

1 Rapid Communication

2 **Partial lockdown on unvaccinated individuals** 3 **promises breaking of fourth COVID-19 wave in** 4 **Bavaria**

5 Tobias Krebs^{1,2*}, Michael J. Moeckel^{1,2}

6
7 ¹*Aschaffenburg University of Applied Sciences, Wuerzburger Str 45, 63739 Aschaffenburg, Germany*

8 ²*Center for Scientific Services and Transfer, Glanzstoffstr 1, Building Wa 07, 63784 Obernburg, Germany*

9 * *To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: tobias.krebs@th-ab.de*

10

11 **Abstract**

12 **Purpose of this report:** The aim of this rapid communication is a projection of the development of the fourth
13 COVID-19 wave in the federal state of Bavaria in Germany, taking into account different lockdown scenarios
14 especially for unvaccinated individuals. In particular, the number of infections and the occupancy of intensive care
15 facilities are considered.

16 **Applied Methods:** We use the agent-based epidemiological simulator Covasim for discussing various
17 epidemiological scenarios. Firstly, we adapt and calibrate our model to reproduce the historical course of the
18 COVID-19 pandemic in Bavaria. For this, we model and integrate numerous public health interventions imposed
19 on the local population. As for some of the political actions rigorous quantification is currently not available, we
20 fit those unknown (free) model parameters to published data on the measured epidemiological dynamics. Finally,
21 we define and analyse scenarios of different lockdown scenarios with restrictions for unvaccinated individuals in
22 different areas of life.

23 **Key message:** The results of our simulations show that in all scenarios considered, the number of infections, but
24 also the number of severe cases, exceed previous maximum values. Interventions, especially restrictions on
25 contacts of unvaccinated persons, can still mitigate the impact of the fourth COVID-19 wave on populations
26 substantially. Excluding unvaccinated students from attending classes has only a small impact on the public health
27 burden. However, many severe cases can be prevented by reducing community and/or work related contacts of
28 unvaccinated people, e.g. by achieving high home office rates.

29 Background

30 The COVID-19 pandemic has kept the world on suspense for almost two years and the number of deaths
31 associated with COVID-19 recently rose to over 100,000 (Robert Koch Institut 2021a). After a summer with low
32 infection rates, the Robert Koch Institute has recorded a rapidly increasing number of infections since the
33 beginning of the cold season, which now exceed all previously measured statistics (Robert Koch Institut 2021a,
34 2021c). The rate of fully vaccinated individuals in the population of Germany at the time of writing this report was
35 68%, in Bavaria slightly lower at 66% (Robert Koch Institut 2021b). A considerable fraction of the German
36 population is -despite the availability of sufficient vaccine- unwilling to be vaccinated for a variety of reasons
37 (Graeber et al. 2021) and thus still represent a large reservoir of susceptible individuals for corona virus
38 SARS-CoV-2 infection. At the time of this report, rising numbers of infections have raised concern on the
39 resilience of the healthcare system to cope with the number of expected hospitalizations. Therefore, the public
40 debate has returned to defining suitable public health interventions to reduce the number of severe cases. Since
41 unvaccinated individuals are at much higher risk of developing severe conditions, protecting them from infection
42 becomes a cornerstone of a public health strategy. This report contributes to the debate by investigating the
43 effectiveness of a partial lockdown, i.e. contact restrictions, only within the sub-population of unvaccinated
44 individuals. Our results show that among the considered scenarios such partial contact restrictions emerge as the
45 most effective way to protect unvaccinated populations from infection and to reduce the peak load on the healthcare
46 system..

47 Since the beginning of the pandemic, epidemiologists have been using computer simulations in an attempt to meet
48 the demands of decision-makers for scientific assessment of political options and forecasts on the development of
49 the pandemic. A variety of models with different approaches have been adapted or newly developed for the
50 COVID-19 pandemic (Panovska-Griffiths et al. 2021). Agent-based models have proven to be capable of
51 representing the complexity of the pandemic in some detail, including public health interventions, such that the
52 number of available models grew rapidly (Lorig et al. 2021). Covasim (Kerr et al. 2020) is one of these agent-
53 based COVID-19 simulators that have already been used by various scientists around the world for epidemiological
54 simulations (Stuart et al. 2020; Latkowski and Dunin-Kępicz 2021; Scott et al. 2021); we adapted it for the federal
55 state of Bavaria in Germany.

56

57 Methods

58 All our results are based on the agent-based simulation tool Covasim, which we used to simulate and compare
59 different lockdown scenarios for the federal state of Bavaria in Germany. We created a synthetic population that
60 matches statistically the real population of Germany in essential aspects, such as age structure or household
61 composition. Since simulations for the 13.1 million inhabitants of Bavaria would take an extremely long time, we
62 decided to scale up from a reduced sample. Thus, we carried out our simulations with 71,000 agents and all absolute
63 numbers were scaled accordingly by a factor of 185. Contact networks between the agents have been set up for
64 four typical environments: home, school, work and free time. The simulation essentially calculates probabilities
65 of virus transmission from one agent to another given existing contacts, allowing for a variety of active
66 countermeasures. In Covasim, a stochastic procedure determines actual infection events for each day by combining
67 specific transmission probabilities and contact networks. Thus, Covasim provides a comprehensive picture of the
68 infection incidence in a population and depicts the temporal evolution of the epidemiological dynamics.

69 We integrated non-pharmaceutical (public health) and pharmaceutical (vaccinations) interventions applied in
70 Bavaria into the Covasim simulator and, whenever possible, quantitatively modelled their extent using publicly
71 available data. Whenever the regulations in Bavaria were not uniform, we applied the regulations of the city of
72 Aschaffenburg for the federal state. The following aspects were accounted for into our model:

- 73 - We calibrated the base transmission probability such that actions like the obligation to wear facemasks,
74 increased hygienic barriers or enlarged average spacing of people at public places are included. From late
75 summer 2021 onwards, due to declining compliance in the population with some regulations, a
76 readjustment of the baseline transmission probability was necessary, reflecting the resulting increased
77 probability of infection in the case of contact between two agents, in order to reproduce the real pandemic
78 trajectory.
- 79 - The crossover from the wild variant of COVID-19 to alpha and delta variants were modelled continuously
80 as the simulation progresses

- 81 - PCR testing of the population is performed daily. We did not apply a uniform probability for selecting
82 agents for testing; however, we ensured that infected individuals with symptomatic courses are more
83 likely to receive testing than asymptomatic cases or uninfected individuals. Especially all severe and
84 critical cases are tested immediately. Covasim sends all diagnosed agents to quarantine. Estimates have
85 been made for the number of tests to be conducted in the future, based essentially on the assumption that
86 approximately the same number of tests will be conducted as last year.
- 87 - At the same time, we modelled contact tracing by public health departments, which trace direct contacts
88 of infected individuals and send them to quarantine.
- 89 - We included full school closures as well as hybrid teaching models with only half of the students present
90 at school.
- 91 - We simulated “working from home”-arrangements by assuming a reduced number of contacts at the work
92 level and represented private contact restrictions by a reduced number of contacts at leisure activities.
- 93 - During the summer months (until end of September) there is a reduced risk of infection (so-called
94 "summer effect"), possibly because of a shift of contacts from indoor to outdoor locations. We modelled
95 it by a correction to the risk of infection.
- 96 - We simulated travel during summer vacations by randomly imported infections during the vacation
97 season.
- 98 - Vaccinations, including first, second and booster vaccinations, were distributed to the population
99 according to the official figures of the Robert Koch Institute. We made assumptions for the number of
100 future vaccinations. For simplicity, we assumed that the Biontech/Pfizer vaccine was used for all
101 vaccinations.
- 102 - Starting on December 01, 2021, additional partial lockdown measures were simulated, which particularly
103 affect different areas of life of unvaccinated persons.

104 To implement the described measures in our Covasim model, some adjustments to the software were necessary.
105 In particular, changes were made to the implementation of vaccinations, for example to enable booster vaccinations
106 (Krebs et al. 2021) or to distribute them to certain age groups according to daily changing quotas. Further source
107 code modifications were necessary to integrate available data.

108 Procedures are described in the literature to allow for an automatic calibration process of agent-based models
109 (Hazelbag et al. 2020). In this case, however, manual adjustment of the model parameters proved to be the best
110 way of fitting. When calibrating the model, we fixed the free parameters of the model in such a way that the
111 simulated curves and the provided real data of the 7-day incidence and the critical cases in the period from February
112 01, 2020, to November 24, 2021, visibly matched well. Then, we used the calibrated model of the pandemic as a
113 starting point for simulating the following future lockdown scenarios:

- 114 - **Scenario NI, “no interventions”**: This scenario represents the case where no further action is taken. All
115 contacts remain as they were in October and November of 2021.
- 116 - **Scenario L2020, “lockdown 2020”**: Very strict interventions were imposed in March 2020 to mitigate
117 the impact of the first COVID wave. In this scenario, analogous to the 2020 lockdown, all schools were
118 closed; work contacts were reduced by 50% and leisure contacts by 70%. This scenario provides a
119 reference of how much could be achieved with a hard lockdown.
- 120 - **Scenario PL S100, “partial lockdown at school”**: In this scenario, it is simulated that only fully
121 vaccinated students are allowed to attend classes on site in the schools and unvaccinated students are
122 taught via home schooling.
- 123 - **Scenario PL W100, “partial lockdown at work”**: Another possibility for a lockdown for unvaccinated
124 people would be to send this group of people (partially or completely) to the home office. Here we
125 consider the case where all unvaccinated workers stay at home.
- 126 - **Scenario PL W50&C50, “partial lockdown at work and leisure time”**: Interventions that affect
127 schoolchildren are very unpopular. Moreover, it will hardly be possible to let all unvaccinated workers
128 work from home. Therefore, in this last scenario, we consider the more realistic case where 50% of the
129 unvaccinated workers work from home and at the same time, all unvaccinated persons reduce their
130 community contacts by 50%. We generate each simulation output from an ensemble of 200 numerically
131 equivalent implementations for the same parameter values to account for Covasim's stochastic approach.
132 Then, we present results as ensemble averages to reduce fluctuations and include statistical uncertainties.

133

134

135 **Limitations**

136 The results of this report are to be considered preliminary and may change with further data and findings collected
137 in the future. In particular, only findings and local data of Bavaria or Germany have been included. Little data is
138 available on the actual implementation of public health orders. Therefore, we had to refer to plausible assumptions
139 or fitted parameters for modelling some public health interventions. The stability of our results with respect to
140 changes in those assumptions has not been established in all cases. In principle, modified assumptions may have
141 some influence on the simulations performed.

142 The greatest uncertainty of our simulation lies in the actual human behaviour. The degree of compliance is difficult
143 to measure, but has a non-negligible impact on the evolution of the pandemic. Past data was used to calibrate,
144 among other things, a baseline probability of transmission of the virus in a contact between two agents. This
145 probability includes aspects such as wearing masks, following distance rules, etc. We did not try to predict any
146 behavioural changes from November 2021 until February 2022 but kept all related simulation parameters constant.


147 Furthermore, we also assume constant simulation parameters referring to other aspects in this study. For example,
148 the emergence of new virus variants with modified infection probabilities could significantly influence the
149 evolution of the pandemic.

150

151 Results

152 Fig. 1 shows the result of calibrating our Covasim model to the course of the pandemic in the period from the
153 beginning of the pandemic in March 2020 to the end of November 2021. Essentially, the simulation was able to
154 reproduce the real course sufficiently well. Both the first three Covid 19 waves and the beginning of the fourth
155 wave were captured by our model. In this way, the previous history of the population, especially regarding existing
156 immunisations through infections and vaccinations, is taken into account for the future scenarios.


157



159 **Fig. 1:** The two plots illustrate the calibration of the Covasim model. The solid line represents the results of the
160 simulations and the marked dots represent real aggregated data for Bavaria. of Simulation results and real data
161 show reasonably good agreement for 7-day incidence and the number of critical cases requiring intensive care.

162

163 Fig. 2 shows the 7-day incidence and the number of critical cases requiring intensive care for the five scenarios
164 considered. The time period of the figure covers one year from the beginning of March 2021 to the end of
165 February 2022, so that a comparison with the third COVID 19 wave, which was also the first wave with the delta
166 variant, is possible.



168 **Fig. 2:** The simulation results for the 7-day incidence and number of intensive care units required are shown. The
169 individual scenarios are colour-coded. Furthermore, the starting point of the interventions, 1 December 2021, is
170 also marked with a dashed line.

171

172 Discussion and Conclusions

173 At the beginning of all scenarios, the health system was already under strain due to many infections and critical
174 cases.

175 The Scenario NI represents the worst-case scenario if no interventions limit the contacts of the population. In this
176 case, the model projects a 7-day incidence of just under 1000 in the second last week of 2021 for the federal state
177 of Bavaria and a total of more than 2600 intensive care units will be required in the first week of January 2021.
178 This is almost three times the previous peak value during the first three waves.

179 However, the simulations also show that interventions starting on 1 December 2021 are able to mitigate the course
180 of the fourth wave substantially. As the number of critical cases follows the increasing number of infections with
181 some delay, a further short-term increase of critical cases is still to be expected even after interventions will come
182 into effect. Scenario L2020 represents an extensive lockdown for the entire population by re-activating previously
183 (March 2020) applied interventions and is regarded as a reference. Applying these interventions to the current
184 situation, the 7-day incidence will reach about 700 and the number of critical concurrent cases will peak at roughly
185 1700. The values of the three other scenarios considered lie between Scenario NI and Scenario L2020.

186 The exclusion of unvaccinated students from classes in schools proved to be the least effective of the measures
187 considered. Working from home of all unvaccinated workers was found to be somewhat more effective. According
188 to our Scenario PL W50&C50, a very good mitigation of the fourth wave can be achieved by a combination of
189 working at home and restricting leisure contacts of the unvaccinated population. Here, the maximum number of
190 intensive care beds required is only slightly higher than in the hard lockdown of Scenario L2020. The total number

191 of infections could also be significantly reduced in our simulation by the two measures described. Scenario PL
192 W50&C50 thus also shows that no additional restrictions on the vaccinated population are required for a drastic
193 mitigation of the fourth wave.

194 However, it is also noteworthy that even without further interventions in Scenario NI, the number of infections
195 decreases shortly before the turn of the year and, somewhat later, the number of critical cases also decreases. We
196 attribute this fact to the ever-increasing immunisation of the population, both through further vaccinations and
197 through infection. As a result, the population's immunisation is progressing towards herd immunity, making
198 infections less probable.

199 However, our simulations show that decisive interventions can drastically reduce the impact on the health system,
200 both in terms of peak burden and in terms of the number of cases that need to be treated, while not further restricting
201 the vaccinated population.

202

203 Acknowledgements

204 The authors gratefully acknowledge funding by the EpiLAB^{KI} project through the Bavarian Programme for
205 Applied Research and Development at Universities of Applied Sciences (6th funding period).

206

207

208 References

209

210 Graeber, Daniel; Schmidt-Petri, Christoph; Schröder, Carsten (2021): Attitudes on voluntary and mandatory
211 vaccination against COVID-19: Evidence from Germany. In *PLOS ONE* 16 (5), e0248372. DOI:
212 10.1371/journal.pone.0248372.

213 Hazelbag, C. Marijn; Dushoff, Jonathan; Dominic, Emanuel M.; Mthombothi, Zinhle E.; Delva, Wim (2020):
214 Calibration of individual-based models to epidemiological data: A systematic review. In *PLOS Computational*
215 *Biology* 16 (5), e1007893. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007893.

216 Kerr, Cliff C.; Stuart, Robyn M.; Mistry, Dina; Abey Suriya, Romesh G.; Rosenfeld, Katherine; Hart, Gregory R.
217 et al. (2020): Covasim: an agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. In *PLOS*
218 *Computational Biology*. DOI: 10.1101/2020.05.10.20097469.

219 Krebs, Tobias; Jouanne-Diedrich, Holger von; Moeckel, Michael J. (2021): COVID-19 scenarios for comparing
220 the effectiveness of age-specific vaccination regimes, exemplified for the city of Aschaffenburg (Germany). In
221 *medRxiv*, 2021.08.31.21262915. DOI: 10.1101/2021.08.31.21262915.

222 Latkowski, Rafał; Dunin-Kępicz, Barbara (2021): An Agent-Based Covid-19 Simulator: Extending Covasim to
223 the Polish Context. In *Procedia Computer Science* 192, pp. 3607–3616. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.09.134.

224 Lorig, Fabian; Johansson, Emil; Davidsson, Paul (2021): Agent-Based Social Simulation of the Covid-19
225 Pandemic: A Systematic Review. In *JASSS* 24 (3). DOI: 10.18564/jasss.4601.

226 Panovska-Griffiths, J.; Kerr, C. C.; Waites, W.; Stuart, R. M. (2021): Mathematical modeling as a tool for policy
227 decision making: Applications to the COVID-19 pandemic 44, pp. 291–326. DOI: 10.1016/bs.host.2020.12.001.

228 Robert Koch Institut (2021a): COVID-19 Datenhub. Available online at [https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-](https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/)
229 [de.hub.arcgis.com/](https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/), checked on 11/26/2021.

230 Robert Koch Institut (2021b): Digitales Impfquotenmonitoring zur COVID-19-Impfung. Available online at
231 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Daten/Impfquoten-Tab.html, checked on
232 11/26/2021.

233 Robert Koch Institut (2021c): DIVI-Intensivregister. Available online at
234 <https://www.intensivregister.de/#/aktuelle-lage/downloads>, checked on 11/26/2021.

235 Scott, Nick; Palmer, Anna; Delport, Dominic; Abeysuriya, Romesh; Stuart, Robyn M.; Kerr, Cliff C. et al.
236 (2021): Modelling the impact of relaxing COVID-19 control measures during a period of low viral transmission.
237 In *Medical Journal of Australia* 214 (2), pp. 79–83. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50845.

238 Stuart, R. M.; Abeysuriya, Romesh G.; Kerr, Cliff C.; Mistry, Dina; Klein, Daniel J.; Gray, Richard et al. (2020):
239 The role of masks, testing and contact tracing in preventing COVID-19 resurgences: a case study from New
240 South Wales, Australia.

241