# Analysis of a dengue disease transmission model with clinical diagnosis in Thailand

R. Kongnuy<sup>\*</sup>. E. Naowanich, and P. Pongsumpun

\*Corresponding author

**Abstract**—An S-I-R epidemiological model with clinical diagnosis of dengue transmission, Dengue Fever (DF), Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever (DHF), Dengue Shock Syndrome (DSS) dynamics in a population in Thailand is discussed. Our model consists of seven non-linear differential equations. The standard dynamical analysis is used for analyzing the behavior for the transmission of dengue disease. Local existence results are given for the resulting ordinary differential system. The numerical results are discussed in terms of threshold parameters and the numerical simulations are shown to confirm our results.

*Keywords*—Clinical diagnosis, numerical simulation, ordinary differential system, S-I-R.

## I. INTRODUCTION

ATHEMATICAL model have been widely used in various areas of infectious disease epidemiology. Mathematical modeling of dengue disease transmission in human and vector populations has been done since the beginning of last century. Some of the recent models could be seen in [1-6]. Several studies on infection model within human have been done for various cases [7-8]. Mathematical models are used in comparing, planning, implementing, evaluating, and optimizing various detection, prevention, therapy, and control programs. Epidemiology modeling can contribute the design and analysis of epidemiological surveys, suggest crucial data that should be collected, identify trends, make general forecasts, and estimate the uncertainty in forecasts [9-10].

The epidemiological systems often exists a peculiar equilibrium the disease free equilibrium, which corresponds to a steady state of the population without disease. The another one equilibrium is the endemic equilibrium state. It is the steady state solutions where the disease persists in the population. In the context of within host dengue viral infection, the basic reproductive number is defined as the average number of secondary infected monocytes generated by a single infected monocyte placed in an uninfected monocyte population [11].

In this paper, we are developing mathematical models to better understand the transmission and spread of dengue disease. Dengue is an acute fever caused by a *Flavivirus*. The disease can occur in three forms: Dengue Fever (DF), Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever (DHF) and Dengue Shock Syndrome (DSS).

DF is an acute viral disease manifesting with myalgias, headache, retro-orbital pain, vomiting, maculopapular rash, leucopenia and thrombocytopenia. DHF is characterized by four major clinical features: high fever, hemorrhagic phenomena, hepatomegaly and signs of impending circulatory failure. The major pathophysiological abnormality differentiating DF from DHF is the plasma leakage syndrome. The severity of disease in DHF depends on the quantum of plasma leakage. The DHF patients are presented with shock due to excessive plasma loss are labeled as dengue shock syndrome (DSS). DHF/DSS are potentially fatal conditions.

As DF, DHF, DSS are endemic in Thailand, cases are reported every years. A total of 220,885 cases of DF, 650,810 cases of DHF and 17,267 cases of DSS have been reported during twelve year review period. Between 1997 and 2008, the percentage of mortality DF, DHF and DSS cases reported 1.04%, 40.83% and 58.13%, respectively. Fig. 1, shows the percentage of cases by clinical diagnosis in Thailand between 1997 and 2008. Fig. 2, shows the percentage of deaths by clinical diagnosis in Thailand during 1997 to 2008.



Fig. 1 The percentage of cases by clinical diagnosis in Thailand between 1997 and 2008 [12].



Fig. 2 The percentage of deaths by clinical diagnosis in Thailand [12].

It can be seen in the Fig. 1 that the percentage of deaths of DSS cases is higher than DHF and DF death cases.

A basic S-I-R (Susceptible-Infected-Recovered) model is used for representing DF, DHF, DSS transmission system in this study. This paper is organized as follows. In the first section, we present the introduction that guided the dengue disease and model's structure. In section 2, we present the model's equations and definition of the variables and parameters. In section 3, we deduce the basic reproductive number, which can be used for predicting all the possible behaviors of the system. Finally, the numerical solutions of this model are presented.

#### II. MATHEMATICAL MODEL

## A. Model Formulation

The model describes the dynamic of dengue in the two components of transmission, namely human hosts and vector. The total human population is denoted by  $N_{\rm H}$ , it is partitioned into five classes, the susceptible, infectious with DF clinical diagnosis, infectious with DHF clinical diagnosis, infectious with DSS clinical diagnosis and recovered are denoted by  $S_{\rm H}$ ,

 $I_{\text{DF}}\,,\,I_{\text{DHF}}\,,\,I_{\text{DSS}}$  and  $R_{\,_{\text{H}}}\,,$  respectively.

The total vector population is  $N_v$  and the vector population is divided into two classes, the susceptible and infectious vector are denoted by  $S_v$  and  $I_v$ , respectively.

The total human population size  $N_{H}$  can be determined by  $N_{H} = S_{H} + I_{DF} + I_{DHF} + I_{DSS} + R_{H}$ . The total vector population size  $N_{v}$  can be determined by  $N_{v} = S_{v} + I_{v}$ .

This model is shown in Fig. 1.



Fig. 3 Compartmental transmission model of DF, DHF, DSS system following a Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered structure in human population and Susceptible-Infectious structure in vector population.

The parameters in our model are defined in Table 1.

Table 1. Parameter involved in the transmission of dengue, incorporated into the model shown in Fig. 1.

Symbol	Meaning			
N <sub>H</sub>	Total human population size			
N <sub>v</sub>	Total vector population size			
А	The constant recruitment rate of mosquitoes			
λ	Birth rate of human population			
$\mu_{\rm H}$	The natural death rate of human population			
$\mu_{\text{DF}}$	Death rate of human population (with DF)			
$\mu_{\text{DHF}}$	Death rate of human population (with DHF)			
$\mu_{\rm DSS}$	Death rate of human population (with DSS)			
$\beta_{VDE}$	Transmission probability from infectious vector to			
I VDF	human and human becomes to infectious with DF			
$\beta_{\rm VDHF}$	Transmission probability from infectious vector to			
0	human and human becomes to infectious with DHF			
$\beta_{VDSS}$	human and human bacomes to infactious with DSS			
0	Transmission probability from infectious human to			
$\beta_{\rm HV}$	vector and vector becomes to infectious			
c.	The contact rate from infectious vector to susceptible			
$O_1$	human and human becomes to infectious human with			
	DF			
σ.	The contact rate from infectious vector to susceptible			
02	human and human becomes to infectious human with			
	DHF			
$\sigma_2$	The contact rate from infectious vector to susceptible			
03	human and human becomes to infectious human with			
	DSS			
$\sigma_4$	The contact rate from infectious human to susceptible			
	vector and vector becomes to infectious vector			
$\mu_{ m v}$	Death rate of vector			
b	Average rate of biting per vector per day			
r	Human recovery rate			

From the averaging of the real data in Thailand between 1997 to 2008, we have  $\beta_{VDHF} > \beta_{VDF} > \beta_{VDSS}$  and

# $\mu_{\text{DSS}} > \mu_{\text{DHF}} > \mu_{\text{DF}}$

#### B. Model Equations

When In our model, the dynamic of epidemic model is established:

$$\frac{\mathrm{dS}_{\mathrm{H}}}{\mathrm{dt}} = \lambda \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{H}} - (\mu_{\mathrm{H}} + (\sigma_{1} + \sigma_{2} + \sigma_{3})\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{v}})\mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{H}},$$

 $\frac{dI_{\rm DF}}{dt} = \sigma_{\rm I} S_{\rm H} I_v - (\mu_{\rm DF} + r) I_{\rm DF},$ 

 $\frac{dI_{\text{DHF}}}{dt} = \sigma_2 S_{\text{H}} I_{\nu} - (\mu_{\text{DHF}} + r) I_{\text{DHF}}, \label{eq:dispersive}$ 

$$\frac{\mathrm{dI}_{\mathrm{DSS}}}{\mathrm{dt}} = \sigma_3 S_{\mathrm{H}} I_{\mathrm{v}} - (\mu_{\mathrm{DSS}} + r) I_{\mathrm{DSS}}, \qquad (1)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}R_{\mathrm{H}}}{\mathrm{d}t} = r(I_{\mathrm{DF}} + I_{\mathrm{DHF}} + I_{\mathrm{DSS}}) - \mu_{\mathrm{H}}R_{\mathrm{H}},$$

$$\frac{dS_{v}}{dt} = A - (\mu_{v} + \sigma_{4}(I_{DF} + I_{DHF} + I_{DSS}))S_{v},$$

$$\frac{dI_{v}}{dt} = \sigma_{4} (I_{DF} + I_{DHF} + I_{DSS}) S_{v} - \mu_{v} I_{v} .$$

The first five equations represent the susceptible, infectious with DF, infectious with DHF, infectious with DSS and recovered human population densities, respectively.

The sixth and seventh equations represent the susceptible and infectious vector population densities.

Before we analyze the system (1), we reduce the number of parameters by introducing

$$\begin{split} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathrm{H}} &= \left(\mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{H}} / \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{H}}\right), \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\mathrm{DF}} = \left(\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{DF}} / \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{H}}\right), \ \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\mathrm{DHF}} = \left(\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{DHF}} / \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{H}}\right), \\ \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\mathrm{DSS}} &= \left(\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{DSS}} / \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{H}}\right), \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{H}} = \left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{H}} / \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{H}}\right), \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathrm{v}} = \left(\mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{v}} / \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{v}}\right), \\ \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\mathrm{v}} &= \left(\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{v}} / \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{v}}\right). \end{split}$$

We get the following model

$$\frac{d\hat{S}_{H}}{dt} = \mu_{H} - (\mu_{H} + (\sigma_{1} + \sigma_{2} + \sigma_{3})\hat{I}_{v}N_{v})\hat{S}_{H},$$

$$\frac{d\hat{I}_{DF}}{dt} = \sigma_1 N_v \hat{S}_H \hat{I}_v - \varepsilon_1 \hat{I}_{DF},$$

$$\frac{d\hat{I}_{DHF}}{dt} = \sigma_2 N_v \hat{S}_H \hat{I}_v - \varepsilon_2 \hat{I}_{DHF}, \qquad (2)$$

$$\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\text{DSS}}}{dt} = \sigma_3 N_v \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\text{H}} \hat{\mathbf{I}}_v - \varepsilon_3 \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\text{DSS}},$$

$$\frac{dI_{v}}{dt} = \sigma_{4} N_{H} (\hat{I}_{DF} + \hat{I}_{DHF} + \hat{I}_{DSS}) (1 - \hat{I}_{v}) - \mu_{v} \hat{I}_{v}$$

where  $\epsilon_1 = \mu_{DF} + r$ ,  $\epsilon_2 = \mu_{DHF} + r$  and  $\epsilon_3 = \mu_{DSS} + r$ .

For the biological interest, the region of system (2) is restricted to

$$\Omega = \{ (\hat{S}_{H}, \hat{I}_{DF}, \hat{I}_{DHF}, \hat{I}_{DSS}, \hat{I}_{v}) : 0 \le \hat{S}_{H}, \hat{I}_{DF}, \hat{I}_{DHF}, \hat{I}_{DSS}, \hat{I}_{v} \le 1 \},\$$

and all of the parameters used in system (2) are positive.

#### **III. MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS**

#### A. Analysis of Models

The local stability of an equilibrium state is determined from the Jacobian matrix of the right hand side of (2) evaluated at the equilibrium point. We obtain the Jacobian matrix

$-\mu_{H}-\mu_{H}\varphi_{I}I_{v}^{*}$	0	0	0	$-\mu_{H}\varphi_{I}S_{H}^{*}$
$\epsilon_l \eta_l I_\nu^*$	E <sub>1</sub>	0	0	$\epsilon_{I}\eta_{I}S_{H}^{*}$
$\epsilon_2\eta_2 I_\nu^*$	0	-E2	0	$\epsilon_2 \eta_2 S_{\rm H}^*$
$\epsilon_{_3}\eta_{_3}I_{_v}^*$	0	0	-E <sub>3</sub>	$\epsilon_{_3}\eta_{_3}S_{_H}^*$
0	$\sigma_{\!_4}N_{\!_H}(1\!-\!I_{\!_v}^*)$	$\sigma_{\!_4}N_{\!_H}(l\!-\!I_{\!_v}^*)$	$\sigma_{\!_4}\!N_{\!_H}(l\!-\!I_{\!_v}^*)$	$\!-\!\sigma_{\!_{4}}N_{\!_{H}}(I_{D\!_{F}}^*\!+\!I_{D\!_{H\!F}}^*\!+\!I_{D\!_{S\!S}}^*)\!-\!\mu_{\!_{v}}\!$

The equilibrium states  $(S_{H}^{*}, I_{DF}^{*}, I_{DHF}^{*}, I_{DSS}^{*}, I_{v}^{*})$  are found by setting the right hand side of (2) to zero, then we obtain:

$$S_{H}^{*} = \frac{1}{1 + \phi_{I} I_{v}^{*}}, \quad I_{DF}^{*} = \frac{\eta_{I} I_{v}^{*}}{1 + \phi_{I} I_{v}^{*}}, \quad I_{DHF}^{*} = \frac{\eta_{2} I_{v}^{*}}{1 + \phi_{I} I_{v}^{*}}$$

$$I_{DSS}^* = \frac{\eta_3 I_v^*}{1 + \phi_1 I_v^*}$$
, and  $I_v^* = 0$  for the disease free state or

 $I_v^* = \frac{\sigma_4 N_H(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3) - \mu_v}{\sigma_4 N_H(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3) + \mu_v \phi_1} \quad \text{for the endemic disease}$ 

state where

$$\phi_{1} = \frac{(\sigma_{1} + \sigma_{2} + \sigma_{3})N_{v}}{\mu_{H}}, \ \eta_{1} = \frac{\sigma_{1}N_{v}}{\epsilon_{1}}, \ \eta_{2} = \frac{\sigma_{2}N_{v}}{\epsilon_{2}}, \ \eta_{3} = \frac{\sigma_{3}N_{v}}{\epsilon_{3}}$$

For this case there are two equilibrium states, those are, the disease free equilibrium  $E_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  when  $I_v^* = 0$  which always exists and the endemic equilibrium  $E_2 = (S_H^*, I_{DF}^*, I_{DHF}^*)$ 

$$I_{DSS}^{*}, I_{v}^{*}) \text{ when } I_{v}^{*} = \frac{\sigma_{4}N_{H}(\eta_{1} + \eta_{2} + \eta_{3}) - \mu_{v}}{\sigma_{4}N_{H}(\eta_{1} + \eta_{2} + \eta_{3}) + \mu_{v}\phi_{1}}.$$

#### B. Analysis of Stability

The local stability of an equilibrium state is determined from the above Jacobian matrix evaluated at equilibrium state around  $I_v^* = 0$  and  $I_v^* = \frac{\sigma_4 N_H (\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3) - \mu_v}{\sigma_4 N_H (\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3) + \mu_v \phi_1}$ .

The local stability property of those equilibrium state is given in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1** If  $R_0 < 1$ , the equilibrium  $E_1$  is locally asymptotically stable. If  $R_0 > 1$ , the equilibrium  $E_1$  is unstable and  $E_2$  is locally asymptotically stable when

$$R_{0} = \frac{(\eta_{1} + \eta_{2} + \eta_{3})N_{H}\sigma_{4}}{\mu_{v}} \le 1.$$

**Proof** The local stability of  $E_1$  is governed by the linearization of system (2) at  $E_1$ . The eigenvalue of the disease free state is  $\lambda = -\mu_H$  and the other eigenvalues are the roots of

$$\lambda^{4} + a_{3}\lambda^{3} + a_{2}\lambda^{2} + a_{1}\lambda + a_{0} = 0$$
(3)

where

$$a_3 = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3 + \mu_v, \qquad (4)$$

$$\begin{split} a_2 &= -N_{\rm H}\sigma_4(\eta_1\epsilon_1 + \eta_2\epsilon_2 + \eta_3\epsilon_3) + \epsilon_2(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_3) + (\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3)\mu_{\rm v}\,, \end{split} \tag{5} \\ a_1 &= -(-\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 + \eta_3N_{\rm H}\sigma_4(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2))\epsilon_3 - N_{\rm H}\sigma_4(\eta_2\epsilon_2(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_3) + \epsilon_3)\mu_{\rm v}\,, \end{split}$$

$$\eta_1 \varepsilon_1 (\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3)) (\varepsilon_2 \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_1 (\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3)) \mu_v, \qquad (6)$$

$$a_{0} = \epsilon_{1}\epsilon_{2}\epsilon_{3}(-(\eta_{1} + \eta_{2} + \eta_{3})N_{H}\sigma_{4} + \mu_{v}).$$
 (7)

By the Hurwitz Criterion [13], all the roots of the polynomial order four have negative real part when

i) 
$$a_3 > 0$$
, (8)

ii) 
$$a_1 > 0$$
, (9)

 $iii) \quad a_0 \ge 0 \,, \tag{10}$ 

iv) 
$$a_3 a_2 a_1 > a_1^2 + a_3^2 a_0$$
. (11)

It can be seen  $a_3$  is always positive.  $a_0 \ge 0$  when

$$\frac{(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)N_H\sigma_4}{\mu_v} \le 1.$$

For the second and fourth conditions, we show the map by putting the regions in  $a_1 - \beta_{VDSS}$  phase space and  $(a_3a_2a_1 - a_1^2 - a_3^2a_0) - \beta_{VDSS}$  phase space to confirm two conditions in Fig. 4.



Fig. 4 The second and fourth conditions which satisfies the Routh-Hurwitz criteria. The value of parameters are defined in Table 2.

Moreover, for  $\mathbf{R}_0 > 1$ , we have the characteristic equation

$$\lambda^{5} + b_{1}\lambda^{4} + b_{2}\lambda^{3} + b_{3}\lambda^{2} + b_{4}\lambda + b_{5} = 0.$$
 (11)

By the Hurwitz Criterion [13], all the roots of the polynomial order five have negative real part when

i) 
$$b_i > 0$$
 [i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5], (12)

ii) 
$$b_1 b_2 b_3 > b_3^2 + b_1^2 b_4$$
, (13)

iii) 
$$(b_1b_4 - b_5)(b_1b_2b_3 - b_3^2 - b_1^2b_4) > b_5(b_1b_2 - b_3)^2 + b_1b_5^2.$$
 (14)

The roots of polynomial (11) have negative real parts when they are corresponding above three conditions. We now map the regions in  $b_i - \beta_{VDSS}$  phase space,

 $(b_1b_2b_3 - b_3^2 - b_1^2b_4) - \beta_{VDSS}$  phase space and  $((b_1b_4 - b_5)(b_1b_2b_3 - b_3^2 - b_1^2b_4) - b_5(b_1b_2 - b_3)^2 - b_1b_5^2) - \beta_{VDSS}$ phase space in which the three above conditions are met and  $R_0 > 1$ . These are shown in the following figures.



Fig. 5 The three above conditions which satisfies the Routh-Hurwitz criteria. The value of parameters are defined in Table 2.

From the above figure, Routh-Hurwitz Criterion are satisfied for  $R_0 > 1$ . Thus, the endemic equilibrium state is locally stable when  $R_0 > 1$ with

$$R_{_{0}} = \frac{(\eta_{_{1}} + \eta_{_{2}} + \eta_{_{3}})N_{_{H}}\sigma_{_{4}}}{\mu_{_{v}}} .$$
(15)

Table 2. Parameter involved in the transmission of dengue, they are used in Fig. 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Symbol	For Fig. 4 and 5	For Fig. 6	For Fig. 7
N <sub>H</sub>	62,226,009	62,226,009	62,226,009
N <sub>v</sub>	10,000	10,000	10,000
λ	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)
b	1/3	1/3	1/3
$\mu_{\rm H}$	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)
$\mu_{v}$	1/14	1/14	1/14
$\mu_{\text{DF}}$	0.1	0.1	0.1
$\mu_{\text{DHF}}$	0.2	0.2	0.2
$\mu_{\text{DSS}}$	0.8	0.8	0.8
$\beta_{VDF}$	0.3	0.3	0.3
$\beta_{VDHF}$	0.5	0.5	0.5
$\beta_{vDSS}$	$0 \!\leq\! \beta_{\rm VDSS} \!\leq\! 1$	0.1	0.1
$\beta_{\rm HV}$	0.01	0.01	0.5
$\sigma_{l}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDF}}  x  b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDF}}xb$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDF}}xb$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$
$\sigma_2$	( $\beta_{\text{VDHF}}  x  b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDHF}}  x  b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDHF}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$
$\sigma_{_3}$	( $\beta_{v_{DSS}} \ x \ b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDSS}} \; x \; b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDSS}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$
$\sigma_4$	( $\beta_{\rm HV}$ x b )/ $N_{\rm H}$	( $\beta_{\rm HV}$ x b )/ $N_{\rm H}$	( $\beta_{\rm HV} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{\rm _H}$
r	1/3	1/3	1/3
$\mathbf{R}_{0}$	-	0.0267251	1.33626
$\sqrt{R_0}$	-	0.163478	1.15597

## C. Numerical Results

In this study, we consider the transmission of dengue disease when consider follow by the clinical diagnosis by using data in Thailand between 1997 and 2008. The value of the parameters used in this study are  $\mu_{\rm H} = 1/(365 \times 70)$  per day, this corresponds to a life expectancy of 70 years in Thai people. The mean life of vector is 14 days so  $\mu_{\rm v} = 1/14$  per day.  $R_0$  is defined in (15).  $\sqrt{R_0}$  is the basic reproductive number.

The trajectories of the numerical solutions of system (2) are shown in the following figures.



Fig. 6 Numerical solutions demonstrate time series when  $R_0 < 1$ . The value of parameters are defined in Table 2.





Fig. 7 Numerical solutions demonstrate time series when  $R_0 > 1$ . The values of parameters are defined in Table 2.



Fig. 8 Numerical solutions demonstrate time series when  $R_0$  are different. The value of parameters are defined in Table 3.

Table 3. The value of parameters which we used for Fig. 8 and 9.

Symbol	For Fig.8a)	For Fig. 8b)	For Fig. 9
N <sub>H</sub>	62,226,009	62,226,009	62,226,009
N,	10,000	10,000	10,000
λ	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)
b	1/3	1/3	1/3
$\mu_{\rm H}$	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)	1/(365x70)
$\mu_{v}$	1/14	1/14	1/14
$\mu_{DF}$	0.1	0.1	0.1
$\mu_{\text{DHF}}$	0.2	0.2	0.2
$\mu_{\text{DSS}}$	0.8	0.8	0.8
$\beta_{VDF}$	0.3	0.3	0.3
$\beta_{VDHF}$	0.5	0.5	$0 \le \beta_{VDHF} \le 1$ for Fig. 9a), $\beta_{VDHF} = 0.5$ for Fig. 9b)
$\beta_{vDSS}$	0.1	0.1	$\begin{split} \beta_{vDSS} =& 0.1 \\ \text{for Fig. 9a}, \\ 0 \leq \beta_{vDSS} \leq 1 \\ \text{for Fig. 9b}. \end{split}$
$\beta_{\rm HV}$	0.5	0.8	0.8
$\sigma_1$	( $\beta_{\text{VDF}}xb$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDF}}xb$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDF}}xb$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$
$\sigma_2$	( $\beta_{\text{VDHF}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDHF}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{\text{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDHF}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{_{H}}$
$\sigma_{_3}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDSS}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{\text{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDSS}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{\text{H}}$	( $\beta_{\text{VDSS}} \: x \: b$ )/ $N_{\text{H}}$
$\sigma_4$	( $\beta_{\rm HV} \; x \; b$ )/ $N_{\rm H}$	( $\beta_{\rm HV}$ x b )/ $N_{\rm H}$	( $\beta_{\rm HV} \; x \; b$ )/ $N_{\rm H}$
r	1/3	1/3	1/3
$\mathbf{R}_0$	1.33626	2.13801	-
$\sqrt{R_0}$	1.15597	1.46219	-

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this model, we have used, it is assumed that the human population is constants. The epidemiological data from the Division of Epidemiology, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand between 1997 and 2008 are used.

From our analysis, we obtain the following threshold number

$$R_{0} = \frac{(\eta_{1} + \eta_{2} + \eta_{3})N_{H}\sigma_{4}}{\mu_{v}}$$
$$= \frac{b^{2}\beta_{Hv}\beta_{VDF}}{(r + \mu_{DF})\mu_{v}} + \frac{b^{2}\beta_{Hv}\beta_{VDHF}}{(r + \mu_{DHF})\mu_{v}} + \frac{b^{2}\beta_{Hv}\beta_{VDSS}}{(r + \mu_{DSS})\mu_{v}}.$$
 (16)

The square root of (16) is the basic reproductive number. We can see from Fig. 6,  $\hat{S}_H$ ,  $\hat{I}_{DF}$ ,  $\hat{I}_{DHF}$ ,  $\hat{I}_{DSS}$  and  $\hat{I}_v$  approach to the disease free equilibrium state (1,0,0,0,0) respectively for  $R_0 < 1$ . From Fig. 7, the fraction of populations spiral to the endemic disease state (0.74838021536, 0.00000000076, 0.00000000103, 0.0000000010, 0.00002729495). Moreover we compare the numerical solutions when  $R_0$  is difference. We see the trajectories spiraling toward the different endemic disease states (0.74838021536, 0.0000000076, 0.00000000103, 0.0000000010, 0.00002729495) in Fig. 8a) and (0.46776807538, 0.00000000160, 0.0000000217, 0.0000000020, 0.00009236983) in Fig. 8b).

Fig. 9, shows all proportions of population when the transmission probability from infectious vector to human and human becomes to infectious with DHF ( $\beta_{VDHF}$ ) and transmission probability from infectious vector to human and human becomes to infectious with DSS ( $\beta_{VDSS}$ ) are difference.



![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

Fig. 9 Numerical solutions demonstrate time series when  $\beta_{VDHF}$ and  $\beta_{VDSS}$  are different. The value of parameters are defined in Table 3.

When  $\beta_{vDHF}$  is higher, we can see the trajectories spiraling towards to the different endemic disease state,  $\hat{S}_{H}$  decreases. While  $\hat{I}_{DF}$ ,  $\hat{I}_{DHF}$ ,  $\hat{I}_{DSS}$  and  $\hat{I}_{v}$  increases. When  $\beta_{vDSS}$  is higher,  $\hat{S}_{H}$ ,  $\hat{I}_{DF}$ ,  $\hat{I}_{DHF}$  and  $\hat{I}_{v}$  decrease while  $\hat{I}_{DSS}$  increase.

In this study, it is assumed that the human population is constant. The effect of the non-constant human population is not taken into mathematical model. So on the further research, the non-constant human population should also be considered in this model.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank Prof. Dr.I-Ming Tang at Mahidol University, Thailand.

#### REFERENCES

- L. Esteva and C. Vargas, "Analysis of a dengue disease transmission model," *Math. Biosci*, vol. 150, pp. 131-151, 1998.
- [2] L. Esteva and C. Vargas, "A model of dengue disease with variable human population," J. Math. Biosci, vol. 38, pp. 220-240, 1999.
- [3] L. Esteva and C. Vargas, "Coexistence of different serotypes of dengue virus," J. Math. Biosci, vol. 46, pp. 31-47, 2003.
- [4] Z. Feng and J. X. Velasco-Hernandez, "Competitive exclusion in a vector-host model for the dengue fever," *J. Math. Biol*, vol. 35, pp. 523-544, 1997.
- [5] N. Nuraini, E. Soewono and K. A. Sidarto, "A mathematical model of dengue disease transmission with severe DHF compartment," *Bull. Malay. Math. Sci. Soc*, vol. 2, pp. 15-29, 2007.
- [6] E. Soewono and A. K. Supriatna, "A two-dimensional model for transmission of dengue fever disease," *Bull. Malay. Math. Sci. Soc*, vol. 24, pp. 49-57, 2001.
- [7] H. W. Hethcote, *Three basic epidemiological models in Applied Mathematical Ecology*. Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [8] H. W. Hethcote and J. W. Van Ark, Modeling HIV Transmission and AIDS in the United State, Lecture Notes in Biomath. Berlin, Springer Verlag, 1992.
- [9] N. Bellomo, N. K. Li and P. Maini, "On the foundation of cancer modelling: Selected topics, speculations and perspectives," *Math. Models. Methods Appl. Sci*, vol. 18, pp. 593-646, 2008.
- [10] M. A. Nowak, and R. M. May, "Virus dynamics," Mathematical Principles of Immunology and Virology, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [11] O. Diekmann and J. A. P. Heesterbeek, *Mathematical Epidemiology of Infectious Disease*, Model Buillding, Analysis and Interpretation, John Wiley Son:Chichester, 2000.
- [10] Epidemiologic Department Ministry of Public Health, Annual Epidemiological Surveillance Report. Ministry of Public Health Royal Thai Government, 1999-2008.

[11] P. C. Park and V. Hahn, *Stability Theory, Prentice Hall, London, 1993. M. Young*, The techincal Writers Handbook. Mill Valley, CA: University Science, 1989.

**R. Kongnuy** is with the Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Rajamangala University of Technology Suvarnabhumi, Nonthaburi I Road, Muang, Nonthaburi, 11000, Thailand (Corresponding author to provide phone: 662-525-2684; fax: 662-525-2682; e-mail: rujirakung20@ gmail.com).

Educational background: Ph.D. (Applied Mathematics) 2009 King Monkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang, Bangkok, Thailand, M.Sc. (Mathematics) 2005 Ramkhamhaeng University, Bangkok, Thailand, B.Sc. (Mathematics) 1998 Price of Songkla University, Songkla, Thailand.

E. Naowanich is with the Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Science and Technology, Rajamangala University of Technology Suvarnabhumi, Nonthaburi I Road, Muang, Nonthaburi, 11000, Thailand (email: ekachai\_nao@ yahoo.com). Educational background: M.Sc. (Computer Sciences) 2007 King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok, Thailand, B.Ed. (Computer Engineering) 1999 Rajamangala Institute of Technology, North Phra Nakhon.

P. Pongsumpun., is with Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang, Chalongkrung road, Ladkrabang, Bangkok 10520, Thailand, (e-mail: kppuntan@kmitl.ac.th). Educational background: Ph.D. (Mathematics) Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand, B.Sc. (Mathematics) Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.