

Rotational worker vaccination provides indirect protection to vulnerable groups in regions with low COVID-19 prevalence

Maria M. Martignoni¹, Proton Rahman², and Amy Hurford³

¹Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University, mmartignoni@mun.ca

²Faculty of Medicine, Memorial University, prahman@mun.ca

³Biology Department and Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University, ahurford@mun.ca

October 5, 2021

Abstract

As COVID-19 vaccines become available, different model-based approaches have been developed to evaluate strategic priorities for vaccine allocation to reduce severe illness. One strategy is to directly prioritize groups that are likely to experience medical complications due to COVID-19, such as older adults. A second strategy is to limit community spread by reducing importations, for example by vaccinating members of the mobile labour force, such as rotational workers. This second strategy may be appropriate for regions with low disease prevalence, where importations are a substantial fraction of all cases and reducing the importation rate reduces the risk of community outbreaks, which can provide significant indirect protection for vulnerable individuals. Current studies have focused on comparing vaccination strategies in the absence of importations, and have not considered allocating vaccines to reduce the importation rate. Here, we provide an analytical criteria to compare the reduction in the risk of hospitalization and intensive care unit (ICU) admission over four months when either older adults or rotational workers are prioritized for vaccination. Vaccinating rotational workers (assumed to be 6,000 individuals and about 1% of the Newfoundland and Labrador (NL) population) could reduce the average risk of hospitalization and ICU admission by 42%, if no community spread is observed at the time of vaccination, because epidemic spread is reduced and vulnerable individuals are indirectly protected. In contrast, vaccinating all individuals aged 75 and older (about 43,300 individuals, or 8% of the NL population) would lead to a 24% reduction in the average risk of hospitalization, and to a 45% reduction in the average risk of ICU admission, because a large number of individuals at high risk from COVID-19 are now vaccinated. Therefore, reducing the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission of the susceptible population by reducing case importations would require a significantly lower number of vaccines. Benefits of vaccinating rotational workers decrease with increasing infection prevalence in the community. Prioritizing members of the mobile labour force should be considered as an efficient strategy to indirectly protect vulnerable groups from COVID-19 exposure in regions with low disease prevalence.

Keywords : Vaccination, priority, vaccines policy, mobile labor force, intraprovincial workers, rotational workers, COVID-19, importations, truck drivers

1 Introduction

2 Vaccines for COVID-19 have become available (Corum et al., 2020), and authorities are facing decisions
3 as to which groups to prioritize to mitigate severe illness due to COVID-19. Model-based approaches have
4 been developed to compare the efficiency of different vaccination strategies in reducing hospitalization,
5 intense care unit (ICU) admission, death, or long COVID (Bubar et al., 2021; Mulberry et al., 2021; Chen
6 et al., 2021). A common strategy has been to prioritize vulnerable individuals, defined as people at high
7 risk from COVID-19 (NHS), such as older adults (Bubar et al., 2021), or people with health conditions
8 (e.g., heart or lung conditions, weakened immune systems, obesity, or diabetes) (Persad et al., 2021).
9 Other effective vaccination strategies have included prioritizing essential workers (Mulberry et al., 2021),
10 or individuals with a large number of social contacts (Chen et al., 2021).

11 An alternative approach is to vaccinate groups that are likely to introduce the disease into the com-
12 munity, such as rotational workers or other members of the mobile labour force (Lemke, 2021). These are
13 workers that, to perform essential functions, are required to cross provincial or international borders on a
14 regular basis (Neis et al., 2020). Examples include fisheries workers, truck drivers, flight crews, or other
15 individuals that alternate times away at work with time at home. These workers may become infected
16 with COVID-19 while working in another province, and when returning home may initiate a community
17 outbreak. No current studies have considered how reducing the importation rate by vaccinating rotational
18 workers could lower the risk of community infections and severe illness due to COVID-19 by preventing
19 spread to all individuals, including those in vulnerable groups.

20 The population of Newfoundland and Labrador (NL) is $\sim 522,000$ and more than 90% of the population
21 lives on the island of Newfoundland (Statistica, 2021). The island has very few ports of entries and during
22 the pandemic has been subject to stringent border control (Hurford et al., 2021). In part, due to these
23 strict measures, NL has experienced very minimal community spread for extended periods of time (Berry
24 et al., 2020). In NL rotational workers are a significant part of the work force (Hewitt et al., 2018),
25 where a rotational worker is defined as ‘a resident of Newfoundland and Labrador who travels to another
26 province or territory of Canada to work, on a set schedule of time away at work alternating with time
27 at home in Newfoundland and Labrador’ (GovNL, 2021). The large majority of rotational workers from
28 NL are intraprovincial workers employed in Ontario, Alberta, and Nova Scotia (Hewitt et al., 2018), and
29 since October 2020 infection prevalence in Ontario and Alberta has been substantially higher than in NL
30 (Berry et al., 2020). Vaccinating rotational workers could reduce the rate at which the virus is imported
31 in a region, reducing the chance of a community outbreak and providing indirect protection for those
32 individuals that are likely to experience medical complications due to COVID-19.

33 Here, we quantify the reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission if: (1) vulnerable
34 groups in the community are vaccinated, thus reducing the average probabilities of hospitalization and
35 ICU admission across the remaining susceptible population, where the average is calculated by considering
36 the age structure and the probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission for each age group in the
37 susceptible population (see Appendix A); or (2) rotational workers are vaccinated, thus reducing the rate
38 that the virus is imported in the community, and, in turn, reducing the risk of community outbreaks,
39 but leaving probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission of the susceptible population unchanged.
40 We derive a concise analytical criteria to compare the reduction in risk occurring when strategies (1) and
41 (2) are applied. The criteria is based on easily accessible quantities, such as infection prevalence in the
42 community at the time of vaccination, the number of importations to the province due to non-self-isolating
43 rotational workers, the percent reduction in viral transmission after vaccination, and the probabilities of
44 hospitalization and ICU admission of the vulnerable group vaccinated (Fig. 1). We calculate the risk of
45 hospitalization and ICU admission for NL when rotational workers or older adults are vaccinated. Our
46 analysis provides additional support for public health decisions regarding vaccine prioritization strategies.




Fig. 1: Schematic representation of our research question. Our objective is to quantify the reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission when vulnerable groups (red individuals in the figure) or rotational workers (blue individuals) are vaccinated. Black individuals represent other non-vulnerable community members. A box around an individual symbolizes vaccination. Vaccinating vulnerable groups reduces the average probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission for the remaining susceptible population. Vaccinating rotational workers reduces the importation rate, and prevents community outbreaks that may otherwise have occurred.

Model and Methods

Modelling the impact of vaccination on the infection dynamics: We use a SIR model (Kermack and McKendrick, 1927) with importations to simulate changes in the infectious status of a population as a consequence of community and disease introduction from external sources. The disease can spread from infected individuals I to susceptible individuals S , with a transmission rate β per day. The rate that infected individuals enter the province and fail to self-isolate is m individuals per day, and all infected individuals are assumed to be immediately infectious. Infected individuals recover from infection (or die) at rate γ per day, and are subsequently removed from the description of the infection dynamics. We assume that the rate that individuals enter the province remains low over time, and the total population size can be approximated by the constant N . The system of differential equation representing the dynamics described above is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{dt} &= \frac{-\beta SI}{N}, \\ \frac{dI}{dt} &= \frac{\beta SI}{N} - \gamma I + m, \\ \frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma I, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with initial conditions $\{S_0, I_0, R_0\}$. We assume that at time zero a certain number of individuals in the community ($V_0 \geq 0$) are already vaccinated. Additionally, we assume that at this time a certain number of

61 vaccines are available to vaccinate either vulnerable individuals (V_g), or rotational workers V_w . Therefore
62 we will consider the situations where the same number V of either vulnerable individuals or rotational
63 workers are vaccinated (i.e., either $V_g = V$ and $V_w = 0$, or $V_w = V$ and $V_g = 0$), as well as the situation
64 where neither rotational workers nor vulnerable individuals are vaccinated ($V_g = V_w = 0$). We assume
65 that vaccination reduces the probability that susceptible individuals become infected and transmit the
66 disease by $(1 - Z)$, where $Z = 0$ indicates that vaccination completely prevents viral transmission, while
67 $Z = 1$ indicates that vaccination does not prevent viral transmission. We derive the following initial
68 condition for the number of susceptible individuals in the community at time zero:

$$69 \quad S_0 = N - I_0 - V_0(1 - Z) - V_w(1 - Z) - V_g(1 - Z), \quad (2)$$

70 where I_0 represents infection prevalence at time zero, and is understood as the number of cases that are
71 not in self-isolation and are spreading infections undetected in the community at the time vaccination
72 begins.

73 Unvaccinated rotational workers are part of the susceptible class, but can also introduce the disease
74 into the community through importations. The importation rate (m infections per day) is determined by
75 the total number of rotational workers W , by the number of rotational workers vaccinated (V_w), by the
76 proportion of importations due to non-self isolating rotational workers (η), by the importation rate due
77 to other non-self-isolating travelers (ω individuals per day), and by the reduction in viral transmission
78 after vaccination (Z). As such:

$$79 \quad m = (W - V_w)\eta + V_w Z \eta + \omega, \quad (3)$$

80 and vaccinating rotational workers reduces the importation rate m . We define m_0 as the importation
81 rate before rotational workers are vaccinated, and m_r as the reduced importation rate when rotational
82 workers have been vaccinated. Vaccinating vulnerable groups does not affect the importation rate. Model
83 parameters and default values used for the simulations are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Description of model variables and parameters used for the simulations. Default values are based on population structure and epidemiological features of NL.

Symbol	Description	Default value
S	Susceptible individuals	–
I	Infected individuals (not in self-isolation)	–
R	Recovered individuals	–
S_0	Susceptible individuals at time zero	see Eq. (2)
I_0	Infected individuals (not in self-isolation) at time zero	0 to 60 individuals
N	Total population	522,103 individuals (Statistica, 2021)
T	Time frame considered for the simulations	120 days
$C(T)$	Number of cumulative cases over a time interval T	–
β	Transmission rate	1.1 γ per day *
β_0 and β_v	Transmission rates before and after vaccination	$\beta S_0/N$
γ	Recovery rate	1/14 per day (Hurford and Watmough, 2021)
m_0 and m_r	Importation rates before and after vaccinating RW	–
Z	Probability of viral transmission after vaccination	0.67 (Wise, 2021)
W	Number of rotational workers	6,000 individuals *
η	Rate of imported cases per non-self-isolating RW	0.4/W to 2/W per month *
ω	Rate of imported cases due to other non-self-isolating travelers	0.4 to 2 per month *
V_0	Number of individuals vaccinated before time zero	~10,000 individuals **
V_g and V_w	Number of VG or RW vaccinated at time zero	~6'000 individuals **
P_h and P_{h_r}	Average probabilities of hospitalization before and after vaccinating VG	7.89% and 7.61% **
P_u and P_{u_r}	Average probabilities of ICU admission before and after vaccinating VG	2.35% and 2.14% **

* Estimated parameters. See Appendix B for variations on the default values. ** See Appendix A for derivation.

Quantification of risk reduction due to vaccination: To quantify the reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission of a community when rotational workers (RW) or vulnerable groups (VG) are vaccinated, we define:

$$\% \text{ Reduction in hospitalization risk} = \left[1 - \frac{\text{Expected hospitalizations (RW or VG vaccinated)}}{\text{Expected hospitalizations (no vaccination)}} \right] \times 100.$$

84 An equivalent equation can be written for the % reduction in the risk of ICU admission.

To calculate the expected number of hospitalizations and ICU admission we compute the number of cumulative infections $C(T)$ over a certain period of time T by using Eq. (1). We multiply then $C(T)$ by the average probabilities of hospitalization (P_h) or ICU admission (P_u) of the susceptible population and obtain:

$$\text{Expected hospitalizations} = P_h C(T) \quad \& \quad \text{Expected ICU admission} = P_u C(T).$$

85 Vaccinating RW reduces the expected number of hospitalizations by reducing the importation rate
86 (see Eq. (3)), and thus the cumulative number of infectious cases. Vaccinating vulnerable groups reduces
87 the average probabilities of hospitalization (from P_h to P_{h_r}) and ICU admission (from P_u to P_{u_r}) for the
88 susceptible population because vaccinated vulnerable individuals are no longer included in the calculation
89 of this average. (see Table 1 and Appendix A).

90 **Application to Newfoundland and Labrador:** We compare the reduction in the risk of hospitalization and
91 ICU admission in NL when vaccinating either rotational workers or vulnerable individuals. We estimate

92 that NL has about 6,000 rotational workers. The census data ([Population and Demographics](#)) indicates
93 that in NL about 12,000 individuals are between 80 and 84 years old. We consider half of the older
94 adults in the 80-84 age group to be the vulnerable individuals of interest for our analysis, as this group
95 offers a good size comparison with RW. Additionally, we consider that individuals aged 85 or older have
96 already received the vaccine. The same analysis could be performed for a different vulnerable group,
97 whose vaccination leads to a decrease in the average probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission
98 of the susceptible population.

99 Using the NL census data ([Population and Demographics](#)), the age-stratified probabilities of hospi-
100 talization and ICU admission ([Ferguson et al., 2020](#); [Kronbichler et al., 2020](#)), and the distribution of
101 asymptomatic cases by age groups ([Kronbichler et al., 2020](#)), we calculate the average probabilities of
102 hospitalization and ICU admission in NL, where the average is taken across the age-structure in the
103 susceptible population. The exact data used are given in Appendix A. Our estimates are $P_h = 7.89\%$
104 for the average probability of hospitalization in NL due to COVID-19 infection, and $P_u = 2.35\%$ for
105 the average probability of ICU admission (if individuals aged 85 and above are vaccinated). Assuming
106 that vaccination prevents severe illness ([Voysey et al., 2021](#); [Knoll and Wonodi, 2021](#)), vaccinating 6,000
107 older adults aged 80-84 would lower the average probability of hospitalization of the remaining susceptible
108 population to $P_{h_r} = 7.61\%$, and the average probability of ICU admission to $P_{u_r} = 2.14\%$. We estimate
109 that NL may experience 0.4 to 2 importations of cases of non-self-isolating individuals every month, and
110 we assume rotational workers are responsible for 20% to 80% of those importations.

111 Results

112 **Quantification of risk reduction due to vaccination:** The risk of hospitalization when vulnerable groups
113 are vaccinated can be expressed as

$$114 \quad \% \text{ Reduction in risk of hospitalization (VG vaccinated)} = \left[1 - \frac{P_{h_r} C(T, \beta_v, m_0)}{P_h C(T, \beta_0, m_0)} \right] \times 100, \quad (4)$$

115 where P_h and P_{h_r} are the average probabilities of hospitalization before and after vaccination and
116 $C(T, \beta, m)$ is the number of cumulative cases, which depends on the time interval T considered, on
117 the transmission rate before or after vaccination ($\beta_j = \beta S_0/N$, for $j = 0, v$), and on the importation
118 rate m_0 . Similarly, the reduction in risk of ICU admission when VG are vaccinated is given by

$$119 \quad \% \text{ Reduction in risk of ICU admission (VG vaccinated)} = \left[1 - \frac{P_{u_r} C(T, \beta_v, m_0)}{P_u C(T, \beta_0, m_0)} \right] \times 100, \quad (5)$$

120 where P_u and P_{u_r} are the average probabilities of ICU admission before and after vaccination.

121 The reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission when RW are vaccinated is:

$$122 \quad \% \text{ Reduction in risk of hospitalization (RW vaccinated)} = \left[1 - \frac{C(m_r, \beta_v, T)}{C(m_0, \beta_0, T)} \right] \times 100, \quad (6)$$

123 where m_0 and m_r represent the importation rates before and after vaccination, and depend on the number
124 of RW (W), on the number of RW vaccinated (V_w), on viral transmission after vaccination (Z), on
125 the proportion of successful importations due to non-self-isolating rotational workers (η), and on the
126 importation rate due to other non-self-isolating travelers (ω) (see Eq. (3)). Note that the reduction in the
127 risk of hospitalization when RW are vaccinated is equal to the reduction in the risk of ICU admission, as
128 the probabilities P_h and P_u remain unchanged before and after vaccination of RW, and can be canceled
129 from the numerator and the denominator of the fraction of Eq. (6).

130 We can determine when a reduction in the risk of hospitalization due to vaccinating VG equals a
 131 reduction in the risk of hospitalization obtained by vaccinating RW as follows:

$$132 \quad \frac{P_{hr}C(T, \beta_v, m_0)}{P_hC(T, \beta_0, m_0)} = \frac{C(T, \beta_v, m_r)}{C(T, \beta_0, m_0)} \quad (7)$$

133 Reduction in hospitalization risk Reduction in hospitalization risk
 134 obtained by vaccinating VG obtained by vaccinating RW

133 Eq. (7) can be simplified as:

$$134 \quad \frac{P_{hr}}{P_h} = \frac{C(T, \beta_v, m_r)}{C(T, \beta_v, m_0)} \quad (8)$$

135 The risk of hospitalization can therefore be equally reduced by a reduction in the average probability of
 136 hospitalization, or by a reduction in the expected number of cumulative infections.

137 When infection prevalence remains low, and changes in the susceptible population over a short period
 138 of time remain small, the system of Eq. (1) can be approximated by a single linear differential equation
 139 in I , namely:

$$140 \quad \frac{dI}{dt} = (\beta_j - \gamma)I + m, \quad \text{with } I(0) = I_0 \quad (9)$$

141 with solution

$$142 \quad I(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{m}{\gamma - \beta_j} + \left(I_0 - \frac{m}{\gamma - \beta_j}\right) e^{-(\gamma - \beta_j)t} & \text{for } \beta_j \neq \gamma, \\ mt + I_0 & \text{for } \beta_j = \gamma. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

143 where $\beta_j = \beta S_0/N$, for $j = 0, v$. The cumulative number of infections can be computed by solving the
 144 integral:

$$145 \quad C(T, \beta_j, m) = \int_0^T [\beta_j I(t) + m] dt, \quad (11)$$

146 with analytical solution

$$147 \quad C(T, \beta_j, m) = \begin{cases} \frac{\beta_j m T}{\gamma - \beta_j} + \frac{\beta_j}{(\gamma - \beta_j)^2} (m - I_0(\gamma - \beta_j))(e^{-(\gamma - \beta_j)T} - 1) + mT, & \text{for } \beta_j \neq \gamma, \\ \frac{1}{2} \beta_j m T^2 + \beta_j I_0 T + mT, & \text{for } \beta_j = \gamma. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

148 Note that if infection prevalence is initially zero (i.e., $I_0 = 0$), the number of cumulative cases is linearly
 149 proportional to the importation rate m (cfr. Eq. (12); to see this note that $C(m, \beta_j, T) = mC(\beta_j, T)$ for
 150 $I_0 = 0$), and Eq. (8) can be rewritten as

$$151 \quad \frac{P_{hr}}{P_h} = \frac{m_r}{m_0} \quad (13)$$

152 Thus, for $I_0 = 0$ (i.e., in the absence of community spread at vaccination time), an $X\%$ reduction in the
 153 importation rate has the same impact on reducing the risk of hospitalization as an $X\%$ reduction in the
 154 average probability of hospitalization. Note that Eq. (13) does not depend on the transmission rate β
 155 in the community or on the time interval T considered.

156 In contrast, for $I_0 > 0$, an $X\%$ reduction in the probability of hospitalization has a much larger
 157 impact than the same $X\%$ reduction in the importation rate. For example, if $I_0 = 20$, a 70% reduction
 158 in the importation rate corresponds to a 10% reduction in the probability of hospitalization. A graphical
 159 representation of Eq. (8) as a function of infection prevalence at the initial time is given in Fig. 2. The
 160 importance of vaccinating rotational workers when $I_0 > 0$ decreases more rapidly when the importation
 161 rate is low, when viral transmission is high and when shorter time intervals are considered (see Appendix
 162 B, Figs. B.1 and B.2). An analogous relationship to Eq. (8) can be written to compare a reduction in the
 163 probability of ICU admission and a reduction in the importation rate:

$$164 \quad \frac{P_{ur}}{P_u} = \frac{C(T, \beta_v, m_r)}{C(T, \beta_v, m_0)} \quad (14)$$

An X% reduction in the importation rate corresponds to an X% reduction in the average probability of hospitalization (or ICU admission)




Fig. 2: Equivalence between an X% reduction in the importation rate (blue lines) and an X% reduction in the average probability of hospitalization (red lines) in reducing the risk of hospitalization, as a function of the number of infectious cases in the community I_0 (not in self-isolation) (cfr. Eq. (8)). A reduction in the importation rate can be achieved by vaccinating rotational workers. A reduction in the average probability of hospitalization can be achieved by vaccinating vulnerable groups in the community. Note that in the absence of community spread (i.e., $I_0 = 0$) an X% reduction in the importation rate corresponds to an X% reduction in the average probability of hospitalization for the susceptible population (cfr. Eq. (13)). When infection prevalence is larger than zero, a reduction in the importation rate has a smaller impact than the same relative reduction in the average probability of hospitalization. For example, if $I_0 = 20$, a 70% reduction in the importation rate corresponds to a 10% reduction in the average probability of hospitalization. Also shown is the equivalence between a reduction in the importation rate and the average probability of ICU admission (cfr. Eq. (14)).

165 **Application to Newfoundland and Labrador:** Fig. 3 shows the reduction in the risk of hospitalization
 166 obtained when 6,000 rotational workers (corresponding to 1% of the total population) or 6,000 individu-
 167 als between 80 and 84 years (i.e., half of the 80-84 age group in NL) are vaccinated. We can see that if
 168 infection prevalence is initially zero and if rotational workers are responsible for 60% of the importations,
 169 vaccinating rotational workers decreases the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission by 42%. Alter-
 170 natively, vaccinating older adults would lead to a 7% reduction in the risk of hospitalization and a 12%
 171 reduction in the risk of ICU admission for the susceptible population. Even if non-self-isolating rotational
 172 workers are responsible for only 20% of importations, vaccination would lead to a 16% reduction in the
 173 risk of hospitalization and ICU admission, which is still higher than the reduction achieved by vaccinating
 174 half of the 80-84 age group.

175 Using Eqs. (3) and (13) we can show that, if infection prevalence at the time of vaccination is zero,
 176 vaccinating rotational workers may ensure a large reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admis-
 177 sion with a lower number of vaccines. We estimate that if vaccination reduces viral transmission by 67%
 178 (Wise, 2021), and if rotational workers are responsible of 60% of the importations (with 1.2 importations
 179 per month due to non-self-isolating rotational workers and 0.8 non-self-isolated importations per month
 180 due to other sources, i.e., $W\eta = 1.2/30$ and $\omega = 0.8/30$), vaccinating 6,000 rotational workers would lead

181 to a 42% reduction in the importation rate, and thus to an equivalent reduction in the risk of hospital-
182 ization and ICU admission (see Eq. (13) and Fig. 3). In contrast, vaccinating all individuals aged 75 and
183 older in NL (about 43,300 individuals, or 8% of the total population) would lead to only a 24% reduction
184 in the risk of hospitalization, and a 45% reduction in the risk of ICU admission.

185 The benefits of vaccinating rotational workers decrease rapidly with increasing number of infectious
186 cases in the community. With 50 infectious cases in the community (not in self-isolation), vaccinating half
187 of the 80-84 age group has a nearly equivalent impact on reducing the risk of hospitalization as vaccinating
188 rotational workers, even if rotational workers are responsible for 80% of the imported cases. With only
189 20 infectious cases, the reduction in the risk of ICU admission obtained when vaccinating older adults is
190 nearly equivalent to what obtained by vaccinating rotational workers.




Fig. 3: Percent reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission when rotational workers (blue curves) or half of adults in the 80-84 age group in NL are vaccinated (red curves). The numbers on the blue lines are the percentage of importations due to non-self-isolating rotational workers. Vaccinating rotational workers decreases the risk of hospitalizations and ICU admissions alike (see Eqs. (6)). Results are obtained using the model presented in the system of Eq. (1), with parameter values given in Table 1.

191 Discussion

192 Most studies on vaccine priorities found that an efficient strategy to reduce severe illness due to COVID-19
193 is to first vaccinate groups that are likely to experience severe illness (Bubar et al., 2021; Babus et al.,
194 2020; Jentsch et al., 2020; Buckner et al., 2020). However, these studies did not consider the impact of
195 disease importations on the infection dynamics. Importations can constitute a significant infection source
196 in regions such as the Atlantic Provinces and the Territories, where most COVID-19 cases are travel-
197 related. We consider both community spread and virus importations by travelers to evaluate the impact
198 of vaccinating rotational workers on reducing the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission. We show
199 that, when disease prevalence at the time of vaccination is low, community spread can be significantly
200 reduced by vaccinating individuals that are likely to introduce the disease in the community, thereby
201 indirectly protecting vulnerable individuals from infection.

202 We compare the expected number of hospitalizations and ICU admission over four months in the

203 absence of vaccination to this same quantity if rotational workers or vulnerable groups had been vaccinated.
204 We found that, when infection prevalence at the time of vaccination is zero, an X% decrease in the
205 importation rate and an X% decrease in the average probability of hospitalization (or ICU admission)
206 reduce the risk of hospitalization (and ICU admission) in the community by equal amounts. However, if the
207 number of rotational workers is low, reducing disease importations would require significantly less vaccines
208 than reducing the average probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission. We show that the reduction
209 in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission when vaccinating 6,000 rotational workers (or 1% of the
210 NL population) can be 3-7 times larger than that obtained if the same number of vaccines were directly
211 given to individuals aged 80 years and older instead. Indeed, vaccinating a small number of older adults
212 would not be sufficient to significantly lower the average hospitalization and ICU admission probabilities
213 amongst the remaining susceptible population when the number of elderly individuals vaccinated is too
214 few. This strategy, however, relies on being able to correctly identify rotational workers, so as to not
215 vaccinate individuals who falsely identify themselves as such.

216 Vaccinating rotational workers becomes less desirable when infection prevalence in the community
217 at the time of vaccination is high. Our findings are in agreement with the analysis of [Russell et al.](#)
218 ([2021](#)), showing that imported cases greatly contribute to local epidemic outbreaks in countries with low
219 COVID-19 prevalence, but not in regions with high prevalence. Our analysis shows that the prioritization
220 of rotational workers for vaccination will reduce the importation rate and is likely to prevent community
221 outbreaks that might otherwise have occurred, but we note that it will not be possible to observe these
222 averted community outbreaks. Therefore, while the prioritization of rotational workers should be consid-
223 ered for communities with low infection prevalence to protect their vulnerable groups, the effect of this
224 vaccination strategy can only be assessed with scenario modelling.

225 Our work provides an analytical criteria that can be easily adopted by public health officials to evaluate
226 whether protection of vulnerable individuals can be achieved by prioritizing members of the mobile labour
227 force for vaccination. Our criteria relates basic elements, such as infection prevalence at the time of
228 vaccination, importation rate, viral transmission after vaccination, and population age structure, to the
229 risk of hospitalization and ICU admission before and after vaccination. Our simple model disentangles
230 the basic relationships between the importation rate and the consequent community infection dynamics,
231 to capture features relevant for planning vaccines prioritization strategies. The analysis presented here
232 can be easily applied to compare vaccinating rotational workers and any vulnerable group known to be
233 at high risk from COVID-19, consisting for example of individuals with health conditions or individuals
234 of other age groups, provided that their vaccination leads to a reduction in the average probabilities of
235 hospitalization and ICU admission of the susceptible population.

236 For more accurate predictions, future research should consider rotational worker compliance with
237 quarantine, self-isolation and testing requirements ([Arino et al., 2020](#)), disease prevalence at work loca-
238 tion (affecting the importation rate) ([Lopez et al., 2016](#)), the risk of importing new variants of concern
239 ([Du et al., 2021](#)), waning immunity ([Bubar et al., 2021](#)), non-pharmaceutical interventions, population
240 heterogeneity, and, more generally, stochasticity. Variants of concern are particularly relevant to consider,
241 as immediately after their identification, the prevalence of the particular variant will be low in all other
242 regions. Therefore, our results may apply to all regions of the world with a substantial mobile work force
243 when variants of concern with significant novel effects emerge. Additionally, the dichotomy we consider
244 is to illustrate the value of vaccinating rotational workers, which has been under-explored, however, in
245 practice a multi-pronged approach where vulnerable groups and rotational workers are vaccinated simulta-
246 neously is sensible, particularly as more vaccines arrive. Finally, the focus of our work is epidemiological,
247 although economic implications, moral and ethical considerations, and consequences for mental health
248 should also be considered ([Giubilini, 2019](#); [Premji, 2020](#)).

249 Acknowledgement

250 We acknowledge Randy Giffen for suggesting that we conduct this study. AH is supported by grants from
251 the National Science and Engineering Research Council (Discovery Grant), the Atlantic Association for
252 Research in the Mathematical Sciences Centre for Disease Modelling, and the Newfoundland and Labrador
253 Centre for Health Information. AH and MM acknowledge financial support from CANMOD (Canadian
254 Network for Modelling Infectious Diseases - Réseau canadien de modélisation des maladies infectieuses).

255 References

- 256 Jonathan Corum, Denise Grady, Sui-Lee Wee, and Carl Zimmer. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. *The New*
257 *York Times*, 5, 2020.
- 258 Kate M Bubar, Kyle Reinholt, Stephen M Kissler, Marc Lipsitch, Sarah Cobey, Yonatan H Grad, and
259 Daniel B Larremore. Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus.
260 *Science*, 371(6532):916–921, 2021.
- 261 Nicola Mulberry, P Tupper, E Kirwin, C McCabe, and Caroline Colijn. Vaccine rollout strategies: The
262 case for vaccinating essential workers early. *medRxiv*, 2021.
- 263 Jiangzhuo Chen, Stefan Hoops, Achla Marathe, Henning Mortveit, Bryan Lewis, Srinivasan Venkatra-
264 manan, Arash Haddadan, Parantapa Bhattacharya, Abhijin Adiga, Anil Vullikanti, et al. Prioritizing
265 allocation of COVID-19 vaccines based on social contacts increases vaccination effectiveness. *medRxiv*,
266 2021.
- 267 NHS. Who’s at higher risk from coronavirus. [https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-](https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/people-at-higher-risk/who-is-at-high-risk-from-coronavirus)
268 [19/people-at-higher-risk/who-is-at-high-risk-from-coronavirus](https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/people-at-higher-risk/who-is-at-high-risk-from-coronavirus), accessed on Sept 23, 2021.
- 269 Govind Persad, Ezekiel J Emanuel, Samantha Sangenito, Aaron Glickman, Steven Phillips, and Emily A
270 Largent. Public Perspectives on COVID-19 Vaccine Prioritization. *JAMA Network Open*, 4(4):e217943–
271 e217943, 2021.
- 272 Michael K Lemke. Commercial truck drivers should be a priority population for COVID-19 vaccinations.
273 *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 64(3):217–219, 2021.
- 274 Barbara Neis, Kerri Neil, and Katherine Lippel. Mobility in a Pandemic: COVID-19 and the Mobile
275 Labour Force, Working Paper. 2020.
- 276 Statistica. Population estimates for Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada from 2000 to
277 2020. [https://www.statista.com/statistics/569858/population-estimates-newfoundland-and-labrador-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/569858/population-estimates-newfoundland-and-labrador-canada)
278 [canada](https://www.statista.com/statistics/569858/population-estimates-newfoundland-and-labrador-canada), accessed March 15, 2021, 2021.
- 279 Amy Hurford, Proton Rahman, and J Concepción Loredó-Osti. Modelling the impact of travel restrictions
280 on COVID-19 cases in Newfoundland and Labrador. *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(6):202266, 2021.
- 281 Isha Berry, Jean-Paul R Soucy, Ashleigh Tuite, and David Fisman. Open access epidemiologic data and
282 an interactive dashboard to monitor the COVID-19 outbreak in Canada. *CMAJ*, 192(15):E420–E420,
283 2020.
- 284 Christopher Macdonald Hewitt, Michael Haan, and Barbara Neis. Interprovincial employees from New-
285 foundland and Labrador, 2005-2014. 2018.
- 286 GovNL. Definition of rotational worker. [https://www.gov.nl.ca/covid-19/self-isolation/rotational-](https://www.gov.nl.ca/covid-19/self-isolation/rotational-workers)
287 [workers](https://www.gov.nl.ca/covid-19/self-isolation/rotational-workers), accessed March 15, 2021, 2021.

- 288 William Ogilvy Kermack and Anderson G McKendrick. A contribution to the mathematical theory of
289 epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A.*, 115(772):700–721, 1927.
- 290 Amy Hurford and James Watmough. Don’t wait, re-escalate: delayed action results in longer duration of
291 COVID-19 restrictions. *medRxiv*, pages 2020–11, 2021.
- 292 Jacqui Wise. COVID-19: New data on Oxford AstraZeneca vaccine backs 12 week dosing interval, 2021.
- 293 NL Population and Demographics. NL Population and Demographics,
294 <https://www.statista.com/statistics/463905/canada-real-gross-domestic-product-by-province>. Ac-
295 cessed: 2021-03-03.
- 296 Neil M Ferguson, Daniel Laydon, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Natsuko Imai, Kylie Ainslie, Marc Baguelin,
297 Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, et al. Impact
298 of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand.
299 Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. *Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team*, page 20,
300 2020.
- 301 Andreas Kronbichler, Daniela Kresse, Sojung Yoon, Keum Hwa Lee, Maria Effenberger, and Jae Il Shin.
302 Asymptomatic patients as a source of COVID-19 infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
303 *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 98:180–186, 2020.
- 304 Merryn Voysey, Sue Ann Costa Clemens, Shabir A Madhi, Lily Y Weckx, Pedro M Folegatti, Parvinder K
305 Aley, Brian Angus, Vicky L Baillie, Shaun L Barnabas, Qasim E Bhorat, et al. Safety and efficacy of the
306 ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised
307 controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *The Lancet*, 397(10269):99–111, 2021.
- 308 Maria Deloria Knoll and Chizoba Wonodi. Oxford–AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine efficacy. *The Lancet*,
309 397(10269):72–74, 2021.
- 310 Ana Babus, Sanmay Das, and SangMok Lee. The optimal allocation of COVID-19 vaccines. *medRxiv*,
311 2020.
- 312 Peter Jentsch, Madhur Anand, and Chris T Bauch. Prioritising COVID-19 vaccination in changing social
313 and epidemiological landscapes. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- 314 Jack H Buckner, Gerardo Chowell, and Michael R Springborn. Optimal dynamic prioritization of scarce
315 COVID-19 vaccines. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- 316 Timothy W Russell, Joseph T Wu, Sam Clifford, W John Edmunds, Adam J Kucharski, Mark Jit, et al.
317 Effect of internationally imported cases on internal spread of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling
318 study. *The Lancet Public Health*, 6(1):e12–e20, 2021.
- 319 Julien Arino, Nicolas Bajeux, Stephanie Portet, and James Watmough. Assessing the risk of covid-19
320 importation and the effect of quarantine. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- 321 Luis Fernandez Lopez, Marcos Amaku, Francisco Antonio Bezerra Coutinho, Mikkel Quam,
322 Marcelo Nascimento Burattini, Claudio José Struchiner, Annelies Wilder-Smith, and Eduardo Massad.
323 Modeling importations and exportations of infectious diseases via travelers. *Bulletin of Mathematical*
324 *Biology*, 78(2):185–209, 2016.
- 325 Zhanwei Du, Lin Wang, Bingyi Yang, Sheikh Taslim Ali, Tim K Tsang, Songwei Shan, Peng Wu, Eric HY
326 Lau, Benjamin J Cowling, and Lauren Ancel. International risk of the new variant COVID-19 impor-
327 tations originating in the United. *Science*, 371:9–10, 2021.

328 Alberto Giubilini. *The ethics of vaccination*. Springer Nature, 2019.

329 Stephanie Premji. A virus that doesn't discriminate? [https://www.onthemovepartnership.ca/a-virus-](https://www.onthemovepartnership.ca/a-virus-that-doesnt-discriminate)
330 that-doesnt-discriminate, accessed on March 11, 2021, 2020.

331 Appendix A: Supplementary Data

332 Population:

- 333 • Age groups considered:
334 $\{0-9, 10-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, 80+\}$.
- 335 • Population of Newfoundland and Labrador by age group ([Population and Demographics](#)):
336 $P_{nl} = \{43778, 53180, 56986, 59093, 67180, 83319, 82057, 53637, 22873\}$.
- 337 • Proportion of the Newfoundland and Labrador population in each age group (where the total pop-
338 ulation size $N = 522,103$ ([Population and Demographics](#))):
339 $p_{nl_0} = \frac{1}{N} P_{nl}$.
- 340 • Proportion of the susceptible Newfoundland and Labrador population in each age group (if individ-
341 uals aged 85 and above, 10,256 people ([Population and Demographics](#)), are vaccinated. We assume
342 that vaccination reduces viral transmission by 0.67% ([Knoll and Wonodi, 2021](#))):
343 $p_{nl} = \frac{1}{N-10,256(1-0.67)} P_{NL}$.
- 344 • Proportion of the unvaccinated Newfoundland and Labrador population in each age group (if half of
345 the 80-84 age group, 6,309 people, and individuals aged 85 and above, 10,256 people, are vaccinated.
346 We assume that vaccination reduces viral transmission by 67% ([Knoll and Wonodi, 2021](#))):
347 $p_{nl_r} = \frac{1}{N-(10,256+6,309)(1-0.67)} P_{NL}$.

348 Probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission:

- 349 • Age-stratified probabilities of hospitalization given symptomatic infection ([Ferguson et al., 2020](#)):
350 $p_s = \{0.001, 0.003, 0.012, 0.032, 0.049, 0.102, 0.166, 0.243, 0.273\}$.
- 351 • Age-stratified probabilities of asymptomatic infection (adapted from [Kronbichler et al. \(2020\)](#)):
352 $p_a = \{0.191, 0.147, 0.162, 0.147, 0.074, 0.103, 0.074, 0.074, 0.074\}$.
- 353 • Age-stratified probabilities of hospitalization (assuming that asymptomatic infections do not result
354 in hospitalization.) ($p_{h_0} = p_s(1 - p_a)$):
355 $p_{h_0} = \{0.0008, 0.0026, 0.0101, 0.0273, 0.0454, 0.0915, 0.1537, 0.2250, 0.2528\}$.
- 356 • Age-stratified probabilities of ICU admission given hospitalization ([Ferguson et al., 2020](#)):
357 $p_{uh_0} = \{0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 0.063, 0.122, 0.274, 0.432, 0.709\}$.
- 358 • Age-stratified probabilities of ICU admission ($p_{u_0} = p_{h_0}p_{uh_0}$):
359 $p_{u_0} = \{0.0000, 0.0001, 0.0005, 0.0014, 0.0029, 0.0112, 0.0421, 0.0972, 0.1792\}$.

360 **Probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission after vaccination of older individuals:** To calculate
361 those probabilities we assume that vaccination prevents severe illness ([Voysey et al., 2021](#); [Knoll and](#)
362 [Wonodi, 2021](#)), and that the probability of hospitalization and ICU admission of vaccinated individuals
363 is 0. In NL, there is 10,256 individuals aged 85 and above, and 12,617 are between 80 and 84 years
364 old ([Population and Demographics](#)). Vaccinating half of the 80-84 age group corresponds therefore to
365 vaccinating 6,309 individuals.

- 366 • Age-stratified probabilities of hospitalization given infection if individuals aged 85 and above are
367 vaccinated:
368 $p_h = \{0.0008, 0.0026, 0.0101, 0.0273, 0.0454, 0.0915, 0.1537, 0.2250, 0.1394\}$.
- 369 • Average probability of hospitalization if individuals aged 85 and above are vaccinated:
370 $P_h = (\sum p_h p_{nl}) \times 100 = 7.89\%$
- 371 • Age-stratified probabilities of ICU admission if individuals aged 85 and above are vaccinated:
372 $p_u = \{0.0000, 0.0001, 0.0005, 0.0014, 0.0029, 0.0112, 0.0421, 0.0972, 0.0988\}$.
- 373 • Average probability of hospitalization if individuals aged 85 and above are vaccinated:
374 $P_u = (\sum p_u p_{nl}) \times 100 = 2.35\%$
- 375 • Age-stratified probabilities of hospitalization if half of the 80-84 age group and individuals aged 85
376 and above are vaccinated:
377 $p_{h_r} = \{0.0008, 0.0026, 0.0101, 0.0273, 0.0454, 0.0915, 0.1537, 0.2250, 0.0697\}$.
- 378 • Average probability of hospitalization when half of the 80-84 age group and individuals aged 85 and
379 above are vaccinated:
380 $P_{h_r} = (\sum p_{h_r} p_{nl_r}) \times 100 = 7.61\%$
- 381 • Age-stratified probabilities of ICU admission if half of the 80-84 age group and individuals aged 85
382 and above are vaccinated:
383 $p_{u_r} = \{0.0000, 0.0001, 0.0005, 0.0014, 0.0029, 0.0112, 0.0421, 0.0972, 0.0494\}$.
- 384 • Average probability of ICU admission if half of the 80-84 age group and individuals aged 85 and
385 above are vaccinated:
386 $P_{u_r} = (\sum p_{u_r} p_{nl_r}) \times 100 = 2.14\%$
- 387 • Most of the rotational workers of Newfoundland and Labrador are between the ages of 25 and
388 39 (Hewitt et al., 2018). As the number of individuals in those age classes is high, and as the
389 probabilities of hospitalization and ICU admission for those age classes are low, we assume that
390 vaccinating rotational workers does not affect the average probabilities of hospitalization and ICU
391 admission of the susceptible population.

392 **Appendix B: The impact of β on reducing the risk of hospitalization and ICU**
 393 **admission.**




Fig. B.1: (a) Number of cumulative cases $C(T)$ as a function of time T for different values of the transmission rate β (cfr. Eq. (12)). Dotted lines represent $C(T)$ before a reduction in the importation rate ($m_0 = 2/30$), while solid lines represent $C(T)$ after the importation rate have been reduced by 50% ($m_r = 1/30$). (b) Reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission due to a reduction in the importation rate, for different values of the transmission rate β , where the percent risk reduction is computed as $[1 - C(T, m_0)/C(T, m_r)] \times 100$. In the plots we consider $I_0 = 20$. For $I_0 = 0$, the reduction in the risk of hospitalization and ICU admission does not depend on β nor on time T (cfr. Eq. (13)) and it is constant at 50% (i.e., $[1 - m_r/m_0] \times 100$). For $I_0 > 0$ the impact of decreasing importations to reduce hospitalization and ICU admission is larger when the transmission rate β is low and when longer time intervals are considered.




Fig. B.2: Same as Fig. B.1 but the importation rate is larger, with $m_0 = 5/30$ and $m_r = 2.5/30$.