Vaccination and Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions: When can the UK relax about COVID-19?

Sam Moore, Edward M. Hill, Michael J. Tildesley, Louise Dyson, Matt J. Keeling*.

The Zeeman Institute for Systems Biology & Infectious Disease Epidemiology Research, School of Life Sciences and Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

* Corresponding Author. Email: M.J.Keeling@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

The announcement of efficacious vaccine candidates against SARS-CoV-2 has been met with worldwide acclaim and relief. Many countries already have detailed plans for vaccine targeting based on minimising severe illness, death and healthcare burdens. Normally, relatively simple relationships between epidemiological parameters, vaccine efficacy and vaccine uptake predict the success of any immunisation programme. However, the dynamics of vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 is made more complex by age-dependent factors, changing levels of infection and the potential relaxation of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) as the perceived risk declines. In this study we use an age-structured mathematical model, matched to a range of epidemiological data, to consider the interaction between the UK vaccination programme and future relaxation (or removal) of NPIs. Our predictions highlight the population-level risks of early relaxation leading to a pronounced wave of infections, and the individual-level risk relative to vaccine status. While the novel vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 offer a potential exit strategy for this outbreak, this is highly contingent on the transmission blocking action of the vaccine and the population uptake, both of which need to be carefully monitored as vaccine programmes are rolled out in the UK and other countries.

1 Introduction

The outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 that began in Wuhan, China, in late 2019 has dramatically shaped life in 2020 as a world-wide pandemic emerged [1]. In the UK, the first cases were identified on 31st January 2020 [2], with February and March witnessing an exponential rise in cases[3]. The first lockdown began on 23rd March and reversed the growth in infection, although important health metrics such as hospital occupancy and deaths continued to increase for several days[4]. The steady, but spatially heterogeneous, decline continued until August 2020 when a relaxation of controls and increased mixing as a result of this precipitated a second wave and, subsequently, a second lock-down in November 2020. By early December 2020, the UK had suffered over 60,000 deaths and 225,000 hospital admissions due to COVID-19; and yet it is estimated that less than 20% of the population have been exposed to the virus [5] suggesting the outbreak is far from complete. Mass vaccination, and hence protection, of the population offers a potentially rapid exit strategy.

Within a year, over 50 companies have developed the first vaccines against any coronavirus. In early December 2020, one of these (Pfizer/BioNTech's BNT162b2[6]) was approved for use in the UK, with several others in late Phase 3 trials showing promising preliminary efficacy data. As of 12th December 2020, the UK has ordered 357 million doses of vaccines from 7 different developers: 100 million doses of University of Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine[7]; 40 million doses of BioNTech/Pfizer vaccine; 7 million doses of Moderna vaccine; 60 million doses of Novavax vaccine; 60 million doses of Valneva vaccine; 60 million doses of GSK/Sanofi Pasteur vaccine; and 30 million doses of Janssen vaccine [8]. This is far in excess of any possible demand from the UK population, but mitigates for potential delays or failures from any single manufacturer. One continuing unknown with the potential vaccines is the degree to which they impact onward transmission (rather than simply preventing symptomatic infection); this is a key uncertainty that is investigated throughout this paper.

Vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 provides multiple unique challenges that are not encountered by other vaccination programmes. Most of the intuition about vaccination programmes is based on childhood vaccines where the aim is simply to achieve high uptake in each birth cohort and associated boosters. To date the seasonal influenza programme represented the largest annual delivery of vaccination in the UK [9], but seasonal influenza immunisation is pro-active (beginning before many cases arise), the 'flu' season is of relatively short duration and R for seasonal influenza is lower than for SARS-CoV-2 owing to both greater population immunity and a lower basic reproduction ratio [10]. In contrast, for SARS-CoV-2 there is a race

between infection and vaccination - vaccination rates are limited by supply and logistics, whereas infection can grow exponentially. However, the infection rate can be reduced by a range of non-pharmaceutical interventions whilst a vaccine can be targeted to where it will have the most impact[11]. The future of COVID-19 control is therefore dependent, in a complex non-linear way, on the initial prevalence of infection, the level of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) and therefore the rate of growth or decay, the speed with which the vaccine can be rolled out, the targeting and uptake of the vaccine and the vaccine characteristics. The uncertainties and interactions between these components necessitates the use of mathematical models to explore scenarios.

Here, we present an age-structured mathematical model, matched to a range of epidemiological data, to forecast the dynamics of COVID-19 into 2021 and beyond based on multiple combinations of scenarios. These model results provide likely bounds on the expected number of deaths and hospitalisations and hence provide important policy insights into the interaction between continued non-pharmaceutical interventions and the forthcoming vaccination programme. We focus on the risk-structured delivery programme for the UK and the potential risks of relaxing NPIs; we also consider the individual risks and how these are mitigated by vaccination.

2 The mathematical model and vaccination assumptions

We adapt an existing age and regionally structured model of SARS-COV-2 dynamics that has been matched to UK data [12, 13] to include the consequences of vaccination [11]. The model captures the historic trends of infection, hospitalisation and deaths in the UK, including the scale of the first and second waves. Including vaccination into this model shows how prioritising the oldest age-groups leads to the greatest reduction in deaths [11]. Here we increase the realism of the vaccination dynamics, including the timing of vaccine roll out across the population and the need to administer two doses. One key issue that the model cannot address is the level of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) that will be imposed in the future and the level of support (and therefore adherence to NPIs) from the general population. We have optimistically assumed that controls in the short-term are sufficient to keep the reproductive number (R) just below one; we then relax controls at various times throughout 2021 to investigate the level of protection generated by vaccination. All results represent the mean of multiple simulations which explore the inferred epidemiological parameter space determined by matching to a range of epidemiological time series; credible intervals for the predictions are shown in the Supporting Information (Section S2).

Vaccination schedules for the UK are still not determined over long time scales, although the immediate priority order has been defined [11, 14]. We implement a three phase programme that approximates a plausible (but optimistic) roll-out of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in the UK (Figure 1a), following in each stage the identified priority ordering:
Phase 1a Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine alone for the first 4M doses (= 2M persons) with roll-out from 8th December and lasting approximately one month. We assumed vaccine efficacy to be 90%.
Phase 1b A mixture of vaccines are deployed until everyone aged over 50 and those with comorbidities classifying them as high risk have been targeted. This takes approximately 3 more months starting from 1st January, and we assumed the mean vaccine efficacy to be 80%.
Phase 2 Vaccines are offered to remaining adults below the age of 50 and above the age of 18, taking approximately three and a half more months with completion occurring by late July. For this phase we again assumed the mean vaccine efficacy to be 80%.

Throughout we assume 95% uptake in care homes and 75% elsewhere, with vaccination randomly distributed across the population. These may be optimistic assumptions; uptake could be lower in younger age-groups due to a belief that COVID-19 infection is likely to have mild symptoms and therefore vaccination does not have a major individual health benefit. In practice, vaccination is also likely to be highly correlated within households and socio-demographic groups [15], which will weaken the population-scale impact of any transmission blocking by the vaccine.

We use a 2-dose model to simulate the impact of vaccination in both reducing disease and in reducing onward transmission. We assume that delivery of the second dose is prioritised over new first doses (Figure 1a). In the absence of detailed vaccine specific information, we also assume a stepped efficacy over time following the first dose, which scales with the assumed final vaccine efficacy (VE): from the first dose to day 7, zero efficacy; from day 7 to second dose on day 28, 50% VE; from day 28 to day 35, 50% VE; from day 35 onwards, 100% VE (Supplementary Material). Vaccine efficacy against disease is assumed to be high (in keeping with preliminary reports): 90% during the earliest phase, dropping to 80% when multiple vaccines



Figure 1: Scheduling and impact of vaccine uptake. a) The assumed up-take over time showing the proportion in each age-group that have received two doses of vaccine by the total number of doses (lower x-axis) or a given date (upper x-axis). b) The impact of the vaccination programme, defined by the number of administered doses, on the reproductive ratio R in the absence of all non-pharmaceutical interventions. Four different assumptions are made about the ability of the vaccine to block transmission: no transmission blocking (-0% transmission, orange line with solid circle markers); low transmission blocking (-25% transmission, purple line with triangle markers); moderate transmission blocking (-50% transmission, yellow line with square markers); high transmission blocking (-75% transmission, green line with diamond markers).

are in use. The role of vaccines in blocking transmission is less clear so we consider a range of transmission efficacy from 0% to 75%, which we assume operates by preventing primary infection. We note that the disease efficacy takes into account both infection blocking and the reduction of severe symptoms if infection does occur (Supporting Information, Section S1.1).

While efficacy against disease is of major early benefit in protecting individuals against severe disease, it is the transmission blocking potential of the vaccine that leads to a reduction in the intrinsic growth rate and the reproduction number, R. Figure 1b shows the reproduction number R, on release of non-pharmaceutical interventions, as the vaccine programme progresses for four different assumptions of transmission efficacy. For zero transmission efficacy (orange line), $R \approx 2.2$ a reduction from the observed growth in the first wave due to the slight depletion in susceptibles from natural infection; whereas when transmission efficacy is high (75% transmission blocking, green line), vaccination can generate a substantial decline in the reproductive number, although still insufficient to drive R below 1 for our default assumptions about vaccine uptake.

3 Predictions under vaccination and changing NPIs

We simulate the infection dynamics from February 2020, matching to the observed pattern of cases, hospitalisations and deaths, and then predict the impact of vaccination on daily deaths until the end of 2021 (Figure 2). Unsurprisingly, in the absence of vaccination (blue line) we observe the largest waves of infection with the most deaths, which are reduced by increasing levels of transmission efficacy. Early, modest relaxation of NPIs (Figure 2a), matched to the levels observed in early September when R was between 1.2 and 1.4 across different English regions and devolved nations, leads to subsequent waves of infection even under the most efficacious assumptions (green line shows a vaccine that blocks 75% of infection). Later relaxation of NPIs (April 2021 in Figure 2b) provides a greater opportunity for some level of herd-immunity to have accrued if the vaccine is moderately effective at blocking infection.

We consider the total number of deaths predicted by the model (Figure 2c), which equates to the areas under the curve in the preceding graphs. This provides an opportunity to consider sensitivity to vaccine uptake. The central bar represents 75% uptake in the general population (as shown in Figure 1 and the rest of Figure 2), whereas the lower limits of each box correspond to more optimistic up-take, corresponding to an increased 85% uptake in those above 50 years old, and the upper limits represent a more pessimistic scenario with 65% uptake in this older age-group and 45% uptake in the remaining population. The main panel shows the predicted mortality from the start of 2021 for different dates at which NPI are partially relaxed (to the level observed in early September 2020). Even maintaining these levels of NPI control and having a highly efficacious vaccine (green bars), we estimate over ten thousand deaths are likely to occur due to the slow decline in cases from its current high level; early relaxation of control measures or low transmission efficacy can lead to a pronounced subsequent wave of infection.

If we wish to completely lift *all* restrictions once both phases of the vaccination campaign is complete, then



Figure 2: Predicted daily deaths in the UK following the start of an immunisation program and relaxation or removal of NPIs. Panels (a) and (b) show the effect of relaxing current NPI measures down to those seen in early September 2020 ($R \sim 1.2 - 1.4$) from January or April 2021 respectively. Panel (c) displays the aggregate effects of partial release of NPI measures at different dates during the vaccination programme (left) compared with complete release from July 2021 (right); the upper limit, central bar and lower limit of each box corresponds to pessimistic, default and optimistic assumptions about vaccine uptake. The lower panels (d) and (e) correspond to a gradual reduction in NPIs until all controls are removed, as illustrated by the grey area. The default scenario (a,b, d & e) assumes 75% uptake in the general population; the optimistic scenario has an increased uptake at 85% in those above 50; while the pessimistic scenario has a decreased 65% uptake in the over 50's and 45% uptake in the remaining population.

we predict a substantial outbreak with a large number of associated deaths (Figure 2c right-hand panel). When the vaccine is not transmission blocking removing NPIs trigger an uncontrolled wave of infection in which only those successfully immunised (approximately 80% of 75%) will escape. Optimistic assumptions for both vaccine and uptake can still lead can still lead to 49 thousand deaths; with 13 thousand from January to July, and 36 thousand from July onwards when NPIs are released.

The step-wise release of all NPIs (Figure 2c right-hand panel, Supporting Information) modelled so far generates an over-shooting wave of infection; a more gradual release of restrictions mitigates against these effects (Figure 2d & e). A slow release of NPIs (as illustrated in Figure 2e) generates the fewest deaths, which under the most optimistic assumptions we predict around 39 thousand deaths (from January 2021).

The precise dynamics and outcomes are contingent on the assumed intrinsic growth rate before the relaxation of NPIs, which here is approximately $R = 0.95$ – other values for this quantity will change the precise curves but do not change the qualitative conclusions. We see similar behaviour if we examine the number of daily hospitalisations (Supporting Information, Section S2), with a notable third wave predicted if NPIs are relaxed too early or if the vaccine has a limited impact on transmission.

4 Impact of vaccination status

While we have predominantly focused on the population-level consequences of the vaccination programme, one key question is the likely vaccination status of individuals that are severely ill. We characterise this relationship as a function of the number of doses delivered so far (as part of the mass vaccination programme) and for a consistent 75% vaccine uptake across all age-groups (Figure 3). We display findings assuming 50% transmission efficacy, with similar results obtained for all levels of transmission efficacy. We consider four categories of individual: those who have not yet been offered the vaccine (grey); those who are in an eligible age-group but due to health reasons or personal beliefs remain unvaccinated (yellow); those who had received one dose so far (light blue); and those that have received both doses dark blue). Those individuals that have not been offered the vaccine declines linearly, while those unvaccinated but in eligible age groups and those that have received two doses grow linearly (Figure 3a). The unfolding epidemic (matched to Figure 2a) is then distributed across these four status groups (Figure 3b). For low numbers of doses, deaths are dominated by those who have yet to be offered the vaccine and those that have only received one dose; for moderate numbers of doses (15-40M) deaths are dominated by those that have not been vaccinated but are in the eligible age groups.

By plotting the proportion of all deaths associated with each status we observe that around 40% of deaths can be expected in those that have been vaccinated (Figure 3c). We stress that while at the individual-level two doses of vaccine reduces the risk of mortality by 80%, because vulnerable vaccinated people rapidly outnumber vulnerable unvaccinated people we should expect to see a high proportion of vaccinated individuals suffering severe disease and mortality.

The final shape of these distributions is a function of vaccine uptake in the most at-risk; increasing vaccine uptake reduces the number of deaths but paradoxically increases the contribution of vaccinated individuals to the proportion of deaths. There is also a strong influence of how well the vaccine protects against severe disease – greater efficacy against the most severe disease will again reduce the number of deaths and will also decrease the proportions associated with vaccinated individuals. However, if the vaccine is less efficacious in the elderly this trend would be reversed.



Figure 3: Characterisation of the dynamics in terms of vaccine status (not yet offered the vaccine; unvaccinated in an eligible age-group; received one dose; received two doses) as a function of the number of doses delivered so far. (a) The composition of the entire population (b) The number of daily deaths (c) The proportion of deaths. We display simulations assuming a consistent 75% vaccine uptake across all age-groups, assuming 50% transmission efficacy, and with a moderate reduction in NPIs at the start of 2021 (corresponding to the yellow curve in Figure 2a).

5 Conclusions

Here we have shown that high efficacy vaccines which provide a substantial level of transmission blocking offer a means of eventually relaxing controls without suffering a large subsequent wave of hospitalisations and deaths. Our conclusions rely on not only the vaccine characteristics but also upon the uptake in the population; in particular the most vulnerable groups, but also in the general population if transmission blocking is to be successful. We examined this in Figure 2e considering three different assumptions about vaccine uptake, but in practice vaccine uptake is likely to be regionally and socio-demographically correlated [16, 17]. Such correlations may potentially lead to pockets of high susceptibility in the population which can act as locations of small-scale outbreaks and reduce herd immunity [18]. It is also likely that vaccine uptake will vary in time as the population's perceived risk varies [19, 20], with high levels of hospitalisations and deaths leading to a greater demand for the vaccine. We expect there to be a complex four-way interaction between levels of infection, NPI policy, NPI adherence and vaccine uptake. From a public health perspective, it is therefore key to understand the drivers of vaccine uptake and vaccine hesitancy, identify groups that may have lower than average uptake and plan accordingly..

Early relaxation of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), before sufficient immunity is established, has been shown to precipitate a large wave of infection with resultant hospitalisations and deaths; a similar impact is predicted from any final release of NPIs if herd immunity has not been achieved (Figure 2). Even with high levels of vaccine uptake, a substantial fraction of the population needs to be immunised to prevent subsequent waves of infection (Figures 1 and 2), and strong NPIs will still be required even when Phase 1 of the vaccination programme is complete. We have focused on scenarios where NPIs are switched off in a step-wise manner, but even a more measured approach in which NPIs are gradually released over a period of many months does not prevent the worse effects (Supporting Information, Section S2). We stress that as hospitalisations and deaths increased we would expect both national legislation and emergent behaviour to limit the spread [21]. Therefore, our scenarios represent a pessimistic view of measures in response to a worsening outbreak.

At the time of writing only two vaccine manufacturers have peer-reviewed publications presenting the findings of their phase 3 trials [6, 7]. These have been used to provide approximate parameters for this modelling work, but many questions have not been quantitatively addressed. However, a number of key vaccine parameters within the model are based on parsimonious assumptions. We identify the following three

issues that require additional experimental data to refine model assumptions: as elucidated throughout this paper determining whether the vaccine blocks transmission is key for the development of herd immunity and hence the role of vaccination in the long-term control of COVID-19; we have assumed that efficacy against disease applies equally across the entire spectrum of disease, however if the vaccine has differential protection against the most severe disease this will impact our predictions for hospital admissions and deaths. Finally, we expect efficacy to vary with age and between risk groups; incorporating such heterogeneity into models is key for more robust predictions.

Over longer time scales the possibilities of waning immunity and mutation may upset these predictions. Waning immunity, either naturally derived or from vaccination, may necessitate seasonal vaccination programmes against SARS-CoV-2 protecting the most vulnerable in a similar manner to seasonal influenza vaccines [22]. Again we are lacking in our fundamental understanding of SARS-CoV-2 epidemiology, in particular whether subsequent infections have the same severity as primary infections, as well as the duration of protection. Both of these elements can be factored into the prediction mechanisms, but without detailed evidence such long-term forecasts are speculation.

Effective vaccines with high uptake are likely to be an essential element in the long-term control and potential elimination of COVID-19. However, experience with other diseases has illustrated that elimination is difficult and generally requires a targeted multi-strategy approach [23], the same is likely to be true for SARS-CoV-2. While mass vaccination will inevitably reduce the reproductive number R and reduce disease prevalence, other measures, such as intensive test-trace-and-isolate, will be needed to target pockets of infection. Ultimately whether we achieve eradication of SARS-CoV-2 is likely to depend on the long-term natural history of infection and the public health importance attached to this goal.

Author contributions

Conceptualisation: Matt J. Keeling.

Data curation: Matt J. Keeling; Edward M. Hill.

Formal analysis: Sam Moore.

Investigation: Sam Moore.

Methodology: Sam Moore; Matt J. Keeling.

Software: Sam Moore; Matt J. Keeling.

Validation: Sam Moore; Matt J. Keeling; Edward M. Hill; Louise Dyson; Michael J. Tildesley.

Visualisation: Sam Moore.

Writing - original draft: Matt J Keeling.

Writing - review & editing: Sam Moore; Matt J. Keeling; Edward M. Hill; Louise Dyson; Michael J. Tildesley.

Financial disclosure

This research was funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) [Policy Research Programme, Mathematical & Economic Modelling for Vaccination and Immunisation Evaluation, and Emergency Response; NIHR200411], the Medical Research Council through the COVID-19 Rapid Response Rolling Call [grant number MR/V009761/1] and through the JUNIPER modelling consortium [grant number EP/V030477/1]. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the funders

Ethical considerations

The data were supplied from the CHESS database after anonymisation under strict data protection protocols agreed between the University of Warwick and Public Health England. The ethics of the use of these data for these purposes was agreed by Public Health England with the Government's SPI-M(O) / SAGE committees.

Competing interests

All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

[1] Shereen MA, Khan S, Kazmi A, Bashir N, Siddique R. Covid-19 infection: Origin, transmission, and characteristics of human coronaviruses. *Journal of Advanced Research* **24**:91 – 98 (2020). doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2020.03.005.

[2] Lillie PJ, Samson A, Li A, Adams K, Capstick R, *et al.* Novel coronavirus disease (Covid-19): The first two patients in the UK with person to person transmission. *J. Infect.* **80**(5):578–606 (2020). doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.02.020.

[3] UK government. Health Protection Report Volume 14: Issue 5 (2020). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/health-protection-report-volume-14-2020/hpr-volume-14-issue-5-news-10-march. [Online] (Accessed: 24 November 2020).

[4] Hadjidemetriou GM, Sasidharan M, Kouyialis G, Parlikad AK. The impact of government measures and human mobility trend on covid-19 related deaths in the UK. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives* **6**:100167 (2020). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2020.100167.

[5] Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey, UK: 11 December 2020 (2020). URL https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveypilot/11december2020. [Online] (Accessed: 11 December 2020).

[6] Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, *et al.* Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N. Engl. J. Med.* page NEJMoa2034577 (2020). doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2034577.

[7] Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, *et al.* Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet* (2020). doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32661-1.

[8] UK Government. UK government secures additional 2 million doses of Moderna COVID-19 vaccine (2020). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-government-secures-additional-2-million-doses-of-moderna-covid-19-vaccine. [Online] (Accessed: 12 December 2020).

[9] UK Government. Immunisation: Annual flu programme (2020). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/annual-flu-programme. [Online] (Accessed: 12 December 2020).

[10] Biggerstaff M, Cauchemez S, Reed C, Gambhir M, Finelli L. Estimates of the reproduction number for seasonal, pandemic, and zoonotic influenza: a systematic review of the literature. *BMC Infect Dis* **4**:480 (2014). doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-480.

[11] Moore S, Hill EM, Dyson L, Tildesley M, Keeling MJ. Modelling optimal vaccination strategy for SARS-CoV-2 in the UK. *medRxiv* page 2020.09.22.20194183 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.09.22.20194183.

[12] Keeling MJ, Hill E, Gorsich E, Penman B, Guyver-Fletcher G, *et al.* Predictions of COVID-19 dynamics in the UK: short-term forecasting and analysis of potential exit strategies. *medRxiv* page 2020.05.10.20083683 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.05.10.20083683.

[13] Keeling MJ, Guyver-Fletcher G, Holmes A, Dyson L, Tildesley MJ, *et al.* Precautionary breaks: planned, limited duration circuit breaks to control the prevalence of COVID-19. *medRxiv* page 2020.10.13.20211813 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.10.13.20211813.

[14] Department of Health & Social Care. Priority groups for coronavirus (COVID-19) vaccination: advice from the JCVI, 2 December 2020 (2020). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-2-december-2020/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-2-december-2020. [Online] (Accessed: 12 December 2020).

[15] Jayasooriya S, Mitchell C, Balen J, Darton TC. Seasonal influenza programme expansion. *BMJ* page m4713 (2020). doi:10.1136/bmj.m4713.

[16] Bachtiger P, Adamson A, Maclean WA, Quint JK, Peters NS. Inadequate intention to receive Covid-19 vaccination: indicators for public health messaging needed to improve uptake in UK. *medRxiv* page 2020.12.07.20243881 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.12.07.20243881.

[17] Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and the social impacts on Great Britain: 18 December 2020 (2020). URL https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandthesocialimpactsongreatbritain/18december2020. [Online] (Accessed: 18 December 2020).

[18] Keeling MJ. The effects of local spatial structure on epidemiological invasions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B.* **266**:859–867 (1999). doi:10.1098/rspb.1999.0716.

[19] Bish A, Yardley L, Nicoll A, Michie S. Factors associated with uptake of vaccination against pandemic influenza: A systematic review. *Vaccine* **29**(38):6472 – 6484 (2011). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.06.107.

[20] Sherman SM, Smith LE, Sim J, Amlôt R, Cutts M, *et al.* COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK:

results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. *Hum. Vaccin. Immunother.* pages 1–10 (2020). doi:10.1080/21645515.2020.1846397.

[21] Weitz JS, Park SW, Eksin C, Dushoff J. Awareness-driven behavior changes can shift the shape of epidemics away from peaks and toward plateaus, shoulders, and oscillations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* page 202009911 (2020). doi:10.1073/pnas.2009911117.

[22] World Health Organisation. Vaccination - WHO/Europe | Influenza (2020). URL https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/communicable-diseases/influenza/vaccination. [Online] (Accessed: 17 December 2020).

[23] Brieger WR, Ramakrishna J, Adeniyi JD, Sridhar M, Kale OO. Guineaworm control case study: Planning a multi-strategy approach. *Social Science & Medicine* **32**(12):1319–1326 (1991). doi:10.1016/0277-9536(91)90191-E.

[24] Keeling MJ, Dyson L, Guyver-Fletcher G, Holmes A, Semple MG, *et al.* Fitting to the UK COVID-19 outbreak, short-term forecasts and estimating the reproductive number. *medRxiv* page 2020.08.04.20163782 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.08.04.20163782.

[25] Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, *et al.* Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLoS Med.* **5**(3):e74 (2008). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074.

[26] Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **13**(9):e1005697 (2017). doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697.

[27] House T, Keeling MJ. Deterministic epidemic models with explicit household structure. *Mathematical biosciences* **213**(1):29–39 (2008).

[28] Hilton J, Keeling MJ. Incorporating household structure and demography into models of endemic disease. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* **16**(157):20190317 (2019).

[29] Keeling MJ, Tildesley MJ, Atkins BD, Penman B, Southall E, *et al.* The impact of school reopening on the spread of COVID-19 in England. *medRxiv* page 2020.06.04.20121434 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.06.04.20121434.

[30] Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, *et al.* Prevalence of sars-cov-2 in spain (ene-covid): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. *The Lancet* **396**(10250):535–544 (2020).

[31] Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Madec Y, Grant R, Besombes C, *et al.* Cluster of COVID-19 in northern France: A retrospective closed cohort study. *medRxiv* page 2020.04.18.20071134 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.04.18.20071134.

[32] Heavey L, Casey G, Kelly C, Kelly D, McDarby G. No evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19 from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **25**(21):pii=2000903 (2020). doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.21.2000903.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

S1 The Mathematical Model

The model involves an extended SEIR-type framework: susceptibles (S) may become infected and move into a latent exposed (E) state before progressing to become infectious. Echoing the observed behaviour of COVID-19 infections, the model differentiates between individuals who are symptomatic (D, and hence likely to be detected) and those who are asymptomatic (U, likely to remain undetected). Partitioning those who are infectious by symptom status allows for a lower level of transmission believed to be associated with asymptomatic infection. It also generates the possible progression of symptoms increasing in severity, leading to hospitalisation and/or death.

Here we present the basic model formulation that underpins the age-structured predictions of COVID-19 dynamics in the UK, and how the parameters of this model have been inferred from the available data. We used a compartmental age-structured model, developed to simulate the spread of SARS-CoV-2 within ten regions of the UK (seven regions in England: East of England, London, Midlands, North East & Yorkshire, North West, South East and South West; and the devolved nations: Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales) [12], with parameters inferred to generate a good match to deaths, hospitalisations, hospital occupancy and serological testing [24]. The model population is stratified by age, with force of infection determined by the use of an age-dependent (who acquires infection from whom) social contact matrix for the UK [25, 26]. Additionally, we allow susceptibility and the probabilities of becoming symptomatic, being hospitalised and the risk of dying to be age dependent; these are matched to UK outbreak data. Finally, we account for the role of household isolation, by separating primary and secondary infections within a household (more details may be found in [12]). This allows us to capture household isolation by preventing secondary infections from playing a further role in onward transmission. Model parameters were inferred on a regional basis using regional time series of recorded daily hospitalisation numbers, hospital bed occupancy, ICU occupancy and daily deaths [24].

S1.1 Model description

We first show the underlying system of equations that account for the transmission dynamics, including symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission, household saturation of transmission and household quarantining. The population is stratified into multiple compartments: individuals may be susceptible (S), exposed (E), infectious with symptoms (I), or infectious and either asymptomatic or with very mild symptoms (A). Asymptomatic infections are assumed to transmit infection at a reduced rate given by τ. To some extent, the separation into symptomatic (I) and asymptomatic (A) within the model is somewhat artificial as there are a wide spectrum of symptom severities that can be experienced.

We let superscripts denote the first infection in a household (F), a subsequent infection from a symptomatic household member (SI) and a subsequent infection from an asymptomatic household member (SA). A fraction (H) of the first detected cases (necessarily symptomatic) in a household are quarantined (QF), as are all their subsequent household infections (QS) - we ignore the impact of household quarantining on the susceptible population as the number in quarantine is assumed small compared with the rest of the population. The recovered class is not explicitly modelled, although it may become important once we have a better understanding of the duration of immunity. We omitted natural demography and disease-induced mortality in the formulation of the epidemiological dynamics.

We extended the model formulation to capture a range of vaccination scenarios. We modelled two vaccination classes for individuals where it has been 7 days since they received their first and second dose of the vaccine, where the 7-day delay allows partial immunity to develop (Figure S2). We included these within the S and E class by adding an additional vaccination subscript for the number of doses received; hence $S_{a,0}$ corresponds to susceptible unvaccinated individuals while $S_{a,2}$ corresponds to those that received their second dose of vaccine at least 7 days ago.



Figure S1: Representation of the basis model states and transitions. Black arrows show key epidemiological transitions while blue arrows show movements to observable states. Parameters in green show the action of vaccine on infection and probability of disease.



Figure S2: Dynamics of vaccine efficacy within an individual. 7 days after the first dose partial efficacy is development, and 7 days after the second dose efficacy is raised to its maximum value. We highlight two forms of efficacy: disease efficacy (red) which prevents the development of symptomatic infection and acts on parameter d within the model; and transmission efficacy (green) which prevents all infection and acts on parameter σ.

The full equations are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_{a,0}}{dt} &= -\left(\lambda^F_{a,0}+\lambda^{SI}_{a,0}+\lambda^{SA}_{a,0}+\lambda^Q_{a,0}\right)\frac{S_{a,0}}{N_a} - v^1(t)S_{a,0},\\
\frac{dS_{a,1}}{dt} &= V^1(t)S_{a,0} - \left(\lambda^F_{a,1}+\lambda^{SI}_{a,1}+\lambda^{SA}_{a,1}+\lambda^Q_{a,1}\right)\frac{S_{a,1}}{N_a} - V^2(t)S_{a,1},\\
\frac{dS_{a,2}}{dt} &= V^2(t)S_{a,1} - \left(\lambda^F_{a,2}+\lambda^{SI}_{a,2}+\lambda^{SA}_{a,2}+\lambda^Q_{a,2}\right)\frac{S_{a,2}}{N_a}\\
\frac{dE^F_{1,a,v}}{dt} &= \lambda^F_{a,v}\frac{S_{a,v}}{N_a} - M\varepsilon E^F_{1,a,v}, \qquad v\in\{0,1,2\}\\
\frac{dE^{SI}_{1,a,v}}{dt} &= \lambda^{SI}_{a,v}\frac{S_{a,v}}{N_a} - M\varepsilon E^{SI}_{1,a,v},\\
\frac{dE^{SA}_{1,a,v}}{dt} &= \lambda^{SA}_{a,v}\frac{S_{a,v}}{N_a} - M\varepsilon E^{SA}_{1,a,v},\\
\frac{dE^{Q}_{1,a,v}}{dt} &= \lambda^{Q}_{a,v}\frac{S_{a,v}}{N_a} - M\varepsilon E^{Q}_{1,a,v},\\
\frac{dE^X_{m,a,v}}{dt} &= M\varepsilon E^X_{m-1,a,v} - M\varepsilon E_{m,a,v}, \qquad X\in\{F,SI,SA,Q\}\\
\frac{dI^F_a}{dt} &= d_{a,v}(1-H)M\varepsilon E^F_{M,a,v} - \gamma I^F_a,\\
\frac{dI^{SD}_a}{dt} &= d_{a,v}M\varepsilon E^{SI}_{M,a,v} - \gamma I^{SI}_a,\\
\frac{dI^{SU}_a}{dt} &= d_{a,v}(1-H)M\varepsilon E^{SA}_{M,a,v} - \gamma I^{SA}_a,\\
\frac{dI^{QF}_a}{dt} &= d_{a,v}HM\varepsilon E^F_{M,a,v} - \gamma I^{QF}_a,\\
\frac{dI^{QS}_a}{dt} &= d_{a,v}HM\varepsilon E^{SA}_{M,a,v} + d_{a,v}\varepsilon E^Q_a - \gamma I^{QS}_a,\\
\frac{dA^F_a}{dt} &= (1-d_{a,v})M\varepsilon E^F_{M,a,v} - \gamma A^F_a,\\
\frac{dA^S_a}{dt} &= (1-d_{a,v})M\varepsilon (E^{SI}_{M,a,v} + E^{SA}_{M,a,v}) - \gamma A^S_a,\\
\frac{dA^Q_a}{dt} &= (1-d_{a,v})M\varepsilon E^Q_{M,a,v} - \gamma A^Q_a,
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we have included m latent classes, giving rise to an Erlang distribution for the latent period, while the infectious period was exponentially distributed. Throughout we have taken $M = 3$.

The forces of infection which govern the non-linear transmission of infection obey:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda^F_{a,v} &= \sigma_{a,v}\sum_b \left(I^F_b + I^{SI}_b + I^{SA}_b + \tau(A^F_b + A^S_b)\right)\beta^N_{ba},\\
\lambda^{SI}_{a,v} &= \sigma_{a,v}\sum_b I^F_b\,\beta^H_{ba},\\
\lambda^{SA}_{a,v} &= \sigma_{a,v}\tau\sum_b A^F_a\,\beta^H_{ba},\\
\lambda^{Q}_{a,v} &= \sigma_{a,v}\sum_b D^{QF}_b\,\beta^H_{ba},
\end{aligned}
$$

where β^H represents household transmission and $\beta^N = \beta^S + \beta^W + \beta^O$ represents all other transmission locations, comprising school-based transmission (β^S), work-place transmission (β^W) and transmission in all other locations (β^O). These matrices are taken from Prem *et al.* [26] to allow easily translation to other geographic settings, although other sources such as POLYMOD [25] could be used.

Two key parameters, together with the transmission matrix, govern the age-structured dynamics: σ_a corresponds to the age-dependent susceptibility of individuals to infection; d_a the age-dependent probability

of displaying symptoms (and hence potentially progressing to more severe disease). Both of these are also modified by the vaccine status, such that those that have received one or two doses of vaccine have a lower risk of infection and a lower risk of developing symptoms. The action of vaccine on the parameter σ captures the transmission blocking aspect of the vaccine, while the action on d captures the efficacy against disease (Figure S2). We also define τ as the reduced transmission from asymptomatic infections compared to symptomatic infections; given the probability of displaying symptoms is less in the younger age groups, this parameter shapes the role of younger ages in onward transmission.

We require our model to capture both individual level quarantining of infected individuals and isolation of households containing identified cases. In a standard ODE framework this level of household structure is only achievable at large computational expense [27, 28]. Thus, we instead made a relatively parsimonious approximation to achieve a comparable effect.

We assume that all within household transmission originates from the first infected individual within the household (denoted with a superscript F, or QF if they become quarantined). This allows us to assume that secondary infections within a household in isolation (denoted with a superscript QS or Q) play no further role in any of the transmission dynamics. As a consequence, high levels of household isolation can drive the epidemic extinct, even if within household transmission is high – an effect not achievable with the standard SEIR-type modelling approach. This improved methodology also helps to capture to some degree household depletion of susceptibles (or saturation of infection), as secondary infections in the household are incapable of generating additional household infections.

S1.2 Capturing social distancing

We obtained age-structured contact matrices for the United Kingdom from Prem et al. [26]. We used these contact matrices to provide information on normal levels household transmission (β^H_{ab}, with the subscript ab corresponding to transmission from age group a against age group b), school-based transmission (β^S_{ab}), work-place transmission (β^W_{ab}) and transmission in all other locations (β^O_{ab}).

We assume that any instigated non-pharmaceutical interventions (patterns of social-distancing or lockdown measures) leads to a reduction in the work, school and other matrices while increasing the strength of household contacts. Any given level of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), captured by the parameter ϕ between zero and one, therefore scales the four transmission matrices between their normal values (when $\phi = 0$) and their value under the most severe lockdown ($\phi = 1$).

We infer the level of NPIs as a slowly varying parameter in the MCMC processes on a weekly basis. In turn, the weekly value of ϕ allows us to calculate the growth rate r (and hence the reproductive number R) by an eigenvalue approach.

S1.3 Parameter Inference

As with any model of this complexity, there are multiple parameters that determine the dynamics. Some of these are global parameters and apply for all geographical regions, with others used to capture the regional dynamics. Some of these parameters are matched to the early outbreak data (including the resultant age-distribution of infection), however the majority are inferred by an MCMC process (Table 1).

We would highlight that the parameters of α and τ are key in determining age-structured behaviour and are therefore essential in quantifying the role of school children in transmission [29]. We argue that a low τ and a low α are the only combination that are consistent with the growing body of data suggesting that levels of seroprevalence show only moderate variation across age-ranges [30], yet children are unlikely to display major symptoms, suggesting their role in transmission may be lower than for other respiratory infections [31, 32].

Throughout the current epidemic, there has been noticeable heterogeneity between the different regions of England and between the devolved nations. In particular, London is observed to have a large proportion of early cases and a relatively steeper decline in the subsequent lock-down than the other regions and the devolved nations. In our model this heterogeneity is captured through three regional parameters (D^R_S, H^R_S and I^R_S) which act on the heterogeneous population pyramid of each region to generate key observables.

Table 1: Key model parameters and their source

Parameter	Description	Source
β	Age-dependent transmission, split into household, school, work and other	Matrices from Prem *et al.* [26]
γ	Recovery rate, changes with τ, the relative level of transmission from undetected asymptomatics compared to detected symptomatics	Fitted from early age-stratified UK case data to match growth rate and R_0
$d_{a,v}$	Age-dependent and vaccine status dependent probability of displaying symptoms (and hence being detected), changes with α and τ	Fitted from early age-stratified UK case data to capture the age profile of infection.
$\sigma_{a,v}$	Age-dependent and vaccine status dependent susceptibility, changes with α and τ	Fitted from early age-stratified UK case data to capture the age profile of infection.
H^R	Household quarantine proportion $= 0.8\phi_R$	Can be varied according to scenario
N_a^R	Population size of a given age within each region	ONS
ε	Rate of progression to infectious disease ($1/\varepsilon$ is the duration in the exposed class). $\varepsilon \sim 0.2$	MCMC
α	Scales the degree to which age-structured heterogeneity is due to age-dependent probability of symptoms ($\alpha = 0$) or age-dependent susceptibility ($\alpha = 1$)	MCMC
τ	Relative level of transmission from asymptomatic compared to symptomatic infection	MCMC
ϕ^R	Regional relative strength of the lockdown restrictions; scales the transmission matrices. Can also be varied according to scenario.	MCMC
σ^R	Regional modifier of susceptibility to account for differences in level of social mixing	MCMC
E_0^R	Initial regional level of infection, rescaled from early age-distribution of cases	MCMC
D_S^R	Regional scaling for the mortality probability P_a(Death|Hospitalised))	MCMC
H_S^R	Regional scaling for the hospitalisation probability P_a(Hospitalised|Symptomatic))	MCMC
I_S^R	Regional scaling for the ICU probability P_a(ICU|Symptomatics))	MCMC

S1.4 Public Health Measurable Quantities

The main model equations focus on the epidemiological dynamics, allowing us to compute the number of symptomatic and asymptomatic infectious individuals over time. However, these quantities are not directly measured - and even the number of confirmed cases (the closest measure to symptomatic infections) is highly biased by the testing protocols at any given point in time. It is therefore necessary to convert infection estimates into quantities of interest that can be compared to data. We considered six such quantities which we calculated from the number of new symptomatic infections on a given day I_a^d.

1. **Hospital Admissions:** An age-dependent fraction of symptomatic individuals are assumed to need hospital treatment, with a distributed lag between infection and hospitalisation.
2. **ICU Admissions:** Similarly, an age-dependent fraction of symptomatic individuals are assumed to need treatment in an Intensive Care Unit. This is not a quantity that is generally reported, and therefore we cannot match our model predictions to this data source.
3. **Hospital Beds Occupied:** By convolving hospital admissions with the distributions of lengths of stay, we can estimate the number of hospital beds occupied.
4. **ICU Beds Occupied:** A similar process generates the number of occupied ICU beds.
5. **Number of Deaths:** Mortality is assumed to occur to a fraction of hospitalised individuals, with the probability of mortality dependent upon age, and occuring after a distributed lag.
6. **Proportion of Pillar 2 positives:** Given that the raw number of detected cases in any region is substantially influenced by the number of tests conducted, we consider the proportion of pillar 2 tests that are positive as a less biased figure. We assume that those symptomatically infected with COVID-

19 compete with individuals suffering symptoms for other infections for the available testing capacity. This leads to proportion of pillar 2 tests that are positive being a saturating function of the number of symptomatic infections, with a single scaling parameter.

We compared these model predictions to the data by assuming that the true numbers are drawn from a negative binomial distribution with the model value as the mean, while the true proportions (Pillar 2 positives) are from a beta-binomial.

S2 Extensions to Main Text Scenarios

In the main text we focused on a few chosen scenarios that illustrate the range of plausible behaviours, and only considered COVID-19 related deaths. Here, we show some other representative scenarios and the impact on the number of hospitalisations under all of these cases. We also display the 95% credible intervals, as defined by the variability in inferred parameters; these shaded regions contain 95% of all simulations at every point in time. (We note that any one prediction will not necessarily follow the upper or lower bound, these are envelopes that contain predictions that may wander both above and below the mean.)

S2.1 Alternative Step-wise NPI relaxation



Figure S3: Predicted daily deaths in the UK following the start of an immunisation program and relaxation or removal of NPIs. Panels (a) and (b) show the effect of partial NPI measures down early September 2020 (when $R \sim 1.2 - 1.4$) from January or April 2021 respectively, while panels (c) and (d) show the complete removal of all NPI measures (leading to $R \sim 2.2$) from either April or at the final stages of vaccination in July 2021. Shaded regions show the 95% credible intervals.

S2.2 Alternative gradual NPI relaxation

S2.3 Impact of Vaccination and NPI release on Hospital Admissions



Figure S4: Effect of gradual relaxation of NPI measures on deaths across the UK following the start of vaccination. In panels (a)-(d) different relaxation scenarios are shown with NPIs reduced linearly from December levels down to complete release over different time periods represented by the height of the grey shading. Panel (e) compares the total predicted deaths from Jan-21 onwards between the scenarios for each vaccine efficacy.



Figure S5: Predicted daily hospitalisations in the UK following the start of an immunisation program and relaxation or removal of NPIs. Panels (a) and (b) show the effect of partial NPI measures down early September 2020 ($R \sim 1.2 - 1.4$) from January or April 2021 respectively, while panels (c) and (d) show the complete removal of all NPI measures (leading to $R \sim 2.2$) from either April or at the final stages of vaccination in July 2021.



Figure S6: Effect of gradual relaxation of NPI measures on hospital admissions across the UK following the start of vaccination. In panels (a)-(d) different relaxation scenarios are shown with NPIs reduced linearly from December levels down to complete release over different time periods represented by the height of the grey shading. Panel (e) compares the total predicted hospital admissions from Jan-21 onwards between the scenarios for each vaccine efficacy.