The importance of sustained compliance with physical distancing during COVID-19 vaccination rollout

Alexandra Teslya, PhD^{a,1}, Ganna Rozhnova, PhD^{a,b}, Thi Mui Pham^a, Daphne A van Wees, PhD^a, Hendrik Nunner^c, Noortje G Godijk^a, Martin Bootsma, PhD^{a,d}, and Mirjam E Kretzschmar, PhD^a

^a Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^bBiolSI—Biosystems & Integrative Sciences Institute, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal; ^cFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht Utrecht, The Netherlands; ^dFaculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht, Utrecht, Utrecht, Utrecht, Utrecht, Ut

This manuscript was compiled on September 21, 2021

Mass vaccination campaigns against SARS-CoV-2 are ongoing in many countries with increasing vaccination coverage enabling relax-2 ation of lockdowns. Vaccination rollout is frequently supplemented 3 with advisory from public health authorities for continuation of phys-4 ical distancing measures. Compliance with these measures is wan-5 ing while more transmissible virus variants such as Alpha (B.1.1.7) 6 and Delta (B.1.617.2) have emerged. In this work, we considered a 7 population where the waning of compliance depends on vaccine cov-8 erage. We used a SARS-CoV-2 transmission model which captures 9 the feedback between compliance, infection incidence, and vaccina-10 tion coverage to investigate factors that contribute to the increase 11 of the prevalence of infection during the initial stages of the vacci-12 nation rollout as compared to no vaccination scenario. We analysed 13 how the vaccine uptake rate affects cumulative numbers of new in-14 fections three and six months after the start of vaccination. Our 15 results suggest that the combination of fast waning compliance in 16 non-vaccinated population, low compliance in vaccinated population 17 and more transmissible virus variants may result in a higher cumula-18 tive number of new infections than in a situation without vaccination. 19 20 These adverse effects can be alleviated if vaccinated individuals do not revert to pre-pandemic contact rates, and if non-vaccinated indi-21 viduals remain compliant with physical distancing measures. Both 22 require convincing, clear and appropriately targeted communication 23 strategies by public health authorities. 24

Covid-19 | Vaccine | Mathematical Model | Behavioural Response | Non-pharmaceutical Interventions | Physical Distancing Measures

ore than one year after the outbreak of COVID-19 was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation 2 (1), the state of the pandemic in many countries around the 3 world remained dire, with hospitalisations and death tolls 4 mounting. Amid the second wave that started in fall 2020 5 (2-4), more transmissible (5-7) SARS-CoV-2 variants emerged (e.g., Alpha (B.1.1.7), Beta (B.1.351), and P.1 (Gamma) (8, 9), causing many countries to reinforce physical distancing measures in order to maintain healthcare capacities and to prevent deaths caused by COVID-19. Since then, an even more 10 infectious virus variant, Delta, emerged, became dominant 11 in Europe (10) and the US (11), and caused new pandemic 12 waves. These events underscored that the physical distancing 13 measures, while effective in significantly reducing SARS-CoV-14 2 transmission during the first wave (12-16), alone are not 15 sufficient to limit SARS-CoV-2 transmission and to eradicate 16 the need for future lockdowns, and further measures such as 17 rigorous vaccination campaigns are required. 18

¹⁹ Fortunately, on the eve of spread of the Alpha variant in

Europe, COVID-19 vaccines developed by BioNTech/Pfizer, 20 Moderna, AstraZeneca, and Johnson & Johnson (Janssen) (17) 21 were approved by EMA, fuelling hopes for the end of lock-22 down periods and relaxation of physical distancing measures. 23 Phase 3 randomised clinical trials reported vaccine efficacies for 24 preventing laboratory-confirmed symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 25 infection of 92% for BioNTech/Pfizer (18), 94.1% for Mod-26 erna (19), and at least 62% for AstraZeneca (20). The data 27 from the vaccination campaign in Israel supports the results 28 of the randomised trials for BioNTech/Pfizer vaccine report-29 ing that the effectiveness of this vaccine against symptomatic 30 disease is 94% (21). On 29 March 2021 CDC released a report 31 that the Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna vaccines have 80% 32 effectiveness in preventing COVID-19 following 14 days or 33 more after the first dose, but before the second dose, and 34 90% effectiveness following 14 or more days since the second 35 dose (22). These findings are consistent with earlier reports 36 that the three vaccines (Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna and As-37 traZeneca) have some effectiveness in blocking SARS-CoV-2 38 transmission (23–25). Studies based on data collected in Is-39 rael estimated that the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine 40 developed by Pfizer/BioNTech reduced the acquisition rate for 41 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection by 80% (26) up to 95%42 (27). Similarly high efficacy against infection acquisition were 43

Significance Statement

SARS-CoV-2 vaccination campaigns are in progress in many countries around the world. As the vaccination coverage increases, the compliance with physical distancing measures aimed at reducing virus transmission may decline. Using a socio-epidemiological model we identify factors that are the drivers of increased transmission when SARS-CoV-2 prevalence is higher than the projected prevalence without vaccination. To maximize the benefits of vaccination campaigns, compliance in vaccinated and non-vaccinated groups should be targeted prioritizing one group over the other depending on the vaccination rate, the efficacy of vaccine in blocking the infection, and the circulating variant.

The authors declare no competing interests.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: a.i.teslya@umcutrecht.nl

AT and MEK conceived the study. AT, MEK, GR, TMP, MCJB developed the model with input from DvW. MEK, AT, GR conceptualized simulation scenarios. AT implemented the model, carried out all model analyses. All authors participated in model outputs discussions. AT prepared figures with input from MEK, GR, and TMP. MEK and AT interpreted the results. DvW, HN, NGG performed relevant literature overview. HN, DvW, NGG wrote the first version of parts of the manuscript. AT, MEK, GR and TMP wrote the final version of the manuscript. All authors contributed to editing of the final version of the manuscript, and gave the final approval for publication.

- ⁴⁴ reported for the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine developed
- 45 by Moderna, NIAID (28). For the adenovirus Ad26.COV2.S
- 46 COVID-19 vaccine developed by Janssen Pharmaceutical Com-
- ⁴⁷ panies the efficacy in preventing infection with SARS-CoV-2
- is reported to be 76% (29). These results were estimated from
- ⁴⁹ data collected between December 2020 and April 2021 in the
- ⁵⁰ USA. During this period, the original variant and the Alpha
- variant (B.1.1.7) were the dominant circulating variants.
- Since then, a new, more infectious variant, Delta (B.1.617.2), 52 has emerged and became dominant in many European coun-53 tries (10) and the USA (11). A recent study based on data 54 from Israel estimated a significant reduction of BNT162b2 55 efficacy for the Delta variant in preventing infection, which 56 was 64% after two doses (30). This estimate was supported 57 by another report based on the data in a highly vaccinated 58 health system workforce of California San Diego Health (31). 59 The understanding of how the deployment of these vaccines 60 can impact transmission is complicated by the emergence of 61 these new variants (32-34). Thus, to reduce the death toll and 62 the burden on healthcare system, as well as to slow down the 63 appearance rate of antigenically relevant mutations that may 64 escape protection conferred by existing vaccines, a swift and 65 rigorous vaccination campaign seems of utmost importance. 66 Vaccination rollout, however, faces multiple challenges. Pub-67 lic health services may be confronted with structural and 68 logistical obstacles (e.g., sufficient supply size, capacity to 69 administer shots (35-37) illustrated by diverging vaccination 70 rates among different countries (38). Another factor that 71
- may affect vaccination rollout is vaccine acceptance (36) that 72 varies greatly across countries from 23.6% in Kuwait to 97% 73 in Ecuador (39, 40). Mass vaccination may also have undesir-74 able consequences such as reducing compliance with physical 75 distancing measures. For example, vaccinated people may 76 increase their contact rate as they perceive COVID-19 to pose 77 a lower risk for them. On the other hand, the non-vaccinated 78 individuals may also become less compliant with the physical 79 distancing measures, relying on decreased transmission due to 80 81 the growing vaccination coverage. Thus, both vaccinated and non-vaccinated people may be less compliant with physical 82 distancing measures due to factors such as lack of motivation 83 or lack of knowledge about the necessity to maintain compli-84 ance post-vaccination. Hence, compliance may decline with 85 increasing vaccination coverage. A number of modeling studies 86 have shown that the feedback between the epidemic dynamics 87 and human behaviour has an important role in the disease 88 transmission (41-43). In an earlier modeling study (43), we 89 showed that relaxation of compliance with physical distancing 90 measures beyond a threshold may cause a significant increase 91 in new infections and hospitalisations. This concern is espe-92
- cially relevant at the start of the vaccination campaign, when
 vaccination coverage is still low.
- We developed a socio-epidemiological model (Figure -1) for 95 96 SARS-CoV-2 transmission to investigate the effects of waning of compliance with physical distancing measures on the dynam-97 ics of SARS-CoV-2 transmission as vaccine is rolled out in the 98 population. The transmission dynamics is modelled through 99 a susceptible-exposed-infectious-recovered (SEIR) framework. 100 The vaccine works as all-or-nothing conferring perfect protec-101 tion to a fraction of susceptible individuals who receive it. The 102 vaccine delivered to individuals in other disease stages has no 103 effect. 104

We assume that the vaccination rollout takes place during a 105 government-imposed lockdown, whereupon many public venues 106 are closed or operate at a reduced capacity, thus limiting the 107 average number of contacts. Additionally, the government 108 may issue a set of recommendations with respect to physical 109 distancing. Compliance with these recommendations is cap-110 tured by a reduction in the daily number of contacts relative 111 to the pre-pandemic level of contacts. The non-vaccinated 112 population is divided into individuals who can be more compli-113 ant (henceforth referred to as "compliant") and less compliant 114 ("non-compliant") to measures. The reduction in contacts is 115 larger for compliant and smaller for non-compliant populations. 116 On the other hand, we assume that vaccinated individuals 117 perceive themselves protected from COVID-19 and therefore, 118 are no longer compelled to comply with physical distancing 119 measures. Thus they are not affected by the compliance 120 acquisition-loss process and increase their contact rate above 121 that of non-compliant individuals, thereby returning to nearly 122 pre-pandemic level of contacts. Non-vaccinated individuals 123 can move between compliant and non-compliant modes, and 124 the rates of moving depend on the state of the epidemic and 125 on vaccination coverage. Specifically, more individuals become 126 compliant with physical distancing measures as the incidence 127 of SARS-CoV-2 infection cases increases and lose compliance 128 faster as the proportion of vaccinated individuals grows (see 129 Methods). 130

We considered a baseline scenario without vaccination and 131 several vaccination scenarios. To observe the full spectrum of 132 possible scenarios, we sampled vaccination rate on a wide range, 133 which was based on the observations during the first six months 134 of the vaccination rollout in European countries and Israel (38). 135 Further, we considered scenarios for three types of SARS-CoV-136 2 variants. The first variant has the transmission potential of 137 the original variant that was circulating in Europe prior to fall 138 2020. The second variant is a more transmissible, Alpha-like 139 variant (B.1.1.7), that spread in many European countries 140 during the winter of 2020/2021 and became dominant in the 141 spring of 2021 (44). Finally, we also considered the dynamics 142 of a "hyper-contagious" Delta-like variant (B.1.617.2), which, 143 as of August 2021, became the dominant strain in Europe 144 (10). We investigated the impact of compliance with physical 145 distancing measures on the numbers of infected, vaccinated and 146 compliant individuals over the course of the vaccination rollout. 147 We also compared the cumulative numbers of new infections 148 after three and six months into the vaccination programme to 149 the numbers without vaccination. We tested the robustness of 150 our findings to the values we chose for the initial conditions 151 and parameters by performing multivariate sensitivity analyses 152 (see Figure 5 and Supplementary materials). The values for 153 initial conditions and parameters were sampled continuously. 154

Next, we considered the potential effects of two interventions 155 aimed at improving compliance. The first intervention is tar-156 geted at people who have not been vaccinated yet and aims 157 at keeping their compliance with physical distancing at the 158 level of prior to vaccination rollout. The second intervention 159 is targeted at people who have been vaccinated and aims at 160 keeping their contact rates low. We also considered a com-161 bined intervention where both interventions are implemented 162 simultaneously. 163

Finally, we considered the possibility that in the case of a sharp rise in prevalence which may occur due to the decline of 165

compliance with physical distancing measures, the government 166 may impose additional physical distancing rules to reduce 167 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. To wit, in the Netherlands, follow-168 ing a sharp increase in the number of detected infections in 169 170 June of 2021, the government imposed additional measures 171 which aimed to reduce infection transmission and which were in effect for nearly a month (July 10, 2021 to August 13, 2021) 172 (45). We have investigated outcomes of the combination of 173 the vaccination rollout with a lockdown which initiates when 174 the prevalence of infectious cases surpasses a threshold. 175

176 Results

Compliance and vaccination rollout. To model the transmis-177 sion dynamics of each of the SARS-CoV-2 virus variants that 178 we consider, the model was calibrated to the state of the epi-179 demic and the level of compliance with physical distancing 180 measures prior to the start of vaccination in the Netherlands 181 in November 2020. The size of the population that recovered 182 from SARS-CoV-2 infection was set based on seroprevalence 183 data from the serological study in an age-stratified and region-184 ally weighted representative sample of the Dutch population 185 (46, 47). The estimated seroprevalence was 4% in June/July 186 of 2020 (46) and increased to 14% in February 2021 (47). To 187 account for the effects of the second wave until the start of 188 vaccination (taken in the simulations to be November 2020) 189 we fixed the recovered population at 8%. The proportion of 190 compliant population was set at 65% using the study on behav-191 ioral measures and well-being conducted in the Netherlands 192 by the National Institute for Public Health and the Environ-193 ment (RIVM) (48). We have investigated the sensitivity of the 194 outcomes that we collected to the assumed initial conditions. 195 We have assumed that the baseline epidemiological dynamics 196 when each one of the three variants circulate are identical, 197 except for for the probability of transmission per contact. We 198 have assumed an Alpha-like virus variant to be approximately 199 1.5 times more infectious than the original variant and that a 200 Delta-like variant to be approximately 2 times more infectious 201 than the original variant. 202

The vaccination rates were sampled on an interval. The lowest 203 boundary of the interval is based on the data from the first six 204 months of vaccination rollout in Belarus (38), one of the slower 205 vaccinating countries in Europe, and would lead to 10% of 206 the population to be vaccinated in the first six months of the 207 vaccination rollout. The upper boundary of the vaccination 208 rate interval is based on the vaccination rollout in Israel in 209 the first six months of the vaccination campaign. Sustaining 210 211 this rate would lead to almost 60% of the population to be vaccinated six months after the start of the vaccination rollout. 212 Henceforth, these rates are referred to as "slow" and "fast". 213 respectively. Figure 2a shows vaccination coverage during 214 the first six months after the start of vaccination rollout for 215 slow and fast vaccination. In our analyses, we considered a 216 wide range of vaccine efficacies with respect to prevention 217 acquisition of the infection, 55% to 95%. For some of the 218 219 results in the main analysis we have fixed the vaccine efficacy to 60% and subsequently explored sensitivity of the outcomes 220 to this parameter. 221

We fixed the contact rate for compliant and non-compliant individuals such that the effective reproduction number for the original variant prior to vaccination rollout is 1.1, as estimated for the Netherlands in November 2020 (49). The effective reproduction number for the Alpha-like variant was 1.65, i.e. 226 50% higher than for the original variant (6). We have set 227 the basic reproductive number for the Delta-like variant using 228 the estimate of 4.92 (50), which makes it approximately 2 229 times more transmissible as the original variant. Therefore, 230 the effective reproductive number for the Delta-like variant 231 was approximately equal to 2.2 at the start of the vaccina-232 tion rollout. The contact rate of vaccinated individuals was 233 assumed to be close to the pre-pandemic rate and 1.5 times 234 higher than the contact rate of non-compliant individuals (51). 235 We explored sensitivity of the outcomes to this parameter. 236 In our model, individuals become compliant if there are in-237 fectious individuals in the population. The per capita rate of 238 switching to the compliant state is proportional to the inci-239 dence of infectious cases (see Methods, Table 1). The rate of 240 moving to the compliant state was fixed in the main analysis. 241 The sensitivity analyses for this parameter are shown in the 242 Supplementary materials. Furthermore, the compliance which 243 has an intrinsic natural decay rate, wanes more rapidly as the 244 vaccination coverage increases. The proportion of compliant 245 population for a constant incidence of infection is shown in 246 Figure 2b where we used slow and fast vaccination rates from 247 Figure 2a. We used incidence of 16,062 cases per day, based on 248 the number of infectious people in the Netherlands which was 249 approximated by RIVM using hospital admissions and data 250 from the Pienter Corona study (47) in the period used for the 251 model calibration (4). For slow vaccination, three months after 252 the start of vaccination, approximately 89% of the population 253 is compliant with physical distancing measures and after six 254 months, 84% is compliant. For fast vaccination, the compliant 255 population decreases more rapidly, with only approximately 256 54% and 32% of individuals being compliant after three and 257 six months, respectively. 258



Fig. 2. Vaccination coverage and proportion of compliant population during the vaccination rollout. a Increase in vaccination coverage for slow (light blue line) and fast (dark blue line) vaccination rates. Stars show data for Belarus (light blue) and Israel (dark blue) (38), respectively. **b** Decrease in the proportion of compliant population for slow and fast vaccination and a fixed incidence of infection (16,062 cases per day) observed in the Netherlands in the period used for the model calibration. Vertical brown lines mark three and six months since the start of vaccination.

The reason for the decline of compliance observed in Figure 259 2b is two-fold. First, as the vaccination coverage increases, 260 Moreover, the speed of this decrease depends on how fast vaccination is rolled out. Second, per our assumption, vaccinated people perceiving themselves protected from COVID-19, 264 subsequently are no longer compelled to comply with physical

distancing. These two processes translate into varying proportions of the compliant population depending on both the

incidence of infection and vaccination coverage.

Epidemic dynamics with vaccination. The model predicts that 269 depending on the speed of the vaccination rollout and transmis-270 sibility of the virus variant, as a result of decreasing compliance 271 with physical distancing measures, the prevalence of infected 272 individuals in the presence of vaccination can be higher than 273 the prevalence in a situation without vaccination (Figure 3). 274 This effect is much more pronounced for the more transmissible 275 Alpha-like and Delta-like variants than for the original variant 276 (Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c). We quantify it as the difference 277 in the cumulative number of new infections relative to the 278 no-vaccination scenario level three and six months after the 279 start of the vaccination rollout. 280



Fig. 3. Epidemic dynamics with and without vaccination. a Prevalence of infected individuals versus time when the original variant circulates. b The same output when an Alpha-like variant circulates. c The same output when a Delta-like variant circulates. d Difference in the cumulative number of new infections relative to the no-vaccination scenario level for the original variant. e The same output when a Alpha-like variant circulates. f The same output when a Delta-like variant circulates. f the same output when a Delta-like variant circulates. d, e and f show the difference in the cumulative number of new infections relative to the no-vaccination levels when respective variants circulate. In a, b, and c, vertical brown lines mark three and six months since the start of vaccination.

If the original variant is circulating (Figures 3a and 3d), vac-281 cination can reduce the prevalence below the level of the 282 no-vaccination scenario six months after the start of the cam-283 paign (Figure 3a). In our simulations, this happens when the 284 285 vaccination rate is fast. When the vaccination rate is slow, as 286 the result of the vaccination rollout, the prevalence eventually decreases below the level of the no-vaccination scenario, but 287 it takes more than 600 days (result not shown). However, for 288 both vaccination rates, due to the decline of compliance follow-289 ing the growing vaccination coverage, in the initial stages of 290 the rollout, the transient prevalence can be higher than in the 291 no-vaccination scenario. This difference in prevalence is higher 292 for the fast vaccination rate than for the slow vaccination rate. 293 Consequently, slow vaccination, if associated with waning of 294

compliance during vaccine rollout, leads to a smaller excess of cumulative infections than fast vaccination at both three and six months time points (Figure 3d). 297



Fig. 4. Contribution of vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals to attack rate during the vaccination rollout. a, b, and c show attack rates versus time given the slow vaccine uptake rate. d, e, and f show attack rates versus time given the fast vaccine uptake rate. a and d show these quantities for the original variant, b and e for an Alpha-like variant, c and f for a Delta-like variant. Vertical brown lines mark three and six months since the start of the vaccination campaign. Attack rate is the proportion of the population that has been infected until a given time. We adjusted the attack rate so that it describes only new infections that appeared during the time interval that we considered

If a more transmissible variant is circulating (for example, an 298 Alpha-like or a Delta-like) (Figures 3b, 3c, 3e, and 3f) de-299 creased compliance with physical distancing measures can lead 300 to an additional peak in prevalence (Figure 3b). Additionally, 301 similar to the scenario with the original variant, vaccination 302 can lead to an increase of cumulative number of new infec-303 tions compared the no-vaccination scenario (Figures 3e and 304 3f). This occurs because waning of compliance coincides with 305 an increased transmissibility of the virus. The period when 306 the prevalence is higher as compared to the no-vaccination 307 scenario lasts even longer than for the original variant (Figures 308 $3\mathbf{b}$ and $3\mathbf{c}$). 309

Contribution of vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals to the at-310 tack rate. To understand the role of vaccinated individuals in 311 the transmission dynamics observed in Figure 3, we calcu-312 lated the proportion of infections occurring in the vaccinated 313 population over time (Figure 4). The analyses show that 314 in the case of slow vaccine uptake (Figures 4a, 4b, and 4c) 315 vaccinated individuals comprise a small proportion of the in-316 fected population even at the end of the six months of the 317 vaccination campaign. Therefore, the increased prevalence 318 among non-vaccinated can be attributed to the decrease of 319 their compliance with physical distancing measures. In the 320 case of fast vaccine uptake, the model predicts that a pro-321 portion of infections among vaccinated individuals is higher. 322 Moreover, for a "hyper-contagious" strain, similar to the Delta 323

variant, and a vaccine with relatively low efficacy (60% in our 324 main analysis), more than a third of infections are expected 325 to be in the vaccinated population. Thus, the observed rise 326 in the prevalence is in part due to the increased contact rate 327 328 of susceptible vaccinated individuals. These findings suggest 329 that for slow vaccination the risk of severe disease and death in the population is hardly lowered, while for fast vaccination 330 a significant proportion of the infected individuals will be 331 protected against severe disease, even if the incidence of cases 332 is high. 333

Sensitivity of the vaccination rollout outcomes to vaccine efficacy 334 and vaccine uptake rate. Finally, we investigated the effect of 335 vaccine efficacy and vaccine uptake rate on the excess of the 336 cumulative number of new infections as compared to the no-337 vaccination scenario three and six months after the start of 338 vaccination rollout (Figures 5a, 5b and Figures 1a, 1b, 2a, 339 and **2b** in Supplementary materials). In all panels, in the 340 region above the magenta curve vaccination rollout yields 341 improvement over the no-vaccination scenario, i.e. the cumula-342 tive number of new infections is lower. Importantly, the slower 343 is the vaccination rollout, i.e. the lower is the vaccination 344 coverage after three months of the vaccination rollout, the 345 higher the vaccine efficacy needs to be to avoid an increase 346 of cumulative number of new infections as compared to the 347 no-vaccination scenario. This is a consequence of fast loss of 348 compliance with physical distancing measures as the vacci-349 nation coverage grows. Vice-versa, depending on the vaccine 350 efficacy, the speed of the rollout can cause increase or de-351 crease of cumulative number of new infections. If the efficacy 352 is low and the rollout is fast, then initially the cumulative 353 number of new infections is expected to be higher than for the 354 355 no-vaccination scenario. Moreover, the combination of fast vaccine uptake and low vaccine efficacy is predicted to cause 356 the largest increase in the cumulative number of new infections 357 as compared to the no-vaccination scenario. This happens due 358 to the combined effect of quickly growing vaccination coverage 359 which affects compliance with physical distancing measures in 360 the non-vaccinated population and of increased contact rates 361 of the vaccinated individuals who while potentially protected 362 363 from the severe disease can still acquire and transmit the infection. However, if the vaccine efficacy is high, given a fast 364 365 vaccination rate, we expect that the cumulative number of new infections to fall below the level of the no-vaccination scenario. 366 The decrease in the number increases as the vaccination rate 367 increases. We observe that for all variants considered (see Fig-368 ures 5a, 5b and Figures 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b in Supplementary 369 materials), the minimal vaccine efficacy where the cumulative 370 number of new infections decreases over the no-vaccination 371 scenario decreases with time since the start of the vaccination 372 rollout. 373

The vaccine efficacy where the vaccination campaign does not 374 cause excess infections due to the reduction of compliance is 375 smaller for more transmissible strains, in particular the Delta-376 like variant (Figures 5a and 5b and Figures 1a, 1b, 2a, and 377 378 **2b** in Supplementary materials).

We refer to the analyses above as to the epidemic dynamics 379 without compliance-targeted interventions. In the following 380 section, we investigated the impact of interventions targeted at 381 maintaining compliance with physical distancing; we compared 382 this to the epidemic dynamics without compliance-targeted 383 interventions and the scenario without either vaccination or 384

interventions.

Interventions targeting compliance. To investigate how inter-386 ventions may improve the impact of vaccination rollout, we 387 considered an intervention that targets compliance of those 388 who are not yet vaccinated and an intervention targeted at the 389 vaccinated population. We assume that the first intervention 390 targets non-vaccinated individuals and is successful in keeping 391 the duration of compliance at the pre-vaccination length (30) 392 days) as vaccination coverage grows. The second intervention, 393 targeted at vaccinated individuals, succeeds in convincing vac-394 cinated individuals to abstain from increasing the contact rate 395 above that of the contact rate of non-compliant individuals. 396 Our model predicts that a successful implementation of either 397 of these interventions reduces the cumulative number of new 398 infections after vaccination rollout and can get this number 399 below the level of the no-vaccination scenario. The effective-400 ness of these interventions depends on the circulating variant 401 and the vaccine uptake rate. We summarize our findings in 402 Figures 5 and Figures 1 and 2 in Supplementary materials. 403 Intervention 1: targeting compliance of non-404 vaccinated individuals 405

For all three variants, an intervention that targets compliance 406 of non-vaccinated individuals (Figures 5c and 5d and Figures 407 1c, 1d, 2c, and 2d in Supplementary materials), reduces the 408 minimal efficacy of vaccine required for the cumulative num-409 ber of new infections after three and six months following the 410 vaccination rollout to be smaller than in the no-vaccination 411 scenario at the respective time points. Moreover, the minimal 412 vaccine efficacy after six months of the vaccination rollout is 413 lower than the minimal efficacy after three months. Above 414 the magenta curve, the reductions in the cumulative num-415 ber of new infections are higher as compared to the scenario 416 where vaccination rollout is not supplemented with compliance-417 targeted intervention (Figures 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d). If there 418 is an excess of new infections, it is smaller as compared to 419 the no compliance targeted intervention scenario (Figures 5a, 420 5b, 5c, and 5d). Finally, we compare the performance of this 421 intervention across different variants. While for all variants 422 the intervention lowers the vaccine efficacy minimum at which 423 the cumulative number of new infections decreases compared 424 to the no-vaccination scenario, this threshold becomes lower 425 for more transmissible variants. Similarly, the intervention 426 yields larger relative reductions in the cumulative number of 427 new infections for more transmissible variants. 428

Intervention 2: targeting compliance of vaccinated individuals

Effects of this intervention on the cumulative number of new infections depend on the circulating virus variant, vaccine efficacy, and vaccination rate (Figures 5e and 5f).

For the original variant and a slow vaccination rate, we observe 434 that after three months of vaccination for the whole range 435 of vaccine efficacies that were considered there is excess of 436 infections as compared to the no-vaccination scenario (Figure 437 5e). This is contrary to the scenario when the vaccination 438 rollout is not supplemented with compliance-targeted interven-439 tions, where vaccinated individuals are characterized by the 440 increased contact rate. This outcome occurs due to the change 441 in mixing. As vaccinated individuals have less contacts, more 442 transmission contacts occur in the non-vaccinated population 443 leading to the increase in the number of infections. 444 445

At the same time point but given a fast vaccination rate,

429

430

431

432

433



Fig. 5. Epidemic dynamics with and without interventions targeting compliance of vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals. The original variant of the virus circulates. All panels show relative difference in the cumulative number of new infections as compared to the no-vaccination scenario. **a** and **b** Vaccination rollout not supplemented with compliance interventions three and six months into the vaccination rollout, respectively. **c** and **d** Vaccination rollout supplemented with compliance interventions targeting non-vaccinated individuals three and six months into the vaccination rollout, respectively. **e** and **f** Vaccination rollout supplemented with compliance interventions targeting vaccinated individuals three and six months into the vaccination rollout, respectively. **g** and **h** Vaccination rollout supplemented with compliance interventions targeting both vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals three and six months into the vaccination rollout, respectively. **g** and **h** Vaccination rollout supplemented with compliance interventions targeting both vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals three and six months into the vaccination rollout, respectively. **g** and **h** Vaccination rollout supplemented with compliance interventions targeting both vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals three and six months into the vaccination rollout, respectively. **g** and **h** Vaccination rollout supplemented with compliance interventions targeting both vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals three and six months into the vaccination rollout, respectively. Magenta curves mark boundaries between parameter regions with different sign of the cumulative number of new infections. The scale of x-axis is not linear since the axes were obtained by conversion of the vaccine uptake rate to the vaccination coverage following three and six months after the start of the vaccination rollout.

we also see mixed results. For the combination of the vac-446 cine efficacy and vaccination rate which gives a decrease in 447 the cumulative number of the new infections in the scenario 448 where vaccination rollout is not supplemented with compliance-449 targeted intervention, we see this decrease reducing in mag-450 nitude. On the other hand, the minimum of vaccine efficacy 451 452 where the cumulative number of new infections is lower. Finally, the region with excess infections is smaller compared to 453 the scenario where the vaccination rollout is not supplemented 454

with compliance-targeted interventions.

Six months after start of the vaccination rollout, the situation 456 is similar (Figure 5f). Given a slow vaccination rate, the 457 minimum of vaccine efficacy where the relative increase of 458 infections can be avoided is higher than in the scenario where 459 the vaccination rollout is not supplemented with the interven-460 tion. But if the vaccination rate is fast, than the respective 461 vaccine efficacy minimum is lower than it was without the 462 intervention. 463

455

⁴⁶⁴ The dynamics for different regions of the vaccine efficacy and

 $_{465}$ $\,\,$ vaccination rate for an Alpha-like or a Delta-like variants when

 $_{\rm 466}$ $\,$ the intervention is deployed are qualitatively similar to the

467 dynamics of the original strain (Figures 1e, 1f, 2e, and 2f in

⁴⁶⁸ Supplementary materials).

469 Combination of two interventions

Finally, combination of the two compliance-targeted inter-470 ventions leads to improvements that exceed the effects of 471 individual interventions (Figures 5g and 5h and Figures 1g, 472 1h, 2g, and 2h in Supplementary materials). For all three 473 variants, the minimum for vaccine efficacy where the excess 474 of infections as compared to the scenario without compliance-475 476 targeted intervention can be avoided, decreased. Also, excess in the cumulative number of infections decreased for the region 477 of vaccine uptake rate and vaccine efficacy that we considered. 478 Similar reductions relative to the scenario where the vacci-479 nation rollout is not supplemented with compliance-targeted 480 intervention are achieved for the more transmissible variants, 481 provided a fast vaccination rate (Figures 1g, 1h, 2g, and 2h 482 in Supplementary materials). 483

484 Sensitivity analysis of the epidemic dynamics with485 vaccination

We performed sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of 486 our findings to the variations of the initial conditions and pa-487 rameter values. More specifically, we were interested whether 488 the possibility of a relative excess in the cumulative number 489 of new infections is preserved and how its value changes. In 490 our analyses we varied one parameter at a time while keeping 491 the initial conditions and parameter values fixed to the values 492 that were used to produce simulations summarized on Figures 493 3 and 4. We considered the dynamics of the original variant. 494 For the ranges used in Sensitivity analysis see Table 1. 495

The existence of the relative increase in the cumulative number 496 of infections after three and six months of the vaccination 497 rollout as compared to the no-vaccination scenario is preserved 498 across the intervals for the initial conditions that we considered 499 (Figures 6-9 in Supplementary materials). The size of the 500 501 relative increase in the cumulative number of infections varies continuously, with the largest increase in its value as compared 502 to what we observed in the main analysis (Figure 3) being 503 equal approximately to 20%. The relative difference in the 504 cumulative number of new infections has the highest sensitivity 505 to the initial state of the seroprevalence as compared to the 506 initial conditions in other compartments. 507

Increase in the relative difference in the cumulative number 508 of new infections as compared to no vaccination scenario is 509 preserved on the sampled intervals for the duration of the 510 exposed and infectious period (Figure 11 in Supplementary 511 materials). In the slow vaccination rate scenario, the absolute 512 size of the cumulative number of new infections after three 513 and six months after the start of the vaccination rollout is not 514 sensitive to perturbations in either parameter (Figures 10a 515 and 10c in Supplementary materials). On the other hand, the 516 cumulative numbers of new infections in the fast vaccination 517 scenario are very sensitive to the the duration of the infectious 518 stage but not to the the duration of the exposed stage (Figures 519 10b and 10d in Supplementary materials). 520

Both the absolute value of the cumulative number of new infections and the relative difference in the number as compared to the no-vaccination scenario are very sensitive to the contact rates of compliant and non-compliant individuals (Figures 12 and 13 in Supplementary materials). The cumulative number 525 of new infections after three months of the vaccination rollout 526 is more sensitive to both than the cumulative number after 527 six months. The cumulative number of new infections is in-528 creasing when either one of the contact rates is growing and is 529 highest in the scenario where the average contact rate of the 530 population was close to the pre-pandemic level. The cumula-531 tive number of new infections decreases below no-vaccination 532 scenario when the contact rate of compliant individuals is suf-533 ficiently close to the contact rate of non-compliant individuals. 534 This happens since the average contact rate of non-vaccinated 535 individuals does not grow significantly even as the growing 536 vaccination coverage causes a decrease in the proportion of 537 compliant population. From Figure 4 we recall that when 538 the original variant circulates, new infections occur mainly 539 among non-vaccinated individuals. This is different for a more 540 transmissible variant such as Delta, where vaccinated individ-541 uals contribute significantly to the cumulative number of new 542 infections. 543

We observe that there is an excess of infections relative to the 544 no-vaccination scenario for the whole range of values for the 545 contact rate of non-compliant individuals that we considered 546 (Figure 13 in Supplementary materials). The largest relative 547 increase in the cumulative number of infections happens when 548 the contact rate of non-compliant individuals is close to the pre-549 pandemic levels and the contact rate of compliant individuals 550 is significantly lower. Therefore since the growing vaccination 551 coverage causes modifications of the compliance distribution, 552 the average contact rate in the non-vaccinated individuals 553 increases significantly. 554

The cumulative number of new infections and the relative 555 difference in the cumulative number of new infections (as com-556 pared to the no-vaccination scenario) are very sensitive to 557 variations of the rate of moving to the compliant state and 558 the duration of the compliant state (Figures 14 and 15 in 559 Supplementary materials). The cumulative number of infec-560 tions is the highest when individuals move to the compliant 561 state at a slow rate but the duration of the compliant state 562 is low (Figure 14). As the rate of moving to compliant state 563 and the duration of being compliant increase the, cumulative 564 number of infections decreases. The relative difference in the 565 cumulative number of infections has the opposite relationship 566 with the two parameters (Figure 15). Such that, the differ-567 ence is largest when the rate of moving to compliant state 568 is fast and the average duration of staying of compliant is 569 long. We observe that the duration of compliant state has 570 little effect on the possibility of excess infections as compared 571 to the no-vaccination scenario. However, if the rate of moving 572 to compliant state is sufficiently high, the cumulative number 573 of infections will exceed the no-vaccination scenario level. 574

For the description of methodology and the complete treatment of this topic see Supplementary Materials.

575

576

577

Supplementing vaccination rollout with a lockdown

Our simulations indicated that due to compliance waning as 578 the vaccination coverage grows, it is possible that an addi-579 tional prevalence peak appears. So far, in our simulations no 580 centralized intervention triggered by a steep increase in the 581 number of new cases was modeled. Here we consider such an 582 intervention, whereupon if during the vaccination rollout the 583 prevalence of new infectious cases exceeds a certain threshold, 584 the government tightens the lockdown, further restricting the 585

⁵⁸⁶ average contact rate. Once the prevalence falls bellow the

 $_{\rm 587}$ $\,$ threshold, the lockdown is being relaxed to its prior state. We

 $_{\tt 588}$ $\,$ investigated the effect of the threshold prevalence at which

589 the lockdown is initiated on the cumulative number of new infections three and six months after the start of the vaccination

⁵⁹¹ campaign (Figures **3-5** in Supplementary materials).

Our simulations indicate that supplementing the vaccination 592 rollout with lockdown which initiates once the prevalence of 593 infectious cases exceeds a threshold can prevent increase of 594 the cumulative number of new infections after three and six of 595 the vaccination rollout as compared to no-vaccination scenario 596 (Figure 3 in Supplementary materials). The cumulative num-597 ber of new infections after three months of the vaccination 598 rollout are larger for the fast vaccination rollout than for the 599 slow. Interestingly, the cumulative number after three months 600 of the vaccination rollout for either vaccination rate is not 601 sensitive to changes in the lockdown strengthening/relaxation 602 threshold on the range that we consider. On the other hand, 603 the cumulative number of new infections after six months of 604 the vaccination rollout for both slow and fast vaccination rates 605 is increasing as the threshold for the strengthening/relaxation 606 of the lockdown grows. Finally, we observe that the rela-607 tive decrease in the cumulative number of infections is higher 608 for the cumulative number of infections six months after the 609 rollout than after three. While the relative difference in the 610 cumulative number of new infections is larger for a lower lock-611 down initiation threshold, the gain is not sufficiently large 612 to warrant a strict lockdown that initiates early. The largest 613 decrease in the cumulative number of new infections relative 614 to the no-vaccination scenario happens when the vaccination 615 rate is fast and the vaccine efficacy is high. Decreasing in 616 either one of these parameters causes the relative difference 617 to decrease (Figure 4 in Supplementary materials). On the 618 other hand, the largest decrease in the cumulative number of 619 new infections relative to the vaccination rollout without com-620 pliance interventions happens when the vaccination rollout is 621 fast and the vaccine efficacy is low (Figure 5 in Supplementary 622 materials). 623

In summary, we gain the following insights for different vac-624 cination strategies and virus variants: (a) if vaccinated and 625 non-vaccinated individuals relax their compliance with physical 626 distancing measures, the cumulative number of new infections 627 may be higher than the no-vaccination scenario, regardless of 628 the vaccine uptake rate; (b) Fast vaccine uptake rate may not 629 630 always be advantageous. If the efficacy is very high, than fast 631 vaccine uptake rate will lead to reduction of infections relative to the no-vaccination level. If the efficacy is low, fast vaccine 632 uptake rate combined with diminished compliance may lead to 633 a significant relative increase in the number of infections; (c) 634 For all variants that we considered, an intervention targeting 635 the non-vaccinated population is effective in reducing the num-636 ber of infections below the no compliance-targeted intervention 637 638 scenario and reduces the minimum value for vaccine efficacy necessary to lower this number below the no-vaccination sce-639 nario level; (d) The intervention that targets compliance of 640 non-vaccinated individuals yields better results in a long run 641 than in short run, with the threshold vaccine uptake rate at 642 six months significantly lower than it was at three months; (e) 643 Slow vaccination with a combined compliance-targeting inter-644 vention can reduce numbers of infections as compared to the 645 no-interventions scenario. But in order to reduce the number 646

of infections below the level of the no-vaccination scenario, 647 vaccine efficacy should exceed 65%; fast vaccination with a 648 combined intervention reduces the number of new infections 649 even for lower vaccine efficacy.; (f) Strengthening of the lock-650 down triggered by the rise in prevalence is another intervention 651 that can prevent increase in the cumulative number of new 652 infections. Our results indicate that the initiation threshold for 653 the lockdown can be sufficiently high, thus potentially allowing 654 for shorter periods of the slowing down of the economy. 655

656

Discussion

Using a compartmental model for the spread of SARS-CoV-2 657 in a population, where physical distancing measures are in 658 place, we investigated the impact of declining compliance with 659 physical distancing measures as vaccination is rolled out on 660 the numbers of infections. One of the key features of our 661 model is a distinct treatment of the loss of compliance by 662 vaccinated and non-vaccinated populations, each of which can 663 relax the compliance of physical distancing measures to a 664 different degree. Additionally, we extended the compliance 665 process to the whole population and not only the susceptible 666 individuals, which qualitatively affects mixing patterns in the 667 population. 668

Our main finding is that, if compliance decays as the vacci-669 nation coverage grows, the speed of vaccination rollout has 670 a strong impact on whether the cumulative number of new 671 infections can be decreased three and six months after the start 672 of vaccination below the level that would have been expected 673 without vaccination. If vaccination rollout is slow, its positive 674 effects on the incidence will be counteracted by fading compli-675 ance and increasing contact rates in the population. This may 676 lead to an increase in the prevalence exceeding the prevalence 677 in a situation without vaccination and, in the short term, we 678 may even see an additional epidemic peak. If vaccination is 679 rolled out faster, these detrimental effects can be avoided. The 680 outcome will depend on the vaccine efficacy. If the efficacy 681 is high, then the cumulative number of new infections will 682 decrease relative to the no-vaccination scenario. If the vaccine 683 efficacy is low and the vaccination rate if fast, an excess of 684 infections is possible in the first six months of the vaccination 685 rollout. Generally, given a low vaccine efficacy, our model pre-686 dicts that after the first six months of the vaccination rollout, 687 the cumulative number of new infections is higher for a faster 688 vaccination uptake rate. This effect happens due to the loss of 689 compliance by vaccinated individuals. Note that, since among 690 the excess infections a certain proportion of infected people 691 will have been vaccinated, they will have a low probability of 692 developing severe disease or death. Finally, as a result of our 693 comprehensive analysis of the effect of the vaccination rate and 694 vaccine efficacy on the cumulative number of new infections. 695 we derived threshold curves which separate parametric regions 696 where the relative difference in the cumulative number of in-697 fections as compared to the no-vaccination scenario changes 698 sign. We observed, that if the vaccine has a high efficacy, then 699 the excess of infections can be avoided for a relatively low 700 vaccination uptake rate. As the vaccine efficacy decreases, the 701 uptake rate increases. 702

In their recently published work Gozzi et al (52) also considered the impact of the feedback between the epidemic dynamics, the vaccination rollout, and compliance with physical distancing on infection transmission dynamics. The authors investigated 706

the effects of waning compliance due to the growing vacci-707 nation coverage provided different vaccination strategies and 708 vaccine efficacies across populations with different age contact 709 matrices. Both ours and Gozzi et al (53) qualitative findings 710 711 are in agreement and are consistent with the results of the 712 earlier studies that have shown that factors that contribute to drastic increase of contact rates (such as vaccination-related 713 behavioral change or premature reduction/removal of non-714 pharmaceutical interventions) may reduce the benefits of a 715 vaccination programme (54-57). 716

Motivated by the conclusions drawn by these studies, we 717 considered the effect of supplementing the vaccination cam-718 paigns with communication strategies promoting maintenance 719 of physical distancing behavior aimed at both vaccinated and 720 non-vaccinated individuals and learned that 1) those inter-721 ventions can significantly improve the outcome of vaccination 722 campaign; 2) the choice of a specific information intervention 723 should be informed by the epidemic circumstance of the situa-724 tion (such as the dominant variant and speed of vaccination 725 rollout). 726

An intervention that succeeds in maintaining the compliance 727 with physical distancing in people not yet vaccinated on the 728 same level as before the start of vaccination ensures significant 729 decrease of the cumulative number of new infections through-730 731 out. Moreover, for all three virus variants, supplementing vaccination rollout with this intervention reduces the vaccine 732 efficacy threshold for which the cumulative number of new 733 infections is lower than without the vaccination. This effect 734 is seen in both short and long term, but is more pronounced 735 in the long term. The effect for an intervention that targets 736 vaccinated individuals to prevent them from increasing their 737 contact rates after being vaccinated depends on the trans-738 missibility of the dominant variant. If the original variant 739 circulates, the intervention has a positive impact for a fast 740 rollout of vaccination, but cannot avoid detrimental effects of 741 waning of compliance if the vaccination rollout is slow. On the 742 other hand, if the dominating variant has the same transmis-743 sibility as Alpha or Delta, then the intervention can improve 744 the outcome of the vaccination rollout over the no-vaccination 745 scenario even when the vaccination rate is slow. Interestingly, 746 for the original and an Alpha-like variant, given a slow vacci-747 nation rate, the minimum vaccine efficacy threshold required 748 to avoid a surplus of infections is higher when the vaccination 749 rollout is supplemented with the intervention than when it 750 is not. If a Delta-like variant circulates, supplementing the 751 vaccination rollout with the intervention reduces the threshold 752 753 for all vaccination rates that we considered. Only the combined effect of both interventions can consistently reduce the 754 cumulative number of new infections below the level of the 755 no-vaccination scenario regardless of the rollout speed (in the 756 vaccination rate range that we considered). 757

Finally, we compared the effect of compliance-targeting inter-758 759 ventions with a centralised intervention that mimics tightening/relaxation of the lockdown when a prevalence threshold 760 is crossed. We observed that the possibility of an excess of 761 infections is eliminated and yields larger decreases in the cu-762 mulative number of new infections over the no-vaccination 763 scenario than the compliance-targeting interventions, both in 764 the short term and in the long term. The outcomes of supple-765 menting the rollout with this intervention are not sensitive to 766 the prevalence threshold. However, it may come at a price of 767

disrupted social fabric and slowing down of the economy.

768

796

797

798

799

800

801

Our results are based on some simplifying assumptions, one 769 of them that physical distancing measures remain in place 770 throughout the time period of analysis (six months). While 771 this would be advantageous for preventing transmission of the 772 virus, it might not be feasible out of societal and economic 773 reasons. Therefore, compliance rates may wane even faster 774 in real populations and contact rates may be up to higher, 775 possibly pre-pandemic values during the rollout of vaccination. 776 We do not expect that this would change our results much, as 777 our results are obtained relative to the no-vaccination scenario, 778 which would similarly be affected by a change in physical dis-779 tancing measures. We expect therefore that the relative effects 780 of vaccination would remain similar as in our simulations. We 781 also assumed that the speed of vaccination rollout stays con-782 stant over the time period of six months, which is not the case 783 in reality. In the Netherlands for example, vaccination rates 784 have increased substantially after a slow start in January 2021 785 (38). These rates will depend on many factors, nevertheless 786 large differences will remain between countries. Finally, we 787 have captured the dependence of rates of becoming compliant 788 and non-compliant on the incidence of new infectious cases 789 and vaccination coverage, respectively, using linear functions. 790 As the vaccination in many countries continues and the popu-791 lation response data is collected, a more precise formulation of 792 the response functions can be obtained. However, our results 793 predominantly depend on the assumed monotonicity of these 794 functions. 795

Furthermore, our model is relatively simple, not taking into account age structure and heterogeneity in contact patterns. Therefore, we do not attempt to make quantitative predictions on the impact of vaccination, but we provide qualitative insight into possible effects of waning compliance with physical distancing in the face of increasing vaccination coverage.

A number of studies/reports estimated the bounds for vac-802 cine efficacy for the original variant in terms of reducing 803 the infection for some vaccines approved for use in Europe 804 (21, 22, 24, 25). As Alpha (B.1.1.7) and Delta (B.1.617.2) 805 variants emerged and, in turn, became dominant in many 806 European countries, the first estimates for vaccine efficacy for 807 reducing the infection became available (30, 31, 58). Whether 808 the reduction in infection comes in the guise of reduction of 809 susceptibility or transmissibility of vaccinated individuals is 810 not known. Therefore, in this work we modeled the vaccination 811 to be all-or-nothing and vaccine efficacy was given in terms 812 of probability of conferring full protection from becoming in-813 fected. Our sensitivity analyses (Figure 5 and Figures 1, 2, 4, 814 and 5 in Supplementary materials) show that the effect of a 815 vaccination campaign and of individual interventions is highly 816 sensitive with respect to this parameter. However, we observed 817 that if no compliance-targeting interventions accompany the 818 vaccination rollout, the range of efficacies for which a surplus 819 of new infections as compared to no-vaccination is possible 820 three and six months following the vaccination rollout falls 821 within the vaccine efficacy boundaries that were reported for 822 different vaccines (22, 24–27, 29–31, 59). To implement the 823 most efficient vaccination rollout it is important to know the 824 boundaries of vaccine-conferred reduction of transmission. 825

Finally, in this work we have considered dynamics of circulation of three SARS-CoV-2 virus variants, the original variant and two mutations, whose transmission potential is similar to the Alpha and Delta variants. For all three variants, we modeled
the immunity induced by the vaccine to be of the identical
type (sterilising).

Our results also show that speed of rollout of a vaccination 832 833 campaign is important, because the speed of the rollout and 834 subsequent changes in contact rates strongly impact cumulative number of new infections. Although in the scenario where 835 vaccination rollout is fast the population may fair worse than 836 it would have been without vaccination in the short term -837 especially for a more transmissible virus variant - on the longer 838 term (> 1 year) it has vast advantages in terms of numbers of 839 infections prevented. 840

Our results emphasize the importance of communication by 841 public health professionals on continued adherence to self-842 imposed measures, to those who are awaiting vaccination as 843 well as to those already vaccinated. Communication messages 844 need to be different and targeted specifically to these two 845 groups. We highlight the positive overall effects of vaccination 846 campaigns in combination with continued adherence to non-847 pharmaceutical preventive measures. 848

Model. We developed a compartmental deterministic model 849 that describes SARS-CoV-2 transmission and vaccination roll-850 out in a population. Subsequently, we modified this model 851 to include acquisition and loss of compliance with physical 852 distancing measures as individuals continuously get exposed 853 to information about disease spread as well as the progress of 854 vaccination rollout (Figure -1). We informed the model using 855 parameter values from the literature as well as estimating 856 parameters from publicly available data for the Netherlands, 857 Belarus, Denmark, and Israel. We used the model to investi-858 gate the effects of interactions between disease transmission. 859 vaccination rollout, and changing compliance with physical 860 distancing measures on transmission dynamics. 861

Population compartments The SARS-CoV-2 transmission 862 dynamics follow a Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered 863 (SEIR) framework that divides the population into the fol-864 lowing compartments: susceptible (S), latently infected (also 865 referred to as "exposed", E), infectious (I), and recovered (R). 866 Susceptible individuals (S) become latently infected (E) with 867 rate λ_{inf} proportional to the fraction of infectious individuals 868 (I/N, where N is the total population size). Individuals stay 869 latently infected (E) for an average duration of $1/\alpha$ days after 870 which they become infectious (I). Infectious individuals re-871 cover after $1/\gamma$ days and move to compartment R. Because of 872 873 a relatively short time horizon of our analyses (not exceeding 874 six months) and relatively small case fatality ratio, we disregarded demographic processes such as births and deaths, and 875 therefore the population size N is constant. Additionally, we 876 assumed that once individuals recover they acquire permanent 877 immunity and cannot be re-infected. Since we are interested 878 in understanding the qualitative dynamics that follow from 879 interaction of infection transmission, changes in compliance, 880 and vaccination rollout, we did not consider different out-881 comes of infection with SARS-CoV-2 (e.g., asymptomatic or 882 symptomatic infection, hospitalisation, death etc.). The in-883 fectious compartment (I), therefore, contains individuals who 884 are asymptomatic, or have mild or severe symptoms. 885

The dynamics of infection transmission are modelled for three variants of the SARS-CoV-2 virus: first, the original variant that was predominant in Europe prior to fall 2020; second, the more transmissible Alpha (B.1.1.7) variant, that was initially detected in the UK and became dominant in many 890 European countries in the spring of 2021; and finally, the 891 "hyper-contagious" Delta (B.1.617.2) variant, which became 892 dominant in Europe in summer 2021. We parameterized the 893 differences between these variants by using different probabil-894 ities of transmission per contact, ϵ . We assumed that in all 895 other respects the variants have the same properties. We inves-896 tigated model dynamics where only one of the three variants 897 circulates in the population. 898

To model vaccination, the population was stratified into vac-899 cinated and non-vaccinated classes. While for some vaccines 900 authorised for use in Europe (BioNTech/Pfizer, Moderna and 901 AstraZeneca, (17)), two vaccine doses, as well as a certain 902 time period passing after the second dose are required for full 903 immunisation, we modelled vaccination as a single event that 904 confers protection instantaneously. We assumed that indi-905 viduals do not obtain a diagnostic or antibody test prior to 906 vaccination, and therefore infected and recovered individuals 907 also get vaccinated. Thus, individuals in all epidemiological 908 compartments can get vaccinated, but only those who were 909 susceptible (S) at the time of vaccination may become immu-910 nised (V). The vaccination rate of susceptible, exposed, and 911 recovered individuals is denoted by v. We introduced a pa-912 rameter $k_1, 0 \le k_1 \le 1$, such that $k_1 v$ denotes the vaccination 913 rate for individuals in the infectious compartment, to reflect 914 that a fraction of infectious individuals (who have symptoms) 915 might not be eligible for or might decide against vaccination. 916 In the main analysis we considered the case where infectious 917 individuals get vaccinated at the same rate as individuals in 918 other compartments $(k_1 = 1)$. We explored sensitivity of the 919 dynamics to variation of k_1 and observed little effect of changes 920 in this parameter (the Supplementary materials). We assumed 921 that the vaccine works as all-or-nothing, i.e. upon vaccination, 922 a proportion ω of susceptible individuals (S) is fully protected 923 (V), while in a proportion $1 - \omega$ of susceptible individuals the 924 vaccine has no effect. We refer to ω as "vaccine efficacy" in 925 the context of conferring sterilising immunity. Vaccination 926 does not confer protection to individuals, who were in other 927 infection compartments (E, I and R) at the time of vacci-928 nation, and their infection progression is identical to that of 929 non-vaccinated individuals. Individuals who were vaccinated 930 but did not obtain the protection are denoted by S^V, E^V, I^V 931 and \mathbb{R}^{V} . 932

Studies based on data collected in Israel estimated that 933 the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine developed by 934 Pfizer/BioNTech reduced the acquisition rate for asymp-935 tomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection by 80% (26) up to 95% (27). 936 Similarly high efficacy against infection acquisition were re-937 ported for the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine developed by 938 Moderna, NIAID (28). For the adenovirus Ad26.COV2.S 939 COVID-19 vaccine developed by Janssen Pharmaceutical Com-940 panies the efficacy in preventing infection with SARS-CoV-2 941 is reported to be 76% (29). These results were estimated from 942 data collected between December 2020 and April 2021 in the 943 USA. During this period, the original variant and the Alpha 944 variant (B.1.1.7) were the dominant circulating variants. Since 945 then, the "hyper-contagious" Delta variant (B.1.617.2) has 946 become dominant in many European countries (10) and the 947 USA (11). A recent study based on data from Israel estimated 948 a significant reduction of BNT162b2 efficacy for the Delta 949 variant in preventing infection, which was 64% after two doses 950



Fig. -1. Flow diagram of the infection transmission dynamics coupled with compliance and vaccination processes. a Flow diagram of infection transmission and vaccination rollout, b Flow diagram of acquisition and loss of compliance. Solid-colored rectangles denote non-vaccinated compartments; solid-bordered rectangles denote non-compliant compartments; orange dashed-bordered rectangles denote compliant compartments; gradient-colored rectangles denote vaccinated compartments. Susceptible individuals $(S, S^C, \text{ and } S^V)$ become exposed $(E, E^C, \text{ and } E^V, \text{ respectively})$ with rates $\lambda_{\text{inf}}, \lambda_{\text{inf}}^C$, and λ_{inf}^V through contact with infectious individuals $(I, I^C, \text{ and } I^V)$ Exposed individuals become infectious (I, I^C , and I^V , respectively) at rate α . Infectious individuals recover (R, R^C , and R^V) at rate γ . Compliance is gained with rate λ^C and lost with rate μ . Individuals in any state of infection or compliance can get vaccinated. A proportion ω of susceptible individuals S, who were vaccinated are fully protected, V. Individuals who were vaccinated, but did not obtain protection, are denoted by S^V, E^V, I^V and R^V and are epidemiologically indistinguishable from their non-vaccinated counterparts.

(30). This estimate was supported by another report based 951 on the data in a highly vaccinated health system workforce of 952 California San Diego Health (31). Therefore, in our analyses, 953 we varied ω in the range of 0.4 and 1.0. 954

Finally, in addition to infection status and vaccination status, 955 individuals in the model are either compliant or non-compliant 956 with physical distancing measures (compliant compartments 957 denoted by superscript $C: S^C, E^C, I^C$, and R^C). Compliant 958 individuals thus have on average a lower contact rate than 959 non-compliant individuals; both contact rates are assumed to 960 be lower than pre-pandemic levels. We denote the contact 961 rate of non-compliant individuals by c, and define a reduc-962 tion factor r_1 that describes the reduction in contact rate of 963 compliant individuals compared to non-compliant individu-964 als, so $0 \leq r_1 \leq 1$. Transitions between the compliant and 965 non-compiant state are described by a modelling framework 966 similar to Perra et al (41) and previously used in (43). We 967 modeled the compliance acquisition rate, λ_C , as a function of 968 the incidence of infection, assuming that individuals obtain 969 information about numbers of cases through mass-media and 970 health authorities. We assumed that compliance wanes when 971 case numbers drop or when the disease is no longer present, 972 and individuals return to the non-compliant state at rate μ . 973 974 If there is no vaccination programme in place then this rate, 975 μ , is constant. However, if vaccination rollout is in progress and as vaccination coverage increases, individuals may feel 976 less motivated to comply with physical distancing measures; 977 we implemented this effect by taking μ as a linear function 978 of vaccination coverage, i.e. the rate of losing compliance 979 increases with increasing vaccination coverage. We assumed 980 that only non-vaccinated individuals can be in the compliant 981 982 state, while vaccinated individuals move into a separate noncompliant state permanently, and even have higher contact 983 rates than non-vaccinated non-compliant individuals. We use 984 $r_2 > 1$ to denote the increase in the contact rates of vacci-985 nated individuals relative to the contact rate of non-compliant 986 individuals, c. Compliant individuals get vaccinated at the 987 same rate as non-compliant individuals. All individuals who 988 were vaccinated will have the same (increased) contact rate 989 regardless of whether vaccination was successful. 990

Rates In this section we define the transition rates that depend 991 on the incidence of infectious cases and on vaccination coverage: 992 rates of infection acquisition, and rates of acquisition and loss 993 of compliance. 994

We assumed that individuals become infected at a rate that 995 depends on the fractions of different types of infectious indi-996 viduals, as well as on the mixing of compliant, non-compliant 997 and vaccinated individuals. Therefore, infection acquisition 998 rates as well as infection transmission rates depend on com-999 pliance and vaccination status of susceptible and infectious 1000 individuals. We define the following matrix to summarize 1001 transmission rates between different types of susceptible and 1002 infectious individuals. 1003

$$M = \frac{c\epsilon}{N(t) + r_1 N^C(t) + r_2 N^V(t)} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & r_1 & r_2 \\ r_1 & r_1^2 & r_1 r_2 \\ r_2 & r_1 r_2 & r_2^2 \end{bmatrix}$$
[1] 1004

with

$$N(t) = S(t) + E(t) + I(t) + R(t)$$

$$N^{C}(t) = S^{C}(t) + E^{C}(t) + I^{C}(t) + R^{C}(t)$$

$$N^{V}(t) = V(t) + S^{V} + E^{V}(t) + I^{V}(t) + R^{V}(t),$$

where $[M]_{11}$ captures the transmission of infection from non-1005 compliant I to non-compliant S, $[M]_{12}$ from compliant I 1006 to non-compliant S, and $[M]_{13}$ from vaccinated I to non-1007 compliant S. Similarly, the second row of the matrix captures 1008 the transmission of infection to susceptible individuals who are 1009 compliant, S^{C} . Finally, the third row of the matrix captures 1010 the transmission of infection to individuals who are susceptible 1011 despite vaccination, S^V . 1012

We assumed that as individuals learn about new infections 1013 they become compliant with physical distancing measures, and 1014 therefore compliance is gained at a rate λ_C which is a positive 1015 increasing function of the incidence of infectious cases (equal 1016 to the rate with which individuals leave the exposed stage): 1017

$$\lambda_{\rm C}(t) = \delta \cdot \alpha \cdot \left[E(t) + E^{\rm C}(t) + E^{\rm V}(t) \right].$$
 [2] 1018

We assumed that compliance is not permanent, becoming shorter as the vaccination coverage grows, and thus we model compliant state to have an average duration $1/\mu$, such that μ

1022 is a positive increasing function of the vaccination coverage, 1023 $\bar{V}(t)/N$:

1024
$$\mu(t) = \mu_0 + \mu_1 \bar{V}(t)/N.$$
 [3]

Equations The system of ordinary differential equations (4) provides a full description of the model.

Dynamics of non-compliant individuals:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t)S(t) - \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t)S(t) + \mu(t)S^{C}(t) - \upsilon S(t)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}E(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}(t)S(t) - \alpha E(t) - \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t)E(t) + \mu(t)E^{C}(t)$$

$$-\upsilon E(t)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}I(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \alpha E(t) - \gamma I(t) - \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t)I(t) + \mu(t)I^{C}(t) - k_{1}\upsilon I(t)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}R(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \gamma I(t) - \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t) + R(t)\mu(t)R^{C}(t) - \upsilon R(t)$$

1027 Dynamics of compliant individuals

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S^{C}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}^{C}(t)S^{C}(t) + \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t)S(t) - \mu(t)S^{C}(t) - vS^{C}(t)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}E^{C}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}^{C}(t)S^{C}(t) - \alpha E^{C}(t) + \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t)E(t) - \mu(t)E^{C}(t)$$

$$- vE^{C}(t)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}I^{C}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \alpha E^{C}(t) - \gamma I^{C}(t) + \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t)I(t) - \mu(t)I^{C}(t)$$

$$- k_{1}vI^{C}(t)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}R^{C}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \gamma I^{C}(t) + \lambda_{\mathrm{C}}(t)R(t) - \mu(t)R^{C}(t) - vR^{C}(t)$$
[4]

Dynamics of vaccinated individuals:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}V(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \omega \upsilon \left(S(t) + S^{C}(t) \right) \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}S^{V}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= (1 - \omega) \upsilon \left(S(t) + S^{C}(t) \right) - \lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}^{V}(t) S^{V}(t) \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}E^{V}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \lambda_{\mathrm{inf}}^{V}(t) S^{V}(t) + \upsilon \left(E(t) + E^{C}(t) \right) - \alpha E^{V}(t) \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}I^{V}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \alpha E^{V}(t) + k_{1}\upsilon \left(I(t) + I^{C}(t) \right) - \gamma I^{V}(t) \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}R^{V}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \gamma I^{V}(t) + \upsilon \left(R(t) + R^{C}(t) \right) \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{V}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \upsilon \left(S(t) + E(t) + R(t) + S^{C}(t) + E^{C}(t) + R^{C}(t) \right) \\ &+ \upsilon k_{1} \left(I(t) + I^{C}(t) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

1028

$$\lambda_{\inf}(t) = [M(t)]_{11}I(t) + [M(t)]_{12}I^C(t) + [M(t)]_{13}I^V(t)$$
[5a]
$$\lambda_{\inf}^C(t) = [M(t)]_{21}I(t) + [M(t)]_{22}I^C(t) + [M(t)]_{23}I^V(t)$$
[5b]
$$\lambda_{\inf}^V(t) = [M(t)]_{31}I(t) + [M(t)]_{32}I^C(t) + [M(t)]_{33}I^V(t).$$
[5c]

Parameters and initial data. A full list of parameters and their
values is given in Table 1. Here we elaborate on our choice
of initial conditions, as well as on the chosen values of the
behavioral parameters.

Initial data To model the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 we used 1033 the approximation made by RIVM for the week November 1034 11-17 for the number of infectious individuals and set the total 1035 number of currently infectious individuals, $I + I^C$, at the start 1036 of vaccination rollout to 112,435 (4). We have used this value 1037 in the main analysis and performed sensitivity analysis to 1038 investigate the sensitivity of our results to this choice. To 1039 estimate the fraction of recovered individuals, $R + R_C$ we used 1040 seroprevalence data from a serological study conducted in the 1041 Netherlands in June and July of 2020. In this study, based on 1042 an age-stratified and regionally weighted representative sample 1043 of the Dutch population, the seroprevalence was estimated at 1044 4%. In a later update of that study, seroprevalence was found 1045 to be 14% in February 2021 (46, 47). We set the number of 1046 recovered, $R + R^C$ such that at the start of vaccination rollout, 1047 which was in January 2021 in the Netherlands, the fraction of 1048 recovered in the population was 8%, and performed sensitivity 1049 analysis with respect to this initial value. 1050

According to the parameter values that we have selected the combined average duration of latent and infectious stage is estimated to be 11 days (Table 1, (60, 61, 63, 65)).

To estimate the total number of exposed individuals $E + E^C$ 1054 at the start of the vaccination rollout, we assumed that, at the 1055 time, the epidemiological dynamics are in (pseudo) equilib-1056 rium, with the prevalence of infectious cases equal to 112,435 1057 individuals (4). Using the average duration of infectious pe-1058 riod equal to 7 days (64), we estimated that, at the start of 1059 the vaccination rollout, the daily incidence of new cases was 1060 16,062 individuals. Using the average duration of the exposed 1061 period of infection equal to 4 days (60, 61, 63), we obtained 1062 $E + E^C$. Having fixed the size of susceptible $(S + S^C)$, exposed 1063 $(E + E^{C})$, and recovered $(R + R^{C})$ compartments and using 1064 the total population size of the Netherlands, the size of the 1065 susceptible compartment $(S + S^C)$ follows. 1066

$$\frac{S}{S+S^{C}} = \frac{E}{E+E^{C}} = \frac{I}{I+I^{C}} = \frac{R}{R+R^{C}}$$
[6] 1073

Using Eq. (6) and the percentage of compliant population , 1074 initial values for $S, E, I, R, S^C, E^C, I^C, R^C$ follow. 1075 Setting the total population size to be equal to approximately that of the Netherlands, 1.7×10^7 we obtain the initial data:

$$\begin{split} S(0) &= 5,412,160 \ , \ E(0) = 22,487 \ , \ I(0) = 39,352 \ , \\ R(0) &= 476,000 \ , \ S^C(0) = 10,051,156 \ , \ E^C(0) = 41,762 \ , \\ I^C(0) &= 73,082 \ , \ R^C(0) = 884,000 \ . \end{split}$$

The initial values for the remaining compartments are set to 1076 0.

Contact rates We defined a contact as an encounter with another individual that is sufficiently long to have a conversation, or that involves physical interactions (51). The pre-pandemic contact rate in the Netherlands was reported to be equal to 14.9 individuals per day (51). We assume that the population is in the state of a partial lockdown at the start and throughout the vaccination rollout. In addition to the lockdown-related 1081

Table 1.	Summary of	of model	parameters.

Name	Description (unit)	Value [*]	Source
Epidemiolo	ogical parameters		
R_0	Basic reproduction number, original variant	2.5	(60, 61)
R_0^{new}	Basic reproduction number, Alpha (B.1.1.7)-like variant	3.75	(6, 7)
R ₀ ^{new}	Basic reproduction number, Delta (B.1.617.2)-like variant	4.92	(50)
$\tilde{R_e}$	Effective reproduction number, original variant	1.1	Computed using the method in (62)
\hat{c} Av (ir	Average contact rate prior to the epidemic	14.9	(51)
	(individuals/day)		
ε	Probability of transmission per contact, original variant	2.4×10^{-2}	From $R_0 = \hat{c}\epsilon/\gamma = 2.5$
ϵ^{Alpha}	Probability of transmission per contact, Alpha-like variant	3.6×10^{-2}	From $R_0 = \hat{c}\epsilon^{Alpha}/\gamma = 3.75$
ϵ^{Delta}	Probability of transmission per contact, Delta-like variant	5.4×10^{-2}	From $R_0 = \hat{c} \epsilon^{Alpha} / \gamma = 5.63$
с	Average contact rate of non-compliant individuals starting November 16, 2020 (individuals/day)	8.8(0.5-15)	Obtained from solving $R_e(0) = 1.1$
r_1	Ratio between contact rates of compliant and non-compliant individuals	0.34(0.01-1)	Assumed, control parameter
r_2	Ratio between contact rates of vaccinated and non-compliant individuals	1.5(1, 1.5)	Assumed, control parameter
$1/\alpha$ D (d	Duration of latent period	4 (2-6)	(60, 61, 63)
	(days)		
$1/\gamma$	Duration of infectious period (days)	7 (5-9)	(64)
Complianc	e parameters		
δ	Rate of moving to compliant state (1/day)	$4 \times 10^{-5} (10^{-6} - 10^{-4})$	Assumed, control parameter
$1/\mu_{0}$	Duration of compliant state when there is no vaccination (days)	30(7-30)	Sensitivity analyses
μ ₁ Ρ	Parameter describing how loss of compliance increases depending on	0, 0.3	Sensitivity analyses
	vaccination coverage (1/day)		
Vaccination	n parameters		
υ	Vaccine uptake rate (1/day)	$(5, 60) \times 10^{-3}$	Based on vaccination data in (38)
ω	Vaccine efficacy in conferring protection against becoming infected	$0.6 \; (0.55 - 0.95)$	Based on estimates of efficacies in block- ing SARS-CoV-2 infections for some of the existing vaccines (22, 24–27, 29– 31, 59) for a variety of variants, control parameter
k_1	Reduction factor in vaccination rate of infectious individuals	1	Assumed
Lockdown	parameters		
	Threshold of infectious individuals for strengthening/relaxation of the lock- down (individuals)	50 - 500	Sensitivity analysis
	Average contact rate during strengthened lockdown (individuals/day)	3	Sensitivity analysis

 * Interval was used in sensitivity analyses.



Fig. 7. Pairs of contact rates of non-compliant and compliant individuals c and $r_1 c$ such that effective reproduction number is equal to 1.1.

changes in the contact rate, individuals may reduce the con-1085 tact rate further by complying with government-recommended 1086 physical distancing measures (e.g. work from home as much as 1087 possible). A fraction of the population is more compliant with 1088 these physical distancing measures and the remaining fraction 1089 is less compliant, such that contact rates in the compliant and 1090 non-compliant states are constant and the average contact 1091 rate is lower than pre-pandemic contact rate. However, as a 1092 consequence of vaccination and subsequent loss of compliance 1093 the average contact rate in the total population will change in 1094 time. 1095

We fixed the contact rates for compliant and non-compliant individuals such that the effective reproduction number R_e at the start of the vaccination rollout was 1.1, which is in agreement with the estimate of R_t reported for the Netherlands in November 2020 (49). We calculated $R_e(0)$ assuming that $R_0 = \beta/\gamma = \hat{c}\epsilon/\gamma = 2.5$ (60, 61).

Recall that the contact rates of non-compliant and compliant individuals are denoted by c and r_1c . We calculated the effective reproduction number using the method described in (62) as

$$R_e = \frac{\epsilon c S(0)}{\gamma (N(0) + N^c(0)r_1)} + \frac{\epsilon r_1 c S_c(0) \left(\mu_0(\alpha + \gamma + \mu_0) + \alpha \gamma r_1\right)}{\gamma (\alpha + \mu_0)(\gamma + \mu_0)(N(0) + N^c(0)r_1)}$$
[7]

The value $R_e = 1.1$ is obtained for pairs of contact rates of non-compliant individuals c_e and compliant individuals $r_e c_e$

1106

non-compliant individuals, c, and compliant individuals, r_1c (Figure 7).

Of all pairs of contact rates that satisfy $R_e(0) = 1.1$, we 1110 selected a combination such that the weighted average contact 1111 rate for the population at the start of the vaccination is 5 1112 contacts per day. This value exceeds the reported number of 1113 contacts in the Netherlands during the government-imposed 1114 1115 physical distancing measures in March 2020 by 1.5 contacts 1116 but is lower than the reported contact rate of 8.8 per day that was observed in June 2020, when some of the physical 1117 distancing measures were relaxed (51). The chosen parameter 1118 pair is c = 8.8 and $r_1 c = 2.8$. 1119

 1120 Contact rates of vaccinated individuals were taken to be 1.5

1121 times the contact rate of non-compliant individuals, assuming

that after vaccination individuals will nearly return to the pre-pandemic contact behaviour.

1124 **Compliance** The proportion of compliant and non-compliant

14 | www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.XXXXXXXXXXX

individuals in the population is determined by the compliance 1125 acquisition rate δ and compliance loss rate μ . For the main 1126 analysis we fixed the duration of compliance when there is no 1127 vaccination, $1/\mu_0$ to 30 days. We selected the per capita rate 1128 of moving to the compliant state, $\delta = 4 \times 10^{-5}$ so that given a 1129 constant daily incidence of 16,062 cases, 95% of the population 1130 is expected to be compliant. In the regime where the epidemic 1131 is seeded with the original variant in a population without any 1132 physical measures as much as 84% of the population can be 1133 compliant provided there were no compliant individuals at the 1134 start of the epidemic. This value denotes the case with high 1135 compliance acquisition rate. We investigated the sensitivity of 1136 the outputs to variation in per capita rate of moving to the 1137 compliant state and the compliance loss rate (Supplementary 1138 materials). 1139

In the main analysis we considered a compliance decay sce-1140 nario where as the vaccination coverage grows, the duration 1141 of compliance decreases, in particular when 33% of the pop-1142 ulation is vaccinated the compliant state lasts on average 7 1143 days. In other words, for a daily incidence of 16,062 cases, 1144 which we used to initialize the model, and a slow vaccination 1145 rate, approximately 83% of the population is still compliant 6 1146 months after start of the vaccination rollout, while for a fast 1147 vaccination rate only 32% are compliant (Figure 2b). These 1148 dynamics occur when the growth rate of compliant decay rate 1149 as the vaccination coverage increase is $\mu_1 = 0.3$ per day. 1150

Model code The model was implemented in MATLAB 1151 R2020b (66). The code producing the analyses and figures for 1152 this study is available at https://github.com/aiteslya/COVID-19-Vaccine-Compliance (67). 1154

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. We thank Marc Bonten (UMC Utrecht) 1155 for comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. MEK ac-1156 knowledges support from the Netherlands Organization for Health 1157 Research and Development (ZonMw; Grant no. 91216062 and 1158 Grant no. 10430022010001). GR acknowledges support from the 1159 Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT; Grant 1160 no. 131 596787873). AT and HN acknowledge support from the 1161 Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development 1162 (ZonMw: Grant no. 91216062) 1163

- World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 — 11 March 2020 (2020) Accessed February 25, 2021. 1165
- World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard (2021) Accessed April 2, 2021.
- 3. MK Looi, Covid-19: Is a second wave hitting Europe? The BMJ 371 (2020).
- Number of infectious people: Coronavirus Dashboard:Government.nl (2021) Accessed August 4, 2021.
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Rapid increase of a SARS-CoV-2 variant with multiple spike protein mutations observed in the United Kingdom (2020) Accessed March 4, 2021.
- N Davies, et al., Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. Science (2021). 1175
- E Volz, et al., Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B.1.1.7 in England: Insights from linking epidemiological and genetic data. *medRxiv* (2021). 1177
- N Davies, C Jarvis, CMMID COVID-19 Working Group, , et al., Increased mortality in community-tested cases of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7. Nature (2021).
- R Challen, et al., Risk of mortality in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern 202012/1: matched cohort study. *The BMJ* 372 (2021).
- WHO/Europe: SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant now dominant in much of European region; efforts must be reinforced to prevent transmission, warns WHO Regional Office for Europe and ECDC (2021) Accessed September 6, 2021.
- 11. Delta variant: What we know about the science: Cdc (2021) Accessed May 5, 2020.
- H Lau, et al., The positive impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China. J. Travel. Medicine 27 (2020).
- T VoPham, et al., Effect of social distancing on COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the US. 1188 MedRxiv (2020). 1189
- J Brauner, et al., Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. 1190 Science 371 (2021). 1191
- Y Li, et al., The temporal association of introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with the time-varying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study across 131 countries. *The Lancet Infect. Dis.* 21, 193 202 (2021).

1168

1180

1181

1185

- 1195
 16. Y Liu, et al., The impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on SARS-CoV-2 transmission across 130 countries and territories. *BMC Medicine* 19 (2021).
- European Medicines Agency. COVID-19 vaccines: authorised (2021) Accessed March 4, 2021.
- F Polack, et al., Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine. New Engl. J. Medicine 383, 2603–2615 (2020).
- L Baden, et al., Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. *New Engl. J. Medicine* 384, 403–416 (2021).
- M Voysey, 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. *The Lancet* **397**, 99–111 (2020).
- N Dagan, et al., BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine in a nationwide mass vaccination setting. New Engl. J. Medicine (2021).
- M Thompson, et al., Interim estimates of vaccine effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccines in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection among health care personnel, first responders, and other essential and frontline workers - eight U.S. locations, December 2020-March 2021. Centers for Dis. Control. Prev. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep., 495–500 (2021) Accessed March 31, 2021.
- Real-World Evidence Confirms High Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine and Profound Public Health Impact of Vaccination One Year After Pandemic Declared (2021) Accessed March 16, 2021.
- 24. M Lipsitch, R Kahn, Interpreting vaccine efficacy trial results for infection and transmission.
 Vaccine 39, 4082–4088 (2021).
- A Shah, et al., Effect of vaccination on transmission of COVID-19: an observational study in healthcare workers and their households. *medRxiv* (2021).
- 1220
 26. O Prunas, et al., Vaccination with BNT162b2 reduces transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to household contacts in Israel. *medRxiv* (2021).
- E Haas, et al., Impact and effectiveness of mRNA BNT162b2 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 infections and COVID-19 cases, hospitalisations, and deaths following a nationwide vaccination campaign in Israel: an observational study using national surveillance data. *The Lancet* **397**, 1819–1829 (2021).
- 1226
 28. C Pawlowski, et al., FDA-authorized mRNA COVID-19 vaccines are effective per real-world evidence synthesized across a multi-state health system. Med 2 (2021).
- 1228
 29. J Corchado-Garcia, et al., Real-world effectiveness of Ad26.COV2.S adenoviral vector vaccine for COVID-19. *medRxiv* (2021).
- Decline in Vaccine Effectiveness Against Infection and Symptomatic Illness: Ministry of Health (2021) Accessed August 11, 2021.
- J Keehner, et al., Resurgence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a highly vaccinated health system workforce. New Engl. J. Medicine (2021).
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Risk related to the spread of new SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in the EU/EEA - first update (2021) Accessed March 9, 2021.
- D Planas, et al., Sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants to neutralizing antibodies. *Nat. Medicine* (2021).
- 1239 34. Threat Assessment Brief: Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617 variants in India and situation in the EU/EEA (2021) Accessed May 13, 2021.
- 35. M Mills, D Salisbury, The challenges of distributing COVID-19 vaccinations. *EClinicalMedicine* 31 (2020).
- 36. A Mokhad, P Hotez, W Orenstein, We have to get it right: Ensuring success. *EClini- calMedicine* **31** (2020).
- J Wang, Y Peng, H Xu, Z Cui, R Williams, The COVID-19 vaccine race: challenges and opportunities in vaccine formulation. *AAPS PharmSciTech* 21, 1–12 (2020).
- 1247 38. Our World In Data. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Vaccinations (2021) Accessed August 3, 2021.
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), the RECOVER Social Sciences team, Public views of COVID-19 vaccination in seven European countries: options for response (2021) Accessed March 10, 2021.
- 1251
 40. M Sallam, COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy worldwide: a concise systematic review of vaccine acceptance rates. Vaccines 9 (2021).
- N Perra, D Balcan, B Gonçalves, A Vespignani, Towards a characterization of behaviordisease models. *PLoS ONE* 6, 1–15 (2011).
- 1255
 42. S Pedro, et al., Conditions for a Second Wave of COVID-19 Due to Interactions Between

 1256
 Disease Dynamics and Social Processes. Front. Phys. 8, 428 (2020).
- A Teslya, et al., Impact of self-imposed prevention measures and short-term governmentimposed social distancing on mitigating and delaying a COVID-19 epidemic: A modelling study. *PLOS Medicine* **17**, 1–21 (2020).
- 44. Rapid risk assessment: Assessing SARS-CoV-2 circulation, variants of concern, non-pharmaceutical interventions and vaccine rollout in the EU/EEA, 15th update (2021) Accessed August 1, 2021.
- 1263
 45. No choice but to take summertime measures in face of rapid increase in infections: News item: Government.nl (2021) Accessed September 8, 2021.
- E Vos, et al., Nationwide seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and identification of risk factors in the general population of the Netherlands during the first epidemic wave. J. Epidemiol. & Community Heal. (2020).
- The National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). PIENTER Corona Studie: Resultaten (2021) Accessed August 1, 2021.
- the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Research on behavioural rules and well-being: round 8 (2021) Accessed February 25, 2021.
- The National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Epidemiologische situatie COVID-19 in Nederland (17 november 2020) (2020) Accessed March 4, 2021.
- F Campbell, et al., Increased transmissibility and global spread of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern as at June 2021. *Eurosurveillance* 26 (2021).
- J Backer, et al., Impact of physical distancing measures against COVID-19 on contacts and mixing patterns: repeated cross-sectional surveys, the Netherlands, 2016-17, April 2020 and June 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 26, 2000994 (2021).

 N Gozzi, P Bajardi, N Perra, The importance of non-pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 vaccine rollout. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **17**, 1–24 (2021).

1281

1282

1286

1298

1299

- N Gozzi, P Bajardi, N Perra, The importance of non-pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 vaccine rollout. *medRxiv* (2021).
- S Moore, E Hill, M Tildesley, L Dyson, M Keeling, Vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infect. Dis.* (2021).
 S Contreras, V Priesemann. Bisking further COVID-19 waves desoite vaccination. *The* 1285

 S Contreras, V Priesemann, Risking further COVID-19 waves despite vaccination. The Lancet Infect. Dis. (2021).

- R Rajaraman, Z Sun, R Sundaram, A Vullikanti, Network effects of risk behavior change following prophylactic interventions. *PLoS One* 8 (2013).
 1288
- T Vilches, M Jaberi-Douraki, S Moghadas, Risk of influenza infection with low vaccine effectiveness: the role of avoidance behaviour. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **147** (2019).
 J Lopez Bernal, et al., Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variation (2019).
- J Lopez Bernal, et al., Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant. New Engl. J. Medicine 385, 585–594 (2021).
 1292
 1293
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294
 1294</l
- M Swift, et al., Effectiveness of Messenger RNA Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccines Against Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection in a Cohort of Healthcare Personnel. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* (2021) ciab361.
- Q Li, et al., Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia. New Engl. J. Medicine 382, 1199–1207 (2020).
- M Park, A Cook, J Lim, Y Sun, B Dickens, A systematic review of COVID-19 epidemiology based on current evidence. J. Clin. Medicine 9, 967 (2020).
- O Diekmann, H Heesterbeek, H Britton, Mathematical Tools for Understanding Infectious Disease Dynamics. (Princeton University Press), (2013).
 1301
- J Backer, D Klinkenberg, J Wallinga, Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. Eurosurveillance 25 (2020).
- G Rozhnova, et al., Model-based evaluation of school- and non-school-related measures to control the COVID-19 pandemic. Nat. Commun. 12 (2021).
- N Davies, et al., Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling study. The Lancet Public Heal. 5, e375–e385 (2020).
- MATLAB, 9.9.0.1570001 (R2020b) Update 4. (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts), 1310 (2020).
- A Teslya, et al., The importance of sustained compliance with physical distancing during COVID-19 vaccination rollout. *GitHub* (2021).