

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Article A DISEASED THREE-SPECIES HARVESTING FOOD-WEB MODEL WITH VARIOUS RESPONSE FUNCTIONS

Megala T^{1*}, Nandha Gopal T¹, Siva Pradeep M¹, and Yasotha A²

- ¹ Department of Mathematics, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu - 641020, India; nandhu792002@yahoo.co.in (N.G.T); sivapradeep@rmv.ac.in (S.P.M)
- ² Department of Mathematics, United Institute of Technology, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu 641020, India; yasotha@uit.ac.in
- * Correspondence: megala369@rmv.ac.in

Abstract: The purpose of this work is to present a three-species harvesting food web model that takes into account with the interactions of susceptible prey, infected prey, and predator species. Prey 2 species are assumed to expand logistically in the absence of predator species. Crowley-Martin and 3 Beddington-DeAngelis Functional Responses are used by predators to consume both susceptible and infected prey. Additionally, susceptible prey is consumed by infected prey in the formation of Holling 5 type II response. Both prey populations are considered when prey harvesting is taken into account. Boundedness, positivity, and positive invariance are considered in this study. The investigation covers all equilibrium points that are biologically feasible. Local stability is evaluated by analyzing 8 the distribution of eigen values, while global stability is evaluated using suitable Lyapunov functions. 9 Moreover, Hopf bifurcation has analyzed at the harvesting rate \mathcal{H}_1 . In the end, we evaluate numerical 10 solutions based on our findings. 11

Keywords: Prey-Predator; Crowley-Martin type; Beddington-DeAngelis form; Equilibrium; Stability; Bifurcation

1. Introduction

In environmental nature, a variety of diseases may arise and spread among species when they interact with other organisms. Mathematical models have evolved into important tools for evaluating disease propagation and control. An Eco-epidemiological model of diseased three-species food webs includes infectious prey, susceptible prey, and predators. At the beginning of the 20th century, several strategies were established in mathematical ecology to predict the presence of organisms and species of growth. The first significant attempt in this field was the well-known traditional Lotka-Volterra model [1] in 1927.

The investigation of predator-prey relationships is a crucial field of ecology research. 22 The mathematical modeling of epidemics has become a prominent field of research. In this 23 field, some of the substantial quantity of research has been done [2], [3], [4]. Furthermore, 24 mining and harvesting are practiced on a large number of the species found in the natural 25 environment. Harvesting of the species is required for coexistent and hence, the researchers 26 were quite interested in the proposed ecological models. Different methods of harvesting 27 have been proposed and explored, including constant harvesting, density dependent 28 proportional harvesting, and nonlinear harvesting [5], [6]. By considering the above in view, 29 in this work we propose and study an eco-epidemiological prey-predator model involving 30 different functional responses of harvesting. The majority of functional responses, like 31 Holling types, are classified as "prey-dependent" because they depend on either the predator 32 or the prey [7]. Both the prey and the predator are taken into account in Crowley-Martin 33 reactions. In the Beddington-DeAngelis form, handling prey and hunting prey are viewed 34 as two separate and independent actions. The response function of Beddington-DeAngelis, 35 Holling type II, and Crowley-Martin form are considered in this work. The main goal of this 36

Citation: T, Megala.; T, Nandha Gopal.; M, Siva Pradeep.; A, Yasotha. A DISEASED THREE-SPECIES HARVESTING FOOD-WEB MODEL WITH VARIOUS RESPONSE FUNCTIONS. Journal Not Specified 2023, 1, 0. https://doi.org/

Received: Revised: Accepted: Published:

Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Submitted to *Journal Not Specified* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). study is to analyze how disease and prey harvesting affect the predator-prey relationship. To the best of our knowledge, no studies have looked at an eco-epidemiological model of the three species food web of harvesting with varying functional responses.

The section 2 addresses the mathematical expression. Some preliminary observations are presented in Section 3. The boundary equilibrium points and stability are shown in Section 4. In subsection 5.1, the coexistence condition of the interior equilibrium point $\mathcal{E}^*(a^*, i^*, r^*)$ is determined by examining its local stability. Global stability analysis for \mathcal{E}^* is verified in subsection 5.2. Furthermore, Section 6, investigates Hopf-bifurcation based on harvesting rate \mathcal{H}_1 . MATLAB software tool is used quantitatively to validate all key results in Section 7. The conclusion of this research, as well as the environmental impacts of our results, are shown in Section 8, which ends our research.

2. Formation and Flowchart of the equation

Prey harvesting is incorporated into the models for a predator-prey system.

$$\frac{d\mathcal{A}}{d\mathcal{T}} = x_1 \mathcal{A} \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{I}}{K} \right) - \frac{\pi \mathcal{A} \mathcal{I}}{s_1 + \mathcal{A}} - \frac{\alpha_1 \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}}{(1 + \eta \mathcal{A})(1 + \mu \mathcal{R})} - \mathcal{H}_1 \mathcal{E}_1 \mathcal{A},
\frac{d\mathcal{I}}{d\mathcal{T}} = \frac{\pi \mathcal{A} \mathcal{I}}{s_1 + \mathcal{A}} - d_1 \mathcal{I} - \frac{g_1 \mathcal{I} \mathcal{R}}{(1 + \beta \mathcal{I} + \gamma \mathcal{R})} - \mathcal{H}_2 \mathcal{E}_2 \mathcal{I},
\frac{d\mathcal{R}}{d\mathcal{T}} = -d_2 \mathcal{R} + \frac{m\alpha_1 \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}}{(1 + \eta \mathcal{A})(1 + \mu \mathcal{R})} + \frac{mg_1 \mathcal{I} \mathcal{R}}{(1 + \beta \mathcal{I} + \gamma \mathcal{R})},$$
(1)

by the positive conditions $\mathcal{A}(0) = \mathcal{A}_0 \ge 0$, $\mathcal{I}(0) = \mathcal{I}_0 \ge 0$ and $\mathcal{R}(0) = \mathcal{R}_0 \ge 0$.

Parameters	Ecological Description	
$\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}$	predator species, susceptible prey, and infected prey	
π, x	Infectious and growth rate of prey	
Κ, η, Ε	carrying capacity, handling time of predators, harvesting effort	
s_1 and β	infected prey and predators half saturation constant	
m, α_1	conversion of prey to predators, of susceptible prey's predation rate	
γ,μ	magnitude of interference by predators of beddington and crowley	
81	consuming rate of susceptible prey by predator	
d_1 and d_2	mortality rate infectious prey and predators	
$\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$	susceptible and infected prey's catchability coefficient	

Table 1. Ecological description of the model



Figure 1. Flowchart of the Dynamical Model with Different Functional Responses

48 49

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

To minimize the parameters in the model (1), we modify the variables as follows: $a = \frac{A}{K}$, $i = \frac{T}{K}$, $r = \frac{R}{K}$; and the dimensionless time $t = \pi KT$. The transformations can be utilized to formate the equations (1) in dimensionless form.

$$\frac{da}{dt} = xa(1-a-i) - \frac{\pi ai}{s+a} - \frac{\alpha ar}{(1+\eta a)(1+\mu r)} - h_1 a,$$

$$\frac{di}{dt} = \frac{\pi ai}{s+a} - di - \frac{\theta ir}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)} - h_2 i,$$

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = -\delta r + \frac{m\alpha ar}{(1+\eta a)(1+\mu r)} + \frac{m\theta ir}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)}$$
(2)

where, $x = \frac{x_1}{\pi K}$, $\alpha = \frac{\alpha_1}{\pi K}$, $s = \frac{s_1}{K}$, $\theta = \frac{g_1}{\rho K}$, $d = \frac{d_1}{\pi K}$, $\delta = \frac{d_2}{\pi K}$. Now, the model's conditions are, $a(0) = a_0 \ge 0$, $i(0) = i_0 \ge 0$ and $r(0) = r_0 \ge 0$.

3. Positivity and Boundedness

Let $F \equiv (a(t), i(t), r(t))^T$ and $\mathcal{V}(F) = (\mathcal{V}_1(F), \mathcal{V}_2(F), \mathcal{V}_3(F))^T$, where

$$\mathcal{V}_1(F) = xa(1-a-i) - \frac{\pi ai}{s+a} - \frac{\alpha ar}{(1+\eta a)(1+\mu r)} - h_1 a,$$

$$\mathcal{V}_2(F) = \frac{\pi ai}{s+a} - di - \frac{\theta ai}{(1+\beta i+\gamma a)} - h_2 i,$$

$$\mathcal{V}_3(F) = -\delta r + \frac{m\alpha ar}{(1+\eta a)(1+\mu r)} + \frac{m\theta ir}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)}.$$

Since, the equation can be denote as $\frac{dF}{dt} = \mathcal{V}(F)$ where $\mathcal{V} : C_+ \to \mathcal{R}^3_+$ with $F(0) = F_0 \in \mathcal{R}^3_+$. Thus, $\mathcal{V}_m \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathcal{R})$ for m = 1, 2, 3. \mathcal{V} is continuous and Lipschitzian function on \mathcal{R}^3_+ . It contains non-negative conditions. So, the region \mathcal{R}^3_+ is under invariant condition.

Theorem 1. The model's (2) potential responses are bounded, and it is in \mathcal{R}^3_+ .

Proof. Let (a(t), i(t), r(t)) are the prescribed response for the model (2). Let, $\frac{da}{dt} \le a(1-a)$. $\limsup_{t\to\infty} a(t) \le 1$. Let $\psi = a + i + r$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\psi}{dt} &= xa(1-a) - ai(x + \frac{\pi}{s+a}) - \frac{\alpha ar(1-m)}{(1+\eta a)(1+\mu r)} - h_1 a + \frac{ai}{s+a} - di \\ &- \frac{\theta ir}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)}(1-m) - h_2 i - \delta r, \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq xa(1-a) - h_1a - air - i(d+h_2) - \delta r, \text{ (since } m < 1)),$$

$$\leq \frac{x}{4} - h_1a - i(d+h_2) - \delta r \text{ (since } Max \{xa(1-a)\} = \frac{x}{4}),$$

$$\leq \frac{x}{4} - \beta \psi, \text{ where, } \beta = min \{h_1, d+h_2, \delta\}.$$

$$Thus, we have $\frac{d\psi}{d\psi} + \theta d\phi \leq \frac{x}{4}, \text{ we have } 0 \leq c\phi \leq \frac{x}{4} (1 - cm^{-\beta t}) + d\phi(a - i, r) cm^{-\beta t} \| b \| t > cc$$$

Thus, we have $\frac{u\psi}{dt} + \beta\psi \leq \frac{x}{4}$. we have $0 < \psi \leq \frac{x}{4\beta}(1 - exp^{-\beta t}) + \psi(a_0, i_0, r_0)exp^{-\beta t}$. If $t \to \infty$, since $0 < \psi \leq \frac{x}{4\beta}$. Hence, the solutions of model (2) are confined to positive around Ω . where, $\Omega = \{(a, i, r) \in \mathcal{R}^3_+ : a + i + r \leq \frac{x}{4\beta} + \epsilon\}$. \Box

4. Presence of Boundary Equilibrium Points

- \mathcal{E}_0 , the equilibria of trivial point. Here, \mathcal{E}_0 (0, 0, 0) exists.
- \mathcal{E}_1 , no infection and predator-free Equilibria, $\mathcal{E}_1(\frac{x-h_1}{x}, 0, 0)$ exists for $h_1 < x$.
- \mathcal{E}_2 is the equilibria of without predator, $\mathcal{E}_2(\bar{a}, \bar{i}, 0)$ where $\bar{a} = \frac{s(d+h_2)}{(1-d-h_2)}$ and $\bar{i} = \frac{(x(1-a)-h_1)(s+a)}{x}$. \mathcal{E}_2 exists for $s(d+h_2) < (1-d-h_2)$ and $h_1 < x(1-a)$.
- \mathcal{E}_3 is the no diseases of equilibria, $\mathcal{E}_3(\bar{a}, 0, \bar{r})$ where $\bar{a} = \frac{\delta(1+\mu r)}{m\alpha \eta\delta(1+\mu r)}$ and $\bar{i} = \frac{(x(1-a)-h_1)(1+\eta a)(1+\mu)}{\alpha}$. \mathcal{E}_3 exists for $\eta\delta(1+\mu r) < m\alpha$ and $h_1 < x(1-a)$.

56 57

61

62

63

69

70

71

73

75

77

• \mathcal{E}^* is the equilibria of coexistent state, \mathcal{E}^* (a^*, i^*, r^*) . It exists for $\delta > m\alpha$, $(1 + \beta i^* + \gamma r^*) > 0$, $x(1 - a^* - i^*) > h_1 - i^*$, $\alpha s > 0$. Where, $a^* = \frac{s + ((d + h_2) + (1 + \beta i^* + \gamma r^*) + \theta r^*)}{(1 + \beta i^* + \gamma r^*)}$, $i^* = \frac{(1 + \beta + \gamma r^*)(\delta(1 + \eta a^*)(1 + \mu r^*) - m\alpha a^*)}{(1 + \eta a^*)(1 + \mu r^*)m\theta}$, $r^* = \frac{((1 + \eta a^*)(1 + \mu))(s + a^*(x(1 - a^* - i^*) - h_1) - i^*)}{\alpha(s + a^*)}$.

5. Stability Analysis

5.1. Local Analysis

The matrix of Jacobian equations is used to investigate local stability at a point in (a, i, r) is

$$\begin{split} n_{11} = & x(1-2a-i) - \frac{si}{(s+a)^2} - \frac{\alpha r}{(1+\eta a)^2(1+\mu r)} - h_1, n_{12} = -ax - \frac{a}{a+s} \\ n_{13} = & -\frac{\alpha a}{(1+\mu r)^2(1+\eta a)^2}, n_{21} = \frac{si}{(s+a)^2}, n_{31} = \frac{\alpha xm}{(1+\eta a)^2(1+\mu r)}, \\ n_{22} = & \frac{a}{a+s} - d - \frac{x\theta(1+\gamma r)}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)^2} - h_2, n_{23} = -\frac{i\theta(1+\beta i)}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)^2}, \\ n_{32} = & \frac{\theta xm(1+\gamma r)}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)^2}, n_{33} = -\delta + \frac{\alpha am}{(1+\mu r)^2(1+\eta a)} + \frac{\theta im(1+\beta i)}{(1+\beta i+\gamma r)^2}. \end{split}$$

Theorem 2. *The following are the points to verify stability condition of model (2). They are*

- 1. Trivial point of equilibria $\mathcal{E}_0(0,0,0)$ is LAS if $x < h_1$.
- 2. The infectious and predator-free points $\mathcal{E}_1(\frac{x-h_1}{x}, 0, 0)$ is LAS if $x < h_1, -d h_2 > \frac{x-h_1}{x-h_1+s}$, $\delta < \frac{(x-h_1)m\alpha}{1+\eta(x-h_1)}$.
- 3. The equilibria with no predator $(\bar{a}, \bar{i}, 0)$ is LAS if $\mathcal{Y}_{11} > 0$, $\mathcal{Y}_{12} > 0$, and $\delta > \frac{m\alpha\bar{a}}{1+\eta\bar{a}} + \frac{\bar{i}m\theta(1+\beta\bar{i})}{(\beta\bar{i}+1)^2}$.

Proof. 1. The trivial point $\mathcal{E}_0(0,0,0)$ of the eigen values are $x - h_1$, $-d - h_2$, $-\delta$. Hence, it is LAS when $x < h_1$ if not, it is unstable.

- 2. The eigen values of $\mathcal{E}_1(\frac{x-h_1}{x}, 0, 0)$ are $h_1 x$, $\frac{(x-h_1)}{(x-h_1)+s} d h_2$, $\delta + \frac{(x-h_1)m\alpha}{1+\eta(x-h_1)}$. Hence, it is LAS if $x < h_1$, $-d h_2 > \frac{(x-h_1)}{(x-h_1)+s}$, $\delta < \frac{(x-h_1)m\alpha}{1+\eta(x-h_1)}$ if not, it is unstable.
- 3. The matrix in its Jacobian form is

$$n_{11} = x(1 - 2\bar{a} - \bar{i}) - \frac{s\bar{i}}{(s + \bar{a})^2} - h_1, \quad n_{12} = -\bar{a}x - \frac{\bar{a}}{\bar{a} + s}, \quad n_{13} = -\frac{\alpha\bar{a}}{1 + \eta\bar{a}},$$

$$n_{21} = \frac{s\bar{i}}{(s + \bar{a})^2}, \quad n_{22} = \frac{\bar{a}}{\bar{a} + s} - d - h_2, \quad n_{23} = -\frac{\bar{i}\theta(1 + \beta i)}{(\beta\bar{i} + 1)^2}, \\ n_{31} = 0, \\ n_{32} = 0,$$

$$n_{33} = -\delta + \frac{\bar{a}m\alpha}{1 + \eta\bar{a}} + \frac{im\theta(1 + \beta i)}{(\beta\bar{i} + 1)^2}.$$

The characteristic form of $J(\mathcal{E}_2)$ is $(n_{33} - \lambda)(\lambda^2 + S_{11}\lambda + S_{12}) = 0$. Where $S_{11} = -(n_{11} + n_{22})$ and $S_{12} = n_{11}n_{22} - n_{12}n_{21}$. As a result, one of the eigenvalues of the equation is n_{33} , (i.e) negative. Hence, the other two must likewise be negative. So, \mathcal{E}_2 is LAS if $S_{11} > 0$, $S_{12} > 0$ and $\delta > \frac{\bar{a}m\alpha}{1+\eta\bar{a}} + \frac{im\theta(1+\beta i)}{(\beta i+1)^2}$. \Box

Theorem 3. Infectious-free point of equilibrium $(\bar{a}, 0, \bar{r})$ is LAS if $\mathcal{D}_{11} > 0$, $\mathcal{D}_{12} > 0$ and $-(d + \frac{r\theta(1+\gamma r)}{(\beta b+\gamma r+1)^2} + h_2) > \frac{a}{a+s}$. (This demonstration is equivalent to Theorem 2 condition (3))

Theorem 4. The equilibrium point \mathcal{E}^* is LAS if $\mathcal{G}_1 > 0$, $\mathcal{G}_3 > 0$, and $\mathcal{G}_1 \mathcal{G}_2 - \mathcal{G}_3 > 0$.

82

83

84

86

87

88

90

91

92

93

94

Proof. As for the model (2), its Jacobian matrix is at $\mathcal{E}^*(a^*, i^*, r^*)$

$$g_{11} = x(1 - 2a^* - i^*) - \frac{si^*}{(s+a^*)^2} - \frac{\alpha r^*}{(1 + \eta a^*)^2(1 + \mu r^*)} - h_1,$$

$$g_{12} = -a^*x - \frac{a^*}{a^* + \mu}, g_{13} = -\frac{\alpha a^*}{(1 + \mu r^*)^2(1 + \eta a^*)^2}, g_{21} = \frac{si^*}{(s+a^*)^2},$$

$$g_{31} = \frac{\alpha r^*m}{(1 + \eta a^*)^2(1 + \mu r^*)}, g_{22} = \frac{a^*}{a^* + s} - d - \frac{r^*\theta(1 + \gamma r^*)}{(1 + \beta i^* + \gamma r^*)^2} - h_2,$$

$$g_{23} = -\frac{i^*\theta(1 + \beta i^*)}{(1 + \beta i^* + \gamma r^*)^2}, g_{32} = \frac{\theta r^*m(1 + \gamma r^*)}{(1 + \beta i^* + \gamma r^*)^2}, g_{33} = 0$$

The cubic characteristic equation is $J(\mathcal{E}^*)$ is

$$\lambda^3 + \mathcal{G}_1 \lambda^2 + \mathcal{G}_2 \lambda + \mathcal{Y}_3 = 0. \tag{3}$$

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{G}_{1}=-(g_{11}+g_{22}), \mathcal{G}_{2}=-(g_{12}g_{21}+g_{13}g_{31}+g_{23}g_{32}-g_{11}g_{22}-g_{11}g_{33}), & & \\ \mathcal{G}_{3}=-(g_{12}g_{23}g_{31}+g_{13}g_{21}g_{32}-g_{13}g_{31}g_{22}-g_{11}g_{23}g_{32}). & & \\ \text{If } \mathcal{G}_{1}>0, \mathcal{G}_{3}>0, \text{ and } \mathcal{G}_{1}\mathcal{G}_{2}-\mathcal{G}_{3}>0. & \text{The root of the characteristic equation is negative} & & \\ \text{real parts iff } \mathcal{G}_{1}, \mathcal{G}_{3}, \text{ and } \mathcal{G}_{1}\mathcal{G}_{2}-\mathcal{G}_{3}>0. & \text{According to Routh-Hurwitz } \mathcal{E}^{*} \text{ is LAS. } & \Box & & \\ \end{array}$

5.2. Global Analysis

Theorem 5. The point \mathcal{E}^* is GAS in $W = \{(a, i, r) : a > a^*, i > i^* and r > r^* or a < a^*, i < i^*$ and $r < r^*\}$

 $W = \{(a, i, r) : a > a^*, i > i^* \text{ and } r > r^*\} \text{ or } a < a^*, i < i^* \text{ and } r < r^*\} \text{ and it shows, } \mathcal{N} \text{ is a }$ suitable Lyapunov function for all the solutions in W. \Box

6. Analysis of the Hopf bifurcation

Theorem 6. If the bifurcating parameter \mathcal{H}_1 exceeds a substantial value, then it occurs Hopfbifurcation in the system (2). The presence of the Hopf-bifurcation requirements listed below is \mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_1^*

1. $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1^*)\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1^*) - \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_1^*) = 0$,

2. $\frac{d}{d\mathcal{H}_1}(Re(\gamma(\mathcal{H}_1)))|_{\mathcal{H}_1=\mathcal{H}_1^*} \neq 0$, where γ represents the positive value of the equilibrium point and is the zero of the characteristic equation.

Proof. For $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_1^*$, let (3) denotes

 $(\gamma^{2}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) + \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}))(\gamma(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) + \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})) = 0.$ (i.e) $\pm i \sqrt{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})}$ and $-\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})$ are the roots of the equation (6). To establish the Hopf-bifurcation exists at the point, we must fulfill the transversality requirement. $\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*} = \mathcal{H}_{1}. \frac{d}{d\mathcal{H}_{1}}(Re(\gamma(\mathcal{H}_{1})))|_{\mathcal{H}_{1}=\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}} \neq 0.$ For all \mathcal{H}_{1} , the 138

106

111

128

129

130

131

132

133 134

135

roots of the form $\gamma_{1,2}(\mathcal{H}_1) = r(\mathcal{H}_1) \pm is(\mathcal{H}_1)$, and $\gamma_3(\mathcal{H}_1) = -\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1)$. Now, we check the condition $\frac{d}{d\mathcal{H}_1}(Re(\gamma_j(\mathcal{H}_1)))|_{\mathcal{H}_1=\mathcal{H}_1^*} \neq 0, j = 1, 2$.Let, $\gamma_1(\mathcal{H}_1) = r(\mathcal{H}_1) + is(\mathcal{H}_1)$ in (6), we get $\gamma_1(\mathcal{H}_1) + i\gamma_2(\mathcal{H}_1) = 0,$

where, $\gamma_1(\mathcal{H}_1) = r^3(\mathcal{H}_1) + r^2(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1) - 3r(\mathcal{H}_1)s^2(\mathcal{H}_1) - s^2(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1) + r(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ + $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1), \gamma_2(\mathcal{H}_1) = 3r^2(\mathcal{H}_1)s(\mathcal{H}_1) + 2r(\mathcal{H}_1)s(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1) - s^3(\mathcal{H}_1) + s(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1).$ ¹⁴³ To complete the equation (6), we need $\gamma_1(\mathcal{H}_1) = 0$ and $\gamma_2(\mathcal{H}_1) = 0$, then differentiating γ_1 ¹⁴⁴ and γ_2 with respect to \mathcal{H}_1 . Since¹⁴⁵

$$\frac{d\gamma_1}{d\mathcal{H}_1} = \mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H}_1)r'(\mathcal{H}_1) - \mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{H}_1)s'(\mathcal{H}_1) + \mathcal{F}_3(\mathcal{H}_1) = 0,$$
(4)

$$\frac{d\gamma_2}{d\mathcal{H}_1} = \mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{H}_1)r'(\mathcal{H}_1) + \mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H}_1)s'(\mathcal{H}_1) + \mathcal{F}_4(\mathcal{H}_1) = 0,$$
(5)

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{F}_{1}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) &= 3r^{2}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) + 2r(\mathcal{H}_{1})\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) - 3s^{2}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) + \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{1}), \\ \mathcal{F}_{2}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) &= 6r(\mathcal{H}_{1})s(\mathcal{H}_{1}) + 2s(\mathcal{H}_{1})\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{1}), \\ \mathcal{F}_{3}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) &= r^{2}(\mathcal{H}_{1})\mathcal{X}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) - s^{2}(\mathcal{H}_{1})\mathcal{X}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) + \mathcal{D}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) + \mathcal{R}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1})r(\mathcal{H}_{1}), \\ \mathcal{F}_{4}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) &= 2r(\mathcal{H}_{1})s(\mathcal{H}_{1})\mathcal{X}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) + s(\mathcal{H}_{1})\mathcal{R}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1}). \end{split}$$

148

146

$$r'(\mathcal{H}_1) = -\frac{\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{F}_3(\mathcal{H}_1) + \mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathcal{F}_4(\mathcal{H}_1)}{\mathcal{F}_1^2(\mathcal{H}_1) + \mathcal{F}_2^2(\mathcal{H}_1)}.$$
(6)

Substituting $r(\mathcal{H}_1) = 0$ and $s(\mathcal{H}_1) = \sqrt{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1)}$ at $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_1^*$ on $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathcal{F}_3(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{F}_4(\mathcal{H}_1)$. So, $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H}_1^*) = -2\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1^*), \mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{H}_1^*) = 2\sqrt{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1^*)}\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1^*),$

$$\mathcal{F}_3(\mathcal{H}_1^*) = -\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1^*)\mathcal{X}'(\mathcal{H}_1^*) + \mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{H}_1^*), \\ \mathcal{F}_4(\mathcal{H}_1^*) = \sqrt{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1^*)\mathcal{R}'(\mathcal{H}_1^*)}.$$

$$r'(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) = \frac{\mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) - (\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})\mathcal{R}'(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) + \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})\mathcal{X}'(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}))}{2(\mathcal{R}^{2}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) + \mathcal{X}^{2}(v^{*}))},$$
(7)

 $\mathrm{If}\ \mathcal{D}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) - (\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})\mathcal{R}^{'}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*}) + \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})\mathcal{X}^{'}\mathcal{H}_{1}^{*})) \neq \mathbf{0},$

(i.e) $\frac{d}{d\mathcal{H}_1}(Re(\gamma_j(\mathcal{H}_1)))|_{\mathcal{H}_1=\mathcal{H}_1^*} = r'(\mathcal{H}_1^*) \neq 0.$ $j = 1, 2, \text{ and } \gamma_3(\mathcal{H}_1^*) = -\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1^*) \neq 0.$ Thus, the condition $\mathcal{J}'(\mathcal{H}_1^*) - (\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_1^*)\mathcal{R}'(\mathcal{H}_1^*) + \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_1^*)\mathcal{X}'(\mathcal{H}_1^*)) \neq 0$, It has been confirmed that the transversality criteria applies to system (2), and Hopf-bifurcation occurs at $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_1^*.$ \Box

7. Numerical Calculations of the model

To verify the theoretical conclusions, this part performs a calculations on system 158 (2). Here, harvesting rate \mathcal{H}_1 is employed as an adjustable element. The simulation is 159 accomplished by utilizing MATLAB software tools for the fixed parameter. Here, x = 0.2, $\delta =$ 160 $0.1, d = 0.2, \theta = 0.21, \pi =$ (variable), $\eta = 0.13, \alpha = 0.3, \mu = 0.11$. If \mathcal{H}_1 is 0.21, when bifurcation 161 occurs, the model (2) for non-negative equilibirium is LAS $\mathcal{E}^*(0.52764, 0.0916818, 0.203662)$ 162 and the rest of the adjustable elements have identical values. The model's (2) stability 163 is lost by increasing the bifurcation adjustable element to \mathcal{H}_1 = 0.47, leading to LAU at 164 \mathcal{E}^* (0.53824, 0.0917748, 0.320178). Model (2) is able to pass the transversality conditions for 165 $(Re(\gamma(\mathcal{H}_1)))|_{\mathcal{H}_1=\mathcal{H}_1^*} = 0.002195 \neq 0$. Hence, the graph shows how the model's behavior 166 changes at a harvesting rate of $\mathcal{H}_1 = 0.47$.

8. Conclusions and Discussion

Our investigation involved examining an eco-epidemiological model where sick prey are harvested from the prey species, and the predator eats both sick and healthy prey. The 171

157

152

167 168



Figure 2. Dynamical changes of the Model(2) at harvesting rate, $H_1 = 0.47$

developed system (2) has been shown to be biologically well-behaved by the boundedness 172 and positivity results. In the event that if the growing rate of uninfected prey is lower than 173 the harvest rate, then the population tends to be extinct. It has been demonstrated that both 174 the local stability at every ecologically possible points and the coexistence (2) are stable. 175 The analytical and numerical outcomes of Hopf bifurcation for harvesting rate \mathcal{H}_1 have 176 been analyzed and evaluated in the above. The dynamic of prey harvesting is powerful 177 due to the complex behavior demonstrated in this study. Thus, we believed that ordinary 178 differential equations will be utilized to solve many future technological equations. 179

Abbreviations		180
The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:		
	LAS Locally Asymptotically Stable	182
	GAS Globally Asymptotically Stable	183
	LAU Locally Asymptotically Unstable	
		184

References

- 1. May, R.M. *Stability and complexity in model ecosystems*; Vol. 1, Princeton university press, 2019.
- 2. Kant, S.; Kumar, V. Dynamics of a prey-predator system with infection in prey 2017.
- 3. Divya, A.; Sivabalan, M.; Ashwin, A.; Siva Pradeep, M. DYNAMICS OF RATIO DEPENDENT ECO EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODEL WITH PREY REFUGE AND PREY HARVESTING **2020**.
- 4. Ashwin, A.; SIVABALAN, M.; Divya, A.; et al. Dynamics of Holling type II eco-epidemiological model with fear effect, prey refuge, and prey harvesting **2023**.
- Abdulghafour, A.S.; Naji, R.K. The impact of refuge and harvesting on the dynamics of prey-predator system. *Science International* (*Lahore*) 2018, 30, 315–323.
- Agnihotri, K.B.; Gakkhar, S. The dynamics of disease transmission in a prey predator system with harvesting of prey. Int. J. Adv. 193 Res. Comput. Eng. Technol 2012, 1.
- Magudeeswaran, S.; Vinoth, S.; Sathiyanathan, K.; Sivabalan, M. Impact of fear on delayed three species food-web model with Holling type-II functional response. *International Journal of Biomathematics* 2022, 15, 2250014.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content. 199

185