_n^* : [\hat{v}_n - \varepsilon_n, \hat{v}_n + \varepsilon_n] \to \mathbb{C}$, such that*

$$\lambda_n^*(\hat{v}_n) = \lambda_n = \hat{\omega}_n \mathrm{i}, \quad \hat{\Delta}_1(v, \lambda_n^*(v)) = 0 \; \forall v \in [\hat{v}_n - \varepsilon_n, \hat{v}_n + \varepsilon_n] \; \textit{and} \; \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_n^*(\hat{v}_n)}{\mathrm{d}v}\right) > 0.$$

(c) Hopf bifurcation

By combining results on the essential growth rate of the linearized equations (equation (4.3)), the simplicity of the imaginary eigenvalues (lemma 4.9), the existence of purely imaginary eigenvalues (lemma 6.4) and the transversality condition (lemma 6.6), we are in a position to apply the centre manifold theorem 4.21 and proposition 4.22 in Magal & Ruan (2009a). Applying the Hopf bifurcation theorem proved in Hassard *et al.* (1981) to the reduced system, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 6.8. *Consider the curves defined by (6.4) in the (v, δ)-plane for some $c \geq 1$. Then, for each $n \geq 0$,*

$$v_n = c\left(\arcsin\left(-\frac{1}{c}\right) + 2(n+1)\pi\right)$$

is a Hopf bifurcation point for the system

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}u(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = Av(t) + F(v, \delta(v), \; u(t)), \; t \geq 0, \quad u(0) = x \in \overline{D(A)}, \quad (6.6)$$

around the branch of equilibrium points $\bar{s} = \bar{s}_{(v,\delta)}$. Moreover, the period of the bifurcating periodic orbits is close to $\omega = c\arcsin(-1/c) + \pi + 2n\pi$.

By using the same arguments as above (i.e. combining equation (4.3), lemmas 4.9, 6.5 and 6.7), we also obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 6.9. *Consider the curves defined by equation (6.5) in the (v, δ)-plane for some $c \geq 1$. Then, for each $n \geq 0$,*

$$v_n = c\left(\arcsin\left(\frac{1}{c}\right) + \pi + 2n\pi\right)$$

is a Hopf bifurcation point for the system (6.6) around the branch of equilibrium points $\bar{s} = \bar{s}_{(v,\delta)}$. Moreover, the period of the bifurcating periodic orbits is close to $\omega = c\arcsin(1/c) + \pi + 2n\pi$.

We would like to point out that we have studied the existence of Hopf bifurcation, while the stability of the bifurcating periodic solutions remains open.

Figure 3. (*a*) When $\rho = 30$ days, $\delta = 0.0033976$ and $1/v = 5$ in days, the trajectories converge to the positive equilibrium value. (*b*) There are sustained oscillations when $\rho = 100$ days, $\delta = 0.0016988$ and $1/v = 5$ in days, via Hopf bifurcation.


Figure 4. (*a*) The oscillations are amplified when $\rho = 200$ days, $\delta = 0.0033976$ and $1/v = 5$ in days. (*b*) Irregular oscillations when $\rho = 365$ days, $\delta = 0.0033976$ and $1/v = 5$ in days.

7. Numerical simulations

In this section, we present some numerical simulations for model (3.1). We consider the percentage of the population in a community. Recall that, by assumption 2.2, $\gamma(ka)$ is equal to δ if $a \geq \rho$ and 0 if $0 < a < \rho$, where $\rho = \tau/k$. Here, we fix $\tau = 30$, $v = 1/5\,\mathrm{days}^{-1}$, $\delta = 0.0034$, and let ρ vary from 0 to 365 days.

When $\rho = 30$ days, there is an endemic equilibrium that is asymptotically stable (figure 3*a*). When $\rho = 100$ days, the endemic equilibrium becomes unstable and there are periodic solutions via Hopf bifurcation (figure 3*b*). The oscillations are amplified when $\rho = 200$ days (figure 4*a*) and irregular when $\rho = 365$ days (figure 4*b*).

Recall that τ is the average number of amino acid substitutions before reinfection and k is the average number of amino acid substitutions per unit of time, that is, the mutation rate. Thus, the threshold ρ represents the time necessary to be reinfected after one infection. The simulations in figures 3 and 4 indicate that, for a given mutation rate, oscillations can start as early as 100 days after the previous infection and become irregular after about a year. It should be emphasized that ρ depends on the average number of amino acid substitutions after one infection and the mutation rate.

8. Discussion

Understanding the seasonal/periodic reoccurrence of influenza will be very helpful in designing successful vaccine programmes and introducing public-health interventions. However, the reasons for seasonal/periodic influenza epidemics are still not clear, even though various explanations have been proposed (Fine 1982; Dushoff *et al.* 2004; Levin *et al.* 2004).

Deterministic SIR models for some infectious diseases with permanent immunity have been shown to have an intrinsic tendency to oscillate periodically (Hethcote *et al.* 1981; Hethcote & Levin 1989; Ruan & Wang 2003; Dushoff *et al.* 2004; Tang *et al.* 2008, etc.). However, this type of models do not apply directly to influenza since immunity is not permanent for influenza. Dushoff *et al.* (2004) modelled antigenic drift by allowing individuals to lose their resistance to the circulating virus and re-enter the susceptible class after a few years, and used a periodic incidence function to describe seasonal changes. They showed that the large oscillations in incidence may be caused by undetectably small seasonal changes in the influenza transmission rate that are amplified by dynamical resonance. Castillo-Chavez *et al.* (1989), Andreasen *et al.* (1997), Lin *et al.* (1999), Andreasen (2003) and Nuño *et al.* (2005) developed multiple influenza A strain models with partial cross-immunity, and showed that such models exhibit sustained oscillations. Note that Castillo-Chavez *et al.* (1989) observed that sustained oscillations do not seem possible for a single-strain model, even with age-specific mortalities. For sustained oscillations to occur, they required at least an age-structured population and two or more co-circulating viral strains.

Pease (1987) used an age-structured type model to describe the evolutionary epidemiological mechanism of influenza A drift, in which the susceptible class is continually replenished because the pathogen changes genetically and immunologically from one epidemic to the next, causing previously immune hosts to become susceptible. However, applied to influenza A, the model only predicted damped oscillations. Inaba (2002) modified the model of Pease (1987) and conjectured that, for realistic parameter values, the modified model may exhibit sustained oscillations due to Hopf bifurcation. In this paper, we first modified the model of Pease (1987) and Inaba (2002) by using the age of infection (instead of the number of amino acid substitutions) as a variable. Then, we applied our recently established centre manifold theory for semilinear equations with non-dense domain (Magal & Ruan 2009*a*) to show that Hopf bifurcation occurs in the modified model. This demonstrates that the age-structured type evolutionary epidemiological model of influenza A drift has an intrinsic tendency to oscillate owing to the evolutionary and/or immunological changes of the influenza viruses.

References

Andreasen, V. 2003 Dynamics of annual influenza A epidemics with immune-selection. *J. Math. Biol.* **46**, 504–536. (doi:10.1007/s00285-002-0186-2)

Andreasen, V., Levin, S. A. & Lin, J. 1996 A model of influenza A drift evolution. *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* **76**, 421–424.

Andreasen, V., Lin, J. & Levin, S. A. 1997 The dynamics of circulating influenza strains conferring partial cross-immunity. *J. Math. Biol.* **35**, 825–842. (doi:10.1007/s002850050079)

Arendt, W. 1987 Resolvent positive operators. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **54**, 321–349. (doi:10.1112/plms/s3-54.2.321)

Arendt, W., Batty, C. J. K., Hieber, M. & Neubrander, F. 2001 *Vector-valued Laplace transforms and Cauchy problems.* Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Buonagurio, D. A., Nakada, S., Parvin, J. D., Krystal, M., Palese, P. & Fitch, W. M. 1986 Evolution of human influenza A viruses over 50 years: rapid, uniform rate of change in NS gene. *Science* **232**, 980–982. (doi:10.1126/science.2939560)

Castillo-Chavez, C., Hethcote, H. W., Andreasen, V., Levin, S. A. & Liu, W. M. 1989 Epidemiological models with age structure, proportionate mixing, and cross-immunity. *J. Math. Biol.* **27**, 233–258. (doi:10.1007/BF00275810)

CDC. 2009 Seasonal flu. See http://www.cdc.gov/flu/.

Cox, N. J. & Subbarao, K. 2000 Global epidemiology of influenza: past and present. *Annu. Rev. Med.* **51**, 407–421. (doi:10.1146/annurev.med.51.1.407)

Ducrot, A., Liu, Z. & Magal, P. 2008 Essential growth rate for bounded linear perturbation of non-densely defined Cauchy problems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **341**, 501–518. (doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2007.09.074)

Dushoff, J., Plotkin, J. B., Levin, S. A. & Earn, D. J. D. 2004 Dynamical response can account for seasonality of influenza epidemics. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **101**, 16 915–16 916. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0407293101)

Earn, D. J. D., Dushoff, J. & Levin, S. A. 2002 Ecology and evolution of the flu. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **17**, 334–340. (doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02502-8)

Engel, K.-J. & Nagel, R. 2000 *One parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations.* New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Fine, P. 1982 Applications of mathematical models to the epidemiology of influenza: a critique. In *Influenza models* (ed. P. Selby), pp. 15–85. Boston, MA: MTP Press.

Fitch, W. M., Bush, R. M., Bender, C. A. & Cox, N. J. 1997 Long term trends in the evolution of H(3) HA1 human influenza type A. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 7712–7718. (doi:10.1073/pnas.94.15.7712)

Hassard, B. D., Kazarinoff, N. D. & Wan, Y. H. 1981 *Theory and applications of Hopf Birfurcation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hethcote, H. W. & Levin, S. A. 1989 Periodicity in epidemiological models. In *Applied mathematical ecology.* Biomathematics texts, vol. 18 (eds S. A. Levin, T. G. Hallam & L. J. Gross), pp 193–211. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Hethcote, H. W., Stech, H. W. & van den Driessche, P. 1981 Periodicity and stability in epidemic models: a survey. In *Differential equations and applications in ecology, epidemics and population problems* (eds S. N. Busenberg & K. L. Cook), pp. 65–82. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Iannelli, M. 1994 *Mathematical theory of age-structured population dynamics.* Pisa, Italy: Giadini Editori e Stampatori.

Ina, Y. & Gojobori, T. 1994 Statistical analysis of nucleotide-sequences of the hemagglutinin gene of human influenza A viruses. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **91**, 8388–8392. (doi:10.1073/pnas.91.18.8388)

Inaba, H. 1998 Mathematical analysis for an evolutionary epidemic model. In *Mathematical methods in medical and health sciences* (ed. M. A. Horn, G. Simonett & G. Webb), pp. 213–236. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Inaba, H. 2002 Epidemic threshold and stability in an evolutionary epidemic model. In *Mathematical approaches for emerging and reemerging infectious diseases: models, methods, and theory.* IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 126 (eds C. Castillo-Chavez, S. Blower, P. van d. Driessche, D. Kirscher & A.-A. Yakubu), pp. 337–359. New York, NY: Springer.

Kellermann, H. & Hieber, M. 1989 Integrated semigroups. *J. Funct. Anal.* **84**, 160–180. (doi:10.1016/0022-1236(89)90116-X)

Kermack, W. O. & McKendrick, A. G. 1927 A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proc. R. Soc.* **115**, 700–721. (doi:10.1098/rspa.1927.0118)

Kermack, W. O. & McKendrick, A. G. 1932 Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics. II. The problem of endemicity. *Proc. R. Soc.* **138**, 55–83. (doi:10.1098/rspa.1932.0171)

Kermack, W. O. & McKendrick, A. G. 1933 Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics–III. Further studies of the problem of endemicity. *Proc. R. Soc.* **141A**, 94–122.

Koelle, K., Cobey, S., Grenfell, B. & Pascual, M. 2006 Epochal evolution shapes the phylodynamics of interpandemic influenza A (H3N2) in humans. *Science* **314**, 1898–1903. (doi:10.1126/science.1132745)

Levin, S. A., Dushoff, J. & Plotkin, J. B. 2004 Evolution and persistence of influenza A and other diseases. *Math. Biosci.* **188**, 17–28. (doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2003.08.010)

Lin, J., Andreasen, V. & Levin, S. A. 1999 Dynamics of influenza A drift: the linear three-strain model. *Math. Biosci.* **162**, 33–51. (doi:10.1016/S0025-5564(99)00042-5)

Lin, J., Andreasen, V., Casagrandi, R. & Levin, S. A. 2003 Traveling waves in a model of influenza A drift. *J. Theoret. Biol.* **222**, 437–445.

Magal, P. 2001 Compact attractors for time periodic age-structured population models. *Electr. J. Diff. Equations* **2001**, 1–35.

Magal, P. & Ruan, S. 2007 On integrated semigroups and age structured models in L^p spaces. *Diff. Integr. Equations* **20**, 197–239.

Magal, P. & Ruan, S. 2009*a* Center manifolds for semilinear equations with non-dense domain and applications on Hopf bifurcation in age structured models. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **202**, no. 951. (doi:10.1090/S0065-9266-09-00568-7)

Magal, P. & Ruan, S. 2009*b* On semilinear Cauchy problems with non-densely defined domain. *Adv. Diff. Equations* **14**, 1041–1084.

Neubrander, F. 1988 Integrated semigroups and their application to the abstract Cauchy problem. *Pacific J. Math.* **135**, 111–155.

Nuño, M., Feng, Z., Martcheva, M. &. Castillo-Chavez, C. 2005 Dynamics of two-strain influenza with isolation and partial cross-immunity. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **65**, 964–982. (doi:10.1137/S003613990343882X)

Pease, C. M. 1987 An evolutionary epidemiological mechanism with application to type A influenza. *Theoret. Pop. Biol.* **31**, 422–452. (doi:10.1016/0040-5809(87)90014-1)

Ruan, S. & Wang, W. 2003 Dynamical behaviour of an epidemic model with a nonlinear incidence rate. *J. Diff. Equations* **188**, 135–163. (doi:10.1016/S0022-0396(02)00089-X)

Schweiger, B., Zadow, I. & Heckler, R. 2002 Antigenic drfit and variability of influenza viruses. *Med. Microbiol. Immunol.* **191**, 133–138. (doi:10.1007/s00430-002-0132-3)

Shih, A. C.-C., Hsiao, T.-C., Ho, M.-S. & Li, W.-H. 2007 Simultaneous amino acid substitutions at antigenic sites drive influenza A hemagglutinin evolutiion. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 6283–6288. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0701396104)

Smith, D. J., Lapedes, A. S., de Jong, J. C., Bestebroer, T. M. Rimmelzwaan, G. F. Osterhaus, A. D. M. E. & Fouchier, R. A. M. 2004 Mapping the antigenic and genetic evolution of influenza virus. *Science* **305**, 371–376. (doi:10.1126/science.1097211)

Tang, Y., Huang, D., Ruan, S. & Zhang, W. 2008 Coexistence of limit cycles and homoclinic loops in an SIRS model with a nonlinear incidence rate. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **69**, 621–639. (doi:10.1137/070700966)

Thieme, H. R. 1990*a* Semiflows generated by Lipschitz perturbations of non-densely defined operators. *Diff. Integr. Equations* **3**, 1035–1066.

Thieme, H. R. 1990*b* 'Integrated semigroups' and integrated solutions to abstract Cauchy problems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **152**, 416–447. (doi:10.1016/0022-247X(90)90074-P)

Thieme, H. R. 1997 Quasi-compact semigroups via bounded perturbation. In *Advances in mathematical population dynamics-molecules, cells and man* (eds O. Arino, D. Axelrod & M. Kimmel), pp. 691–713. River Edge, NJ: World Scientific Publishers.

Thieme, H. R. & Yang, J. 2002 An endemic model with variable re-infection rate and application to influenza. *Math. Biosci.* **180**, 207–235. (doi:10.1016/S0025-5564(02)00102-5)

Treanor, J. 2004 Influenza vaccine—outmaneuvering antigenic schift and drift. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **350**, 218–220. (doi:10.1056/NEJMp038238)

Viboud, C., Bjørnstad, O. N., Smith, D. L., Simonsen, L., Miller, M. A. & Grenfell, B. T. 2006 Synchrony, waves, and spatial hierarchies in the spread of influenza. *Science* **312**, 447–451. (doi:10.1126/science.1125237)

Webb, G. F. 1985 *Theory of nonlinear age-dependent population dynamics.* New York, NY: Marcel Dekker.

Webb, G. F. 1987 An operator-theoretic formulation of asynchronous exponential growth. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **303**, 155–164. (doi:10.2307/2000695)

WHO. 2009 Influenza. See http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs211/en/index.html.