

Analysis and Control of Antibiotic Dynamic Models

Lakshmi. N. Sridhar*

Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, PR 00681, Puerto Rico

*Corresponding Author

Lakshmi. N. Sridhar, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, PR 00681, Puerto Rico

Submitted: 25 Jul 2025; Accepted: 02 Aug 2025; Published: 25 Aug 2025

Citation: Sridhar, L.N. (2025). Analysis and Control of Antibiotic Dynamic Models. *Med Clin Res*, 10(8), 1-10.

Summary

Many infections are treated using antibiotics. The dynamics of treatment involving antibiotics is extremely nonlinear. Bifurcation analysis is a powerful mathematical tool used to deal with the nonlinear dynamics of any process. Several factors must be considered, and multiple objectives must be met simultaneously. Bifurcation analysis and multi-objective nonlinear model predictive control (MNLMP) calculations are performed on two dynamic models involving antibiotics. The MATLAB program MATCONT was used to perform the bifurcation analysis. The MNLMP calculations were performed using the optimization language PYOMO in conjunction with the state-of-the-art global optimization solvers IPOPT and BARON. The bifurcation analysis revealed the existence of branch points in both models. The branch points (which cause multiple steady-state solutions from a singular point) are very beneficial because they enable the Multiobjective nonlinear model predictive control calculations to converge to the Utopia point (the best possible solution) in the models. It is proved (with computational validation) that the branch points were caused because of the existence of two distinct separable functions in one of the equations in each dynamic model. A theorem was developed to demonstrate this fact for any dynamic model.

Keywords: Bifurcation, Optimization, Control, Antibiotic

1. Background

Bonhoer et al. evaluated treatment protocols to prevent antibiotic resistance. Austin and Anderson conducted studies of antibiotic resistance within the patient, hospitals, and the community using simple mathematical models. Lipstich et al. studied the epidemiology of antibiotic resistance in hospitals [1-3]. Weinstein et al. researched the spread of antibiotic-resistant pathogens in hospitals with mathematical models as tools for control [4]. Bergstrom et al. developed an ecological theory that suggests that antimicrobial cycling will not reduce antimicrobial resistance in hospitals. Webb et al. developed a model of antibiotic-resistant bacterial epidemics in hospitals [5, 6]. Alavez-Ramirez et al. studied the within-host population dynamics of antibiotic-resistant M [7]. Tuberculosis. Boldin et al. investigated the effects of barrier precautions and topical antibiotics on nosocomial bacterial transmission using multi-compartment models. D'Agata et al. modelled antibiotic resistance in hospitals and studied the impact of minimizing treatment duration [8, 9]. Massad et al. developed an optimization model for antibiotic use. Hellweger et al. developed a simple model of tetracycline antibiotic resistance in the aquatic environment [10,11]. Martinez et al. studied the environmental pollution by antibiotic resistance genes, Liu et al. developed a competitive model in a chemostat with nutrient recycling and antibiotic treatment [11-13]. Bootsma et al. studied various models of non-inherited antibiotic resistance, and Esteva et al. developed mathematical models on bacterial resistance to multiple antibiotics caused by spontaneous mutations [14, 15]. Ibarguen-Mondragón et al. performed mathematical modelling of bacterial resistance to antibiotics by mutations and plasmids. Cen et al. performed bifurcation analysis of a mathematical model of antibiotic resistance in hospitals [16]. Mena et al., investigated the random perturbations in a mathematical model of bacterial resistance, performing analysis and optimal control [17]. This work aims to perform bifurcation analysis and multiobjective nonlinear control (MNLMP) studies in two models involving antibiotics, which are discussed in Mena et al. (model 1), and Cen et al. (model 2) [17,18]. The paper is organized as follows. First, the model equations are presented, followed by a discussion of the numerical techniques involving bifurcation analysis and multiobjective nonlinear model predictive control (MNLMP). The results are then presented, followed by the discussion and conclusions.

2. Model Description

Model 1 Mena et al. [18]

The model equations are

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d(sval)}{dt} &= \beta_s sval(1 - sval - rval) - \alpha sval - \mu_s sval \\ \frac{d(rval)}{dt} &= \beta_r rval(1 - sval - rval) + (1 - \eta)q\alpha sval - \mu_r rval\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

sval and *rval* denote the number of sensitive and resistant bacteria population to antibiotics, respectively. The base values of the parameters are

$$\beta_s = 0.4; \beta_r = 0.1; \mu_s = 0.2; \mu_r = 0.5; \alpha = 0.1204; q = 0.3992; \eta = 0.5;$$

Model 2 Cen et al. [17]

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d(sval)}{dt} &= m\mu + \beta sval(xval) - (\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \gamma + \mu)sval + \sigma\beta c(sval)(rval) \\ \frac{d(rval)}{dt} &= \beta xval(1 - c)rval - (\tau_2 + \gamma + \mu)rval - \sigma\beta c(sval)(rval) \\ \frac{d(xval)}{dt} &= (1 - m)\mu + (\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \gamma + \mu)sval + (\tau_2 + \gamma)rval - \beta sval(xval) - \beta xval(1 - c)rval - \mu(xval)\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

The model considers two strains of a bacterial species having two antimicrobial agents. Individuals may have strains of these bacteria that are either sensitive(*sval*) or resistant (*rval*) to the first drug, or they may be free of these bacteria (*xval*). The base values of the parameters are

$$m = 0.75; \mu = 0.1; \beta = 1; \tau_1 = 0.35; \tau_2 = 0.1; \gamma = 1/30; \sigma = 0.25; c = 0.05;$$

3. Bifurcation Analysis

The MATLAB software MATCONT is used to perform the bifurcation calculations. Bifurcation analysis deals with multiple steady-states and limit cycles. Multiple steady states occur because of the existence of branch and limit points. Hopf bifurcation points cause limit cycles. A commonly used MATLAB program that locates limit points, branch points, and Hopf bifurcation points is MATCONT(Dhooge Govaerts, and Kuznetsov, 2003[19]; Dhooge Govaerts, Kuznetsov, Mestrom and Riet, 2004[20]). This program detects Limit points(LP), branch points(BP), and Hopf bifurcation points(H) for an ODE system

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(x, \alpha)\quad (3)$$

$x \in R^n$ Let the bifurcation parameter be α . Since the gradient is orthogonal to the tangent vector, The tangent plane at any point $z = [z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, \dots, z_{n+1}]$ must satisfy

$$Az = 0\quad (4)$$

Where A is

$$A = [\partial f / \partial x \quad | \quad \partial f / \partial \alpha]\quad (5)$$

where $\partial f / \partial x$ is the Jacobian matrix. For both limit and branch points, the matrix $[\partial f / \partial x]$ must be singular. The $n+1^{\text{th}}$ component of the tangent vector $Z_{n+1} = 0$ for a limit point (LP) and for a branch point (BP) the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A \\ z \end{bmatrix}$ must be singular. At a Hopf bifurcation point,

$$\det(2f_x(x, \alpha) @ I_n) = 0\quad (6)$$

@ indicates the bialternate product while I_n is the n -square identity matrix. Hopf bifurcations cause limit cycles and should be eliminated because limit cycles make optimization and control tasks very difficult. More details can be found in Kuznetsov and Govaerts [21-23].

Hopf bifurcations cause unwanted oscillatory behavior and limit cycles. The tanh activation function (where a control value u is replaced by $(u \tanh u / \varepsilon)$) is commonly used in neural nets (Dubey et al.; Kamalov et al. and Szandała, and optimal control problems (Sridhar

to eliminate spikes in the optimal control profile [24-27]. Hopf bifurcation points cause oscillatory behavior. Oscillations are similar to spikes, and the results in Sridhar, demonstrate that the tanh factor also eliminates the Hopf bifurcation by preventing the occurrence of oscillations [24]. Sridhar explained with several examples how the activation factor involving the tanh function successfully eliminates the limit cycle causing Hopf bifurcation points [28]. This was because the tanh function increases the time period of the oscillatory behavior, which occurs in the form of a limit cycle caused by Hopf bifurcations.

3.1 Multiobjective Nonlinear Model Predictive Control (MNLMP)

Flores Tlacuahuaz et al. developed a multiobjective nonlinear model predictive control (MNLMP) method that is rigorous and does not involve weighting functions or additional constraints [29]. This procedure is used for performing the MNLMP calculations Here $(j=1, \sum_{t=0}^{t_f} q_j(t), 2..n)$ represents the variables that need to be minimized/maximized simultaneously for a problem involving a set of ODE

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x, u) \tag{7}$$

t_f being the final time value, and n the total number of objective variables and u the control parameter. This MNLMP procedure first solves the single objective optimal control problem independently optimizing each of the variables $\sum_{t=0}^{t_f} q_j(t)$ individually. $\sum_{t=0}^{t_f} q_j(t)$ The minimization/maximization of will lead to the values q_j^* . Then the optimization problem that will be solved is

$$\begin{aligned} \min & \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{t_i=0}^{t_i=t_f} q_j(t_i) - q_j^* \right)^2 \right) \\ \text{subject to} & \frac{dx}{dt} = F(x, u); \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

This will provide the values of u at various times. The first obtained control value of u is implemented and the rest are discarded. This procedure is repeated until the implemented and the first obtained control values are the same or if the Utopia point where $(\sum_{t=0}^{t_f} q_j(t) = q_j^* \text{ for all } j)$ is obtained.

Pyomo (Hart et al.) is used for these calculations [30]. Here, the differential equations are converted to a Nonlinear Program (NLP) using the orthogonal collocation method. The NLP is solved using IPOPT (Wächter And Biegler and confirmed as a global solution with BARON [31,32].

The steps of the algorithm are as follows

1. Optimize $\sum_{t=0}^{t_f} q_j(t)$ and obtain q_j^* at various time intervals t_i . The subscript i is the index for each time step.
2. Minimize $(\sum_{t=0}^{t_f} (q_j(t) - q_j^*))^2$ and get the control values for various times.
3. Implement the first obtained control values
4. Repeat steps 1 to 3 until there is an insignificant difference between the implemented and the first obtained value of the control variables or if the Utopia point is achieved. The Utopia point is when $\sum_{t=0}^{t_f} q_j(t) = q_j^*$ for all j .

Sridhar, proved that the MNLMP calculations to converge to the Utopia solution when the bifurcation analysis revealed the presence of limit and branch points [33]. This was done by imposing the singularity condition on the co-state equation [34]. If the minimization q_1 of lead to the value and q_1^* the minimization of q_2 lead to the value q_2^* The MNLMP calculations will minimize the function. $(q_1 - q_1^*)^2 + (q_2 - q_2^*)^2$ The multiobjective optimal control problem is

$$\min (q_1 - q_1^*)^2 + (q_2 - q_2^*)^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = F(x, u) \tag{9}$$

Differentiating the objective function results in

$$\frac{d}{dx_i} ((q_1 - q_1^*)^2 + (q_2 - q_2^*)^2) = 2(q_1 - q_1^*) \frac{d}{dx_i} (q_1 - q_1^*) + 2(q_2 - q_2^*) \frac{d}{dx_i} (q_2 - q_2^*) \tag{10}$$

The Utopia point requires that both $(q_1 - q_1^*)$ and $(q_2 - q_2^*)$ are zero. Hence

$$\frac{d}{dx_i} ((q_1 - q_1^*)^2 + (q_2 - q_2^*)^2) = 0 \tag{11}$$

the optimal control co-state equation (Upreti)[34] is

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\lambda_i) = -\frac{d}{dx_i}((q_1 - q_1^*)^2 + (q_2 - q_2^*)^2) - f_x \lambda_i; \quad \lambda_i(t_f) = 0 \quad (12)$$

λ_i is the Lagrangian multiplier. t_f is the final time. The first term in this equation is 0 and hence

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\lambda_i) = -f_x \lambda_i; \quad \lambda_i(t_f) = 0 \quad (13)$$

At a limit or a branch point, for the set of ODE $\frac{dx}{dt} = f(x, u)$ f_x is singular. Hence there are two different vectors-values for $[\lambda_i]$ where $\frac{d}{dt}(\lambda_i) > 0$ and $\frac{d}{dt}(\lambda_i) < 0$. In between there is a vector $[\lambda_i]$ where $\frac{d}{dt}(\lambda_i) = 0$. This, coupled with the boundary condition $\lambda_i(t_f) = 0$ will lead to $[\lambda_i] = 0$. This makes the problem an unconstrained optimization problem, and the only solution is the Utopia solution.

4. Results

4.1 Model 1

The bifurcation analysis (with β_s as the bifurcation parameter) revealed a branch point at $(sval, rval, \beta_s)$ values of $(0, 0, 0.3204)$. This is shown in Figure 1a. For the MNLMPCC calculations, $\sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} rval(t), \sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} \eta(t)$ were minimized individually and led to values of 0 and 0. η was the control parameter. The multiobjective optimal control problem will involve the minimization of $(\sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} rval(t))^2 + (\sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} \eta(t))^2$ subject to the equations governing Model 1. This led to a value of zero (the Utopia solution). The MNLMPCC control value (η) was 0.6963. Figures 1b, 1c, and 1d. show the various MNLMPCC profiles.




Figure 1a: Bifurcation analysis of Antibiotic model 1 (indicating branch point)




Figure 1b: MNLMPCC model 1 sval vs t




Figure 1c: MNL MPC model 1 rval vs t




Figure 1d: MNL MPC model 1 eta (η) vs t

4.2 Model 2

The bifurcation analysis (with τ_2 as the bifurcation parameter) revealed a branch point at $(sval, rval, xval, \tau_2)$ values of $(0.242641, 0, 0.757359, 0.583125)$. This is shown in Figures 2a.

For the MNL MPC calculations, $sval(0)=0.6$; $\sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} rval(t_i)$ was minimized and $\sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} xval(t_i)$ was maximized leading to values of 0 and 2. The multiobjective optimal control problem will involve the minimization of $(\sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} rval(t_i))^2 + (\sum_{t=0}^{t=t_f} xval(t_i) - 2)^2$ and resulted in the Utopia point(0). The MNL MPC control value (τ_2) was 0.18248. Figures 2b,2c, and 2d. show the various MNL MPC profiles. The profile of the control variable (τ_2) exhibited a lot of noise, which was remedied using the Savitzky-Golay filter. Both the original and the modified profiles are shown in Figure 2e.




Figure 2a: Bifurcation analysis of Antibiotic model 2 (indicating branch point)




Figure 2b: MNL MPC model 2 sval vs t




Figure 2c: MNL MPC model 2 rval vs t




Figure 2d: MNL MPC model 2 xval vs t




Figure 2e: MNLMPc model 2 tau2() with noise and tau2sg (with Savitzky Golay Filter) vs t

5. Discussion

5.1 Theorem

A branch point singularity will occur in a dynamic system if and only if one of the functions in a dynamic system is separable into two distinct functions.

Proof

The proof consists of two parts. In the first part, the “if” condition will be proved. This will involve demonstrating that the presence of two distinct functions in an ODE set will lead to a branch point bifurcation.

Consider a system of equations

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(x, \alpha) \quad (14)$$

α is the bifurcation parameter. $x \in R^n$. Define $y = [x, \alpha]$ and the matrix A as

$$A = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right] \quad (15)$$

The tangent at any point y ; ($z = [z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, \dots, z_{n+1}]$) must satisfy

$$Az = 0 \quad (16)$$

For a branch bifurcation point (Branch point from now on) $B = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ z^T \end{bmatrix}$ (BP) the matrix must be singular. Let any of the functions (in the set $f(y)$); f_i be separable into 2 functions ϕ_1, ϕ_2 as

$$f_i = \phi_1 \phi_2 \quad (17)$$

At steady-state $f_i(y) = 0$ and this will imply that either $\phi_1 = 0$ or $\phi_2 = 0$ or both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 must be 0. This implies that two branches $\phi_1 = 0$ and $\phi_2 = 0$ will meet at a point where both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are 0.

At this point, the corresponding row in the matrix B would be

$$\left[\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial y_k} \right] \quad (18)$$

However,

$$\left[\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial y_k} = \phi_1 (= 0) \frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial y_k} + \phi_2 (= 0) \frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial y_k} = 0 (\forall k = 1, \dots, n) \right] \quad (19)$$

This implies that every element in the row $\left[\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial y_k}\right]$ would be 0, and hence the matrix B would be singular. The singularity in B implies that there exists a branch point.

In the second part, the “only if” condition will be proved and will involve demonstrating that the presence of a branch point requires that one of the functions must be separable into two distinct functions, each of which will be 0 at the branch point.

For a branch point (BP) the matrix $B = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ z^T \end{bmatrix}$ must be singular. Any tangent at a point y that is defined by $z = [z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, \dots, z_{n+1}]$ must satisfy

$$Az = 0 \tag{20}$$

For a branch point, there must exist two tangents at the singularity. Let the two tangents be z and w . This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} Az &= 0 \\ Aw &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Consider a vector v that is orthogonal to one of the tangents (say z). v can be expressed as a linear combination of z and w ($v = \alpha z + \beta w$). Since $Az = Aw = 0$; $Av = 0$ and since z and v are orthogonal,

$z^T v = 0$. Hence $Bv = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ z^T \end{bmatrix} v = 0$ which implies that B is singular.

The vector v is orthogonal to z (a tangent). Any vector orthogonal to the tangent is the gradient of a function in the dynamic system $\frac{dx}{dt} = f(x)$. Hence, v must be the gradient of a function in the set of functions, $f(x, \alpha)$. Let this function be f_j . The gradient of f_j is $\nabla f_j = \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial y_k}$. Hence

$$v = \nabla f_j = \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial y_k} \forall k \tag{22}$$

Multiplying B and v would result in the row $\left[\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial y_k}\right]$ multiplying the vector v which will result in $\sum \left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial y_k}\right)^2; k=1..n+1$ and the only way this can be zero is if each $\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial y_k}\right) = 0$ implying that every element in the row is 0.

At steady-state (say at a point $y = b$ where b is a vector of dimension $n+1$); $f_j = 0$ and hence f_j can be represented as

$$f_j = (y - b)g_j \tag{23}$$

This implies that

$$f_j(y_k) = (y_k - b_k)g_j(y_k) \forall k \tag{24}$$

And

$$0 = \left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial y_k}\right) = g_j + (y_k - b_k) \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial y_k} \tag{25}$$

Since $y_k = b_k$ this would imply that $g_j = 0$

Hence $f_j = 0$ would imply that at a branch point, it can be split into two equations

$$\begin{aligned} (y - b) &= 0 \\ g_j &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

This completes the proof.

Additionally, the MNLMPC calculations in both models converge to the Utopia solution, justifying the analysis of Sridhar(2024).

6. Conclusion

Bifurcation analysis and multiobjective nonlinear control (MNL MPC) studies in two antibiotic models. The bifurcation analysis revealed the existence and branch points in both models. The branch points (which cause multiple steady-state solutions from a singular point) are very beneficial because they enable the Multiobjective nonlinear model predictive control calculations to converge to the Utopia point (the best possible solution) in the models. It is proved (with computational validation) that the branch points were caused because of the existence of two distinct separable functions in one of the equations in each dynamic model. A theorem was developed to demonstrate this fact for any dynamic model. A combination of bifurcation analysis and Multiobjective Nonlinear Model Predictive Control (MNL MPC) for dynamic models involving antibiotics is the main contribution of this paper.

Data Availability Statement

All data used is presented in the paper

Conflict of Interest

The author, Dr. Lakshmi N Sridhar, has no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgement

Dr. Sridhar thanks Dr. Carlos Ramirez and Dr. Suleiman for encouraging him to write single-author papers

References

1. Bonhoeffer, S., Lipsitch, M., & Levin, B. R. (1997). Evaluating treatment protocols to prevent antibiotic resistance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 94(22), 12106–12111
2. Austin, D. J., & Anderson, R. M. (1999). Studies of antibiotic resistance within the patient, hospitals, and the community using simple mathematical models. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 354(1384), 721–738.
3. Lipsitch, M., Bergstrom, C. T., & Levin, B. R. (2000). The epidemiology of antibiotic resistance in hospitals: paradoxes and prescriptions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(4), 1938–1943.
4. Weinstein, R. A., Bonten, M. J., Austin, D. J., & Lipsitch, M. (2001). Understanding the spread of antibiotic resistant pathogens in hospitals: mathematical models as tools for control. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 33(10), 1739–1746.
5. Bergstrom, C. T., Lo, M., & Lipsitch, M. (2004). Ecological theory suggests that antimicrobial cycling will not reduce antimicrobial resistance in hospitals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(36), 13285–13290.
6. Webb, G., D'Agata, E. M. C., Magal, P., & Ruan, S. (2005). A model of antibiotic resistant bacterial epidemics in hospitals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102(37), 13343–13348.
7. Alavez-Ramírez, J., Castellanos, J. R. A., Esteva, L., Flores, J. A., Fuentes-Allen, J. L., García-Ramos, G., Gómez, G., & López-Estrada, J. (2007). Within-host population dynamics of antibiotic-resistant *M. tuberculosis*. *Mathematical Medicine and Biology: A Journal of the IMA*, 24, 35–56.
8. Boldin, B., Bonten, M. J. M., & Diekmann, O. (2007). Relative effects of barrier precautions and topical antibiotics on nosocomial bacterial transmission: Results of multi-compartment models. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 69(7), 2227–2248
9. D'Agata, E. M., Magal, P., Olivier, D., Ruan, S., & Webb, G. F. (2007). Modeling antibiotic resistance in hospitals: The impact of minimizing treatment duration. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 249(3), 487–499.
10. Massad, E., Burattini, M. N., & Coutinho, F. A. B. (2008). An optimization model for antibiotic use. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 201(1–2), 161–167.
11. Hellweger, F. L., Ruan, X., & Sanchez, S. (2011). A simple model of tetracycline antibiotic resistance in the aquatic environment (with application to the Poudre River). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 8(2), 480–497.
12. Martínez, J. L., & Olivares, J. (2012). Environmental pollution by antibiotic resistance genes. In P. L. Keen & M. H. Montforts (Eds.), *Antimicrobial resistance in the environment* (pp. 151–171). Wiley-Blackwell.
13. Liu, M., H. Huo, Y. Li, A competitive model in a chemostat with nutrient recycling and antibiotic treatment, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 13(6)(2012), 2540–2555 Liu, M., Huo, H., & Li, Y. (2012). A competitive model in a chemostat with nutrient recycling and antibiotic treatment. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 13(6), 2540–2555.
14. Bootsma, M., van der Horst, M., Guryeva, T., Ter Kuile, B., & Diekmann, O. (2012). Modeling non-inherited antibiotic resistance. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 74, 1691–1705.
15. Esteva, L., & Romero-Leiton, J. P. (2014). Mathematical modeling on bacterial resistance to multiple antibiotics caused by spontaneous mutations. *Biosystems*, 117, 60–67.
16. Ibarguen-Mondragón, E., Romero-Leiton, J. P., Esteva, L., & Burbano, E. (2016). Mathematical modeling of bacterial resistance to antibiotics by mutations and plasmids. *Journal of Biological Systems*, 24(1), 129–146.
17. Cen, X., Feng, Z., Zheng, Y., & Zhao, Y. (2017). Bifurcation analysis and global dynamics of a mathematical model of antibiotic

-
- resistance in hospitals. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 75(6–7), 1463–1485.
18. Mena, H., Pfürtscheller, L.-M., & Romero-Leiton, J. P. (2020). Random perturbations in a mathematical model of bacterial resistance: Analysis and optimal control. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 17(5), 4477–4499.
 19. Dhooge, A., Govaerts, W., & Kuznetsov, A. Y. (2003). MATCONT: A MATLAB package for numerical bifurcation analysis of ODEs. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 29(2), 141–164.
 20. Dhooge, A., W. Govaerts; Y. A. Kuznetsov, W. Mestrom, and A. M. Riet, “CL_MATCONT”; *A continuation toolbox in Matlab*, 2004.
 21. Kuznetsov, Y. A. (1998). *Elements of applied bifurcation theory* (2nd ed.). Springer.
 22. Kuznetsov, Y. A. (2009). *Five lectures on numerical bifurcation analysis*. Utrecht University.
 23. Govaerts, W. J. F. (2000). *Numerical methods for bifurcations of dynamical equilibria*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM).
 24. Dubey S. R. Singh, S. K. & Chaudhuri B. B. (2022). Activation functions in deep learning: A comprehensive survey and benchmark. *Neurocomputing*, 503, 92-108.
 25. Kamalov A. F. Nazir M. Safaraliev A. K. Cherukuri and R. Zgheib (2021). Comparative analysis of activation functions in neural networks," 2021 28th IEEE International Conference on Electronics, Circuits, and Systems (ICECS), Dubai, United Arab Emirates, , pp. 1-6.
 26. Szandala, T. (2020). Review and Comparison of Commonly Used Activation Functions for Deep Neural Networks. *ArXiv*.
 27. Sridhar, L. N. (2023). Bifurcation Analysis and Optimal Control of the Tu–mor Macrophage Interactions. *Biomed J Sci & Tech Res* 53(5). BJSTR. MS.ID.008470.
 28. Sridhar, L. N. (2024b). Elimination of oscillation causing Hopf bifurcations in engineering problems. *Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 2(4), 1826.
 29. Flores-Tlacuahuac, A., Morales, P., & Rival Toledo, M. (2012). Multiobjective nonlinear model predictive control of a class of chemical reactors. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 51(16), 5891–5899.
 30. Hart, W. E., Laird, C. D., Watson, J.-P., Woodruff, D. L., Hackedbeil, G. A., Nicholson, B. L., & Sirola, J. D. (2017). *Pyomo – Optimization modeling in Python* (2nd ed., Vol. 67). Springer.
 31. Wächter, A., Biegler, L. (2006). On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming". *Math. Program.* 106, 25–57.
 32. Tawarmalani, M., & Sahinidis, N. V. (2005). A polyhedral branch-and-cut approach to global optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(2), 225–249.
 33. Sridhar, L. N. (2024). Coupling bifurcation analysis and multiobjective nonlinear model predictive control. *Austin Chemical Engineering*, 10(3), 1107.
 34. Upreti, S. R. (2013). *Optimal control for chemical engineers*. Taylor & Francis

Copyright: ©2025 M BANGAI TIZI Nasser, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.