medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

An integrated epidemiologic and economic model to assess optimal COVID-19 pandemic policy

Joshua Szanyi (MD)[1*], Tim Wilson (PhD)[1], Samantha Howe (MPH)[1], Jessie Zeng (MPH)[1], Hassan Andrabi (BComm, Hons)[1], Tony Blakely (PhD)[1]

[1]*Population Interventions Unit, Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia*

[*]joshua.szanyi@unimelb.edu.au (corresponding author)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background

Identifying optimal COVID-19 policies is challenging. For Victoria, Australia (6.6 million people), we ranked 44 policy packages (two levels of stringency of public health and social measures [PHSMs]; providing respirators during infection surges; 11 vaccination schedules of current and next-generation vaccines) in the context of 64 future SARS-CoV-2 variants (combinations of transmissibility, virulence, immune escape, and incursion date).

Methods

We used an agent-based model to estimate morbidity, mortality, and costs over 18 months from 1 April 2022 for each scenario. Policies were ranked on cost-effectiveness (health system only and health system plus GDP perspectives), deaths and days exceeding hospital occupancy thresholds.

Findings

The median number of infections across the 44 policies was 6.2 million (range 5.4 to 7.1 million).

Higher stringency PHSMs ranked better from a health system perspective, but not a health system plus GDP perspective. The provision of respirators to replace surgical/cloth masks had minimal impact. Vaccinating all ages was superior to nil further vaccination and targeted vaccination of individuals aged ≥60 years.

Averaging over 64 future SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios the optimal policy was a multivalent vaccine for all age groups with higher stringency PHSMs and no respirator provision. For the SARS-CoV-2 variant scenario approximating recent BA.4/5, Omicron-targeted vaccines were more likely optimal even with a three-month delay compared to boosting with current-generation vaccines.

Interpretation

Modelling that accommodates future scenarios with uncertainty, and that can be rapidly updated as new data arises, can provide a framework for pandemic decision making.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Funding

Anonymous donation, University of Melbourne funding.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

RESEARCH IN CONTEXT

Evidence before this study

We searched Ovid MEDLINE to 28 July 2022 for studies using the terms (economic evaluation.mp. OR cost effectiveness.mp. OR health economic*.mp.) AND (simulation.mp. OR model*.mp.) AND pandemic*.mp. to identify existing simulation modelling analyses of pandemic preparedness and response that incorporated cost effectiveness considerations. All identified literature examined pandemic influenza and COVID-19 and was highly heterogeneous in terms of modelled interventions (which included school closures, masks, hand hygiene, vaccination, testing strategies, antiviral medication, physical distancing measures, indoor ventilation, and personal protective equipment), quality, context, model structure, and economic evaluation approach.

Systematic reviews of COVID-19 modelling studies that include a health economic component generally indicate that SARS-CoV-2 testing, personal protective equipment, masks, and physical distancing measures are cost-effective. However, few prior studies consider optimal packages of interventions (as opposed to standalone interventions), and none explicitly account for ongoing viral evolution or capture the complexities of vaccine- or natural infection-derived immunity to SARS-CoV-2.

For example, a previous study integrating a dynamic SARS-CoV-2 transmission model with an economic analysis using a net monetary benefit approach published in early 2021 emphasized the combined public health and economic advantages of COVID-19 vaccination combined with physical distancing measures in the UK. However, considering current knowledge regarding the substantial waning of vaccine effectiveness and relatively low protection against infection conferred by vaccination (compared to more severe clinical outcomes), this model likely over-estimated the impact of COVID-19 vaccination on viral transmission. Scenarios that considered the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern (and thus associated changes in viral transmissibility, immune escape capacity or virulence) were also not modelled.

Added value of this study

To our knowledge, our study is the first that utilises a dynamic disease transmission model combined with an integrated economic evaluation framework to systematically compare COVID-19 policy intervention packages while accounting for ongoing SARS-CoV-2 evolution and waning population

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

immunity. In this context we found that a considerable degree of COVID-19 disease burden should be expected in the future, with optimal modelled interventions able to reduce but not entirely ameliorate morbidity and mortality associated with the pandemic.

Averaged over 64 plausible future SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios higher stringency PHSMs ranked better from a health system perspective, but not when societal losses (i.e., GDP losses from stringent PHSMs) were considered. The provision of respirators to the public, for use instead of surgical or cloth masks during infection surges, had little impact at a population level despite their efficacy in reducing viral transmission between individuals. Next-generation vaccines adapted for SARS-CoV-2 variants and administered to all ages (as opposed to just ≥60-year-olds) performed optimally when taking into account cost effectiveness, the burden on the hospital system and deaths.

For the one of 64 scenarios that approximates most closely the recently dominant BA.4/5 Omicron variant, vaccine schedules that delay three months for an Omicron-targeted vaccine outrank schedules with current-generation vaccines rolled out at the time of variant emergence.

Implications of all the available evidence

The policy implications of this study are three-fold. Firstly, it reinforces the cost-effectiveness of ongoing vaccination of the public to mitigate morbidity and mortality associated with COVID-19. Vaccines with improved effectiveness against emerging variants, and less waning over time, will likely deliver important gains in the pandemic response. Secondly, the specific characteristics of emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants substantially influence public health outcomes. When these characteristics can be predicted, optimal policy responses (for example, vaccine schedules) can be tailored accordingly. Finally, at a phase of the pandemic characterised by growing intervention options urgently requiring prioritisation by decision makers alongside a large degree of ongoing uncertainty about future variants, this study provides a framework within which to systematically compare the health and economic benefits and burdens of packages of interventions that can be rapidly updated with new information (such as estimated effectiveness and waning kinetics of newly-developed vaccines) to support policy making.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic is well into its third year, with ongoing high levels of SARS-CoV-2 transmission driving significant morbidity and mortality globally. This is due in part to the emergence of variants, such as Omicron, that possess enhanced innate transmissibility and/or the capacity to evade pre-existing immunity. Continued SARS-CoV-2 evolution is likely,[1] now occurring against a backdrop of dynamic population immunity (from vaccination, natural infection, or both) and an expanding array of public health and clinical intervention options. As such, COVID-19-related policy decisions must be made in the context of substantial uncertainty, a significant challenge for policy makers. In this complex environment it is increasingly important that the benefits and drawbacks of interventions are rigorously and systematically compared – including from a cost effectiveness perspective.[2]

In response to these needs we developed an integrated epidemiologic and economic simulation model to determine the optimal of 44 illustrative policy packages (two stringency levels of public health and social measures [PHSMs], two respirator provision policies, and 11 vaccination schedules) for the state of Victoria, Australia, applied between April 2022 and September 2023. Each policy was modelled in the context of 64 future SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios: low or high virulence, low or high innate transmissibility, antigenic similarity to the Omicron variant and associated immune escape capacity, and four dates of new variant incursion. Policies were then ranked based on cumulative deaths, hospital occupancy, and cost effectiveness from both health system and health system plus gross domestic product (GDP) perspectives, providing a framework for assessing optimal pandemic policy in the face of a rapidly evolving and uncertain future.

METHODS

Agent-based model

We used an agent-based model (ABM)[3] with a daily cycle length and 2,500 agents that are scaled up to represent the Victorian population. Each agent moves in a two-dimensional space, creating opportunities for infection informed by parameters that influence viral transmission (Table 1, Appendix section 1). This model was initially calibrated to the first COVID-19 waves in Australia and New Zealand and has previously been used to inform policy in Victoria. For this study, it was further calibrated to the Victorian experience in April and May of 2022. Beginning in April 2022, each of 2,816 scenarios (44

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

policies and 64 variants) were run 400 times (100 iterations of separate draws of input parameters, each run four times to dampen stochastic variation), to generate estimates of COVID-19-related morbidity, mortality and costs over 18 months.

Modelled scenarios

Policy options

Five stages of PHSMs were specified (Supplementary Table 1). Stages incrementally impose more restrictions up to stage 5, which approximates a lockdown. The ABM (de)escalates through these stages based on hospital occupancy thresholds and two PHSM policy options (higher and lower stringency; Table 1). We modelled two respirator (e.g., N95 mask) policies – no respirator provision, or the maintenance of a respirator stockpile that is distributed to the population for use if in stage 3 or higher. Eleven future vaccine schedules were modelled, including currently available mRNA vaccines as well as next-generation vaccines specifically targeting the Omicron variant or targeting several variants (multivalent vaccines). The effects of administering these vaccines to the general population or individuals aged ≥60 years were modelled separately. The multivalent vaccine was specified to have twice the vaccine effectiveness (VE; on an odds scale) of current mRNA vaccines against all variants, and the Omicron-targeted vaccine twice the VE for variants antigenically like Omicron (Appendix section 2).

Variant scenarios

Four dates of variant arrival were specified, approximating the beginning of July and October 2022 and January and April 2023. The intrinsic transmissibility of variants was set as either an R_0 of 11 (approximating Omicron BA.2[4], range 10 to 12) or 14 (range 13 to 15). New variants were characterized as either low (approximating Omicron) or high virulence. To set the low virulence infection fatality risk (IFR), we scaled age-specific IFRs associated with the ancestral variant[5] to match deaths observed in Victoria in April and May 2022 (an Omicron BA.2-dominant period), taking into account previous infection and vaccination. This process was repeated using hospital and ICU admission risks.[6] We assumed 4, $4^{0.75}$, $4^{0.5}$ and $4^{0.25}$ ratio differences in IFR, ICU admission risk, hospital admission risk and probability of being symptomatic given infection, respectively, between high and low virulence variants.

Immune escape capacity of variants was set as nil, moderate or high using odds ratios (ORs) applied to VE estimates (Appendix section 2). Each new variant was allowed one of two levels of immune escape depending on its antigenic similarity to the Omicron variant and its innate transmissibility. For example,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

variants with an R_0 of 11 would likely require moderate or high immune escape to have a selection advantage over the current Omicron variant given similar innate transmissibility.

Vaccine effectiveness and protection against reinfection

Protection following vaccination or previous infection was a function of age, time since last vaccine or infection, the number and type of vaccine doses received, and the variant responsible for primary infection, based on a previously published model of VE (Appendix section 3).[7]

Morbidity and mortality

We quantified acute COVID-19 morbidity using disability rates (DRs) from the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) study.[8] Morbidity was calculated separately for high and low virulence variant infections by altering the duration of illness and length of hospital stay.[9,10] Morbidity from long COVID was estimated based on reported symptoms and their prevalence and duration (by age, severity of infection, vaccination status, and viral variant), each assigned a disability weight from the GBD study.[8,11-14] For each COVID-19 death we estimated future HALY loss (discounted at 3%), assuming people dying of COVID-19 have twice the mortality and 1.5 times the morbidity of the average person of the same sex and age (Appendix section 4).

Economic analyses

We used a net monetary benefit (NMB) approach where total net health expenditure was subtracted from monetized HALYs at a given willingness to pay (WTP; Australian GDP per capita [AUD 70,000 = USD 50,000] per HALY unless otherwise specified) in each model iteration, with two perspectives considered – health system only, and health system plus GDP loss (Appendix section 5).

For acute illness we applied unit costs to each agent depending on their infection and clinical outcome status, including for testing, medication, ambulatory care, and hospital costs. We also determined healthcare utilisation costs for those experiencing long COVID based on international data and Australian clinical guidelines, stratified by acute disease severity, variant virulence, and vaccination status. Interventions were costed using the unit costs of vaccines and respirators, in addition to transportation, storage, vaccine administration, respirator distribution and health promotion costs. Future reduced health expenditure due to deaths was estimated using an approach similar to that for future HALY losses, where expected health system savings (discounted at 3%) were allocated to each remaining life year lost. Costs to society due to PHSMs were assumed to be nil for stages 1 and 2, and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

10% to 50% of the Australian Government-estimated GDP losses per week from 2020[15] for stages 3 to 5 (Table 1).

Ranking

We ranked each policy option, averaged over all variant scenarios, by: (a) the cumulative number of SARS-CoV-2 deaths over 18 months, (b) the number of days hospital occupancy by COVID-19 patients was >750 (114 per million) or >1500 (227 per million), (c) NMB from a health system perspective, and (d) NMB from a health system plus GDP perspective. We then generated an average ranking across these four dimensions.

Uncertainty and sensitivity analyses

We generated tornado plots showing the variation in model outputs when comparing the lowest and highest quintiles of key input parameters. Additionally, we re-ran the ABM for 12 rather than 18 months and used an alternative discounting approach recommended by the UK Treasury[16] (1.5% for HALYs and 3.5% for costs).

Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

RESULTS

Health and cost impacts of modelled policies

Figure 1 shows cumulative infections, hospitalisations and deaths over 18 months for all 44 policies, with each whisker plot depicting the median, interquartile, 90th percentile ranges and outliers across all 64 SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios. Across the 44 policies the median number of infections, hospitalisations and deaths were 6.2 million (range of medians 5.4 million to 7.1 million), 29,600 (25,300 to 41,500), and 4,670 (4,060 to 7,710) respectively. There was substantial variation across the SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios, such that, for example, mean total infections across all 2,816 policy-by-variant scenarios ranged from 4.2 to 8.9 million.

Hospitalisations and deaths were least for vaccination of all age groups, intermediate for vaccinating only those aged ≥60 years, and highest for nil further vaccination. Total infections were greater when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

vaccinating only ≥60-year-olds compared to either vaccination of all age groups or nil further vaccination. Higher compared to lower stringency PHSMs were associated with fewer infections, hospitalisations and deaths. Respirator provision (leading to 80% of mask users using respirators compared to 20%, but no overall change in any mask use) only modestly reduced these outputs.

Figure 2 shows HALYs lost, net health expenditure and GDP loss. HALY losses show similar patterns to hospitalisations and deaths. Net health expenditure was least when no further vaccines were provided, and highest when vaccinating all age groups (i.e., health expenditure savings from fewer infection with vaccination did not fully offset the upfront costs of ongoing vaccination). Net health expenditure was also higher with the provision of respirators, in contrast to respirator provision's modest effects on morbidity and mortality (again, upfront intervention costs of storing and providing masks outweighing any health expenditure savings from fewer infections). GDP losses varied widely across the SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios and were considerably greater for higher stringency compared to lower stringency PHSM strategies.

Time spent in stages ≥3, the number of days in which hospitals had >750 or >1500 COVID-19 patients admitted, NMB and health expenditure are illustrated in Supplementary Figures 1 to 3. The distribution of NMB from a health system perspective was generally higher (i.e., more cost effective) for policies not including respirator provision but varied minimally between vaccination schedules. The median number of days with high hospital occupancy was greater for lower stringency PHSM strategies and nil further vaccination. Heat maps for all scenarios are shown in Supplementary Figures 4 to 11, illustrating the influence of specific variant characteristics such as virulence on key model outputs.

Optimal ranking using net monetary benefit, hospital occupancy and deaths

Figure 3 presents policies ranked by NMB from health system and health system plus GDP perspectives, high hospital occupancy, and deaths. Weighting these four measures evenly, the optimal policy was the rollout of a multivalent vaccine (in quarters three and five of the 18 months modelled), in combination with higher stringency PHSMs and no respirator provision. Rankings in Figure 3 consider each of the 64 future SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios equally likely; for users that wish to weight the likelihood of future variants differently (e.g., the next major variant being more likely to possess higher innate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

transmissibility), Figure 3 can be reproduced using this alternate weighting in an accompanying online tool.[17]

Figure 4 ranks optimal policies over a 12-month period for a SARS-CoV-2 variant that is antigenically like Omicron with low virulence, additional immune escape capacity and an R_0 of 11, emerging in July 2022 (i.e., for the one of the 64 SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios most like the recently emergent Omicron BA.4/5 variant). For this SARS-CoV-2 scenario, four policies rank equal first, three of which include an Omicron-targeted vaccine (with the first dose rolled out in October to December 2022) administered to all age groups. Of note, these were superior to current generation vaccine boosters rolled out in July to September 2022 (coincident with arrival of the new variant) followed by Omicron-targeted vaccines administered in January to March and July to September 2023.

Sensitivity analyses

Using UK Treasury-recommended discount rates (1.5% per annum for HALYs, 3.5% per annum for costs) resulted in minimal changes in policy ranking (Supplementary Figure 12). Valuing HALYs at AUD 35,000 (Supplementary Figure 13; compared to the default of AUD 70,000 or USD 50,000 in above analyses) saw vaccine schedules targeting ≥60-year-olds increase in rank. Valuing HALYs at AUD 140,000 (Supplementary Figure 14) resulted in respirator stockpiling combined with a multivalent vaccine and higher stringency PHSMs becoming the most optimal. Supplementary Figure 15 indicates that uncertainty regarding the input rate of waning immunity following infection drives the greatest amount of uncertainty in outputs of the model including infections, hospitalisations, deaths, NMB and days in stages ≥3.

DISCUSSION

Decision makers increasingly require frameworks to systematically weigh up the costs and benefits of pandemic policy choices.[2] A growing number of recent publications integrate economic evaluation with epidemiologic modelling in an attempt to facilitate decision making in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.[18-20] However, none have examined combined interventions, accounted for SARS-CoV-2 evolution, accurately represented waning immunity, and included both acute COVID-19 and long COVID morbidity simultaneously. Our model addresses all these imperatives.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Our study models over 2,800 future possibilities. Irrespective of the mitigation policies implemented, our findings suggest that significant ongoing pandemic-related morbidity and mortality should be expected in the coming months and years. That is, our control over cumulative viral transmission may be limited. Nevertheless, our model still discloses several meaningful (and cost effective) impacts of the policies we examined. Firstly, we found that higher stringency PHSMs tended to perform better when outcomes were assessed from a health system perspective, but this was often in conflict with findings when GDP losses were considered. This conflict of perspectives makes explicit the tension between protecting public health and protecting the economic interests of society at this stage of the pandemic. Earlier in the pandemic, in the absence of vaccines and especially for countries pursuing a zero-COVID strategy, the optimal policy from health and societal perspectives was more aligned.[15]

Secondly, the provision of respirators to the public (to use as an alternative to surgical or cloth masks) had modest effects only. In our analysis we increased respirator use from 20% to 80% of mask-wearers (due to government provision) when there were surges of infection, but we did not alter the overall proportion of people using masks. In addition to this policy being 'only' a substitution policy, another reason for its modest impact is likely that during infection peaks (when the policy was active) many people (or agents in our model) are remaining at home where masks are not worn. Another reason is the now high innate transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 variants; masks reduce the immediate risk of transmission,[21] but do not make it zero, which may serve more to increase the number of days to (perhaps inevitable) infection rather than prevent infection altogether. Delay of infection may still be useful to 'flatten' the epidemic curve and protect health services from being overwhelmed, consistent with reduced days with hospital capacity exceeding thresholds in our modelling with the respirator-substitution policy (Supplementary Figure 1) – although these reductions were modest. We are exploring further these short- and long-term tradeoffs of mask wearing elsewhere.

Third, the provision of any vaccine booster was more beneficial than not providing ongoing vaccination. Our results suggest that next-generation vaccines targeting multiple variants may have an increasingly important role to play in the pandemic response. Importantly, vaccinating people of all ages appeared to be more optimal than targeted vaccination of older age groups. In fact, targeted vaccination of individuals ≥60 years old counter-intuitively resulted in more infections than not providing any further vaccinations at all. This was likely because (de)escalation between stages of PHSMs was modelled based

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

on health service pressure; if only older individuals were vaccinated, the total number of infections could be considerably higher for the same hospitalisation load.

Our primary analyses considered policy performance across 64 equally likely future variant scenarios. If a future variant is considered more likely, the optimal policy changes. For example, when considering only the emergence of a single variant like BA.4/BA.5 (Figure 4), three of the four most optimal scenarios included an Omicron-targeted vaccine rolled out in October to December 2022 and April to June 2023, despite the variant arriving in July 2022. Interestingly, these policies were more optimal than administering a current generation vaccine in July to September 2022 (coinciding with variant emergence) then boosting with Omicron-targeted vaccines six and 12 months later.

Our modelling parameterized Omicron-targeted vaccines as having twice the VE on the odds scale against Omicron BA.1/BA.2 (and antigenically similar variants) compared to current generation vaccines. This is equivalent to increasing peak VE for agents in the model against any infection from 51.6% (the value we use at two weeks post second dose for younger adults; see Appendix sections 2 and 3 for details) to 68.0%, or VE against death from 96.9% to 98.4%. Our model also includes the same waning of protection over time for current-generation and next-generation vaccines, and a 25% and 50% higher unit cost for Omicron-targeted and multivalent vaccines respectively. Whilst these seem reasonable assumptions at the time of writing, it will be important to revise these assumptions as with updated estimates of expected VE and waning (e.g., based on in vitro antibody titers[22,23] or rapidly conducted real-world VE studies) and updated costs. Such model flexibility, augmented by both comprehensive surveillance systems monitoring SARS-CoV-2 variant emergence (which currently have limited coverage globally)[24] and close links to vaccine producers with the capacity to rapidly deliver new vaccines, suggests a fruitful policy pathway to better population health outcomes over the remainder of this (and future) pandemics.

In comparison to similar models our framework has many advantages. We simulated combined interventions to reflect the fact that policy choices are not made in isolation, modelled viral evolution, developed a novel method to quantify long COVID morbidity, and accounted for acute COVID-19, long COVID and intervention costs in addition to future health expenditure and the economic consequences of PHSMs. Uniquely, our model also includes a data-driven representation of waning protection following vaccination, previous infection, or both, in contrast to most previously published COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

transmission models.[25] While there are substantial gaps in the COVID-19 literature (e.g., regarding the risk and symptom profile of long COVID, the waning kinetics of vaccine- and natural infection-derived immunity, and the effect of immunity on onward transmission once infected), we incorporated generous uncertainty in model inputs, reflect the impact of uncertainty in our results, and still find important differences that lead to some policies being quantified as more optimal.

Our model only allowed for one new variant during the 18-month period. Future modelling should allow for important new variants emerging more frequently, but (using our modelling framework) this will increase the number of SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios to much greater than 64 and make the results more challenging to summarize and interpret. Future modelling should also include sequelae other than the long COVID symptoms accounted for here (e.g., post-acute cardiovascular complications of COVID-19) as this evidence base improves.[26] Finally, a limited number of policy options were considered. It is important to recognise that minor adjustments in these policies (e.g., decreasing the baseline use of masks or altering vaccine schedules) could significantly alter the results.

Decision making during the COVID-19 pandemic is challenging and requires consideration of the costs and benefits of interventions in an increasingly complex policy environment. This model demonstrates that in the absence of, for example, a new vaccine associated with substantially less VE waning or improved neutralising protection against infection, the health system in Victoria – and similar jurisdictions internationally – should be prepared for significant ongoing COVID-19-related morbidity and mortality over the next 18 months. It reaffirms the importance of regular COVID-19 vaccination and PHSMs in the pandemic response. Crucially, this modelling provides a framework that can be rapidly updated to systematically compare the health and economic benefits and burdens of COVID-19 policy options despite a highly uncertain future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge funding from an anonymous philanthropist and the contributions of collaborators to earlier versions of our modelling that this paper builds on (Jason Thompson, Nathan Grills, Laxman Bablani, Patrick Abraham, Natalie Carvalho, Edifofon Akpan, Mark Stevenson, Rod McClure, and Nick Wilson). We also acknowledge the work of Kirsti Hakala Assendelft, Courtney Gee, Samantha Grimshaw and Zainab Albadri for assistance with data collection, Shania Rossiter for editing assistance, and Quentin Grafton and Tom Kompas for assistance with estimating GDP losses. This research was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

supported by The University of Melbourne's Research Computing Services and the Petascale Campus Initiative.

DATA SHARING

The data analysis protocol is available online at https://mspgh.unimelb.edu.au/research-groups/centre-for-epidemiology-and-biostatistics-research/population-interventions/protocols. All model inputs are detailed in the appendix. Detailed output data is provided in the appendix and the accompanying online tool. Requests for additional model output data may be granted upon reasonable request to the researchers. Access to model code is generally not available but negotiated access may be possible. Please contact the researchers for further information.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Separate to the current study, the research group will likely soon receive funding from Moderna to conduct vaccine effectiveness studies in Australia. Moderna had no role in the current study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

JS – conceptualization, investigation, methodology, project administration, supervision, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

TW – conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, software, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

SH – conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

JZ – conceptualization, investigation, methodology, writing – review and editing

HA – data curation, formal analysis, visualization, software, writing – review and editing

TB – conceptualization, formal analysis, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project administration, supervision, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: Key model input parameters

Parameter	Details
Key baseline ABM inputs	
Agent infectivity	Agent infectiousness on each day[27] is parameterised by agent-level draws for peak infectivity, time to peak infectivity, and illness duration. Infectivity prior to the peak is linearly interpolated to 10% of peak infectivity on day 0, and infectivity after the peak is linearly interpolated to zero at illness duration.
Time to peak infectivity (days)	Per-agent log normal distribution: mean = 4.4, SD = 1.5[27]
Illness duration (days)	Per-agent log normal distribution: Mean = 10.9, SD = 2 (time to peak infectivity plus estimated duration of active disease[28])
Adherence with isolation (infected agents)	Global beta distribution (beta 450.3, 23.7; mean = 95%, SD = 1%)
Infectiousness of asymptomatic v. symptomatic cases	RR 0.58 (95% CI 0.34 to 0.99)[29] (parameterised as a log normal distribution with median = -0.545 and SD = 0.270)
Relative susceptibility to infection, by age (OR)	0 – 9 years: 0.34 10 – 19 years: 0.67 20 – 59 years: 1 60 – 69 years: 1.23 ≥70 years: 1.47[30] Uncertainty on all values +/- 15% SD
Policy option specification	
PHSM strategy	
Lower stringency	Escalation: if average expected number of people in hospital due to COVID-19 10-14 days into the future is estimated to be >600 per million → Stage 5; >400 per million → Stage 4; >270 per million → Stage 3; >180 per million → Stage 2. De-escalation: if no de-escalation in last 7 days, and average expected number of people in hospital 10-14 days into the future is estimated to be <450 → Stage 4 if in Stage 5; <300 → Stage 3 if in stage 4 or 5; <200 → Stage 2 if in Stage 3, 4 or 5; <140 → Stage 1.
Higher stringency	Thresholds half those for lower stringency
GDP costs	Assumed GDP loss per week sampled uniformly between AUD 0.073 to 0.363 billion in stage 3, 0.128 to 0.638 billion in stage 4, and 0.261 to 1.305 billion in stage 5
Respirator strategy	
Nil	Baseline mask wearing at destinations other than the home:

Age	*Stage 1*	*Stage 2*	*Stage 3*	*Stage 4*	*Stage 5*
≥20-year-olds	20%	35%	60%	80%	90%
10- to 19-year-olds	16.7%	26.7%	40%	53.3%	60%
<10-year-olds	11.1%	17.8%	26.7%	35.6%	40%

	Of mask wearers, 20% assumed to be using respirators, 80% cloth or surgical masks
Government supply of respirators	Same population use of masks as above, but in stages 3 – 5 the proportion of mask use that is with respirators increases from 20% to 80% (for those aged ≥10 years only). 10 respirators are provided per person aged ≥10 years every four weeks spent in stages 3 and above.
Cost	Includes cost of respirators (AUD 1.47 per respirator), distribution, overheads, warehouse storage and promotion (Appendix section 5)
Vaccination strategy	
Vaccine schedules	Three generic vaccines were modelled: current-generation mRNA vaccines (CG);

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Parameter	Details
	next-generation Omicron-targeted vaccines (OT) with vaccine effectiveness (VE) on an odds scale of 2 against variants that are antigenically like Omicron compared to CG; and next-generation multivalent vaccines (MV) with VE on an odds scale of 2 against all variants compared to CG. VE against new variants depends on immune escape (Appendix section 2). 11 vaccine schedules were specified (Figure 1).
Cost	Includes cost of vaccines (AUD 35 for CG vaccines, cost of OT and MV vaccines estimated at 1.25 and 1.5 times the cost of GC vaccines respectively), transport, vaccine administration, overheads and promotion (Appendix section 5)

SD: standard deviation; OR: odds ratio; RR: relative risk; CG: current generation; OT: Omicron-targeted; MV: multivalent
See Appendix for complete details regarding model parameterization

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1: Cumulative infections, hospitalisations and deaths over 18 months for 44 policy options, presented as medians, interquartile ranges, 90th percentile ranges and outliers across 64 future SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios



Vaccination policy schedules

	Apr - Jun 2022	Jul - Sep 2022	Oct - Dec 2022	Jan - Mar 2023	Apr - Jun 2023	Jul - Sep 2023
A: No further vaccination						
B: 3 CG *		CG		CG		CG
C: 1 CG then 2 OT *		CG		OT		OT
D: 2 OT only *			OT		OT	
E: 1 CG then two MV *		CG		MV		MV
F: 2 MV only *			MV		MV	
G: 3 CG (≥60 years)		CG		CG		CG
H: 1 CG then 2 OT (≥60 years)		CG		OT		OT
I: 2 OT only (≥60 years)			OT		OT	
J: 1 CG then two MV(≥60 years)		CG		MV		MV
K: 2 MV only (≥60 years)			MV		MV	

The mean across 100 Monte Carlo simulations for each of the 64 SARS-CoV-2 scenarios within each stratum of the 44 policy options was calculated. These whisker plots show the median, interquartile range, 90th percentile range and outlier values of the means of the 64 scenarios for each of the 44 policy options. indicates that vaccines are administered to all age groups. CG: current generation vaccine; OT: Omicron-targeted vaccine; MV: multivalent vaccine.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2: Lifetime HALY loss, health expenditure and GDP loss over 18 months for 44 policy options (compared to no COVID-19 pandemic), presented as medians, interquartile ranges, 90th percentile ranges and outliers across 64 future SARS-CoV-2 variant scenarios



Vaccination policy schedules

	Apr - Jun 2022	Jul - Sep 2022	Oct - Dec 2022	Jan - Mar 2023	Apr - Jun 2023	Jul - Sep 2023
A: No further vaccination						
B: 3 CG *		CG		CG		CG
C: 1 CG then 2 OT *		CG		OT		OT
D: 2 OT only *			OT		OT	
E: 1 CG then two MV *		CG		MV		MV
F: 2 MV only *			MV		MV	
G: 3 CG (≥60 years)		CG		CG		CG
H: 1 CG then 2 OT (≥60 years)		CG		OT		OT
I: 2 OT only (≥60 years)			OT		OT	
J: 1 CG then two MV(≥60 years)		CG		MV		MV
K: 2 MV only (≥60 years)			MV		MV	

The mean across 100 Monte Carlo simulations for each of the 64 SARS-CoV-2 scenarios within each stratum of the 44 policy options was calculated. These whisker plots show the median, interquartile range, 90th percentile range and outlier values of the means of the 64 scenarios for each of the 44 policy options. Net health expenditure is made up of three components: costs of implementing interventions; health expenditure on acute and long COVID for infections occurring in the 18-month period modelled; and unrelated future health expenditure changes (reduced health expenditure for decedents). See Supplementary Figure 3 *for a breakdown of these costs. *indicates that vaccines are administered to all age groups. CG: current generation vaccine; OT: Omicron-targeted vaccine; MV: multivalent vaccine.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3: Heat map for 44 policy options (over 18 months, considering all 64 future SARS-CoV-2 scenarios equally likely) of their: rank in net monetary benefit (with a health-adjusted life year valued at AUD 70,000 = USD 50,000) from both health system and health system plus GDP perspectives[†]; number of days that >750 and >1500 people were in hospital due to COVID-19[‡]; cumulative deaths[‡]; and combined rank[€]

Vaccine schedule	Vaccines	Age group vaccinated	Stockpile respirators?	PHSM stringency	NMB rank (health system only)	NMB rank (health system plus GDP)	Hospitalisations >750 (days)	Hospitalisations >1500 (days)	Deaths	Overall rank
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	No	Higher	2	23	52	12	4069	1
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Higher	14	25	50	11	4062	2
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	No	Higher	1	24	53	12	4186	3
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Lower	16	2	64	24	4440	4
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	No	Lower	12	1	65	25	4601	5
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Higher	15	26	52	11	4182	6
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	No	Higher	11	28	52	14	4151	6
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Higher	8	33	52	10	4501	8
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Lower	17	4	66	25	4502	9
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Higher	5	27	54	11	4607	10
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Higher	7	34	53	10	4553	11
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Higher	22	32	51	12	4136	11
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	No	Lower	13	3	67	26	4674	13
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	No	Higher	10	31	54	15	4269	14
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Higher	4	29	55	11	4673	15
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	No	Higher	9	36	56	14	4364	16
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Higher	21	35	53	13	4214	17
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Higher	24	30	53	10	4608	18
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Higher	27	39	52	9	4488	19
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Lower	18	5	70	25	5018	19
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	No	Higher	6	37	56	11	4668	21
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Higher	26	40	53	10	4521	22
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	Yes	Higher	20	41	55	13	4348	23
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Lower	19	7	71	25	5075	24
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Higher	23	38	54	10	4670	25
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Lower	36	6	69	24	5040	26
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	No	Lower	29	10	68	29	4933	27
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	Yes	Higher	25	42	55	11	4648	28
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Lower	37	8	70	24	5078	29
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Lower	38	14	67	28	4802	29
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	No	Lower	30	15	69	30	5006	31
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Lower	42	12	70	26	5026	32
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Lower	39	16	68	28	4872	33
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Lower	33	9	70	26	5120	33
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Lower	32	11	71	27	5092	35
A	None	None	No	Higher	3	43	78	17	6989	36
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Lower	41	13	71	26	5075	37
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	No	Lower	31	18	73	31	5138	38
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	No	Lower	34	17	75	29	5258	39
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	Yes	Lower	40	20	71	29	5056	39
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	Yes	Lower	43	19	73	28	5211	41
A	None	None	Yes	Higher	28	44	78	17	6925	42
A	None	None	No	Lower	35	21	93	37	7711	43
A	None	None	Yes	Lower	44	22	92	36	7565	44

[†] *Using a 3% discount rate for both HALYs and costs. This ranking used sequential net monetary benefit (NMB) analyses, whereby the proportion of times each of the 44 policy options had the highest NMB across the 100 iterations (i.e. pooling the 64 SARS-CoV-2 strata, meaning they were equally weighted in likelihood) was determined. The top ranked policy was selected and put aside. The remaining 43 policies were re-analyzed, the now remaining top-ranked policy identified and put aside. This ranking was repeated 43 times until there was only one (least optimal) policy left.*

[‡] *For deaths and days with hospitalisations > 750 and >1500, the same analytical procedure was used for this figure as in* Figure 1 *and* Figure 2.

[€] *For each of the 44 policies the average rank of the ranking according to (a) NMB from a health system perspective, (b) the ranking according to NMB from a health plus GDP system perspective, (c) the ranking of the average of the ranking of days with >750 and > 1500 people in hospital, and (d) the ranking of deaths was calculated. Note, this inherently weights these four constructs equally in selecting the overall optimal policy; different decision makers wish to apply different weights across these four metrics.*

For vaccine schedule key see Figure 1. *CG: current generation vaccine; OT: Omicron-targeted vaccine; MV: multivalent vaccine. Quarters (Q) referenced refer to quarters of the 18-month period modelled beginning in April 2022.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 4: Heat map for 44 policy options (over 12 months, considering a single* future SARS-CoV-2 scenario) of their: rank in net monetary benefit (with a health-adjusted life year valued at AUD 70,000 = USD 50,000) from both health system and health system plus GDP perspectives†; number of days that >750 and >1500 people were in hospital due to COVID-19‡; cumulative deaths‡; and combined rank€

Vaccine schedule	Vaccines	Age group vaccinated	Stockpile respirators?	PHSM stringency	NMB rank (health system only)	NMB rank (health system plus GDP)	Hospitalisations >750 (days)	Hospitalisations >1500 (days)	Deaths	Overall rank
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	No	Higher	1	23	41	7	3682	1
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Lower	7	4	56	18	3755	1
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Lower	6	3	56	18	3756	1
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	No	Lower	2	1	56	18	3780	1
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	No	Higher	3	24	41	7	3682	5
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	No	Lower	4	2	56	18	3779	6
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	No	Higher	20	25	41	6	3713	7
D	OT (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Higher	21	28	41	7	3674	8
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	No	Higher	22	27	41	6	3714	9
F	MV (Q3/5)	All	Yes	Higher	23	29	41	7	3674	10
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	No	Higher	19	26	42	6	3910	11
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Higher	13	31	43	6	4098	12
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Higher	15	32	43	6	4100	13
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Lower	8	5	59	18	4248	14
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Higher	43	35	41	6	3698	14
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	No	Lower	31	13	57	18	3851	16
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	No	Higher	12	30	44	6	4217	16
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	No	Lower	32	15	57	18	3851	18
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Lower	17	9	59	18	4178	19
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Higher	44	37	41	6	3698	19
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Lower	11	6	59	18	4251	21
C	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Lower	36	19	57	18	3843	22
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	No	Lower	18	10	59	18	4180	23
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Higher	9	33	45	7	4245	24
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Lower	24	7	59	18	4240	24
E	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	All	Yes	Lower	37	22	57	18	3845	24
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Lower	28	16	59	18	4188	27
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	Yes	Higher	42	36	42	6	3879	28
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	No	Higher	14	34	45	7	4245	29
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Lower	26	11	59	18	4238	30
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Lower	29	18	59	18	4188	31
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	No	Lower	30	14	60	19	4058	32
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	No	Lower	16	8	62	19	4309	33
A	None	None	No	Lower	10	12	76	23	6231	34
H	CG (Q2), OT (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Higher	39	39	43	6	4116	35
B	CG (Q2/4/6)	All	Yes	Lower	35	21	59	18	4041	35
J	CG (Q2), MV (Q4/6)	≥60	Yes	Higher	40	40	43	6	4116	37
A	None	None	No	Higher	5	43	60	10	6110	38
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	Yes	Higher	38	38	45	7	4230	39
G	CG (Q2/4/6)	≥60	Yes	Lower	27	17	61	18	4313	40
I	OT (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Higher	34	41	45	7	4243	41
A	None	None	Yes	Lower	25	20	76	23	6223	42
K	MV (Q3/5)	≥60	Yes	Higher	41	42	45	7	4243	43
A	None	None	Yes	Higher	33	44	62	10	6108	44

** low virulence, R_0 = 11, antigenically Omicron-like with immune escape capacity, incursion 91 days into model run (approximating BA.4/BA.5)*

† Using a 3% discount rate for both HALYs and costs. This ranking used sequential net monetary benefit (NMB) analyses, whereby the proportion of times each of the 44 policy options had the highest NMB across the 100 iterations was determined. The top ranked policy was selected and put aside. The remaining 43 policies were re-analyzed, the now remaining top-ranked policy identified and put aside. This ranking was repeated 43 times until there was only one (least optimal) policy left.

‡ For deaths and days > 750 and >1500, we used the mean of the metric across the 1000 Monte Carlo simulations for each of the 44 policy option strata.

€ For each of the 44 policies the average rank of the ranking according to (a) NMB from a health system perspective, (b) the ranking according to NMB from a health plus GDP system perspective, (c) the ranking of the average of the ranking of days with >750 and > 1500 people in hospital, and (d) the ranking of deaths was calculated. Note, this inherently weights these four constructs equally in selecting the overall optimal policy; different decision makers wish to apply different weights across these four metrics.

For vaccine schedule key see Figure 1. *CG: current generation vaccine; OT: Omicron-targeted vaccine; MV: multivalent vaccine. Quarters (Q) referenced refer to quarters of the 18-month period modelled beginning in April 2022 – given this figure refers to a 12-month period, vaccines are only administered up to Q4.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Markov PV, Katzourakis A, Stilianakis NI. Antigenic evolution will lead to new SARS-CoV-2 variants with unpredictable severity. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2022; **20**(5): 251-2.
2. Persad G, Pandya A. A Comprehensive Covid-19 Response — The Need for Economic Evaluation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2022; **386**(26): 2449-51.
3. Blakely T, Thompson J, Carvalho N, Bablani L, Wilson N, Stevenson M. The probability of the 6-week lockdown in Victoria (commencing 9 July 2020) achieving elimination of community transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Medical Journal of Australia* 2020; **213**(8): 349-51.e1.
4. Shearer F, Bennett C, Vally H, McCaw J, Golding N. New COVID variants may be more transmissible but that doesn't mean the R0 – or basic reproduction number – has increased. 2022. https://theconversation.com/new-covid-variants-may-be-more-transmissible-but-that-doesnt-mean-the-r0-or-basic-reproduction-number-has-increased-186826 (accessed 31 July 2022).
5. COVID-19 Forecasting Team. Variation in the COVID-19 infection–fatality ratio by age, time, and geography during the pre-vaccine era: a systematic analysis. *The Lancet* 2022.
6. Knock ES, Whittles LK, Lees JA, et al. Key epidemiological drivers and impact of interventions in the 2020 SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in England. *Sci Transl Med* 2021; **13**(602).
7. Szanyi J, Wilson T, Scott N, Blakely T. A log-odds system for waning and boosting of COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness. *Vaccine* 2022; **40**(28): 3821-4.
8. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, et al. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet* 2020; **396**(10258): 1204-22.
9. Tobin RJ, Wood JG, Jayasundara D, et al. Hospital length of stay in a mixed Omicron and Delta epidemic in New South Wales, Australia. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.03.16.22271361.
10. Menni C, Valdes AM, Polidori L, et al. Symptom prevalence, duration, and risk of hospital admission in individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 during periods of omicron and delta variant dominance: a prospective observational study from the ZOE COVID Study. *The Lancet* 2022; **399**(10335): 1618-24.
11. Vedel Sørensen AI, Spiliopoulos L, Bager P, et al. Post-acute symptoms, new onset diagnoses and health problems 6 to 12 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection: a nationwide questionnaire study in the adult Danish population. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.02.27.22271328.
12. Behnood SA, Shafran R, Bennett SD, et al. Persistent symptoms following SARS-CoV-2 infection amongst children and young people: A meta-analysis of controlled and uncontrolled studies. *J Infect* 2022; **84**(2): 158-70.
13. Caspersen IH, Magnus P, Trogstad L. Excess risk and clusters of symptoms after COVID-19 in a large Norwegian cohort. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2022; **37**(5): 539-48.
14. Magnúsdóttir I, Lovik A, Unnarsdóttir AB, et al. Acute COVID-19 severity and mental health morbidity trajectories in patient populations of six nations: an observational study. *The Lancet Public Health* 2022; **7**(5): e406-e16.
15. Blakely T, Thompson J, Bablani L, et al. Association of Simulated COVID-19 Policy Responses for Social Restrictions and Lockdowns With Health-Adjusted Life-Years and Costs in Victoria, Australia. *JAMA Health Forum* 2021; **2**(7): e211749-e.
16. HM Treasury. The Green Book: Central Government Guidance on Appraisal and Evaluation. London, United Kingdom, 2022.
17. Population Interventions Unit, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health. Population Interventions Unit - Visualisations. 2022. www.pandemictradeoffs.com (accessed 1 August 2022).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.01.22278262; this version posted August 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

18. Elvidge J, Summerfield A, Nicholls D, Dawoud D. Diagnostics and Treatments of COVID-19: A Living Systematic Review of Economic Evaluations. *Value Health* 2022; **25**(5): 773-84.
19. Vandepitte S, Alleman T, Nopens I, Baetens J, Coenen S, De Smedt D. Cost-Effectiveness of COVID-19 Policy Measures: A Systematic Review. *Value Health* 2021; **24**(11): 1551-69.
20. Sandmann FG, Davies NG, Vassall A, Edmunds WJ, Jit M, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working Group. 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* 2021; **21**(7): 962-74.
21. Andrejko KL, Pry JM, Myers JF, et al. Effectiveness of Face Mask or Respirator Use in Indoor Public Settings for Prevention of SARS-CoV-2 Infection - California, February-December 2021. *MMWR - Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report* 2022; **71**(6): 212-6.
22. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature Medicine* 2021; **27**(7): 1205-11.
23. Gilbert PB, Montefiori DC, McDermott AB, et al. Immune correlates analysis of the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy clinical trial. *Science* 2022; **375**(6576): 43-50.
24. Chen Z, Azman AS, Chen X, et al. Global landscape of SARS-CoV-2 genomic surveillance and data sharing. *Nature Genetics* 2022; **54**(4): 499-507.
25. Colosi E, Bassignana G, Contreras DA, et al. Screening and vaccination against COVID-19 to minimise school closure: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2022; **22**(7): 977-89.
26. Xie Y, Xu E, Bowe B, Al-Aly Z. Long-term cardiovascular outcomes of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* 2022; **28**(3): 583-90.
27. Zhang M, Xiao J, Deng A, et al. Transmission Dynamics of an Outbreak of the COVID-19 Delta Variant B.1.617.2 - Guangdong Province, China, May-June 2021. *China CDC Wkly* 2021; **3**(27): 584-6.
28. Trauer JM, Lydeamore MJ, Dalton GW, et al. Understanding how Victoria, Australia gained control of its second COVID-19 wave. *Nature Communications* 2021; **12**(1): 6266.
29. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, Clark J, McLaws M-L, Glasziou P. Estimating the extent of asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Official Journal of the Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease Canada* 2020; **5**(4): 223-34.
30. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science* 2020; **368**(6498): 1481-6.