

Public Health Interventions for Fractional Optimal Control of Buruli Ulcer

Solomon Nortey¹, Ernest Akorly², Mark Dadzie³, and Stephen E. Moore*³

¹Department of Mathematics, North Dakota State University, Fargo, U.S.A

²African Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Accra, Ghana

³Department of Mathematics, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana

Abstract

Buruli Ulcer, a devastating skin disease caused by *Mycobacterium Ulcerans*, poses considerable public health challenges in endemic areas. This article focuses on the use of fractional optimal control theory to prevent the spread of Buruli ulcers via integrated public health interventions. We formulated a mathematical model using the Atangana-Baleanu-Caputo fractional order derivative operator. We investigated the model's existence and uniqueness and presented numerical simulations using the predict-evaluate-correct-evaluate (PECE) method of Adam-Bashforth Moulton. We also study the fractional optimal control problem (FOCP) to minimize the spread of the disease in the endemic regions. We employ the Fractional Pontryagin's Maximum Principle (FPMP) and implement the forward-backward method to determine the extremals of the problem. Four control strategies were implemented: promoting health education on the use of protective clothing, enhancing vaccination rates, improving treatment protocols for infected individuals, and spraying insecticides to reduce water-bug populations. After examining the optimal control dynamics of the Buruli ulcer transmission model via multiple simulations with and without control, we discover that there is a substantial decrease in the population of infected humans and the water-bug population. Hence we conclude that the best strategy to implement is by applying all the control strategies suggested.

Key words: Buruli ulcer; Atangana-Baleanu; Fractional Pontryagin Maximum Principle.

1 Introduction

Buruli ulcer is a mysterious necrotizing tropical skin disease which is found mainly in the tropical regions with high cases recorded in Africa, America, Asia and Western Pacific [51, 36, 27, 58]. Amongst the 20 countries in Africa that cases have been recorded, Ghana recorded over 11,000 cases, Cote d'Ivoire recorded 21,000 and Togo reported over 2,000 cases[51]. While previously considered a childhood disease, statistical analysis shows that over 25% of affected individuals are over 50 years old [7].

The disease-causing organism belongs to the same family of bacteria that causes leprosy and tuberculosis, presenting a possibility for collaboration between the two disease programs [29]. Whereas the disease is known to be linked to contaminated water, according to the authors of [35] the mode of transmission to humans is still unclear, which makes it difficult to propose control interventions[50]. While the mode of transmission remains unresolved, once the causative bacterial, *Mycobacterium Ulcerans* enters the skin through direct injury or bites from insects like water bugs or mosquitoes as hypothesized in literature, it releases the Mycolactone Toxin [20, 34]. This toxin is responsible for the immunosuppression, cytotoxicity, modulation of host cell function and ultimately, the proliferation of *Mycobacterium Ulcerans* [14, 22]. Buruli Ulcer starts as nodule with no pains in patients but develops into painless ulcerating wound with weakened edges[16, 24]. Due to its painlessness [18], patients who mostly live in rural areas report late for treatment due to the reliance on traditional medication

*Corresponding author : stephen.moore@ucc.edu.gh

[49] and by which at the time of reporting, the ulcerating wound might have reached a severe stage which may lead to amputation of body part(s) or weeks to months of hospitalization. The cost and long duration of treatment coupled with its associated stigma and economic hardships that comes to bear on patients and their immediate aids is very alarming [9]. However, although clinical treatment is the ultimate effective preventive measure, one of the effective control measures for Buruli Ulcer is promoting education on the relevance of early detection through targeted programs and campaigns can increase public awareness of the availability and of clinical interventions[56] thereby reducing the disease's stress.

Although several mathematical models on BU are found in literature, few of these models provide insight into the understanding of the dynamics of the transmission of the disease, efficient and effective control measures and the use of the model to predict a suitable prevention technique. The authors in [29] developed a non-linear mathematical model to examine the optimal control of transmission dynamics of Mycobacterium Ulcerans and obtained qualitative results using theories of stability of differential equations, optimal control and computer simulations. The authors employed two optimal control conditions, that is environmental and health education to people for prevention and to apply water and environmental purification rate. Based on the numerical results obtained, the authors established that, application of optimal control leads to the decrease of the number of infected water-bugs and also decreases the number of human infected by MU. However the authors concluded that, in order to reduce the spread of MU infection, the application of optimal control on environmental and health education in human must be used for prevention. Although [15] and [36] used somewhat different optimal control conditions, they yielded similar results and conclusions to those found in [29].

In [21], the authors used fractional and integer derivatives to study the dynamics of the transmission of Buruli ulcer. They established that, in quantitative sense, the fractional model used in the study presented knowledge of the history as compared to the classical model. Nevertheless, the authors admitted that all results obtained are limited to fractional derivatives in the Caputo sense and expressed uncertainty in the possible results of using other fractional derivatives such as the Caputo - Fabrizio or Atangana-Baleanu. Again the authors did not incorporate any optimal control conditions but rather maintained it as a constant. However, in this study, we formulated a mathematical model to prevent the spread of Buruli Ulcer using the Atangana-Baleanu-Caputo fractional order derivative operator as well as public health interventions.

The rest of the article is organized as follows: the preliminaries of fractional calculus are introduced in section 2, the fractional BU model is derived in section 3, the analysis of the BU model is discussed in section 4, the numerical simulation of the BU model is discussed in section 5, section 6 describe the fractional optimal control problem, the numerical simulation and discussion of optimal control problem is presented in section 7 and finally we conclude in section 8.

2 Mathematical Preliminary on Fractional Calculus

We present important definitions and Lemma necessary for the development and analysis of the fractional model.

Definition 2.1 ([39, 42]). *The Atangana-Baleanu fractional derivative in the Caputo sense (ABC) with order $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and lower limit zero for a function $g \in H^1(0, T)$ is defined by*

$${}^ABC D_t^\alpha g(t) = \frac{M(\alpha)}{1-\alpha} \int_a^t \mathbb{E}_\alpha \left(\frac{-\alpha}{1-\alpha} (t-\tau)^\alpha \right) g'(\tau) d\tau$$

where $M(\alpha) = 1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)}$ is the normalization function satisfying $M(0) = M(1) = 1$, and \mathbb{E}_α is the Mittag-Leffler function expressed as

$$E_\alpha(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{\Gamma(\alpha k + 1)} \quad (1)$$

Definition 2.2 ([19]). *The associated ABC fractional integral is defined by*

$${}^AB I_t^\alpha g(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g(t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_a^t (t-\tau)^{\alpha-1} g(\tau) d\tau. \quad (2)$$

86 **Definition 2.3** ([39, 42]). *The Laplace transformation of the equation above is expressed as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\{ {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha g(t) \}(s) &= \frac{M(\alpha)}{1-\alpha} \mathcal{L} \left[\int_a^t \mathbb{E}_\alpha \left(\frac{-\alpha}{1-\alpha} (t-\tau)^\alpha \right) g'(\tau) d\tau \right] \\ &= \frac{M(\alpha) (s^\alpha \mathcal{L}\{g(t)\}(s) - s^{\alpha-1}g(0))}{(1-\alpha)s^\alpha + \alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

87 **Lemma 2.4** ([6, 12]). *If $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $h(t) \in C[0, 1]$. Then the solution to*

$$\begin{cases} ({}^{ABC}D_0^\alpha g)(t) = h(t) \\ g(0) = g_0, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

88 *is given by*

$$g(t) = g_0 + {}^{AB}I_0^\alpha ({}^{ABC}D_0^\alpha g)(t). \quad (5)$$

89 3 Fractional Order Model Derivation

Using systems of nonlinear differential equations, we build up a compartmental model for the transmission dynamics of Buruli Ulcer. The model includes two population, that is human and water-bug populations. The total human population is given by $N_H(t)$ is subdivided into five classes; Susceptible $S_H(t)$, Vaccinated, $V_H(t)$, Exposed $E_H(t)$, Infected $I_H(t)$ and Recovered $R_H(t)$. Hence the dynamics of the total human population is

$$N_H(t) = S_H(t) + E_H(t) + V_H(t) + I_H(t) + R_H(t).$$

The second population which is the water-bug has a total population $N_w(t)$ which is subdivided into Susceptible water-bug $S_w(t)$ and Infected water-bug class $I_w(t)$. Hence the dynamic of the total water-bugs population is

$$N_w(t) = S_w(t) + I_w(t).$$

We consider Λ_H to be the recruitment rate into the susceptible human class. We assume that susceptible humans get infected when bitten by infected water-bugs, hence the force of infection is given by $\rho\beta_1 S_H I_w$ where ρ is the biting rate and β_1 is the transmission probability rate. We also assume that the vaccine is imperfect, hence vaccinated individuals can be infected when bitten by infected water-bugs at a reduce rate of $(1 - \sigma)$. The parameters τ and λ are the rate at which susceptible humans are vaccinated and the vaccine wane rate respectively. μ_H is the natural mortality rate that occurs in the human population. Hence the dynamics of both the susceptible and vaccinated class is

$$\frac{dS_H}{dt} = \Lambda_H - \rho\beta_1 S_H I_w - (\tau + \mu_H)S_H + \kappa R_H + \lambda V_H$$

and

$$\frac{dV_H}{dt} = \tau S_H - (\mu_H + \lambda)V_H - \omega(1 - \sigma)V_H I_w,$$

respectively. The exposed class increases by $\rho\beta_1 S_H I_w$ and $\omega(1 - \sigma)V_H I_w$ while it decreases by $(\mu_H + \varepsilon)$ where ε is the rate at which exposed class become infected. Hence the dynamics of the exposed class is

$$\frac{dE_H}{dt} = \rho\beta_1 S_H I_w - (\mu_H + \varepsilon)E_H + \omega(1 - \sigma)V_H I_w.$$

The infected human class increases at the rate by which individuals leave the exposed class εE_H and decreases by $(\mu_H + \delta + \gamma)$. Therefore the dynamics of the infected human class is

$$\frac{dI_H}{dt} = \varepsilon E_H - (\mu_H + \delta + \gamma)I_H,$$

where the δ and γ are death induce by the disease and recovery rate respectively. The recovery class increases by the rate τ and decreases by $(\mu_H + \kappa)$ where κ is the rate at which recovered individuals become susceptible again. Hence the dynamics of the recovered class is

$$\frac{dR_H}{dt} = \gamma I_H - (\kappa + \mu_H) R_H.$$

The susceptible water-bug becomes infected by biting an infected human and coming into contact with the Mycobacterium Ulceran, hence the force of infection is given by $\rho\beta_2 S_w I_H$. The dynamics of the susceptible water-bug class is

$$\frac{dS_w}{dt} = \Lambda_w - \rho\beta_2(1 - \phi) S_w I_H,$$

where ϕ is the rate at which susceptible water-bugs are infected by coming into contact with the Mycobacterium Ulceran environment. Lastly the dynamics of the infected water-bugs is given by


$$\frac{dI_w}{dt} = \rho\beta_2(1 - \phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w I_w.$$

90 The following assumptions were made in order to derive the Buruli Ulcer model[36]. The transmis-
91 sion dynamics consist of two populations, human and water-bug population, the pathogen is trans-
92 ferred from waterbugs to humans and vice versa, Distinct recruitment and death rates, Imperfect
93 Vaccination: Hence vaccinated, individuals can be infected when bitten by infected water-bugs at
94 reduce rate of $(1 - \sigma)$, potential reinfection of recovered individuals, the population of water-bugs is
95 higher than that of humans and the rate at which water-bugs come into contact with Mycobacterium
96 Ulcerans in their environment is ϕ .

97 In Fig (3) and system (6), the schematic diagram and equations are described respectively.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{dS_H}{dt} = \Lambda_H - \rho\beta_1 S_H I_w - (\mu_H + \tau) S_H + \lambda V_H + \kappa R_H \\ \frac{dE_H}{dt} = \rho\beta_1 S_H I_w - (\mu_H + \varepsilon) E_H + \omega(1 - \sigma) V_H I_w \\ \frac{dI_H}{dt} = \varepsilon E_H - (\mu_H + \gamma + \delta) I_H \\ \frac{dR_H}{dt} = \gamma I_H - (\kappa + \mu_H) R_H \\ \frac{dV_H}{dt} = \tau S_H - (\mu_H + \lambda) V_H - \omega(1 - \sigma) V_H I_w \\ \frac{dS_w}{dt} = \Lambda_w - \rho\beta_2(1 - \phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w S_w \\ \frac{dI_w}{dt} = \rho\beta_2(1 - \phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w I_w, \end{array} \right. \quad (6)$$

98 with positive initial conditions $S_H(0) > 0$, $V_H(0) \geq 0$, $E_H(0) \geq 0$, $I_H(0) \geq 0$, $R_H(0) \geq 0$, $S_w(0) >$
99 0 and $I_w(0) \geq 0$.



The compartmental model for Buruli Ulcer

100

101 We now formulate the Atangana-Baleanu Caputo (ABC) fractional order derivative form of the equa-
 102 tion (6) as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_H = \Lambda_H^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) S_H + \lambda^\alpha V_H + \kappa^\alpha R_H \\ {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha E_H = \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha) E_H + \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w \\ {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_H = \epsilon^\alpha E_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \gamma^\alpha + \delta^\alpha) I_H \\ {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha R_H = \gamma^\alpha I_H - (\kappa^\alpha + \mu_H^\alpha) R_H \\ {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha V_H = \tau^\alpha S_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \lambda^\alpha) V_H - \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w \\ {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_w = \Lambda_w^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w^\alpha S_w \\ {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_w = \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w^\alpha I_w \end{array} \right. \quad (7)$$

103 with the initial conditions $S_H(0) > 0$, $V_H(0) \geq 0$, $E_H(0) \geq 0$, $I_H(0) \geq 0$, $R_H(0) \geq 0$, $S_w(0) >$
 104 0 and $I_w(0) \geq 0$, where $0 \leq t < T$ and ${}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha$ denotes the Atangana-Baleanu Caputo fractional
 105 derivative of order $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. The parameters and variables of the model (7) are described in detail
 106 below, see Table 1.

107 4 Mathematical Analysis of the Model

108 In this section, we consider the qualitative aspects of the model (7). We present the proof of existence
 109 and uniqueness of the solution by means of fixed point iteration technique in specific norm.

110 4.1 Existence And Uniqueness Of Solution

111 **Theorem 4.2.** [41] Suppose that $F(X)$ is a Banach space of real-valued continuous functions defined
 112 on the interval $X = [0, T]$ with the sup norm, and let $G = F(X) \times F(X) \times F(X) \times F(X) \times F(X) \times F(X)$
 113 with the norm $\|(S_H, E_H, I_H, R_H, V_H, S_w, I_w)\| = \|S_H\| + \|E_H\| + \|I_H\| + \|R_H\| + \|V_H\| + \|S_w\| + \|I_w\|$,

Parameter	Description
β_1	The transmission probability of infected water-bugs.
ρ	The biting rate of infected water-bugs on susceptible individuals.
μ_H	The natural mortality rate of the human population.
ε	Represent the rate at which exposed class become infected.
γ	The recovery rate.
Λ_H	Birth rate of susceptible humans.
Λ_w	The recruitment rate of susceptible water-bugs.
β_2	The transmission probability of infected humans .
κ	The rate at which recovered individuals become susceptible.
δ	Represent the induced death rate by the disease.
σ	Efficacy of the vaccine.
ϕ	The proportion of Mycobacterium Ulceran infecting water-bugs.
τ	Vaccination rate.
λ	Vaccine wane rate.

Table 1: Parameter and Variable Descriptions

114 where

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|S_H\| = \sup\{|S_H(t)| : t \in X\}, \\ \|E_H\| = \sup\{|E_H(t)| : t \in X\}, \\ \|I_H\| = \sup\{|I_H(t)| : t \in X\}, \\ \|R_H\| = \sup\{|R_H(t)| : t \in X\}, \\ \|V_H\| = \sup\{|V_H(t)| : t \in X\}, \\ \|S_w\| = \sup\{|S_w(t)| : t \in X\}, \\ \|I_w\| = \sup\{|I_w(t)| : t \in X\}. \end{array} \right. \quad (8)$$

115 *Proof.* Applying the fractional ABC operator on both side of the equation (7) yields

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_H(t) - S_H(0) = {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_H = \Lambda_H^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) S_H + \lambda^\alpha V_H + \kappa^\alpha R_H \\ E_H(t) - E_H(0) = {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha E_H = \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \varepsilon^\alpha) E_H + \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w \\ I_H(t) - I_H(0) = {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_H = \varepsilon^\alpha E_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \gamma^\alpha + \delta^\alpha) I_H \\ R_H(t) - R_H(0) = {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha R_H = \gamma^\alpha I_H - (\kappa^\alpha + \mu_H^\alpha) R_H \\ V_H(t) - V_H(0) = {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha V_H = \tau^\alpha S_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \lambda^\alpha) V_H - \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w \\ S_w(t) - S_w(0) = {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_w = \Lambda_w^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w^\alpha S_w \\ I_w(t) - I_w(0) = {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_w = \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w^\alpha I_w, \end{array} \right. \quad (9)$$

116 with the initial conditions $S_H(0) > 0$, $V_H(0) \geq 0$, $E_H(0) \geq 0$, $I_H(0) \geq 0$, $R_H(0) \geq 0$, $S_w(0) \geq 0$
 117 and $I_w(0) \geq 0$ where $0 \leq t < \infty$ and ${}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha$ denotes the Atangana-Baleanu Caputo fractional

118 derivative of order $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Applying Definition (2) on the model system Eq (6) we obtain;

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_H(t) - S_H(0) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_1(S_H(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_1(S_H(r), r) dr \\ E_H(t) - E_H(0) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_2(E_H(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_2(E_H(r), r) dr \\ I_H(t) - I_H(0) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_3(I_H(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_3(I_H(r), r) dr \\ R_H(t) - R_H(0) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_4(R_H(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_4(R_H(r), r) dr \\ V_H(t) - V_H(0) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_5(V_H(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_5(V_H(r), r) dr \\ S_w(t) - S_w(0) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_6(S_w(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_6(S_w(r), r) dr \\ I_w(t) - I_w(0) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_7(I_w(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_7(I_w(r), r) dr \end{array} \right. \quad (10)$$

119 where

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} g_1(S_H(t), t) = \Lambda_H^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) S_H + \lambda^\alpha V_H + \kappa^\alpha R_H \\ g_2(E_H(t), t) = \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \varepsilon^\alpha) E_H + \omega^\alpha (1-\sigma) V_H I_w \\ g_3(I_H(t), t) = \varepsilon^\alpha E_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \gamma^\alpha + \delta^\alpha) I_H \\ g_4(R_H(t), t) = \gamma^\alpha I_H - (\kappa^\alpha + \mu_H^\alpha) R_H \\ g_5(V_H(t), t) = \tau^\alpha S_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \lambda^\alpha) V_H - \omega^\alpha (1-\sigma) V_H I_w \\ g_6(S_w(t), t) = \Lambda_w^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1-\phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w^\alpha S_w \\ g_7(I_w(t), t) = \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1-\phi) S_w I_H - \mu_w^\alpha I_w. \end{array} \right. \quad (11)$$

120 Given that $S_H(t), E_H(t), I_H(t), R_H(t), V_H(t), S_w(t)$ and $I_w(t)$ have an upper bound, then
121 $g_1(S_H(t), t), g_2(E_H(t), t), g_3(I_H(t), t), g_4(R_H(t), t), g_5(V_H(t), t), g_6(S_w(t), t)$, and $g_7(I_w(t), t)$ are said to
122 satisfy the Lipschitz condition. Let $S_H(t)$ be two functions, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_1(S_H(t), t) - g_1(S_H^*(t), t)\| &= \| -\rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) S_H + \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H^* I_w + (\mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) S_H^* \| \\ &= \| -S_1 S_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) S_H + S_1 S_H^* + (\mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) S_H^* \| \\ &= \| -(S_1 + \mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha) (S_H - S_H^*) \| \\ &= |(S_1 + \mu_H^\alpha + \tau^\alpha)| \| (S_H - S_H^*) \| \\ &\leq w_1 \| (S_H - S_H^*) \| \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

123 In the same procedure we obtain;

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|g_2(E_H(t), t) - g_2(E_H^*(t), t)\| \leq w_2 \| (E_H - E_H^*) \| \\ \|g_3(I_H(t), t) - g_3(I_H^*(t), t)\| \leq w_3 \| (I_H - I_H^*) \| \\ \|g_4(R_H(t), t) - g_4(R_H^*(t), t)\| \leq w_4 \| (R_H - R_H^*) \| \\ \|g_5(V_H(t), t) - g_5(V_H^*(t), t)\| \leq w_5 \| (V_H - V_H^*) \| \\ \|g_6(S_w(t), t) - g_6(S_w^*(t), t)\| \leq w_6 \| (S_w - S_w^*) \| \\ \|g_7(I_w(t), t) - g_7(I_w^*(t), t)\| \leq w_7 \| (I_w - I_w^*) \|. \end{array} \right. \quad (13)$$

124 Hence, $w_i, i = \{1, \dots, 7\}$ are the corresponding Lipschitz constants that satisfies the Lipschitz condi-
125 tion for all the functions $S_H(t), E_H(t), I_H(t), R_H(t), V_H(t), S_w(t)$ and $I_w(t)$. We can rewrite equation

126 (10) recursively as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_H(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_1(S_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_1(S_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) dr + S_H(0) \\ E_H(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_2(E_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_2(E_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) dr + E_H(0) \\ I_H(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_3(I_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_3(I_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) dr + I_H(0) \\ R_H(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_4(R_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_4(R_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) dr + R_H(0) \\ V_H(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_5(V_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_5(V_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) dr + V_H(0) \\ S_w(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_6(S_{w_{n-1}}(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_6(S_{w_{n-1}}(r), r) dr + S_w(0) \\ I_w(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} g_7(I_{w_{n-1}}(t), t) + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} g_7(I_{w_{n-1}}(r), r) dr + I_w(0). \end{array} \right. \quad (14)$$

127 Taking the difference of the successive terms together with the initial conditions in equation (7), the
128 following system of equations are derived, given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lambda_{S_{H,n}(t)} = S_H(t) - S_{H_{n-1}}(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} (g_1(S_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) - g_1(S_{H_{n-2}}(t))) \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (g_1(S_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) - g_1(S_{H_{n-2}}(r), r)) dr, \\ \lambda_{E_{H,n}(t)} = E_H(t) - E_{H_{n-1}}(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} (g_2(E_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) - g_2(E_{H_{n-2}}(t))) \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (g_2(E_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) - g_2(E_{H_{n-2}}(r), r)) dr, \\ \lambda_{I_{H,n}(t)} = I_H(t) - I_{H_{n-1}}(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} (g_3(I_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) - g_3(I_{H_{n-2}}(t))) \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (g_3(I_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) - g_3(I_{H_{n-2}}(r), r)) dr, \\ \lambda_{R_{H,n}(t)} = R_H(t) - R_{H_{n-1}}(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} (g_4(R_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) - g_4(R_{H_{n-2}}(t))) \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (g_4(R_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) - g_4(R_{H_{n-2}}(r), r)) dr, \\ \lambda_{V_{H,n}(t)} = V_H(t) - V_{H_{n-1}}(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} (g_5(V_{H_{n-1}}(t), t) - g_5(V_{H_{n-2}}(t))) \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (g_5(V_{H_{n-1}}(r), r) - g_5(V_{H_{n-2}}(r), r)) dr, \\ \lambda_{S_{w,n}(t)} = S_w(t) - S_{w_{n-1}}(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} (g_6(S_{w_{n-1}}(t), t) - g_6(S_{w_{n-2}}(t))) \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (g_6(S_{w_{n-1}}(r), r) - g_6(S_{w_{n-2}}(r), r)) dr, \\ \lambda_{I_{w,n}(t)} = I_w(t) - I_{w_{n-1}}(t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} (g_7(I_{w_{n-1}}(t), t) - g_7(I_{w_{n-2}}(t))) \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (g_7(I_{w_{n-1}}(r), r) - g_7(I_{w_{n-2}}(r), r)) dr, \end{array} \right. \quad (15)$$

129 Also, it can be observed that

$$S_{H,n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{S_{H,j}}(t), \quad E_{H,n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{E_{H,j}}(t), \quad I_{H,n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{I_{H,j}}(t), \quad R_{H,n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{R_{H,j}}(t),$$

130

$$V_{H,n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{V_{H,j}}(t), \quad S_{w,n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{S_{w,j}}(t), \quad I_{w,n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{I_{w,j}}(t),$$

131 Using equations (12) and (13) and taking into account that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lambda_{S_{H,n-1}}(t) = S_{H_{n-1}}(t) - S_{H_{n-2}}(t), \\ \lambda_{E_{H,n-1}}(t) = E_{H_{n-1}}(t) - E_{H_{n-2}}(t), \\ \lambda_{I_{H,n-1}}(t) = I_{H_{n-1}}(t) - I_{H_{n-2}}(t), \\ \lambda_{R_{H,n-1}}(t) = R_{H_{n-1}}(t) - R_{H_{n-2}}(t), \\ \lambda_{V_{H,n-1}}(t) = V_{H_{n-1}}(t) - V_{H_{n-2}}(t), \\ \lambda_{S_{w,n-1}}(t) = S_{w_{n-1}}(t) - S_{w_{n-2}}(t), \\ \lambda_{I_{w,n-1}}(t) = I_{w_{n-1}}(t) - I_{w_{n-2}}(t), \end{array} \right. \quad (16)$$

132 Then, the following are derived

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|\lambda_{S_{H,n}}(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_1\right)\|\lambda_{S_{H,n-1}}(t)\| + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1}w_1\|\lambda_{S_{H,n-1}}(r)\| dr, \\ \|\lambda_{E_{H,n}}(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_2\right)\|\lambda_{E_{H,n-1}}(t)\| + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1}w_2\|\lambda_{E_{H,n-1}}(r)\| dr, \\ \|\lambda_{I_{H,n}}(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_3\right)\|\lambda_{I_{H,n-1}}(t)\| + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1}w_3\|\lambda_{I_{H,n-1}}(r)\| dr, \\ \|\lambda_{R_{H,n}}(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_4\right)\|\lambda_{R_{H,n-1}}(t)\| + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1}w_4\|\lambda_{R_{H,n-1}}(r)\| dr, \\ \|\lambda_{V_{H,n}}(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_5\right)\|\lambda_{V_{H,n-1}}(t)\| + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1}w_5\|\lambda_{V_{H,n-1}}(r)\| dr, \\ \|\lambda_{S_{w,n}}(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_6\right)\|\lambda_{S_{w,n-1}}(t)\| + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1}w_6\|\lambda_{S_{w,n-1}}(r)\| dr, \\ \|\lambda_{I_{w,n}}(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_7\right)\|\lambda_{I_{w,n-1}}(t)\| + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1}w_7\|\lambda_{I_{w,n-1}}(r)\| dr, \end{array} \right. \quad (17)$$

133

□

134 **Theorem 4.3.** [41] *The proposed fractional order Buruli Ulcer ABC operator model equation (7)*
135 *possesses a unique solution for some $t_0 \in [0, T]$ if the following condition holds true.*

$$\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)}w_j + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)}w_j^\alpha t_0 < 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, \quad (18)$$

136 *Proof.* It is evident that $S_H(t)$, $E_H(t)$, $I_H(t)$, $R_H(t)$, $V_H(t)$, $S_w(t)$ and $I_w(t)$ are bounded functions
137 and adhere to the Lipschitz condition. Furthermore, the functions g_1 , g_2 , g_3 , g_4 , g_5 , g_6 and g_7 also
138 comply with the Lipschitz condition as demonstrated in(12) and (13). Therefore, by applying the

139 recursive principle and using equation (17), the following system can be derived.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|\lambda_{S_{H,n}}\| \leq \|S_H(0)\| \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_1 + \frac{\alpha t_0}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} w_1 \right)^n, \\ \|\lambda_{E_{H,n}}\| \leq \|E_H(0)\| \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_2 + \frac{\alpha t_0}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} w_2 \right)^n, \\ \|\lambda_{I_{H,n}}\| \leq \|I_H(0)\| \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_3 + \frac{\alpha t_0}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} w_3 \right)^n, \\ \|\lambda_{R_{H,n}}\| \leq \|R_H(0)\| \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_4 + \frac{\alpha t_0}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} w_4 \right)^n, \\ \|\lambda_{V_{H,n}}\| \leq \|V_H(0)\| \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_5 + \frac{\alpha t_0}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} w_5 \right)^n, \\ \|\lambda_{S_{w,n}}\| \leq \|S_w(0)\| \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_6 + \frac{\alpha t_0}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} w_6 \right)^n, \\ \|\lambda_{I_{w,n}}\| \leq \|I_w(0)\| \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_7 + \frac{\alpha t_0}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} w_7 \right)^n. \end{array} \right. \quad (19)$$

140 Thus, the sequences derived above exist and satisfy

$$\|\lambda_{S_{m,n}}(\alpha)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\lambda_{V_{e,n}}(\alpha)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\lambda_{I_{m,n}}(\alpha)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\lambda_{I_{e,n}}(\alpha)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\lambda_{T_{m,n}}(\alpha)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and} \\ 141 \|\lambda_{R_{m,n}}(\alpha)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

142 Additionally, from equation (19) and utilizing the triangular inequality for any r , we obtain

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|S_{H_{n+r}}(t) - S_{H_n}(t)\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+r} \chi_1^j = \frac{\chi_1^{n+1} - \chi_1^{n+r+1}}{1 - \chi_1}, \\ \|E_{H_{n+r}}(t) - E_{H_n}(t)\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+r} \chi_2^j = \frac{\chi_2^{n+1} - \chi_2^{n+r+1}}{1 - \chi_2}, \\ \|I_{H_{n+r}}(t) - I_{H_n}(t)\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+r} \chi_3^j = \frac{\chi_3^{n+1} - \chi_3^{n+r+1}}{1 - \chi_3}, \\ \|R_{H_{n+r}}(t) - R_{H_n}(t)\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+r} \chi_4^j = \frac{\chi_4^{n+1} - \chi_4^{n+r+1}}{1 - \chi_4}, \\ \|V_{H_{n+r}}(t) - V_{H_n}(t)\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+r} \chi_5^j = \frac{\chi_5^{n+1} - \chi_5^{n+r+1}}{1 - \chi_5}, \\ \|S_{w_{n+r}}(t) - S_{w_n}(t)\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+r} \chi_6^j = \frac{\chi_6^{n+1} - \chi_6^{n+r+1}}{1 - \chi_6}, \\ \|I_{w_{n+r}}(t) - I_{w_n}(t)\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+r} \chi_7^j = \frac{\chi_7^{n+1} - \chi_7^{n+r+1}}{1 - \chi_7}, \end{array} \right. \quad (20)$$

143 Where, $\chi_i = \frac{1-\alpha}{M(\alpha)} w_i + \frac{\alpha}{M(\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} t_0 w_i$ for $i = \{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$. As a result, $S_{H,n}, E_{H,n}, I_{H,n}, R_{H,n}, V_{H,n}, S_{w,n}$
144 and $I_{w,n}$ form Cauchy sequences within $F(x)$, converging uniformly. The limit of these sequences
145 represents the unique solution to (7), demonstrated through the application of the limit theory in
146 equation (14) as n approaches infinity. Thus, the existence of the unique solution for the fractional
147 order ABC model system equation(7) is established. \square

148 5 Numerical Results

149 In this section, we present the numerical simulation of the fractional model (7). We consider the param-
150 eter values in (2) and observe the dynamics of both class of human and the water-bug population. We

151 considered the following initial conditions $S_H(0) = 280, E_H = 80, I_H(0) = 25, R_H(0) = 20, V_H(0) =$
 152 $20, S_w(0) = 700, I_w(0) = 44$. Varying orders of the fractional derivatives $\alpha = \{0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95\}$
 153 were used for the simulations.

Parameter/ Variables	Values	Source
β_1	0.69	[36]
ρ	0.0099	Assumed
μ_H	0.001066	Assumed
μ_w	0.021	[36]
ε	0.08	Assumed
γ	0.005	Assumed
Λ_H	0.03	[36]
Λ_w	0.15	[36]
β_2	0.099	Assumed
κ	0.05	Assumed
δ	0.0002	Assumed
σ	0.005	Assumed
ϕ	0.0005	Assumed
τ	0.002	Assumed
λ	0.02	Assumed
ω	0.00005279	Assumed
c_1	4000	Assumed
c_2	1090	Assumed
c_3	550	Assumed
c_4	990	Assumed

Table 2: Model's parameter values




Figure 1: Sensitivity indices of the basic reproductive number.

154 From Figure (2), we observe that the number of susceptible humans S_H decline as they become
 155 exposed to the Buruli ulcer disease, while the number of infected individuals increase. A similar
 156 behaviour is seen in the water-bugs. The number of infected water-bugs increases while the susceptible
 157 water-bugs decrease. This trend illustrates the natural progression of the Buruli ulcer disease outbreak,
 158 where the susceptible population diminishes as more individuals become infected. Also, we observe




Figure 2: Simulation of the fractional model model without control.

159 that both the vaccinated and recovered humans decrease. In the Figures 2a to 2f, we plot the solution
 160 trajectory for each compartment with varying fractional orders $\alpha = \{0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95\}$.

161 The graph (3a) and (3b) shows the dynamics of the susceptible and infected human class with
 162 varying parameter ρ . It can be observed that decrease (increase) in the biting rate of the water bugs
 163 on humans, ρ lead to an increase (decrease) in the susceptible humans and a decrease (increase) in
 164 the infected humans. An increase in the recovery rate γ from figure (4) leads to a rise in the number
 165 of susceptible humans and a decrease in the infected humans class. From Figure (5) we observe that

166 when the parameter τ is varied there is much effect on the susceptible and vaccinated human class.
 167 When the value of the parameter τ is increased the vaccination of humans rises as the susceptible
 168 humans decline.




Figure 3: The dynamics of Susceptible and infected humans when the parameter ρ is varied.




Figure 4: The dynamics of susceptible and infected humans when the parameter γ is varied.

169 6 Fractional Optimal Control of Buruli Ulcer

170 In this section, we present the Buruli ulcer fractional optimal control problem. From the model
 171 (7) we modify it by applying the the optimal control interventions for effective management of the
 172 Buruli ulcer infection. The control interventions arose as a result of the computation of the sensitivity
 173 indices. We incorporate in the new model four control interventions namely; health education $u_1(t)$,
 174 vaccination rate $u_2(t)$, effective treatment of infected humans $u_3(t)$, and spraying insecticides on water-
 175 bugs population $u_4(t)$. The goal is to minimize the number of exposed humans E_H , infected humans
 176 I_H and the population of water-bugs N_w while minimizing the cost of control interventions. Hence
 177 the objective function $J(u)$ can be formulated as

$$J(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) = \int_0^{t_f} \left(E_H + I_H + N_w + \frac{c_1}{2} u_1^2 + \frac{c_2}{2} u_2^2 + \frac{c_3}{2} u_3^2 + \frac{c_4}{2} u_4^2 \right) dt, \quad (21)$$




Figure 5: The dynamics of the Buruli model when the parameter τ is varied.




Figure 6: The dynamics of Susceptible and infected humans when the parameter μ_H is varied.

178 subject to the fractional optimal control problem with interventions,

$$\begin{aligned}
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_H &= \Lambda_H^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + u_2) S_H + \lambda^\alpha V_H + \kappa^\alpha R_H, \\
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha E_H &= \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1^\alpha) S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha) E_H + \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w, \\
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_H &= \epsilon^\alpha E_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \gamma^\alpha + \delta^\alpha + u_3^\alpha) I_H, \\
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha R_H &= \gamma^\alpha I_H - (\kappa^\alpha + \mu_H^\alpha) R_H, \\
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha V_H &= u_2 S_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \lambda^\alpha) V_H - \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w, \\
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_w &= \Lambda_w^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1) (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4) S_w, \\
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_w &= \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1) (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4^\alpha) I_w.
 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

179 with positive initial conditions :

$$S_H(0) > 0, V_H(0) \geq 0, E_H(0) \geq 0, I_H(0) \geq 0, R_H(0) \geq 0, S_w(0) \geq 0 \text{ and } I_w(0) \geq 0, \quad (23)$$

180 where c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 are the weights associated with the cost of the control measures. The primary goal
181 of the fractional optimal control problem is to identify an optimal control $u_1^*, u_2^*, u_3^*, u_4^*$ such that

$$J(u_1^*, u_2^*, u_3^*, u_4^*) = \min_{(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)} \left\{ J(u_1(t), u_2(t), u_3(t), u_4(t)) \mid u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 \in U \right\},$$

182 where the admissible set of controls is given by

$$U = \{(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) \in (L^\infty(0, t_f))^2 \mid 0 \leq u_i(t) \leq 1, i = 1, \dots, 4\}.$$

183 6.1 Characterization of Optimal Control

184 The existence outcome for optimal control from the adjoint variable of the state variables satisfies the
185 following set of differential equations, and the required criteria that an optimal control must meet were
186 obtained from Pontryagin's Maximum Principle according to [39, 45]. With regard to the controls
187 u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 , this principle transforms system (22) into a problem of minimizing a Hamiltonian H
188 point-wise. Our initial step will be finding the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian for the optimal control
189 problem.

190 The Lagrangian formulation is given by

$$L = E_H + I_H + N_w + \frac{c_1}{2}u_1^2 + \frac{c_2}{2}u_2^2 + \frac{c_3}{2}u_3^2 + \frac{c_4}{2}u_4^2 \quad (24)$$

191 The Hamiltonian associated with the control problem is

$$H = L + \mathcal{L}_{S_H} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_H + \mathcal{L}_{E_H} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha E_H + \mathcal{L}_{I_H} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_H + \mathcal{L}_{R_H} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha R_H \\ + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha V_H + \mathcal{L}_{S_w} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha S_w + \mathcal{L}_{I_w} {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha I_w \quad (25)$$

192 Hence by Pontryagin's Maximum Principle, the Hamiltonian H is as follows:

$$H = E_H + I_H + N_w + \frac{c_1}{2}u_1^2 + \frac{c_2}{2}u_2^2 + \frac{c_3}{2}u_3^2 + \frac{c_4}{2}u_4^2 \\ + \mathcal{L}_{S_H} (\Lambda_H^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + u_2) S_H + \lambda^\alpha V_H + \kappa^\alpha R_H) \\ + \mathcal{L}_{E_H} (\rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) S_H I_w - (\mu_H^\alpha + \varepsilon^\alpha) E_H + \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w) \\ + \mathcal{L}_{I_H} (\epsilon^\alpha E_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \gamma^\alpha + \delta^\alpha + u_3) I_H) \\ + \mathcal{L}_{R_H} (\gamma^\alpha I_H - (\kappa^\alpha + \mu_H^\alpha) R_H) \\ + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} (\tau^\alpha S_H - (\mu_H^\alpha + \lambda^\alpha) V_H - \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H I_w) \\ + \mathcal{L}_{S_w} (\Lambda_w^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1) (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4) S_w) \\ + \mathcal{L}_{I_w} (\rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1) (1 - \phi) S_w I_H - (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4) I_w) \quad (26)$$

193 where $\mathcal{L}_{S_H}, \mathcal{L}_{E_H}, \mathcal{L}_{I_H}, \mathcal{L}_{R_H}, \mathcal{L}_{V_H}, \mathcal{L}_{S_w}, \mathcal{L}_{I_w}$ are the adjoint variables or the Lagrangian multipliers.

194 The maximal principle of Pontryagin states that if (X, U) gives an optimal solution to an optimal
195 control problem, then there exists a nontrivial vector function $(\mathcal{L}_{S_H}, \mathcal{L}_{E_H}, \mathcal{L}_{I_H}, \mathcal{L}_{R_H}, \mathcal{L}_{V_H}, \mathcal{L}_{S_w}, \mathcal{L}_{I_w})$
196 with the following properties.

$$- {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_i = \frac{\partial H(t, X, u, \mathcal{L}_i)}{\partial i} \quad \text{where } i = S_H, E_H, I_H, R_H, V_H, S_w, I_w \\ \frac{\partial H(t, X, u, \mathcal{L}_i)}{\partial u} = 0 \quad (27) \\ \mathcal{L}(t_f) = 0$$

197 where X and U are the optimal solution and controls respectively. The existence of the optimal control
198 u_i^* can be establish in the following theorem.

199 **Theorem 6.2.** *Let $S_H^*, E_H^*, I_H^*, R_H^*, V_H^*, S_w^*, I_w^*$ be the associated solution to the following optimal
200 control problem and u_1^*, u_2^*, u_3^* and u_4^* be the optimal control that minimizes $J(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)$ over U .
201 Then there exist adjoint functions \mathcal{L}_i satisfying the following three results*

202 1. Equations of adjoint state variables

$$\begin{aligned}
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{S_H} &= \mathcal{L}_{S_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) I_w + \mathcal{L}_{S_H} (\mu_H^\alpha + u_2) - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) I_w - \mathcal{L}_{V_H} u_2 \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{E_H} &= -1 + \mathcal{L}_{E_H} (\mu_H^\alpha + \varepsilon^\alpha) - \mathcal{L}_{I_H} \varepsilon^\alpha \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{I_H} &= -1 + \mathcal{L}_{I_H} (\mu_H^\alpha \gamma^\alpha + \delta^\alpha + u_3) - \mathcal{L}_{R_H} \gamma^\alpha + \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1) (1 - \phi) S_w (\mathcal{L}_{S_w} - \mathcal{L}_{I_w}) \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{R_H} &= -\mathcal{L}_{S_H} \kappa^\alpha + \mathcal{L}_{R_H} (\kappa^\alpha + \mu_H^\alpha) \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{V_H} &= -\mathcal{L}_{S_H} \lambda^\alpha - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) I_w + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) I_w + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} (\mu_H + \lambda) \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{S_w} &= -1 + \mathcal{L}_{S_w} \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1) (1 - \phi) I_H + \mathcal{L}_{S_w} (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4) \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{I_w} &= -1 + \mathcal{L}_{S_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) S_H - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) S_H - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H \\
 &\quad + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H + \mathcal{L}_{I_w} (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4)
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

2. With transversality conditions

$$\mathcal{L}_i(t_f) = 0, \quad \text{for } i = S_H, E_H, I_H, R_H, V_H, S_w, I_w$$

203 3. Furthermore, the optimality condition for FOCP as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_1^* &= \max \left\{ 0, \min \left\{ 1, \frac{-\rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w (\mathcal{L}_{S_H} - \mathcal{L}_{E_H}) - \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - \phi) S_w I_H (\mathcal{L}_{S_w} - \mathcal{L}_{I_w})}{c_1} \right\} \right\} \\
 u_2^* &= \max \left\{ 0, \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\mathcal{L}_{S_H} S_H - \mathcal{L}_{V_H} S_H}{c_2} \right\} \right\} \\
 u_3^* &= \max \left\{ 0, \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\mathcal{L}_{I_H} I_H}{c_3} \right\} \right\} \\
 u_4^* &= \max \left\{ 0, \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\mathcal{L}_{S_w} S_w + \mathcal{L}_{I_w} I_w}{c_4} \right\} \right\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

204 *Proof.* In trying to show the proof to the above theorem we use the Hamiltonian function (25) to
205 get the adjoint and transversality criteria. We compute the adjoint system by employing Pontryagin's
206 maximal principle as follows;

$$\begin{aligned}
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{S_H} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial S_H} = \mathcal{L}_{S_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) I_w + \mathcal{L}_{S_H} (\mu_H^\alpha + u_2) - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) I_w - \mathcal{L}_{V_H} u_2 \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{E_H} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial E_H} = -1 + \mathcal{L}_{E_H} (\mu_H^\alpha + \varepsilon^\alpha) - \mathcal{L}_{I_H} \varepsilon^\alpha \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{I_H} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial I_H} = -1 + \mathcal{L}_{I_H} (\mu_H^\alpha \gamma^\alpha + \delta^\alpha + u_3) - \mathcal{L}_{R_H} \gamma^\alpha + \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1) (1 - \phi) S_w (\mathcal{L}_{S_w} - \mathcal{L}_{I_w}) \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{R_H} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial R_H} = -\mathcal{L}_{S_H} \kappa^\alpha + \mathcal{L}_{R_H} (\kappa^\alpha + \mu_H^\alpha) \\
 ABC D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{V_H} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial V_H} = -\mathcal{L}_{S_H} \lambda^\alpha - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) I_w + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) I_w + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} (\mu_H + \lambda)
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{S_w} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial S_w} = -1 + \mathcal{L}_{S_w} \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - u_1)(1 - \phi) I_H + \mathcal{L}_{S_w} (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4) \\
 {}^{ABC}D_t^\alpha \mathcal{L}_{I_w} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial I_w} = -1 + \mathcal{L}_{S_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) S_H - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha (1 - u_1) S_H - \mathcal{L}_{E_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H \\
 &\quad + \mathcal{L}_{V_H} \omega^\alpha (1 - \sigma) V_H + \mathcal{L}_{I_w} (\mu_w^\alpha + u_4)
 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

207 , with transversality condition

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_H}(t_f) = \mathcal{L}_{E_H}(t_f) = \mathcal{L}_{I_H}(t_f) = \mathcal{L}_{R_H}(t_f) = \mathcal{L}_{V_H}(t_f) = \mathcal{L}_{S_w}(t_f) = \mathcal{L}_{I_w}(t_f) = 0. \tag{32}$$

208 Also the optimal functions $u_1^*, u_2^*, u_3^*, u_4^*$ satisfies

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u_i} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \tag{33}$$

209 Hence by making use of (33) the optimal control variables are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_1 &= \frac{-\rho^\alpha \beta_1^\alpha S_H I_w (\mathcal{L}_{S_H} - \mathcal{L}_{E_H}) - \rho^\alpha \beta_2^\alpha (1 - \phi) S_w I_H (\mathcal{L}_{S_w} - \mathcal{L}_{I_w})}{c_1}, \\
 u_2 &= \frac{\mathcal{L}_{S_H} S_H - \mathcal{L}_{V_H} S_H}{c_2}, \quad u_3 = \frac{\mathcal{L}_{I_H} I_H}{c_3} \quad \text{and} \quad u_4 = \frac{\mathcal{L}_{S_w} S_w + \mathcal{L}_{I_w} I_w}{c_4}
 \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

210 Hence the proof is complete. □

211 The uniqueness of the optimality system (28) was obtained as a result of the priori boundedness
 212 of the state system (22), the adjoint system, and so on. To ensure the uniqueness of the optimality
 213 system, we limit the duration of the time interval $[1, t_f]$. The optimal state can be found by substituting
 214 u_i^* into (22).

215 7 Numerical Simulations

216 In this section, we look at how the interventions affect the Buruli ulcer transmission in a population.
 217 We used the modified PECE method of Adam-Bashforth Moulton to solve the adjoint variable (28)
 218 and the fractional optimal control problem numerically, see, e.g. [39]. In order to reduce the incidence
 219 of Buruli ulcer infections in humans and water bugs, respectively, we use the weight c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 , and
 220 parameter values in table (2). We vary the fractional order for four α values and set the time limit
 221 at six months. There are many combinations of intervention strategies we could consider however we
 222 limit ourselves to the following intervention strategies implemented in the simulations shown in the
 223 graphs below.

224 7.1 Strategy A: All strategies

225 The intervention method here present the solution of the optimal control system (22) when we focus
 226 on all the control variables that is $u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 \neq 0$. From the figures in (7a)-(7f) we observe
 227 that there is a rise in the susceptible humans and a decrease in the number of infected humans due
 228 to the decline in the number of people exposed to the disease. This then leads to high recovery rate.
 229 Concurrently there is a slow increase in susceptible water-bugs as the infected water-bugs decreases.




Figure 7: Applying all control strategies

230 7.2 Strategy B: $(u_1), (u_2)$, and (u_3) only

231 In this strategy, we consider the case where education on the use of protective clothing, the rate of
 232 vaccination and treatment of infected humans are implemented, when $u_1 = u_2 = u_3 \neq 0, u_4 = 0$. From
 233 the figures in (8a)-(8f), we observe that the populations of the susceptible and recovered humans
 234 increases as the infected humans decline relative to the uncontrolled situation in figure (2). This is
 235 as a result of a rapid decline in the number of humans exposed to the disease in the endemic region.

236 In the same vane we observe a decreasing effect on the infected water-bugs and a linear rise in the
237 susceptible water-bugs.




Figure 8: The intervention by education on wearing protective clothing, rate of vaccination and treatment of infected humans.

238 **7.3 Strategy C: $(u_1), (u_2),$ and (u_4) only**

239 The intervention method present here looks similar to strategy A where there is a rise in the susceptible
 240 and recovered humans as a result of decline in exposed humans which leads to a rapid decrease in the
 241 infected human. Simultaneously there is a rapid decline in the infected water-bugs and slowly increase
 in the susceptible water-bugs.




Figure 9: The intervention by education on wearing protective clothing, rate of vaccination and applying insecticides on water-bug.

243 7.4 Strategy D: (u_1) and (u_2) only

244 The strategy shown over here is a combination of education on wearing protective clothing and rate
 245 of of vaccination where $u_1 = u_2 \neq 0, u_3 = u_4 = 0$. It is clearly observed that this strategy is also very
 246 effective as the rate at which people are exposed to the disease falls which leads to increase in the
 247 number of susceptible and recovered humans and a decrease in the infected humans. There is also rise
 248 in the susceptible water-bugs and a fall in infected water-bugs respectively.




Figure 10: The intervention by education on wearing protective clothing and rate of vaccination only.

249 **7.5 Strategy E: (u_3) and (u_4) Only**

250 The intervention method here presents the solution of the optimal control system (22) when we
251 focus on treating infected humans and applying insecticides on the water-bug population only, that
252 is $u_1 = u_2 = 0$, $u_3 = u_4 \neq 0$. From the figures (11a)-(11), combining these two control interventions
253 leads to a rapid increase in the susceptible humans and decline in the number of infected humans as
254 there is a decrease in the number of people exposed to outbreak of the disease. We also observe that
255 recovered humans increases while there is rapid decline in the infected water-bugs and slowly increase
256 in the susceptible water-bugs.

257 **8 Conclusion**

258 In this study, we developed a fractional optimal control model for Buruli ulcer transmission that
259 includes health education on the use of protective clothes, vaccination rates, treatment of infected
260 persons, and insecticide spraying on the water bug population. We used ABC fractional order deriva-
261 tives to test the effect of fractional order derivatives. The basic features of the model without control
262 variables were examined, revealing that the model is both biologically and mathematically well-posed.
263 We subsequently formulated the fractional optimal control problem by using Pontryagin's Maximum
264 Principle, the optimal control problem was solved. We then presented a numerical simulation of the
265 fractional model without control and with control. Several control strategies were implemented and we
266 observed from the graphs that when the control measures are applied relative to the one without control
267 there is an increase in the susceptible, recovered, and vaccinated humans while there is a decline
268 in infected humans and infected water-bugs. We then conclude and recommend that governments in
269 the endemic regions should invest more in finding perfect vaccines, implement comprehensive health
270 education on wearing protective cloths, ensure early and effective treatment of infected humans, and
271 applying insecticides on the vectors that carry the *Mycobacteria Ulcerans*.

272 **Author Contribution**

273 **SN:** Writing - review & editing, Methodology, Conceptualization. **EA:** Writing - original draft,
274 Simulations, Formal analysis. **MD:** Writing - review & editing. **SM:** Writing - review & editing,
275 Conceptualization, Methodology

276 **Conflict of interest**

277 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

278 **Data Availability Statement**

279 No Data associated in the manuscript




Figure 11: Intervention by treating infected humans and Spraying insecticides on Water-bugs only.

280 References

- 281 [1] A. Abd-Elmonem, R. Banerjee, S. Ahmad, W. Jamshed, K. S. Nisar, M. R. Eid, R. W. Ibrahim,
 282 and S. M. El Din. A comprehensive review on fractional-order optimal control problem and its
 283 solution. *Open Mathematics*, 21(1):20230105, 2023.
- 284 [2] A. I. Abioye, O. J. Peter, H. A. Ogunseye, F. A. Oguntolu, T. A. Ayoola, and A. O. Oladapo. A

- fractional-order mathematical model for malaria and covid-19 co-infection dynamics. *Healthcare Analytics*, 4:100210, 2023.
- [3] A. I. Abioye, O. J. Peter, F. A. Oguntolu, A. F. Adebisi, and T. F. Aminu. Global stability of seir-sei model of malaria transmission. *Adv. Math., Sci. J*, 9:5305–5317, 2020.
- [4] A. Adom-Konadu, E. Yankson, S. M. Naandam, and D. Dwomoh. A mathematical model for effective control and possible eradication of malaria. *Journal of Mathematics*, 2022, 2022.
- [5] P. Agbenorku. Buruli ulcer disability in ghana: the problems and solutions. 2014.
- [6] I. Ahmed, E. F. D. Goufo, A. Yusuf, P. Kumam, P. Chaipanya, and K. Nonlaopon. An epidemic prediction from analysis of a combined hiv-covid-19 co-infection model via abc-fractional operator. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 60(3):2979–2995, 2021.
- [7] G. Amofah, F. Bonsu, C. Tetteh, J. Okrah, K. Asamoah, K. Asiedu, and J. Addy. Buruli ulcer in ghana: results of a national case search. *Emerging infectious diseases*, 8(2):167, 2002.
- [8] I. K. Amponsah, P. K. Atchoglo, R. Y. Ackah, P. V. T. Fokou, S. Y. Aboagye, D. Yeboah-Manu, R. Appiah-Opong, and A. Y. Mensah. In vitro anti-mycobacterium ulcerans and cytotoxic activities of some selected medicinal plants and an indoloquinoline alkaloid. *The International Journal of Mycobacteriology*, 10(1):60–65, 2021.
- [9] K. Asiedu and S. Etuaful. Socioeconomic implications of buruli ulcer in ghana: a three-year review. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*, 59(6):1015–1022, 1998.
- [10] K. Asiedu, M. C. Raviglione, R. Scherpbier, W. H. Organization, and G. B. U. Initiative. Buruli ulcer: Mycobacterium ulcerans infection. Technical report, World Health Organization, 2000.
- [11] M. Aslam, R. Murtaza, T. Abdeljawad, G. u. Rahman, A. Khan, H. Khan, and H. Gulzar. A fractional order hiv/aids epidemic model with mittag-leffler kernel. *Advances in Difference Equations*, 2021:1–15, 2021.
- [12] A. Atangana and D. Baleanu. New fractional derivatives with nonlocal and non-singular kernel: theory and application to heat transfer model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.03408*, 2016.
- [13] I. Aujoulat, C. Johnson, C. Zinsou, A. Guédénon, and F. Portaels. Psychosocial aspects of health seeking behaviours of patients with buruli ulcer in southern benin. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, 8(8):750–759, 2003.
- [14] M. S. Avumegah. Mycobacterium ulcerans disease and host immune responses. In *New Advances in Neglected Tropical Diseases*. IntechOpen, 2022.
- [15] E. Bonyah, I. Dontwi, and F. Nyabadza. Optimal control applied to the spread of buruli ulcer. *American Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 4(3):61–76, 2014.
- [16] J. Butler, J. Ogden, R. Phillips, R. Hay, R. E. Simmonds, and C. Erolin. Multisensory medical illustrations of buruli ulcer for improved disease detection, help seeking behaviour and adherence to treatment. *Journal of Visual Communication in Medicine*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [17] Clancey, O. Dodge, H. Lunn, M. Oduori, et al. Mycobacterial skin ulcers in uganda. *Lancet*, pages 951–954, 1961.
- [18] W. Daan B, Y. Stienstra, M. G. Huitema, W. A. Thompson, E. O. Klutse, E. O. Ampadu, H. M. Boezen, P. C. Limburg, and T. S. van der Werf. Cytokine responses to stimulation of whole blood from patients with buruli ulcer disease in ghana. *Clinical and Vaccine Immunology*, 12(1):125–129, 2005.
- [19] C. T. Deressa and G. F. Duressa. Analysis of atangana–baleanu fractional-order seair epidemic model with optimal control. *Advances in Difference Equations*, 2021:1–25, 2021.

- 328 [20] L. Dhungel. *Investigations on mechanisms of survival and pathogenesis of Mycobacterium ulcerans*
329 *in polymicrobial environments*. Mississippi State University, 2020.
- 330 [21] R. Fandio, H. Abboubakar, H. P. E. Fouda, A. Kumar, and K. S. Nisar. Mathematical modelling
331 and projection of buruli ulcer transmission dynamics using classical and fractional derivatives: A
332 case study of cameroon. *Partial Differential Equations in Applied Mathematics*, 8:100589, 2023.
- 333 [22] M. Foulon, M. Robbe-Saule, J. Manry, L. Esnault, Y. Boucaud, A. Alcaïs, M. Mallocci, M. Fan-
334 ton d’Andon, T. Beauvais, N. Labarrière, et al. Mycolactone toxin induces an inflammatory
335 response by targeting the il-1 β pathway: Mechanistic insight into buruli ulcer pathophysiology.
336 *PLoS pathogens*, 16(12):e1009107, 2020.
- 337 [23] D.-p. Gao and N.-j. Huang. Optimal control analysis of a tuberculosis model. *Applied Mathe-*
338 *matical Modelling*, 58:47–64, 2018.
- 339 [24] E. Gyamfi, C. A. Narh, C. Quaye, A. Abbass, B. Dzudzor, and L. Mosi. Microbiology of secondary
340 infections in buruli ulcer lesions; implications for therapeutic interventions. *BMC microbiology*,
341 21:1–12, 2021.
- 342 [25] D. D. Hailemichael, G. K. Edessa, and P. R. Koya. Mathematical modeling of dog rabies trans-
343 mission dynamics using optimal control analysis. *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 296–319,
344 2023.
- 345 [26] J. Hayman. Postulated epidemiology of mycobacterium ulcerans infection. *International journal*
346 *of epidemiology*, 20(4):1093–1098, 1991.
- 347 [27] G. K. L. Huang and P. D. Johnson. Epidemiology and management of buruli ulcer. *Expert review*
348 *of anti-infective therapy*, 12(7):855–865, 2014.
- 349 [28] T. D. Keno, L. B. Dano, and O. D. Makinde. Modeling and optimal control analysis for
350 malaria transmission with role of climate variability. *Computational and Mathematical Meth-*
351 *ods*, 2022(1):9667396, 2022.
- 352 [29] M. A. Kimaro, E. S. Massawe, and D. O. Makinde. Modelling the optimal control of transmission
353 dynamics of mycobacterium ulceran infection. *Open Journal of Epidemiology*, 5(04):229–243,
354 2015.
- 355 [30] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, A. W. Marshall, and I. Olkin. Gamma and beta functions. *Life*
356 *Distributions: Structure of Nonparametric, Semiparametric, and Parametric Families*, pages 717–
357 727, 2007.
- 358 [31] M. Martcheva. *An introduction to mathematical epidemiology*, volume 61. Springer, 2015.
- 359 [32] M. McAsey, L. Mou, and W. Han. Convergence of the forward-backward sweep method in optimal
360 control. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 53:207–226, 2012.
- 361 [33] L. C. d. C. Medeiros, C. A. R. Castilho, C. Braga, W. V. de Souza, L. Regis, and A. M. V.
362 Monteiro. Modeling the dynamic transmission of dengue fever: investigating disease persistence.
363 *PLOS neglected tropical diseases*, 5(1):e942, 2011.
- 364 [34] R. W. Merritt and E. Walker. Small plc, wallace jr, johnson pdr, benbowme, boakye da. ecology
365 and transmission of buruli ulcer disease: a systematic review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, 4(12):e911,
366 2010.
- 367 [35] R. W. Merritt, E. D. Walker, P. L. Small, J. R. Wallace, P. D. Johnson, M. E. Benbow, and D. A.
368 Boakye. Ecology and transmission of buruli ulcer disease: a systematic review. *PLoS neglected*
369 *tropical diseases*, 4(12):e911, 2010.

- 370 [36] A. A. Momoh, H. M. Abdullahi, N. G. Abimbola, and A. I. Michael. Modeling, optimal control of intervention strategies and cost effectiveness analysis for buruli ulcer model. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 60(2):2245–2264, 2021.
- 371
372
- 373 [37] A. A. Mulder, R. P. Boerma, Y. Barogui, C. Zinsou, R. C. Johnson, J. Gbovi, T. S. van der Werf, and Y. Stienstra. Healthcare seeking behaviour for buruli ulcer in benin: a model to capture therapy choice of patients and healthy community members. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 102(9):912–920, 2008.
- 374
375
376
- 377 [38] H. D. Ngoma, P. R. Kiogora, and I. Chepkwony. A fractional order model of leptospirosis transmission dynamics with environmental compartment. *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 18(1):81–110, 2022.
- 378
379
- 380 [39] S. Nortey, M. A. Fellah, S. O. Akindeinde, and S. E. Moore. Optimal control for fractional order dynamics of tumor growth. *Researchsquare*, 2023.
- 381
- 382 [40] F. Nyabadza and E. Bonyah. On the transmission dynamics of buruli ulcer in ghana: Insights through a mathematical model. *BMC research notes*, 8:1–15, 2015.
- 383
- 384 [41] O. M. Ogunmiloro, A. S. Idowu, T. O. Ogunlade, and R. O. Akindutire. On the mathematical modeling of measles disease dynamics with encephalitis and relapse under the atangana–baleanu–caputo fractional operator and real measles data of nigeria. *International Journal of Applied and Computational Mathematics*, 7(5):185, 2021.
- 385
386
387
- 388 [42] K. Oldham and J. Spanier. *The fractional calculus theory and applications of differentiation and integration to arbitrary order*. Elsevier, 1974.
- 389
- 390 [43] W. H. Organization. Treatment of mycobacterium ulcerans disease (buruli ulcer): guidance for health workers. 2012.
- 391
- 392 [44] K. Oshinubi, O. J. Peter, E. Addai, E. Mwizerwa, O. Babasola, I. V. Nwabufo, I. Sane, U. M. Adam, A. Adeniji, and J. O. Agbaje. Mathematical modelling of tuberculosis outbreak in an east african country incorporating vaccination and treatment. *Computation*, 11(7):143, 2023.
- 393
394
- 395 [45] L. S. Pontryagin. *Mathematical theory of optimal processes*. Routledge, 2018.
- 396 [46] Portaels, K. Chemlal, P. Elsen, P. Johnson, J. Hayman, J. Hibble, R. Kirkwood, and W. Meyers. Mycobacterium ulcerans in wild animals. *Revue Scientifique et Technique-Office International des Epizooties*, 20(1):252–264, 2001.
- 397
398
- 399 [47] F. Portaels, M. T. Silva, and W. M. Meyers. Buruli ulcer. *Clinics in dermatology*, 27(3):291–305, 2009.
- 400
- 401 [48] N. PR, I. Adikorley, P. Amoako Yirenkyi, and I. Dontwi. Mathematical modeling and numerical simulation for mycobacterium ulcerans tissue invasion: A macroscopic model for the buruli ulcer disease. *Int. J. Adv. Sci. Eng. Technol*, 4:41–48, 2017.
- 402
403
- 404 [49] A. M. Renzaho, P. V. Woods, M. M. Ackumey, S. K. Harvey, and J. Kotin. Community-based study on knowledge, attitude and practice on the mode of transmission, prevention and treatment of the buruli ulcer in ga west district, ghana. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, 12(3):445–458, 2007.
- 405
406
407
- 408 [50] B. Roche, M. E. Benbow, R. Merritt, R. Kimbirauskas, M. McIntosh, P. L. Small, H. Williamson, and J.-F. Guégan. Identifying the achilles heel of multi-host pathogens: the concept of key-stone ‘host’ species illustrated by mycobacterium ulcerans transmission. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(4):045009, 2013.
- 409
410
411
- 412 [51] E. N. Tabah, C. R. Johnson, H. Degnonvi, G. Pluschke, and K. Röltgen. Buruli ulcer in africa. *Buruli Ulcer: Mycobacterium Ulcerans Disease*, pages 43–60, 2019.
- 413

- 414 [52] B. Tang, Y. Xiao, S. Tang, and J. Wu. Modelling weekly vector control against dengue in the
415 guangdong province of china. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 410:65–76, 2016.
- 416 [53] P. Van den Driessche and J. Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic
417 equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Mathematical biosciences*, 180(1-
418 2):29–48, 2002.
- 419 [54] D. S. Walsh, F. Portaels, and W. M. Meyers. Buruli ulcer (mycobacterium ulcerans infection).
420 *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 102(10):969–978, 2008.
- 421 [55] M. Wansbrough-Jones and R. Phillips. Buruli ulcer: emerging from obscurity. *The Lancet*,
422 367(9525):1849–1858, 2006.
- 423 [56] B. J. Webb, F. R. Hauck, E. Houp, and F. Portaels. Buruli ulcer in west africa: strategies
424 for early detection and treatment in the antibiotic era. *East African Journal of Public Health*,
425 6(2):144–147, 2009.
- 426 [57] B. WR. Albert cook 1870-1951: Uganda pioneer. *British Medical Journal*, 4(5737):738, 1970.
- 427 [58] D. Zingue, A. Bouam, R. B. Tian, and M. Drancourt. Buruli ulcer, a prototype for ecosystem-
428 related infection, caused by mycobacterium ulcerans. *Clinical microbiology reviews*, 31(1):10–1128,
429 2018.