medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# Vaccination strategies for minimizing loss of life in Covid-19 in a Europe lacking vaccines

Patrick Hunziker

University Hospital Basel; University of Basel, Switzerland; CLINAM Foundation

**Brief title**: "Covid-19 vaccination strategies"

**Contact**:

Patrick Hunziker, MD
Intensive Care Unit
University Hospital Basel
Petersgraben 5
4031 Basel
email: hunzikerp@swissnano.org
direct phone: +41 79 463 64 34
fax: +41 61 265 53 00

**Author's contributions:** PH performed all aspects of study design, performance and writeup

**Funding:** Self-funded

**Conflicts of interest**: None

**Ethics committee approval**: Not subject to ethical committee requirements

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Abstract**

**Aim and Background: We aimed at identifying vaccination strategies that minimize loss of life in the Covid-19 pandemic**. Covid-19 mainly kills the elderly, but the pandemic is driven by social contacts that are more frequent in the young. Vaccines elicit stronger immune responses per dose in younger persons. As vaccine production is a bottleneck, many countries have adopted a strategy of first vaccinating the elderly and vulnerable, while postponing vaccination of the young.

Methods: Based on published age-stratified immunogenicity data of the Moderna mRNA-1273 vaccine, we compared the established "one dose fits all" approach with tailored strategies: The known differential immunogenicity of vaccine doses in different age groups is exploited to vaccinate the elderly at full dose, while the young receive a reduced dose, amplifying the number of individuals receiving the vaccine early. A modeling approach at European Union scale with population structure, Covid-19 case and death rates similar to Europe in late January 2021 is used.

Results: When the elderly were vaccinated preferentially, the pandemic initially continued essentially unchecked, as it was dominantly driven by social contacts in other age groups. Tailored strategies, including regular dosing in the elderly but reduced dose vaccination in the young, multiplied early vaccination counts, and even with some loss in protection degree for the individual person, the protective effect towards stopping the pandemic and protecting lives was enhanced, even for the elderly. In the European Union, pandemic duration (threshold >100'000 cases/day) was shortened from 53 to 18-24 days; cumulative death count over 100 days was reduced by >30'000. Data suggest that the findings may be relevant to both, the Moderna and the Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines.

**Conclusion: Protecting the vulnerable, minimizing overall deaths and stopping the pandemic is best achieved by an adaptive vaccination strategy using an age-tailored vaccine dose.**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# Figure 1

A) **«Vaccinate the old >64years first, using full vaccine dose»**




B) **«Half of vaccine to the old >64years at full dose, half to the young≤64years at quarter dose»**




C) **«All vaccines to the young ≤64years used at quarter dose»**




D) **«All vaccines to the young ≤64year used at full dose»**



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## Introduction

Faced with the Covid-19 pandemic, vaccines against SARS-Cov2 have been developed in unprecedented speed, and mRNA vaccines like the Pfizer BNT162b2 vaccine[1](Tozinameran) and the Moderna mRNA-1273 vaccine[2] have shown excellent immunogenicity, safety and protection against disease, and data indicating that they protect against virus transmission are accumulating. While vaccines development was rapid, vaccine production capacities are now the key bottleneck for national and global deployment. During development, dose optimization of the Moderna vaccine has been performed towards optimal protection of the elderly, exploring doses of 25, 50, 100 and 250ug, as the elderly show reduced immune response on vacccination[3]. Laboratory-assessed immunity levels typically exceeded those seen in the plasma of reconvalescent patients who have a protection of 83% for at least 5 months[4]. Immunogenicity in the young is even higher than in the elderly. Certain Covid-19 vaccination study populations have 76% protection against infection for at least four months[5] despite some decline of the measured immunity parameter in the elderly, indicating that vaccination can protect against infection as well as against symptomatic disease, rendering vaccination a rational approach for stopping the pandemic. We noted that in the young, a 25µg dose of the Moderna vaccine elicited an immune response level at day 57 that was comparable to the immune response seen in patients older than 71 years at day 119 (Table), a group in which the vaccine achieves >86% protection. Likewise, published data for the Pfizer Tozinameran vaccine show strong immunogenicity[6] at threefold reduced dose in the young. The interpretation that good immunogenicity translates into good protection is very plausible[7],[8], [9], implying that in the young, having a stronger immune response, a lower vaccine dose may suffice to achieve sufficient protection. We therefore hypothesized that exploiting age-tailored vaccination dosing may allow multiplying the proportion of persons early and thereby may lead to improved pandemic control.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## Methods

Data reported by Moderna on phase I[10,11,12,13,14] II and III[15] studies were analyzed. Population size and age structure was modeled according to the European Union with a population of 447'706'200, split into a cohort > 64 years "old" of 90'436'652 and 357'269'547 "young" persons ≤64, as reported in the EU Eurostat respository[16]. European Covid-19 case numbers were from the Johns Hopkins University CSSE dataset and were used to initialize the model to 195'000 per day as per mid January 2021. The infectious window after Covid-19 infection was assumed to be day one to day 7 days after infection. Vaccine stock is available for 1 million full dose vaccinations (Moderna, 2x100 µg) per day. The interval from vaccination to protection was 10 days. Protective efficacy for the 100µg vaccine dose was 95·6% in the young and 86·2% in the elderly as reported; in one analysis, the vaccine efficacy for avoidance of transmission of a 25µg dose in the young was set to 86·2% based on the levels of immunogenicity achieved in the young compared to the immune response in the elderly vaccinated with 100µg; then, transmission blocking efficacies were varied between 30% and 90% for the 25µg dose in the young to explore the impact of blocking efficacy on strategy preference. Young persons were set to have 80% of their social contacts with the "young" and 20% with the "old"[17], while for the old, contacts to other elderly and the young were each assumed to be 50%. Daily transmissions for each age group were derived from the daily proportion of "risk contacts", i. e. encounters of non-immune persons with infectious persons of either age group, plus, weighted by vaccine protection level, of "semi-risk contacts", i. e. encounters of a vaccinated person with an infectious person. Deaths were based on the case fatality rate in the Europe in December 2020/January 2021, approximately 2·5% during a quasi-steady state in case numbers. The age distribution of Covid-19 deaths was computed from age-dependent mortality taken from the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control situation dashboard[18]. Ethics: According to a written statement from the relevant Ethical Kommittee Nordwestschweiz EKNW, computer modeling studies not including subjects do not fall under ethical committee jurisdiction.

## Results

Results are summarized in the Figure 1. A "one dose fits all" vaccination strategy starting with the elderly allows an initially unchecked propagation of the virus in younger population segments with high "risk contact" numbers, as shown in figure, panel A; a large number of infections in the young inevitably spreads to some degree to the elderly (who are not 100% protected by the vaccine), with case numbers above 100'000 per day up to day 53, 199'000 cumulative deaths over 100 days and death rates of >1000 deaths per day until day 80. In contrast, a strategy initially vaccinating the young only, at full vaccine dose, shown in panel D, stops the pandemic earlier with case numbers falling below 100'000 on day 36, but lacking protection for the vulnerable leads to 226'000 deaths, with death rates falling below 1000 on day 84.

Remarkably, an adaptive strategy using half the available vaccine stock for vaccinating the elderly at full vaccine dose and using the other half at a reduced dose (figure 1, panel B) to immunize a much larger number of younger people, even at the price of a somewhat reduced vaccine efficacy per individual person, is much more effective in reducing case numbers and deaths in each age group. Using a quarter dose for the young (25µg), assuming 86·4% protection, allows shortening the time to <100'000 cases to 24 days and reducing deaths to 165'000 at 100 days. This scenario also reaches the milestone of <1000 deaths per day significantly faster, in 61 days.
Distributing a quarter dose (25µg) only to the young (i.e., not vaccinating the elderly; figure 1, panel C), also assuming 86·4% protection, reduced deaths to 148'000, protecting the elderly indirectly by shortening the pandemic, with< 100'000 cases per day reached on day 18 and <1000 deaths per day reached on day 52.

Results proved to be robust against varying input parameters. An adaptive strategy with quarter dose vaccination was advantageous down to a transmission blocking vaccine efficacy of 30% (Figure 2). Decreasing vaccine efficacy, in particular below 80%, required more intense social contact reduction to make each strategy perform to the same degree.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## Discussion

Combining demographic and recent epidemiologic data from Europe with published immunity responses of vaccinated persons from different age groups, we find that vaccination strategies tailored to the characteristics of the existing vaccines have a large potential for saving more lives and shortening the duration of the pandemic, compared to the current "one dose fits all" approach and the current strategy of prioritizing the elderly.

The different pattern of social contacts in the young[19], the strong immunogenicity of the Moderna vaccine in the young and its excellent protective effect at full dose in the elderly inspire an adaptive strategy that uses the established dose in the elderly, but in parallel, applies a reduced vaccine dose to a much larger number of younger people, exploiting its extremely good efficacy in this population segment. In this model, this approach allows an acceleration of the vaccination campaigns, resulting in fewer deaths and shorter duration of the pandemic emergency.

The significant effectiveness of the Moderna vaccine already at moderate immune response level, evident by its effectiveness in preventing disease already at 10 days after vaccination with a single standard dose in the pivotal trial, before the full immune response is reached, supports biological benefit already before reaching full titers. Emerging data confirm a protective effect of mRNA Covid-19 vaccines for blocking transmission[20]; as this effect is manifest in elderly patients already after a single dose, we infer that those patients have not yet reached full immunity titers but are already protected, supporting our line of thought. Likewise, 83% protection against reinfection is documented after natural infection[21], where average immune titers are lower than after vaccination. Experiences with "fractional" dose vaccination in other viral diseases[22],[23] further lend credibility to the results.

Notably, "protecting the vulnerable" is achieved best, when not only the vulnerable, but all population segments are immunized, in particular those that contribute more to drive the pandemic than the elderly[24],[25],[26]. A large number of infected young people combined with the imperfect protection achievable by vaccination in the elderly still represents a relevant threat to the vulnerable, rendering the strategy focusing on the elderly-first inferior to stopping the pandemic through a comprehensive approach.

More effective vaccination strategies may also have profound repercussions on preserving functionality of healthcare systems and on economies. Hopefully, they will also accelerate access to vaccination in poorer countries in a time when nations risk to quarrel over this precious resource, although Covid-19 can only be overcome by global collaboration.

The benefit of a reduced-dose approach results from a non-linear dose-efficacy relationship of a given vaccine, where the fractional loss of protection for the individual person is less than the gain in additional vaccine doses. We note that antibody responses and T-cell responses observed[27] in the Pfizer Tozinameran (BNT162b2) vaccine show a similar nonlinear dose-response relationship, in that at most a marginal reduction in immune titers is observed when dose is reduced from 30 to 10ug (with an antibody and T-cell response even observable at 1ug). These findings suggest that also for the Pfizer vaccine used in the young, a dose reduction of at least 3-fold, and thus an increase in early vaccinations of 3-fold, could be considered for implementing a similar strategy as quantitatively analyzed here for the Moderna vaccine.

While the Moderna vaccine appears to retain full activity for the mutant of concern B.1.1.7 that currently spreads rapidly[28], thereby rendering the proposed strategy rational also with this new threat, other coronavirus mutations that might evade the immune response imparted by prior infection or by the current vaccines are feared to arise soon[29] and may require additional shots with modified vaccines, and thereby will put further strain on production lines, adding considerable urgency to optimizing vaccine strategies now. The risk of mutants developing after reduced dose vaccination does not appear high[30] because virus infection after coronavirus vaccination typically induces a strong immunity boost[31].

The study is limited because it is based on reinterpretation and extrapolation of existing data and includes the assumption of a degree of clinical efficacy of transmission blocking of a reduced vaccine dose based on laboratory surrogate parameters, while safety has already been documented for these doses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Protection from transmission has been shown for the Astra Zeneca vaccine but detailed data are not yet available for the vaccines used here. The proof of benefit of such an approach for society is amenable to straight-forward study designs that are immediately implementable: Allocate entire cities or countries to this approach, and count the cases, death rates and outbreak duration. The approach described here focuses on high-efficacy mRNA vaccines; generalizations to other vaccines will require examining specific dose-response relationships per vaccine.
As this approach is an "off-label" use of a registered drug, applying it in patients will require specific permits from relevant ethics committees and regulatory bodies.

**Conclusion**

Adaptive vaccination strategies, namely fully dosing a vaccine in the elderly, vulnerable, and concomitantly applying a highly effective mRNA vaccine at a reduced dose in the remainder of the population, or even a reduced dose strategy focused on the young only, will multiply the number of persons receiving the vaccine early, may contribute to stopping the pandemic faster and have the potential to save many lives.
Evidently, the vulnerable are best protected by protecting society as a whole.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Data sharing statement:**

A spreadsheet with daily data will be available, starting with publication, for 6 months, by email request from the author, for non-commercial, scientific purposes by academic institutions and government agencies, with mandatory source attribution when used. For use of the statistical model and for other uses, contact the author directly.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Table. Reported immune responses elicited by the Moderna vaccine.**

Note that the 25µg dose in the <55 year old elicits a similar or stronger immune response compared to the >71 years old at 119 days, and compares favorably with the immune levels found in convalescent plasma.

S-2P is the antigen encoded by the vaccine. RBD ELISA measures receptor-binding domain binding antibodies. $PsVNA_{50}$ is the pseudovirus neutralization assay's 50% inhibitory dilution. $PRNT_{80}$ is the live-virus plaque-reduction neutralization testing assay's 80% inhibitory dilution.

| | **>71y** [Widge, NEJM 2021] | **<55y** [Jackson, NEJM 2020] | **Convalescent plasma** [Jackson, NEJM 2020] |
|---|---|---|---|
| | ***2x 100µg,*** *day 119* | ***2x25µg,*** *day 57* | |
| **S-2P ELISA** | | 299'751 | 142'140 |
| **RBD ELISA** | 157'964 | 183'652 | 37'857 |
| **$PsVNA_{50}$** | 109 | 80·7 | 109·2 |
| **$PRNT_{80}$** | 165 | 339·7 (d43) | 158·3 |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Legend Figure 1:**

Impact of different vaccination strategies on Covid-19 cases, deaths and the propensity of "risk contacts".

Panel A) vaccinating the elderly first leaves large population segments unprotected. Note that the prolonged spread of infection in the non-vaccinated young spills over to frequent infections and deaths in the elderly that are not yet vaccinated or only partly protected by the vaccine.

Panel B) using half of the vaccine supply to vaccinate the elderly at full dose, and using the other half of the supply to vaccinate the young with a quarter dose, leads to a faster decline in infection and fewer deaths, even in the elderly.

Panel C) Using all vaccines for vaccinating the young with a quarter dose leads to faster reduction of overall case numbers, and thereby, indirectly, also protect the elderly after a sufficient overall vaccination rate is achieved, yielding low overall deaths.

Panel D) Compared to the best scenarios, using the full vaccine dose for vaccinating only the young ("the frequent transmitters") is slower compared to the quarter dose strategies in stopping the pandemic despite being more protective for the individual person, and is associated with substantial death counts in the elderly.

"Risk contact" designates an encounter of a non-immune with an infectious person, and "semi-risk contact" designates an encounter of a vaccinated person with an infectious person, taking into account that vaccine protection is less than 100%. X-axes are days. Blue labels show the day when case numbers fall below 100'000. Black labels show the day death numbers fall below 1000.

**Legend Figure 2:**

Sensitivity of choice of strategy to different efficacies for transmission blocking or vaccine- and infection-mediated immunity. Transmission blocking efficacy for vaccine and infection-mediated immunity is varied between 30 and 90% for the young. For the elderly, a transmission blocking efficacy is kept at 86.4%, potentially biasing the results in favor of the "elderly first" strategy. Nevertheless, the adaptive strategy, reaching large numbers of young persons early, is more effective in reducing the Covid-19 case load at all transmission blocking efficacies tested.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## Figure 2



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# References

[1] Polack F P, Thomas S J, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**, 2603–15.
[2] Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine *N Engl J Med* December 30, 2020. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2035389.
[3] Varnica Bajaj V, Nirupa Gadi N, Allison P. Spihlman AP et al. Aging, Immunity, and COVID-19: How Age Influences the Host Immune Response to Coronavirus Infections? Front. Physiol., 2021. DOI : doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2020.571416
[4] Lumley S F, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, et al. Antibody status and incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in health care workers. *N Engl J Med* 2020; DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2034545
[5] Voysey M, Costa Clemens SA, Madhi SA et al. ‚Single dose administration, and the influence of the timing of the booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine. Preprint, available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3777268
[6] Sahin U, Muik A, Vogler I, et al. BNT162b2 induces SARS-CoV-2-neutralising antibodies and T cells in humans. medRxiv. 2020; DOI: doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.09.20245175.
[7] Voysey M, Costa Clemens SA, Madhi SA et al. ‚Single dose administration, and the influence of the timing of the booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine. Preprint, available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3777268
[8] Lumley S F, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, al. Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 are associated with protection against reinfection. *medRxiv* 2020; DOI: 10.1101/2020.11.18.20234369
[9] Kim JH, Marks F, Clemens JD. Looking beyond COVID-19 vaccine phase 3 trials. *Nature Medicine.* 2021 Jan 19:1-7.
[10] Jackson L A, Anderson EJ, Rouphael NG, et al. An mRNA vaccine against SARS-CoV-2—preliminary report. *N Engl J Med* 2020; DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2022483.
[11] Anderson E J, Rouphael NG, Widge AT, al. Safety and immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 vaccine in older adults. *N Engl J Med N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**: 2427–38.
[12] Widge A T, Rouphael NG, Jackson LA, et al. "Durability of responses after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 vaccination." *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**: 80–2.
[13] Supplement to: Jackson LA, Anderson EJ, Rouphael NG, et al. An mRNA vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 — preliminary report. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**:1920–31. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2022483
[14] Jacqueline M. Miller. mRNA-1273 Clinical Development Program. Moderna presentation, August 26, 2020, retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/meetings/downloads/slides-2020-08/COVID-02-Miller-508.pdf
[15] Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine *N Engl J Med* 2020. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2035389.
[16] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/tps00010/default/table?lang=en last accessed on January 25, 2021
[17] Wallinga J, Teunis P, Kretzschmar M. Using data on social contacts to estimate age-specific transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents. *American Journal of Epidemioogyl*. 2006; **164**:936–44.
[18] https://qap.ecdc.europa.eu/public/extensions/COVID-19/COVID-19.html#enhanced-surveillance-tab last accessed on January 25,2021
[19] Fumanelli L, Ajelli M, Manfredi P, Vespignani A Merler S. Inferring the structure of social contacts from demographic data in the analysis of infectious diseases spread. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2012 ; **8**, Article e1002673. DOI : doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002673
[20] Mallapaty S. Are COVID vaccination programmes working? Scientists seek first clues. *Nature* 2021 **; 589**, 504–5. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-021-00140-w
[21] Lumley S F, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, et al. Antibody status and incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in health care workers. *N Engl J Med* 2020; DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2034545
[22] Resik S, Tejeda A, Diaz M, et al. Boosting immune responses following fractional-dose inactivated poliovirus vaccine: a randomized, controlled trial. *The Journal of infectious diseases* 2017, **215**, 175–82.
[23] de Menezes Martins R, Maria de Lourdes S M, de Lima S M B Duration of post-vaccination immunity to yellow fever in volunteers eight years after a dose-response study. *Vaccine* 2018; **36**, 4112–7.
[24] Matrajt L, Eaton J, Leung T, Brown ER. Vaccine optimization for COVID-19: who to vaccinate first? *medRxiv* 2020; DOI: 10.1101/2020.08.14.20175257
[25] Meehan MT, Cocks DG, Caldwell JM, et al. Age-targeted dose allocation can halve COVID-19 vaccine requirements. *medRxiv2020*; DOI: 10.1101/2020.10.08.20208108
[26] Brüningk SC, Juliane Klatt J, Stange M, et al. Determinants of SARS-CoV-2 transmission to guide vaccination strategy in a city. *medRxiv* 2020.12.15.20248130; DOI: 10.1101/2020.12.15.20248130

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[27] Sahin U, Muik A, Vogler I, et al. BNT162b2 induces SARS-CoV-2-neutralising antibodies and T cells in humans. *medRxiv*. 2020; DOI: doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.09.20245175.

[28] Wu K, Werner AP, Moliva JI, et al. mRNA-1273 vaccine induces neutralizing antibodies against spike mutants from global SARS-CoV-2 variants. *medRxiv* 2020: DOI:10.1101/2021.01.25.427948

[29] Faria NR, Morales Claro I, Candido D, et al, on behalf of CADDE Genomic Network. Genomic characterisation of an emergent SARS-CoV-2 lineage in Manaus: preliminary findings. Retrieved Jan 26,2021 on from https://virological.org/t/genomic-characterisation-of-an-emergent-sars-cov-2-lineage-in-manaus-preliminary-findings/586

[30] Kennedy DA, Read AF. Why the evolution of vaccine resistance is less of a concern than the evolution of drug resistance. *PNAS*. 2018; **115**:12878–86.

[31] Callow KA, Parry HF, M. Sergeant M, Tyrrell DAJ. The time course of the immune response to experimental coronavirus infection of man. *Epidemiol. Infect.* 1990; **105**, 435–46

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Research in Context**

Evidence before this study

As source of demographics of Europe, we used the official EU Eurostat repository. For epidemiology of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Johns Hopkins University CSSE dataset and the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control situation dashboard were used. For immunogenicity of the Moderna vaccine, PubMed was used to identify the published data related to "mRNA-1273"; a Bing search retrieved an additional presentation slide set from Moderna about its testing pipeline. Vaccine supply limitations are amply referred to in official statements published by the media outlets. Efficacy for the Moderna vaccine at regular dose is 95·6% (95% CI, 90·6-97·9) for those up to 64 years and 86·4% (95% CI, 61·4-95·2%) for those above, as reported in the pivotal phase 3 publication. Immunogenicity data are given in the table.

Added value of this study

Using an epidemic model initialized with EU-wide population, Covid-19 case and death data from mid-January 2021, alternative, up to now unexplored vaccination strategies were defined and compared to the currently preferred approach that consists of initially focussing vaccination on the elderly because vaccine supplies are insufficient for a broader initial use. The study addressed several alternative vaccination strategy scenarios, in particular the use of a reduced vaccine dose in the group that showed the strongest immune response to vaccination, namely those < 65 years.

Implications of all the available evidence

Vaccination, combined with societal measures up to lock down, will be the mainstay of mastering the SARS-CoV2 pandemic. The available evidence, including the findings reported here, imply that tailored vaccination schemes adapted to the specific characteristics of the vaccine, the demographics and the immune response of population subgroups have a large potential for reducing case numbers and deaths in Europe.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# Supplementary material

## Model construction

The model has discrete structure with daily assessment for 100 consecutive days.
It is initialized with the population size of the European Union split in two age segments, ≤ 64 years ("young") and >64 years("old"), using the daily infection rate and the cumulative number of infections documented in mid-January 2021.

Contact modelling between persons assumes that a "young" person has 80% of its social encounters with the "young" and 20% with the "old", while "old" persons have 50% of its social encounters with the "old". "Risk contacts" are defined as the proportion of encounters (relative to day 1) of noninfected persons with persons newly infected within the past 7 days, and "Semi-Risk contacts" are defined as the proportion of encounters of immune (natural or post vaccination) persons with newly infected persons, using separate computation for each age group. Daily contact frequency is conservatively chosen as equal in both groups. Selecting larger contact numbers in the young would further underline the key findings of the study.

The number of new infections for is computed as proportional to the risk contacts, plus the semi-risk contacts scaled by the degree of immunity (i.e., effectivity of the vaccination for this group, or natural immunity). The infectious window is on day 1 to 7 after infection.
The number of deaths was modeled as proportional to the number of new infections, with a time lag of 14 days.

1 million vaccine full vaccine sets (2*100 µg) per day are used. In the different scenarios, they are either applied as 1 million full vaccinations of the >64 year old person per day in the standard vaccination strategy until day 65% of the elderly population is vaccinated, followed by 1 million full vaccinations per day in the young. In the other scenarios, daily 500'000 vaccinations are performed in the elderly and 2 million vaccinations at quarter dose in the young in the adaptive scheme, or 4 million vaccinations at quarter dose limited to the young, or 1 million vaccinations at full dose limited to the young, respectively. Vaccinated persons became protected against infection on day 10, to a degree corresponding to the level of immunity conferred by the given vaccine dose and age group as described in the methods paragraph.

Counts of population, newly infected, infectious, immune, susceptible, vaccinated persons and deaths were updated daily.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.29.21250747; this version posted February 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# GATHER checklist of information that should be included in reports of global health estimates

| Item number | Checklist item |
|---|---|
| **Objectives and funding** | |
| 1 | Define the indicator(s), populations (including age, sex, and geographic entities), and time period(s) for which estimates were made. OK(methods) |
| 2 | List the funding sources for the work. OK(title page) |
| **Data inputs** | |
| *For all data inputs from multiple sources that are synthesised as part of the study:* | |
| 3 | Describe how the data were identified and how the data were accessed: OK(methods,research in context block) |
| 4 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Identify all ad-hoc exclusions. |
| 5 | Provide information about all included data sources and their main characteristics. (not applicable)<br>For each data source used, report reference information or contact name/institution, population represented, data collection method, year(s) of data collection, sex and age range, diagnostic criteria or measurement method, and sample size, as relevant. OK(methods,research in context block) |
| 6 | Identify and describe any categories of input data that have potentially important biases (eg, based on characteristics listed in item 5).OK(age groupe differences in figure) |
| *For data inputs that contribute to the analysis but were not synthesised as part of the study:* | |
| 7 | Describe and give sources for any other data inputs.(not applicable) |
| *For all data inputs:* | |
| 8 | Provide all data inputs in a file format from which data can be efficiently extracted (eg, a spreadsheet rather than a PDF), including all relevant meta-data listed in item 5. OK(data inputs referenced data respositories in extractable format)<br>For any data inputs that cannot be shared because of ethical or legal reasons, such as third-party ownership, provide a contact name or the name of the institution that retains the right to the data.(not applicable) |
| **Data analysis** | |
| 9 | Provide a conceptual overview of the data analysis method.(OK, in methods and supplement) A diagram may be helpful. |
| 10 | Provide a detailed description of all steps of the analysis, including mathematical formulae. This description should cover, as relevant, data cleaning, data pre-processing, data adjustments and weighting of data sources, and mathematical or statistical model(s). OK(in methods and supplement) |
| 11 | Describe how candidate models were evaluated and how the final model(s) were selected. (OK, in methods, supplement and figure) |
| 12 | Provide the results of an evaluation of model performance, if done, as well as the results of any relevant sensitivity analysis. OK (in results) |
| 13 | Describe methods of calculating uncertainty of the estimates. State which sources of uncertainty were, and were not, accounted for in the uncertainty analysis. OK(uncertainity is given as confidence interval for input data) |
| 14 | State how analytical or statistical source code used to generate estimates can be accessed. OK(data sharing statement) |
| **Results and discussion** | |
| 15 | Provide published estimates in a file format from which data can be efficiently extracted.OK(data sharing statement) |
| 16 | Report a quantitative measure of the uncertainty of the estimates (eg, uncertainty intervals).(not applicable) |
| 17 | Interpret results in light of existing evidence. If updating a previous set of estimates, describe the reasons for changes in estimates. OK(discussion section) |
| 18 | Discuss limitations of the estimates. Include a discussion of any modelling assumptions or data limitations that affect interpretation of the estimates. OK (limitation section) |