The role of connectivity on COVID-19 preventive approaches

V. Miró Pina[†1,2,3], J. Nava-Trejo[†3], A. Tóbiás[4], E. Nzabarushimana[5], A. Gonzalez-Casanova[*††3], I. Gonzalez-Casanova[††5] .

Affiliations:

[1]Centre for Genomic Regulation (CRG), The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Dr. Aiguader 88, Barcelona 08003, Spain

[2]Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Barcelona, Spain

[3]National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM)

[4]Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

[5]Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana, USA

*Correspondence to: adriangcs@matem.unam.mx or inegonza@iu.edu

[†]Both contributed equally and should be considered first authors.

[††]Both should be considered senior authors.

Abstract

Preventive and modelling approaches to address the COVID-19 pandemic have been primarily based on the age or occupation, and often disregard the importance of the population contact structure and individual connectivity. To address this gap, we developed models that first incorporate the role of heterogeneity and connectivity and then can be expanded to make assumptions about demographic characteristics. Results demonstrate that variations in the number of connections of individuals within a population modify the impact of public health interventions such vaccination approaches. We conclude that the most effective vaccination strategy will vary depending on the underlying contact structure of individuals within a population and on timing of the interventions.

Introduction

The Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), responsible for the coronavirus infectious disease COVID-19, has infected over 116 million and caused more than 2.5 million deaths globally. [1, 2] It continues to spread in most countries despite the wide range of preventive approaches that have been deployed.

In the absence of effective vaccines, country-level responses ranged from strict and prolonged lockdowns aimed at completely stopping the transmission of the virus, to attempts to achieve natural herd immunity by allowing a substantial proportion of the population to get infected. [3] Even with new evidence suggesting that heterogeneity in age and social connectivity reduces the proportion of individuals that need to be infected to reach herd immunity, the human cost of this approach is unacceptable from a public health perspective and effective immunisation of the

population remains the only viable approach to reach herd immunity. [4] Now that effective vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 have been approved, it is imperative to identify prioritisation strategies that maximise the impact of the limited doses available to reach herd immunity with the minimum loss of human life. [5]

Most countries have laid out vaccination strategies that prioritise healthcare workers, followed by the elderly (especially those residing in long-term care settings), or essential workers (e.g., teachers, those working in food production), and then age groups from older to younger. [5-8] This prioritisation of older populations is based on disease severity and higher risk of death of COVID-19 among this group. However, another popular prioritisation strategy - that has been shown to be effective for influenza - is to begin with younger individuals to create an immune shelter around those most vulnerable. [9] Beubar et al. [10] evaluated these two strategies in different contexts and demonstrated that, in most scenarios, years of life lost were minimised by strategies that prioritised adults over 60 years, even as incidence was minimised when younger adults were prioritised. The exceptions to that rule were under low community transmission (basic reproductive number - R_0 = 1.15 vs 1.5) or when the efficacy of the vaccine was significantly lower among older populations; in these cases, prioritising adults between 20-49 years resulted in the greatest reductions in mortality. A limitation of previous studies modelling different vaccine allocation strategies has been that connectivity has been directly linked with age. While dividing the population in age groups is a practical and actionable solution for vaccine prioritisation, it has the limitation of being a social construct with artificial cutoffs, which can sometimes mask the important role of the underlying contact structure.

Another challenge estimating the potential impact of COVID-19 preventive approaches has been that traditionally epidemiological models have depicted populations and epidemics as homogeneous [4], however the spread of COVID-19 has been characterized by a high variance in its reproductive number (R_t) which leads to a pattern of super-connected individuals being responsible for most infections. [11, 12] This represents a major deviation from how influenza, which has a smaller R_t variance, spreads and requires adjustments to traditional models. Hence, the aim of this study was to estimate the potential role of individual connectivity and heterogeneity on the COVID-19 epidemic, and to identify the vaccination strategies that minimise infection and maximise death based on the underlying contact structure of the population.

Methods

We used a model that focuses on the interactions that infectious individuals have during the period when they are contagious. It is a middle-ground approach between agent-based [13] and mean-field [14] models, in the sense that we do not model every interaction that occurs in the population, as an agent-based model would, but we keep some randomness in the interactions instead relying on averages, which is one limitation of mean-field models. We consider a random graph of interactions, in which connections between nodes (i.e., individuals) represent interactions during the infectivity period (which we will call “risky interactions” or “risky contacts”). In other words, we first choose at random the interactions individuals will have if

they become infected. After setting up the underlying graph, we spread the infection on top in the form of a traditional SIR model, and let the infection spread like a contact process on top of the graph.

In order to assess how the contact structure of the population can affect the dynamics of an epidemics, we compared two types of populations, a homogeneous one, where the number of contacts had lower variability among individuals (modelled by an Erdős-Rényi graph - ER) and another one that has a higher variance in the number of contacts of each individual (modelled by a graph with power-law degree distribution - PL). Vertices of the graph correspond to individuals and edges to risky contacts between individuals during the time that one of them is infectious.

The degree distributions of both graphs are shown in Figure 1 and a visualisation of their structure (with small N) is shown in Supplementary Figure S. A detailed description of the construction of the graphs is presented next.

Interaction graphs

The Erdős-Rényi graph is one of the most classical random network models. [15] In a graph with N vertices, for any pair of vertices there exists an edge with probability $q = \frac{44}{N}$, independently of each other. Hence, the number of connections per individual is binomially distributed with parameters N and q, which has mean $Nq = e$ and variance $Nq(1-q)$.

To construct a graph with power-law degrees, we follow the method proposed by Qiao et al.. Power-law [16] with exponent γ roughly means that the probability that a given vertex in the network has k connections (in other words, it has degree k) behaves like $k^{-\gamma}$ for large k if the total population size is large enough compared to k. [16] To construct this graph, to each individual i we assigned a random number δ_i, which is an exponentially distributed random variable of parameter λ (this parameter is related to the exponent γ), and we fix a positive parameter b (this parameter is related to the average number of connections per individual). Each pair of individuals (i, j) has risky interaction with probability $b^{1+\delta_i+\delta_j}$. With this construction, we have $\gamma = 1 + \lambda / ln\left(E\left[b^{1+\delta_i+\delta_j}\right]\right)$, where E denotes expectation. In order to have e=44, we choose b such that $E\left[b^{1+\delta_i+\delta_j}\right] = \frac{e}{N}$. To do so, we use the moment generating function of an exponential random variable. We need to choose b such that:

$E\left[b^{1+\delta_i+\delta_j}\right] = bE\left[b^{\delta_i}\right]E\left[b^{\delta_j}\right] = b\left(\frac{\lambda}{(\lambda - lnb)}\right)^2 = \frac{e}{N}$. For this study, λ was set to 3, leading to γ= 0.307.

Infection dynamics

After simulating the structure of the interactions in the population, we simulate the spread of the infection using a SIR model. It is a continuous-time Markov chain where individuals can be in

each of four states: Susceptible, Infected, Recovered or Dead. At time 0, we start with one infected individual chosen at random (the rest are all susceptible). Infected individuals can transmit the disease to susceptible individuals (if they have a risky interaction). At the end of the infectious period, the infected individual can either recover or die. We assume that recovered individuals cannot be reinfected (See Supplementary Figure S2 and Supplementary Movies).

In more detail, for each individual that gets infected (the 'focal' individual) the duration of the infectivity period is an exponential random variable with parameter $T_r = 10$. This means that the expected duration of the infectivity period is 10 days.

During this infectious period, he can infect each of his contacts with probability P_i. The way we implement this in a Markovian way is by assigning to each of his neighbors an exponential random variable of parameter T_i. If one (or several) of these variables is smaller than the infectivity period, the focal individual transmits the disease to the corresponding neighbor. All these exponential random variables are assumed to be independent. The parameter T_i is chosen in such a way that the probability of infecting each of the susceptible neighbors P_i is 0.05. To do so, we use a classical result on the minimum of two exponential random variables: $P_i = \frac{T_i}{(T_i + T_r)}$.

At the end of the infectious period, with some probability P_d the focal individual dies and with probability $1 - P_d$ it recovers. The probability of death was initially set to 0.01 for all individuals.

The process is simulated using a Gillespie algorithm. Simulations were performed in R and code is available at our git repository (see Data Availability).

Vaccination strategies

In our model, vaccination corresponds to reducing the number of vertices with certain probability based on the effectiveness of the vaccine (efficacy ϵ). Each vaccination strategy corresponds to a way of subsampling D individuals in a population of size N. We implemented 4 different vaccination strategies that correspond to different ways of choosing the sample of individuals to vaccinate.

- "Uniform": D individuals uniformly selected at random for vaccination.
- "Most connected": D individuals selected in order from most connected (those with the highest degree) to less connected.
- "Neighbour": Randomly selected one individual and vaccinated a connection (i.e., one that is connected to the first one by an edge) also selected at random. This was repeated until D individuals were selected and vaccinated, ensuring that tendentially, individuals with a high number of connections get vaccinated. This is a real-life approximation following an approach that has been used to identify and vaccinate the most connected individuals.
- "Among most connected": Subdivided the population into two groups of equal size: the "most connected" (those having the highest degree) and the "least connected" and chose D individuals uniformly at random among the most connected. This is a real-life

approximation where groups which tend to be highly connected (i.e., healthcare workers) are prioritised for vaccination.

- "Among least connected": Subdivided the population into two groups of equal size: "most connected" (those having the highest degree) and the "least connected" and chose D individuals uniformly at random among the least connected.
- "Least connected" :D individuals selected in order from least connected (those with the lowest degree) to more connected.

We tested two variants of each of these strategies:

- Strategy S: selecting only among the susceptible individuals.
- Strategy SIR: selecting among the susceptible, infected or recovered (but not among the dead).

If vaccination is conducted at time 0, both strategies are equivalent because everyone is susceptible.

As a simplifying assumption, we considered that vaccinated individuals do not contribute to disease spread. It was assumed that the vaccine had an effectiveness of . This means that among the *D* chosen individuals, only ϵD are effectively deleted from the graph. We tested three different vaccination starting times where vaccination started after the cumulative proportion of infected individuals reached 0%, 10% or 30%. Most models were conducted with vaccine doses available to vaccinate 25% of the population, but in an extended model we tested the impact of different interventions when the number of doses was doubled but the effectiveness *(ϵ)* was decreased from 90 to 50% to mimic the dose sparing strategies that have been applied in some countries.

As mentioned before, the probability of death was originally set uniformly to $p_d = 0.01$, thus the number of infected is directly correlated with the number of dead. In extended models that assumed that old individuals were less connected and more vulnerable than younger individuals, we assigned a probability of death of $p_d = 0.07$ to the 17% least connected and $p_d = 0.005$ for the rest. This percentage corresponds to the proportion of individuals older than 65 in Utrecht and the probabilities are in line with the case fatality rate of COVID-19 for different age groups. [17]

<u>Choice of the parameters</u>

Since the simulations are computationally intensive and we wanted to test as many scenarios as possible, we chose a population size of 20000 (N). We also assessed if the sample size affected the results from the models with sample sizes varying from 5000 to 60000 (Supplementary Figure S2). We see that the fraction of infected individuals seem to reach a stationary behavior for large N, which is a good indicator that, qualitatively, a larger population should behave similarly to our small world simulations.

The average number of risky interactions (e) was set to 44 following a study made in the city of Utrecht, Netherlands. [17] In this study, individuals of different age groups reported the number of people with whom they had a conversation of at least 10 minutes during a week, which we

consider is a proxy for the number of risky interactions. We took the average of these numbers (according to the population census).

Repeatability and sample size

The results presented consider independent realisations of the process. In a small number of simulations, the epidemic died out after infecting less than 0.5% of the population. These simulations were excluded from the results (because they are not consistent with the case of COVID-19). Results presented show the mean and dispersion of 30 repetitions conditioned on infecting a macroscopic fraction of the population (>0.5%). For the purposes of this analysis we considered interventions significantly different if over 95% of the simulations did not overlap.

Results

Association of connectivity with time to infection

In the first model assessing the relationship between connectivity and time to infection, under the parameters described in the methods section (N=20000, e=44, probability of infecting a contact per interaction =0.05), we computed the basic reproduction number R_0 as the expected number of cases directly generated by one infected individual if all his neighbours are susceptible, i.e. $R_0 = e.p_i = 2.2$. The effective reproduction number R_t (estimated from the simulations using 14 days rolling windows) varied from 1.7 at the beginning of the outbreak to 0.9 towards the end. Highly connected individuals tend to get infected early during the epidemic, while less connected individuals get infected at random times throughout the epidemic. This is especially clear for heterogeneous contact structures, where the average number of risky connections per individual at early stages is significantly higher and decreases with time (Figure 1).

Vaccination strategies based on contact structure.

In the simulations with doses available for 25% of the population, vaccinating the most connected among the susceptible always resulted in the smallest proportion of infected individuals independently of heterogeneity or timing of the intervention, although the effect is larger in the heterogeneous graph (Figure 2). In models where susceptibility status is not considered (SIR vaccination), the benefits of targeting the most connected individuals decreased when more people became infected before the intervention. Both in heterogeneous and homogeneous graphs, vaccinating uniformly performed similarly to vaccinating the most connected when the intervention started after 30% of the population had already been infected (Figure 2).

Similarly, if the vaccine intervention was implemented early in the epidemic, when only 10% of the population or less was infected, vaccinating the highly connected individuals first resulted in the greatest decline in the speed of propagation (Figure 3, top panels). However, when the intervention was implemented after 30% of the population had already been infected, the decrease in the speed of propagation was much smaller (Figure 3, bottom panels).

Both the neighbour vaccination approach and vaccinating amongst the most connected were less effective preventing infection compared to the most connected approach. In the more homogeneous graphs, when the intervention was implemented no later than when 10% of the population had been infected, vaccinating amongst the more connected was significantly better than the neighbour and the uniform approaches. In these same graphs, when the intervention started after 30% of the population had been infected, the only factor that had a significant impact was the targeting of susceptible individuals. Conversely, in the heterogeneous graphs, when vaccination started after 10% had been infected, the neighbour approach performed better than vaccinating amongst the most connected but was similarly effective to the uniform and slightly less effective than vaccinating amongst the most connected when 30% of the population had already been infected (Figure 4).

Dose sparing under different vaccination strategies.

In the case of a homogeneous population (ER), both strategies yield similar results with respect to the total number of infected individuals, the fatality rate, or number of infected individuals at the same time. However, in the case of a heterogeneous population (PL), when vaccinating the most connected individuals administering the two doses to less people was a more efficient strategy since it produced a smaller number of infected individuals in total. For the uniform strategy, the way of administering the doses made no difference, and for the sampling among the most connected strategy dose sparing resulted in a slightly lower number of infected. (Figure 5).

Vaccination strategies, connectivity, and mortality.

In models where number of connections were linked to fatality rate, in the homogeneous case (ER), Uniform and Most connected strategies performed similarly, preventing significantly more deaths than the control. However, vaccinating the least connected (which were also the most vulnerable) was a worse strategy, preventing significantly less deaths than the control. These results were independent on the time of the intervention. In a heterogeneous population (PL), Most connected (S and SIR) were the strategies that allowed to prevent more deaths. Uniform and Least connected strategies performed equally well, preventing significantly less deaths than Most connected S but slightly more deaths than the control. When vaccination started after 10 or 30% of the population had been infected, Most connected S had an advantage over Most connected SIR, especially in the last case, where Most connected SIR performed similarly to Uniform or Least connected (Figure 6).

Discussion

In this study, we modelled different vaccination strategies based on connectivity and found that the heterogeneity that characterises COVID-19 spreading modified the effectiveness of different vaccine prioritisation approaches. In this heterogeneous context, interventions that prioritise more connected individuals in general performed better at preventing infection and deaths when compared with uniform strategies where vaccines are distributed at random. Conversely, strategies that prioritised the less connected individuals had the worst outcomes even when a

higher fatality rate was assigned to the less connected. Most current strategies begin vaccination with highly connected individuals (healthcare workers, elder populations living in residences or assisted living) but then turn to vaccinate older groups and vulnerable populations which tend to be among the least connected individuals. If in fact more vulnerable individuals are less connected, current vaccination strategies that prioritise older and more vulnerable individuals over younger and more connected might be suboptimal to address the COVID-19 pandemic.

Another important result is the importance of intervention timing during the history of the epidemic. Especially under heterogeneous contact structures that are similar to the COVID-19 spread pattern, highly connected individuals tend to get infected very early and drive the early stages of the contingency. This finding highlights the importance of considering what proportion of the population has already been exposed to the virus and potentially developed some immunity at the time when the vaccine intervention is implemented. We observed that in the absence of susceptibility-based targeting, interventions prioritising highly connected individuals were more effective early in the epidemic. Others have highlighted the importance of antibody testing to prevent infection and death, [10, 18] and our results further support this approach especially when targeting highly connected individuals late in an epidemic when a high proportion has already been infected. The proportion of healthcare workers with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies ranges between 2-50% in different settings, [19] based on our results, targeting the available doses based on previous immunity could maximise its impact especially in settings where seroprevalence is high.

A challenge of these connectivity-based strategies is that identifying the most connected individuals in real life is not easy. To address this, we tested two modified versions of the “most connected” vaccination strategy. The first one consists of randomly selecting an individual and then vaccinating a person connected to them (“neighbour”), which biases the selection towards the most connected within a network. For the second one, we tested the approach of dividing the population into two groups based on their number of connections (most connected, and least-connected) and then sampling “among the most connected” group for vaccination. In the heterogeneous infection scenario (PL), vaccinating the most connected remained the most effective approach; however, in most scenarios the “neighbour” and the “among the” approaches also performed better than the uniform approach in most scenarios supporting the targeting of highly-connected individuals as a promising strategy for COVID-19 vaccination. An operationalisation of vaccinating among the most connected would be to prioritise individuals with occupations that require face-to-face interactions, for example factory or warehouse workers, and those in the service industry.

Most of the vaccines that are available for COVID-19 were designed to be administered in two doses (and the efficacy was shown to be over 90%). However, it has been suggested that governments should aim to give as many people as possible a single dose, instead of using half the vaccines currently available on second doses (i.e., dose sparing). [20] The efficacy after a single dose has been estimated to be around 50%. In the case of a heterogeneous population, when vaccinating the most connected individuals, administering the two doses to fewer people was a more effective strategy producing a smaller number of infected individuals in total.

However, when the least connected were prioritised in our models, dose sparing to maximise the number of doses resulted in fewer infections, suggesting that if current strategies that prioritise less connected individuals continue, applying a single dose to more people would be the best approach (although still significantly worse than targeting the most connected individuals or even distributing the vaccine at random).

A criticism of targeting the most connected individuals has been the notion that these tend to be young and less vulnerable, hence we also extended these models to assess their impact on mortality under the assumption that connectivity is inversely associated with fatality. We observed that, when vaccination starts late, vaccinating uniformly reduces the number of deaths with respect to vaccinating the highly connected in the homogeneous connectivity structure (ER). Conversely, in heterogeneous populations, when vaccination started relatively early (after only 10% of the population had been infected) all the strategies targeting more connected individuals performed better than the uniform and there were no significant differences when vaccination started after 30% of the population had already been infected. Uniform approaches have the advantage of being easier to implement and they perform significantly better than targeting less connected individuals, which resulted in the greatest number of deaths. Some counties in the US have started implementing uniform approaches because they originally faced challenges distributing vaccines to older populations first, [21] our results support this vaccination approach over targeting less connected individuals.

A strength of this study is the middle-ground modelling approach between agent-based and mean-field models, that combines the dynamic nature of the first with the computational efficiency of the latter. This is achieved by focusing solely on the interactions that infectious individuals have during the period when they are infectious, a crucial part of the social dynamics of the propagation of the virus. While our method disregards some features of a real society, it allows us to capture the essential differences between homogeneous and heterogeneous contact structures. In this sense, a limitation of these models is that they do not provide quantitative estimates of the exact impact of different interventions, however they provide sound qualitative judgments that allow to rank different vaccination strategies based on number of infections and deaths. Similarly, the graphs used in this study were parameterised based on data from a single study from a European city and have a relatively small sample size compared to most urban areas, however modifying the average number of contacts or the sample size did not modify the conclusions about the best vaccination strategies.

In conclusion, the effectiveness of vaccination strategies depends on the heterogeneity of the contact structure and the specific infection dynamics, it is important to consider COVID-19 vaccine prioritisation based on individuals' connectivity.

Figures



Figure 1.: Two different ways of modelling social interactions. Top panels represent the distribution of the number of risky contacts in the ER and the PL graphs with 20000 individuals. Panels in the middle show a realisation of the SIR process for each of the models. Bottom panels show the number of risky contacts individuals have, as a function of the order in which they are infected (dots show the average over 30 simulations).



Figure 2. Proportion of infected and dead individuals for three vaccination strategies. The plot shows the proportion of infected at the end of the infection for 30 repetitions. The number of doses of the vaccine represents 25% of the population size (N = 20000). Different starting times are shown in the different panels (when 0, 10 and 30% of the individuals have been infected). On the top right panel, when vaccinating the most connected, the epidemic always died out quickly, before infecting at least 50 individuals, which is the minimum required to be considered a successful simulation (see Methods).



Figure 3. Effect of the vaccination strategy on the rank of infection. The dots represent averages over 30 simulations. The number of doses of the vaccine represents 25% of the population size (N= 20000). In these simulations we vaccinate individuals regardless of their status (S, I, R).. Vertical bars indicate the time when the intervention is made.



Figure 4. Proportion of infected and dead individuals for all the vaccination strategies. The plot shows the proportion of infected at the end of the infection for 30 repetitions. The number of doses of the vaccine represents 25% of the population size (N = 20000). Different starting times are shown in the different panels (when 0, 10 and 30% of the individuals have been infected). On the top right panel, when vaccinating the most connected, the epidemic always died out quickly, before infecting at least 50 individuals, which is the minimum required to be considered a successful simulation (see Methods).



Figure 5. Dose sparing. In the top panels, 25% of the population receives two doses of the vaccine (efficacy 90%). In the bottom panels 50% of the population receives a single dose of the vaccine (efficacy 50%). Histograms represent the total number of infected individuals across 30 simulations, for the different vaccination strategies. The time of the vaccination t_V is when the cumulative number of infected individuals reaches 10%.



Figure 6. Proportion of deaths, for an efficacy of 90% and for different values of t_v (top panels vaccination starts at 10% and bottom panels at 30%) The horizontal lines in the middle of the boxes show the mean values among all simulations, the upper and lower edges of the boxes are the quantiles q0.25and q0.75 corresponding to 75% respectively 25%. The vertical lines reach until q0.25-1.5*(q0.75-q0.25) downwards and until q0.75+1.5*(q0.75-q0.25). The points represent outliers (i.e., simulations whose results are atypical).

Data Availability

Code is available at: https://github.com/JulioNava31/The-role-of-connectivity-on-COVID-19-preventive-approaches.

Funding

The authors acknowledge support of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation to the EMBL partnership, the Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa and the CERCA Programme / Generalitat de Catalunya, the Indiana University Bloomington Mexico Gateway and Indiana University UITS Research Technologies computing resources. VMP also acknowledges support of the DGAPA-UNAM postdoctoral program. AGCS acknowledges support from the Mexican science council (CONACYT) grant A1-S-14615. IGC is supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) career development grants HL137338-03S1 and HL126146-02

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Arno Siri-Jégousse, Fabian Freund, Ximena Escalera-Fanjul, Karla Galaviz, Gloria Soberon, Adithya Cattamanchi, April Mohanty and Anarina Murillo for fruitful discussions.

Author contributions

VMP: Investigation, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Validation, Supervision, Writing-Review & Editing; JNT: Formal analysis, Software, Visualization. AT: Methodology, Investigation, Writing-Review & Editing, EN: Software, Formal Analysis, Investigation; ACGS: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing; IGC: Writing – Original Draft, Resources, Supervision. All authors analyzed the results of the simulations and approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of interest statement

Authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Dong, E., H. Du, and L. Gardner, *An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time.* The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2020. **20**(5): p. 533-534.
2. *COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University*. Feb 2, 2021].
3. Alwan, N.A., et al., *Scientific consensus on the COVID-19 pandemic: we need to act now.* The Lancet, 2020. **396**(10260): p. e71-e72.
4. Britton, T., F. Ball, and P. Trapman, *A mathematical model reveals the influence of population heterogeneity on herd immunity to SARS-CoV-2.* Science, 2020. **369**(6505): p. 846.
5. Persad, G., M.E. Peek, and E.J. Emanuel, *Fairly Prioritizing Groups for Access to COVID-19 Vaccines.* JAMA, 2020. **324**(16): p. 1601-1602.
6. *Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation: advice on priority groups for COVID-19 vaccination*. 2020; Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-30-december-2020/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-advice-on-priority-groups-for-covid-19-vaccination-30-december-2020.
7. *COVID-19 vaccination and prioritisation strategies in the EU/EEA*. 2020, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control: Stockholm.
8. Grupo Técnico Asesor de Vacunación, C., *Priorización inicial y consecutiva para la vacunación contra SARS-CoV-2 en la población mexicana. Recomendaciones preliminares.* Salud Pública de México, 2020. **0**(0).

9. Medlock, J. and A.P. Galvani, *Optimizing Influenza Vaccine Distribution.* Science, 2009. **325**(5948): p. 1705.
10. Bubar, K.M., et al., *Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus.* Science, 2021: p. eabe6959.
11. Adam, D.C., et al., *Clustering and superspreading potential of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Hong Kong.* Nature Medicine, 2020. **26**(11): p. 1714-1719.
12. Endo, A., et al., *Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China [version 1; peer review: 1 approved, 1 approved with reservations].* Wellcome Open Research, 2020. **5**(67).
13. Macal, C.M. and M.J. North. *Agent-based modeling and simulation*. in *Proceedings of the 2009 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*. 2009.
14. Sherborne, N., et al., *Mean-field models for non-Markovian epidemics on networks.* Journal of Mathematical Biology, 2018. **76**(3): p. 755-778.
15. A Erdos, P. and A. A Renyi, *On the evolution of random graphs.* J Publ. Math. Inst. Hungary. Acad. Sci., 1960. **5**.
16. Qiao, M., et al., *Adapting Stochastic Block Models to Power-Law Degree Distributions.* IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics, 2019. **49**(2): p. 626-637.
17. Wallinga, J., P. Teunis, and M. Kretzschmar, *Using data on social contacts to estimate age-specific transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents.* Am J Epidemiol, 2006. **164**(10): p. 936-44.
18. Tran, T.N.-A., et al., *Optimal SARS-CoV-2 vaccine allocation using real-time seroprevalence estimates in Rhode Island and Massachusetts.* medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences, 2021: p. 2021.01.12.21249694.
19. Gómez-Ochoa, S.A., et al., *COVID-19 in Health-Care Workers: A Living Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical Characteristics, and Outcomes.* American Journal of Epidemiology, 2021. **190**(1): p. 161-175.
20. Barnabas, R.V. and A. Wald, *A Public Health COVID-19 Vaccination Strategy to Maximize the Health Gains for Every Single Vaccine Dose.* Annals of Internal Medicine, 2021.
21. Romero, S., *Can't Get a Covid Vaccine? In This County, Everybody is Eligible*, in *New York Times*. 2021: New York, USA.

Supplementary Figures



Fig. S1. An Erdős-Rényi graph (left hand side) and a power-law degrees graph (right hand side). For an easy visualisation, the parameters where set to N = 200, e = 12, λ=3.



Fig. S2 Transition rates of our SIR model. Susceptible individuals can become infected with probability P_i if they have an infected neighbour. Infected individuals remain infected for an exponential random time with mean T_r. At the end of this infectious period they can recover with probability $1 - P_d$ or die with probability P_d .



Fig. S3. Infected and recovered curves for population sizes 10 000, 20 000, 30 000, 40 000, 50 000, 60 000 and 70 000. The curves represent the proportion of individuals in each category as functions of time. Each curve corresponds to the mean over 30 repetitions. A, C: Erdős-Rényi graphs, B, D: Power-law degree, A, B: e = 5. C, D: e = 10. The rest of the parameters are p_i= 0.5 and λ =3.



Fig. S4. Effect of the number of doses of the vaccine. Plots show the total number of infected individuals in 30 simulations for the Erdős-Rényi (right) and power-law (left) graphs. From top to bottom we increase the number of individuals that we can vaccinate (10, 25, 50%). The time of vaccination is when the cumulative number of infected reaches 30% of the populations (t_V= 30%)..

Supplementary Materials

Movie S1.

Propagation of the epidemics in an Erdős-Rényi graph. Vertices are coloured depending on the status of the individual they represent. Blue: susceptible, red: infected, green: recovered, black: dead. The edge connecting *i* and *j* is coloured in red when individual *i* infects individual *j*. The numbers that appear at the end are the number of individuals that were infected by each individual.

Movie S2.

Propagation of the epidemics in a power-law degree distribution graph. Vertices are coloured depending on the status of the individual they represent. Blue: susceptible, red: infected, green: recovered, black: dead. The edge connecting *i* and *j* is coloured in red when individual *i* infects individual *j*. The numbers that appear at the end are the number of individuals that were infected by each individual.