

1 **Fairness and efficiency considerations in COVID-19 vaccine**

2 **allocation strategies: a case study comparing front-line**

3 **workers and 65-74 year olds in the United States**

4

5

6 Eva Rumpler ^{1*}, Justin M. Feldman ², Mary T. Bassett ², Marc Lipsitch ¹

7

8

9 ¹ Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H.

10 Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA.

11 ² Harvard FXB Center for Health and Human Rights, Boston, MA, USA.

12

13 * Corresponding author, email: erumpler@hsph.harvard.edu (ER)

14

15 **1 Abstract**

16 The COVID-19 epidemic in the United States has been characterized by two stark
17 disparities. COVID-19 burden has been unequally distributed among racial and ethnic
18 groups and at the same time the mortality rates have been sharply higher among older age
19 groups. These disparities have led some to suggest that inequalities could be reduced by
20 vaccinating front-line workers before vaccinating older individuals, as older individuals in
21 the US are disproportionately Non-Hispanic White.

22 We compare the performance of two distribution policies, one allocating vaccines to front-
23 line workers and another to older individuals aged 65-74-year-old. We estimate both the
24 number of lives saved and the number of years of life saved under each of the policies,
25 overall and in every race/ethnicity groups, in the United States and every state.

26 We show that prioritizing COVID-19 vaccines for 65-74-year-olds saves both more lives and
27 more years of life than allocating vaccines front-line workers in each racial/ethnic group, in
28 the United States as a whole and in nearly every state. When evaluating fairness of vaccine
29 allocation policies, the overall benefit to impact of each population subgroup should be
30 considered, not only the proportion of doses that is distributed to each subgroup. Further
31 work can identify prioritization schemes that perform better on multiple equity metrics.

32

33 **2 Introduction**

34 Two stark disparities define the mortality impact of the COVID-19 epidemic in the United
35 States. The risk of death given infection (infection fatality rate) rises sharply with age. By

36 one estimate, this increase is exponential, about 10-fold for each 19-year increase in age [1].

37 Another estimate fits a linear increase and finds a 1·18 percentage-point absolute increase

38 in infection fatality rate per decade of age [2]. At the same time, Black, Hispanic, and Native

39 American persons in the US have experienced confirmed infections, hospitalizations, and

40 deaths at dramatically higher rates than White or Asian persons [3], reflecting a pattern of

41 racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparity that is observed also in other populations [4–7].

42 As of March 2021, White and Asian populations in the US have similar age-adjusted COVID-

43 19 mortality rates (respectively 121/100,000 and 117/100,000). Compared to White

44 populations, the age-adjusted COVID-19 mortality rate is 1·7-fold higher among Black

45 populations (241/100,000), 1·9-fold higher among Indigenous populations (263/100,000),

46 2·0-fold higher among Hispanic populations (287/100,000) and 2·2-fold higher among

47 Pacific Islander populations (312 / 100,000) [8]. An additional relevant fact that connects

48 these two disparities is that White and Asian populations are older on average than Black,

49 Hispanic, and other racial/ethnic groups in the United States.

50 The two risk factors of age and race, as well as their interaction, have received attention in

51 discussions on vaccine prioritization. While prioritization of older adults and individuals

52 with comorbid conditions predisposing them to higher infection-fatality rates is under most

53 scenarios expected to save more lives in the aggregate than non-prioritized strategies [9–

54 12], such a strategy in the US involves providing more vaccine doses, earlier, to White

55 individuals and fewer to Black, Hispanic, Asian and Native American people, due to the

56 differences in age distribution. An alternative strategy, that of prioritizing essential or front-

57 line workers, has been discussed as a way to provide more vaccine doses to those

58 racial/ethnic groups that are hardest hit by COVID-19, because essential workers are more
59 ethnically and racially diverse than older individuals in the US.

60 Here we quantify the potential impacts overall and by race/ethnicity, comparing two
61 groups that have been widely discussed for prioritization below long-term care residents
62 and health care workers and those 75 and older, but above other members of the
63 population: i) individuals 65-74 not in long-term care or nursing homes, and ii) front-line
64 (non health care) workers. For the United States and each state individually, we quantify
65 the extent to which these two policies would provide vaccines to members of different
66 racial and ethnic groups, and we ask the further question of how the two policies compare
67 in terms of expected lives and years of life saved overall and for each racial/ethnic group.

68 Such estimates require certain modeling assumptions. We outline those in detail in
69 Methods, but we emphasize here the most important. First, we consider only the direct
70 effects of vaccination in preventing death from COVID-19 in vaccinated persons. Indirect
71 effects on transmission are not considered in this study, to simplify and make transparent
72 the analysis and because vaccines' effects on transmission were not clear at the time of
73 vaccine allocation decisions. Second, we make the assumption that from the moment the
74 prioritization decision is made, future COVID-19 deaths in strata defined by age group,
75 race/ethnicity and state, and occupation (essential worker or not) are proportional to those
76 estimated for the period prior to January 30, 2021. This assumption links future disparities
77 in death rates related to all these factors to past ones. Third, we assume that vaccine uptake
78 and effectiveness is even across race/ethnic groups within an age group and state under
79 each policy; we discuss the impact of this assumption later. The second and third

80 assumptions together enable a comparison of the projected number of lives saved in each
81 race/ethnicity, by state, by allocating a fixed number of vaccine doses under each of the two
82 policies.

83 **3 Methods**

84 **3.1 Notation**

85 We repeat our analyses across multiple age categories, race/ethnicity groups and US states.
86 We consider various geographical entities k : either the entirety of the United States, or any
87 one of 50 states or the District of Columbia. The age groups considered are either 65-74
88 year old for policy S , or 16-64 (further detailed into 16-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64) for
89 front-line workers for policy F . We conducted our analyses for seven race/ethnicity
90 categories (Non-Hispanic Whites, Hispanics, Non-Hispanic Blacks or African American, Non-
91 Hispanic Asians, Non-Hispanic Two or more races, Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska
92 Native, Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander).

93 Notations used are detailed in Table 1 below.

94 **Table 1: Notation and input values**

Notation	Meaning	Values	Source
v	Number of vaccine courses available for individuals of a given age i a given state	1,000 (arbitrary)	
k			

Notation	Meaning	Values	Source
R	Increased risk of COVID-19 deaths for front-line workers	1.56 (1, 2, 3, 4 in sensitivity analysis)	[13]
D_{ijk}	COVID-19 deaths among individuals of a given age i and race/ethnicity j in state k that take place outside nursing homes and long-term care facilities	20% of the number of COVID-19 deaths among these individuals between January 1st 2020 and January 31st 2021	[14, 15]
D_{ijk}^F	COVID-19 deaths among front-line workers of a given age i and race/ethnicity j in state k that take place outside nursing homes and long-term care facilities		[14, 15]
N_{ijk}	Number of individuals of a given age i and race/ethnicity j in state k		[16]
N_{ik}	Number of individuals of a given age i of any race/ethnicity in state k		[16]
N_{ijk}^F	Number of front-line workers of a given age i and race/ethnicity j in state k		[16]
N_k^F	Number of front-line workers of any age and any race/ethnicity in state k		[16]

Notation	Meaning	Values	Source
LS_{jk}	Number of lives in each race/ethnicity group j saved by vaccinating v 65-74 year olds in state k		
LF_{jk}	Number of lives in each race/ethnicity group j saved by vaccinating v front-line workers in state k		
$ratioL_{jk}$	Ratio of LS_{jk} and LF_{jk} comparing the efficacy of both policies in a given race/ethnicity j and a state k in terms of number of lives saved		
YS_{jk}	Number of years of life in each race/ethnicity group j saved by vaccinating v 65-74 year olds in state k		
YF_{jk}	Number of years of life in each race/ethnicity group j saved by vaccinating v front-line workers in state k		
$ratioY_{jk}$	Ratio of YS_{jk} and YF_{jk} comparing the efficacy of both policies in a given race/ethnicity j and a state k in terms of number of years of life saved		

95

96 **3.2 Data sources and estimation**

97 **3.2.1 Estimating the number of COVID-19 deaths outside of nursing homes and long term
98 care facilities by state, race/ethnicity and age categories.**

99 We obtained the number of COVID-19 deaths by state, age, race and Hispanic origin group
100 reported to the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) between January 1st 2020 and
101 January 30th 2021 [14]. We also extracted the proportion of COVID-19 deaths that took
102 place outside of nursing homes and long term care facilities between January 4th 2020 and
103 January 30th 2021, by state and age categories from the NCHS [15]. Deaths counts ranging
104 between 1 and 9, which were not reported due to the NCHS confidentiality standards, were
105 approximated by the median value 5.

106 As nursing home and long-term care facilities residents and employees have access to
107 vaccination before 65-74 and front-line workers, we do not consider deaths that took place
108 in those settings as part of our analysis. Assuming that this proportion of COVID-19 deaths
109 in nursing homes and long term care facilities is constant across races and ethnicity for a
110 given state and age category, we compute the proportion of COVID-19 deaths that took
111 place outside of these settings for each joint stratum of state, age category and race.

112 **3.2.2 Extracting the number of front-line workers and total number of individuals by state,
113 race and age categories**

114 We obtained the number of individuals in each US state, race and age category from the
115 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates for the year 2019 [16]. The demographic

116 variables we included were State, Age, Occupation, Race and Hispanic origin. We
117 categorized these into seven race/ethnicity groups: Non-Hispanic Whites, Hispanics, Non-
118 Hispanic Blacks or African American, Non-Hispanic Asians, Non-Hispanic Two or more
119 races, Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native, Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or
120 other Pacific Islander.

121 For each state, race/ethnicity, and 10-year age category 16-64, we also construct the
122 number of front-line workers employed in occupation categories corresponding to the
123 definition of workers who are likely to be exposed to COVID-19 as defined by the state of
124 Massachusetts [17]. This list includes K-12 educators, drivers, retail, funeral, food and
125 beverage workers. Summary tables showing the occupations included, as well as the share
126 of individuals from each race/ethnicity in each occupation can be found in S1 Table.

127 **3.2.3 Estimating the mortality rate among front-line workers**

128 Because of higher exposure to infection and possibly other factors, front-line workers may
129 experience a higher risk of COVID-19 death than other individuals of the same age,
130 race/ethnicity, and state. To estimate the increased mortality rate among front-line
131 workers, we multiply the mortality rate of a given age/state/race category by R , the
132 increased risk due to their increased exposure to SARS-CoV-2 at work and possible
133 increased mortality from other factors.

$$\frac{D_{ijk}^F}{N_{ijk}^F} = R * \frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}} \quad (1)$$

134 where:

135 $\frac{D_{ijk}^F}{N_{ijk}^F}$ is the mortality rate among front-line workers of a given age group i , race/ethnicity

136 group j and state k , and

137 $\frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}}$ is the mortality rate among adults regardless of their occupation of that same age i ,

138 race/ethnicity j and state k .

139 Mutambudzi et al. [13] provide risk ratios for severe COVID-19 by occupational group.

140 When compared to non-essential workers, education workers, food workers and transport

141 workers appear to have risk ratios of respectively 1.56 (0.87-2.91), 0.84 (0.39-1.80) and

142 1.43 (0.78-2.63) in a fully adjusted model. We use 1.56 as an estimate of R in our main

143 analysis, and then vary its value from 1 to 4 in sensitivity analyses, both to account for

144 uncertainty in these estimates and variation among them, and also to account for the

145 possibility that the value could increase during a period of restriction on economic activity,

146 when relative exposure will be particularly high for front-line workers .

147 **3.3 Estimation of the number of lives saved by a fixed number of vaccine**

148 **courses v in a given state k**

149 We aim at estimating a quantity proportional to the number of lives saved among

150 race/ethnicity groups j by allocating a fixed number of vaccine courses v to individuals of a

151 given age group i in a given US state k . We first describe the estimation for the purely age-

152 based policy S and then describe the approach for occupation-based policy F .

153 Throughout our analysis, we assume $v = 1,000$ for each state, and 95% vaccine efficacy.

154 Because all calculations are linear in v and in efficacy against death, the comparative results

155 are unaffected by the choice of values for these variables. As noted above we make the
156 further assumption that future COVID-19 deaths in an (age, state, race) group in the absence
157 of vaccine would be proportional to the number of deaths up to January 31, 2021. To
158 present results, we assume that the future number of deaths in the absence of vaccine is
159 20% as large as the number to January 31, 2021, but again this choice has no effect on the
160 relative magnitudes of benefit from different policies.

161

162 **3.3.1 Estimating the number of lives saved under policy S**

163 As this policy allocated vaccines purely by age category, the number of doses allocated to
164 each race/ethnicity group j is proportional to the probability that individuals in age
165 category i and state k belong to each race/ethnicity group j .
166 Under these assumptions, the number of lives saved in a given age group i and
167 race/ethnicity group j by v vaccination in state k is proportional to:

$$v * \frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}} * \frac{N_{ijk}}{N_{ik}} \quad (2)$$

168 where :

169 v is the number of vaccine courses available for individuals of a given age i in a given state
170 k ,

171 $\frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}}$ is the mortality rate among individuals of age i , race/ethnicity j in state k , and

172 $\frac{N_{ijk}}{N_{ik}}$ is the probability that a vaccine goes to a j member of the age group i in state k ,

173 assumed to be the share of j individuals in the age group i .

174 We can then drop the N_{ijk} term in equation 2 and write that the number of lives saved is
175 proportional to

$$\nu * \frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ik}} \quad (3)$$

176

177 We apply this equation to estimate the number of lives saved by allocating a fixed number
178 of vaccine courses ν to one of two groups in a given state k : older individuals aged 65-74
179 years not in long-term care or nursing homes (policy S) or public-facing front-line workers
180 aged 16-64 (policy F).

181

182 We're first interested in estimating the number of lives in each race/ethnicity group j saved
183 by vaccinating ν 65-74 year old, termed LS_{jk} . Applying the equations defined above in the
184 age category 65-74 year old, we obtain:

$$LS_{jk} = \nu * \frac{D_{65-74jk}}{N_{65-74k}} \quad (4)$$

185 We took into account the uncertainty in the 65-74 year olds mortality rate estimate ($\frac{D_{65-74jk}}{N_{65-74k}}$)
186) by sampling 10,000 values from a beta distribution parametrized from the number of
187 deaths among individuals aged 65-74 ($D_{65-74jk}$) and the number individuals aged 65-74
188 ($N_{65-74jk}$), where the α parameter is ($0 + D_{65-74jk}$) and the β parameter is ($0 + N_{65-74jk} -$
189 $D_{65-74jk}$). The 10,000 simulations of the 65-74 year olds mortality rate ($\frac{D_{65-74jk}}{N_{65-74jk}}$) are then

190 used to compute 10,000 values of LS_{jk} , the number of lives saved under policy S. The mean,
191 2.5 percentile and 97.5 percentile are then computed.

192

193 **3.3.2 Estimating the number of lives saved under policy F**

194 Next, we estimate the number of lives saved among each race/ethnicity j by vaccinating v
195 front-line workers, termed LF_{jk} .

196 Two layers of complexity need to be taken into account when estimating LF_{jk} . First, as
197 detailed above, deaths counts for front-line workers are not available and mortality rates
198 among front-line workers need to be estimated from mortality rates in the general
199 population. Second, we need to account for front-line workers having a different age
200 distribution than the general population of adults aged 16 to 64 year old, as shown in S2 Fig.
201 We thus start by computing LF_{ijk} among each of five age categories $i : 16-24, 25-34, 35-44,$
202 $45-54$, and $55-64$ year olds.

203 Similarly as above,

$$LF_{ijk} = v * R * \frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}} * \frac{N_{ijk}^F}{N_k^F} \quad (5)$$

204 where :

205 $R * \frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}}$ is the mortality rate among front-line workers, as detailed in section 3.2.3 above,

206 and

207 $\frac{N_{ijk}^F}{N_k^F}$ is the probability that a vaccine goes to a front-line worker of race/ethnicity j member

208 of the age group i in state k , assumed to be the share of front-line workers of that
209 age/race/ethnicity ij in state k .
210 We then sum all LF_{ijk} over the five age categories i among front-line workers to obtain the
211 total number of lives saved for front-line workers aged 16 to 64 years, LF_{jk} .

$$LF_{jk} = \sum^i LF_{ijk} \quad (6)$$

212 We take into account the uncertainty both in the age/race/ethnicity/state-specific mortality
213 rate ($\frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}}$), and in the proportion of front-line workers of a given age/race/ethnicity/state
214 ($\frac{N_{ijk}^F}{N_k^F}$) by sampling 10,000 random variables of each. For the first term, the parameters of the
215 beta distribution are $(0 + D_{ijk})$ and $(0 + N_{ijk} - D_{ijk})$ and for the second term the
216 parameters of the beta distribution are $(0 + N_{ijk}^F)$ and $(0 + N_k^F - N_{ijk}^F)$. The 10,000
217 simulations of each of the five LF_{ijk} are summed over to obtain 10,000 values for LF_{jk} , the
218 number of lives saved under policy F. We then compute the mean, 2.5 percentile and 97.5
219 percentile values. We have to note that as the two terms $\frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}}$ and $\frac{N_{ijk}^F}{N_k^F}$ are not independent,
220 and the resulting 95% uncertainty interval likely overestimates the dispersion in the
221 estimated number of lives saved (LF_{jk}).

222

223 **3.3.3 Comparing policy S and policy F**

224 For each race/ethnicity j and state k of interest, we compute the $ratioL_{jk}$ of the number of
225 lives saved under each policy S and F for a given number of vaccine doses v . A $ratioL_{jk}$
226 larger than 1 indicates that policy S is preferable to policy F for race/ethnicity j in state k .

$$ratioL_{jk} = \frac{LS_{jk}}{LF_{jk}} \quad (7)$$

227 We divide each of the 10,000 estimates of LS_{jk} by one estimate of LF_{jk} , thus generating
228 10,000 values of $ratioL_{jk}$. These are in turn used to compute mean, 2.5 percentile and 97.5
229 percentile estimates.

230

231 **3.4 Estimation of the number of years of life saved by a fixed number of
232 vaccine courses v in a given state k**

233 Next, we extend our analysis by estimating the number of *years* of life saved, instead of the
234 number of lives.

235 We extend the calculations above to include an estimate of the expected number of life
236 years saved among race/ethnicity groups. We extracted the expectations of life at different
237 age categories between 15 and 74 years old from the WHO Global Health Observatory
238 (GHO) [18]. As estimates are given for 5-year age bins in the WHO GHO, we average
239 estimates two by two to obtain estimates for our 10-year age bins of interest, as shown in
240 S2 Table. We used life expectancy estimates that do not vary by race/ethnicity groups as
241 doing so would perpetuate existing inequities by favoring the groups that are most

242 privileged and have the longest life expectancy, as they have most to lose.

243 We then adapt the calculations of the absolute number of years of life lost (YLL) described

244 by Martinez et al. [19] to the estimation of number of years of life saved (YLS):

$$Y_{ijk} = D_{ijk} * SLE_i \quad (8)$$

245 where :

246 Y_{ijk} is the number of years of life saved for a given age/race/ethnicity ij in state k ,

247 D_{ijk} is the number of COVID deaths for a given age/race/ethnicity ij in state k ,

248 SLE_i is the standard life expectancy at age i in the USA in 2019 .

249 We extend the equations 4, 5, and 6 above to compute YS_{jk} and YF_{jk} , the number of years of

250 lives saved under both policies S and F by including the SLE_i term. We thus obtain:

$$YS_{jk} = v * \frac{D_{65-74jk}}{N_{65-74k}} * SLE_{65-74} \quad (9)$$

251 and,

$$YF_{ijk} = v * R * \frac{D_{ijk}}{N_{ijk}} * \frac{N_{ijk}^F}{N_k^F} * SLE_i \quad (10)$$

$$YF_{jk} = \sum^i YF_{ijk} \quad (11)$$

252 Then, similarly as in equation 7, we compute a new ratio $ratioY_{jk}$, showing the relative

253 performance of policies S and F in terms of number of lives saved:

$$ratioY_{jk} = \frac{YS_{jk}}{YF_{jk}} \quad (12)$$

254 As described in section 3.3, we take into account the uncertainty by simulating a
255 distribution of each of the input parameters. We then compute a mean and 95% interval
256 around YS_{jk} , YF_{jk} and $ratioY_{jk}$.

257

258 4 Results

259 4.1 Comparative vaccine dose allocation and mortality rates by race /ethnicity

260 Table 2 shows that Non-Hispanic Whites receive more doses under policy S than under
261 policy F , while all other groups (Hispanics, Non-Hispanic Blacks and Non-Hispanic Asians,
262 Non-Hispanic Two or more races, Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native, and Non-
263 Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander) receive more doses under policy F . This
264 can be explained by the over-representation of Non-Hispanic Whites among elderly in the
265 US (S1 Fig).

266 Next we show the estimated COVID-19 mortality rates per 100,000 individuals, per
267 race/ethnicity, for individuals aged 65 to 74 and for front-line workers. As shown in bold in
268 Table 2, for all races the mortality rates are considerably higher among older individuals
269 compared to essential workers. Also, Hispanics, Non-Hispanic Blacks, Non-Hispanic
270 American Indian or Alaska Native and Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific
271 Islander 65-74 have higher mortality rates than Non-Hispanic Whites and Asians.

272 The calculations in Table 2 are repeated for each state and the District of Columbia in S3

273 Table.

274 **Table 2. Proportion of doses allocated under policy S and policy F, and mortality**
275 **rates per 100,000 individuals for individuals 65-74 year olds and for front-line**
276 **workers, per race/ethnicity categories in the United States.**

Race/ethnicity	Proportion of doses		Mortality rate	
	received under policy S	received under policy F	among 65-74 year olds	among front-line workers
All races	100	100	39·5	6·9
Non-Hispanic White	74·6	58·2	27·1	3·7
Hispanic	9·0	19·7	95·2	12·6
Non-Hispanic Black	10·0	13·2	82·4	12·2
Non-Hispanic Asian	4·7	5·4	33·2	5·9
Non-Hispanic 2+ races	0·9	2·6	17·3	2·3
Non-Hispanic Native	0·5	0·7	105·0	27·5
Non-Hispanic NHPI	0·1	0·2	96·1	36·7

277 For each race/ethnicity category the highest proportion of doses and mortality rate are in
278 bold. "2+ races" stands for Two or more races, "Native" stands for American Indian or
279 Alaska Native, and "NHPI" stands for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.

280

281 **4.2 Comparative number of lives saved under policies S and F by race/ethnicity**

282 Next, we compute the number of lives saved in each race/ethnicity group by vaccinating
283 1,000 individuals, targeting either individuals aged 65-74 (policy S), or front-line workers
284 (policy F). As shown in Table 3, for the total US population as well as each race/ethnicity
285 groups, the number of lives saved is higher when vaccinating 65-74 year olds (LS_j)

286 compared to vaccinating front-line workers (LF_j). The ratio $\frac{LS_j}{LF_j}$ indicates for each
287 race/ethnicity group how much better policy S performs when compared to policy F . Policy
288 S is expected to save more lives for each race/ethnicity individually, and overall. However,
289 the comparative performance of policy S is most beneficial for Non-Hispanic Whites than
290 for any other race/ethnicity category.

291 The calculations in Table 3 are repeated for each state and the District of Columbia for
292 which the number of deaths reported in each racial/ethnic group among both 16-64 and
293 65-74 year olds was larger than 2, as shown in Fig 1 and S4 Table. In all of race and state
294 combinations for which ratios could be computed, ratios are larger than 1, suggesting that
295 policy S performs best across geographies. Again, Non-Hispanic Whites benefited most from
296 policy S .

297 The calculation of the ratio in Table 3 are repeated for varying values of R , the increased
298 risk of infection for front-line workers, as shown in S5 Table. Policy S performs best for all
299 race/ethnicity categories for values of R up to 2·4. For R values between 2·5 and 4·2, policy
300 S still performs best in all but one race/ethnicity category, Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or
301 other Pacific Islander.

302
303 **Table 3. Number of lives saved in each race/ethnicity group by vaccinating 1,000**
304 **individuals, either allocating doses to individuals 65-74 (LS_j) or to front-line workers**
305 **(LF_j).**

306

Race/ethnicity	LS_j (95% uncertainty interval)	LF_j (95% uncertainty interval)	Ratio L (95% uncertainty interval)
All races	0.375 (0.368; 0.382)	0.066 (0.064; 0.067)	5.72 (5.57; 5.86)
Non-Hispanic White	0.192 (0.187; 0.197)	0.0206 (0.0200; 0.0213)	9.31 (8.94; 9.68)
Hispanic	0.082 (0.079; 0.085)	0.0236 (0.0228; 0.0243)	3.47 (3.31; 3.64)
Non-Hispanic Black	0.078 (0.075; 0.081)	0.0154 (0.0148; 0.0159)	5.09 (4.82; 5.36)
Non-Hispanic Asian	0.015 (0.014; 0.016)	0.0030 (0.0028; 0.0033)	4.95 (4.36; 5.6)
Non-Hispanic 2+ races	0.0015 (0.0012; 0.0020)	0.0006 (0.0005; 0.0007)	2.71 (1.9; 3.77)
Non-Hispanic Native	0.0054 (0.0047; 0.0063)	0.0018 (0.0016; 0.0020)	3.03 (2.5; 3.63)
Non-Hispanic NHPI	0.0010 (0.0007; 0.0014)	0.0007 (0.0005; 0.0008)	1.54 (1.01; 2.24)

307

308
309 The ratio $L = \frac{LS_j}{LF_j}$ shows the relative number of lives saved comparing the two policies. Results
310 shown per race/ethnicity categories for the United States. "2+ races" stands for Two or more

311 *races, "Native" stands for American Indian or Alaska Native, and "NHPI" stands for Native
312 Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.*

313

314 **Fig 1. Comparative performance of policies S and F (shown in the form of a ratio L =**
315 $\frac{LS_j}{LF_j}$ **) for all race/ethnicity categories in all states and the District of Columbia in terms**
316 **of lives saved. States are grouped by HHS Region. Stars indicate the**
317 **race/ethnicity/state for which the lower bound of the 95% interval did not include 1.**

318

319 **4.3 Comparative number of years of life saved under policies S and F by**
320 **race/ethnicity**

321 Next, we compute the number of years of life saved in each race/ethnicity group by
322 vaccinating 1,000 individuals, targeting either individuals aged 65-74 (policy *S*), or front-
323 line workers (policy *F*).

324 As shown in Table 4, for the whole US populations, as well as for most racial/ethnicity
325 groups, more years of life are saved under policy *S* than policy *F*. It seems like only Non-
326 Hispanic Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders would benefit more from a
327 vaccination strategy targeting front-line workers, and the uncertainty interval for this ratio
328 overlaps with the null value 1. Similarly to Table 3, Non-Hispanic Whites would benefit
329 most from a vaccination prioritizing older 65-74 individuals.

330 The ratios $\frac{YS_j}{YF_j}$ shown in Table 4 are closer to 1 than the ratios $\frac{LS_j}{LF_j}$ shown in Table 3,

331 indicating that accounting for number of years of life lost leads to more similar performance
332 for both policies.

333 The calculations in Table 4 are repeated for each state and the District of Columbia for
334 which the number of deaths reported in each racial/ethnic group among both 16-64 and
335 65-74 year olds was larger than 2, as shown in Fig 2 and S6 Table. In the vast majority of
336 race and state combinations for which ratios could be computed, ratios are larger than 1,
337 suggesting that policy S performs best across geographies. Nine race/ethnicity/state
338 combinations lead to ratios smaller than 1, indicative of a better performance of policy F , as
339 shown in orange colours in Fig 2. However, none of these excluded 1 from the uncertainty
340 interval.

341 The calculation of the ratio in Table 4 are repeated for varying values of R , the increased
342 risk of infection for front-line workers, as shown in S7 Table. For values of R up to 2, policy
343 F performs best only for Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. For R
344 values of 3 or 4, policy F performs better in 4 race/ethnicity groups.

345

346 **Table 4. Number of years of life saved in each race/ethnicity group by vaccinating
347 1,000 individuals, either allocating doses to individuals 65-74 (YS_j) or to front-line
348 workers (YF_j).**

Race/ethnicity	YS_j (95% uncertainty interval)	YF_j (95% uncertainty interval)	Ratio Y (95% uncertainty interval)
All races	6.53 (6.42; 6.65)	2.08 (2.04; 2.12)	3.14 (3.06; 3.23)

Non-Hispanic White	3·35 (3·26; 3·43)	0·62 (0·59; 0·64)	5·44 (5·21; 5·67)
Hispanic	1·43 (1·37; 1·48)	0·77 (0·74; 0·79)	1·85 (1·76; 1·95)
Non-Hispanic Black	1·36 (1·31; 1·41)	0·49 (0·47; 0·51)	2·77 (2·62; 2·93)
Non-Hispanic Asian	0·26 (0·24; 0·28)	0·094 (0·085; 0·102)	2·79 (2·45; 3·16)
Non-Hispanic 2+ races	0·03 (0·02; 0·04)	0·021 (0·017; 0·027)	1·29 (0·88; 1·82)
Non-Hispanic Native	0·10 (0·08; 0·11)	0·066 (0·058; 0·074)	1·45 (1·19; 1·75)
Non-Hispanic NHPI	0·018 (0·012; 0·024)	0·024 (0·019; 0·030)	0·73 (0·47; 1·07)

349

350 The ratio $Y = \frac{YS_j}{YF_j}$ shows the relative number of lives saved comparing the two policies. Results

351 shown per race/ethnicity categories for the United States. "2+ races" stands for Two or more

352 races, "Native" stands for American Indian or Alaska Native, and "NHPI" stands for Native

353 Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.

354

355 **Fig 2. Comparative performance of policies S and F (shown in the form of a ratio Y =**

356 $\frac{YS_j}{YF_j}$) for all race/ethnicity categories in all states and the District of Columbia in terms

357 of years of life saved. States are grouped by HHS Region. Stars indicate the

358 race/ethnicity/state for which the lower bound of the 95% interval did not include 1.

359

360 5 Discussion

361 The burden of COVID-19 infections and deaths has been unequally distributed among racial
362 and ethnic groups in the US, while deaths have been sharply higher among older age groups.
363 The ethical imperatives of saving the most lives and minimizing inequalities have led to
364 debate about age- and occupation-based criteria for prioritizing access to vaccines when
365 they are scarce [20–22]. Because the hardest-hit racial and ethnic groups in the US also
366 have younger age distributions, prioritization schemes that favor older ages intrinsically
367 provide fewer vaccines to members of these disadvantaged groups, as we quantify in Table
368 2. This consideration has led some to suggest that fairness goals could be better achieved by
369 prioritizing vaccines for front-line workers, a category that has greater exposure to
370 infection, has high pandemic-related excess mortality [23], and that includes members of
371 highly-affected racial and ethnic groups.
372 One might expect that a policy such as prioritizing front-line workers, which provides more
373 vaccine doses to Black, Hispanic, and Asian persons than prioritizing 65-74 year olds, would
374 also save more lives in these non-White groups. On the other hand, some have argued that
375 this is unlikely because for each race/ethnicity, risk of death increases dramatically with
376 age, and providing more doses to relatively young members of the hardest-hit groups ahead
377 of (a smaller number of) older members of these groups misses the opportunity to prevent
378 deaths in these groups. Consistent with this latter argument, we have shown that in the
379 United States as a whole and in nearly every state, a front-line worker prioritization saves
380 fewer lives in each racial/ethnic group than prioritization of 65-74-year-olds, at least when
381 considering the direct effects of vaccination in protecting the vaccinated person.

382 Specifically, prioritizing 65-74 year olds is projected to save 3·5 times as many Hispanic
383 lives, 5·1 times as many non-Hispanic Black, 4·9 times as many non-Hispanic Asian lives,
384 3·0 times as many Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native lives, 1·5 times as
385 many Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 2·7 times as many non-
386 Hispanic multiracial lives, and 9·4 times more non-Hispanic White lives than prioritizing
387 front-line workers. Simply put, this is because the dramatically higher COVID-19 mortality
388 rates in older persons (ranging from 2·6 to 7·5 fold by our estimates for the different
389 race/ethnicity groups) outweigh the more modest differences in representation of these
390 groups among different races (ranging from 1·1-fold for Asians to 2·8-fold for individuals
391 with two or more races). This is likely driven by the over-representation of younger adults
392 among the front-line workers when compared to the general population (S2 Fig). In short,
393 Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, American Indians and Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiian and other
394 Pacific Islanders and individuals with more than one race get somewhat more vaccines
395 under a front-line worker priority, but those vaccines go to individuals at much lower risk
396 of dying.

397 This finding demonstrates by example that it is possible to choose a vaccine distribution
398 strategy that provides a more equal vaccine distribution by race/ethnicity, yet prevents
399 fewer deaths in every racial/ethnic group. Under our assumptions, if one considers vaccines
400 as means to the ends of saving lives, the greater number of lives saved under the age-based
401 policy, including in the hardest-hit groups, should lead one to favor the age-based policy
402 over the front-line-worker policy regardless of how one weighs overall societal benefit and
403 benefit to the hardest-hit groups, because the age-based policy maximizes both.

404 Our model relies on multiple simplifying modelling assumptions. We assume that (i) the
405 vaccine efficacy and uptake is constant across age, race and location, (ii) the proportion of
406 deaths that took place in nursing homes and long-term care facilities is constant across
407 races for a given age and state (an assumption made because nursing home status of deaths
408 is given by age and state, but not race), (iii) 10% of deaths recorded for the 15-24 year old
409 category took place among 15 year olds, (iv) that we can account for the increased risk of
410 infection and deaths among front-line workers by multiplying the mortality rate by an
411 increased risk R constant across age, race and state, and that (v) analyses by Mutambudzi et
412 al. [13] appropriately estimate this R .

413 We have shown in sensitivity analyses that the increase in infection risk for front-line
414 workers would need to be larger than 3 for a policy vaccinating front-line workers over 65-
415 74 year olds to become preferable for some race/ethnicity groups (S5 and S7 Table). Such
416 large values would be more likely to happen during lock-down periods, when public-facing
417 workers have much larger contact rates than the rest of the population. If vaccines are being
418 rolled-out during such periods, then a policy allocating doses to front-line workers first may
419 be preferable.

420 Our analysis is subject to other limitations. First, we focus our analysis on two outcomes:
421 deaths and years of life lost. We did not assess the impact of the two vaccination policies on
422 other outcomes such as number of infections, morbidity such as 'long COVID',
423 hospitalization or other economic consequences. As it has been show that vaccination
424 strategies targeting younger adults can lead to lower number of infections but higher
425 number of deaths [9], it is possible that vaccinating front-line workers would lead to less
426 infections. Second, we assume that the number of deaths occurring after vaccine allocation

427 and roll-out is proportional to the death count up to January 30, 2021 (more exactly is it
428 assumed to be equal to 20% of the cumulative deaths up to that date in each age, race and
429 state combination). We thus assume that the inequalities in infection and mortality rates
430 stay constant over the duration of the pandemic. Third, we only consider the direct effect of
431 vaccination on the vaccinated, and not the indirect effect of vaccination protecting the rest
432 of the population by limiting onward transmission. When this work began, it was unclear
433 how to what extent COVID-19 vaccines reduce transmission [24]. While evidence is now
434 accumulating for substantial vaccine effects on infection and onward spread [25], these
435 results reflect the knowledge available at the time prioritization decisions were being made.
436 Moreover, as the B.1.617.2 (Delta) and B.1.1.529 (Omicron) variants have become dominant
437 worldwide, doubts on vaccine efficacy against it are being raised [26]. If the protection
438 against transmission of Delta, Omicron, and future variants is indeed found to be limited,
439 vaccine allocation strategies should focus on direct protection from infection. The
440 magnitude of the relative benefit of the 65-74 strategy over the front-line strategy via direct
441 protection studied here suggests that the greater indirect effects of vaccinating front-line
442 workers would have to be large to make it superior in preventing deaths in any
443 racial/ethnic group, or overall. Front-line workers and members of racial/ethnic minorities
444 [27] may be more likely to live in multi-generation households and contribute to more
445 onward transmission than 65-74 year old individuals. Mulberry et al. [28] studied the
446 indirect effect of vaccination (without considering race/ ethnicity) using an age-stratified
447 SEIR model including compartment for essential workers. Under strong assumptions that
448 drastic social distancing measured are in place (no workplace contacts for non-essential
449 workers and all contacts reduced), that the impact of vaccination on transmission is strong,

450 and that R_t is not kept at very low levels, they showed that vaccinating essential workers
451 and/or all adults 20-79 after individuals over 80 leads to lower number of infections,
452 hospitalization and deaths than a solely age-based strategy. Further work is needed to
453 understand these tradeoffs and the extent to which accounting for indirect protection might
454 reverse our findings under the rapidly changing conditions of COVID-19.

455 Notwithstanding these limitations, we have shown that from the perspective of infections
456 directly prevented, a front-line-worker COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategy does not
457 save as many lives and years of life as prioritization of 65-74 year olds, overall or in each
458 racial/ethnic group, and that this effect is qualitatively consistent across US states.

459 Although these two strategies received the most attention from committees considering
460 prioritization schemes, there may be other strategies that might outperform either one, as
461 some work has already suggested. For example, once health-care workers and individuals
462 aged 65+ are vaccinated, prioritizing adults at increased risk of severe COVID-19 would
463 increase access to vaccines for Non-Hispanic Blacks, while Hispanics would receive most
464 doses under a strategy targeting essential workers and Non-Hispanic Whites and Asians
465 under a solely age-based strategy [29]. For the goal of saving the most lives with a
466 prevention intervention such as vaccination, it is optimal to prioritize individuals in order of
467 their estimated mortality risk from the disease, which is the product of the mortality risk if
468 infected (the infection-fatality risk) and their probability of becoming infected (a function of
469 exposure). It is evident in the United States and elsewhere, at least from the pandemic
470 history to date, that both older age and non-White race or Hispanic ethnicity are associated
471 with higher risks [30]. Mortality risk at a given age varies with racial/ethnic classification,

472 as for instance, in the US in 2020 Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaskan Native aged 35-
473 44 and Hispanic individuals aged 45-54 had higher mortality rates than Non-Hispanic White
474 individuals aged 55-64 (S3 Fig). It follows that a policy that allocated vaccine priority
475 according to this criterion would at each age prioritize Black and Hispanic individuals over
476 White ones, and would assign equal priority, all other factors being equal, to a younger
477 Hispanic or Black individual as to an older White one [31]. A version of this approach –
478 lower age cutoffs for Black persons to receive priority – has been proposed [32] and would
479 both enhance equity and, if done appropriately, also enhance the number of lives saved
480 overall and for Black Americans compared to an age-only prioritization. Likewise,
481 geographic targeting to areas of high risk would increase racial equity while improving
482 access to vaccination for those at greater risk of death from COVID-19 [31]. Overall,
483 questions related to the fairness of vaccine prioritization are most important when vaccine
484 distribution is slow. If the roll-out is rapid, the difference in the benefit from different
485 strategies diminishes, as all individuals get access to vaccines at similar times regardless of
486 their age, race/ethnicity and occupation.
487

488 **6 Acknowledgement**

489 The authors thank Dr. Elizabeth Wrigley-Field and Dr. Ayesha Mahmud for useful comments
490 on an earlier version of this work.

491 7 References

- 492 1. Levin AT, Hanage WP, Owusu-Boaitey N, Cochran KB, Walsh SP, Meyerowitz-Katz G.
493 Assessing the age specificity of infection fatality rates for COVID-19: systematic review,
494 meta-analysis, and public policy implications. Eur J Epidemiol. 2020 Dec;35(12):1123–38.
- 495 2. O'Driscoll M, Ribeiro Dos Santos G, Wang L, Cummings DAT, Azman AS, Paireau J, et
496 al. Age-specific mortality and immunity patterns of SARS-CoV-2. Nature. 2021 Feb
497 4;590(7844):140–5.
- 498 3. Mackey K, Ayers CK, Kondo KK, Saha S, Advani SM, Young S, et al. Racial and Ethnic
499 Disparities in COVID-19–Related Infections, Hospitalizations, and Deaths. Ann Intern Med.
500 2020 Dec 1;174(3):362–73.
- 501 4. Williamson EJ, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, Bacon S, Bates C, Morton CE, et al. Factors
502 associated with COVID-19-related death using OpenSAFELY. Nature. 2020 Aug
503 20;584(7821):430–6.
- 504 5. Lassale C, Gaye B, Hamer M, Gale CR, Batty GD. Ethnic disparities in hospitalisation
505 for COVID-19 in England: The role of socioeconomic factors, mental health, and
506 inflammatory and pro-inflammatory factors in a community-based cohort study. Brain,
507 Behavior, and Immunity. 2020 Aug;88:44–9.
- 508 6. Baqui P, Bica I, Marra V, Ercole A, van der Schaar M. Ethnic and regional variations in
509 hospital mortality from COVID-19 in Brazil: a cross-sectional observational study. The
510 Lancet Global Health. 2020 Aug;8(8):e1018–26.

- 511 7. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. COVID-19 Hospital Surveillance
512 Update, South Africa [Internet]. 2021 Mar. Available from: <https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp->
513 content/uploads/2021/03/NICD-COVID-19-Weekly-Sentinel-Hospital-Surveillnace-update-
514 Week-10-2021.pdf
- 515 8. APM Research Lab Staff. The Color of Coronavirus: COVID-19 deaths analyzed by
516 race and ethnicity in the US [Internet]. APM Research Lab. [cited 2021 Apr 12]. Available
517 from: <https://www.apmresearchlab.org/covid/deaths-by-race>
- 518 9. Bubar KM, Reinholt K, Kissler SM, Lipsitch M, Cobey S, Grad YH, et al. Model-
519 informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus. Science. 2021
520 Feb 26;371(6532):916–21.
- 521 10. Matrajt L, Eaton J, Leung T, Brown ER. Vaccine optimization for COVID-19: Who to
522 vaccinate first? Sci Adv. 2020 Feb;7(6):eabf1374.
- 523 11. Moore S, Hill EM, Dyson L, Tildesley MJ, Keeling MJ. Modelling optimal vaccination
524 strategy for SARS-CoV-2 in the UK. Perkins A, editor. PLoS Comput Biol. 2021 May
525 6;17(5):e1008849.
- 526 12. Hogan A, Winskill P, Watson O, Walker P, Whittaker C, Baguelin M, et al. Report 33:
527 Modelling the allocation and impact of a COVID-19 vaccine [Internet]. Imperial College
528 London; 2020 Sep [cited 2020 Nov 26]. Available from:
529 <http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/82822>

- 530 13. Mutambudzi M, Niedwiedz C, Macdonald EB, Leyland A, Mair F, Anderson J, et al.
531 Occupation and risk of severe COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075 UK Biobank
532 participants. Occup Environ Med. 2020 Dec 9; oemed-2020-106731.
- 533 14. National Center for Health Statistics. Deaths involving coronavirus disease 2019
534 (COVID-19) by race and Hispanic origin group and age, by state [Internet]. [cited 2021 Apr
535 12]. Available from: <https://data.cdc.gov/NCHS/Deaths-involving-coronavirus-disease-2019-COVID-19/ks3g-spdg>
- 537 15. National Center for Health Statistics. NVSS Provisional COVID-19 Deaths by Place of
538 Death and Age [Internet]. [cited 2021 Apr 12]. Available from:
539 <https://data.cdc.gov/NCHS/NVSS-Provisional-COVID-19-Deaths-by-Place-of-Death/4va6-ph5s>
- 541 16. United States Census Bureau. American Community Survey Data [Internet]. The
542 United States Census Bureau. [cited 2021 Apr 12]. Available from:
543 <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html>
- 544 17. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Massachusetts' COVID-19 vaccination phases
545 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Apr 12]. Available from: <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/massachusetts-covid-19-vaccination-phases>
- 547 18. WHO Global Health Observatory. Life tables by country - United States of America
548 [Internet]. WHO. World Health Organization; [cited 2021 May 20]. Available from:
549 <https://apps.who.int/gho/data/view.main.61780?lang=en>

- 550 19. Martinez R, Soliz P, Caixeta R, Ordunez P. Reflection on modern methods: years of life
551 lost due to premature mortality—a versatile and comprehensive measure for monitoring
552 non-communicable disease mortality. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2019 Aug
553 1;48(4):1367–76.
- 554 20. Persad G, Peek ME, Emanuel EJ. Fairly Prioritizing Groups for Access to COVID-19
555 Vaccines. *JAMA*. 2020 Oct 27;324(16):1601.
- 556 21. Schmidt H, Gostin LO, Williams MA. Is It Lawful and Ethical to Prioritize Racial
557 Minorities for COVID-19 Vaccines? *JAMA*. 2020 Nov 24;324(20):2023.
- 558 22. Committee on Equitable Allocation of Vaccine for the Novel Coronavirus, Board on
559 Health Sciences Policy, Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Health and
560 Medicine Division, National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Framework
561 for Equitable Allocation of COVID-19 Vaccine [Internet]. Gayle H, Foege W, Brown L, Kahn B,
562 editors. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press; 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 28]. Available
563 from: <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/25917>
- 564 23. Chen Y-H, Glymour M, Riley A, Balmes J, Duchowny K, Harrison R, et al. Excess
565 mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic among Californians 18–65 years of age,
566 by occupational sector and occupation: March through November 2020. Devleesschauwer
567 B, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2021 Jun 4;16(6):e0252454.
- 568 24. Lipsitch M, Dean NE. Understanding COVID-19 vaccine efficacy. *Science*. 2020 Nov
569 13;370(6518):763–5.

- 570 25. Shah ASV, Gribben C, Bishop J, Hanlon P, Caldwell D, Wood R, et al. Effect of
571 vaccination on transmission of COVID-19: an observational study in healthcare workers and
572 their households [Internet]. Public and Global Health; 2021 Mar [cited 2021 Apr 28].
573 Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.03.11.21253275>
- 574 26. Chia PY, Xiang Ong SW, Chiew CJ, Ang LW, Chavatte J-M, Mak T-M, et al. Virological
575 and serological kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant vaccine-breakthrough infections: a
576 multi-center cohort study [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2021 Jul [cited
577 2021 Oct 6]. Available from:
578 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.07.28.21261295>
- 579 27. Cohn D, Passel JS. Record 64 million Americans live in multigenerational households
580 [Internet]. Pew Research Center. 2018 [cited 2021 Sep 22]. Available from:
581 [https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/04/05/a-record-64-million-americans-
582 live-in-multigenerational-households/](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/04/05/a-record-64-million-americans-live-in-multigenerational-households/)
- 583 28. Mulberry N, Tupper P, Kirwin E, McCabe C, Colijn C. Vaccine Rollout Strategies: The
584 Case for Vaccinating Essential Workers Early [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except
585 HIV/AIDS); 2021 Feb [cited 2021 Apr 12]. Available from:
586 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.02.23.21252309>
- 587 29. Selden TM, Berdahl TA, Fang Z. Research Findings #46: COVID-19 Vaccination
588 Prioritization Scenarios and Their Effects on Eligibility by Poverty Level, Race, and Ethnicity
589 [Internet]. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2021 Mar. Available from:
590 https://meps.ahrq.gov/data_files/publications/rf46/rf46.shtml

591 30. Bassett MT, Chen JT, Krieger N. Variation in racial/ethnic disparities in COVID-19
592 mortality by age in the United States: A cross-sectional study. Tsai AC, editor. PLoS Med.
593 2020 Oct 20;17(10):e1003402.

594 31. Wrigley-Field E, Kiang MV, Riley AR, Barbieri M, Chen Y-H, Duchowny KA, et al.
595 Geographically-targeted COVID-19 vaccination is more equitable than age-based thresholds
596 alone [Internet]. Epidemiology; 2021 Mar [cited 2021 Apr 12]. Available from:
597 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.03.25.21254272>

598 32. Blackstock O, Blackstock U. Opinion: Black Americans should face lower age cutoffs
599 to qualify for a vaccine. Washington Post [Internet]. 2021 Feb 19 [cited 2021 Apr 12];
600 Available from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/black-americans-should-face-lower-age-cutoffs-to-qualify-for-a-vaccine/2021/02/19/3029d5de-72ec-11eb-b8a9-b9467510f0fe_story.html

603

604 **8 Supplementary Information**

605

606 **S1 Fig. Proportion of adults aged 16-64, front-line workers aged 16-64, and older**
607 **individuals aged 65-74 in each race/ethnicity categories .**

608

609 **S2 Fig. Proportion of adults and front-line workers in each age subcategories**
610 **between 16 and 64.**

611

612 **S3 Fig. COVID-19 mortality rates per 100,000 by age and race/ethnicity categories in**
613 **the US in 2020.**

614

615 **S1 Table. List of occupations included in the definition of front-line occupations. For**
616 **each race, proportion of front-line workers in each occupation.**

617

618 **S2 Table. Expectation of life at age categories i9/27/2022 4:14:00 PM in the USA in**
619 **2019 from the WHO GlobalHealth Observatory [18].**

620

621 **S3 Table. Proportion of doses allocated under policy S and policy F, and mortality**
622 **rates per100,000 individuals for individuals 65-74 year olds and for front-line**
623 **workers, per US state and race/ethnicity categories. "NH" stands for "Non-Hispanic",**
624 **"2+ races" stands for "Two or more races", "Native" stands for "American Indian or Alaska**
625 **Native", "NHPI" stands for "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander".**

626

627 **S4 Table. Number of lives saved by vaccinating 1,000 individuals, either allocating**
628 **doses to 65-74 year olds (policy S), or to front line workers (policy F). The ratio $\frac{LS_j}{LF_j}$**
629 **shows the relative number of lives saved comparing the two policies. Results shown**
630 **for each US state per race/ethnicity categories. "NH" stands for "Non-Hispanic", "2+**
631 **races" stands for "Two or more races", "Native" stands for "American Indian or Alaska**
632 **Native", "NHPI" stands for "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander".**

633

634 **S5 Table. Relative number of lives saved comparing a policy allocating vaccines to 65-**
635 **74 year olds (policy S) to one allocating vaccines to front-line workers (policy F).**
636 **Results shown for varying values of R, the increased risk of infection for front-line**
637 **workers. The ratios for an R value of 1·56 correspond to those shown in Table 3. "NH"**

638 stands for "Non-Hispanic", "2+ races" stands for "Two or more races", "Native" stands for
639 "American Indian or Alaska Native", "NHPI" stands for "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific
640 Islander".

641


642 **S6 Table. Number of years of life saved by vaccinating 1,000 individuals, either**
643 **allocating doses to 65-74 year olds (policy S), or to front line workers (policy F).** The
644 **ratio $\frac{YS_j}{YF_j}$ shows the relative number of lives saved comparing the two policies. Results**
645 **shown for each US state per race/ethnicity categories.** "NH" stands for "Non-Hispanic",
646 "2+ races" stands for "Two or more races", "Native" stands for "American Indian or Alaska
647 Native", "NHPI" stands for "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander".

648

649 **S7 Table. Relative number of years of life saved comparing a policy allocating**
650 **vaccines to 65-74 year olds (policy S) to one allocating vaccines to front-line workers**
651 **(policy F). Results shown for varying values of R, the increased risk of infection for**
652 **front-line workers.** The ratios for an R value of 1.56 correspond to those shown in Table 4.
653 "NH" stands for "Non-Hispanic", "2+ races" stands for "Two or more races", "Native" stands
654 for "American Indian or Alaska Native", "NHPI" stands for "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific
655 Islander".

656

State and HHS Region



State and HHS Region

