Comparison of the 2021 COVID-19 'Roadmap' Projections against Public Health Data

Matt J. Keeling[1,2], Louise Dyson[1,2], Michael J. Tildesley[1,2], Edward M. Hill[1,2], Samuel Moore[1,2]

1 The Zeeman Institute for Systems Biology & Infectious Disease Epidemiology Research, School of Life Sciences and Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK.

2 Joint UNIversities Pandemic and Epidemiological Research, https://maths.org/juniper/

Control and mitigation of the COVID-19 pandemic in England has relied on a combination of vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) such as closure of non-essential shops and leisure activities, closure of schools, social distancing, mask wearing, testing followed by isolation and general public health awareness. Some of these measures are extremely costly (both economically and socially), so it is important that they are relaxed promptly but without overwhelming already burdened health services. The eventual policy was a Roadmap of four relaxation steps throughout 2021, taking England from lock-down to the cessation of all restrictions on social interaction; with a minimum of five weeks between each step to allow the data to reflect the changes in restrictions and the results to analysed. Here we present a retrospective analysis of our six Roadmap documents generated in 2021 to assess the likely impacts of future relaxation steps in England. In each case we directly compare results generated at the time with more recent public health data (primarily hospital admissions, but also hospital occupancy and death) to understand discrepancies and potential improvements. We conclude that, in general, the model projections generated a reliable estimation of medium-term hospital admission trends, with the data points up to September 2021 generally lying within our 95% projection intervals. The greatest uncertainties in the modelled scenarios came from estimates of vaccine efficacy, hampered by the lack of data in the early stages of the Alpha and Delta variant waves, and from assumptions about human behaviour in the face of changing restrictions and changing risk. These are clearly avenues for future study.

1 Introduction

Mathematical and statistical models have been an important tool in understanding the historical behaviour of the COVID-19 pandemic in England and extrapolating this understanding into the near future [1–9]. Such model projections rely on robust estimates of epidemiological parameters (usually inferred by matching models to data), estimates of vaccine characteristics (often from external sources) and assumptions about population behaviour in terms of testing, isolation, social mixing and vaccine uptake - errors in any one of these can affect the projected exponential growth rate and hence the medium and longer term dynamics. There has been considerable interest from the media and the general public about the accuracy of model projections, and whether these are generally far more pessimistic than what transpired [10]. While model projections are not forecasts – they are designed to illustrate "what if" scenarios [11] – it is still important that such projections remain broadly consistent with the realised epidemic if they are to be of use in public health planning.

Here we focus on the Warwick SARS-CoV-2 transmission model [5, 7, 12] and its use in the six Roadmap documents developed throughout 2021 [13–18] that helped to shape the relaxation of restrictions in England after the January 2021 lockdown [19]. These Roadmap documents chronicle our

changing understanding of SARS-CoV-2, vaccination and human behaviour over this period. Throughout we use the daily number of hospital admissions as our main metric of interest, but also consider hospital occupancy and deaths as key epidemiological quantities. We do not seek to perform a rigorous statistical comparison between model projections and data, since projections cannot be expected to account for the multitude of unknowable factors (human behaviour, advances in treatment, novel variants); the further into the future the models consider, the greater the compounded impact of multiple uncertainties due to more of these unknowable possibilities. Instead, in this paper, we qualitatively assess whether the projections were sufficiently close to what transpired to be informative for policy.

While details differ in each of the Roadmap documents, as both the situation and our understanding of the epidemiology changed, there are two main themes that are broadly consistent as time progresses. Firstly, as more data are collected there has been a general improvement in the accuracy of the vaccine related parameters that underpin each version of the model, often with a trend for the later, more refined estimates to suggest higher levels of vaccine protection. Secondly, during this process a better understanding of human behaviour in response to changing protective measures has been developed [20, 21]; in the early Roadmaps it was naively assumed that behaviour would track legal restrictions whereas population behaviour has proved to be far more complex.

2 Methods

2.1 Roadmap 1, 6th February 2021

During early modelling, upon which Roadmap 1 was based, data on the degree of vaccine protection was extremely limited. Clinical trials had been against the wild-type virus, whereas at this time the population in England was predominantly infected with the Alpha variant (Table 1). We used two levels of vaccine protection, which were independent of the type of vaccine (AstraZeneca or Pfizer) administered, and due to lack of evidence, the modelled vaccine provided no additional protection against hospital admission or death beyond blocking infection (although [13] appendix 13 did consider a scenario of very high efficacy against severe disease). The central assumptions were chosen to be close to the mid-points of the confidence intervals for efficacy values estimated at the time [22–24]. The cautious assumptions were chosen as half this protective effect for infection blocking (where there was limited data) and closer to the lower confidence intervals for efficacy against symptomatic disease. The central and cautious assumptions also differ in the assumed level of vaccine uptake in 18-49 year olds, assuming 85% and 75%, respectively; whereas in all projections vaccine uptake was modelled as 95% in the over 80s, and 85% in those aged 50-79.

Four timing scenarios were investigated that set the scene for the relaxation of controls, each based on 5 Steps (although we note that the adopted policy on 22nd February 2021 was for 4 Steps [19]) – from a return of children in primary and secondary schools to full-time education (Step 1) to an absence of all controls (Step 5). Only the three timing scenarios (scenarios Two, Three and Four) that most closely correspond to the realised relaxation are shown here. For each relaxation step, there was the challenge of determining the level of social mixing and hence the modelled degree of transmission. Stage 1 was based upon the January lockdown data (but with children returning to schools), while Stage 4 was based upon behaviour in September 2020; Stages 2 and 3 were a 70:30 and 30:70 mix of Stages 1 and 4 respectively. Stage 5, which removed all controls was considered at three levels of mixing (low, medium and high) - which we set at 20%, 10% or 0% precautionary behaviour. These levels of precautionary behaviour (see Fig. 1) are better characterised in terms of the (model independent) reproductive ratio excluding immunity R_{ei}: low ($R_{ei} = 3.0$), medium ($R_{ei} = 3.6$), and high ($R_{ei} = 4.0$). Here, the reproductive ratio excluding immunity corresponds to the average number of secondary cases produced by an average infectious individual when the entire population is susceptible, but when some

degree of control potential exists; as such it provides a useful model-independent quantification for the strength of controls - and later for the impact of new variants.

	Central		Cautious	
Protection against:	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 1	Dose 2
Infection	48%	60%	24%	30%
Symptoms	70%	88%	56%	70%
Hospitalisation	70%	88%	56%	70%
Deaths	70%	88%	56%	70%
Onward Transmission	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 1: Assumed vaccine efficacy parameters against the Alpha variant from Roadmap 1[13]. These parameters were largely based on the initial vaccine trial data[22, 23], which were against the wild-type variant, supplemented by early assessments of efficacy in England[24].

2.2 Roadmap 2, 29th March 2021

By the time the second Roadmap document was produced, the relaxation pathway taking England from lockdown to the complete absence of controls was clearly defined, with four Steps between the January 2021 lockdown and removal of all social mixing restrictions. The second Roadmap document [14] considered a number of sensitivity analyses, including the impact of seasonal forcing (which we present in this paper, as including a moderate level of seasonality became a default assumption in future work). Estimates of social mixing within each of the relaxation steps was still challenging, having to be based on assumptions about how the population was expected to react to each of the relaxation step changes. We assumed that each Step would lead to a discrete change in the level of precautionary behaviour (75% of the early March 2021 level in Step 2, 35% in Step 3 and 15% in Step 4), which we again translate into R excluding immunity: Step 1 $R_{ei} = 1.49$ (CI $1.27 - 1.65$); Step 2 $R_{ei} = 1.76$ (CI $1.59 - 1.90$); Step 3 $R_{ei} = 2.53$ (CI $2.40 - 2.69$); and Step 4 $R_{ei} = 2.97$ (CI $2.79 - 3.14$). We note that the assumptions for Step 4 (complete absence of legislation) is most comparable to the medium mixing assumption during Stage 5 in Roadmap 1.

By the end of March 2021, the parameters for vaccine efficacy (against Alpha) had also been refined, with new estimates for the protection against severe disease (hospital admission and death) and the differences between the AstraZeneca and Pfizer vaccines (Table 2). The reduction in onward transmission (from individuals that have been vaccinated but then later infected) was still unknown due to the difficulties of estimating this quantity; taking a precautionary approach this reduction was set to zero (Table 2). The absence of attenuation in onward transmission from infectious but vaccinated individuals reduces the estimated impact of vaccination in terms of indirect protection, although there is still considerable indirect protection from both reduced levels of infection and lower levels of symptomatic disease.

	AstraZeneca		Pfizer	
Protection against:	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 1	Dose 2
Infection	60%	65%	60%	85%
Symptoms	60%	70%	60%	90%
Hospitalisation	80%	90%	80%	90%
Deaths	80%	90%	80%	90%
Onward Transmission	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 2: Assumed vaccine efficacy parameters against the Alpha variant from Roadmap 2 [14]. Parameters are largely based on estimates from PHE (unpublished) and early reports from Israel and England [25–28]

2.3 Roadmap 3, 1st May 2021

By late April 2021, the clear exponential decline in cases and severe disease was well established. Vaccine efficacy for the Alpha variant was also reasonably well defined (Table 3), although higher and lower efficacies were considered as a sensitivity analysis. For this Roadmap, modelling the easing of restrictions for England [15], two major refinements were made to the model structure: the inclusion of a reduction in onward transmission from vaccinated individuals who become infected (although the precise scale of this reduction was, and remains, difficult to estimate); and the inclusion of 10% seasonality as a default - reducing the scale of any summer outbreaks.

The model still assumed that each Step would lead to a discrete change in the level of precautionary behaviour estimated at 55% of the value at the end of the third lockdown in early March 2021 for Step 3 and 15% for Step 4. This can be translated into R excluding immunity: Step 1 $R_{ei} = 1.66$ (CI $1.42 - 1.83$); Step 2 $R_{ei} = 1.88$ (CI $1.64 - 2.10$); Step 3 $R_{ei} = 2.41$ (CI $2.25 - 2.57$); and Step 4 $R_{ei} = 3.51$ (CI $3.31 - 3.71$) - with Steps 1 and 2 informed by the most recent data.

	AstraZeneca		Pfizer	
Protection against:	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 1	Dose 2
Infection	60%	65%	60%	85%
Symptoms	60%	80%	60%	90%
Hospitalisation	80%	90%	80%	90%
Deaths	80%	90%	80%	90%
Onward Transmission	40%	50%	50%	50%

Table 3: Assumed vaccine efficacy parameters against the Alpha variant from Roadmap 3 [15]. Parameters are largely based on estimates from PHE (unpublished) and early reports from Israel and England [25–29]

2.4 Roadmap 4a, 5th June 2021

We produced our initial Roadmap modelling for the Step 4 easing restrictions in England using data up to 3rd June 2021 [16], less than a month after Delta was declared a Variant of Concern (6th May 2021 [30]) and around the time that Delta became the dominant variant in the UK. These circumstances inherently meant that the projections were being made with relatively little data on the transmission advantage of Delta over Alpha and with extremely limited data on the protection offered by vaccination. We estimated that the Delta variant had a 56% (CI 34-81%) transmission advantage over the Alpha variant, which produced a good match to the early increase in S-gene positive cases – a rapid signal from PCR testing of the spread of Delta [31]. It was thought at this time that a single dose (of either vaccine) would offer far less protection against Delta compared to Alpha. The lower protection afforded by the vaccine towards the Delta variant was reflected in the model assumptions; the Central vaccine assumptions were taken from the preliminary PHE estimates, where a single dose of vaccine only generated 34% protection against Delta, compared to 60% against Alpha (Table 4). A range of vaccine efficacy parameters were explored to capture the uncertainty in these parameters.

In this Roadmap we also still assumed that Step 4 (and the removal of all legal restrictions on behaviour) would lead to a large increase in social mixing, and hence a large increase in transmission. The assumed mixing for Step 3 and 4 would lead to R excluding immunity estimates for the more transmissible Delta variant of $R_{ei} = 3.85$ (CI $3.63 - 4.10$) and $R_{ei} = 5.66$ (CI $5.4 - 5.95$) respectively. Although Step 3 had begun on 17th May 2021, there was still insufficient evidence from cases and more severe disease to infer the level of precautionary behaviour.

This uncertainty is acknowledged in the Roadmap document [16] where we say "A delay to the relax-

ation roadmap would have three main epidemiological advantages: (a) delay and reduce the epidemic peak providing more time for additional vaccination and protection; (b) provide additional time to understand the degree to which the vaccine protects against B.1.617.2; (c) allow more confidence to separate the impacts of B.1.617.2 from changes due to Step 3." There was also concern at the time that Delta had a slightly elevated case hospitalisation rate when compared with Alpha [32], which would increase associated projections by a multiplicative scaling.

	Central		Cautious		Optimistic	
Protection against:	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 1	Dose 2
Infection	34%	72%	32%	58%	45%	84%
Symptoms	34%	82%	25%	64%	45%	84%
Hospitalisation	64%	91%	59%	86%	85%	95%
Deaths	60%	96%	59%	93%	80%	99%
Onward Transmission	45%	45%	40%	40%	50%	50%

Table 4: Assumed vaccine efficacy parameters against the Delta variant from Roadmap 4a [16]. Parameters are largely based on early estimates from PHE [33].

2.5 Roadmap 4b, 6th July 2021

Our second Roadmap modelling focusing on easing restrictions for England (Step 4) used data up to 2nd July 2021 [17], by which point far more information had been gathered on vaccine efficacy, suggesting that protection against hospitalisation was closer to the most optimistic of earlier assumptions [34], whilst protection against infection from the Pfizer vaccine was again very high (Table 5). Despite the availability of an additional month of data to refine vaccine efficacy estimates, within this Roadmap we still considered more cautious and more optimistic assumptions as part of the sensitivity analysis given the importance of vaccine efficacy parameters. The extra data (since Roadmap 4a) also allowed better inference of the precautionary behaviour in Step 3 and hence a refinement of the transmission advantage of Delta over Alpha, with an updated estimate of 68% (38-86%).

For the first time in our Roadmap modelling we also had sufficient data to establish that behaviour did not respond rapidly to legislation and consequently that individuals were unlikely to return to pre-COVID mixing as soon as restrictions were lifted. However, this gave rise to substantial uncertainty about the future, and as such, multiple pathways to a complete return to normality were investigated, ranging in both the initial drop once Step 4 occurred and the time taken to reach pre-COVID mixing.

	AstraZeneca		Pfizer	
Protection against:	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 1	Dose 2
Infection	34%	64%	56%	80%
Symptoms	34%	70%	56%	88%
Hospitalisation	81%	94%	90%	98%
Deaths	81%	95%	90%	98%
Onward Transmission	45%	45%	45%	45%

Table 5: Assumed default vaccine efficacy parameters against the Delta variant from Roadmap 4b [17]. Parameters are largely based on estimates from PHE [34].

2.6 Roadmap 5, 12th October 2021

In our final Roadmap document of 2021 [18], the aim was to consider the likely dynamics for Autumn and Winter 2021. Echoing the previous Roadmap document [17], we considered the return to pre-COVID mixing over multiple time-scales (from December 2021 to June 2022).

The largest change in model structure for this Roadmap was the inclusion of waning vaccine efficacy - supported by growing evidence about the decline in protection over time. To combat this decline in immunity, booster vaccines were modelled in this Roadmap document as being offered to all those over 50 years old at a rate of 1.3 million doses per week. Therefore, while the early protection against the Delta variant offered by vaccination was by this point well-defined (Table 6), we now encountered a new set of uncertainties about waning and boosters. Firstly, would vaccine efficacy from the first two doses continue to decline to zero, or would protection asymptote to a low (but non-zero) level (Table 7)? Secondly, there was also considerable uncertainty about the strength and duration of protection after the booster. We modelled two limiting scenarios (Table 6): in the first the booster resets vaccine protection to the level after the second dose (nullifying the waning effect after the primary vaccine doses), but efficacy then wanes as before; in the second the action of boosters provided high levels of long-lasting protection.

	AstraZeneca		Pfizer		Booster	
Protection against:	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 1	Dose 2	Waning	Permanent
Infection	45%	70%	55%	85%	85%	92%
Symptoms	45%	70%	55%	90%	90%	95%
Hospitalisation	80%	95%	80%	95%	95%	97%
Deaths	80%	98%	80%	98%	98%	99%
Onward Transmission	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%

Table 6: Assumed protection against the Delta variant shortly (2-weeks) after vaccination, from Roadmap 5 [18].

Protection against:	Assumption 1	Assumption 2	Assumption 3
Infection	50%	30%	0%
Symptoms	55%	35%	10%
Hospitalisation	85%	79%	70%
Deaths	85%	79%	70%
Onward Transmission	20%	20%	20%
Vaccine half-life (days)	180	270	460

Table 7: Protection against the Delta variant in the asymptotic waned state, from Roadmap 5 [18]. The half-life is the expected time for a double-vaccinated individual to transition into the waned state. Waning efficacy assumptions are chosen to match the available data [35–38].

3 Results



Fig. 1: Changes in the inferred precautionary behaviour from April 2020 to December 2021 (top panel), together with the resultant changes to R excluding immunity for the three main variants (lower panel). Vertical lines indicate the time of key changes to the control measures, while the top bar specifies the dominant variant over time. From May 2021 onwards, we have inferred two levels of precautionary behaviour applying to younger (under 40) and older (over 65) individuals, with those between 40 and 65 scaling between the two.

We begin by considering the change in estimated level of precautionary behaviour over time (Fig. 1). The precautionary behaviour parameter captures all social and behavioural changes that lead to a change in the underlying transmission rate - this includes enforced measures such as lockdowns and tiers, as well as voluntary measures such as avoiding crowded areas, mask-wearing and lateral flow testing. Three key points can be observed from the inferred temporal pattern: (i) precautionary behaviour increases in response to imposed restrictions (such as the three lockdowns); (ii) there is a gradual decline in precautionary behaviour at other times, as individuals seek a return to normality during periods of relative stability; (iii) on top of this pattern there are numerous anomalies when the population responds to external events. For example, precautionary behaviour initially increased during June 2021 in response to concerns about the Delta variant, decreased dramatically in late June/July 2021 (during the 2020 UEFA European Football Championship), and then increased again due to increased isolation caused by the 'pingdemic'.

We translate these behavioural changes into variations in the underlying transmission rate which, together with the impact of new variants, generates a reproductive ratio. In the lower panel of Fig. 1 we plot R excluding immunity (R_{ei}), which captures what the reproductive ratio would be without the depletion of susceptibles due to prior infection or the actions of vaccination. As such R_{ei} provides an intuitive measure of the combined effects of behaviour and variants. Each variant has led to a



Fig. 2: Realised delivery of vaccine in England, from December 2020 to December 2021 (black lines represent a 7-day moving average), compared with assumptions for the six roadmap documents (top panel) and the resultant number of individuals eventually vaccinated in each 5-year age group (lower panel). In the top panel, the solid lines correspond to the time to give two doses to all adults (18+) at the assumed uptake; the black solid line is the reported rate of adult vaccination, while the black dashed line is the combined rate of vaccinating children and adults. In the lower panel, the pale grey bars represent the population size as estimated by ONS [39], with dashed borders representing individuals under 18 year of age. In the Roadmap 5 document, we based uptake on the observations taken in early October 2021.

noticeable rise in R_{ei}, with Delta (and more recently Omicron) generating substantial increases over the initial wild type variant.

Two of the key assumptions for each Roadmap document were the rate at which doses of vaccine could be delivered and the level of vaccine uptake within each age-group (Fig. 2). The expected level of uptake, together with assumptions about vaccine efficacy, defines the eventual impact of vaccination on the epidemic dynamics, while the deployment rate helps to define the time-scales over which this impact is achieved. Both the delivery rate and uptake quantities were fixed parameters in the default Roadmap modelling, based on information from the Cabinet Office, although we often considered sensitivity to these assumptions. Early Roadmap assumptions (Fig. 2, Roadmap 1 in red and Roadmap 2 in dark blue) were optimistic in terms of delivery speed, optimistic about uptake in the youngest age-groups but pessimistic about uptake in the older generations. Later Roadmaps were all slightly optimistic that vaccine delivery would be sustained at high levels for relatively long times, but included more accurate uptake assumptions. Roadmaps 1 to 4b did not include the vaccination of those under 18 nor the booster programme, hence these are not shown in Fig. 2; only Roadmap 5 includes these features as well as booster (third dose) vaccination.

3.1 Roadmap 1, 6th February 2021

The earliest Roadmap was hampered by the limited amount of information in early February 2021 on the Alpha variant (especially in terms of vaccine protection) and a largely unknowable level of vaccine uptake. The assumed vaccine efficacy (based on trial data and early estimates in England) was slightly pessimistic, as was the assumed uptake level in older adults, but the rate of vaccine delivery was highly optimistic (Fig. 2).



Fig. 3: From Roadmap 1 [13], low (left) and medium (right) transmission assumptions together with central vaccine efficacy assumptions. Top panel shows the inferred level of precautionary behaviour (grey) together with three different scenarios and two levels of transmission in Step 5. The lower figures show projected level of daily hospital admissions (second row), hospital occupancy (third row) and daily deaths (fourth row) together with the associated data until December 2021; data points from before the Roadmap and used in parameter inference are in blue, those after the Roadmap are in orange. Shaded regions correspond to the 95% prediction interval; blue regions for Scenario Two, orange regions for Scenario Three and yellow regions for Scenario Four

Figure 3 is taken from the February 2021 Roadmap document [13], plotting the projections for Scenarios Two, Three and Four, overlaid with the epidemiological data for England (up to December 2021). Considering the assumed changes in behaviour (Fig. 3, top graph) it is clear that scenarios Three and Four, together with low transmission in Step 5, are in closer agreement with the realised pattern of behaviour than the other assumptions considered; these correspond to the orange and yellow

projections in the left-hand column of results (Fig. 3).

The data for the latter half of 2021 lie well within the 95% projection intervals (shaded regions) of the central vaccine efficacy assumptions, which are wide due to the considerable uncertainty of long-term projections. For hospital admissions and occupancy the projected means provide a reasonable approximation to the scale of outbreak. The model results do however over-estimate the number of deaths; the lower realised number of deaths may be attributable to better treatments administered in 2021 lowering the case-fatality ratio [40]. Four factors influence the comparison between model and data: (i) the model does not include the Delta variant; (ii) the assumed precautionary mixing in Step 5 was lower than inferred; (iii) the initial estimates of vaccine protection were too low (compare Table 1 with Table 3); and (iv) the forecast deployment speed of vaccination was higher than observed (Fig. 2). The actions of (ii) and (iii) are to push the projection to be an overestimate of the true disease severity, while (i) and (iv) would generate underestimates.

3.2 Roadmap 2, 29th March 2021

Roadmap 2 considered two distinct scenarios: the impact of just allowing Step 2 (opening of non-essential retail and outdoor hospitality venues); and the longer term dynamics of Steps 2-4. For the longer term projections, the Roadmap document [14] considered a number of different sensitivities in order to explore a range of parameter uncertainties including: the strength of social mixing (and hence transmission) in Step 4; the strength of social mixing in Steps 2 and 3; seasonality, such that transmission is lower in the summer months; as well as vaccine roll-out speed, efficacy and uptake. Of these uncertainties we focus here on the inclusion of seasonal effects (Fig. 4), as we subsequently included moderate levels of seasonality (10%) in all future Roadmaps.

Roadmap 2 overestimated the degree to which the population would return to pre-COVID mixing in each Step of restrictions being eased (Fig. 4, top panel). Additionally, the Roadmap 2 document only considered the dynamics of the Alpha variant, whereas in May 2021 the Delta variant invaded increasing R by an estimated 67% (CI 44-95%) (Fig. 1). The action of these two factors works in opposite directions: our assumed lower level of precautionary behaviour will act to increase our projections, while maintaining the Alpha variant will suppress the projections.

We highlight outcomes under different seasonality assumptions. In particular, we investigated the impact of assuming no seasonality (Fig. 4, black line) and 10% seasonality (as assumed in future Roadmaps, represented in Fig. 4 by the blue line), both of which are shown with 95% prediction intervals (shaded regions). The data on hospital admissions (Fig. 4, main left panel), hospital occupancy and deaths (Fig. 4, right-hand panels) all fall within the 95% projection interval of 0% and 10% seasonality until late August 2021; while the assumption of 10% seasonality leads to an excellent agreement between the median prediction and the hospital data prior to the peak in late July 2021. The median deaths are again an overestimate, likely due to improvements in medical treatments that were applied as we progressed through 2021. In addition, we included in later Roadmaps a correlation between the mortality risk and hospital occupancy, meaning smaller waves in the summer of 2021 would be associated with relatively lower deaths than the major wave of January 2021.

3.3 Roadmap 3, 1st May 2021

Our assumptions in Roadmap 3 [15] about social mixing associated with Steps 3 and 4 significantly underestimated the level of precautionary behaviour (Fig. 5, top panel), leading to modelled outputs with greater transmission than was realised. Even our low transmission assumption (blue line) was an underestimate of precautionary behaviour until December 2021. Despite this, our projections of hospital admissions and hospital occupancy were underestimates of the true dynamics – although the majority of the data points until September 2021 fall within the 95% prediction intervals. This is most



Fig. 4: From Roadmap 2 Figure 2.8 [14], which considered the impact of seasonality. Top panel shows the inferred level of precautionary behaviour (grey) together with the assumed default levels from Roadmap 2 [14]. Lower panels show the model outputs for daily hospital admissions (left), hospital occupancy (top right) and daily deaths (lower right) together with the associated data until December 2021; data points from before the Roadmap and used in parameter inference are in blue, those after the Roadmap are in orange. Shaded regions correspond to the 95% prediction interval, and are only shown for the default scenario (no seasonality) and 10% seasonality scenario that is used in later models.

clearly seen during May and early June 2021 when hospital admissions began to slowly climb, but the mean projection was for relatively constant levels of hospital admissions until the impact of Step 4 was realised.

There are two main reason for this underestimate. Firstly, given we expected R to be close to one, even relatively small errors can translate into substantial divergence in projections - changing trajectories from flat to exponentially increasing. However, the key driver is undoubtedly the invasion and increase of the Delta variant in late May 2021. Subsequent analysis suggests that Delta is 67% (CI 44-95%) more transmissible than Alpha [18], a factor that is more than sufficient to overcome the errors in our assumptions about precautionary behaviour and drive pronounced exponential growth.



Fig. 5: From Roadmap 3 Fig. 10 [15], which considered the impact of social mixing and hence transmission in Step 4. Top panel shows the inferred level of precautionary behaviour (grey) together with the assumed default levels from Roadmap 3 [15]. Lower panels show projected level of daily hospital admissions (left), hospital occupancy (top right) and daily deaths (lower right) together with the associated data until December 2021; data points from before the Roadmap and used in parameter inference are in blue, those after the Roadmap are in orange. Shaded regions correspond to the 95% prediction interval for the default models; vertical lines correspond to the expected date of Steps 2, 3 and 4 on 12th April 2021, 17th May 2021 and 21st June 2021.

3.4 Roadmap 4a, 5th June 2021

The assumptions in Roadmap 4a [16] for Step 3 and 4 clearly underestimated the level of precautionary behaviour (Fig. 6, top panel). The heightened concerns in late May and early June 2021 over the invasion of the Delta variant led to an increase in precautionary behaviour at a time when we were anticipating a decline due to the relaxation of Step 3. Again, the level of social mixing assumed in Step 4 is far higher (analogously the precautionary behaviour was far lower) than observed at any point in 2021. In particular, the 'pingdemic' of late July 2021 which led to a massive rapid decline in infection was not included in the modelled scenarios and could not have been forecast.



Fig. 6: From Roadmap 4a Fig. 10 [16], which considered the impact of delaying the transition to Step 4. The top panel shows the inferred level of precautionary behaviour (grey) together with the assumed a range of assumed delays. Lower panels show projected level of daily hospital admissions for the default (centre), optimistic (left) and cautious (right) assumptions about vaccine protection, together with the associated data until December 2021; data points from before the Roadmap and used in parameter inference are in blue, those after the Roadmap are in orange. Shaded regions correspond to the 95% prediction intervals for the default model (black) and the delay until 19th July 2021 (orange).

With the mounting concern over the Delta variant, one of the pivotal considerations of Roadmap 4a is whether Step 4 (originally scheduled for 21st June 2021 at the earliest) should be delayed. Given the substantial uncertainty in estimating vaccine efficacy against Delta, this Roadmap considered three assumptions about vaccine protection: default, optimistic and cautious (Fig. 6). Later studies (e.g. Table 6) suggest that the optimistic assumptions are closest to the level of protection realised. The default assumptions therefore, unsurprisingly, overestimate the true level of hospital admissions; the model projected a far more rapid rise in the Delta variant due to less suppression by vaccine immunity and no public reaction to the new variant. When using the optimistic vaccine assumptions (lower left panel), there is closer correspondence between the model and how the outbreak unfolded: the data comfortably lie within the 95% prediction interval until September 2021 for the realised scenario of Step 4 on 19th July 2021 (Fig. 6, lower left graph, orange line and shaded area).

It could be questioned why Roadmap 4a predicted a single, although broad-peaked, epidemic, while in reality the Delta variant maintained a plateau of hospital admissions for a duration of around four months. Again, this is driven by errors in the early estimates of behaviour. By overestimating the level of social mixing in Step 3 (it was difficult to estimate both the transmission advantage of Delta and the change in behaviour due to Step 3), our inference methodology underestimated the transmission advantage of Delta. While these two factors counteract one another, by virtue of fitting to the data until 3rd June 2021, for longer term projections these factors no longer cancel due to the greater impact of depletion of susceptibles in a model with intrinsically lower transmission. In addition, the waning of vaccine efficacy, especially in the elderly, who were amongst the first to be vaccinated, also acts to promote the high plateau of hospital admissions.

3.5 Roadmap 4b, 6th July

The assumptions in Roadmap 4b [17] for the behaviour in response to moving to Step 4 cover a wide range of scenarios (Fig. 7, top panel); however, none captured the sudden increase in mixing during the 2020 UEFA European Football Championships, nor the sudden subsequent decline from the 'pingdemic'. With the advantage of hindsight, the fact that these events would precipitate changes may have been anticipated but their scale was unforeseeable. Of the scenarios considered, the slow decline (Fig. 7, top panel green curve) was the closest to the realised pattern of social mixing but, since there were pronounced changes in behaviour during June and July 2021 that were absent from the modelled scenarios, we would not expect the associated modelled projections to closely match the data.

The data predominantly lie within the envelop of model projections. Many of the individual mean trajectories (for example the green, blue, red and cyan trajectories Fig. 7) capture the approximate level of severe disease – although in relative terms hospital occupancy is lower than hospital admissions due to a slight reduction in the average length of stay in hospitals over this period. The data between July 2021 and December 2021 is characterised by a high plateau of infection with gradual oscillations that can only be caused by a finely balanced combination of susceptible depletion, waning immunity and increased social mixing. As such, many of the mean trajectories (e.g. red curve) show this type of pattern, but we should not expect a close match to any one trajectory given the perturbations that occurred in June and July 2021.

3.6 Roadmap 5, 12th October

This final Roadmap of 2021, considering possible SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics and the associated COVID-19 disease burden for Autumn and Winter 2021, was by far the most complex in terms of the dynamics being modelled. The Roadmap document also sought to capture the widest range of uncertainties in combination: three assumptions about waning immunity (red, green and blue in



Fig. 7: From Roadmap 4b Fig. 5 [17], which shows the projections associated with seven assumptions about Step 4 precautionary behaviour. The top panel shows the inferred level of precautionary behaviour (grey) together with the seven different assumptions. The lower panels show daily hospital admissions (left), hospital occupancy (centre) and daily deaths (right) for the seven main assumptions (coloured lines) and for the naive assumption of a return to pre-COVID mixing (black dashed line) together with the combined envelope of all prediction intervals (shaded grey). The lower panels show a magnified section of upper panels, which include a range of other declines in precautionary behaviour (thin dark-grey lines). Data points from before the Roadmap and used in parameter inference are in blue, with subsequent data points displayed in yellow.

Fig. 8), two assumptions about the duration of boosters (centre and right-hand panels in Fig. 8), and multiple assumptions about the return to pre-pandemic mixing (of which we show four: cyan, magenta, yellow and purple in Fig. 8).

The four assumptions about the return to pre-pandemic mixing (Fig. 8, top panel) clearly span the range of inferred behaviour, although our initial estimates of precautionary behaviour in August and September 2021 were lower than our most recent estimates for these values– with implications for the inferred parameters for the Delta variant (including the transmission rate and the risk of requiring hospital treatment).

The projections show the true number of hospital admissions in England both when the Delta variant dominated (orange circles, Fig. 8) and at later times when the Omicron variant generated the majority of hospital admissions (red crosses, Fig. 8). The time period corresponding to when the Delta variant remained dominant compares reasonably well with the range of model projections, although none of the individual replicates is a perfect fit. One factor that contributed to such discrepancies was uncertainty about the patterns of waning vaccine efficacy – the most recent data suggest a notable difference in waning between AstraZeneca and Pfizer vaccines in terms of protecting against symptomatic infections, but maintaining a high level of protection against hospital admissions – placing parameters closest to Assumption 1 (red curves in Fig. 8). Unsurprisingly, the sharp rise in hospital admissions in December 2021 due to the Omicron variant could not have been predicted.

4 Discussion

Here we have discussed the development of the model outputs, generated using the Warwick SARS-CoV-2 transmission model, that underpinned the six Roadmap documents produced to study the easement of restrictions in England during 2021. The chronological evolution across these documents is characterised by an increased understanding of vaccine efficacy, a greater appreciation for the uncertainty in population behaviour and a corresponding increase in model complexity. In general the models have performed remarkably well, often aligning with the reported levels of hospital admissions over multiple months. Two clear lessons for the future are how such pandemic models handle the early sparse data on vaccine efficacy and the inherent uncertainty in human behaviour.

The Roadmap models have always been driven by externally generated estimates of vaccine efficacy (Tables 1 to 7). Any changes to these assumptions requires a refitting of the model to the entire period since vaccination began, and therefore we are constrained to use a small number of vaccine assumptions. Moreover, small changes to vaccine efficacy can generate large changes in model outcomes; changing the vaccine efficacy against death from 98% to 99%, for example, would halve the number of COVID-19 related mortalities in the vaccinated group. Similarly, small changes in the vaccine efficacy against infection or the reduction in onward transmission (both of which are inherently difficult to directly measure) will generate changes in growth rate; long-term projections are highly sensitive to any variation in the growth rate due to the amplifying effects of exponential processes. In general, early estimates of vaccine efficacy have been slightly pessimistic (comparing Table 1 and Table 3, or Table 4 with Table 6), which may be due to early biases in the initial vaccine prioritisation as well as biases due to targeting those most likely to contract SARS-CoV-2 and require treatment.

The second consistent issue is estimating population behaviour in response to changes in legislation, case numbers and media messaging. Although we conceptualise precautionary behaviour in terms of social mixing, it really refers to a reduction in mixing between susceptible and infected individuals. Therefore, mass testing followed by strict adherence to isolation rules is likely to prevent more transmission and hence lead to a higher estimate of precautionary behaviour than a simple change in the population-wide level of social mixing.



Fig. 8: From Roadmap 5 Fig. 5 [18], showing four assumptions about precautionary behaviour (rows and left-hand column), three assumptions about waning vaccine efficacy (red, green blue) and two assumptions about the long-term action of boosters (centre and right columns). The top panel shows the inferred level of precautionary behaviour (grey) together with the four different assumptions about the return to pre-pandemic mixing. The lower panels show daily hospital admissions for the different assumptions, with marker style denoting the times corresponding to dates before the projections were performed (blue circles), later times dominated by Delta (orange circles) and later times dominated by Omicron (red crosses).

The initial models [13–16], in the absence of any other data, assumed that changes in legislation would generate a step-change in population behaviour as people took advantage of new freedoms and opportunities. While the assumption of a step-change responding to relaxing measures was supported by the sudden increases in precautionary behaviour when measures were initially introduced, we now observe that the response to the introduction of measures was much quicker than to the relaxation of measures. Later models [17, 18] assumed a more gradual response to the relaxation steps; but population behaviour remains unpredictable over long timescales. Although we have seen a gradual decline in the inferred precautionary behaviour (and hence an increase in social mixing) since the end of the January 2021 lockdown (Fig. 1) the change has been anything but smooth. While an increase in mixing during the 2020 UEFA European Football Championship, which occurred in late June to early July 2021, could have been foreseen, the magnitude and duration was unpredictable; similarly the 'pingdemic' of late July 2021 was an unexpected and emergent phenomenon that only subsided due to a change in the NHS App (switching from a notification window of 5 days to just 2 days for asymptomatically infected individuals, and hence minimising the number of individuals isolating).

More recently, warnings and concerns over the Omicron variant (Fig. 8, top panel) generated marked changes in behaviour over the Christmas and New Year period at the end of 2021 and into early 2022. Such behavioural changes highlight our inability to make accurate long-term predictions; neither the timing of Omicron emergence, the characteristics of this variant, nor the public response to this potential health problem could be forecast before the event. This uncertainty highlights why model results should be considered as projections of particular (epidemiologically-plausible) scenarios, rather than predictions. To generate true predictions would require models that incorporated the full uncertainty in public behaviour and the emergence of novel variants [41]– leading to prediction intervals that would likely be too large for the results to be useful. A corollary of this expanding uncertainty is the difficulty of making assessments even with hindsight. For example we may wish to calculate the effects of taking the relaxation steps faster or slower; this requires prediction of the behavioural response over time, yet precautionary behaviour is likely to be driven by the numbers of cases and hospital admissions, the associated media coverage, the restrictions in place, the public health messaging and a range of other exogenous factors.

One of the inherent difficulties with the assumed level of precautionary behaviour is that any errors impact the projections in a complex and non-linear manner. The precautionary behaviour can be thought of as partially determining the growth rate - so a small error in the inference of the precautionary behaviour level at any one time has long-term consequences. In a similar manner, due to the exponential nature of epidemic growth, underestimates of the precautionary behaviour (leading to faster growth) will have a disproportionately larger error than overestimates.

Although we have primarily discussed vaccine efficacy and population behaviour as the two key determinants of the accuracy of longer-term projections, other factors also influence the model results. Vaccine uptake and the speed of vaccine delivery also both affect the projected scale of future outbreaks. Inaccuracies in estimating the delivery speed generally impact the short-term dynamics, while inaccuracies in the level of vaccine uptake have longer term consequences due to changing the ultimate level of vaccine protection (in a similar manner to errors in estimating vaccine efficacy). While estimates of future vaccine delivery speed were prescribed to the modelling teams, estimates of uptake have instead been based on observed historical patterns. However, it is worth noting that while there is highly accurate data on the number of vaccines delivered, the information on the number of people of a given age within England is an estimate, here taken from ONS [39]. In particular, the recorded number of vaccine first doses given to 55-59 and 60-64 year olds exceeds the estimated population size used in the model (Fig. 2, thin black bar and wide grey bar) and hence requires re-scaling. Given that we are primarily interested in those not vaccinated (and hence more likely to be susceptible to the

virus), small errors in the estimation of population size could affect both the model projections and our ability to estimate vaccine efficacy.

These Roadmap projections [13–18], together with the projections from other groups [42–47], have provided quantitative support for the steady relaxation of mitigation measures. In general, Roadmap modelling suggested that hospital admissions would not rise to the extreme levels observed during the first and second waves (with peak admissions of 3099 and 4134 in England respectively) following the relaxation steps. The exception to this was Roadmap 4a [16, 45], where uncertainty over the Delta variant (especially the protection afforded by vaccination) led to a range of projections many with high peak hospital admissions (Fig. 6). As such, these model projections have proved to be a useful policy tool, providing a mechanism for translating epidemiological knowledge and uncertainties into medium-term assessments of the likely range of public health burden.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank many people for their thoughts, comments and help during the lengthy process of producing the six Roadmap documents. Members of the JUNIPER consortium have offered continual support, encouragement and advice throughout this period; Graham Medley and Angela McLean as chairs of SPI-M-O provided invaluable input into the development of these Roadmaps; the SPI-M secretariat for their continued support (Paul Allen, Tom Irving, Libby Richards, Mat Katz, Jen Huynh and Alastair Ikin); members of PHE/UKHSA that have assisted with data access (Andre Charlotte and Nick Gent) and estimates of vaccine efficacy (Nick Andrews, Jamie Lopez Bernal and Mary Ramsay); and members of DSTL who have helped with data processing (Ronni Bowman and Phillippa Spencer).

Ethical Considerations

Data from the CHESS and SARI databases were supplied after anonymisation under strict data protection protocols agreed between the University of Warwick and Public Health England. The ethics of the use of these data for these purposes was agreed by Public Health England with the Government's SPI-M(O) / SAGE committees.

Data Availability

Data on cases were obtained from the COVID-19 Hospitalisation in England Surveillance System (CHESS) data set that collects detailed data on patients infected with COVID-19. Data on COVID-19 deaths were obtained from Public Health England. These data contain confidential information, with public data deposition non-permissible for socioeconomic reasons. The CHESS data resides with the National Health Service (www.nhs.gov.uk) whilst the death data are available from Public Health England (www.phe.gov.uk). The ethics of the use of these data for these purposes was agreed by Public Health England with the Governments SPI-M(O) / SAGE committees. More aggregate data is freely available from the UK Coronavirus dashboard: https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/

Funding

MJK, LD and MJT were supported through the JUNIPER modelling consortium [grant number MR/V038613/1]; MJK and SM were supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) [Policy Research Programme, Mathematical and Economic Modelling for Vaccination and Immunisation Evaluation, and Emergency Response; NIHR200411]; MJK, LD, MJT and EMH were supported

by the Medical Research Council through the COVID-19 Rapid Response Rolling Call [grant number MR/V009761/1] MJK is affiliated to the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Gastrointestinal Infections at University of Liverpool in partnership with UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), in collaboration with University of Warwick. MJK is also affiliated to the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Genomics and Enabling Data at University of Warwick in partnership with UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care or UK Health Security Agency.

Competing interests

All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

[1] Barnard RC, Davies NG, Pearson CA, Jit M, Edmunds WJ. Projected epidemiological consequences of the omicron sars-cov-2 variant in england, december 2021 to april 2022. *medRxiv* (2021).

[2] Davies NG, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, Semple MG, *et al.* Association of tiered restrictions and a second lockdown with covid-19 deaths and hospital admissions in england: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **21**(4):482–492 (2021).

[3] Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Kucharski AJ, *et al.* Estimated transmissibility and impact of sars-cov-2 lineage b. 1.1. 7 in england. *Science* **372**(6538):eabg3055 (2021).

[4] Funk S, Abbott S, Atkins BD, Baguelin M, Baillie JK, *et al.* Short-term forecasts to inform the response to the covid-19 epidemic in the uk. *medRxiv preprint-BMJ Yale* (2020).

[5] Keeling MJ, Hill EM, Gorsich EE, Penman B, Guyver-Fletcher G, *et al.* Predictions of COVID-19 dynamics in the UK: Short-term forecasting and analysis of potential exit strategies. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **17**(1):e1008619 (2021). doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008619.

[6] Knock ES, Whittles LK, Lees JA, Perez-Guzman PN, Verity R, *et al.* Key epidemiological drivers and impact of interventions in the 2020 sars-cov-2 epidemic in england. *Science Translational Medicine* **13**(602):eabg4262 (2021).

[7] Moore S, Hill EM, Tildesley MJ, Dyson L, Keeling MJ. Vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **21**(6):793–802 (2021). doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00143-2.

[8] Sandmann FG, Davies NG, Vassall A, Edmunds WJ, Jit M, *et al.* The potential health and economic value of sars-cov-2 vaccination alongside physical distancing in the uk: a transmission model-based future scenario analysis and economic evaluation. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **21**(7):962–974 (2021).

[9] Sonabend R, Whittles LK, Imai N, Perez-Guzman PN, Knock ES, *et al.* Non-pharmaceutical interventions, vaccination, and the sars-cov-2 delta variant in england: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet* **398**(10313):1825–1835 (2021).

[10] Vallance P. It's not true COVID-19 modellers look only at worst outcomes (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/its-not-true-covid-19-modellers-look-only-at-worst-outcomes.

[11] SAGE. Introduction to epidemiological modelling, October 2021 (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/introduction-to-epidemiological-modelling/introduction-to-epidemiological-modelling-october-2021.

[12] Keeling MJ, Dyson L, Guyver-Fletcher G, Holmes A, Semple MG, *et al.* Fitting to the uk covid-19 outbreak, short-term forecasts and estimating the reproductive number. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* page 09622802211070257 (2020).

[13] Moore S, Keeling MJ. Roadmaps for Relaxation of NPIs (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/963444/S1118_Roadmaps_for_relaxation_of_NPIs__Warwick.pdf.

[14] Keeling MJ, Moore S, Dyson L, Tildesley MJ, Hill EM. Road Map Scenarios & Sensitivity (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/975911/S1184_SPI-M_University_of_Warwick_Road_Map_Scenarios_and_Sensitivity.pdf.

[15] Keeling MJ, Dyson L, Hill EM, Moore S, Tildesley MJ. Road Map Scenarios and Sensitivity: Steps 3 and 4 (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/984533/S1229_Warwick_Road_Map_Scenarios_and_Sensitivity_Steps_3_and_4.pdf.

[16] Keeling MJ, Dyson L, Hill EM, Moore S, Tildesley MJ. Road Map Scenarios and Sensitivity: Step 4 (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/993358/s1288_Warwick_RoadMap_Step_4.pdf.

[17] Keeling MJ, Dyson L, Hill EM, Moore S, Tildesley MJ. Road Map Scenarios and Sensitivity: Step 4 (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1001172/S1302_University_of_Warwick_Road_Map_Scenarios_and_Sensitivity_Step_4.2__6_July_2021__1_.pdf.

[18] Keeling MJ, Dyson L, Hill EM, Moore S, Tildesley MJ. Projections of SARS-CoV-2 transmission and COVID-19 disease until June 2022 (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1027907/S1384_Warwick_Autumn_and_Winter_scenarios.pdf.

[19] Cabinet Office. COVID-19 Response - Spring 2021 (Summary) (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-response-spring-2021/covid-19-response-spring-2021-summary.

[20] Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, Del Fava E, Grow A, *et al.* Rapid review of social contact patterns during the covid-19 pandemic. *Epidemiology* **32**(6):781 (2021).

[21] Gimma A, Munday J, Wong K, Coletti P, van Zandvoort K, *et al.* Changes in social contacts in england during the covid-19 pandemic between march 2020 and march 2021 as measured by the comix survey: A repeated cross-sectional study. *PLoS Medicine* page 1003907 (2022).

[22] Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, *et al.* Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **383**(27):2603–2615 (2020). doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2034577.

[23] Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, *et al.* Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet* **397**(10269):99–111 (2021). doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32661-1.

[24] JCVI. Optimising the COVID-19 vaccination programme for maximum short-term impact (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/prioritising-the-first-covid-19-vaccine-dose-jcvi-statement/optimising-the-covid-19-vaccination-programme-for-maximum-short-term-impact.

[25] Dagan N, Barda N, Kepten E, Miron O, Perchik S, *et al.* Bnt162b2 mrna covid-19 vaccine in a nationwide mass vaccination setting. *New England Journal of Medicine* (2021).

[26] Voysey M, Costa Clemens SA, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, *et al.* Single-dose administration and the influence of the timing of the booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine: a pooled analysis of four randomised trials. *Lancet* **397**(10277):881–891 (2021). doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00432-3.

[27] Vasileiou E, Simpson CR, Robertson C, Shi T, Kerr S, *et al.* Effectiveness of first dose of covid-19 vaccines against hospital admissions in scotland: national prospective cohort study of 5.4 million people (2021). URL https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/scotland_firstvaccinedata_preprint.pdf.

[28] Hyams C, Marlow R, Maseko Z, King J, Ward L, *et al.* Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 COVID-19 vaccination at preventing hospitalisations in people aged at least 80 years: a test-negative, case-control study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* (2021). doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00330-3.

[29] Harris R, Hall J, Zaidi A, Andrews N, Dunbar K, *et al.* Impact of vaccination on household transmission of sars-cov-2 in england (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/news/one-dose-of-covid-19-vaccine-can-cut-household-transmission-by-up-to-half. [Online] (Accessed: 2021-04-28).

[30] Public Health England. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in England: technical briefing 10 (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/984274/Variants_of_Concern_VOC_Technical_Briefing_10_England.pdf. [Online] (Accessed: 07 March 2022).

[31] Challen R, Dyson L, Overton CE, Guzman-Rincon LM, Hill EM, *et al.* Early epidemiological signatures of novel SARS-CoV-2 variants: establishment of B. 1.617. 2 in England. *Medrxiv* (2021).

[32] Twohig KA, Nyberg T, Zaidi A, Thelwall S, Sinnathamby MA, *et al.* Hospital admission and emergency care attendance risk for sars-cov-2 delta (b. 1.617. 2) compared with alpha (b. 1.1. 7) variants of concern: a cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **22**(1):35–42 (2022).

[33] PHE. COVID-19 vaccine surveillance report: Week 21 (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/990096/Vaccine_surveillance_report_-_week_21.pdf.

[34] PHE. COVID-19 vaccine surveillance report: Week 26 (2021). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/998411/Vaccine_surveillance_report_-_week_26.pdf.

[35] Andrews N, Tessier E, Stowe J, Gower C, Kirsebom F, *et al.* Vaccine effectiveness and duration of protection of comirnaty, vaxzevria and spikevax against mild and severe covid-19 in the uk. *Medrxiv* (2021).

[36] Pouwels KB, Pritchard E, Matthews PC, Stoesser N, Eyre DW, *et al.* Effect of delta variant on viral burden and vaccine effectiveness against new sars-cov-2 infections in the uk. *Nature medicine* **27**(12):2127–2135 (2021).

[37] Lin D, Gu Y, Wheeler B, Young H, Holloway S, *et al.* Effectiveness of covid-19 vaccines in the united states over 9 months: surveillance data from the state of north carolina. *medRxiv* (2021).

[38] Keeling MJ, Thomas A, Hill EM, Thompson RN, Dyson L, *et al.* Waning, boosting and a path to endemicity for sars-cov-2. *medRxiv* (2021).

[39] Office for National Statistics. Dataset: Estimates of the population for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland (2021). URL https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland. [Online] (Accessed: 16 March 2022).

[40] National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing COVID-19 - Update information (2021). URL https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng191/chapter/Update-information. [Online] (Accessed: 15 March 2022).

[41] Dyson L, Hill EM, Moore S, Curran-Sebastian J, Tildesley MJ, *et al.* Possible future waves of sars-cov-2 infection generated by variants of concern with a range of characteristics. *Nature communications* **12**(1):1–13 (2021).

[42] SPI-M-O. SPI-M-O: Summary of modelling on easing restrictions, 3 February 2021 (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-summary-of-modelling-on-easing-restrictions-3-february-2021.

[43] SPI-M-O. SPI-M-O: Summary of further modelling of easing restrictions – Roadmap Step 2, 31 March 2021 (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-summary-of-further-modelling-of-easing-restrictions-roadmap-step-2-31-march-2021.

[44] SPI-M-O. SPI-M-O: Summary of further modelling of easing restrictions – roadmap step 3, 5 May 2021 (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-summary-of-further-modelling-of-easing-restrictions-roadmap-step-3-5-may-2021.

[45] SPI-M-O. SPI-M-O: Summary of further modelling of easing restrictions – roadmap Step 4 (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-summary-of-further-modelling-of-easing-restrictions-roadmap-step-4-9-june-2021.

[46] SPI-M-O. SPI-M-O: Summary of further modelling of easing restrictions – Roadmap Step 4 on 19 July 2021, 7 July 2021 (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-summary-of-further-modelling-of-easing-restrictions-roadmap-step-4-on-19-july-2021-7-july-2021.

[47] SPI-M-O. SPI-M-O: Summary of modelling for scenarios for COVID-19 autumn and winter 2021 to 2022, 13 October 2021 (2021). URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-summary-of-modelling-for-scenarios-for-covid-19-autumn-and-winter-2021-to-2022-13-october-2021