Incorporating the mutational landscape of SARS-COV-2 variants and case-dependent vaccination rates into epidemic models

Mohammad Mihrab Chowdhury [1a], Md Rafiul Islam[b], Md Sakhawat Hossain[a], Nusrat Tabassum[a], Angela Peace[a]

[a] *Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA*
[b] *Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA*

Abstract

Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), which began as a small outbreak in Wuhan, China in December 2019, became a global pandemic within months due to its high transmissibility. In the absence of pharmaceutical treatment, various non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to contain the spread of COVID-19 brought the entire world to a halt. After almost a year of seemingly returning to normalcy with the world's quickest vaccine development, the advent of more infectious and vaccine resistant coronavirus variants is bringing the situation back to where it was a year ago. In the light of this new situation, we conducted a study to portray the possible scenarios based on the three key factors : impact of interventions (pharmaceutical and NPIs), vaccination rate, and vaccine efficacy. In our study, we assessed two of the most crucial factors, transmissibility and vaccination rate, in order to reduce the spreading of COVID in a simple but effective manner. In order to incorporate the time-varying mutational landscape of COVID-19 variants, we estimated a weighted transmissibility composed of the proportion of existing strains that naturally vary over time. Additionally, we consider time varying vaccination rates based on the number of daily new cases. Our method for calculating the vaccination rate from past active cases is an effective approach in forecasting probable future scenarios as it actively tracks people's attitudes toward immunization as active cases change. Our simulations show that if a large number of individuals cannot be vaccinated in a short period of time, adopting NPIs is the best approach to manage disease transmission with the emergence of new vaccine breakthrough variants and more infectious variants.

Keywords: Break-Through Variants, Waning Immunity, Reinfection, Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs), Vaccination Rate

1. Introduction

The catastrophic effect of the H1N1 virus (Influenza Flu) in the twentieth century has returned with the worldwide spread of coronavirus. Coronavirus illness (COVID-19) is an excellent illustration of what may happen if the proper preventive measures are not taken in a timely way, even in this advanced age of technology and medical understanding (Rossen et al., 2020). Although NPIs have played a critical role in reducing the death toll and number of infected people in the absence of medical treatment, delayed interventions and

[1] corresponding author e-mail address: mu.chowdhury@ttu.edu

underestimating the severity of the situation have resulted in over 205 million infected cases, 4.3 million deaths, and billions of dollars in economic losses worldwide (Cutler and Summers, 2020). Due to delayed measures during the initial wave, coronavirus is responsible for between 593,126 and 752,284 excess deaths in the USA (Center for Disease Control, 2021b).
To counteract the economic losses and death toll, the world's quickest vaccine was invented (Andreadakis et al., 2020). With the proper allocation of the vaccine, the number of infected persons and disease-related mortality has reduced over time, allowing people to return to their normal lifestyles without using NPIs after more than a year (Islam et al., 2021). However, the advent of new variants (delta, lambda, delta plus, and so on) is prompting a new pandemic wave to sweep the world right now. With the mass vaccination program, there was an almost exponential drop in the number of infected persons between January 8, 2021 to June 7, 2021 but with the emergence of new variants, the number of infected people is exponentially growing again. If proper steps are not implemented quickly, the new variants could produce a considerably worse situation than previous coronavirus waves. The false sense of security can reenact the historic super-spreader incident of the Philadelphia Parade-1918, which resulted in 13000 more deaths in Philadelphia in three months owing to the Spanish flu pandemic (Stetler, 2017).

In light of this situation, in our study, we sought to model scenarios by varying the overall population adoption of NPIs in conjunction with vaccine efficacy, antibody waning, and change in prevalence of the co-circulating variants of the coronavirus over time. One of the most pressing questions during the COVID-19 pandemic was how to correctly parameterize the value of transmission rate (β). It has been quite challenging to keep up with the evolution of coronavirus in estimating β value. Due to the continual appearance of newer strains of coronavirus with distinct characteristics, estimating a transmissibility value without taking the strains into consideration has now become redundant.

In our model, we have considered a time-varying variant((prevalence) dependent transmission parameter (β) by adapting the approach from Islam et al. (2021). To assess the transmissibility, our approach takes into consideration a crucial factor: the changing nature of coronavirus predominant strains over time, making it useful in the present. On the other hand, boosting the number of vaccinated people is one of the most important elements in reducing COVID-19's devastating effects. As people's perceptions fluctuate over time, especially with the number of active cases (Center for Disease Control, 2021a), fixed vaccination rate will give a false hope to curb the disease. This method gives a fair picture of how the vaccination rate changes when the number of current cases changes, which is one of the key reasons why individuals become vaccinated (Hamel et al., KFF,Sep 28, 2021). Furthermore, with the emergence of new variants, this strategy can be very valuable for planning the third dose and booster dose vaccine based just on historical data of daily cases. As vaccine protection lasts at least six months (Pfizer Inc, 2021), we observed from our simulations that the best way to reduce disease-induced death is to increase vaccination rates, presuming the vaccine is extremely effective against all variants. However, owing to people's concern over vaccination safety, NPIs are the only thing that can prevent unvaccinated individuals from falling ill. Interestingly, we found that NPIs had an effect comparable to raising vaccination rates to control the epidemic. As a result, the best method for reducing the spread and death toll is to boost immunization and implement NPIs until herd immunity is achieved. With more data available, this model can provide more accurate projections.

2. Methodology

2.1. Model development

We developed an extension of the basic SEIR type compartmental deterministic model to project future disease dynamics in the USA. Our model consists of two distinct tracks for vaccinated and unvaccinated persons, which take into consideration vaccination rates, waning immunity, viral variantions, and reinfection. The compartmental model diagram is shown in figure 1. The model divides the population into seven compartments: unvaccinated susceptible individuals (S), vaccinated susceptible individuals (V), unvaccinated exposed individuals (E), vaccinated exposed individuals (E_v), unvaccinated infected individuals (I), vaccinated infected individuals (I_v), and recovered individuals (R).



Figure 1: SEIR (Susceptible, Exposed, Infected, Recovered) type Compartmental Model. Here people moves from susceptible (S) and vaccinated (V) compartment to exposed compartment (E and E_v) at $\beta\sigma$ and $\beta\rho\sigma$ respectively. From E and E_v people become infected (I and I_v) after incubation period α. Then from I and I_v, infected people either go to the recovery compartment R or die. With the waning of antibodies, individuals move back to the S compartment from the R and V compartments.

Here, we assume that successful transmission has occurred for both exposed vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals (E and E_v). Unlike existing models in Byambasuren et al. (2020); Buitrago-Garcia et al. (2020); Aguilar et al. (2020); Kronbichler et al. (2020), this model does not explicitly track asymptomatic infections separately from symptomatic infections. This will not impact the result of our model as the asymptomatic cases go to the recovery without getting identified. In fact, there isn't enough information on asymptomatic cases of the variants. Further to that, due to the increased virulence of the new variants, we focused our research on how the changing proportions of variants affects symptomatic people, for whom the cases may be more deadly than the original strain.

2.2. Disease Dynamics

The susceptible population is exposed to the illness at a rate of β and vaccinated at a rate of η. Although, the vaccinated susceptible population is exposed to the disease at the same rate as the unvaccinated people, but only a fraction of them will become infected due to the vaccine's protection. After the incubation period (α), the exposed population goes to I and I_v compartment. Then infected persons transfer from I and I_v compartments by recovering at γ and γ_v or by passing away at μ and μ_v rates respectively. We are assuming both vaccinated and non-vaccinated people will take same time to recover. The vaccinated

and recovered population again become susceptible owing to the decrease in immunity over time at a rates ω_v and ω respectively.

The following system of differential equations is our model equations which keep tracks how the individual moves from one compartment to another compartment.

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
\dot{S} &= \omega_v V + \omega R - \beta\sigma(I + I_v)S - \eta S \\
\dot{E} &= \beta\sigma(I + I_v)S - \alpha E \\
\dot{I} &= \alpha E - (\gamma + \mu)I \\
\dot{V} &= \eta S - \beta\rho\sigma(I + I_v)V - \omega_v V \\
\dot{E}_v &= \beta\rho\sigma(I + I_v)V - \alpha E_v \\
\dot{I}_v &= \alpha E_v - (\mu_v + \gamma_v)E_v \\
\dot{R} &= \gamma I + \gamma_v I_v - \omega R
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1}$$

2.3. Model Parameterization

Our model consists of ten parameters. Depending on the availability of data, we estimated some and took some of the well established parameters value based on literature. Determining the value of transmissibility, β, is the most challenging parameter of all due to the coronavirus's ever-changing nature and the abundance of circulating variants. To take into account circulating variants and their relative transmissibility, we used the data from Center for Disease Control (2021a) to generate a weighted average of transmissibility based on relative infectivity and circulating variants prevalence over time by incorporating the approach from Islam et al. (2021). Then β becomes time dependent that takes into account the emergence of newer virulent variants.



(a) (b)

Figure 2: (a) Based on CDC's Prevalence statistics, the change in prevalence of variants of coronavirus over time from May 29 to Aug 28 (Center for Disease Control, 2021a). (b) The relative infectivity of circulating viral variants is shown based on 50% increase in infectivity for alpha (B.1.1.7)with respect to gamma and other co-circulating variants and a 50% increase in infectivity for delta (B.1.617.2) in comparison to alpha (B.1.1.7) (blue circles). To estimate future relative infectivity, a logistic equation is fitted with the model (pink curve). (See the Appendix C for fitted logistic equation)

By plotting the daily infection and vaccination data over time from the Center for Disease Control (2021a), we see that the number of people who have been vaccinated per day fluctuates according to the number of infected people per day(figure 3a). We assume that

the time-varying vaccination rate (η) is proportional to the number of active cases based on this phenomenon. If the number of cases rises, more individuals will be interested to take the vaccine. Using the data from Center for Disease Control (2021a), we have calculated the vaccination rate (η) by using the formula, $\eta = \frac{\text{Vaccination Per Day}}{\text{Total Population}}$,where for total population we used the most recent value from the U.S. Census Bureau (2020).

Using the vaccination data from the Center for Disease Control (2021a), we utilized statistical techniques to fit the vaccination rate to the number of daily cases shown in figure 3b. To estimate the vaccination rate using the linear regression approach, we used the number of daily cases as a predictor to estimate the vaccination rate using the linear regression approach. This fitted function will predict future vaccination rates based on the values of past cases.



(a) (b)

Figure 3: (a) Daily data on infections and vaccination rate from the Center for Disease Control (2021a). (b) The red solid line here represents the linear function which estimates the vaccination rate.

We have assumed the incubation period (α) is the same for both vaccinated and unvaccinated people to become infected (Center for Disease Control, 2021c). The recovery rate (γ) and disease induced death rate (μ) for the non vaccinated persons are adopted from Sy et al. (2021). We have used the recovery rate (γ_v) and disease induced death rate (μ_v) adopted from Vahidy et al. (2021) or Center for Disease Control (2021d) for vaccinated people. Based on the recent study, we assumed that the vaccination would be effective for at least 6 months (Pfizer Inc, 2021) and the recovered patients would have the same period of protection as vaccinated persons.

Parameter	Base Value	Source
β (Transmission rate)	[0.3430 - 0.5819]	Callibrated
η (Vaccination rate)	[.0004 - .001]	Estimated
ρ (Vaccination Efficacy)	.95	Katella (2021); Pfizer Inc (2021)
α (Incubation Period)	$\frac{1}{5}\ day^{-}1$	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2020)
γ (Recovery rate)	0.1	Usherwood et al. (2021)
μ (Disease Induced Death Rate)	0.0005	Usherwood et al. (2021)
μ_v (Vaccinated Disease Induced Death Rate)	0.000041	Vahidy et al. (2021)
ω (Antibody Waning rate)	$\frac{1}{180} day^{-}1$	Assumed
ω_v (Vaccine Waning rate)	$\frac{1}{180} day^{-}1$	Pfizer Inc (2021)
σ (Adoption of NPIs)	[60%-80%]	Varying the parameter based on Borchering et al. (2021)

Table 1: Model Parameters and their description

3. Results

3.1. Analytic Results

The basic reproduction number (R_0) is an epidemiologic statistic used to describe the transmissibility of infectious agents. Although the vaccination of susceptible individuals of the community will limit the number of effective contacts between infectious and susceptible people, this activity will not reduce the R_0 value as R_0 assumes a completely susceptible population (Delamater et al., 2019). As a result, in addition to calculating the basic reproduction number (R_0) without the vaccination compartment, we have also estimated the effective reproduction number (R_e). The analytic expression of the effective reproduction number (R_e) is,

$$R_e = \beta\sigma\left(\frac{\omega_v}{(\omega_v+\eta)(\gamma+\mu)} + \frac{\eta\rho}{(\gamma_v+\mu_v)(\omega_v+\eta)}\right)$$

The detailed calculation using the next generation matrix approach of the basic reproduction number and effective reproduction number is shown in the Appendix A and B. The R_e value, rather than the R_0 value, would be reduced if the number of susceptible people in a population were reduced through vaccination. If R_e can be decreased to a value < 1, immunization might potentially halt an epidemic. (Anderson and May, 1992; Anderson, 1992; Rubió, 2012).

3.2. Co-Circulating Variants, Vaccine Efficacy and NPIs



(a) 70% (b) 80% (c) 95%

(d) 70% (e) 80% (f) 95%

Figure 4: The effect of NPIs adoption and vaccine efficacy on the daily number of infected cases is depicted in this graph. Figures A, B, and C depict the change in daily case count with fixed vaccination rate (70%,80%,95%) and changing adoption of NPIs and vaccine effectiveness, while figures D, E, and F depict the corresponding cumulative case count.From A,B,C,D,E,F, it is clear that if the majority of the population uses NPIs, NPIs will have the greatest influence on lowering the daily number of instances in the short and long term. If NPI adoption is not achievable, the only way to minimize the number of cases is to have a high vaccination rate with high effectiveness. (Check out Appendix D for a comparison of Peak values.)

Keeping a steady rate of viral transmission, we simulated the scenarios based on the adoption of NPIs and vaccine effectiveness (figure: 4). The reduction in vaccine efficacy occurs with time as well as with the advent of new vaccine breakthrough variants. People, on the other hand, are adopting NPIs as they see fit because there is no set of mandates for individuals to follow when it comes to NPI strategy, making it impossible to get information on which NPI approach is employed by how many people. Instead of concentrating on which NPIs are used, it is now more appropriate to take into account the proportion of the population that uses NPIs as a measure of prevention.
To simulate the scenarios of waning efficacy of vaccine, we varied the effectiveness of the vaccine from 70% to 95% (figure 4a, 4b, 4c). In the simulation, as the efficacy rises, the number of persons afflicted decreases significantly, implying that a highly effective vaccine is needed to reduce the number of illnesses in the short and long term.

On the other hand, if the number of infected people decreases, people will be less likely to use NPIs which is why we have varied the total populations adoption of NPIs to simulate the situations with different adoption rate. Figure 4 indicates that even if 80% of the population uses NPIs, the number of sick people will remain relatively low, regardless of vaccine effectiveness. It implies that using NPIs, until herd immunity is obtained or high vaccine efficacy is maintained indefinitely, is the best strategy.

3.3. Effective Reproduction Number

The effective reproduction number R_e is affected by changes in immunization rate, vaccine efficacy, and NPI adoption. While vaccine efficacy cannot be modified quickly, NPI adoption and vaccination rate can change drastically. Also, against the new variants, vaccine loses its efficacy (Center for Disease Control, 2021d) for whcih we calculated the R_e value by setting the vaccine effectiveness to 80% instead of 90% while varying the vaccination rate, η from .0001 to .003, as well as the NPIs adoption rate from 0% to 80%. The effective reproduction number fluctuates between 3.1953 (best scenario) and 0.4553 (worst scenario).

4. Discussion

The adoption of NPIs, effective allocation, and deployment by assuring the high efficacy of the vaccine against the virus throughout time are the most significant components in controlling the spread of the COVID-19. With the introduction of novel coronavirus variants and declining immunity over time, along with an increasing perception of safety, has produced an ideal environment for the superspreading of highly infectious and lethal coronavirus variants. In this situation, we developed an extension of the standard compartmental SEIR type model that dynamically tracks changes in co-circulating variants and dynamic vaccination rates. As time passes, the emergence of new coronavirus variants renders a fixed transmission rate obsolete, because each variant differs in terms of transmission potential. The overall coronavirus transmission rate changes over time depending on the transmissibility of the co-circulating variants. As a result, tracking the change in β value with the change in co-circulating variants over time is a useful technique to track the transmission rate of coronavirus at any given time. Furthermore, the vaccination data was not uniform at first due to people's anxiety and misinformation about the COVID-19 vaccinated. Based on our data fitting, it is clear that the vaccination rate currently follows the trend in daily number of cases with a lag, allowing us to create a time-varying case-dependent vaccination rate. This strategy particularly accounts for people's shifting attitudes toward vaccination as the



Figure 5: Heat-map here depict how with fixed vaccine efficiency the effective reproduction number (R_e), varies with vaccine rates and adoption of NPIs. With vaccine efficacy 80%, the most efficient method to halt the spread of the disease is to increase immunization rates paired with good implementation of NPIs until herd immunity is reached.

number of cases grows, making it a practical way to account for variants and vaccination rates in the current situation.

To reduce the complexity caused by the continual change in variants, we did not explicitly include asymptomatic infected people in our model, instead focusing on the shifting landscape of variant strains and parameterizing relative transmissibility using empirical time series weighted prevalence data for symptomatic people (figure 2). Furthermore, rather than indicating which NPIs are most beneficial, we now state what percentage of the population has implemented NPIs. This is the logical thing to do right now, because individuals are no longer adopting a predetermined set of NPIs plan, but rather choosing to protect themselves against the COVID-19 in their own way, as states no longer have a mandate. Moreover, to avoid the ambiguity about the efficacy of different NPIs measures, we concentrated on the overall adoption of NPIs by the proportion of the population.

Based on the findings of our model, we can definitely claim that vaccination rate, vaccine effectiveness, and NPIs are significant factors in reducing the number of infected patients and controlling the disease. According to our simulation, if vaccination efficacy declines slightly, the number of sick people increases considerably, demonstrating that vaccine efficacy is crucial for viral containment. As a result, the race to create and deliver booster doses and third dose is critical right now in order to maintain the vaccine's efficacy against new strains. On the other hand, if mass vaccination is not possible in a timely way or if vaccine breakthrough variants become prevalent, NPIs are the only option for controlling the spread of COVID-19.

The project's next phase will be to add asymptomatic individuals with strain-based data. Furthermore, vaccination data will grow more consistent over time, improving the accuracy of this model. Therefore, this modeling technique highlights the importance of the individuals to become vaccinated, as well as the need of planning and distributing booster dosages in a timely manner in order to mitigate the spread of coronavirus.

References

J. B. Aguilar, J. S. Faust, L. M. Westafer, and J. B. Gutierrez. Investigating the impact of asymptomatic carriers on COVID-19 transmission. *MedRxiv*, 2020.

R. M. Anderson. The concept of herd immunity and the design of community-based immunization programmes. *Vaccine*, 10(13):928–935, 1992.

R. M. Anderson and R. M. May. *Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control*. Oxford University Press, 1992.

Z. Andreadakis, A. Kumar, R. G. Román, S. Tollefsen, M. Saville, and S. Mayhew. The COVID-19 vaccine development landscape. *Nature reviews. Drug discovery*, 19(5):305–306, 2020.

R. K. Borchering, C. Viboud, E. Howerton, C. P. Smith, S. Truelove, M. C. Runge, N. G. Reich, L. Contamin, J. Levander, J. Salerno, et al. Modeling of future COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations, and deaths, by vaccination rates and nonpharmaceutical intervention scenarios—United States, April–September 2021. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 70(19):719, 2021.

D. Buitrago-Garcia, D. Egli-Gany, M. J. Counotte, S. Hossmann, H. Imeri, A. M. Ipekci, G. Salanti, and N. Low. Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS medicine*, 17(9):e1003346, 2020.

O. Byambasuren, M. Cardona, K. Bell, J. Clark, M.-L. McLaws, and P. Glasziou. Estimating the extent of asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Official Journal of the Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease Canada*, 5(4):223–234, 2020.

Center for Disease Control. Covid-data-tracker. https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home (Last accessed Sep 12, 2021), 2021a.

Center for Disease Control. Excess deaths associated with COVID-19. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid19/excess_deaths.htm (Sep 12, 2021), 2021b.

Center for Disease Control. Interim Clinical Guidance for Management of Patients with Confirmed Coronavirus Disease COVID-19. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html (Feb. 16, 2021), 2021c.

Center for Disease Control. Science brief: COVID-19 vaccines and vaccination. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/fully-vaccinated-people.html#ref15 (July 27, 2021), 2021d.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Prioritizing COVID-19 contact tracing mathematical modeling methods and findings. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/prioritization/mathematicalmodeling.html(Nov 23, 2020), 2020.

D. M. Cutler and L. H. Summers. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the $16 Trillion Virus. *JAMA*, 324 (15):1495–1496, 10 2020. ISSN 0098-7484. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.19759. URL https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.19759.

P. L. Delamater, E. J. Street, T. F. Leslie, Y. T. Yang, and K. H. Jacobsen. Complexity of the basic reproduction number (R0). *Emerging infectious diseases*, 25(1):1, 2019.

L. Hamel, L. Lopes, G. Sparks, A. Kirzinger, A. Kearney, M. Stokes, and M. Brodie. Kff COVID-19 vaccine monitor: September 2021. https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/poll-finding/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-september-2021/ (Last accessed Sep 30, 2021), KFF,Sep 28, 2021.

M. R. Islam, T. Oraby, A. McCombs, M. M. Chowdhury, M. Al-Mamun, M. G. Tyshenko, and C. Kadelka. Evaluation of the United States COVID-19 vaccine allocation strategy. *PLoS ONE*, 16(11):e0259700, 2021.

K. Katella. Comparing the COVID-19 vaccines: how are they different? Yale Medicine. *Family Health. https://www. yalemedicine. org/news/COVID-19-vaccine-comparison*, 2021.

A. Kronbichler, D. Kresse, S. Yoon, K. H. Lee, M. Effenberger, and J. I. Shin. Asymptomatic patients as a source of COVID-19 infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International journal of infectious diseases*, 98:180–186, 2020.

Pfizer Inc. Pfizer and BioNTech confirm high efficacy and no serious safety concerns through up to six months following second dose in updated top line analysis of landmark COVID-19 vaccine study. Pfizer, New York, April 1, 2021. (https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-and-biontech-confirm-high-efficacy-and-no-serious.opensinnewtab) (press release)., 2021.

L. M. Rossen, A. M. Branum, F. B. Ahmad, P. Sutton, and R. N. Anderson. Excess deaths associated with COVID-19, by age and race and ethnicity—United States, January 26–October 3, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69(42):1522, 2020.

P. P. Rubió. Is the basic reproductive number (R0) for measles viruses observed in recent outbreaks lower than in the pre-vaccination era? *Eurosurveillance*, 17(31):20233, 2012.

C. M. Stetler. The 1918 Spanish influenza: three months of horror in Philadelphia. *Pennsylvania History*, 84(4):462–487, 2017.

K. T. L. Sy, L. F. White, and B. E. Nichols. Population density and basic reproductive number of COVID-19 across United States counties. *PloS one*, 16(4):e0249271, 2021.

U.S. Census Bureau. QuickFacts United States. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/POP010220, 2020.

T. Usherwood, Z. LaJoie, and V. Srivastava. A model and predictions for COVID-19 considering population behavior and vaccination. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1):1–11, 2021.

F. S. Vahidy, L. Pischel, M. E. Tano, A. P. Pan, M. L. Boom, H. D. Sostman, K. Nasir, and S. B. Omer. Real World Effectiveness of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines against Hospitalizations and Deaths in the United States. *medRxiv*, 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.04.21.21255873.

Supplementary Materials

A. Base Reproduction Number

The Jacobian matrix J is obtained from linearizing the system 1. The disease-free equilibria of the model at $X_0 = (S_0, ...0, 0)$; where S_0 is the initial population of susceptible individuals. Evaluating the Jacobian matrix at X_0 yields

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega_v & 0 & \text{-}\beta & 0 & -\beta & \omega \\ 0 & \text{-}\omega_v & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\alpha & \beta & 0 & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & -\gamma \text{ - } \mu & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \text{-}\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha & \text{-}\gamma_v - \mu_v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma & 0 & \gamma_v & -\omega \end{pmatrix}$$

The linearized infected subsystem of 1 evolves according to the following set of equations for minor perturbations $z = (S, E, I, V, E_v, I_v, R)$ near the X_0

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = Mz$$

Here,

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha & \beta & 0 & \beta \\ \alpha & -\gamma \text{ - } \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{-}\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & \text{-}\gamma_v - \mu_v \end{pmatrix}$$

We decompose the matrix M into transmission (T) and transition (Σ) matrices respectively, obtaining

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = (T + \Sigma)$$

where

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta & 0 & \beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha & -\gamma \text{ - } \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{-}\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & \text{-}\gamma_v - \mu_v \end{pmatrix}$$

K is a large-domain next-generation matrix. Because T is ranked first, the NGM K is likewise ranked first. As a result, non-zero entries are only found in the first row of K. Therefore, K's spectral radius is the first item on the diagonal, i.e., K_{11}, which is identical to R_0. Therefore,

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma+\mu}$$

B. Effective Reproduction Number

The Jacobian matrix J is obtained from linearizing the system 1. The disease-free equilibria of the model at $X_0 = (\frac{V\omega_v}{\eta}, V, 0, ..., 0)$; where S_0 is the initial population of susceptible individuals. Now, reorganizing the DFE using, N = S + V as at DFE the population are either in susceptible compartment or in vaccinated compartment, we get, $X_0 = (\frac{N\omega_v}{(\omega_v+\eta)}, \frac{N\eta}{(\omega_v+\eta)}, 0, ..., 0)$ Evaluating the Jacobian matrix at X_0 yields

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} -\eta & \omega_v & 0 & -\frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 & -\frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} & \omega \\ \eta & -\omega_v & 0 & -\frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 & -\frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\alpha & \frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 & \frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & -\gamma - \mu & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} & -\alpha & \frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha & -\gamma_v - \mu_v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma & 0 & \gamma_v & -\omega \end{pmatrix}$$

The linearized infected subsystem of 1 evolves according to the following set of equations for minor perturbations $z = (S, E, I, V, E_v, I_v, R)$ near the X_0

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = Mz$$

Here,

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha & \frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 & \frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} \\ \alpha & -\gamma - \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} & -\alpha & \frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & -\gamma_v - \mu_v \end{pmatrix}$$

We decompose the matrix M into transmission (T) and transition (Σ) matrices respectively, obtaining

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = (T + \Sigma)$$

where

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} & 0 & \frac{\beta\sigma\omega_v}{\omega_v+\eta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} & -\alpha & \frac{\beta\rho\sigma\eta}{\omega_v+\eta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha & -\gamma \text{ - } \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{-}\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & \text{-}\gamma_v - \mu_v \end{pmatrix}$$

K is a large-domain next-generation matrix. Because T is ranked first, the NGM K is likewise ranked first. As a result, non-zero entries are only found in the first row of K. Therefore, K's spectral radius is the first item on the diagonal, i.e., K_{11}, which is identical to R_e. Therefore,

$$R_e = \beta\sigma\left(\frac{\omega_v}{(\omega_v+\eta)(\gamma+\mu)} + \frac{\eta\rho}{(\gamma_v+\mu_v)(\omega_v+\eta)}\right)$$

C. Data Fitting

C.1. Relative Infectivity

Relative infectivity is fitted against the number of days as time from May 29,2021 to August 28,2021 using the following logistic model.

$$\text{Relative Infectivity} = \frac{a_1}{1+exp(-(b_1+c_1*\text{time}))}.$$

where as the p-values are within range, all of the parameters a_1, b_1,and c_1 are statistically significant (table 2).
The fitted model:

$$\text{Relative Infectivity} = \frac{2.337597}{1+exp(-(0.276435+0.036925*\text{time}))}.$$

Parameters	Estimates	t-values	p-values
a_1	2.337598	50.577	$2.22e^{-14}$
b_1	0.276434	4.906	0.000467
c_1	0.036925	8.654	$3.07e^{-06}$

Table 2: Model Parameters and their description.

C.2. Vaccination Rate

Based on the daily number of cases, we built a simple linear regression model to estimate the vaccination rate. The fitted model is

$$\eta = a_2 + b_2 * \text{Daily Cases}$$

where all the estimate coefficient of the daily instances is statistically significant as all the $p - values$ are small.
The fitted model:

$$\eta = 6.176 * 10^{-9} + 9.028 * 10^{-5} * \text{Daily Cases}.$$

D. Peak Infections

The number of infections at their peak fluctuates dramatically depending on the circumstance. This statistic is critical for the health sector to take adequate precautions in order to prepare for the worst-case scenario in terms of affected persons.



Figure 6: The variation in the peak value of daily infected cases as a function of NPI uptake and vaccination effectiveness. With an increase in NPI uptake or vaccine efficacy, the peak value is much lower.