This is a preprint of a paper whose final and definite form is with *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, ISSN 0170-4214.

Submitted Aug 10, 2017; Revised Nov 13, 2017; accepted for publication Nov 14, 2017

Mathematics Subject Classification: 34D20; 92D30

Mathematical modeling of Zika disease in pregnant women and newborns with microcephaly in Brazil

Faïçal Ndaïrou[a,b], Iván Area[b], Juan J. Nieto[c], Cristiana J. Silva[d], Delfim F. M. Torres[d]*

We propose a new mathematical model for the spread of Zika virus. Special attention is paid to the transmission of microcephaly. Numerical simulations show the accuracy of the model with respect to the Zika outbreak occurred in Brazil.

Keywords: stability; epidemiology; mathematical modeling; zika virus and microcephaly; Brazil; positivity and boundedness of solutions.

arXiv:1711.05630v1 [q-bio.PE] 14 Nov 2017

1. Introduction

Zika virus infection on humans is mainly caused by the bite of an infected *Aedes* mosquito, either *A. aegypti* or *A. albopictus*. The infection on human usually causes rash, mild fever, conjunctivitis, and muscle pain. These symptoms are quite similar to dengue and chikungunya diseases, which can be transmitted by the same mosquitoes. Other modes of transmission of Zika disease have been observed, as sexual transmission, though less common [1]. Such modes of transmission are included in mathematical models found in the recent literature: see [2, Section 8] for a good state of the art.

The name of the virus comes from the Zika forest in Uganda, where the virus was isolated for the first time in 1947. Up to very recent times, most of the Zika outbreaks have occurred in Africa with some sporadic outbreaks in Southeast Asia and also in the Pacific Islands. Since May 2015, Zika virus infections have been confirmed in Brazil and, since October 2015, other countries and territories of the Americas have reported the presence of the virus: see [3], where evolutionary trees, constructed using both newly sequenced and previously available Zika virus genomes, reveal how the recent outbreak arose in Brazil and spread across the Americas. The subject attracted a lot of attention and is now under strong current investigations. In [4], a deterministic model, based on a system of ordinary differential equations, was proposed for the study of the transmission dynamics of the Zika virus. The model incorporates mother-to-child transmission as well as the development of microcephaly in newly born babies. The analysis shows that the disease-free equilibrium of the model is locally and globally asymptotically stable, whenever the associated reproduction number is less than one, and unstable otherwise. A sensitivity analysis was carried out showing that the mosquito biting, recruitment and death rates, are among the parameters with the strongest impact on the basic reproduction number. Then, some control strategies were proposed with the aim to reduce such values [4]. A two-patch model, where host-mobility is modeled using a Lagrangian approach, is used in [1], in order to understand the role of host-movement on the transmission dynamics of Zika virus in an idealized environment. Here we are concerned with the situation in Brazil and its consequences on brain anomalies, in particular microcephaly, which occur in fetuses of infected pregnant woman. This is a crucial question as far as the main problem related with Zika virus is precisely the number of neurological disorders and neonatal malformations [5].

Our study is based on the Zika virus situation reports for Brazil, as publicly available at the World Health Organization (WHO) web page. Based on a systematic review of the literature up to 30th May 2016, the WHO has concluded that Zika virus infection during pregnancy is a cause of congenital brain abnormalities, including microcephaly. Moreover, another important conclusion of the WHO is that the Zika virus is a trigger of Guillain-Barré syndrome [6]. Our analysis is focused on the number of confirmed cases of Zika in Brazil. For this specific case, an estimate of the population of the country is known, as well as the number of

[a] *African Institute for Mathematical Sciences, AIMS-Cameroon, P.O. Box 608, Limbé Crystal Gardens, South West Region, Cameroon*
[b] *Departamento de Matemática Aplicada II, E.E. Aeronáutica e do Espazo, Universidade de Vigo, Campus As Lagoas s/n, 32004 Ourense, Spain*
[c] *Facultade de Matemáticas, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain*
[d] *Center for Research and Development in Mathematics and Applications (CIDMA), Department of Mathematics, University of Aveiro, 3810–193 Aveiro, Portugal*
* *Correspondence to: Delfim F. M. Torres, Department of Mathematics, University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal. Email: delfim@ua.pt*

Accepted for publication in *Math. Meth. Appl. Sci.*

newborns. Moreover, from WHO data, it is possible to have an estimation of the number of newborn babies with neurological disorder. Our mathematical model allows to predict the number of cases of newborn babies with neurological disorder.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the model. Then, in Section 3, we prove that the model is biologically well-posed, in the sense that the solutions belong to a biologically feasible region (see Theorem 1). In Section 4, we give analytical expressions for the two disease free equilibria of our dynamical system. We compute the basic reproduction number R_0 of the system and study the relevant equilibrium point of interaction between women and mosquitoes, showing its local asymptotically stability when R_0 is less than one (see Theorem 2). The sensitivity of the basic reproduction number R_0, with respect to the parameters of the system, is investigated in Section 5 in terms of the normalized forward sensitivity index. The possibility of occurrence of an endemic equilibrium is discussed in Section 6. We end with Sections 7 and 8 of numerical simulations and conclusions, respectively.

2. The Zika model

We consider women as the population under study. The total women population, given by N, is subdivided into four mutually exclusive compartments, according to disease status, namely: susceptible pregnant women (S); infected pregnant women (I); women who gave birth to babies without neurological disorder (W); women who gave birth to babies with neurological disorder due to microcephaly (M).

As for the mosquitoes population, since the Zika virus is transmitted by the same virus as Dengue disease, we shall use the same scheme as in [7]. There are four state variables related to the (female) mosquitoes, namely: $A_m(t)$, which corresponds to the aquatic phase, that includes the egg, larva and pupa stages; $S_m(t)$, for the mosquitoes that might contract the disease (susceptible); $E_m(t)$, for the mosquitoes that are infected but are not able to transmit the Zika virus to humans (exposed); $I_m(t)$, for the mosquitoes capable of transmitting the Zika virus to humans (infected).

The following assumptions are considered in our model:

(A.1) there is no immigration of infected humans;

(A.2) the total human populations N is constant;

(A.3) the coefficient of transmission of Zika virus is constant and does not varies with seasons;

(A.4) after giving birth, pregnant women are no more pregnant and they leave the population under study at a rate μ_h equal to the rate of humans birth;

(A.5) death is neglected, as the period of pregnancy is much smaller than the mean humans lifespan;

(A.6) there is no resistant phase for the mosquito, due to its short lifetime.

Note that the male mosquitoes are not considered in this study because they do not bite humans and consequently they do not influence the dynamics of the disease. The differential system that describes the model is composed by compartments of pregnant women and women who gave birth:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{dS}{dt} = \Lambda - (\phi B \beta_{mh} \dfrac{I_m}{N} + (1-\phi)\tau_1 + \mu_h) S, \\ \dfrac{dI}{dt} = \phi B \beta_{mh} \dfrac{I_m}{N} S - (\tau_2 + \mu_h) I, \\ \dfrac{dW}{dt} = (1-\phi)\tau_1 S + (1-\psi)\tau_2 I - \mu_h W, \\ \dfrac{dM}{dt} = \psi \tau_2 I - \mu_h M, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $N = S + I + W + M$ is the total population (women). The parameter Λ denotes the new pregnant women per week, ϕ stands for the fraction of susceptible pregnant women that gets infected, B is the average daily biting (per day), β_{mh} represents the transmission probability from infected mosquitoes I_m (per bite), τ_1 is the rate at which susceptible pregnant women S give birth (in weeks), τ_2 is the rate at which infected pregnant women I give birth (in weeks), μ_h is the natural death rate for pregnant women, ψ denotes the fraction of infected pregnant women I that give birth babies with neurological disorder due to microcephaly. The above system (1) is coupled with the dynamics of the mosquitoes [8]:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{dA_m}{dt} = \mu_b \left(1 - \dfrac{A_m}{K}\right)(S_m + E_m + I_m) - (\mu_A + \eta_A) A_m, \\ \dfrac{dS_m}{dt} = \eta_A A_m - \left(B \beta_{hm} \dfrac{I}{N} + \mu_m\right) S_m, \\ \dfrac{dE_m}{dt} = \left(B \beta_{hm} \dfrac{I}{N}\right) S_m - (\eta_m + \mu_m) E_m, \\ \dfrac{dI_m}{dt} = \eta_m E_m - \mu_m I_m, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where parameter β_{hm} represents the transmission probability from infected humans I_h (per bite), μ_b stands for the number of eggs at each deposit per capita (per day), μ_A is the natural mortality rate of larvae (per day), η_A is the maturation rate from larvae to adult (per day), $1/\eta_m$ represents the extrinsic incubation period (in days), $1/\mu_m$ denotes the average lifespan of adult mosquitoes (in days), and K is the maximal capacity of larvae. See Table 1 for the description of the state variables and parameters of the Zika model (1)–(2).

Table 1. Variables and parameters of the Zika model (1)–(2).

Variable/Symbol	Description
$S(t)$	susceptible pregnant women
$I(t)$	infected pregnant women
$W(t)$	women who gave birth to babies without neurological disorder
$M(t)$	women who gave birth to babies with neurological disorder due to microcephaly
$A_m(t)$	mosquitoes in the aquatic phase
$S_m(t)$	susceptible mosquitoes
$E_m(t)$	exposed mosquitoes
$I_m(t)$	infected mosquitoes
Λ	new pregnant women (per week)
ϕ	fraction of S that gets infected
B	average daily biting (per day)
β_{mh}	transmission probability from I_m (per bite)
τ_1	rate at which S give birth (in weeks)
τ_2	rate at which I give birth (in weeks)
μ_h	natural death rate
ψ	fraction of I that gives birth to babies with neurological disorder
β_{hm}	transmission probability from I_h (per bite)
μ_b	number of eggs at each deposit per capita (per day)
μ_A	natural mortality rate of larvae (per day)
η_A	maturation rate from larvae to adult (per day)
$1/\eta_m$	extrinsic incubation period (in days)
$1/\mu_m$	average lifespan of adult mosquitoes (in days)
K	maximal capacity of larvae

In Figure 1, we describe the behavior of the movement of individuals among these compartments.



Figure 1. Flowchart presentation of the compartmental model (1)–(2) for Zika.

We consider system (1)–(2) with given initial conditions

$$S(0)=S_0,\quad I(0)=I_0,\quad W(0)=W_0,\quad M(0)=M_0,\quad A_m(0)=A_{m0},\quad S_m(0)=S_{m0},\quad E_m(0)=E_{m0},\quad I_m(0)=I_{m0},$$

with $(S_0, I_0, W_0, M_0, A_{m0}, S_{m0}, E_{m0}, I_{m0}) \in \mathbb{R}^8_+$. In what follows, we assume $\beta_{mh}=\beta_{hm}$.

3. Positivity and boundedness of solutions

Since the systems of equations (1) and (2) represent, respectively, human and mosquitoes populations, and all parameters in the model are nonnegative, we prove that, given nonnegative initial values, the solutions of the system are nonnegative. More precisely, let us consider the biologically feasible region

$$\Omega = \left\{ (S, I, W, M, A_m, S_m, E_m, I_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^8 : S + I + W + M \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\mu_h}, \quad A_m \leq kN_h, \quad S_m + E_m + I_m \leq mN_h \right\}. \tag{3}$$

The following result holds.

Theorem 1 *The region Ω defined by (3) is positively invariant for model (1)–(2) with initial conditions in $\mathbb{R}_+^8$.*

Proof. Our proof is inspired by [8]. System (1)–(2) can be rewritten in the following way: $\frac{dX}{dt} = M(X)X + F$, where $X = (S, I, W, M, A_m, S_m, E_m, I_m)$, $M(X) = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & M_2 \end{pmatrix}$ with

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -\phi B \beta_{mh} \frac{I_m}{N} - (1-\phi)\tau_1 - \mu_h & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \phi B \beta_{mh} \frac{I_m}{N} & -\tau_2 - \mu_h & 0 & 0 \\ (1-\phi)\tau_1 & -(1-\psi)\tau_2 & -\mu_h & 0 \\ 0 & \psi\tau_2 & 0 & -\mu_h \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\mu_b \frac{S_m + E_m + I_m}{K} - \mu_A - \eta_A & \mu_b & \mu_b & \mu_b \\ \eta_A & -B\beta_{hm}\frac{I}{N} - \mu_m & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B\beta_{hm}\frac{I}{N} & -\eta_m - \mu_m & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \eta_m & -\mu_m \end{pmatrix},$$

and $F = (\Lambda, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T$. Matrix $M(X)$ is Metzler, i.e., the off diagonal elements of A are nonnegative. Using the fact that $F \geq 0$, system $\frac{dX}{dt} = M(X)X + F$ is positively invariant in R_+^8 [9], which means that any trajectory with initial conditions in R_+^8 remains in Ω for all $t > 0$. □

4. Existence and local stability of the disease-free equilibria

System (1)–(2) admits two disease free equilibrium points (DFE), obtained by setting the right-hand sides of the equations in the model to zero: the DFE E_1, given by

$$E_1 = (S^*, I^*, W^*, M^*, A_m^*, S_m^*, E_m^*, I_m^*) = \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\tau_1(1-\phi) + \mu_h}, 0, \frac{\tau_1 \Lambda\ (1-\phi)}{\mu_h\ (\tau_1(1-\phi) + \mu_h)}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0 \right),$$

which corresponds to the DFE in the absence of mosquitoes, and the DFE in the presence of mosquitoes, E_2, given by

$$E_2 = (S^*, I^*, W^*, M^*, A_m^*, S_m^*, E_m^*, I_m^*) = \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\tau_1(1-\phi) + \mu_h}, 0, \frac{\tau_1 \Lambda\ (1-\phi)}{\mu_h\ (\tau_1(1-\phi) + \mu_h)}, 0, -\frac{K\varrho}{\mu_b \eta_A}, -\frac{K\varrho}{\mu_b \mu_m}, 0, 0 \right),$$

where

$$\varrho = \eta_A(\mu_m - \mu_b) + \mu_A \mu_m. \tag{4}$$

In what follows, we consider only the DFE E_2, because this equilibrium point considers interaction between humans and mosquitoes, being therefore more interesting from the biological point of view.

The local stability of E_2 can be established using the next-generation operator method on (1)–(2). Following the approach of [10], we compute the basic reproduction number R_0 of system (1)–(2) writing the right-hand side of (1)–(2) as $\mathcal{F}-\mathcal{V}$ with

$$\mathcal{F}=\begin{pmatrix} 0\\ \phi B\beta_{mh}\frac{I_m}{N}S\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ B\beta_{hm}\frac{I}{N}S_m\\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{V}=\begin{pmatrix} -\Lambda+(\phi B\beta_{mh}\frac{I_m}{N}+(1-\phi)\tau_1+\mu_h)S\\ (\tau_2+\mu_h)I\\ -(1-\phi)\tau_1 S+(1-\psi)\tau_2 I+\mu_h W\\ \mu_h M-\psi\tau_2 I\\ -\mu_b(1-\frac{A_m}{K})(S_m+E_m+I_m)+(\mu_A+\eta_A)A_m\\ -\eta_A A_m+(B\beta_{hm}\frac{I}{N}+\mu_m)S_m\\ (\eta_m+\mu_m)E_m\\ -\eta_m E_m+\mu_m I_m \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we consider the Jacobian matrices associated with $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{V}$:

$$J_{\mathcal{F}}=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ \frac{\phi\epsilon I_m(I+W+M)}{N} & -\frac{\phi\epsilon I_m S}{N} & -\frac{\phi\epsilon I_m S}{N} & -\frac{\phi\epsilon I_m S}{N} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \phi\epsilon S\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ -\frac{\epsilon I S_m}{N} & \frac{\epsilon S_m(S+W+M)}{N} & -\frac{\epsilon I S_m}{N} & -\frac{\epsilon I S_m}{N} & 0 & \epsilon I & 0 & \epsilon S_m\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\epsilon=B\beta_{mh}/N$, and $J_{\mathcal{V}}=\begin{pmatrix} J_{\mathcal{V}1} & J_{\mathcal{V}2}\end{pmatrix}$ with

$$J_{\mathcal{V}1}=\begin{pmatrix} A & -\frac{\phi\epsilon I_m S}{N} & -\frac{\phi\epsilon I_m S}{N} & -\frac{\phi\epsilon I_m S}{N}\\ 0 & \tau_2+\mu_h & 0 & 0\\ \tau_1(\phi-1) & (\psi-1)\tau_2 & \mu_h & 0\\ 0 & -\psi\tau_2 & 0 & \mu_h\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ -\frac{\epsilon I S_m}{N} & \frac{\epsilon S_m(S+W+M)}{N} & -\frac{\epsilon I S_m}{N} & -\frac{\epsilon I S_m}{N}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_{\mathcal{V}2}=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \phi\epsilon S\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ \frac{\mu_b(S_m+E_m+I_m)+(\mu_A+\eta_A)K}{K} & \frac{\mu_b(A_m-K)}{K} & \frac{\mu_b(A_m-K)}{K} & \frac{\mu_b(A_m-K)}{K}\\ -\eta_A & \frac{\epsilon I}{N}+\mu_m & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \eta_M+\mu_m & 0\\ 0 & 0 & -\eta_M & \mu_m \end{pmatrix}$$

and $A=\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h+\dfrac{\phi B\beta_{mh}I_m(N-S)}{N^2}$. The basic reproduction number R_0 is obtained as the spectral radius of the matrix $J_{\mathcal{F}}\times(J_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1}$ at the disease-free equilibrium E_2, and is given by

$$R_0=\frac{\sqrt{-\mu_b\Lambda(\mu_h+\tau_2)(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)(\eta_m+\mu_m)K\phi\eta_m(\eta_A(\mu_m-\mu_b)+\mu_A\mu_m)}\beta_{mh}\mu_h B}{\mu_b\Lambda(\mu_h+\tau_2)(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)(\eta_m+\mu_m)\mu_m} \tag{5}$$

or

$$R_0^2=\frac{\phi B^2\beta_{mh}^2 K\mu_h^2\eta_m(\mu_b\eta_A-\mu_m(\mu_A+\eta_A))}{\mu_m^2\mu_b\Lambda(\mu_h+\tau_2)(\eta_m+\mu_m)(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)}. \tag{6}$$

The disease-free equilibrium E_2 is locally asymptotically stable if all the roots of the characteristic equation of the linearized system associated to (1)–(2) at the DFE E_2 have negative real parts. The characteristic equation associated with E_2 is given by

$$p_1(\lambda)p_2(\lambda)p_3(\lambda)p_4(\lambda)=0 \tag{7}$$

with $p_1(\lambda)=\lambda+\mu_h+\tau_1(1-\phi)$, $p_2(\lambda)=(\lambda+\mu_h)^2$, $p_3(\lambda)=-\lambda^2\mu_m+\left(-\mu_b\eta_A-\mu_m^2\right)\lambda+\mu_m(\mu_m(\mu_A+\eta_A)-\mu_b\eta_A)$ and $p_4(\lambda)=a_3\lambda^3+a_2\lambda^2+a_1\lambda+a_0$, where

$$a_0=-\frac{\mu_m^2\mu_b\Lambda(\mu_h+\tau_2)(\eta_m+\mu_m)(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)-\phi B^2\beta_{mh}^2 K\mu_h^2\eta_m(\mu_b\eta_A-\mu_m(\mu_A+\eta_A))}{\Lambda\mu_m^2\mu_b(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)},$$

$$a_1=-\frac{\mu_m^2+(2\tau_2+2\mu_h+\eta_m)\mu_m+\eta_m(\tau_2+\mu_h)}{\mu_m}, \quad a_2=-\frac{\mu_h+\eta_m+\tau_2+2\mu_m}{\mu_m}, \quad a_3=-\frac{1}{\mu_m}.$$

By the Routh–Hurwitz criterion, all the roots of the characteristic equation (7) have negative parts whenever $R_0<1$. We have just proved the following result.

Theorem 2 *The disease free equilibrium in the presence of non-infected mosquitoes, E_2, is locally asymptotically stable if $R_0 < 1$ and unstable if $R_0 > 1$.*

5. Sensitivity of the basic reproduction number

The sensitivity of the basic reproduction number R_0 is an important issue because it determines the model robustness to parameter values. The sensitivity of R_0 with respect to model parameters is here measured by the so called *sensitivity index*.

Definition 3 (See [11, 12]) *The normalized forward sensitivity index of a variable υ that depends differentiability on a parameter p is defined by* $\Upsilon_p^{\upsilon} := \dfrac{\partial \upsilon}{\partial p} \times \dfrac{p}{|\upsilon|}$.

Remark 4 *If $\Upsilon_p^{\upsilon} = +1$, then an increase (decrease) of p by x% increases (decreases) υ by x%; if $\Upsilon_p^{\upsilon} = -1$, then an increase (decrease) of p by x% decreases (increases) υ by x%.*

From (5) and Definition 3, it is easy to derive the normalized forward sensitivity index of R_0 with respect to the average daily biting B and to the transmission probability β_{mh} from infected mosquitoes I_m per bite.

Proposition 5 *The normalized forward sensitivity index of R_0 with respect to B and β_{mh} is one: $\Upsilon_B^{R_0} = 1$ and $\Upsilon_{\beta_{mh}}^{R_0} = 1$.*

Proof. It is a direct consequence of (5) and Definition 3. □

The sensitivity index of R_0 with respect to ϕ, η_m, μ_h, η_A, μ_m, τ_1, τ_2, μ_b, μ_A, K and Λ is given, respectively, by

$$\Upsilon_{\phi}^{R_0} = \frac{\mu_h+\tau_1}{2(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)}, \quad \Upsilon_{\eta_m}^{R_0} = \frac{\mu_m}{2(\eta_m+\mu_m)}, \quad \Upsilon_{\mu_h}^{R_0} = \frac{(\tau_1(\mu_h+2\tau_2))(1-\phi)+\tau_2\mu_h}{2(\mu_h+\tau_2)(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)}, \quad \Upsilon_{\eta_A}^{R_0} = \frac{(\mu_m-\mu_b)\eta_A}{2(\mu_m(\eta_A+\mu_A)-\eta_A\mu_b)},$$
$$\Upsilon_{\mu_m}^{R_0} = \frac{\mu_m((\eta_A+\mu_A)(-\eta_m-2\mu_m)+3\eta_A\mu_b)+2\eta_A\eta_m\mu_b}{2(\eta_M+\mu_M)(\mu_M(\eta_A+\mu_A)-\eta_A\mu_b)}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tau_1}^{R_0} = \frac{\tau_1(-1+\phi)}{2(\tau_1(1-\phi)+\mu_h)}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tau_2}^{R_0} = -\frac{\tau_2}{2(\mu_h+\tau_2)},$$
$$\Upsilon_{\mu_b}^{R_0} = -\frac{\mu_M(\mu_A+\eta_A)}{2(\mu_M(\eta_A+\mu_A)-\eta_A\mu_b)}, \quad \Upsilon_{\mu_A}^{R_0} = \frac{\mu_A\mu_m}{2(\mu_m(\eta_A+\mu_A)-\eta_A\mu_b)}, \quad \Upsilon_{K}^{R_0} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \Upsilon_{\Lambda}^{R_0} = -\frac{1}{2}.$$

In Section 7, we compute the previous sensitivity indexes for data from Brazil.

To analyze the sensitivity of R_0^2 with respect to all the parameters involved, we compute appropriate derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \phi} = \frac{\mu_h+\tau_1}{\phi(\mu_h+(1-\phi)\tau_1)}R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial B} = \frac{2}{B}R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \beta_{mh}} = \frac{2}{\beta_{mh}}R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \eta_m} = \frac{\mu_m}{\eta_m(\mu_m+\eta_m)}R_0^2,\\
&\frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \mu_b} = \frac{\mu_m(\eta_a+\mu_a)}{\mu_b(\eta_a\mu_b-\mu_m(\eta_a+\mu_a))}R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \eta_A} = \frac{\mu_b-\mu_m}{\eta_a\mu_b-\mu_m(\eta_a+\mu_a)}R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \mu_A} = \frac{\mu_m}{\mu_m(\eta_a+\mu_a)-\eta_a\mu_b}R_0^2,\\
&\frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \mu_m} = \left(\frac{\eta_a+\mu_a}{\mu_m(\eta_a+\mu_a)-\eta_a\mu_b}-\frac{1}{\eta_m+\mu_m}-\frac{2}{\mu_m}\right)R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \Lambda} = -\frac{1}{\Lambda}R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \tau_2} = -\frac{1}{\mu_h+\tau_2}R_0^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

In Section 7 we compute the values of these expressions according with the numerical values given in Table 2, up to the R_0^2 factor, which appears in all the right-hand expressions of (8), in order to determine which are the most and less sensitive parameters.

6. Existence and stability analysis of the endemic equilibrium point

The system (1)–(2) has one endemic equilibrium (EE) with biologic meaning whenever $R_0 > 1$. This EE is given by $E^+ = (S_+^*, I_+^*, W_+^*, M_+^*, A_{m+}^*, S_{m+}^*, E_{m+}^*, I_{m+}^*)$ with $S_+^* = \dfrac{\zeta_S}{d^*}$, $I_+^* = \dfrac{\zeta_I}{d^*(\mu_h+\tau_2)}$, $W_+^* = \dfrac{\zeta_W}{d^*\,\mu_h(\mu_h+\tau_2)}$, $M_+^* = \dfrac{\zeta_M}{d^*\,\mu_h(\mu_h+\tau_2)}$,

$A^*_{m+} = \dfrac{-K\varrho}{\mu_b\eta_A}$, $S^*_{m+} = \dfrac{\zeta_{S_m}}{d^*_m}$, $E^*_{m+} = \dfrac{\zeta_{E_m}}{(\eta_m+\mu_m)d^*_m}$, $I^*_{m+} = E^*_{m+}\dfrac{\eta_m}{\mu_m}$, where ϱ is defined in (4) and

$$
\begin{aligned}
d^* &= \left[BK\beta_{mh}\,\eta_m\,\phi\,\mu_h\,\varrho - \Lambda\,\mu_m\mu_b\,(\eta_m\,\tau_1\,(1-\phi) + \mu_m\,\tau_1\,(1-\phi) + \mu_h\,(\eta_m+\mu_m))\right]\mu_h\,\beta_{mh}\,B,\\
d^*_m &= \mu_b\,(B\beta_{mh}\mu_h + \mu_m\mu_h + \mu_m\tau_2)\,\eta_m\phi B\beta_{mh}\mu_h > 0,\\
\zeta_S &= -\mu_b\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)\,(B\beta_{mh}\,\mu_h + \mu_m(\mu_h+\tau_2))\,\mu_m\Lambda^2,\\
\zeta_I &= \Lambda\,\left(B^2K\beta^2_{mh}\eta_m\,\phi\,\mu^2_h\varrho + \Lambda\,\mu^2_m\mu_b\,(\mu_h+\tau_2)\,((1-\phi)\,\tau_1+\mu_h)\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)\right),\\
\zeta_W &= \Lambda\,K\beta^2_{mh}\eta_m\mu^2_h\phi\tau_2\,(1-\psi)\,\varrho B^2 - \Lambda^2\beta_{mh}\mu_m\mu_b\mu_h\tau_1\,(1-\phi)\,(\mu_h+\tau_2)\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)\,B\\
&\quad - (\Lambda^2\mu^2_m\mu_b\,(\mu_h+\tau_2)\,(\mu_h\tau_2\,(-1+\psi) + \psi\tau_1\tau_2\,(1-\phi) + \mu_h\tau_1\,(1-\phi))\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)),\\
\zeta_M &= \Lambda\,\left(\mu^2_h\varrho K\beta^2_{mh}B^2\eta_m\phi + \Lambda\mu^2_m\mu_b\,(\mu_h+\tau_2)\,(\tau_1\,(1-\phi)+\mu_h)\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)\right)\psi\,\tau_2,\\
\zeta_{S_m} &= -\,(\mu_h+\tau_2)\,(BK\beta_{mh}\eta_m\phi\mu_h\varrho - \Lambda\mu_m\mu_b\,((1-\phi)\,\tau_1+\mu_h)\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)),\\
\zeta_{E_m} &= -\mu^2_h\varrho K\beta^2_{mh}B^2\eta_m\phi - (\mu_h+\tau_2)\,\Lambda\mu^2_m\mu_b\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)\,((1-\phi)\,\tau_1+\mu_h).
\end{aligned}
$$

From (6), $\mu_b\eta_A > \mu_m(\mu_A+\eta_A)$, $\phi<1$, and $d^*<0$. Thus, $S^*_+>0$, $I^*_+ = \dfrac{\left(1-R_0^2\right)\Lambda^2\mu_b\mu^2_m\,((1-\phi)\tau_1+\mu_h)\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)}{d^*} > 0$, and $M^*_+ = \dfrac{\left(1-R_0^2\right)\Lambda^2\mu_b\mu^2_m\,\psi\tau_2\,((1-\phi)\,\tau_1+\mu_h)\,(\eta_m+\mu_m)}{d^*\,\mu_h} = \dfrac{\psi\tau_2}{\mu_h}I^*_+ > 0$. Moreover, as for W^*_+, we have that it can be expressed as $W^*_+ = \dfrac{\varpi}{d^*\,\mu_h\,(\mu_h+\tau_2)}$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varpi &= B^2\beta^2_{mh}\eta_m K\Lambda\mu^2_h\phi(\psi-1)\tau_2(\eta_A\mu_b - \mu_m(\eta_A+\mu_A)) + \Lambda^2\mu_b\mu_m(\eta_m+\mu_m)(\mu_h+\tau_2)\\
&\quad\times[(\phi-1)(\tau_1-\tau_2)(B\beta_{mh}\mu_h + \mu_m(\mu_h+\psi\tau_2)) + \tau_2(B\beta_{mh}\mu_h(\phi-1) + \mu_h\mu_m(\phi-\psi) + \mu_m(\phi-1)\psi\tau_2)].
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, W^*_+ is positive assuming that $\tau_1>\tau_2$ and $\psi>\phi$. Finally, by using again $\mu_b\eta_A > \mu_m(\mu_A+\eta_A)$ and $1-\phi>0$, we obtain that $A^*_{m+}>0$ and, moreover,

$$
S^*_{m+} = \frac{-(\mu_h+\tau_2)d^*}{B\beta_{mh}\mu_h d^*_m} > 0, \quad E^*_{m+} = \frac{\Lambda\,\left(R_0^2-1\right)\mu^2_m\mu_b\,(\mu_h+\tau_2)\,((1-\phi)\,\tau_1+\mu_h)}{d^*_m} > 0, \quad I^*_{m+} = E^*_{m+}\frac{\eta_m}{\mu_m} > 0.
$$

After some appropriate manipulations, the matrix associated to E_+ is given by

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
V_{11} & V_{12} & V_{12} & V_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 & V_{18}\\
V_{21} & -\mu_h-\tau_2-V_{12} & -V_{12} & -V_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -V_{18}\\
\tau_1(1-\phi) & \tau_2(1-\psi) & -\mu_h & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\
0 & \psi\tau_2 & 0 & -\mu_h & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & V_{45} & V_{56} & V_{56} & V_{56}\\
V_{61} & V_{62} & V_{61} & V_{61} & \eta_a & -\mu_m-V_{76} & 0 & 0\\
-V_{61} & -V_{62} & -V_{61} & -V_{61} & 0 & V_{76} & -\eta_m-\mu_m & 0\\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta_m & -\mu_m
\end{pmatrix}
\tag{9}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{11} &= -\mu_h + (\phi-1)\tau_1 - \frac{\mu_h\zeta_I+\zeta_S+\zeta_W}{\mu_h\zeta_S)(\mu_h+\tau_2)}V_{12}, \quad V_{21} = \frac{B\beta_{mh}d^*\eta_m\mu_h\zeta_{I_m}\,(\mu_h\zeta_I+\zeta_S+\zeta_W)\,\phi(\mu_h+\tau_2)}{d^*_m\mu_m(\eta_m+\mu_m)(\zeta_M+\zeta_W+\mu_h(\zeta_I+\zeta_S(\mu_h+\tau_2)))^2},\\
V_{45} &= -\eta_a - \mu_a - \frac{\mu_b(\mu_m\zeta_{E_m}+\eta_m\zeta_{I_m}+\mu_m(\eta_m+\mu_m\zeta_{S_m})}{d^*_m K\,\mu_m(\eta_m+\mu_m)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

With these notations, we have that the eigenvalues of the matrix are

$$
\lambda_1 = \mu_h, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(V_{45}-\mu_m+\sqrt{4\eta_aV_{56}+(\mu_m+V_{45})^2}\right), \quad \lambda_3 = \frac{1}{2}\left(V_{45}-\mu_m-\sqrt{4\eta_aV_{56}+(\mu_m+V_{45})^2}\right)
$$

and the roots of a polynomial of degree five. Equivalently, we can write λ_2 and λ_3 as follows:

$$
\lambda_2 = \frac{\sqrt{\eta^2_a\mu^2_b+4\mu^3_m(\eta_a+\mu_a)-2\eta_a\mu_b\mu^2_m+\mu^4_m}-\eta_a\mu_b-\mu^2_m}{2\mu_m}, \quad \lambda_3 = -\frac{\sqrt{\eta^2_a\mu^2_b+4\mu^3_m(\eta_a+\mu_a)-2\eta_a\mu_b\mu^2_m+\mu^4_m}+\eta_a\mu_b+\mu^2_m}{2\mu_m}.
$$

Moreover, the polynomial of degree five has leading coefficient one, being given by $x^5 + \kappa_4 x^4 + \kappa_3 x^3 + \kappa_2 x^2 + \kappa_1 x + \kappa_0$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\kappa_4 &= \eta_m + 2\mu_h + 2\mu_m + \tau_2 - V_{11} + V_{12} + V_{76},\\
\kappa_3 &= \eta_m\left(2\mu_h + \mu_m + \tau_2 - V_{11} + V_{12} + V_{76}\right) + \mu_h\left(4\mu_m + \tau_2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12} + 2V_{76}\right) + \mu_h^2\\
&\quad + V_{76}\left(\mu_m + \tau_2 - V_{11} + V_{12}\right) + 2\tau_2\mu_m - 2V_{11}\mu_m + 2V_{12}\mu_m + \mu_m^2 + \phi\tau_1 V_{12} - \tau_2 V_{11}\\
&\quad - \tau_1 V_{12} + \tau_2 V_{12} - V_{12}V_{21} - V_{11}V_{12},\\
\kappa_2 &= \eta_m\left(\mu_h\left(2\mu_m + \tau_2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12} + 2V_{76}\right) + \mu_h^2 + \mu_m\left(\tau_2 - V_{11} + V_{12}\right) + (\phi - 1)\tau_1 V_{12} - \tau_2 V_{11} + \tau_2 V_{12}\right.\\
&\quad \left. + V_{76}\left(\tau_2 - V_{11} + V_{12}\right) - V_{11}V_{12} - V_{12}V_{21} + V_{18}(V_{61} - V_{62})\right) + \mu_h\left(2\mu_m\left(\tau 2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12} + V_{76}\right) + 2\mu_m^2\right.\\
&\quad \left. + (\phi - 1)\tau_1 V_{12} - \tau_2 V_{11} + V_{76}\left(\tau_2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12}\right) - V_{11}V_{12} - V_{12}V_{21}\right) + \mu_h^2\left(2\mu_m - V_{11} + V_{76}\right) + 2\phi\tau_1 V_{12}\mu_m\\
&\quad + V_{76}\left(\mu_m\left(\tau_2 - V_{11} + V_{12}\right) + (\phi - 1)\tau_1 V_{12} + \tau_2\left(V_{12} - V_{11}\right) - \left(V_{11} + V_{21}\right)V_{12}\right) - 2\tau_2 V_{11}\mu_m - 2\tau_1 V_{12}\mu_m\\
&\quad + 2\tau_2 V_{12}\mu_m + \tau_2\mu_m^2 - V_{11}\mu_m^2 + V_{12}\mu_m^2 - 2V_{11}V_{12}\mu_m - 2V_{12}V_{21}\mu_m + \phi\tau_1\tau_2 V_{12} - \tau_1\tau_2 V_{12}\\
&\quad - \tau_2 V_{11}V_{12} - \tau_2 V_{12}V_{21},\\
\kappa_1 &= \eta_m\left(\mu_h\left(\mu_m\left(\tau_2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12}\right) + (\phi - 1)\tau_1 V_{12} - \tau_2 V_{11} + V_{76}\left(\tau_2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12}\right) - V_{12}V_{11} - V_{12}V_{21}\right.\right.\\
&\quad \left.\left. + V_{18}\left(2V_{61} - V_{62}\right)\right) + \mu_h^2\left(\mu_m - V_{11} + V_{76}\right) - \mu_m\left(V_{12}\left(-\phi\tau_1 + \tau_1 + V_{11} + V_{21}\right) + \tau_2\left(V_{11} - V_{12}\right)\right)\right.\\
&\quad \left. + \phi\tau_1\tau_2 V_{12} - \phi\tau_1 V_{18}V_{61} - V_{76}\left(V_{12}\left(-\phi\tau_1 + \tau_1 + V_{11} + V_{21}\right) + \tau_2\left(V_{11} - V_{12}\right)\right) - \tau_1\tau_2 V_{12} - \tau_2 V_{11}V_{12}\right.\\
&\quad \left. - \tau_2 V_{12}V_{21} + \tau_1 V_{18}V_{61} + V_{11}V_{18}V_{62} + V_{18}V_{21}V_{62}\right) + \mu_m\left(\mu_h\left(\mu_m\left(\tau_2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12}\right)\right.\right.\\
&\quad \left.\left. - 2\left(V_{12}\left(-\phi\tau_1 + \tau_1 + V_{11} + V_{21}\right) + \tau_2 V_{11}\right)\right) + \mu_h^2\left(\mu_m - 2V_{11}\right) - \mu_m\left(V_{12}\left(-\phi\tau_1 + \tau_1 + V_{11} + V_{21}\right)\right.\right.\\
&\quad \left.\left. + \tau_2\left(V_{11} - V_{12}\right)\right) + 2\tau_2 V_{12}\left((\phi - 1)\tau_1 - V_{11} - V_{21}\right)\right) + V_{76}\left(\mu_h\left(\mu_m\left(\tau_2 - 2V_{11} + V_{12}\right) + (\phi - 1)\tau_1 V_{12}\right.\right.\\
&\quad \left.\left. - V_{11}\left(\tau_2 + V_{12}\right) - V_{21}V_{12}\right) + \mu_h^2\left(\mu_m - V_{11}\right) - \mu_m\left(V_{12}\left(-\phi\tau_1 + \tau_1 + V_{11} + V_{21}\right)\right.\right.\\
&\quad \left.\left. + \tau_2\left(V_{11} - V_{12}\right)\right) + \tau_2 V_{12}\left((\phi - 1)\tau_1 - V_{11} - V_{21}\right)\right),\\
\kappa_0 &= \eta_m\left(-\mu_h\left(V_{12}\mu_m\left(-\phi\tau_1 + \tau_1 + V_{11} + V_{21}\right) + \tau_2 V_{11}\mu_m + (\phi - 1)\tau_1 V_{18}V_{61}\right.\right.\\
&\quad \left.\left. + V_{12}V_{76}\left(-\phi\tau_1 + \tau_1 + V_{11} + V_{21}\right) + \tau_2 V_{76}V_{11} - \tau_2 V_{18}V_{61} - V_{18}\left(V_{11} + V_{21}\right)V_{62}\right)\right.\\
&\quad \left. + \mu_h^2\left(-\left(V_{11}\left(\mu_m + V_{76}\right) - V_{18}V_{61}\right)\right) + \tau_2\left(V_{12}\left(\mu_m + V_{76}\right) - V_{18}V_{61}\right)\left((\phi - 1)\tau_1 - V_{11} - V_{21}\right)\right)\\
&\quad - \mu_m\left(\mu_h + \tau_2\right)\left(\mu_m + V_{76}\right)\left(V_{11}\mu_h + V_{12}\left((1 - \phi) + V_{11} + V_{21}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Obviously, these expressions become rather long. As a consequence, it is not possible to use the Routh–Hurwitz criterion in this general setting, but only for particular values of the parameters. Moreover, the eigenvalues can be computed numerically for the specific values given in Table 2 of the next section (realistic data from Brazil), and they are given by $\lambda_1 = -0.02$, $\lambda_2 = -0.02$, $\lambda_3 = -5000$, $\lambda_4 = -22.3938$, $\lambda_5 = -0.0511697$, $\lambda_6 = -0.044689$, $\lambda_7 = -0.00919002$, $\lambda_8 = -0.0079988$. We can observe that local stability of the endemic equilibrium holds, since all eigenvalues are negative real numbers.

7. Numerical simulations: case study of Brazil

We perform numerical simulations to compare the results of our model with real data obtained from several reports published by the World Health Organization (WHO) [13], from the starting point when the first cases of Zika have been detected in Brazil and for a period of 40 weeks (from February 4, 2016 to November 10, 2016), which is assumed to be a regular pregnancy time.

7.1. Zika model fits well real data

According to several sources, the total population of Brazil is 206,956,000, and every year there are about 3,073,000 new born babies. As a consequence, there are about 3,000,000/52 new pregnant females every week. The number of babies with neurological disorders is taken from WHO reports [13]. See Table 2, where the values considered in this manuscript have been collected, such that the numerical experiments give good approximation of real data obtained from the WHO [13].

Figure 2 shows how our model fits the real data in the period from February 4, 2016 to November 10, 2016. More precisely, the ℓ_2 norm of the difference between the real data and the curve produced by our model, in the full period, is 392.5591, which gives an average of about 9.57 cases of difference each week. We have considered as initial values $S_0 = 2,180,686$ (S_0 is the number of newborns corresponding to the simulation period) and the number of births in the period, $I_0 = 1$, $M_0 = 0$, and $W_0 = 0$ for the women populations, and $A_{m0} = S_{m0} = I_{m0} = 1.0903\text{e+}06$, and $E_{m0} = 6.5421\text{e+}06$ for the mosquitoes populations. The system of differential equations has been solved by using the `ode45` function of Matlab, in a MacBook Pro computer with a 2,8 GHz Intel Core i7 processor and 16 GB of memory 1600 MHz DDR3.

7.2. Local stability of the endemic equilibrium

In order to illustrate the local stability of the endemic equilibrium, we show that for different initial conditions the solution of the differential system (1)–(2) tends to the endemic equilibrium point. We have done a number of numerical experiments. Precisely,

Table 2. Parameter values for system (1)–(2).

Symbol	Description	Value
Λ	new pregnant women (per week)	3000000/52
ϕ	fraction of S that gets infected	0.459
B	average daily biting (per day)	1
β_{mh}	transmission probability from I_m (per bite)	0.6
τ_1	rate at which S give birth (in weeks)	37
τ_2	rate at which I give birth (in weeks)	1/25
μ_h	natural death rate	1/50
ψ	fraction of I that gives birth to babies with neurological disorder	0.133
β_{hm}	transmission probability from I_h (per bite)	0.6
μ_b	number of eggs at each deposit per capita (per day)	80
μ_A	natural mortality rate of larvae (per day)	1/4
η_A	maturation rate from larvae to adult (per day)	0.5
$1/\eta_m$	extrinsic incubation period (in days)	125
$1/\mu_m$	average lifespan of adult mosquitoes (in days)	125
K	maximal capacity of larvae	1.09034e+06



Figure 2. Number of newborns with microcephaly. The red line corresponds to the real data obtained from the WHO [13] from 04/02/2016 to 10/11/2016 and the blue line has been obtained by solving numerically the system of ordinary differential equations (1)–(2). The ℓ_2 norm of the difference between the real data and our prediction is 992.5591, which gives an error of less than 9.57 cases per week.

we consider here four different initial conditions for the women population, C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, defined in Table 3, giving the same value for $S_0 + I_0 + M_0 + W_0$. The system of differential equations (1)–(2) has been solved for a period of 156 weeks, which correspond approximately to 3 years, by using the same numerical method and machine as for the comparison between our model and real data provided by the World Health Organization in Figure 2. These numerical experiments are included in Figure 3.

	S_0	I_0	M_0	W_0
C_1	2.18069×10^6	1	0	0
C_2	2.17633×10^6	1454.79	1453.79	1453.79
C_3	2.17851×10^6	727.896	726.896	726.896
C_4	2.18025×10^6	146.379	145.379	146.379

Table 3. Initial conditions used in the numerical simulations for the case study of Brazil (see Figure 3).



Figure 3. The solution of differential system (1)–(2) tends to the endemic equilibrium point, independently of initial conditions. In this figure, we show the evolution of the populations of infected women (I) and cases of microcephaly (M). Initial conditions are those of Table 3.

7.3. Sensitivity analysis of the basic reproduction number

In order to determine which are the most and less sensitive parameters of our model, we compute the values of expressions (8) according to the numerical values given in Table 2. The numerical results are as follows:

$$\frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \phi} = 4.02523R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial B} = 2R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \beta_{mh}} = 3.33333R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \eta_m} = 62.5R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \mu_b} = 1.8753 \times 10^{-6}R_0^2,$$
$$\frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \eta_a} = 2.0001R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \mu_a} = -0.00020003R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \mu_m} = -312.51R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \Lambda} = -0.0000173333R_0^2, \quad \frac{\partial R_0^2}{\partial \tau_2} = -16.6667R_0^2.$$

In Table 4, we present the sensitivity index of parameters Λ, ϕ, B, β_{mh}, τ_1, τ_2, μ_b, μ_A, η_A, η_m, μ_m and K computed for the parameter values given in Table 2. From Table 4, we conclude that the most sensitive parameters are B and β_{mh}, which means

Parameters	Sensitivity index	Parameters	Sensitivity index
Λ, K	$-1/2$	μ_b	0.00007501125170
ϕ	0.9237909865	μ_A	-0.2500375056e-4
B, β_{mh}	1	η_A	0.5000250040
τ_1	-0.4995009233	η_m	$1/4$
τ_2	$-1/3$	μ_m	-1.250075011

Table 4. The normalized forward sensitivity index of the basic reproduction number R_0, for the parameter values of Table 2.

that in order to decrease the basic reproduction number in $x\%$ we need to decrease these parameter values in $x\%$. Therefore, in order to reduce the transmission of the Zika virus it is crucial to implement control measures that lead to a reduction on the number of daily biting (per day) B and the transmission probability from the infected mosquitoes, β_{mh}. The fraction ϕ of susceptible pregnant women S that get infected has a sensitive index very close to $+1$. This fact reinforces the importance of prevention measures, which protect susceptible pregnant women of becoming infected.

8. Conclusion

We proposed a new mathematical model for the transmission of Zika disease taking into account newborns with microcephaly. It has been shown that the proposed model fits well the recent reality of Brazil from February 4, 2016 to November 10, 2016 [13]. From a sensitivity analysis, we conclude that in order to reduce the number of new infection by Zika virus, it is important to implement control measures that reduce the average number of daily biting and the transmission probability from infected mosquitoes to susceptible pregnant women.

Acknowledgements. Area and Nieto were supported by *Agencia Estatal de Innovación* of Spain, project MTM2016-75140-P, co-financed by FEDER and *Xunta de Galicia*, grants GRC 2015–004 and R 2016/022. Silva and Torres were supported by FCT and CIDMA within project UID/MAT/04106/2013; by PTDC/EEI-AUT/2933/2014 (TOCCATA), co-funded by 3599-PPCDT and FEDER funds through COMPETE 2020, POCI. Silva is also grateful to the FCT post-doc fellowship SFRH/BPD/72061/2010.

References

1. V. M. Moreno, B. Espinoza, D. Bichara, S. A. Holechek, C. Castillo-Chavez. Role of short-term dispersal on the dynamics of Zika virus in an extreme idealized environment, Infect. Dis. Model. 2 (2017), 21–34.
2. P. van den Driessche. Reproduction numbers of infectious disease models, Infect. Dis. Model., in press. DOI: 10.1016/j.idm.2017.06.002
3. M. Worobey. Epidemiology: Molecular mapping of Zika spread, Nature 546 (2017), 355–357.
4. F. B. Agusto, S. Bewick, W. F. Fagan. Mathematical model of Zika virus with vertical transmission, Infect. Dis. Model. 2 (2017), 244–267.
5. H. Tang, C. Hammack, S. C. Ogden, Z. Wen, Z. Qian, Y. Li, B. Yao, J. Shin, F. Zhang, E. M. Lee, K. M. Christian, R. A. Didier, P. Jin, H. Song, G.-li Ming. Zika virus infects human cortical neural progenitors and attenuates their growth, Cell Stem Cell. 18 (2016), no. 5, 587–590.
6. WHO Zika Causality Working Group, Zika Virus Infection as a Cause of Congenital Brain Abnormalities and GuillainBarré Syndrome: Systematic Review, PLOS Medicine, 2017, 27 pp. DOI:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002203
7. H. S. Rodrigues, M. T. T. Monteiro, D. F. M. Torres. Seasonality effects on dengue: basic reproduction number, sensitivity analysis and optimal control, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. 39 (2016), no. 16, 4671–4679. arXiv:1409.3928
8. H. S. Rodrigues, M. T. T. Monteiro, D. F. M. Torres, A. Zinober. Dengue disease, basic reproduction number and control, Int. J. Comput. Math. 89 (2012), no. 3, 334–346. arXiv:1103.1923
9. A. Abate, A. Tiwari, S. Sastry. Box invariance in biologically-inspired dynamical systems, Automatica 45 (2009), no. 7, 1601–1610.
10. P. van den Driessche, J. Watmough. Reproduction numbers and subthreshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission, Math. Biosc. 180 (2002), 29–48.
11. N. Chitnis, J. M. Hyman, J. M. Cushing. Determining important parameters in the spread of malaria through the sensitivity analysis of a mathematical model, Bull. Math. Biol. 70 (2008), no. 5, 1272–1296.
12. Q. Kong, Z. Qiu, Z. Sang, Y. Zou. Optimal control of a vector-host epidemics model, Math. Control Relat. Fields 1 (2011), 493–508.
13. http://www.who.int/emergencies/zika-virus/situation-report/en/, accessed July 13, 2017.