The Optimal Allocation of Covid-19 Vaccines

Ana Babus,[1*] Sanmay Das,[2] SangMok Lee[1]

[1]Department of Economics, University of Washington in St. Louis,
One Brookings Dr., St. Louis, MO 63130, USA

[2]Department of Computer Science, University of Washington in St. Louis,
One Brookings Dr., St. Louis, MO 63130, USA

Abstract

Covid-19 vaccine prioritization is key if the initial supply of the vaccine is limited. A reasonable policy will surely prioritize populations facing high risk of severe illness in high-exposure occupations. The challenge is deciding between high-risk populations in low-exposure occupations and those that are young and healthy but work in high-exposure occupations. We estimate occupation-based infection risks and use age-based infection fatality rates in a model to assign priorities over populations with different occupations and ages. Among others, we find that 50 year-old food-processing workers and 60 year-old financial advisors are equally prioritized. Our model suggests a vaccine distribution that emphasizes age-based mortality risk more than occupation-based exposure risk. Designating some occupations as essential does not affect the optimal vaccine allocation, unless a stay-at-home order is also in effect. Even with vaccines allocated optimally, 1.37% of the employed workforce is still expected to be infected with the virus until the vaccine becomes widely available, provided the vaccine is 50% effective and assuming a supply of 60mil doses.

*Correspding author. E-mail: anababus@wustl.edu.

The ongoing severe acute respiratory syndrome–coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic has claimed over of 600,000 lives worldwide as of July 20th, 2020, and paralyzed economic activity around the globe for extended periods of time. Vaccination is seen as the principal strategy for containing the pandemic. However, even though vaccines are being developed at historical speed, they are expected to be initially in limited supply Cohen (2020). A crucial question stands: who will get first access to a vaccine when one becomes available?

Vaccination strategies under limited resources have been debated following both the H5N1 avian flu outbreak in 2001 and H1N1 influenza pandemic in 2009. Various trade-offs on how to prioritize influenza vaccination have been considered. One set of discussions have focused on whether the distribution of vaccines should be based on age, with children being prioritized based on years of life to lose Couzin (2004); Lipsitch (2005); Emanuel (2006). Alternatively, an allocation of the influenza vaccine can be guided not only by demographic categories, but also by virus transmission dynamics Medlock and Galvani (2009); Zhang, Adiga, Saha, Vullikanti, and Prakash (2016). For example, schoolchildren are most responsible for the spread of the influenza virus and vaccinating them has the indirect benefit of decreasing transmission. Currently, such principles used for pandemic influenza vaccination have been informing the deliberations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) concerning Covid-19 vaccination.

However, the characteristics of Sars-Cov-2 are markedly different than those of influenza, and new vaccine distribution protocols are necessary. To start with, a disproportionate toll on the elderly suggests that age should be the primary consideration. Infection clusters arising in hospitals and meatpacking plants point that high-risk occupations should be considered as well. Deciding whether to prioritize meatpacking plant workers over elderly citizens must factor in both the ages of the workers and the occupations of the elderly. Moreover, the coronavirus pandemic is unique in its wide-spread impact on economic activity. Non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as social distancing and stay-at-home orders, have been implemented on an unprecedented scale. While many countries are relaxing constraints, lockdowns are expected to be imposed again as the virus re-surges. Thus, vaccines perhaps should be allocated not only based on the risk of infection or death but also based on the economic benefits of allowing certain groups of people to return to their workplaces.

We develop and estimate a model to evaluate vaccination allocation strategies. We recognize that

people face different levels of infection risks depending on their occupations and that, conditional on being infected, the risk of death depends on their ages. The vaccine is assumed to be effective only to some extent and in limited supply relative to the entire population. A vaccine distribution strategy may be supplemented by a targeted stay-at-home order that prevents certain age-occupation groups to return to their workplaces.

We solve a simple linear-program that takes into account the cost that an individual expects to incur if infected and the economic benefit from going back to her workplace. Rather than comparing the efficacy of various vaccination policies, our procedure allows us to derive the optimal vaccine distribution among all allocations based on occupation and age. This enables us to address who should get the vaccine first: young meatpacking plant workers or elderly school teachers?

We track 8 age-groups for the 2017 U.S. population, 16-19, 20-29, 30-39,..., and 80+, distributed over 454 occupations. We obtain the number of people for each age-group employed in a given occupation from the 2017 American Community Survey (ACS). Our sample is representative of 60% of the U.S. population. To proxy for the benefit that an individual generates from participating in economic activity, we use the average yearly wage for each age group and occupation, also provided by the 2017 ACS. From an economics perspective, the wage captures a worker's contribution to the production of total output as measured by GDP, or equivalently the GDP loss if a worker is unable to work due to a stay-at-home order Hulten (1978); Baqaee, Farhi, Mina, and Stock (2020). The average cost for an infected person depends on the infection fatality rate Salje, Kiem, Lefrancq, Courtejoie, Bosetti, Paireau, Andronico, Hozé, Richet, Dubost, Strat, Lessler, Levy-Bruhl, Fontanet, Opatowski, Boelle, and Cauchemez (2020) and on the value of statistical life (VSL) for her age group Murphy and Topel (2006); Greenstone and Nigam (2020). Table S1 reports the details.

The remaining variable that we need to estimate in the model is the infection rate associated with each occupation, for which the data is not directly available. To circumvent the lack of data, we proceed in two steps. First, we infer the infection rate for each occupation group based on the coronavirus-related deaths by occupation that have occurred between 9 March and 25 May 2020, as reported by the U.K. Office for National Statistics (ONS). ONS reports the age-standardized death rate, D_i, per 100,000 of each minor occupation i. This death rate is unconditional on infection and based on the 2013 E.U. standard population distribution. Given the infection fatality rate, d_j, for age

group j provided by Salje, Kiem, Lefrancq, Courtejoie, Bosetti, Paireau, Andronico, Hozé, Richet, Dubost, Strat, Lessler, Levy-Bruhl, Fontanet, Opatowski, Boelle, and Cauchemez (2020), we obtain the infection rate for each U.K. minor occupation per $100,000$ people as $r_i = \frac{D_i}{\sum_j q_j d_j}$, where q_j denotes the fraction of E.U. standard population for age group j. Our maintained assumption is that exposure to the virus depends on occupation, but the infection fatality rate depends on patients' ages.

Next, we impute infection rates for the U.S. occupations. The approach we take exploits the relationship between an occupation's death rate and the degree of physical proximity that it involves. In an occupation with a higher physical proximity score, workers have to interact more closely with other people, such as co-workers or clients. Thus, presumably, the virus transmission rate is higher in occupations that require a higher degree of physical proximity, and, consequently, this will be reflected in death rates. Even as various social distancing measures are observed, we expect that occupations with a higher degree of physical proximity will still entail a higher infection risk than ones with a lower degree of physical proximity.

We run a fractional probit model Papke and Wooldridge (1996) using the infection rates corresponding to each U.K. minor occupation we have derived above and physical proximity measures that are also provided by ONS. A worker employed in occupation i with degree of physical proximity $x_i \in [0, 100]$ is going to be infected over a two-month period with probability

$$P[\text{Infection}|x_i] = r_i = \Phi(\alpha + \beta x_i),$$

where the estimates are $\hat{\alpha} = -2.672885$ (CI [-3.01342, -2.332349]) and $\hat{\beta} = 0.0091686$ (CI [0.0035577, 0.0147796]), and Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. We then impute the infection rate for each US occupation using the proximity score that Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2020) has developed based on O*Net data.

We undertake three exercises. First, we find the optimal vaccine distribution under the assumption that there is no stay-at-home order, and everyone returns to work regardless of whether they have received a vaccine or not. Second, we derive the optimal vaccine distribution when a targeted stay-at-home order is implemented and that the individuals who are unable to return to work produce no output. That is, everyone who cannot return to work receives no wage for the duration of

the stay-at-home order. Third, we derive the optimal vaccine distribution when a targeted stay-at-home order is implemented, but for some occupations, employees can work from home. In this case, individuals that can work from home receive the same wages as if they were to return to work, while individuals that cannot work from home produce no output and receive no wages for the duration of the stay-at-home order. For the last two exercises, 121 occupations deemed to be essential are exempt from the stay-at-home order. We assume that the length of the stay-at-home order is 2 months Abbasi (2020) to reflect the expected time lag until a vaccine becomes widely available and scale the yearly wage loss accordingly. We also cautiously assume that the initial supply of the vaccine allocated to employed people above the age of 16 is 60mil doses, covering approximately one-third of the employed workforce. Similarly, we assume that the vaccine effectiveness is 50% Food and Drug Administration (2020).

The overall vaccine policy is presented in Fig. 1. We order occupations based on their infection risk, and show how the vaccine distribution policy and stay-at-home mandate depend on occupations and ages. The main insight from all three exercises is that age is more important than an occupation's infection risk when allocating vaccines optimally. The largest volume of vaccines are allocated to the populations of age 50-59, followed by age 60-69 in exercise 1 and 2, or age 30-39 in exercise 3 (Table 1). The loss in economic benefits from being out of work plays a role in allocating vaccines only when a stay-at-home order is also used as a policy tool (as in exercise 2 and 3).

When we derive the optimal vaccine allocation absent of a stay-at-home order, all employed people above age 60 receive the vaccine (Fig. 1A). Some occupations, such as paramedics and flight attendants, are eligible to receive the vaccine if they are at least 40 years old. For many other occupations, including most other health-care workers, the eligibility threshold for receiving the vaccine is age 50. There is naturally a trade-off between the infection risk associated with occupation and the risk of death related to age. For instance, any food processing workers above age 50 receive a vaccine, while financial advisors receive the vaccine only if they are above 60 years old.

When a stay-at-home order complements the vaccination policy, most employees who are at least 80 years old and some in their 70s are mandated to stay at home (Fig. 1B). For the 80+ age-group, the risk of death is so substantial that a 50% effective vaccine is insufficient to overcome the loss in wages for the duration of the stay-at-home order. For a few occupations such as textile-

related, the stay-at-home order targets teenagers as well. While the infection fatality rate for their age group is meager, the economic value of practicing their occupation given the corresponding infection rate does not justify the risk. In turn, the stay-at-home order allows nurses as young as 40 years old to receive vaccines.

Once we take into account that for some occupations, employees can work from home without any loss in wages, then the supply of the vaccine can be distributed only towards those occupations in which employees need to be present at their workplace. Allocating vaccines across fewer occupations implies that younger people, for instance, as young as 20 for nurses and food preparation workers, are now eligible to receive the vaccine (Fig. 1C).

The top 10 occupations that receive the highest number of vaccine doses have a relatively higher infection risk and a large number of workers of age of 50 and above (Table 2). These occupations receive between 25% (exercise 1 and 2) and 36% (exercise 3) of the vaccine's total supply. With the stay-at-home order under which individuals who are not returning to work receives no benefit, the composition of the top 10 occupations that receive most doses of the vaccine remains the same. This is because some occupations, such as teachers, both employ a large number of people, and the economic benefit of their activity is too large to sacrifice by mandating them to stay at home. In contrast, when employees in some occupations can work from home, the ten occupations that receive the most vaccine doses are different. For instance, teachers can teach virtually from home and no longer receive the vaccine.

Designating occupations as essential affects the optimal allocation of the vaccine only when a targeted stay-at-home order is also used (Fig. S1 and Table S2). In designating, for instance, food processing workers as essential, we ensure that the individuals over 50 years old in this occupation receive vaccines. Otherwise, if food processing workers can be subject to the stay-at-home order, only the population under 70 years old, representing 99.3% of the workforce, can return to their workplace, with individuals over 50 years old (in exercise 2) or over 20 years old (in exercise 3) receiving the vaccine.

A more abundant initial supply of the vaccine also decreases the age of the youngest eligible recipients, as expected (Fig. S4). Perhaps surprisingly, an infection fatality rate steeper with age, as presumably observed in South Korea, also decreases the age of the youngest vaccine recipients. In this case, the risk of infection associated with an occupation becomes increasingly crucial in

allocating vaccines. Thus, individuals employed occupations in which infections are likelier would receive the vaccine if they are at least 30 years old. The threshold age above which individuals become eligible to receive the vaccine is overall steeper (Fig. S6). The stay-at-home order reinforces this effect because most people over 80 and many people in their 70s are not allowed to return to their workplaces.

Finally, our model allows us to derive the proportion of people that will still be infected with the virus even under the optimal vaccination policy, given any effectiveness and supply of the vaccine. When the vaccine is 50% effective, 1.37% of the employed workforce will still get the virus over the two months until the vaccine becomes widely available. When some occupations can be done at home, the proportion decreases to 0.53%. An increase in the vaccine effectiveness to 70% changes the vaccine allocation (Fig. S2) and reduces the fraction of infected people close to 1.27% (exercise 1 and 2) or to 0.41% (exercise 3). However, the fraction of infected people decreases also as the supply of the vaccine increases. For instance, with a supply of 100mil doses the fraction of infected people decreases to 1.18% (in both exercise 1 and 2) even with a vaccine effectiveness is 50%.

In deriving the optimal allocation of vaccines based on age and occupations, we implicitly considered that people are exposed to the coronavirus only through their occupations. Naturally, spending time with family, shopping, or engaging in leisurely activities are other activities through which infection with the virus can occur. If people face the same non-occupation related infection risk, our analysis suggests that the optimal allocation of vaccines would be tilted even more towards the elderly. In other words, exposure to infection risk outside working hours dampens the role of the infection risk within working hours in the allocation of vaccines.

A model in which the population faces a death risk that depends on age and an infection risk that depends on occupation allows us to determine the optimal vaccine distribution policy for all U.S. employed population above the age of 16. Identifying priority groups for COVID-19 vaccination is critical for implementation planning, and our analysis can be input into how to allocate the vaccine across different populations.

Table 1. Vaccine Distribution by Ages

	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+
Exercise 1	0	0	1,503,581	27,180,360	24,040,335	6,094,810	1,180,914
Exercise 2	0	0	1,757,797	27,216,478	24,039,593	6,030,180	955,952
Exercise 3	1,571,230	16,111,831	15,109,864	15,223,264	9,520,810	2,123,659	339,342

Table 2. Ten Most Vaccinated Occupations

Ages	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+	Total
Exercise 1: Simple vaccination policy								
Miscellaneous (incl. Funeral Service) Managers	0	0	0	1,326,323	799,064	189,658	34,522	2,349,567
Driver/Sales Workers And Truck Drivers	0	0	0	1,041,716	683,778	185,164	34,112	1,944,770
Elementary And Middle School Teachers	0	0	0	834,207	677,004	139,968	21,765	1,672,944
Janitors And Building Cleaners	0	0	0	791,948	575,782	145,966	31,308	1,545,004
Registered Nurses	0	0	0	767,116	621,456	114,780	15,611	1,518,963
Retail Salespersons	0	0	0	594,362	556,977	205,653	38,935	1,395,927
First-Line Supervisors Of Retail Sales Workers	0	0	0	733,838	420,711	103,043	22,210	1,279,802
Secretaries And Administrative Assistants	0	0	0	0	814,497	228,834	47,964	1,091,295
Nursing, Psychiatric, And Home Health Aides	0	0	211,117	466,208	277,486	64,247	10,527	1,029,585
Customer Service Representatives	0	0	0	519,304	337,902	68,643	13,771	939,620
Exercise 2: Vaccination and Stay-at-Home Order without work-from-home								
Miscellaneous (incl. Funeral Service) Managers	0	0	0	1,326,323	799,064	189,658	34,522	2,349,567
Driver/Sales Workers And Truck Drivers	0	0	0	1,041,716	683,778	185,164	34,112	1,944,770
Elementary And Middle School Teachers	0	0	0	834,207	677,004	139,968	21,765	1,672,944
Janitors And Building Cleaners	0	0	0	791,948	575,782	145,966	31,308	1,545,004
Registered Nurses	0	0	24,233	767,116	621,456	114,780	15,611	1,543,196
Retail Salespersons	0	0	0	594,362	556,977	205,653	38,935	1,395,927
First-Line Supervisors Of Retail Sales Workers	0	0	0	733,838	420,711	103,043	22,210	1,279,802
Nursing, Psychiatric, And Home Health Aides	0	0	441,100	466,208	277,486	64,247	10,527	1,259,568
Secretaries And Administrative Assistants	0	0	0	0	814,497	228,834	47,964	1,091,295
Customer Service Representatives	0	0	0	519,304	337,902	68,643	13,771	939,620
Exercise 3: Vaccination and Stay-at-Home Order with work-from-home								
Driver/Sales Workers And Truck Drivers	0	768,300	938,994	1,041,716	683,778	185,164	34,112	3,652,064
Registered Nurses	0	850,471	784,554	767,116	621,456	114,780	15,611	3,153,988
Janitors And Building Cleaners	0	540,275	618,824	791,948	575,782	145,966	31,308	2,704,103
Nursing, Psychiatric, And Home Health Aides	596,407	511,969	441,100	466,208	277,486	64,247	10,527	2,367,944
Laborers And Freight, Stock, And Material Movers	0	573,185	456,357	480,062	274,045	50,308	0	1,833,957
Cooks	0	598,261	474,185	405,306	213,961	40,150	9,045	1,740,908
Construction Laborers	0	584,172	513,667	409,912	185,688	30,481	7,110	1,731,030
Maids And Housekeeping Cleaners	0	438,210	468,170	462,300	270,364	58,315	0	1,697,359
Personal Care Aides	0	314,454	330,113	406,893	311,577	80,345	0	1,443,382
Stock Clerks And Order Fillers	0	390,569	287,879	314,893	209,579	51,353	11,157	1,265,430

A. Exercise 1: Simple Vaccination policy



B. Exercise 2: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order without work from home



C. Exercise 3: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order with work from home



Fig. 1. Age cutoffs for vaccinations and age groups staying at home. Occupations on the x-axis are ordered based on their infection risk. (A) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine. (B) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. (C) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation which cannot be done from home that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. Occupations that can be done from home do not receive a vaccine.

S Supplementary Text

S.1 The Model

We partition the population into groups by occupations and ages. In particular, our environment consists of the set of occupations I, the set of age-groups J, and the population distribution over occupations and age-groups $P \in \mathbb{R}_+^{I \times J}$. Hence, each element p_{ij} denotes the number of people with certain occupation i and in an age-group j. Each person in occupation i faces a risk of infection denoted by r_i. Associated with each person in an age-group j there is a cost of infection c_j.

A policy consists of a distribution of a limited supply of vaccines and a targeted stay-at-home order. A vaccine distribution $V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{I \times J}$ with v_{ij} represents the number of people in occupation i and age-group j that receive a vaccine. The vaccine distribution satisfies a supply-side budget constraint $\sum_{i,j} v_{ij} \leq b$, where b represents the quantity of vaccine initially available, and it is assumed to be less than the total population $\sum_{ij} p_{ij}$. The vaccine allocation policy can be supplemented by a targeted stay-at-home order $H \in \mathbb{R}_+^{I \times J}$ with h_{ij} representing the number of people in occupation i and age-group j that cannot return to their workplace. Overall, $V + H \leq P$.

A vaccine recipient becomes immune to the virus with probability γ, which captures the vaccine's effectiveness. Hence, the policy can reduce the number of exposed population by $\gamma V + H$ across different occupations and age groups. For each group (i, j), the policy prevents certain population to be exposed to infection by the virus and saves costs by $(\gamma v_{ij} + h_{ij}) r_i c_j$. The stay-at-home policy H comes with the suspension of economic activities. Let $F \in \mathbb{R}_+^{I \times J}$ denote the values of economic activities that accrue to individuals. In particular, each f_{ij} denotes the value of the economic activity i undertaken by an individual in the age-group j. Thus, the total loss in value from stay-at-home for the group (i, j) is $f_{ij} h_{ij}$, unless the occupation i can be worked at home, which we allow in exercise 3.

The goal is to find a policy (V, H) that minimizes the loss of lives and the economic burden

from a stay-at-home order. The planner solves the following linear program:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\text{LP}; \gamma, b) \quad & \min_{V,H} \sum_{i,j} -(\gamma v_{ij} + h_{ij}) r_i c_j + f_{ij} h_{ij} \\
& \text{subject to} \\
& (i) \sum_{i,j} v_{ij} \leq b, \quad \text{(budget constraint)} \\
& (ii) v_{ij} + h_{ij} \leq p_{ij} \quad \text{(feasibility)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Our model also allows us to project the infection rate expected to occur in the population, $\sum_{i,j} r_i(p_{ij} - \gamma v_{ij} - h_{ij})$, following the optimal policy (V, H) when the vaccine effectiveness is γ.

S.2 Estimation strategy

We track 8 age-groups for the 2017 U.S. population: 16-19, 20-29, 30-39,..., and 80+. The population is distributed over 454 occupations, aggregated at the 4-digit Census OCC code. We use the 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) to obtain the number of people, p_{ij}, in an age-group j employed in occupation i. To proxy the economic value, f_{ij}, we use the average yearly wage earned by an individual in age-group j employed in occupation i, also given by the 2017 ACS.[1] The yearly average wage will be scaled to reflect the potential length of the stay-at-home order.

The cost of infection, c_j, for a person in age-group j that has been infected with the virus depends on the infection fatality rate, d_j, that her age group faces and on the value of statistical life (VSL) for her age group. In particular, the cost of infection is given by

$$c_j = d_j \times \text{Value of statistical life}_j.$$

For the infection fatality rate – the number of deceased among the infected people – we use the estimates provided by Salje, Kiem, Lefrancq, Courtejoie, Bosetti, Paireau, Andronico, Hozé, Richet, Dubost, Strat, Lessler, Levy-Bruhl, Fontanet, Opatowski, Boelle, and Cauchemez (2020) who jointly analyze French hospital data with the results of a detailed outbreak investigation aboard the Diamond Princess cruise ship.[2] For the VSL, we use the estimates provided by Greenstone

[1] The data is public and can be downloaded from the Census ACS website: https://data.census.gov/mdat/#/.

[2] In a separate robustness exercise (Fig. S6 and Table S3) we also use the reported infection fatality rate data from

and Nigam (2020) who update the estimates of Murphy and Topel (2006) to 2015. The details are reported in Table S1.

The critical variable that we then need to estimate the model is the infection rate, r_i, associated with each occupation. Such data is not directly available. We proceed in two steps. First, we infer the infection rate from the coronavirus related death rates for each U.K. minor occupation. The rates are reported by the U.K. Office for National Statistics (ONS) for deaths that occurred between 9 March and 25 May 2020. The reported mortality rate is unconditional on infection and based on the 2013 E.U. standard population distribution. We take the employment weighted average of the death rates by gender and construct the death rate, D_i, per 100,000 people for each U.K. minor occupation. Uncovering the infection rate from the ONS-reported death rate relies on the assumption that exposure to the virus depends on occupations but the infection fatality rate, $d_j \in [0, 1]$, depends on the patients' ages. Thus, we obtain that the infection rate per $100,000$ people over the course of two months for each U.K. minor occupation i is

$$r_i = \frac{D_i}{\sum_j q_j d_j}, \tag{S.1}$$

where $q_j \in [0, 1]$ denotes the fraction of age-group j according to the E.U. standard population distribution.

Next, we impute infection rates for U.S. occupations. We estimate a fractional probit model Papke and Wooldridge (1996) which gives us the probability that a worker in occupation i is infected over a two-month period as

$$P[\text{Infection}|x_i] = \frac{r_i}{100,000} = \Phi(\alpha + \beta x_i),$$

where $x_i \in [0, 100]$ represents the physical proximity score of occupation i and Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. We run the fractional probit regression using the data on infection rates, r_i, for U.K. minor occupations that we have derived based on (S.1) and occupation proximity scores that also have been provided by ONS. The estimates from the U.K.

South Korea, which has a very accurate track-and-trace system. Among non-elderly workers, the infection fatality rate of 30-39 in South Korea are much higher than in France. As such, the optimal policy will suggest lower the vaccination cutoffs for high risk occupations and, to satisfy the vaccine budget constraint, mandate stay-at-home to a larger number of elderly population.

data are $\hat{\alpha} = -2.672885$ and $\hat{\beta} = 0.0091686$.

These estimates allow us to extrapolate the infection rate for the U.S. occupations.[3] In particular, we construct the infection rate per $100,000$ people over a two-month period for each U.S. occupation i with proximity score $x_i \in [0, 100]$ as

$$\hat{r}_i = 100,000 * \Phi(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_i).$$

We use the proximity score developed by Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2020) who calculate an the employment-weighted average of survey-based job characteristics for each 4-digit OCC occupation code based on O*NET data.

We also provide a robustness in which we estimate the model using only mortality rates for occupations deemed to be essential in the U.K. to preempt a potential downward bias in the death rates that the stay-at-home order could have introduced. In this case, the parameter estimates from the fractional probit regression are $\hat{\alpha} = -2.392303$ and $\hat{\beta} = 0.005559$. The lower estimate of $\hat{\beta}$ implies that our estimates of the infection rates for U.S. occupations will be less responsive to proximity scores, i.e., more homogeneous infection rates across occupations. Hence, our main finding – vaccines to be distributed mostly by ages rather than occupations – becomes even stronger (Fig. S5).

S.3 Physical Proximity Scores

O*NET asks a number of questions about individuals' working conditions and day-to-day tasks of their job. To evaluate proximity, the question asks, "How physically close to other people are you when you perform your current job?". Respondents provide a response on a scale between one and five, one indicating that the respondent does not work near other people (beyond 100ft.), while five indicating that they are very close to others (near touching). More information on these questions is provided in the Instructions for Work Context Questionnaire (Q 21), published by O*NET.

The responses to this question are standardized by Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2020)to a scale ranging from 0 to 100 as follows. First, O*NET reports the answers to the survey using the fine occupation SOC-code. Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2020) calculate an employment-

[3] One may consider bypassing the infection rate by matching the U.K. death rates by occupation to U.S. occupations. We do not take such approach as we need to find unconditional death rate for each occupation *and* age-group.

weighted average, $\bar{m}_i$, of the response to this question that corresponds to each occupation, i, classified according to the 4-digit Census OCC code. Second, Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2020) follow the procedure used by O*NET and re-scale the survey answer to the interval $[0, 100]$ using the following equation:

$$x_i = \frac{(\bar{m}_i - \bar{m}_i^{\min})}{\left(\bar{m}_i^{\max} - \bar{m}_i^{\min}\right)} * 100,$$

where x_i is the final physical proximity standardized score for occupation i.

S.4 Work-from-Home Occupations

The work-from-home classification of occupations has been developed by Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2020) and Dingel and Neiman (2020) using O*NET survey answers from the Work Activities Questionnaire and Work Context Questionnaire. The Work Context Questionnaire includes questions aiming to capture the "physical and social factors that influence the nature of work" such as interpersonal relationships, physical work conditions, and structural job characteristics. The Work Activities Questionnaire includes questions aiming to capture the "general types of job behaviors occurring on multiple jobs" such as the input of information, mental processes, and work output.

We use the classification of Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2020) because they provide an employment weighted aggregation at the 4-digit Census OCC codes. In particular, they aggregate 18 occupational attributes based on answers to the questions Q4, Q14, Q17, Q18, Q29, Q33, Q37, Q43, Q44, in the Work Context Questionnaire, and Q4A, Q16A, Q17A, Q18A, Q20A, Q22A, Q23A, Q32A in The Work Activities Questionnaire. The responses to these questions are standardized to a work-from-home score ranging from 0 to 1 following the same procedure as the one used to calculate the physical proximity score. In the next step, an occupation is classified either as that it can be done from home if its work-from-home score is above the median, or that it cannot be done from home if its work-from-home score is below the median.

We use this classification to derive the optimal allocation of vaccines when a stay-at-home order is used, and some occupations can be done from home (exercise 3). However, we acknowledge that this classification has limitations, as some occupation categories may be too coarse. For instance,

physicians and surgeons have been classified as a work-from-home occupation. While for many physicians telemedicine seems feasible for limited periods of time, as has been evident during the lockdown in the U.S., we understand that telemedicine is not applicable for surgeons or critical care doctors. Another example is teachers, who is also classified as a work-from-home occupation. At the same time, our approach is flexible and an optimal vaccine allocation can be derived under various specifications, including fractional ones, for which occupations are done from home. Thus, as some physicians return to hospitals, and some teachers return to teach in person, these occupations can be re-classified partly as occupations that are not done from home, and our model will assign vaccines accordingly.

S.5 Essential Occupations

We have designated occupations to be essential based on the guidelines Agency (2020) issued by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA). Our classification is inherently subjective, and is also subject to the limitation that some occupations are very coarse. For instance, we have classified network and computer systems administrators to be an essential occupation according to the guidelines issued by CISA. However, we acknowledge that it is likely that not all system administrators are actually essential workers. It is re-assuring that designating an occupation as essential plays no role when a simple vaccination policy is considered, as in exercise 1.

Table S1: The Value of Statistical Life (VSL) and Infection Fatality Rate by age-groups.

Age group	EU population	Infection fatality rate (%)	VSL in mil. USD	The cost of infection in USD
< 19	0.215	0.001	15.3	153
20-29	0.12	0.005	16.1	805
30-39	0.135	0.02	15.8	3,160
40-49	0.14	0.05	13.8	6,900
50-59	0.135	0.2	10.3	20,600
60-69	0.115	0.7	6.7	46,900
70-79	0.09	1.9	3.7	70,300
80+	0.05	8.3	1.5	124,500

Note: for the age group 16-19, we used VSL of the ages 10-19.

Table S2. Ten Most Vaccinated Occupations when no occupations are designated to be essential.

Ages	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+	Total
Exercise 2: Vaccination and Stay-at-Home Order without work-from-home								
Miscellaneous (incl. Funeral Service) Managers	0	0	0	1,326,323	799,064	189,658	34,522	2,349,567
Driver/Sales Workers And Truck Drivers	0	0	0	1,041,716	683,778	185,164	34,112	1,944,770
Elementary And Middle School Teachers	0	0	0	834,207	677,004	139,968	21,765	1,672,944
Registered Nurses	0	0	123,724	767,116	621,456	114,780	15,611	1,642,687
Janitors And Building Cleaners	0	0	0	791,948	575,782	145,966	31,308	1,545,004
Retail Salespersons	0	0	0	594,362	556,977	205,653	38,935	1,395,927
First-Line Supervisors Of Retail Sales Workers	0	0	0	733,838	420,711	103,043	22,210	1,279,802
Nursing, Psychiatric, And Home Health Aides	0	0	441,100	466,208	277,486	64,247	0	1,249,041
Secretaries And Administrative Assistants	0	0	0	0	814,497	228,834	47,964	1,091,295
Customer Service Representatives	0	0	0	519,304	337,902	68,643	13,771	939,620
Exercise 3: Vaccination and Stay-at-Home Order with work-from-home								
Driver/Sales Workers And Truck Drivers	0	768,300	938,994	1,041,716	683,778	185,164	34,112	3,652,064
Registered Nurses	17,694	850,471	784,554	767,116	621,456	114,780	15,611	3,171,682
Janitors And Building Cleaners	0	540,275	618,824	791,948	575,782	145,966	31,308	2,704,103
Nursing, Psychiatric, And Home Health Aides	662,955	511,969	441,100	466,208	277,486	64,247	0	2,423,965
Laborers And Freight, Stock, And Material Movers	0	573,185	456,357	480,062	274,045	50,308	0	1,833,957
Cooks	0	598,261	474,185	405,306	213,961	40,150	0	1,731,863
Construction Laborers	0	584,172	513,667	409,912	185,688	30,481	0	1,723,920
Maids And Housekeeping Cleaners	0	438,210	468,170	462,300	270,364	58,315	0	1,697,359
Personal Care Aides	0	314,454	330,113	406,893	311,577	80,345	0	1,443,382
Stock Clerks And Order Fillers	0	390,569	287,879	314,893	209,579	51,353	11,157	1,265,430

Note: We omit exercise 1 which remains the same as in Fig. 1A. Exercise 1 requires workers of all occupations to return to work regardless of being vaccinated or not. Designating an occupation to be essential does not affect the optimal vaccine allocation in this case.

Table S3: The Value of Statistical Life (VSL) and Infection Fatality Rate by age-groups.

Age group	Infection fatality rate (%)
< 19	0
20-29	0
30-39	0.13
40-49	0.17
50-59	0.63
60-69	2.35
70-79	9.33
80+	25.26

A. Exercise 2: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order without work from home



B. Exercise 3: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order with work from home



Fig. S1. Age cutoffs for vaccinations and age groups staying at home when no occupations are designated to be essential. Occupations on the x-axis are ordered based on their infection risk. (A) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. (B) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation which cannot be done from home that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. Occupations that can be done from home do not receive a vaccine.

Note: We omit exercise 1 which remains the same as in Fig. 1A. Exercise 1 requires workers of all occupations to return to work regardless of being vaccinated or not. Designating an occupation to be essential does not affect the optimal vaccine allocation in this case.

A. Exercise 1: Simple Vaccination policy



B. Exercise 2: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order without work from home



C. Exercise 3: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order with work from home



Fig. S2. Age cutoffs for vaccinations and age groups staying at home when vaccine effectiveness is 0.7. Occupations on the x-axis are ordered based on their infection risk. (A) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine. (B) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. (C) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation which cannot be done from home that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. Occupations that can be done from home do not receive a vaccine.

A. Exercise 1: Simple Vaccination policy



B. Exercise 2: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order without work from home



C. Exercise 3: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order with work from home



Fig. S3. Age cutoffs for vaccinations and age groups staying at home, when the supply of vaccines is 30mil doses. Occupations on the x-axis are ordered based on their infection risk. (A) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine. (B) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. (C) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation which cannot be done from home that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. Occupations that can be done from home do not receive a vaccine.

A. Exercise 1: Simple Vaccination policy



B. Exercise 2: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order without work from home



C. Exercise 3: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order with work from home



Fig. S4. Age cutoffs for vaccinations and age groups staying at home, when the supply of vaccines is 100mil doses. Occupations on the x-axis are ordered based on their infection risk. (A) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine. (B) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. (C) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation which cannot be done from home that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. Occupations that can be done from home do not receive a vaccine.

Note: While, in exercise 3, the vaccination cutoffs may appear to be non-monotonic in occupations' risks, that is only because some occupations have no teenage workers.

A. Exercise 1: Simple Vaccination policy



B. Exercise 2: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order without work from home



C. Exercise 3: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order with work from home



Fig. S5. Age cutoffs for vaccinations and age groups staying at home (probit estimation with only essential U.K. occupations, α=-2.392303 and β=0.005559). Occupations on the x-axis are ordered based on their infection risk. (A) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine. (B) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. (C) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation which cannot be done from home that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. Occupations that can be done from home do not receive a vaccine.

A. Exercise 1: Simple Vaccination policy



B. Exercise 2: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order without work from home



C. Exercise 3: Vaccination policy and Stay-at-Home order with work from home



Fig. S6. Age cutoffs for vaccinations and age groups staying at home based on South-Korean infection fatality rates from Table S3. Occupations on the x-axis are ordered based on their infection risk. (A) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine. (B) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. (C) The optimal vaccination policy showing the youngest age for each occupation which cannot be done from home that is eligible to receive the vaccine, together with the occupation-age groups that are mandated to stay at home. Occupations that can be done from home do not receive a vaccine.

References

Abbasi, Jennifer, 2020, Anthony Fauci, MD, on COVID-19 Vaccines, Schools, and Larry Kramer, *JAMA*.

Agency, Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security, 2020, Advisory Memorandum on Identification of Critical Infrastructure Workers during COVID-19 Response, Guidance for Industry.

Baqaee, D., E. Farhi, M. Mina, and J. H. Stock, 2020, Policies for a Second Wave, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity.

Cohen, Jon, 2020, The line is forming for a COVID-19 vaccine. who should be at the front?, *Science*.

Couzin, J., 2004, INFECTIOUS DISEASES: Ethicists to guide rationing of flu vaccine, *Science* 306, 960b–961b.

Dingel, Jonathan I., and Brent Neiman, 2020, How many jobs can be done at home?, *Journal of Public Economics* 189, 104235.

Emanuel, E. J., 2006, PUBLIC HEALTH: Who should get influenza vaccine when not all can?, *Science* 312, 854–855.

Food and Drug Administration, 2020, Development and Licensure of Vaccines to Prevent COVID-19, Guidance for Industry.

Greenstone, Michael, and Vishan Nigam, 2020, Does social distancing matter?, *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

Hulten, C. R., 1978, Growth accounting with intermediate inputs, *The Review of Economic Studies* 45, 511–518.

Lipsitch, M., 2005, Ethics of rationing the flu vaccine, *Science* 307, 41b–41b.

Medlock, J., and A. P. Galvani, 2009, Optimizing influenza vaccine distribution, *Science* 325, 1705–1708.

Mongey, Simon, Laura Pilossoph, and Alex Weinberg, 2020, Which workers bear the burden of social distancing policies?, *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

Murphy, Kevin M., and Robert H. Topel, 2006, The value of health and longevity, *Journal of Political Economy* 114, 871–904.

Papke, Leslie E., and Jeffrey M. Wooldridge, 1996, Econometric methods for fractional response variables with an application to 401(k) plan participation rates, *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 11, 619–632.

Salje, Henrik, Cécile Tran Kiem, Noémie Lefrancq, Noémie Courtejoie, Paolo Bosetti, Juliette Paireau, Alessio Andronico, NathanaÃńl Hozé, Jehanne Richet, Claire-Lise Dubost, Yann Le Strat, Justin Lessler, Daniel Levy-Bruhl, Arnaud Fontanet, Lulla Opatowski, Pierre-Yves Boelle, and Simon Cauchemez, 2020, Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in france, *Science*.

Zhang, Yao, Abhijin Adiga, Sudip Saha, Anil Vullikanti, and B. Aditya Prakash, 2016, Near-optimal algorithms for controlling propagation at group scale on networks, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 28, 3339–3352.