

1           Considering indirect benefits is critical when evaluating  
2                           SARS-CoV-2 vaccine candidates

3       Molly E. Gallagher<sup>1\*</sup>, Andrew J. Sieben<sup>2</sup>, Kristin N. Nelson<sup>3</sup>, Alicia N. M. Kraay<sup>3</sup>,  
          Ben Lopman<sup>3</sup>, Andreas Handel<sup>4</sup>, Katia Koelle<sup>1,5</sup>

          The authors wish to be identified to the reviewers.

4                           August 2020

5       1. Department of Biology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA.

6       2. School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

7       3. Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA,  
8       USA

9       4. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Georgia,  
10      Athens, GA, USA

11      5. Emory-UGA Center of Excellence of Influenza Research and Surveillance (CEIRS), Atlanta GA,  
12      USA

13      \* Corresponding author; e-mail: [mgallagher@emory.edu](mailto:mgallagher@emory.edu)

14  
15    **Abstract**

16    Significant progress has already been made in development and testing of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines, and  
17    Phase III clinical trials have begun for 6 novel vaccine candidates to date. These Phase III trials seek to  
18    demonstrate direct benefits of a vaccine on vaccine recipients. However, vaccination is also known to bring  
19    about indirect benefits to a population through the reduction of virus circulation. The indirect effects of  
20    SARS-CoV-2 vaccination can play a key role in reducing case counts and COVID-19 deaths. To illustrate  
21    this point, we show through simulation that a vaccine with strong indirect effects has the potential to reduce  
22    SARS-CoV-2 circulation and COVID-19 deaths to a greater extent than an alternative vaccine with stronger  
23    direct effects but weaker indirect effects. Protection via indirect effects may be of particular importance  
24    in the context of this virus, because elderly individuals are at an elevated risk of death but are also less  
25    likely to be directly protected by vaccination due to immune senescence. We therefore encourage ongoing  
26    data collection and model development aimed at evaluating the indirect effects of forthcoming SARS-CoV-2  
27    vaccines.

28 SARS-CoV-2 has spread globally since its emergence in December 2019 [1], resulting in more  
29 than 17 million confirmed infections and 650,000 COVID-19 deaths to date [2]. Current pub-  
30 lic health interventions aimed at curbing the spread of SARS-CoV-2 have been limited to non-  
31 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), including travel-associated quarantines, contact tracing, and  
32 implementation of social distancing regulations. These measures have had various degrees of suc-  
33 cess worldwide [3, 4, 5]. While critical to slowing viral spread, some of these NPIs have resulted  
34 in widespread job loss and economic hardship [6, 7, 8], and profoundly changed the way we inter-  
35 act with one another locally, regionally, and internationally. Given the substantial political and  
36 economic costs associated with NPIs, long-term solutions are needed. A vaccine remains the most  
37 promising solution. Thanks to tremendous research efforts worldwide, vaccine development is well  
38 underway, with more than 30 vaccine candidates in clinical trials, including 6 novel candidates in  
39 Phase III trials as of July 31st, 2020 [9].

40 Clinical trials for SARS-CoV-2 vaccines evaluate both the safety and efficacy of vaccine candi-  
41 dates. Ethically, a vaccine cannot be licensed if it does not provide a direct protective benefit to  
42 the vaccinee [10]. Direct protective benefits of vaccines include protection from infection, reduced  
43 symptom development, and lower mortality rates. While significant attention should be given to a  
44 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine’s direct benefits, vaccination can also bring about indirect effects [11]. These  
45 indirect effects decrease the infection risk of both vaccinated and unvaccinated susceptible individ-  
46 uals by reducing the extent of virus circulation in a community. Virus circulation can decrease  
47 because vaccinated individuals are less susceptible to infection, or because vaccinated individuals  
48 have shorter durations of infection or lower viral loads that reduce their infectiousness.

49 Vaccination campaigns can significantly reduce the number of infections and deaths in subpop-  
50 ulations that remain unvaccinated, even when vaccination coverage is quite low [12] - a crucial  
51 consideration, given that extensive vaccine coverage will be a formidable challenge. Vaccine doses,  
52 and the public health infrastructure needed to administer them, will almost certainly be limited  
53 in supply relative to demand, and given the current politically and emotionally charged climate,  
54 vaccine refusal could pose an additional barrier [13, 14]. The vast majority of the global population  
55 remains susceptible to the virus and we are likely well below the herd immunity threshold, despite  
56 the staggering rates of infection that some regions have already experienced. Therefore the indi-  
57 rect effects of vaccine candidates are critically important to consider when evaluating SARS-CoV-2  
58 vaccine candidates and formulating strategies for their roll-out.

59 Clinical trials to test vaccine effectiveness do not evaluate population level effects. Quantify-  
60 ing both the direct and indirect effects of vaccines on population level outcomes, such as disease  
61 incidence and mortality, requires evaluating data after a vaccine has been in use for some time.  
62 Therefore, mathematical models are needed to assess the potential indirect effects in advance.  
63 These models can also help us gauge which vaccines should be further considered, even if direct  
64 effects may be lower than desired. To demonstrate the utility of these types of models, consider

65 two hypothetical vaccines. Vaccine 1 reduces the risk of clinical infection in vaccinated individuals  
66 to 30% of the original risk (a direct effect), and reduces the infectiousness of vaccinated individuals  
67 to 70% of the original value (an indirect effect). Vaccine 2 reduces the risk of clinical infection  
68 to 70% of the original and the infectiousness to 30% of the original. To evaluate the direct and  
69 total (direct + indirect) effects of these vaccines, we can use a compartmental susceptible-exposed-  
70 infected-recovered (SEIR) model with infected individuals experiencing either clinical or subclinical  
71 infection (Figure 1A and supplemental material). This model classifies individuals as susceptible  
72 to infection ( $S$ ), exposed ( $E$ ), actively infected with either a clinical ( $I_c$ ) or subclinical ( $I_{sc}$ ) infec-  
73 tion; or recovered from infection ( $R$ ). Although not explicitly included, COVID-19 mortality can  
74 be gauged by assuming that a certain fraction of clinically infected individuals succumb to infec-  
75 tion. In our model, we assume that susceptible individuals, once vaccinated, remain susceptible to  
76 infection but are both less likely to develop a clinical infection and less likely to transmit the virus.  
77 Simulation of this model, in the absence of vaccination, results in a maximum of nearly 190  
78 new clinical infections daily per 100,000 individuals, and a cumulative total of almost 9,000 clinical  
79 infections per 100k (Figure 1B). If we model the effects of distributing 40,000 vaccine doses in a  
80 population of 100k, for 40% vaccination coverage, we find that both vaccines 1 and 2 lower peak rates  
81 of clinical infections and the cumulative number of clinical infections relative to the no-vaccination  
82 scenario. However, vaccine 1 (with a greater direct effect) does not reduce the number of clinical  
83 infections to the extent that vaccine 2 (with a smaller direct effect) does. Further, vaccine 1 does  
84 not act to ‘flatten the curve’ to the extent that vaccine 2 does. The effectiveness of vaccine 2 at the  
85 population level stems from the magnitude of the indirect effects it brings about. Repeating these  
86 simulations while considering only the direct effects of the vaccines results in a less pronounced  
87 reduction in clinical infections. This result is true in both cases, but particularly for vaccine 2  
88 (Figure 1C).




Figure 1: Direct and indirect effects of vaccines act together to lower population level clinical infection rates. A. Schematic of an SEIR mathematical model for SARS-CoV-2. Susceptible individuals are denoted by  $S$ , exposed individuals by  $E$ , infected individuals by  $I$ , and recovered individuals by  $R$ . Superscripts  $c$  and  $sc$  refer to clinical and subclinical infections. Subscript  $v$  denotes those that are vaccinated. Model is adapted from [15]. In simulations with vaccination, vaccination of susceptible individuals occurred on day 0 [16]. B. Daily clinical infection rates and the cumulative number of clinical infections over time under a no-vaccine scenario and under separate scenarios of vaccines 1 and 2 rolled out at 40% coverage. C. Percent of clinical infections averted by vaccine 1 (blue) and vaccine 2 (green) at 40% vaccination coverage. Shaded bars indicate the percent of infections averted by the direct effect only of each vaccine. These predictions were obtained by simulating models in which vaccination does not act to reduce the infectiousness of vaccinated individuals who become infected. Solid bars indicate the total percent of clinical infections averted by each vaccine’s reduction of both clinical infection risk and infectiousness. Note that the direct effect of vaccine 1 is much greater than vaccine 2, but the total effect of vaccine 2 averts the most infections. D. Percent clinical infections averted by each vaccine for a range of vaccination coverage levels. More infections are averted by vaccine 2 than by vaccine 1 for the majority of simulated vaccination rates.

89 Clinical trial evaluations would heavily favor vaccine 1 over vaccine 2 because it provides a much  
 90 stronger individual (direct) benefit. However, we find that significantly reducing infectiousness via  
 91 vaccine 2 is as or more effective at reducing clinical infections, and therefore mortality, at the  
 92 population level. The model tells us that when evaluating vaccine candidates, we should be wary

93 of discounting a candidate that has a moderate direct effect if it also has the potential to have a  
94 pronounced indirect effect. A vaccine with relatively weak direct effects could still potentially reduce  
95 disease incidence and mortality at the population level more effectively than another vaccine that  
96 offers stronger direct protection. In the example presented here, the result that vaccine 2 averts more  
97 clinical infections than vaccine 1 is fairly robust across a range of values for vaccination coverage  
98 (Figure 1D), although the total number of infections averted by each vaccine changes significantly  
99 across coverage levels.

100 Our model simulations show that the reduction in clinical SARS-CoV-2 infections due to vac-  
101 cination can be substantial and that indirect effects of vaccination are critically important at the  
102 population level. These indirect benefits may be particularly crucial given the severity profile of  
103 SARS-CoV-2. Indirect protection of older individuals (>65 years) may be especially important,  
104 because vaccinating older individuals is often less effective in providing direct protection due to  
105 immune senescence [17]. But quantifying the indirect effects of a vaccine is more difficult than  
106 quantifying the direct effects, and requires information not yet available. The duration of immu-  
107 nity, the risk of antibody-dependent enhancement, and the potential for viral evolution and vaccine  
108 escape are all unknown. While some of these effects will require years of assessment, there are some  
109 important factors that can be evaluated more quickly. For example, measurements of the level  
110 and duration of viral shedding and symptoms, from both vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals  
111 who become infected, would greatly inform our understanding of relative infectiousness. In parallel  
112 to assessing the efficacy and safety of vaccine candidates for individual recipients, we argue that  
113 research aimed at gauging indirect effects is a similarly critical area of investigation. Continued  
114 data collection and assessment of the long-term impacts of vaccines through the use of mathemat-  
115 ical models can provide decisive information about population level protective effects. Through  
116 these efforts we can ultimately inform public health officials and politicians how to most effectively  
117 incorporate vaccination into the global public health response to SARS-CoV-2.

## 118 **Acknowledgments**

119 The authors thank J. Baker, E. Sajewski, and the members of the COVAMOD consortium for help-  
120 ful comments and discussion. The research reported in this paper was supported by NIH/NIGMS  
121 grant 3R01GM124280-03S1, NSF grant 2032084, and NIAID Centers of Excellence for Influenza  
122 Research and Surveillance (CEIRS) grant HHSN272201400004C.

123

124 **Supplementary Material**

125 **Model Equations**

126 We model the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 using a set of deterministic ordinary differential equations,  
 127 with susceptible individuals  $S$ , exposed individuals  $E$ , infected individuals  $I$ , and recovered indi-  
 128 viduals  $R$ . Subscripts  $c$  and  $sc$  refer to clinical and subclinical infections. Subscript  $v$  denotes those  
 129 that are vaccinated. Population size  $N$  is constant.

130  $\beta$  represents the transmission rate (infectiousness),  $\frac{1}{\sigma}$  represents the average latent period,  $\nu$  repre-  
 131 sents the proportion of exposed individuals who develop clinical symptoms,  $\frac{1}{\gamma}$  represents the average  
 132 infectious period, and  $\rho_c$  represents the probability of death due to clinical infections.

133 Vaccine 1: reduces risk of clinical infection to 30% of the original value and transmission rate to  
 134 70% of the original value:

135  $\nu_v = 0.3\nu, \beta_v = 0.7\beta$

136 Vaccine 2: reduces risk of clinical infection to 70% of the original value and transmission rate to  
 137 30% of the original value:

138  $\nu_v = 0.7\nu, \beta_v = 0.3\beta$

139

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta \frac{S}{N} (I_c + I_{sc}) - \beta_v \frac{S}{N} (I_{c,v} + I_{sc,v}) & (1) \\
 \frac{dS_v}{dt} &= -\beta \frac{S_v}{N} (I_c + I_{sc}) - \beta_v \frac{S_v}{N} (I_{c,v} + I_{sc,v}) \\
 \frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta \frac{S}{N} (I_c + I_{sc}) + \beta_v \frac{S}{N} (I_{c,v} + I_{sc,v}) - \sigma E \\
 \frac{dE_v}{dt} &= \beta \frac{S_v}{N} (I_c + I_{sc}) + \beta_v \frac{S_v}{N} (I_{c,v} + I_{sc,v}) - \sigma E_v \\
 \frac{dI_c}{dt} &= \nu \sigma E - \gamma I_c \\
 \frac{dI_{c,v}}{dt} &= \nu_v \sigma E_v - \gamma I_{c,v} \\
 \frac{dI_{sc}}{dt} &= (1 - \nu) \sigma E - \gamma I_{sc} \\
 \frac{dI_{sc,v}}{dt} &= (1 - \nu_v) \sigma E_v - \gamma I_{sc,v} \\
 \frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma (I_c + I_{c,v} + I_{sc} + I_{sc,v})
 \end{aligned}$$

## 140 Conditions and Parameter Values

141 Total population size for the simulations was fixed at  $N = 100k$  and we assume 20% of the population  
142 is already in the ‘recovered’ class  $R$ . The initial size of the exposed class  $E$  was set to 200 individuals,  
143 and values for the  $I_c$  and  $I_{sc}$  classes were calculated under a fast dynamics assumption:

$$I_c = \frac{\nu\sigma E}{\gamma} = 140$$
$$I_{sc} = \frac{(1-\nu)\sigma E}{\gamma} = 260$$

144 The initial size of the susceptible class  $S = 0.8(1-f)N$  and the initial susceptible vaccinated  
145 class  $S_v = 0.8fN$ , where  $f$  is the vaccination coverage level. All other vaccinated classes ( $E_v$ ,  $I_{sc,v}$ ,  
146  $I_{c,v}$ ) are initially set to 0, and simulations were run for one year.

147 We set the average latent period ( $1/\sigma$ ) to 4.6 days and the average infectious period ( $1/\gamma$ ) to 5  
148 days [18]. We set the transmission rate  $\beta$  to 0.5 per day, resulting in a basic reproduction number  
149 of  $R_0 = 2.5$  [19]. We set the risk of an unvaccinated individual developing a clinical infection at  
150  $\nu = 0.14$  [20], and the risk of dying from a clinical infection at  $\rho_c = 0.02$  [21, 22].

## References

151

152 [1] Na Zhu, Dingyu Zhang, Wenling Wang, Xingwang Li, Bo Yang, Jingdong Song, Xiang Zhao,  
153 Baoying Huang, Weifeng Shi, Roujian Lu, Peihua Niu, Faxian Zhan, Xuejun Ma, Dayan Wang,  
154 Wenbo Xu, Guizhen Wu, George F. Gao, and Wenjie Tan. A novel coronavirus from patients  
155 with pneumonia in China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(8):727–733, February  
156 2020.

157 [2] WHO situation reports. [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/  
158 novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports). Accessed 17 July 2020.

159 [3] Benjamin J Cowling, Sheikh Taslim Ali, Tiffany W Y Ng, Tim K Tsang, Julian C M Li,  
160 Min Whui Fong, Qiuyan Liao, Mike YW Kwan, So Lun Lee, Susan S Chiu, Joseph T Wu,  
161 Peng Wu, and Gabriel M Leung. Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions  
162 against coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in Hong Kong: An observational study. *The  
163 Lancet Public Health*, 5(5):e279–e288, May 2020.

164 [4] S Flaxman, S Mishra, A Gandy, H Unwin, H Coupland, T Mellan, H Zhu, T Berah, J Eaton,  
165 P Perez Guzman, N Schmit, L Cilloni, K Ainslie, M Baguelin, I Blake, A Boonyasiri, O Boyd,  
166 L Cattarino, C Ciavarella, L Cooper, Z Cucunuba Perez, G Cuomo-Dannenburg, A Dighe,  
167 A Djaafara, I Dorigatti, S Van Elsland, R Fitzjohn, H Fu, K Gaythorpe, L Geidelberg,  
168 N Grassly, W Green, T Hallett, A Hamlet, W Hinsley, B Jeffrey, D Jorgensen, E Knock,  
169 D Laydon, G Nedjati Gilani, P Nouvellet, K Parag, I Siveroni, H Thompson, R Verity, E Volz,  
170 C Walters, H Wang, Y Wang, O Watson, P Winskill, X Xi, C Whittaker, P Walker, A Ghani,  
171 C Donnelly, S Riley, L Okell, M Vollmer, N Ferguson, and S Bhatt. Report 13: Estimating  
172 the number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in  
173 11 European countries. 2020.

174 [5] An Pan, Li Liu, Chaolong Wang, Huan Guo, Xingjie Hao, Qi Wang, Jiao Huang, Na He,  
175 Hongjie Yu, Xihong Lin, Sheng Wei, and Tangchun Wu. Association of public health interven-  
176 tions with the epidemiology of the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*, 323(19):1915,  
177 May 2020.

178 [6] Sebastian Doerr and Leonardo Gambacorta. BIS Bulletin 16: COVID-19 and regional employ-  
179 ment in Europe. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/bis/bisblt/16.html>, 2020.

180 [7] Martin McKee and David Stuckler. If the world fails to protect the economy, COVID-19 will  
181 damage health not just now but also in the future. *Nature Medicine*, 26(5):640–642, April  
182 2020.



- 183 [8] Steffie Woolhandler and David U. Himmelstein. Intersecting U.S. epidemics: COVID-19 and  
184 lack of health insurance. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 173(1):63–64, July 2020.
- 185 [9] COVID-19 vaccine tracker. <https://biorender.com/covid-vaccine-tracker>. Accessed 17  
186 July 2020.
- 187 [10] FDA drug development process. [https://www.fda.gov/patients/  
188 drug-development-process/step-3-clinical-research#phases](https://www.fda.gov/patients/drug-development-process/step-3-clinical-research#phases). Accessed 17 July  
189 2020.
- 190 [11] Roy M Anderson and Robert M May. Vaccination and herd immunity to infectious diseases.  
191 *Nature*, 318(6044):323–329, 1985.
- 192 [12] Martin Eichner, Markus Schwehm, Linda Eichner, and Laetitia Gerlier. Direct and indirect  
193 effects of influenza vaccination. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 17(1), April 2017.
- 194 [13] Eve Dubé, Maryline Vivion, and Noni E MacDonald. Vaccine hesitancy, vaccine refusal and  
195 the anti-vaccine movement: influence, impact and implications. *Expert Review of Vaccines*,  
196 14(1):99–117, November 2014.
- 197 [14] Lauran Neergaard and Hannah Fingerhut. AP-NORC poll: Half of Americans would get a  
198 COVID-19 vaccine. <https://apnews.com/dacdc8bc428dd4df6511bfa259cfec44>, May 2020.
- 199 [15] Kiesha Prem, Yang Liu, Timothy W. Russell, Adam J. Kucharski, Rosalind M. Eggo, Nicholas  
200 Davies, Stefan Flasche, Samuel Clifford, Carl A.B. Pearson, James D. Munday, Sam Abbott,  
201 Hamish Gibbs, Alicia Rosello, Billy J. Quilty, Thibaut Jombart, Fiona Sun, Charlie Diamond,  
202 Amy Gimma, Kevin van Zandvoort, Sebastian Funk, Christopher I. Jarvis, W. John Edmunds,  
203 Nikos I. Bosse, Joel Hellewell, Mark Jit, and Petra Klepac. The effect of control strategies to  
204 reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling  
205 study. *The Lancet Public Health*, pages 261–270, 2020.
- 206 [16] Jan Medlock and Alison P Galvani. Optimizing influenza vaccine distribution. *Science*,  
207 325(5948):1705–1708, 2009.
- 208 [17] Steven C Castle. Clinical relevance of age-related immune dysfunction. *Clinical Infectious  
209 Diseases*, 31(2):578–585, 2000.
- 210 [18] Stephen M. Kissler, Christine Tedijanto, Edward Goldstein, Yonatan H. Grad, and Marc Lip-  
211 sitch. Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period.  
212 *Science*, 5793, April 2020.

- 213 [19] Ying Liu, Albert A Gayle, Annelies Wilder-Smith, and Joacim Rocklöv. The reproductive  
214 number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *Journal of Travel Medicine*,  
215 27(2), February 2020.
- 216 [20] Ruiyun Li, Sen Pei, Bin Chen, Yimeng Song, Tao Zhang, Wan Yang, and Jeffrey Shaman.  
217 Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus  
218 (SARS-CoV-2). *Science*, 368(6490):489–493, March 2020.
- 219 [21] Graziano Onder, Giovanni Rezza, and Silvio Brusaferro. Case-fatality rate and characteristics  
220 of patients dying in relation to COVID-19 in italy. *JAMA*, March 2020.
- 221 [22] Robert Verity, Lucy C Okell, Ilaria Dorigatti, Peter Winskill, Charles Whittaker, Natsuko Imai,  
222 Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Hayley Thompson, Patrick Walker, Han Fu, Amy Dighe, Jamie Grif-  
223 fin, Anne Cori, Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Zulma M Cucunuba,  
224 Rich Fitzjohn, Katy A M Gaythorpe, Will Green, Arran Hamlet, Wes Hinsley, Daniel Laydon,  
225 Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Steven Riley, Sabine van Elsland, Erik Volz, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong  
226 Wang, Xiayoue Xi, Christl Donnelly, Azra Ghani, and Neil Ferguson. Estimates of the severity  
227 of COVID-19 disease. *MedRxiv*, March 2020.