



Published in final edited form as:

Math Biosci. 2010 September ; 227(1): 56–67. doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2010.06.002.

Qualitative Analysis of Models with Different Treatment Protocols to Prevent Antibiotic Resistance

Hong-Rui Sun^{a,*}, Xinxin Lu^{b,†}, and Shigui Ruan^{c,‡}

^a School of Mathematics and Statistics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu 730000, China

^b Department of Clinical Laboratory, Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100041, China

^c Department of Mathematics, University of Miami, P. O. Box 249085, Coral Gables, FL 33124-4250, USA

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the qualitative analysis of two models (Bonhoeffer et al., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **94** (1997), 12106–12111) for different treatment protocols to prevent antibiotic resistance. Detailed qualitative analysis about the local or global stability of the equilibria of both models is carried out in term of the basic reproduction number R_0 . For the model with a single antibiotic therapy, we show that if $R_0 < 1$, then the disease-free equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable; if $R_0 > 1$, then the disease endemic equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable. For the model with multiple antibiotic therapies, stabilities of various equilibria are analyzed and combining treatment is shown better than cycling treatment. Numerical simulations are performed to show that the dynamical properties depend intimately upon the parameters.

Keywords

Antibiotic resistance; mathematical model; basic reproduction number; equilibrium; stability

1 Introduction

Infections caused by antibiotic-resistant bacteria, such as methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) and Vancomycin-resistant *enterococci* (VRE), are increasing rapidly throughout the world and pose a serious threat to public health (Levy and Marshall, 2004; Grundmann et al., 2006; Spellberg et al., 2008). The transmission dynamics of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in hospitals are complex which involve the patients, health care workers, and their interactions. Antibiotic exposure is crucial to the emergence and spread of these resistant bacteria (D'Agata et al., 2007). Compared to infections caused by antimicrobial-susceptible bacteria, infections with antimicrobial-resistant bacteria cause higher mortality rates, longer hospital stays and greater hospital costs (Daxboeck et al., 2006). It was estimated that in 2005 the deaths in patients with invasive methicillin-resistant

*Research was supported by NSFC (10801065) and NSF of Gansu Province of China (0803RJZA096).

†Research was partially supported by NSFC (30970126).

‡Research was partially supported by NIH (R01GM083607).

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

S. aureus in the United States exceeded the total number of deaths due to HIV/AIDS in the same year (Klebens et al., 2007).

Recently, mathematical models have been extensively used to simulate the spread of the antibiotic-resistant bacteria, to identify various factors responsible for the prevalence of the antibiotic-resistant bacteria, to examine different antibiotic treatments, and to help design effective control programs (Austin and Anderson, 1999; Bonhoeffer et al., 1997; Bonten et al., 2001; Bergstrom et al., 2004; Webb et al., 2005; Boldin et al., 2007; D'Agata et al., 2007). We refer to the survey papers of Grundmann and Hellriegel (2006) and Temime et al. (2008) for more details and references on this topic.

To generate predictions concerning the effects of various patterns of antibiotic treatment at the population level, Bonhoeffer et al. (1997) proposed two mathematical models. In the first model, patients with bacterial infections may be treated with a single antibiotic. The model consists of three ordinary differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{dt} = \Lambda - dx - bx(y_w + y_r) + r_w y_w + r_r y_r + fh(1-s)y_w, \\ \frac{dy_w}{dt} = (bx - c - r_w - fh)y_w, \\ \frac{dy_r}{dt} = (bx - c - r_r)y_r + fh s y_w, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $x(t)$, $y_w(t)$, and $y_r(t)$ denote the density of uninfected patients, infected by sensitive (wild type) bacteria to the treating antibiotic, and infected by resistant bacteria to the treating antibiotic at time t , respectively. We refer to Fig. 1A in Bonhoeffer et al. (1997) for a chart diagram for the three compartment model. Λ is the recruitment rate of the population, d is the per capita removal rate from the population, b is the transmission rate parameter, c is the death rate of the infected host, which includes natural and disease-associated mortality. r_w and r_r are the rates of patients infected with wild type and resistant bacteria recover from the infection in the absence of treatment. Patients infected with wild type bacteria are removed from the wild type infected compartment at a rate fh , where f is a scaling parameter (between 0 and 1) reflecting the fraction of patients treated and h is the maximum rate when all patients are treated. A fraction s of treated wt-infected develops resistance during treatment. Bonhoeffer et al. (1997) considered treatment with a single antibiotic and resistance to that antibiotic and analyzed the model to predict the consequences of different usage patterns.

In the second model, two antibiotics A and B are used. The model takes the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{dt} = \Lambda - dx - bx(y_w + y_a + y_b + y_{ab}) + r_w y_w + r_a y_a + r_b y_b + r_{ab} y_{ab} + h(1-q)f_{ab} y_w + h(1-s)((f_a + f_b)y_w + f_a y_b + f_b y_a + f_{ab}(y_a + y_b)), \\ \frac{dy_w}{dt} = (bx - c - r_w - h(f_a + f_b + f_{ab}))y_w, \\ \frac{dy_a}{dt} = (bx - c - r_a - h(f_b + f_{ab}))y_a + h s f_a y_w, \\ \frac{dy_b}{dt} = (bx - c - r_b - h(f_a + f_{ab}))y_b + h s f_b y_w, \\ \frac{dy_{ab}}{dt} = (bx - c - r_{ab})y_{ab} + h s (f_{ab}(y_a + y_b) + f_a y_b + f_b y_a) + q h f_{ab} y_w, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where the variables are $x(t)$ for the susceptible, $y_w(t)$, $y_a(t)$, $y_b(t)$ and $y_{ab}(t)$ for patients infected with wild type (wt), A-resistant (A-res), B-resistant (B-res), and AB-resistant (AB-res) bacteria, respectively (see Fig. 1B in Bonhoeffer et al. (1997) for a chart diagram for the model). Λ is the recruitment rate of the population, d is the per capita removal rate from the population, b is the transmission rate parameter, c is the death rate of the infected host, which includes natural and disease-associated mortality. r_w , r_a , r_b and r_{ab} are the recovery

rates of wt, A-res, B-res and AB-res infected, respectively; f_a, f_b and f_{ab} reflect the fraction of patients treated with antibiotic A, B, or AB, they fulfill the relation $0 \leq f_a, f_b, f_{ab} \leq 1$, and $f_a + f_b + f_{ab} \leq 1$. h is the maximum rate when all patients are treated. A fraction s or q of treated wt-infected develop resistance with single antibiotic treatment or two antibiotics treatment. Bonhoeffer et al. (1997) analyzed the population-level consequences of different usage patterns of the two antibiotics and made various conclusions based on numerical analysis of their models. In this paper we provide detailed qualitative analysis of the two mathematical models (1.1) and (1.2), including the existence and stability of all possible equilibria, and numerical simulations to support these conclusions.

We would like to make some remarks about the comparisons of models (1.1) and (1.2) with the competition models of resources (see, for example, Amarasekar [1] and Smith and Li [22]) and the multi-strain models in epidemiology (see Bremermann and Thieme [9] and Webb et al. [25]). Firstly models (1.1) and (1.2) are not competition models since the two strains of bacteria, sensitive and resistant, are not competitors. Secondly, patients infected with the sensitive strain can be infected with the resistant strain due to the treatment of antibiotics or the interaction from the contaminated health-care workers, and patients infected with the resistant strain can be cleaned due to treatment. So models (1.1) and (1.2) are different from the multi-strain models in epidemiology (see Bremermann and Thieme [9]) and the two-resistant strains model studied by Webb et al. [25]. Moreover, our results are not about which strain will win, it is about how the resistant strains establish in the patients and how to control that.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we consider the compartment model (1.1) with a single antibiotic therapy and evaluate a threshold, the basic reproduction number R_0 (Brauer and Castillo-Chavez, 2000), for two cases: (i) in the absence of treatment $fh = 0$ and (ii) with treatment $fh > 0$. The disease-free equilibrium always exists and is globally stable if $R_0 < 1$ and the disease-endemic equilibrium exists and is globally stable if $R_0 > 1$. Section 3 is devoted to discussing the existence and stability of equilibria of the model (1.2) with multiple antibiotic therapies. In order to understand how antibiotic usage patterns may be optimized to preserve or restore antibiotic effectiveness, we consider four different modes of antibiotic therapy, namely, (i) in the absence of treatment $f_a = f_b = f_{ab} = 0$; (ii) cycling treatment $f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0$ or $f_b = 1, f_a = f_{ab} = 0$; (iii) 50-50 treatment $f_a = f_b = \frac{1}{2}, f_{ab} = 0$; and (iv) combination treatment $f_a = f_b = 0, f_{ab} = 1$. We present stability results for all different cases. In section 4, we present some numerical simulations to illustrate the obtained results and present a brief discussion.

2 The Model with a Single Antibiotic Therapy

In this section, we discuss the existence and stability of equilibria of the compartment model (1.1). In this model, we assume that the fitness cost associated with resistance is manifest by a higher rate of clearance of the infection (recovery) of hosts infected with resistant bacteria relative to those infected with sensitive ($r_r > r_w$) and the death rate of infected patients is higher than that of susceptible one, that is $c > d$ (Bonhoeffer et al., 1997).

Because of the biological meaning of the components ($x(t), y_w(t), y_r(t)$), we focus on the model in the first octant of R^3 . We first consider the existence of equilibria of system (1.1). By some calculation, we find that system (1.1) has at most three equilibria:

$$E_0 = (\Lambda/d, 0, 0), \quad E_r = \left(\frac{c+r_r}{b}, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_r}{bc} \right),$$

and

$$\tilde{E} = \left(\frac{c+r_w+fh}{b}, \frac{(r_r - r_w - fh)(\Lambda - d(c+r_w+fh)/b)}{c(r_r - r_w - fh(1-s))}, \frac{fhs(\Lambda - d(c+r_w+fh)/b)}{c(r_r - r_w - fh(1-s))} \right),$$

under certain conditions (to be specified later).

We define the basic reproduction number as follows

$$R_0 = \max \left\{ \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w+fh)}, \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_r)} \right\}.$$

First we determine the stability of the disease-free equilibrium E_0 . The Jacobian matrix of system (1.1) at E_0 is given by

$$J_{E_0} = \begin{bmatrix} -d & -\frac{b\Lambda}{d} + r_w + fh(1-s) & -\frac{b\Lambda}{d} + r_r \\ 0 & \frac{b\Lambda}{d} - c - r_w - fh & 0 \\ 0 & fhs & \frac{b\Lambda}{d} - d - r_r \end{bmatrix}.$$

We can see that E_0 is locally stable if $R_0 < 1$.

In the following, we shall study the existence and stability property of other equilibria of model (1.1). We consider two cases.

2.1 In the absence of treatment

$$fh = 0$$

We first consider the case of absence of therapy, that is $fh = 0$. To deduce the threshold for the antibiotic resistance in the patient, we analyze the existence of equilibria and their stability for model (1.1). Now the basic reproduction number is $R_0 = \frac{br}{d(c+r_w)}$. By examining the linearized form of system (1.1) at the equilibrium, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.1—Assume $fh = 0$, then $R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w)}$.

- i. If $R_0 < 1$, then system (1.1) has a disease-free equilibrium $E_0 = (\Lambda/d, 0, 0)$, which is locally asymptotically stable.
- ii. If $R_0 > 1$, then system (1.1) has two or three equilibria, the disease-free equilibrium $E_0 = (\Lambda/d, 0, 0)$, which is a saddle point and unstable, the nontrivial equilibrium

$$E_w = \left(\frac{c+r_w}{b}, \frac{d(c+r_w)(R_0 - 1)}{bc}, 0 \right),$$

which is locally asymptotically stable, and another nontrivial equilibrium

$$E_r = \left(\frac{c+r_r}{b}, 0, \frac{d(c+r_w)(R_0-1)}{bc} - \frac{d(r_r-r_w)}{bc} \right),$$

which is unstable if it exists.

2.2 With treatment

$$fh > 0$$

We first consider the case $r_r < r_w + fh$. In this case

$$R_0 = \max \left\{ \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w+fh)}, \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_r)} \right\} = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_r)}$$

and system (1.1) has at most two equilibria, the disease-free equilibrium E_0 and the semitrivial equilibrium $E_r = \left(\frac{c+r_r}{b}, 0, \frac{d(c+r_r)(R_0-1)}{bc} \right)$ if $R_0 > 1$.

The Jacobian matrix of system (1.1) at E_r is

$$J_{E_r} = \begin{bmatrix} -R_0d - \frac{dr_r}{c}(R_0-1) & -c - r_r + r_w + fh(1-s) & -c \\ 0 & r_r - r_w - fh & 0 \\ d(1+r_r/c)(R_0-1) & fhs & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows that E_r is locally asymptotically stable under the assumption of $R_0 > 1$.

From the above discussion, we have the following result.

Theorem 2.2—Suppose $r_r < r_w + fh$, then $R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_r)}$. If $R_0 < 1$, then system (1.1) has a disease-free equilibrium $E_0 = (\Lambda/d, 0, 0)$, which is locally asymptotically stable. If $R_0 > 1$, then E_0 is unstable, and the semitrivial equilibrium $E_r = \left(\frac{c+r_r}{b}, 0, \frac{d(c+r_r)(R_0-1)}{bc} \right)$ exists and is locally asymptotically stable.

Next we discuss the case $r_r > r_w + fh$. In this case

$$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w+fh)}$$

and system (1.1) may have three equilibria, the disease-free equilibrium E_0 , the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strain E_r and a positive equilibrium $\tilde{E} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}_w, \tilde{y}_r)$. For convenience, we denote

$$\tilde{y}_w = \frac{(r_r - r_w - fh)(\Lambda - d(c+r_w+fh)/b)}{c(r_r - r_w - fh(1-s))}, \quad \tilde{y}_r = \frac{fhs(\Lambda - d(c+r_w+fh)/d)}{c(r_r - r_w + fh(1-s))}.$$

From the expressions of \tilde{y}_w and \tilde{y}_r , we know that \tilde{E} exists if and only if $R_0 > 1$. The Jacobian matrix of system (1.1) at \tilde{E} is

$$J_{\tilde{E}} = \begin{bmatrix} -d - b(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_r) & -c - fhs & r_r - r_w - fh - c \\ b\tilde{y}_w & 0 & 0 \\ b\tilde{y}_r & fhs & fh + r_w - r_r \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, the corresponding characteristic equation is

$$\lambda^3 + a_1\lambda^2 + a_2\lambda + a_3 = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= b(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_r) + r_r - r_w - fh + d, \\ a_2 &= bc(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_r) + b\tilde{y}_w(r_r - r_w - fh(1 - s)) + d + r_r - r_w + fh, \\ a_3 &= bc\tilde{y}_w(r_r - r_w - fh(1 - s)). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by the relation

$$(r_w + fh - r_r)\tilde{y}_r + fhs\tilde{y}_w = 0,$$

we have

$$a_2 = bc\tilde{y}_w \left(1 + \frac{fhs}{r_r - r_w - fh} \right) + b\tilde{y}_w(r_r - r_w - fh(1 - s)) + d(r_r - r_w + fh).$$

Thus, in view of the new expression of a_2 , it is easy to see that $a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0$ and $a_1 a_2 - a_3 > 0$. By Routh-Hurwitz criteria (see Korn and Korn, 2000, Section 1.6-6(b)), all roots of equation (2.1) have negative real parts. Therefore, when $R_0 > 1$, the positive equilibrium \tilde{E} is locally stable. Thus, we have the following conclusion.

Theorem 2.3—Assume $r_r > r_w + fh$, then $R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w+fh)}$. If $R_0 < 1$, then system (1.1) has a disease-free equilibrium $E_0 = (\Lambda/d, 0, 0)$, which is locally asymptotically stable. If $R_0 > 1$, then E_0 is unstable and the disease endemic equilibrium

$$\tilde{E} = \left(\frac{c+r_w+fh}{b}, \frac{d(c+r_w+fh)(r_r - r_w - fh)(R_0 - 1)}{bc(r_r - r_w - fh(1 - s))}, \frac{dfhs(c+r_w+fh)(R_0 - 1)}{bc(r_r - r_w - fh(1 - s))} \right)$$

is locally asymptotically stable. Furthermore, if $R_0 > 1 + \frac{r_r - r_w - fh}{c+r_w+fh}$, then the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strain

$$E_r = \left(\frac{c+r_r}{b}, 0, \frac{d}{bc}((c+r_w+fh)(R_0-1) - (r_r - r_w - fh)) \right)$$

exists and is unstable.

To explore the global stability of the positive equilibrium, we define the new variables

$$X = \frac{d}{\Lambda}x, \quad Y_w = \frac{d}{\Lambda}y_w, \quad Y_r = \frac{d}{\Lambda}y_r,$$

and parameters

$$\tilde{t} = dt, \quad \tilde{b} = \frac{b}{d}, \quad \tilde{r}_w = \frac{r_w}{d}, \quad \tilde{r}_r = \frac{r_r}{d}, \quad \tilde{h} = \frac{h}{d}, \quad \tilde{c} = \frac{c}{d}.$$

Using these changes of variables and parameters, system (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX}{d\tilde{t}} = 1 - X - \frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{d}X(Y_w + Y_r) + \tilde{r}_w Y_w + \tilde{r}_r Y_r + f \tilde{h} (1 - s)Y_w, \\ \frac{dY_w}{d\tilde{t}} = \left(\frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{d}X - \tilde{c} - \tilde{r}_w - f \tilde{h} \right) Y_w, \\ \frac{dY_r}{d\tilde{t}} = \left(\frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{d}X - \tilde{c} - \tilde{r}_r \right) Y_r + f \tilde{h} s Y_w \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

with $\tilde{N}(t) = X(t) + Y_w(t) + Y_r(t)$. The equation for the total population \tilde{N} is

$$\frac{d\tilde{N}}{d\tilde{t}} = 1 - X - \tilde{c} Y_w - \tilde{c} Y_r. \quad (2.3)$$

Clearly, $\tilde{N} \in (0, 1]$ since at the disease-free equilibrium $\tilde{N} = X = 1$ and the natural expectation is that the spread of the disease in the population will reduce \tilde{N} (that is $\tilde{N} < 1$). Therefore, we study the stability of the model (2.2) in the region

$$D = \{(X, Y_w, Y_r) \in R_+^3 : 0 \leq X + Y_w + Y_r \leq 1\}.$$

Consider the subset D^* of D given by

$$D^* = \{(X, Y_w, Y_r) \in D : X + \tilde{c} Y_w + \tilde{c} Y_r = 1\}.$$

From (2.3), it is obvious that $\frac{d\tilde{N}}{d\tilde{t}} = 0$ in D^* . If $X + \tilde{c} Y_w + \tilde{c} Y_r > 1$, then $\frac{d\tilde{N}}{d\tilde{t}} < 0$ and if $X + \tilde{c} Y_w + \tilde{c} Y_r < 1$, then $\frac{d\tilde{N}}{d\tilde{t}} > 0$. It follows that D^* is a positively invariant set in D . Thus the ω -limit set

of each solution of model (2.2) is contained in D^* . Moreover, it is easy to see that \tilde{E}_0 attracts the region $D_0 = \{(X, Y_w, Y_r) \in D : Y_w = Y_r = 0\}$.

In the next result, we will show that there cannot be any closed orbit around the equilibrium.

Lemma 2.4—The model (2.2) has no periodic orbits, homoclinic orbits or polygons in D^* .

Proof—Let f_1, f_2, f_3 denote the three functions on the right hand sides in system (2.2), respectively. Denote $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3)^T$ (T denotes transpose), $g(X, Y_w, Y_r) = \frac{1}{XY_w Y_r} \cdot r \times f$, (where $r = (X, Y_w, Y_r)^T$), then

$$g \cdot f = 0.$$

By straightforward calculation, we have in the interior of domain D that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{curl}g)_1 &= \frac{\partial g_3}{\partial Y_w} - \frac{\partial g_2}{\partial Y_r} = \frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{dY_r} - \frac{\tilde{Y}_w + f\tilde{h}(1-s)}{XY_r} - \frac{\tilde{f}hs}{Y_r^2} + \frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{dY_w} - \frac{\tilde{r}_r}{XY_w}, \\ (\text{curl}g)_2 &= -\frac{\partial g_3}{\partial X} + \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial Y_r} = -\frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{dY_r} - \frac{\tilde{r}_r}{X^2} - \frac{1+(f\tilde{h}+\tilde{r}_w)Y_w}{X^2 Y_r}, \\ (\text{curl}g)_3 &= \frac{\partial g_2}{\partial X} - \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial Y_w} = -\frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{dY_w} - \frac{1+\tilde{r}_r Y_r}{X^2 Y_w} - \frac{\tilde{r}_w + f\tilde{h}(1-s)}{X^2} - \frac{\tilde{f}hs}{XY_r}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the normal vector $\mathbf{n} = (1, \tilde{c}, \tilde{c})$ on D^* , it can be shown that

$$\text{curl}g \cdot (1, \tilde{c}, \tilde{c}) = -(\tilde{c} - 1) \frac{\tilde{b}\Lambda}{d} \left(\frac{1}{r_r} + \frac{1}{r_w} \right) - \frac{\tilde{Y}_w + f\tilde{h}}{XY_r} - \frac{f\tilde{h}s}{Y_r^2} - \frac{\tilde{r}_r}{XY_w} - \frac{\tilde{r}_r}{X^2} - \frac{1+(f\tilde{h}+\tilde{r}_w)Y_w}{X^2 Y_r} - \frac{1+\tilde{r}_r Y_r}{X^2 Y_w} - \frac{\tilde{r}_w + f\tilde{h}(1-s)}{X^2} - \frac{f\tilde{h}s}{XY_r}.$$

In view of the assumption of $\tilde{c} > 1$, we have that $\text{curl}g \cdot (1, \tilde{c}, \tilde{c})$ is negative on $D \setminus \partial D$. From Corollary 4.2 in Busenberg and van den Driessche (1990), there are no solutions of the stated type in $D \setminus \partial D$. The desired result is obtained.

From Theorems 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, the following theorem can be obtained.

Theorem 2.5—For system (1.1), the following results hold.

- i. Assume $f\tilde{h} < r_r - r_w$, then system (1.1) has at most three equilibria E_0, E_r, \tilde{E} with $R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w+f\tilde{h})}$. If, $R_0 > 1$ then the DFE E_0 is globally asymptotically stable, if $R_0 < 1$, E_0 is unstable, the positive equilibrium \tilde{E} is globally asymptotically stable, the semitrivial equilibrium E_r is unstable if it exists.
- ii. Assume $f\tilde{h} > r_r - r_w$, then system (1.1) has at most two equilibria E_0, E_r with $R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_r)}$. If $R_0 < 1$, then the DFE E_0 is globally stable, if $R_0 > 1$, E_0 is unstable, the semitrivial equilibrium E_r is globally asymptotically stable.

The above results can be summarized in the following chart (see Table 1. BRN=Basic Reproduction Number).

3 The Model with Multiple Antibiotic Therapies

In this section we consider model (1.2), where we assume that the fitness cost associated with resistance is manifest by a higher rate of clearance of the infection (recovery) of hosts

infected with resistant bacteria relative to those infected with sensitive bacteria ($r_r > r_w$) and the death rate of infected patients is higher than that of susceptible one, that is $c > d$ (Bonhoeffer et al., 1997).

Because of the components of $(x(t), y_w(t), y_a(t), y_b(t), y_{ab}(t))$ have to be nonnegative, we focus on the model in the first octant of R^5 . We first consider the existence of equilibria of system (1.2). For any values of parameters, model (1.2) always has a disease-free equilibrium $E_0 = (\Lambda/d, 0, 0, 0, 0)$.

We first determine the stability of the disease-free equilibrium E_0 . The Jacobian matrix of system (1.2) at E_0 is

$$J_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -d & j_{12} & j_{13} & j_{14} & j_{15} \\ 0 & j_{22} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & hsf_a & j_{33} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & hsf_a & 0 & j_{44} & 0 \\ 0 & hqfab & hs(f_{ab}+f_b) & hs(f_a+f_{ab}) & j_{55} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} j_{12} &= -b\Lambda/d + r_w + h(1-q)f_{ab} + h(1-s)(f_a + f_b), & j_{13} &= -b\Lambda/d + r_a + h(1-s)(f_b + f_{ab}), \\ j_{14} &= -b\Lambda/d + r_b + h(1-s)(f_a + f_{ab}), & j_{15} &= -b\Lambda/d + r_{ab}, \\ j_{22} &= b\Lambda/d - c - r_w - h(f_a + f_b + f_{ab}), & j_{33} &= b\Lambda/d - c - r_a - h(f_b + f_{ab}), \\ j_{44} &= b\Lambda/d - c - r_b - h(f_a + f_{ab}), & j_{55} &= b\Lambda/d - c - r_{ab}. \end{aligned}$$

The eigenvalues of J_0 are $-d, j_{22}, j_{33}, j_{44}, j_{55}$. So from the expressions of $j_{ii} (i = 2, 3, 4, 5)$, we can see that the steady state E_0 is locally asymptotically stable if

$$b\Lambda/d - c < \min\{r_w + h(f_a + f_b + f_{ab}), r_a + h(f_b + f_{ab}), r_b + h(f_a + f_{ab}), r_{ab}\},$$

and unstable if

$$b\Lambda/d - c > \min\{r_w + h(f_a + f_b + f_{ab}), r_a + h(f_b + f_{ab}), r_b + h(f_a + f_{ab}), r_{ab}\}.$$

By using the next generation operator approach as described by Diekmann, Heesterbeek, and Metz (1999), we obtain the basic reproduction number as follows

$$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d} \frac{1}{c + \min\{r_w + h(f_a + f_b + f_{ab}), r_a + h(f_b + f_{ab}), r_b + h(f_a + f_{ab}), r_{ab}\}}.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& b\Lambda/d - c - \min\{r_w \\
& \quad + h(f_a \\
& \quad + f_b + f_{ab}), r_a + h(f_b \\
& \quad + f_{ab}), r_b + h(f_a \\
& \quad + f_{ab}), r_{ab}\} = (R_0 - 1) \min\{r_w \\
& \quad + h(f_a \\
& \quad + f_b + f_{ab}), r_a + h(f_b \\
& \quad + f_{ab}), r_b + h(f_a \\
& \quad + f_{ab}), r_{ab}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have the following result.

Theorem 3.1—For model (1.2), the disease-free equilibrium E_0 is locally asymptotically stable if $R_0 < 1$ and unstable if $R_0 > 1$.

In order to analyze the stability of other equilibria of model (1.2), we consider four cases.

3.1 In the absence of treatment

$$f_a = f_b = f_{ab} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.2—When $f_a = f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, for system (1.2), there are at most five possible steady state

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_0 = (\Lambda/d, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\
& E_w = \left(\frac{c+r_w}{b}, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_w}{bc}, 0, 0, 0 \right), \quad E_a = \left(\frac{c+r_a}{b}, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_a}{bc}, 0, 0 \right), \\
& E_b = \left(\frac{c+r_b}{b}, 0, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_b}{bc}, 0 \right), \quad E_{ab} = \left(\frac{c+r_{ab}}{b}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_{ab}}{bc} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The existence and stability of equilibria are described in Table 2.

Proof—When $f_a = f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, the Jacobian matrix of system (1.2) at the nontrivial equilibrium E_w is

$$J_{E_w} = \begin{bmatrix} -d - b\left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_w}{bc}\right) & -c & -c - r_w + r_a & -c - r_w + r_b & -c - r_w + r_{ab} \\ -b\left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_w}{bc}\right)y_w & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r_w - r_a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & r_w - r_b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r_w - r_{ab} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We can see that the eigenvalues of J_{E_w} are $r_w - r_a$, $r_w - r_b$, $r_w - r_{ab}$, and the roots of the polynomial equation

$$\lambda^2 + \left(d + b \left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_w}{bc} \right) \right) \lambda + bc \left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_w}{bc} \right) = 0.$$

Thus, under the condition $r_w < \min\{r_a, r_b, r_{ab}\}$, if $R_0 < 1$, namely $\frac{\Lambda}{c} < \frac{d}{b} + \frac{dr_w}{bc}$, the equilibria E_w, E_a, E_b, E_{ab} do not exist and the trivial equilibrium E_0 is locally stable. If $R_0 > 1$, all eigenvalues of J_{E_w} have negative real parts, so E_w is locally stable. Equilibria E_a, E_b, E_{ab} are unstable, since their corresponding Jacobian matrices have positive eigenvalues $r_a - r_w, r_b - r_w, r_{ab} - r_w$, respectively.

For the other cases, the discussion is similar, we omit it here.

3.2 Cycling treatment

$$f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0 \text{ or } f_b = 1, f_a = f_{ab} = 0$$

When $f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, system (1.2) becomes

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{dx}{dt} = \Lambda - dx - bx(y_w + y_a + y_b + y_{ab}) + r_w y_w + r_a y_a + r_b y_b + r_{ab} y_{ab} + h(1-s)(y_w + y_b), \\ \frac{dy_w}{dt} = (bx - c - r_w - h)y_w, \\ \frac{dy_a}{dt} = (bx - c - r_a)y_a + hsy_w, \\ \frac{dy_b}{dt} = (bx - c - r_b - h)y_b, \\ \frac{dy_{ab}}{dt} = (bx - c - r_{ab})y_{ab} + hsy_b. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.1)$$

It has at most five possible steady state

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= (\Lambda/d, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ E_a &= \left(\frac{c+r_a}{b}, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_a}{bc}, 0, 0 \right), \quad E_{ab} = \left(\frac{c+r_{ab}}{b}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_{ab}}{bc} \right), \\ E_{w,a} &= \left(\frac{c+r_w+h}{b}, \frac{(r_a-r_w-h)(\Lambda-d(c+r_w+h)/b)}{c(r_a-r_w-h)(1-s)}, \frac{hs(\Lambda-d(c+r_w+h)/b)}{c(r_a-r_w-h)(1-s)}, 0, 0 \right), \\ E_{b,ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_b+h}{b}, 0, 0, \frac{(r_{ab}-r_b-h)(\Lambda-d(c+r_b+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_b-h)(1-s)}, \frac{hs(\Lambda-d(c+r_b+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_b-h)(1-s)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The basic reproduction number is defined by

$$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d} \frac{1}{c + \min\{r_w+h, r_a, r_b+h, r_{ab}\}}.$$

Theorem 3.3—When $f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, the existence and stability of equilibria are described in Table 3.

Proof

- i. When $f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, the Jacobian matrix of system (1.2) at the semitrivial equilibrium E_a is

$$J_{E_a} = \begin{bmatrix} -d - b\left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_a}{bc}\right) & r_w + h(1-s) - c - r_a & -c & r_b + h(1-s) - c - r_a & -c - r_a + r_{ab} \\ 0 & r_a - r_w - h & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ b\left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_a}{bc}\right) & hs & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & r_a - r_b - h & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & hs & r_a - r_{ab} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows that $r_a - r_w - h$, $r_a - r_b - h$, $r_a - r_{ab}$ are the eigenvalues of J_{E_a} , the other two eigenvalues of J_{E_a} are the roots of the quadratic polynomial equation

$$\lambda^2 + \left(d + b \left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_a}{bc} \right) \right) \lambda + bc \left(\frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_a}{bc} \right) = 0.$$

In view of the assumption and above discussion, the existence and stability of the equilibrium E_a can be obtained. For the other equilibria, the discussion is similar, we omit it here.

- ii. The existence and stability of E_{ab} is similar to that of E_a , we omit it.
- iii. By the expression of $E_{w,a}$, we find that when $r_w + h < r_a$ and $\Lambda < d(c + r_w + b)/b$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{w,a}$ exists. For the convenience of discussion, we denote

$$\widehat{y}_w = \frac{(r_a - r_w - h)(\Lambda - d(c + r_w + h)/b)}{c(r_a - r_w - h(1 - s))}, \quad \widehat{y}_a = \frac{hs(\Lambda - d(c + r_w + h)/b)}{c(r_a - r_w - h(1 - s))}.$$

Then the Jacobian matrix of system (3.2) at the equilibrium $E_{w,a} = ((c + r_w + fh)/b, \widehat{y}_w, \widehat{y}_a, 0, 0)$ has the form

$$J_{E_{w,a}} = \begin{bmatrix} -d - b(\widehat{y}_w + \widehat{y}_a) & -c - hs & r_a - c - r_w - h & r_b - c - r_w - hs & r_{ab} - c - r_w - h \\ b\widehat{y}_w & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ b\widehat{y}_a & hs & r_w + h - r_a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & r_w - r_b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & hs & r_w + h - r_{ab} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that $r_w - r_b$ and $r_w + h - r_{ab}$ are the eigenvalues of $J_{E_{w,a}}$. After some algebra, we can find that the other three eigenvalues of $J_{E_{w,a}}$ are the roots of

$$\lambda^3 + a_1\lambda^2 + a_2\lambda + a_3 = 0$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= b(\widehat{y}_w + \widehat{y}_a) + d + r_a - r_w - h, \\ a_2 &= bc(\widehat{y}_w + \widehat{y}_a) + b\widehat{y}_w(r_a - r_w - h(1 - s)) + d(r_a - r_w - h) = bc\widehat{y}_w \left(\frac{hs}{r_a - r_w - h} + 1 \right) + b\widehat{y}_w(r_a - r_w - h(1 - s)) + d(r_a - r_w - h), \\ a_3 &= bc\widehat{y}_w(r_a - r_w - h(1 - s)). \end{aligned}$$

From the expressions of a_1, a_2, a_3 , it is easy to see that under the assumption $r_w + h < \min\{r_a, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, we have $a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0$ and $a_1a_2 - a_3 > 0$. Therefore, by Routh-Hurwitz criteria (Korn and Korn, 2000), the local stability of $E_{w,a}$ is obtained. Equilibria E_a, E_{ab} and $E_{b,ab}$ are unstable since their corresponding Jacobian matrices have positive eigenvalues $r_a - r_w - h, r_{ab} - r_w - h, r_b - r_w$ respectively.

- iv. The existence and stability discussion of $E_{b,ab}$ is similar to that of $E_{w,a}$, we omit it here.

The case that $f_b = 1, f_a = f_{ab} = 0$ can be analyzed similarly and analogue results can be obtained.

3.3 50-50 treatment $f_a = f_b = \frac{1}{2}, f_{ab} = 0$

When $f_a = f_b = \frac{1}{2}, f_{ab} = 0$, system (1.2) becomes

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} &= \Lambda - dx - bx(y_w + y_a + y_b + y_{ab}) + r_w y_w + r_a y_a + r_b y_b + r_{ab} y_{ab} + h(1-s)(y_w + \frac{1}{2}y_a + \frac{1}{2}y_b), \\ \frac{dy_w}{dt} &= (bx - c - r_w - h)y_w, \\ \frac{dy_a}{dt} &= (bx - c - r_a - \frac{h}{2})y_a + \frac{h}{2}sy_w, \\ \frac{dy_b}{dt} &= (bx - c - r_b - \frac{h}{2})y_b + \frac{h}{2}sy_w, \\ \frac{dy_{ab}}{dt} &= (bx - c - r_{ab})y_{ab} + \frac{h}{2}s(y_a + y_b). \end{aligned} \right. \tag{3.2}$$

It has at most five possible steady state

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= (\Lambda/d, 0, 0, 0, 0), & E_{ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_{ab}}{b}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_{ab}}{bc} \right), \\ E_{a,ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_a+h/2}{b}, 0, \frac{(r_{ab}-r_a-h/2)(\Lambda-d(c+r_a+h/2)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_a-h/2)}, 0, \frac{hs(\Lambda-d(c+r_a+h/2)/b)}{2c(r_{ab}-r_a-h/2)} \right), \\ E_{b,ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_b+h/2}{b}, 0, 0, \frac{(r_{ab}-r_b-h/2)(\Lambda-d(c+r_b+h/2)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_b-h/2)}, \frac{hs(\Lambda-d(c+r_b+h/2)/b)}{2c(r_{ab}-r_b-h/2)} \right), \\ \tilde{E} &= (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}_w, \tilde{y}_a, \tilde{y}_b, \tilde{y}_{ab}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x} &= \frac{c+r_w+h}{b}, \\ \tilde{y}_w &= \left(1 + \left(1 + \frac{hs/2}{r_{ab}-r_w-h} \right) \left(\frac{hs/2}{r_a-r_w-h/2} + \frac{hs/2}{r_b-r_w-h/2} \right) \right)^{-1} \frac{b\Lambda-d(c+r_w+h)}{bc}, \\ \tilde{y}_a &= \frac{hs/2}{r_a-r_w-h/2} \tilde{y}_w, \\ \tilde{y}_b &= \frac{hs/2}{r_b-r_w-h/2} \tilde{y}_w, \\ \tilde{y}_{ab} &= \frac{hs/2}{r_{ab}-r_w-h} \left(\frac{hs/2}{r_a-r_w-h/2} + \frac{hs/2}{r_b-r_w-h/2} \right) \tilde{y}_w. \end{aligned}$$

The basic reproduction number is defined by

$$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d} \frac{1}{c + \min\{r_w+h, r_a+h/2, r_b+h/2, r_{ab}\}}.$$

Theorem 3.4—When $f_a = f_b = 1/2, f_{ab} = 0$, the existence and stability of equilibria can be summarized in Table 4.

Proof—We find the steady states of system (3.2) by equating the derivatives on the left-hand sides to zero and solving the resulting algebraic equations. The discussion (acquisition) of the trivial or semitrivial equilibria are easy, we omit it here. Now we consider the existence of the positive equilibrium.

From the corresponding second equilibrium equation of (3.2), we obtain the solution

$\tilde{x} = \frac{c+r_w+h}{b}$. Substituting $\tilde{x} = \frac{c+r_w+h}{b}$ into the corresponding third, fourth, fifth equilibrium equations of (3.2), we obtain

$$\left(r_w + \frac{h}{2} - r_a\right)\tilde{y}_a + \frac{hs}{2}\tilde{y}_w = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\left(r_w + \frac{h}{2} - r_b\right)\tilde{y}_b + \frac{hs}{2}\tilde{y}_w = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

$$(r_w + h - r_{ab})\tilde{y}_{ab} + \frac{hs}{2}(\tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b) = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Combining equations (3.3), (3.4), (3.5) with the first one of (3.2), after some calculation we obtain that

$$\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b + \tilde{y}_{ab} = \frac{1}{c}(\Lambda - d\tilde{x}) = \frac{1}{c}\left(\Lambda - \frac{d}{b}(c + r_w + h)\right).$$

Thus, when $r_w + h < \min\{r_a + h/2, r_b + h/2, r_{ab}\}$ and $\Lambda > \frac{d}{b}(c + r_w + h)$, system (3.2) has a unique componentwise positive equilibrium \tilde{E} .

Linearizing system (3.2) about the positive equilibrium $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}_w, \tilde{y}_a, \tilde{y}_b, \tilde{y}_{ab})$ yields the Jacobian matrix

$$J_{\tilde{E}} = \begin{bmatrix} -d - b(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b + \tilde{y}_{ab}) & r_w + h(1-s) - b\tilde{x} & r_a + \frac{h(1-s)}{2} - b\tilde{x} & r_b + \frac{h(1-s)}{2} - b\tilde{x} & r_{ab} - b\tilde{x} \\ b\tilde{y}_w & b\tilde{x} - c - r_w - h & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ b\tilde{y}_a & \frac{hs}{2} & b\tilde{x} - c - r_a - \frac{h}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ b\tilde{y}_b & \frac{hs}{2} & 0 & b\tilde{x} - c - r_b - \frac{h}{2} & 0 \\ b\tilde{y}_{ab} & 0 & \frac{hs}{2} & \frac{hs}{2} & b\tilde{x} - c - r_{ab} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Substituting $\tilde{x} = (c + r_w + h)/b$ into $J_{\tilde{E}}$ and expanding the determinant of the obtained matrix $\lambda I - J_{\tilde{E}}$ by the second row, after some calculation, it can be seen that the eigenvalues are $r_w + \frac{h}{2} - r_a, r_w + \frac{h}{2} - r_b$, and the roots of

$$\lambda^3 + a_1\lambda^2 + a_2\lambda + a_3 = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= b(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b + \tilde{y}_{ab}) + d + r_{ab} - r_w - h, \\ a_2 &= bc(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b + \tilde{y}_{ab}) + (b(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b) + d)(r_{ab} - r_w - h) + \frac{bhs}{2}(\tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b), \\ a_3 &= bc(\tilde{y}_w + \tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b + \tilde{y}_{ab})(r_{ab} - r_w - h). \end{aligned}$$

It is noted that in the expression of a_3 , we have used the relation

$$\frac{hs}{2}(\tilde{y}_a + \tilde{y}_b) = (r_{ab} - r_w - h)\tilde{y}_{ab}.$$

From the expressions of a_1, a_2, a_3 , it is clear that under the assumption $r_w + h < \min\{r_a + h/2, r_b + h/2, r_{ab}\}$, we have $a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0$ and $a_1 a_2 - a_3 > 0$. Therefore, by Routh-Hurwitz criteria (Korn and Korn, 2000), the stability of the positive equilibrium \tilde{E} is established.

3.4 Combination treatment

$$f_a = f_b = 0, f_{ab} = 1.$$

When $f_a = f_b = 0, f_{ab} = 1$, system (1.2) becomes

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{dx}{dt} = \Lambda - dx - bx(y_w + y_a + y_b + y_{ab}) + r_w y_w + r_a y_a + r_b y_b + r_{ab} y_{ab} + h(1-q)y_w + h(1-s)(y_a + y_b), \\ \frac{dy_w}{dt} = (bx - c - r_w - h)y_w, \\ \frac{dy_a}{dt} = (bx - c - r_a - h)y_a, \\ \frac{dy_b}{dt} = (bx - c - r_b - h)y_b, \\ \frac{dy_{ab}}{dt} = (bx - c - r_{ab})y_{ab} + hs(y_a + y_b) + hqy_w. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.6)$$

The basic reproduction number is defined as

$$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d} \frac{1}{c + \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}}.$$

It has at most five possible steady state

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= (\Lambda/d, 0, 0, 0, 0), & E_{ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_{ab}}{b}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\Lambda}{c} - \frac{d}{b} - \frac{dr_{ab}}{bc} \right), \\ E_{a,ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_a+h}{b}, 0, \frac{(r_{ab}-r_a-h)(\Lambda-d(c+r_a+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_a-h(1-s))}, 0, \frac{hs(\Lambda-d(c+r_a+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_a-h(1-s))} \right), \\ E_{b,ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_b+h}{b}, 0, 0, \frac{(r_{ab}-r_b-h)(\Lambda-d(c+r_b+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_b-h(1-s))}, \frac{hs(\Lambda-d(c+r_b+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_b-h(1-s))} \right), \\ E_{w,ab} &= \left(\frac{c+r_w+h}{b}, \frac{(r_{ab}-r_w-h)(\Lambda-d(c+r_w+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_w-h(1-q))}, 0, 0, \frac{hq(\Lambda-d(c+r_w+h)/b)}{c(r_{ab}-r_w-h(1-q))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the discussion of the case $f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, we have the following conclusion.

Theorem 3.5—When $f_a = f_b = 0, f_{ab} = 1$, the existence and stability of equilibria of system (3.6) are described in Table 5.

4 Numerical Simulations

In this section, we perform some numerical simulations on the two models to illustrate the results obtained in sections 2 and 3. For the purpose of simulations, we fix most of the parameters in the models and let the other parameters vary.

For the model with single antibiotic therapy, we fix the values of Λ, d, b, s, c as $\Lambda = 10, d = 1, b = 2, s = 0.3, c = 1.5$ and initial values $x(0) = 1.4, y_w(0) = 1.0, y_a(0) = 0.4$, let the

parameters r_w, r_r, f, h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. When $r_r > r_w$ and $fh = 0$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the wild type strain E_w is stable (Figure 4.1(i)). When $r_r < r_w + fh$ and $fh > 0$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strain E_r is stable (Figure 4.1(ii)). When $r_r > r_w + fh$ and $fh > 0$, the endemic equilibrium with both the wild type strain and resistant strain \tilde{E} is stable (Figure 4.1(iii)).

For the model with multiple antibiotic therapies, we first consider the case in the absence of treatment, that is, $f_a = f_b = f_{ab} = 0$. We choose parameters $\Lambda = 10, d = 2, b = 1, q = 0.1, s = 0.3, c = 1.5, h = 0.2$ and initial values $x(0) = 0.65, y_w(0) = 0.35, y_a(0) = 2.4, y_b(0) = 1.5, y_{ab}(0) = 0.2$, and let r_w, r_a, r_b, r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. When $r_w < \min\{r_a, r_b, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the wild type strain E_w is stable (Figure 4.2(i)). When $r_a < \min\{r_w, r_b, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strain A E_a is stable (Figure 4.2(ii)). When $r_b < \min\{r_w, r_a, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strain B E_b is stable (Figure 4.2(iii)). When $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w, r_a, r_b\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strains A and B E_{ab} is stable (Figure 4.2(iv)).

Next we consider the case with cycling treatment, that is, $f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0$. Choose parameters $\Lambda = 10, d = 2, b = 1, q = 0.1, s = 0.3, c = 1.5, h = 0.2$ initial values $x(0) = 0.65, y_w(0) = 0.35, y_a(0) = 2.4, y_b(0) = 0.5, y_{ab}(0) = 0.2$, and let r_w, r_a, r_b, r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. When $r_a < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with resistant strain A E_a is stable (Figure 4.3(i)). When $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a, r_b + h\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strains A and B E_{ab} is stable (Figure 4.3(ii)). when $r_w + h < \min\{r_a, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with wild type strain and resistant strain A $E_{w,a}$ is stable (Figure 4.3(iii)). (iv) when $r_b + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_a, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with resistant strain B and both strains $E_{b,ab}$ is stable (Figure 4.3(iv)).

Now we consider the case with 50-50 treatment, that is, $f_a = f_b = \frac{1}{2}, f_{ab} = 0$. Choose the parameters $\Lambda = 10, d = 1, b = 1, q = 0.1, s = 0.3, c = 1.5, h = 0.2$, initial values $x(0) = 0.45, y_w(0) = 0.35, y_a(0) = 1.4, y_b(0) = 0.9, y_{ab}(0) = 2.6$, and let r_w, r_a, r_b, r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. When $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h/2, r_b + h/2\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with both resistant strains A and B E_{ab} is stable (Figure 4.4(i)). When $r_a + h/2 < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h/2, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with resistant strain A and both resistant strains A and B $E_{a,ab}$ is stable (Figure 4.4(ii)). When $r_b + h/2 < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h/2, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with resistant strain B and both resistant strains A and B $E_{b,ab}$ is stable (Figure 4.4(iii)). When $r_w + h < \min\{r_a + h/2, r_b + h/2, r_{ab}\}$, the positive equilibrium with all strains \tilde{E} is stable (Figure 4.4(iv)).

Finally we consider the case with combining treatment, that is, $f_a = f_b = 0, f_{ab} = 1$. Choose parameters $\Lambda = 10, d = 1, b = 1, q = 0.1, s = 0.3, c = 1.5, h = 0.2$, initial values $x(0) = 0.45, y_w(0) = 1.5, y_a(0) = 1.0, y_b(0) = 0.5, y_{ab}(0) = 1.6$, and let r_w, r_a, r_b, r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. When $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h, r_b + h\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with both resistant strains A and B E_{ab} is stable (Figure 4.5(i)). When $r_a + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with resistant strain A and both resistant strains A and B $E_{a,ab}$ is stable (Figure 4.5(ii)). When $r_b + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with resistant strain B and both resistant strains A and B $E_{b,ab}$ is stable (Figure 4.5(iii)). When $r_w + h < \min\{r_a + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the wild type strain and both resistant strains A and B $E_{w,ab}$ is stable (Figure 4.5(iv)).

5 Discussion

We provided qualitative analysis of models for different treatment protocols to prevent antibiotic resistance. For the model with a single antibiotic therapy, we carried out a global qualitative analysis and studied the existence and stability of the disease-free and endemic

equilibria. In terms of the basic reproduction number $R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c + \min\{r_w + fh, r_r\})}$, our results indicate that when $R_0 < 1$, then the disease-free equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable. If $R_0 > 1$, when the rate of patients infected with wild type bacteria recover from the wild type infected compartment (fh) is less than the difference of the rates of patients infected with resistant bacteria (r_r) and wild type (r_w) recover from the infection in the absence of treatment, the endemic equilibrium with both strains is globally stable; when $fh > r_r - r_w$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the resistant strain is globally stable. Which shows that preventing the initiation or enhancing the discontinuation of unnecessary antibiotic therapy will have a great impact to preserve antibiotic effectiveness (Bonhoeffer et al., 1997).

For the model with multiple antibiotic therapies, stability of various equilibria are analyzed. The model allows quantification of the consequences of different therapy regimens and hospital controls in terms of the complex dynamics of competing bacterial strains (Bonhoeffer et al., 1997). The results show that, in the absence of treatment, when $R_0 < 1$, the disease free equilibrium is stable, when $R_0 > 1$, the semitrivial equilibrium with the strain which has the lowest recovery rate is stable. The results for the cases with 50-50 treatment, cycling treatment and combining treatment demonstrate the essential difficulties in controlling the advance of resistant bacterial infections in hospitals. When more than one antibiotic is employed, as shown by Bonhoeffer et al. (1997), Bergstrom et al. (2004), Reluga (2005), D'Agata et al. (2008), cycling use of different antibiotics is not as good as that with a combination of antibiotics.

An ultimate goal is to validate these models by applying it to a particular hospital to compare the predicted endemic states with the prevalence data. We leave this for future study.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the referee and the handling Editor for their helpful comments and suggestions.

References

1. Amarasekar P. Interference competition and species coexistence. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 2002;269:2541–2550.
2. Austin DJ, Anderson RM. Studies of antibiotic resistance within the patient, hospitals and the community using simple mathematical models. *Phil Trans R Soc Lond B* 1999;354:721–738. [PubMed: 10365398]
3. Austin DJ, Bonten MJM, Weinstein RA, Slaughter S, Anderson RM. Vancomycin-resistant enterococci in intensive-care hospital settings: Transmission dynamics, persistence, and the impact of infection control programs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1999;96:6908–6913. [PubMed: 10359812]
4. Bergstrom CT, Lo M, Lipsitch M. Ecological theory suggests that antimicrobial cycling will not reduce antimicrobial resistance in hospitals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2004;101:13285–13290. [PubMed: 15308772]
5. Boldin B, Bonten MJ, Diekmann O. Relative effects of barrier precautions and topical antibiotics on nosocomial bacterial transmission: results of multi-compartment models. *Bull Math Biol* 2007;69:2227–2248. [PubMed: 17453305]
6. Bonhoeffer S, Lipsitch M, Levin BR. Evaluating treatment protocols to prevent antibiotic resistance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1997;94:12106–12111. [PubMed: 9342370]
7. Bonten MJM, Austin DJ, Lipsitch M. Understanding the spread of antibiotic resistant pathogens in hospitals: mathematical models as tools for control. *Clin Infect Dis* 2001;33:1739–1746. [PubMed: 11595995]
8. Brauer, F.; Castillo-Chavez, C. *Mathematical Models in Population Biology and Epidemiology*. Springer; New York: 2000.

9. Bremermann HJ, Thieme HR. A competitive exclusion principle for pathogen virulence. *J Math Bio* 1989;27:179–190. [PubMed: 2723551]
10. Busenberg S, van den Driessche P. Analysis of a disease transmission model in a population with varying size. *J Math Biol* 1990;28:257–270. [PubMed: 2332704]
11. D'Agata EMC, Dupont-Rouzeyrol M, Magal P, Olivier D, Ruan S. The impact of different antibiotic regimens on the emergence of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria. *PLoS ONE*. 2008 (accepted).
12. D'Agata EMC, Magal P, Olivier D, Ruan S, Webb GF. Modeling antibiotic resistance in hospitals: The impact of minimizing treatment duration. *J Theor Biol* 2007;249:487–499. [PubMed: 17905310]
13. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Metz JAJ. On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio R_0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous populations. *J Math Biol* 1999;28:365–382. [PubMed: 2117040]
14. Daxboeck F, et al. Economic burden associated with multi-resistant Gram-negative organisms compared with that for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a university teaching hospital. *J Hosp Infect* 2006;62:214–218. [PubMed: 16257092]
15. Grundmann H, Aires-de-Sousa M, Boyce J, Tiemersma E. Emergence and resurgence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* as a public-health threat. *Lancet* 2006;368:874–885. [PubMed: 16950365]
16. Grundmann H, Hellriegel B. Mathematical modeling: A tool for hospital infection control. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2006;6:39–45. [PubMed: 16377533]
17. Klevens RM, et al. Invasive methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in the United States. *JAMA* 2007;298:1763–1771. [PubMed: 17940231]
18. Korn, GA.; Korn, TM. Theorems and Formulas for Reference and Review. Dover Publications; Mineola, NY: 2000. *Mathematical Handbook for Scientists and Engineers: Definitions*.
19. Levy SB, Marshall B. Antibacterial resistance worldwide: Causes, challenges and responses. *Nat Med* 2004;10:S122–S129. [PubMed: 15577930]
20. Reluga TC. Simple models of antibiotic cycling. *Math Med Biol* 2005;22:187–208. [PubMed: 15778333]
21. Spellberg B, et al. The epidemic of antibiotic-resistant infections: a call to action for the medical community from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2008;46:155–164. [PubMed: 18171244]
22. Smith HL, Li B. Competition for essential resources: a brief review. *Fields Institute Communications* 2003;36:213–227.
23. Temime L, et al. The rising impact of mathematical modeling in epidemiology: Antibiotic resistance research as a case study. *Epidemiol Infect* 2008;136:289–298. [PubMed: 17767792]
24. Webb GF, D'Agata EMC, Magal P, Ruan S. A model of antibiotic-resistant bacterial epidemics in hospitals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2005;102:13343–13348. [PubMed: 16141326]
25. Webb GF, Horn MA, D'Agata EMC, Moellering RC, Ruan S. Competition of hospital-acquired and community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* strains in hospitals. *J Biol Dynamics* 2010;4:115–129.




Figure 4.1.

Solution trajectories of the model with a single antibiotic therapy, the parameters $\Lambda = 10$, $d = 1$, $b = 2$, $s = 0.3$, $c = 1.5$ and initial values $x(0) = 1.4$, $y_w(0) = 1$, $y_r(0) = 0.4$ are fixed and the parameters r_w , r_r , f , h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. (i) When $r_r > r_w$ and $fh = 0$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_w is stable; (ii) when $r_r < r_w + fh$ and $fh > 0$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_r is stable; (iii) when $r_r > r_w + fh$ and $fh > 0$, the endemic equilibrium \tilde{E} is stable.




Figure 4.2.

System (1.2) with no treatment, i.e. $f_a = f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, we choose parameters $\Lambda = 10$, $d = 2$, $b = 1$, $q = 0.1$, $s = 0.3$, $c = 1.5$, $h = 0.2$, initial values $x(0) = 0.65$, $y_w(0) = 0.35$, $y_a(0) = 2.4$, $y_b(0) = 0.5$, $y_{ab}(0) = 0.2$, and let r_w , r_a , r_b , r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. (i) When $r_w < \min\{r_a, r_b, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_w is stable; (ii) when $r_a < \min\{r_w, r_b, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_a is stable; (iii) when $r_b < \min\{r_w, r_a, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_b is stable; (iv) when $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w, r_a, r_b\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_{ab} is stable.




Figure 4.3. System (1.2) with cycling treatment, i.e., when $f_a = 1, f_b = f_{ab} = 0$, we choose parameters $\Lambda = 10, d = 2, b = 1, q = 0.1, s = 0.3, c = 1.5, h = 0.2$, initial values $x(0) = 0.65, y_w(0) = 0.35, y_a(0) = 2.4, y_b(0) = 0.5, y_{ab}(0) = 0.2$, and let r_w, r_a, r_b, r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. (i) When $r_a < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_a is stable; (ii) when $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a, r_b + h\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_{ab} is stable; (iii) when $r_w + h < \min\{r_a, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{w,a}$ is stable; (iv) when $r_b + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_a, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{b,ab}$ is stable.




Figure 4.4. System (1.2) with 50-50 treatment, i.e., when $f_a = f_b = \frac{1}{2}, f_{ab} = 0$, we choose the same parameters $\Lambda = 10, d = 1, b = 1, q = 0.1, s = 0.3, c = 1.5, h = 0.2$, the same initial values $x(0) = 0.45, y_w(0) = 0.35, y_a(0) = 1.4, y_b(0) = 0.9, y_{ab}(0) = 2.6$, and let r_w, r_a, r_b, r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. (i) When $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h/2, r_b + h/2\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_{ab} is stable; (ii) when $r_a + h/2 < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h/2, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{a,ab}$ is stable; (iii) when $r_b + h/2 < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h/2, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{b,ab}$ is stable; (iv) when $r_w + h < \min\{r_a + h/2, r_b + h/2, r_{ab}\}$, the positive equilibrium \tilde{E} is stable.




Figure 4.5. System (1.2) with combining treatment, i.e., when $f_a = f_b = 0, f_{ab} = 1$, we choose the same parameters $\Lambda = 10, d = 1, b = 1, q = 0.1, s = 0.3, c = 1.5, h = 0.2$, the same initial values $x(0) = 0.45, y_w(0) = 1.5, y_a(0) = 1.0, y_b(0) = 0.5, y_{ab}(0) = 1.6$, and let r_w, r_a, r_b, r_{ab} and h vary such that $R_0 > 1$. (i) When $r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h, r_b + h\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium E_{ab} is stable; (ii) when $r_a + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{a,ab}$ is stable; (iii) when $r_b + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{b,ab}$ is stable; (iv) when $r_w + h < \min\{r_a + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$, the semitrivial equilibrium $E_{w,ab}$ is stable.

Table 1

Stability chart for system (1.1).

Condition	BRN	Cases	E_0	E_r	\tilde{E}
$fh < r_r - r_w$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_r+fh)}$	$R_0 < 1$	globally stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	if exist, unstable	globally stable
$fh > r_r - r_w$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_r)}$	$R_0 < 1$	globally stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	globally stable	\bar{A}

Table 2

Existence and Stability Chart for System (1.2) with no Treatment.

Condition	BRN	Cases	E_0	E_w	E_a	E_b	E_{ab}
$r_w < \min\{r_a, r_b, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_w)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	stable	*	*	*
$r_a < \min\{r_w, r_b, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_a)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	stable	*	*
$r_b < \min\{r_w, r_a, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_b)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	*	stable	*
$r_{ab} < \min\{r_w, r_a, r_b\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_{ab})}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	*	*	stable

Here * represents that if the equilibrium exists, it is unstable.

Table 3

Existence and Stability Chart for System (1.2) with Cycling Treatment.

Condition	BRN	Cases	E_0	E_a	E_{ab}	$E_{w,a}$	$E_{b,ab}$
$r_a < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_a)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	stable	*	*	*
$r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a, r_b + h\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_{ab})}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	stable	*	*
$r_w + h < \min\{r_a, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w+h)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	*	stable	*
$r_b + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_a, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_b+h)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	*	*	stable

Here * represents that if the equilibrium exists, it is unstable.

Table 4

Existence and Stability Chart for System (1.2) with 50-50 Treatment.

Condition	BRN	Cases	E_0	E_{ab}	$E_{a,ab}$	$E_{b,ab}$	\tilde{E}
$r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + \frac{h}{2}, r_b + \frac{h}{2}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_{ab})}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	stable	*	*	*
$r_a + \frac{h}{2} < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + \frac{h}{2}, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_a+h/2)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	stable	*	*
$r_b + \frac{h}{2} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + \frac{h}{2}, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_b+h/2)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	*	stable	*
$r_w + h < \min\{r_a + \frac{h}{2}, r_b + \frac{h}{2}, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\Lambda}{d(c+r_w+h)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	*	*	stable

Here * represents that if the equilibrium exists, it is unstable.

Table 5

Existence and Stability Chart for System (1.2) with Combining Treatment.

Condition	BRN	Cases	E_0	E_{ab}	$E_{a,ab}$	$E_{b,ab}$	$E_{w,ab}$
$r_{ab} < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h, r_b + h\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_{ab})}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	stable	*	*	*
$r_a + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_a+h)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	stable	*	*
$r_b + h < \min\{r_w + h, r_a + h, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_b+h)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	*	*	stable	*
$r_w + h < \min\{r_a + h, r_b + h, r_{ab}\}$	$R_0 = \frac{b\lambda}{d(c+r_w+h)}$	$R_0 < 1$	stable	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}	\bar{A}
		$R_0 > 1$	unstable	stable	*	*	*

Here * represents that if the equilibrium exists, it is unstable.