Rural prioritization may increase the impact of COVID-19 vaccines in Sub-Saharan Africa due to ongoing internal migration: A modeling study

Prashanth Selvaraj^a, Bradley G. Wagner^a, Dennis L. Chao^a, Maïna L’Azou Jackson^b, J. Gabrielle Breugelmans^c, Nicholas Jackson^c, Stewart T. Chang^a

^a*Institute for Disease Modeling, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, Washington, USA*

^b*Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness and Innovations, Oslo, Norway*

^c*Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness and Innovations, London, UK*

Abstract

How COVID-19 vaccine is distributed within low- and middle-income countries has received little attention outside of equity or logistical concerns but may ultimately affect campaign impact in terms of infections, severe cases, or deaths averted. In this study we examined whether subnational (urban-rural) prioritization may affect the cumulative two-year impact on disease transmission and burden of a vaccination campaign using an agent-based model of COVID-19 in a representative Sub-Saharan Africa country setting. We simulated a range of vaccination strategies that differed by urban-rural prioritization, age group prioritization, timing of introduction, and final coverage level. Urban prioritization averted more infections in only a narrow set of scenarios, when internal migration rates were low and vaccination was started by day 30 of an outbreak. Rural prioritization was the optimal strategy for all other scenarios, e.g., with higher internal migration rates or later start dates, due to the presence of a large immunological naive rural popula-

Preprint submitted to Lancet Global Health

June 19, 2021

tion. Among other factors, timing of the vaccination campaign was important to determining maximum impact, and delays as short as 30 days prevented larger campaigns from having the same impact as smaller campaigns that began earlier. The optimal age group for prioritization depended on choice of metric, as prioritizing older adults consistently averted more deaths across all of the scenarios. While guidelines exist for these latter factors, urban-rural allocation is an orthogonal factor that we predict to affect impact and warrants consideration as countries plan the scale-up of their vaccination campaigns.

Keywords: COVID-19, vaccination, urban/rural transmission, serology, sub-Saharan Africa, vaccination impact, low and middle income countries

1 Introduction

2 COVID-19 has presented every country with a challenge to formulate
 3 a strategy to protect its population, initially with non-pharmaceutical in-
 4 terventions (NPI)/public health and safety measures (PHSM) and more re-
 5 cently vaccination. As of June 2021, the World Health Organization (WHO)
 6 has granted Emergency Use Listing to five vaccines [1], though supplies are
 7 expected to be limited, particularly in low- and middle-income countries
 8 (LMIC). The COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access (COVAX) Advance Market
 9 Commitment (AMC) is expected to be the primary mechanism by which
 10 most of 92 eligible LMICs procure COVID-19 vaccines, beginning with 3%
 11 population coverage for health care workers (HCW) and increasing to 20%
 12 population coverage for the elderly and adults with comorbidities [2]. Previ-
 13 ous modeling studies have indicated that prioritizing elderly adults for vac-

14 cination would yield the largest reductions in mortality [3, 4] given the steep
15 gradient of mortality observed with age in China, Europe, and other coun-
16 tries [5, 6]. Meanwhile, HCW have been prioritized to preserve health system
17 capacity [2].

18 How countries should allocate vaccines subnationally has received little
19 attention outside of equity or logistical considerations. While the WHO re-
20 quires countries to submit national deployment and vaccination plans (ND-
21 VPs) [7] prior to receiving vaccines from COVAX [8], WHO guidance on
22 developing NDVPs mentions geography only in the context of ensuring equi-
23 table access. In particular the guidance encourages countries to give special
24 consideration to “those living in informal settlements or urban slums... pop-
25 ulations in conflict settings or those affected by humanitarian emergencies,
26 and other hard-to-reach population groups” but does not explore the epi-
27 demiological impact of such policy decisions [7]. Likewise, WHO guidance
28 on logistics mentions “remote areas” but only with respect to the ultra-low
29 temperatures required to store certain vaccines and the need for special de-
30 vices such as thermal shippers with dry ice [9]. These documents highlight
31 the challenges that rural areas (and some urban areas) are expected to face
32 during COVID-19 vaccination campaigns and suggest that the default may
33 be to overlook these areas or distribute vaccine to these areas at a slower
34 pace.

35 In this study we ask whether urban or rural prioritization of COVID-19
36 vaccines may also affect the impact of the vaccination campaign on disease
37 burden. Using an agent-based model set in a representative Sub-Saharan
38 African (SSA) setting, we examine the possible impact on transmission and

disease burden of campaigns prioritizing urban or rural areas to receive vaccine first, while also accounting for other factors such as age group prioritization, variable dates of vaccine introduction, and final vaccine coverage levels.

Results

Ongoing migration generates multiple peaks in COVID-19 incidence at the country level

To explore possible COVID-19 trajectories in SSA, we created an agent-based model of the spread of COVID-19 in a SSA-like country setting where the population was split between urban and rural areas. The population was assumed to be immunologically naive, and NPI/PHSM policies were simulated as dynamic changes in transmission. Infections were seeded in the urban node and allowed to spread to rural nodes through internal urban-rural migration (Figure 1).

In the baseline scenario, moderate transmission and ongoing migration ($R_0 = 2.4$, migration = 20 000 daily trips per million individuals, dtpmi) resulted in separate incidence peaks in urban and rural areas which aggregated to give two peaks at the country level (Figure 1, middle column, middle row). Cases rose quickly in urban areas and more gradually in rural areas with urban and rural peaks separated by approximately four months. After two years, a majority of the overall population ($58\% \pm 2\%$) had been infected at some point (Figure 2). A larger fraction of the urban population was ever infected (81% cumulative urban infections vs. 48% cumulative rural infections), but rural infections outnumbered urban infections due to the larger

Figure 1: Daily COVID-19 incidence with varying transmission and migration in an archetypal SSA country setting. Urban and rural curves show new cases per day out of a population of 400 000 individuals split 40% urban and 60% rural. Peak percentages represent cumulative incidence as a percentage of the respective sub-population on the date when the highest incidence in each sub-population occurs indicated by the dashed vertical line. Time in days since first imported case. Low, medium, and high migration = 2000, 20 000, and 200 000 dtpmi, respectively.

63 rural population (Figure 2).

64 Using the baseline scenario as reference, we examined the effects of trans-
65 mission and migration separately on the epidemic characteristics (Figure 1).

Figure 2: Cumulative COVID-19 incidence with varying transmission and migration in an archetypal SSA country. Urban and rural curves show percentage ever infected out of a population of 400 000 individuals split 40% urban and 60% rural. Peak percentages represent cumulative incidence as a percentage of the respective sub-population on the date when the highest incidence in each sub-population occurs indicated by the dashed vertical line. Time in days since first imported case. Low, medium, and high migration = 2000, 20 000, and 200 000 dtpmi, respectively.

66 Increasing the transmission rate (from $R_0 = 2.0$ to 2.8) while holding mi-
67 gration constant shortened the time between urban and rural peaks (e.g.,

68 from 287 to 92 days when migration = 20 000 dtpmi, Figure 1). This also
69 resulted in a proportional increase in cumulative incidence as expected (Fig-
70 ure 2; however, other qualitative features such as the number of peaks at the
71 country level remained unchanged (Figure 1).

72 By comparison, increasing the internal migration rate while holding trans-
73 mission constant resulted in qualitative changes to the incidence curve includ-
74 ing the number of peaks at the country level (Figure 1). At medium rates of
75 migration (migration = 20 000 dtpmi), separate urban and rural peaks were
76 apparent at the country level with any level of transmission (Figure 1). In
77 this scenario, approximately equal numbers of cases came from urban and
78 rural areas (Figure 2). At low rates of migration (migration = 2000 dtpmi),
79 the outbreak was predominantly urban, with urban areas contributing the
80 majority of cases (Figure 2). Rural incidence failed to increase appreciably
81 but instead contributed to a long tail of declining incidence at the country
82 level (Figure 1). Conversely, at high rates of migration (migration = 200 000
83 dtpmi), a predominantly rural outbreak was observed, with rural areas con-
84 tributing the majority of cases (Figure 2). Incidence increased in both urban
85 and rural areas but continued increasing in rural areas even after starting to
86 decline in urban areas (Figure 1). Therefore, both low and high migration
87 rates tended to produce single-peak outbreaks, while intermediate migration
88 rates resulted in multiple peaks, marking the transition between between
89 predominantly urban and rural outbreaks.

90 At extreme values of transmission and migration, the model demonstrated
91 two contrasting outbreak scenarios. A more contained, primarily urban out-
92 break was generated when transmission and migration rates were low ($R_0 =$

2.0 and migration = 2000 dtpmi); cumulative incidence was 62% and 5% in urban and rural areas, respectively, and $22\% \pm 2\%$ at the country level (Figure 2). A less contained, widespread outbreak was generated when transmission and migration rates were high ($R_0 = 2.8$ and migration = 200 000 dtpmi); cumulative incidence was 78% and 63% in urban and rural areas, respectively, and $68\% \pm 2\%$ at the country level (Figure 2). This range of cumulative incidence was consistent with seroprevalence rates in SSA [10, 11, 12, 13, 14].

Increasing coverage has a limited capacity to compensate for delays in COVID-19 vaccine introduction

To examine the effect of COVID-19 vaccination policies on population-level impact, we simulated roll-out strategies that differed in several respects: age prioritization (i.e., older or younger adults first), timing (start day) of vaccine introduction, final vaccine coverage level, and spatial prioritization (i.e., urban or rural areas first). Vaccines were assumed to be either acquisition-blocking (preventing most infection after exposure) or disease-blocking (allowing infection and limited transmission but preventing most disease). Impact was evaluated on the basis of cumulative infections, severe cases, and deaths averted after two years compared to a counterfactual baseline scenario of moderate transmission and ongoing migration ($R_0 = 2.4$, migration = 20 000 dtpmi).

We first asked what effect age prioritization and timing of introduction might have on vaccination impact (Figure 3). To simplify the analysis, we fixed vaccine coverage at 50% and distributed vaccine to both urban and rural areas with equal priority. We found that the optimal age prioritization strategy depended on the choice of impact metric. Prioritizing younger

adults to receive an acquisition-blocking vaccine averted more infections than prioritizing older adults or random distribution by age (e.g., $15\% \pm 3\%$ versus $13\% \pm 2\%$ and $7\% \pm 2\%$, respectively, when introduced at day 60, Figure 3, left column, top row), consistent with the large proportion of younger adults in SSA populations ([15]) and degree of contact that occurs within this age group ([16]). With a disease-blocking vaccine, prioritizing younger adults continued to be more effective in averting infections than prioritizing older adults, but the relative differences were reduced (Figure 3, left column, bottom row).

Figure 3: Vaccination impact by age prioritization and timing of vaccine introduction. Age groups for prioritization were as follows: “old first” = beginning with adults age 70 years or older; “young first” = beginning with adults age 15–49 years; “random” = without prioritization (i.e., all ages have equal priority).

By comparison, prioritizing older adults was consistently more effective at averting severe cases or deaths than prioritizing younger adults or random distribution by age. For an acquisition-blocking vaccine, prioritizing older

adults averted approximately twice as many deaths as prioritizing younger adults, regardless of date of introduction (Figure 3, right column, top row). These differences were greater in magnitude for a disease-blocking vaccine (Figure 3, right column, bottom row). Regardless of impact metrics, delays in vaccine introduction reduced but did not negate the absolute differences in impact between age prioritization strategies (Figure 3).

We then asked whether higher coverage levels could compensate for a later date of introduction. In this case, we assumed priority would go to older adults based on the deaths averted as a metric (Figure 4) and WHO fair allocation guidelines [2]. Final coverage levels were varied between 20% and 80% representing COVAX targets [2] and an optimistic scenario with additional vaccine procurement, respectively. Regardless of metric (infections, severe cases, or deaths averted) or start day of vaccination (30-180 days after first case), increasing vaccination coverage also increased the impact (Figure 4).

The maximum possible impact for any given coverage level diminished rapidly with delays in the start of vaccination (Figure 4). An optimistic campaign with 80% coverage of an acquisition-blocking vaccine averted 16% of infections when introduced on day 30 but only 2% of infections when introduced on day 180. The impact of vaccination at other coverage levels was similarly diminished by delays in introduction (Figure 4). As a result, higher coverage levels were necessary for a campaign started later to have the same impact as a campaign started earlier with lower coverage levels. In certain cases, the gain from starting vaccination earlier could not be matched by delayed vaccination, even with very high final coverage levels. For example,

155 to avert the same number of deaths (32% of baseline deaths) as a campaign
 156 started on day 30 with 30% coverage, a campaign started on day 90 would
 157 need to attain 80% coverage (Figure 4, right column, top row). However,
 158 campaigns started on day 30 with $\geq 60\%$ coverage resulted in levels of impact
 159 ($\geq 44\%$ of baseline deaths averted) that could not be achieved by campaigns
 160 started later, regardless of coverage level (examined up to 80% coverage)
 161 (Figure 4, right column, top row).

Figure 4: Vaccination campaign impacts by final coverage level and timing of vaccine introduction. Percentage reductions are shown for the respective cumulative indicator (infections, severe cases, or deaths) with respect to the baseline scenario without intervention.

162 Trends with respect to age prioritization, timing of introduction, and final
 163 coverage levels were robust to choice of baseline scenarios, including changing
 164 the level of transmission or ongoing migration (Supplementary Information).

165 *Rural prioritization optimizes vaccination in the presence of ongoing migra-*
 166 *tion*

167 Finally we asked to what extent spatial (urban or rural) prioritization
 168 could affect the impact of a COVID-19 vaccination campaign in an archety-
 169 pal SSA setting. We again assumed that priority would be given to older
 170 adults but that within each age tier, those in the prioritized spatial setting
 171 would be vaccinated first. For example, for rural prioritization, we assumed
 172 vaccine would go to rural individuals 70+ years, then urban 70+ years, ru-
 173 ral 60-69 years, and so on. We also varied final coverage levels (20%, 50%,
 174 or 80%), start dates of introduction (30, 90, or 180 days), and type of vac-
 175 cine (acquisition- or disease-blocking). For our counterfactual, we assumed
 176 a baseline of moderate transmission and ongoing migration ($R_0 = 2.4$, mi-
 177 gration = 20 000 dtpmi) or the extremes of a more confined or less confined
 178 outbreak ($R_0 = 2.0$, migration = 2000 dtpmi or $R_0 = 2.8$, migration = 200
 179 000 trips dtpmi, respectively) (cf. Figures 1, 2).

180 For the majority of vaccination scenarios, we found that rural priori-
 181 tization would avert more infections, severe cases, and deaths than urban
 182 prioritization (Figure 5). Urban prioritization achieved greater impact for
 183 a small set of conditions: when the outbreak was largely confined to urban
 184 areas (with low transmission and low migration) and vaccination was started
 185 early in the outbreak (by day 30) (Figure 5, left column). For all other sce-
 186 narios, including those with higher transmission or migration, or campaigns
 187 started at later dates, rural prioritization resulted in greater impact (Fig-
 188 ure 5, center and right columns). These differences were most pronounced
 189 when impact was measured by infections averted. For other metrics such as

190 severe cases (Figure 5, rows 2 and 5), the differences between urban and ru-
 191 ral prioritization tended to be modest but still significant, e.g., with medium
 192 transmission and migration ($R_0 = 2.4$, migration = 20 000 dtpmi, medium
 193 migration). This was attributable to the prolonged spread of the epidemic in
 194 such scenarios (Figure 1) as well as our assumption that age groups would be
 195 given priority over spatial distribution such that in all scenarios in Figure 5,
 196 older age groups were vaccinated first.

197 The acquisition-blocking vaccine had a higher impact on transmission
 198 than the disease-blocking vaccine, particularly when impact was measured
 199 by infections averted. However, differences in impact between the two vac-
 200 cine types were strongly dependent on transmission trajectories over time,
 201 coverage, and the start time of vaccine roll-out. In the low migration and low
 202 transmission scenario ($R_0 = 2.0$, migration = 2000 dtpmi), the two vaccines
 203 were largely similar. For example, for campaigns prioritizing urban areas
 204 started on day 30, both vaccines had negligible effects on infections averted
 205 with 20% final coverage. These differences increased to 7% of infections (10%
 206 and 3% with acquisition- and disease-blocking, respectively) with 80% final
 207 coverage (Figure 5, left column) and decreased with delays in the start date
 208 of vaccine roll-out. When transmission and migration were both higher (R_0
 209 = 2.4, migration = 20 000 dtpmi, medium migration), the epidemic per-
 210 sisted longer (Figure 1), and larger magnitude differences between vaccine
 211 types were observed. For campaigns prioritizing rural areas started on day
 212 30, the difference between vaccine types was 3% of infections with 20% final
 213 coverage and 15% of infections with 80% final coverage (Figure 5, middle
 214 column). These modest absolute differences in impact were attributable to

Figure 5: Vaccination campaign impact on infections, severe cases and deaths by spatial (urban-rural) prioritization. Bars indicate mean reduction in respective cumulative indicator, and error bars indicate standard error.

the slow roll-out of vaccine over a 12-month period, particularly during the first 9 months when $<50\%$ of the vaccine will have been distributed [17].

The differences between acquisition-blocking and disease-blocking vaccines were reduced when impact was measured by severe cases and deaths (Figure 5). The acquisition-blocking vaccine resulted in 2-4% more severe cases averted than the disease-blocking vaccine across transmission scenarios due to the reduction in transmission (Figure 5, rows 2 and 5). However, the difference between vaccine types was negligible for deaths averted (Figure 5, rows 3 and 6). This was attributable to our assumption that both vaccines provide protection against severe disease and deaths and that age groups would be given priority over spatial distribution.

In all three transmission scenarios in Figure 5 as well as the remaining scenarios (Supplemental Information), increased NPI/PHSM that also reduced migration maximized the impact of vaccination campaigns.

Discussion

By applying an agent-based model with discrete individuals, we found that ongoing urban-rural migration has the potential to extend COVID-19 outbreaks in a SSA-like setting. With either low or high internal migration rates, our model predicted that a single incidence peak at the country level would follow introduction, predominated by cases in urban and rural areas, respectively. However, with intermediate migration rates, our model predicted that an initial predominantly urban outbreak would be followed by a second rural outbreak, resulting in two peaks and extending the duration of the outbreak.

Each of these migration scenarios was in turn associated with a different optimal vaccination strategy. When migration rates were low (whether due to geography, NPI/PHSM, or other causes) and if the vaccine could be rolled out quickly, the optimal strategy was to target urban areas, preventing the predominantly urban outbreak. However, with higher rates of urban-rural migration, targeting rural areas resulted in greater impact and was the optimal strategy, consistent with the largely rural population in SSA. Delays in vaccination also resulted in rural prioritization becoming the optimal strategy, as urban areas experienced outbreaks faster than rural areas and a larger proportion of the population resided in rural areas.

The differences in impact between urban and rural prioritization strategies warrant consideration as countries begin vaccinating their populations in larger numbers. We are not aware of any NDVPs (such as made available on the WHO COVID-19 Partners Platform [18]) that distinguish between urban and rural areas, though a few countries such as Mexico are reportedly prioritizing rural areas [19]. While WHO guidance on subnational allocation has been limited to equity or logistical considerations, possible effects on impact were not explored [7, 9, 8]. If resources are not intentionally directed to rural areas, urban allocation is likely to be the default strategy throughout SSA and other LMIC. For example, Ameyaw et al. examined Demographic and Health Survey data from 2010-2018 and found that children in urban areas were fully vaccinated at higher rates than their rural counterparts (by 53% to 41%, respectively) [20]. While we do not consider other mitigating factors such as the ease of distribution in urban areas, the question of whether to vaccinate a larger, immunologically naive rural population or a smaller, pre-

264 viously exposed urban population encapsulates what we expect is a dilemma
265 that countries may be facing in the near future. In this study we found that
266 vaccinating rural areas may have benefits beyond equity.

267 Spatial prioritization complemented other strategies such as prioritizing
268 older adults, as recommended by official WHO guidance [2]. Prioritizing
269 younger adults with a vaccine effective against acquisition reduced the over-
270 all number of infections, but prioritizing older adults more greatly reduced
271 severe cases and deaths. The inability of prioritizing younger age groups to
272 prevent as many severe cases and deaths as prioritizing older age groups was
273 ultimately due to the anticipated slow roll-out of vaccine. This in turn reflects
274 current projections which foresee a 12-month roll-out to reach 20% coverage
275 that is back-loaded; approximately 50% of the available doses is expected to
276 come in the last three months [17]. This pace, even assuming coverage rates
277 >20%, make it difficult to achieve herd immunity fast enough to prevent
278 infections, severe cases, and deaths in older adults without direct targeting.
279 These results are consistent with other recent models on COVID-19 vaccine
280 impact [21, 4, 3].

281 Our model also supports the position that countries should begin their
282 vaccination campaigns as soon as possible. Campaigns that started later had
283 a limited capacity to make up for the delay in vaccination, even when higher
284 coverage levels were assumed. In many scenarios, larger campaigns that
285 started later resulted in more deaths than smaller campaigns that started
286 earlier. This supports the urgency to direct vaccine to SSA as quickly as
287 possible, a position espoused by COVAX [22], the African Union [23], and
288 civil society [24].

289 One question that we did not address directly is which scenario currently
 290 best fits each country in SSA: which have high or low ongoing internal mi-
 291 gration, or high or low transmission? Because both of these parameters are
 292 abstracted in the model, we propose that a careful epidemiological assess-
 293 ment would be needed for each country to measure the outcome of ongoing
 294 migration if present: a high cumulative incidence in rural areas compared to
 295 urban areas. For example, this might be accomplished through serosurveys
 296 as in Niger State in Nigeria [12] or through genomic surveillance to track
 297 variants as in South Africa [25], Nigeria [26], and Kenya [27]. Both studies
 298 showed that infections spread from urban centers to rural areas and that ru-
 299 ral areas were slower to see increases in incidence, consistent with a degree of
 300 restricted migration. Both countries and others in SSA may still have large
 301 immunologically naive populations in rural areas.

302 Our model was informed by a mix of historical data but plausibly rep-
 303 resents a future scenario. For example, while almost all SSA countries saw
 304 initial outbreaks during the year 2020, the example of Manaus, Brazil demon-
 305 strates how new variants may evade even high levels of existing immunity
 306 [28]. In such situations, future outbreaks may continue to resemble new
 307 outbreaks, leading to successive almost-memoryless incidence peaks. In ad-
 308 dition, the vaccine roll-out in SSA has been limited thus far, making our
 309 assumption reasonable that future vaccinations will essentially be starting
 310 anew. As of June 2021, the Africa CDC reported that less than 2% of mem-
 311 ber country populations received at least one dose of any vaccine and less
 312 than 0.5% have been fully vaccinated [29]. Therefore, variants and low ex-
 313 isting vaccine-induced immunity suggest our model and other outbreak-type

314 models will continue to have relevance.

315 Our study had several limitations. As an abstraction of a SSA country
 316 setting, our model represents an average in many respects: demographics
 317 (ages, contact patterns, urban-rural localization), COVID-19 response (as
 318 tracked by Oxford CGRT [30]), and a generic urban-seeded outbreak. This
 319 abstraction represents a trade-off that allowed us to focus on outbreak scenar-
 320 ios that may be applicable to many countries, though not precisely calibrated
 321 to any particular country. Our model also had several parameters that were
 322 abstractions of physical processes and not precisely matched to data. For ex-
 323 ample, internal migration did not correspond to a particular indicator such as
 324 mobile phone-based movement but represents an aggregate of this and other
 325 factors contributing to net migration [31]. We also made several simplifying
 326 assumptions on COVID-19 immunity and vaccines such as previous infection
 327 leading to perfect immunity and optimistic vaccine characteristics such as
 328 those based on mRNA vaccines [32, 33], as well as no opportunity for rein-
 329 fection. We also did not explicitly account for any particular SARS-CoV-2
 330 variants. However, by spanning a range of transmission rates, we accounted
 331 for increased infectiousness expected of new variants. In this case, our se-
 332 lected vaccine efficacy rates may represent best-case scenarios, with variants
 333 further reducing the impact on infections, severe cases, and deaths.

334 In sum, our model supports the position that countries should consider
 335 spatial prioritization among other factors when planning how to distribute
 336 COVID-19 vaccine, particularly those in SSA where vaccine supplies are ex-
 337 pected to be limited. These countries have an ongoing opportunity to adapt
 338 their strategy and if necessary set up an infrastructure that allows vaccine

339 to be prioritized to maximize impact.

340 **Methods**

341 *Model structure and demographics*

342 COVID-19 transmission dynamics were simulated using EMOD, a soft-
 343 ware platform for agent/individual-based epidemiological modeling of infec-
 344 tious diseases [34]. EMOD was used to represent an archetypal country
 345 in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) [35] through demographics (age pyramid and
 346 urban-rural population distribution), contact structure, and mobility pat-
 347 terns. Demographics were represented by taking the mean of each five year
 348 age bin from the population pyramids in the SSA region [36]. The urban-rural
 349 distribution of the population was obtained from published UN estimates,
 350 and the mean was taken for all countries in SSA [15] (Figure 10). Contact
 351 structures for the same set of age bins and countries in urban and rural set-
 352 tings were obtained from Prem et al. [16]. These matrices were available for
 353 home, school, workplace, and community settings, and a simple mean was
 354 taken across SSA countries. To obtain the total contact matrices, we multi-
 355 plied the NPI policy effect from the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response
 356 Tracker described below and then summed all four settings together. Mobil-
 357 ity patterns represented the within-country movement of people as described
 358 below. Baseline parameter values are provided in Table 1 except for contact
 359 matrices which are provided in Supplemental Methods.

360 Individuals were created at model initialization and assigned (a) an age to
 361 match the desired age distribution and (b) a node representing either urban
 362 or rural settings to match the desired urban-rural population distribution.

In total the model contained 200 nodes with node₁ representing an urban setting and node_{2..200} representing rural settings with the same population sizes at initialization (Figure 6). The urban node accounted for 40% of the total population, while the rural nodes accounted for the remaining 60%. This node structure was chosen to represent an SSA country having a capital city serving as the main hub of international traffic and rural areas whose residents travel to the capital city and other rural towns. Migration between urban and rural nodes and between rural nodes was represented as a change in the node assignment of individuals. The probability of a change in node was calculated as the product of a base rate and the population sizes of each pair of nodes, i.e., using a gravity-based model (Figure 6). The base migration rate was not known a priori, so a range of values were evaluated spanning several orders of magnitude (Table 1). This rate and other rates in the model were implemented as exponentially distributed waiting times between random events. Other demographic processes such as births, non-disease deaths, and migration to other countries were assumed negligible on the timescale of the model. The model was run for a simulated 2-year (730 day) duration.

COVID-19 epidemiology in the model

We represented COVID-19 outbreaks where an infected case was introduced into a population that did not have pre-existing immunity (as happened in year 2020) or where a new SARS-CoV-2 variant might be introduced that completely evades existing immunity. Individuals (agents) were assumed to be in one of the following states: susceptible, infected, or removed (recovered or dead). Infected individuals were seeded in the urban

Figure 6: Model schematic showing sample node and migration. Infected individuals were seeded in the urban node and infection spread to rural nodes via urban-rural migration.

Symbol	Parameter	Units	Baseline value	Range	Reference
$S_{t=0}$	Initial susceptible prop	Percent	99.9	NA	NA
$I_{t=0}$	Initial infected prop	Percent	0.1	NA	NA
$R_{t=0}$	Initial removed prop	Percent	0	NA	NA
R_0	Base reproduction number	New infections / infected indiv	2.4	2.0 - 2.8	NA
NPI_t	NPI intensity effect	Unitless multiplier	Varies	0 - 100	[30]
γ	$(\text{Avg infec duration})^{-1}$	Days^{-1}	14^{-1}	NA	[37]
VE_S	Vax effic vs infec	Scalar	0.95	{0.95, 0}	[32, 33]
VE_I	Vax effic vs trans	Scalar	0.3	{0, 0.7}	NA
VE_P	Vax effic vs progr	Scalar	1.0	{0, 1.0}	[32, 33]
P_{vac}	Final vax coverage	Percent	50	{20, 50, 80}	[2]
p_{rural}	Rural pop	Percent	60	NA	[15]
b	Baseline migration	Probability / time step	20 000 dtpmi	20 - 200 000 dtpmi	NA
N_{tot}	Model agents	Integer	4×10^5	NA	NA
n_{rural}	Rural nodes	Integer	199	NA	NA
n_{urban}	Urban nodes	Integer	1	NA	NA
t	Time step	Days	1	NA	NA

Table 1: Model parameters

node at multiple time points (Table 1) during the first 60 days after which
no additional importations were assumed to occur due to suspension of air

travel. Susceptible individuals became infected at a rate proportional to a baseline rate of transmission $R_0 I(t) / c_{i,j} \gamma$ where R_0 represents the base reproduction number of COVID-19 from literature (Table 1), $I(t)$ the number of infected individuals in the same node, $c_{i,j}$ the mean contact rate of individuals of age groups i and j , and γ = mean infectious duration in the model. $c_{i,j}$ was obtained from the age- and location-dependent contact rates from Prem et al. [16] across settings and countries in SSA. Infected individuals transitioned to the removed state with the sum rate of recovery and death, i.e., the inverse of the total infectious duration. Removed individuals did not return to the susceptible state which was equivalent to (a) births and deaths being negligible on the timescale of the model and (b) recovered individuals having perfect immunity that did not wane on the timescale of the model. Individual-level behaviors were also simulated to a limited extent: 10% of infected individuals were assumed to self-isolate which reduced their contributions to transmission in their respective node by 80%.

Country-level events and policies in the model

To represent typical country-level policies to outbreaks, we included a quantification of NPI/PHSM policy strengths implemented in SSA since early 2020. We obtained data from the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT) Containment and Health Index which is the average of 14 sub-indexed indicators ranging between 0 and 100 where each sub-index rates a specific type of policy on each day [30]. Dates in OxCGRT were re-scaled to the date since first case reported to the WHO ([38], Table 2). To derive a mean value for SSA, we used the mean NPI_t across countries in SSA for each date since respective first case 7. $(1 - NPI_t/100)$ was used

as a contact rate multiplier for work and community settings. The school settings was assumed to be closed (i.e., with $NPI_t = 100$) for 135 days after first reported case then reopened with the same contact rate multiplier as work and community settings. The home setting was assumed to have increased contact rates by 25% (i.e., with $NPI_t = -25$). After the last day of available NPI_t data, work, school, and community settings were assumed to be opened to 75% of pre-COVID levels (i.e., with $NPI_t = 25$) to simulate near-complete reopening in most SSA countries. We used the same multiplier $(1 - NPI_t/100)$ on migration between all spatial nodes in the simulation to account for changes in migration because of NPI policies.

Calendar day	Epidemic day (t)	Event or policy
15	-60	Importations begin
75	0	Earliest policies (assumed first reported case)
90	15	Importations stop
105 – 255	30 – 180	Vaccinations begin
210	135	Schools reopen

Table 2: Summary of events and policy implementation dates in model. Calendar day 0 = January 1, 2020

Vaccination in the model

COVID-19 vaccines in the model were represented as protecting individuals by one of the following mechanisms:

1. Acquisition-blocking: preventing susceptible individuals from becoming infected (called efficacy against susceptibility, VE_S in the biostatistical literature [39])
2. Transmission-blocking: preventing shedding of infectious particles after infection (efficacy against infectiousness, VE_I , in the literature [39])

Figure 7: NPI policies as scored by OxCGRT for SSA countries

433 3. Disease-blocking: preventing individuals from developing symptomatic
 434 disease (efficacy against symptomatic illness, VE_P , in the literature
 435 [39])

436 We assumed that vaccines would be highly efficacious and comparable to
 437 the Pfizer/BioNTech or Moderna mRNA vaccines with $>90\%$ clinical trial
 438 efficacy and effectiveness [32, 33]. We also made the simplifying assumption
 439 that observed efficacy VE_{obs} was entirely attributable to either VE_S or VE_I
 440 (see 1). That is, for an acquisition-blocking vaccine, we assumed $VE_S =$
 441 VE_{obs} and $VE_P = 1$ resulting in all of the vaccinated individuals being
 442 protected from disease progression despite infection. For a disease-blocking

443 vaccine, we assumed $VE_I = VE_{obs}$, $VE_P = 1$, again resulting in all of
 444 the vaccinated individuals being protected from disease progression, even
 445 if infected. Thus all vaccines, regardless of type, were assumed to prevent
 446 severe disease and mortality. In the case of vaccines with lower efficacy, the
 447 preventive effect on severe disease and deaths is also assumed to decrease
 448 linearly. Finally, as our focus was on factors under the control of country
 449 policymakers, we did not explicitly model SARS-CoV-2 variants or their
 450 impact on vaccine efficacy. However, we expect that variants would have the
 451 net effect of reducing impact similar to reduced coverage levels.

452 Vaccine availability followed the COVAX projections of vaccine supply
 453 available from GAVI [17]. Briefly these projections assume vaccine will be-
 454 come increasingly available over a period of 12 months until reaching a final
 455 vaccination population coverage of $P_{vac} = 20\%$ or greater (Table 1).

456 Different age prioritization schemes were assumed to be available: oldest
 457 first (in order: 70+ years, 60-69, 50-59, and 15-49), youngest first (in order:
 458 15-49 years, 50-59, 60-69, and 70+), or random (all ages at the same time)
 459 (Figure 9). Likewise, different spatial allocation schemes were assumed vi-
 460 able: urban first, rural first, or random (equal priority to urban and rural ar-
 461 eas) (Figure 9). Under random spatial prioritization, vaccine was distributed
 462 to urban and rural nodes at a rate proportional to population size, e.g., at 1%
 463 coverage, both 1% of the urban population and 1% of the rural population
 464 would be covered. In the case of both age and spatial prioritization, age was
 465 assumed to take precedence before spatial (urban, rural) setting.

466 At the individual (agent) level, if an individual was selected to receive a
 467 vaccine, each dose was assumed to confer an increasing level of protection

468 until the level of protection specified by VE_S , VE_I , or VE_P was attained
 469 (Figure 8). This profile was chosen to reflect the Moderna scheduling of
 470 28 days between first and second doses [33]. Individual efficacy (regardless
 471 of type) was assumed to begin at 0% on day 0 and increase linearly until
 472 reaching 80% of final efficacy on day 10. This was maintained until day
 473 28 when a second dose was assumed administered, then efficacy increased
 474 linearly until final efficacy was reached on day 35. We assumed that all
 475 individuals selected for vaccination would receive both vaccine doses and
 476 that individual protection would not wane on the timescale of the model.
 477 Vaccination scenarios in the model used the same random number draws as
 478 baseline scenarios so that the individual- and population-level characteristics
 479 were the same until the vaccination campaign began. Each scenario was
 480 run with 40 realizations to derive mean and standard deviation of summary
 481 statistics.

Figure 8: Ramp-up of protective effect within a vaccinated individual in the model

Figure 9: Vaccine allocation scenarios by spatial prioritization, age group, and month

482 Parameter ranges for scenarios

483 We evaluated vaccine distribution scenarios over a range of base trans-
 484 mission intensities represented by R_0 and migration rates. In the scenarios
 485 presented, R_0 varied between 2.0 to 2.8. Migration varied from a scenario
 486 where simulated agents make 2000 daily trips per million individuals (dtpmi)

under unmitigated (no NPI/PHSM) conditions to a high migration scenario where 200 000 trips are completed each day.

With respect to vaccine distribution, we evaluated different final coverage levels and vaccine distribution start times in addition to different age and spatial prioritization strategies in urban and rural areas. Coverage levels were varied from 20%-80% of the total population, while start times were varied between 30-180 days after the first case. While the same start times were used across different transmission scenarios, the number of infected individuals varied depending on transmission intensity preceding the start of vaccine distribution. Vaccine distribution start times could thus be considered a proxy for different levels of population immunity at the start of a vaccination campaign.

Contact structure, age pyramid, and government response tracker data were available for 37 countries in sub-Saharan Africa, and all 37 countries (shown in Figure 10) were used to develop a representative SSA country. A full list of countries is available upon request.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Jonathan Bloedow and Christopher Lorton from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for software support and Bob Small and Amol Chaudhari from the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations and the WHO SAGE Working Group on Covid-19 Vaccines for informative discussions. This publication is based on research conducted by the Institute for Disease Modeling at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. No external funding was involved.

Figure 10: Sub-Saharan African countries that were aggregated to form a representative country.

511 **Supporting information**

512 Supplementary figures: `Supplementary_figures.pdf`.

513 All code to reproduce the modeling results are available on Github or by
514 request to the authors.

515 **Author contributions statement**

516 P.S., B.W., D.L.C., and S.C. conceived the model scenarios. P.S. designed
517 and implemented the model and generated model outputs. S.C. and P.S.

wrote the manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

References

- [1] World Health Organization. Status of COVID-19 Vaccines within WHO EUL/PQ evaluation process. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021. Available from: <https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/key-resources/documents/status-covid-19-vaccines-within-who-eulpq-evaluation-process>.
- [2] Fair allocation mechanism for COVID-19 vaccines through the COVAX Facility; 2021. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/fair-allocation-mechanism-for-covid-19-vaccines-through-the-covax-facility>.
- [3] Bubar KM, Reinholt K, Kissler SM, Lipsitch M, Cobey S, Grad YH, et al. Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus. *Science*. 2021 Feb 26;371(6532):916–921. doi:10.1126/science.abe6959.
- [4] Hogan AB, Winskill P, Watson OJ, Walker PGT, Whittaker C, Baguelin M, et al. Within-country age-based prioritisation, global allocation, and public health impact of a vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: A mathematical modelling analysis. *Vaccine*. 2021 May 21;39(22):2995–3006. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.002.
- [5] Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-

- 540 based analysis. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020 Jun;20(6):669–677.
541 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7.
- 542 [6] Levin AT, Hanage WP, Owusu-Boaitey N, Cochran KB, Walsh SP,
543 Meyerowitz-Katz G. Assessing the age specificity of infection fatality
544 rates for COVID-19: systematic review, meta-analysis, and public policy
545 implications. European Journal of Epidemiology. 2020 Dec;35(12):1123–
546 1138. doi:10.1007/s10654-020-00698-1.
- 547 [7] Guidance on developing a national deployment and vaccination plan for
548 COVID-19 vaccines. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021. Avail-
549 able from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccine_deployment-2020.1)
550 [WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccine_deployment-2020.1](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccine_deployment-2020.1).
- 551 [8] COVID-19 national deployment and vaccination plan: Submission
552 and review process, 29 January 2021. Geneva: World Health
553 Organization; 2021. Available from: [https://www.who.int/](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-NDVP-country_plans-2021.1)
554 [publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-NDVP-country_](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-NDVP-country_plans-2021.1)
555 [plans-2021.1](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-NDVP-country_plans-2021.1).
- 556 [9] COVID-19 vaccination: supply and logistics guidance.
557 Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021. Available from:
558 [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/who-2019-ncov-vaccine-deployment-logistics-2021-1)
559 [who-2019-ncov-vaccine-deployment-logistics-2021-1](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/who-2019-ncov-vaccine-deployment-logistics-2021-1).
- 560 [10] Milleliri JM, Coulibaly D, Nyobe B, Rey JL, Lamontagne F, Hocqueloux
561 L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Ivory Coast: A Serosurveillance Sur-

- vey among Gold Mine Workers. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2021;104(5). doi:10.4269/ajtmh.21-0081.
- [11] Milleliri JM, Coulibaly D, Nyobe B, Rey JL, Lamontagne F, Hocqueloux L, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies among truck drivers and assistants in Kenya. medRxiv. 2021;doi:10.1101/2021.02.12.21251294v1.
- [12] Majiya H, Aliyu-Paiko M, Balogu V, Musa D, Salihu I, Kawu A, et al. Seroprevalence of COVID-19 in Niger State. medRxiv. 2020;doi:10.1101/2020.08.04.20168112.
- [13] Mukwege D, Byabene AK, Akonkwa EM, Dahma H, Dauby N, Buhendwa JPC, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence in Health-care Workers in Bukavu, Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2021;104(4):1526–1530. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-1526.
- [14] Sykes W, Mhlanga L, Swanevelder R, Glatt TN, Grebe E, Coleman C, et al. Prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among blood donors in Northern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape, and Free State provinces of South Africa in January 2021. Res Sq. 2021;doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-233375/v1.
- [15] United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World urbanization prospects: the 2018 revision. United Nations; 2019. OCLC: 1120698127.
- [16] Prem K, van Zandvoort K, Klepac P, Eggo RM, Davies NG, Cook AR, et al. Projecting contact matrices in 177 geographical regions: an update

585 and comparison with empirical data for the COVID-19 era. medRxiv.
586 2021;doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.22.20159772>.

587 [17] COVAX Global Supply Forecast;. Available from: <https://www.gavi.org/news/document-library/covax-global-supply-forecast>.

589 [18] COVID-19 Partners Platform;. Available from: <https://covid19partnersplatform.who.int/en/pillar10>.

591 [19] Mexico is vaccinating its poorest citizens first – against the
592 advice of health experts. Washington Post. 2021;Available
593 from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/the_americas/mexico-coronavirus-vaccine-lopez-obrador/2021/02/25/81c28c50-76ad-11eb-9537-496158cc5fd9_story.html.

596 [20] Ameyaw EK, Kareem YO, Ahinkorah BO, Seidu AA, Yaya S. Decom-
597 posing the rural–urban gap in factors associated with childhood immu-
598 nisation in sub-Saharan Africa: evidence from surveys in 23 countries.
599 BMJ Global Health. 2021 Jan;6(1):e003773. Available from: <https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/1/e003773>. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003773.

601 [21] Matrajt L, Eaton J, Leung T, Brown ER. Vaccine optimization
602 for COVID-19: Who to vaccinate first? Sci Adv. 2020 Feb;7(6).
603 doi:10.1126/sciadv.abf1374.

604 [22] COVAX Joint Statement: Call to action to equip
605 COVAX to deliver 2 billion doses in 2021;. Avail-
606 able from: <https://www.who.int/news/item/27-05-2021-covax-joint-statement-call-to-action-to-equip-covax-to-deliver-2-b>

- 608 [23] Communique of the High-Level Emergency Virtual Meeting of
609 African Ministers of Health On the COVID-19 situation in
610 Africa;. Available from: [https://africacdc.org/news-item/](https://africacdc.org/news-item/communique-of-the-high-level-emergency-virtual-meeting-of-african-ministers-o)
611 [communique-of-the-high-level-emergency-virtual-meeting-of-african-ministers-o](https://africacdc.org/news-item/communique-of-the-high-level-emergency-virtual-meeting-of-african-ministers-o)
- 612 [24] Civil society to World Bank: Help us hold governments ac-
613 countable in COVID-19 vaccine distribution; 2021. Avail-
614 able from: [https://www.devex.com/news/sponsored/](https://www.devex.com/news/sponsored/civil-society-to-world-bank-help-us-hold-governments-accountable-in-covid-19-)
615 [civil-society-to-world-bank-help-us-hold-governments-accountable-in-covid-19-](https://www.devex.com/news/sponsored/civil-society-to-world-bank-help-us-hold-governments-accountable-in-covid-19-)
- 616 [25] Happi AN, Ugwu CA, Happi CT. Tracking the emergence of
617 new SARS-CoV-2 variants in South Africa. Nature Medicine.
618 2021 Mar;27(3):372–373. Available from: [https://www.nature.com/](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01265-1)
619 [articles/s41591-021-01265-1](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01265-1). doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01265-1.
- 620 [26] Happi C, Ihekweazu C, Oluniyi PE, Olawoye I. SARS-CoV-2 genomes
621 from Nigeria reveal community transmission, multiple virus lineages
622 and spike protein mutation associated with higher transmission and
623 pathogenicity. 2020;. Available from: [https://virological.org/t/](https://virological.org/t/sars-cov-2-genomes-from-nigeria-reveal-community-transmission-multiple-virus-)
624 [sars-cov-2-genomes-from-nigeria-reveal-community-transmission-multiple-virus-](https://virological.org/t/sars-cov-2-genomes-from-nigeria-reveal-community-transmission-multiple-virus-)
625 [494.](https://virological.org/t/sars-cov-2-genomes-from-nigeria-reveal-community-transmission-multiple-virus-)
- 626 [27] Githinji G. Introduction and local transmission of SARS-CoV-
627 2 cases in Kenya;. Available from: [https://virological.org/t/](https://virological.org/t/introduction-and-local-transmission-of-sars-cov-2-cases-in-kenya/)
628 [introduction-and-local-transmission-of-sars-cov-2-cases-in-kenya/](https://virological.org/t/introduction-and-local-transmission-of-sars-cov-2-cases-in-kenya/)
629 [497.](https://virological.org/t/introduction-and-local-transmission-of-sars-cov-2-cases-in-kenya/)
- 630 [28] Sabino EC, Buss LF, Carvalho MPS, Prete CA, Crispim MAE,

- 631 Fraiji NA, et al. Resurgence of COVID-19 in Manaus, Brazil, de-
632 spite high seroprevalence. The Lancet. 2021 Feb;397(10273):452–
633 455. Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(21)00183-5/abstract)
634 [article/PIIS0140-6736\(21\)00183-5/abstract](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(21)00183-5/abstract). doi:10.1016/S0140-
635 6736(21)00183-5.
- 636 [29] COVID-19 Vaccination;. Available from: [https://africacdc.org/](https://africacdc.org/covid-19-vaccination/)
637 [covid-19-vaccination/](https://africacdc.org/covid-19-vaccination/).
- 638 [30] Hale T, Webster S, Petherick A, Phillips T, Kira B. Oxford COVID-
639 19 Government Response Tracker. Blavatnik School of Govern-
640 ment; 2020. Available from: [https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/covid-19-government-response-tracker)
641 [research-projects/covid-19-government-response-tracker](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/covid-19-government-response-tracker).
- 642 [31] Grantz KH, Meredith HR, Cummings DAT, Metcalf CJE, Grenfell
643 BT, Giles JR, et al. The use of mobile phone data to inform anal-
644 ysis of COVID-19 pandemic epidemiology. Nat Commun. 2020 Sep
645 30;11(1):4961. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-18190-5.
- 646 [32] Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchen N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lock-
647 hart S, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19
648 Vaccine. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020 Dec;383(27):2603–
649 2615. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2034577>.
650 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2034577.
- 651 [33] Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, Kotloff K, Frey S, Novak
652 R, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2
653 Vaccine. New England Journal of Medicine. 2021 Feb;384(5):403–

416. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2035389>.
doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2035389.
- [34] Bershteyn A, Gerardin J, Bridenbecker D, Lorton CW, Bloedow J, Baker RS, et al. Implementation and applications of EMOD, an individual-based multi-disease modeling platform. *Pathog Dis*. 2018;76(5):fty059. doi:10.1093/femspd/fty059.
- [35] About Africa; 2021. Available from: <https://www.africa.undp.org/content/rba/en/home/regioninfo.html>.
- [36] World Population Prospects - Population Division - United Nations; 2021. Available from: <https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Standard/Population/>.
- [37] Ali ST, Wang L, Lau EHY, Xu XK, Du Z, Wu Y, et al. Serial interval of SARS-CoV-2 was shortened over time by nonpharmaceutical interventions. *Science*. 2020 Aug 28;369(6507):1106–1109. doi:10.1126/science.abc9004.
- [38] WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021. Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/info/>.
- [39] Basta NE, Halloran ME, Matrajt L, Longini IM Jr. Estimating influenza vaccine efficacy from challenge and community-based study data. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2008 Dec;168(12):1343–1352. doi:10.1093/aje/kwn259.

Government response to COVID-19 in SSA countries

Creating

Rural 1

Rural 2

Rural 3

Cumulative fraction of final vaccine allocation

Urban Rural

Start Day
30 90 180

16.0	11.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	2.0
13.0	9.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	2.0
11.0	7.0	6.0	4.0	3.0	2.0
8.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
6.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	-0.0

36.0	28.0	20.0	16.0	11.0	8.0
33.0	25.0	20.0	14.0	11.0	7.0
30.0	23.0	18.0	14.0	10.0	6.0
26.0	20.0	16.0	11.0	8.0	5.0
22.0	17.0	13.0	9.0	7.0	4.0
17.0	13.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	3.0
12.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	4.0	2.0

51.0	41.0	33.0	26.0	19.0	14.0
47.0	38.0	32.0	24.0	18.0	12.0
44.0	36.0	30.0	23.0	17.0	11.0
41.0	34.0	26.0	20.0	15.0	10.0
37.0	29.0	23.0	17.0	12.0	8.0
32.0	24.0	19.0	14.0	10.0	7.0
23.0	19.0	14.0	11.0	8.0	5.0

4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	-0.0
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	-0.0
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	-0.0

33.0	27.0	20.0	15.0	11.0	7.0
30.0	24.0	18.0	14.0	10.0	6.0
28.0	23.0	16.0	12.0	9.0	6.0
23.0	19.0	14.0	11.0	8.0	5.0
20.0	16.0	12.0	9.0	7.0	4.0
16.0	13.0	9.0	7.0	5.0	3.0
12.0	9.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	2.0

51.0	42.0	33.0	26.0	20.0	13.0
48.0	40.0	32.0	25.0	18.0	12.0
47.0	38.0	29.0	23.0	17.0	11.0
40.0	34.0	25.0	20.0	15.0	10.0
36.0	31.0	24.0	17.0	13.0	8.0
31.0	24.0	20.0	16.0	10.0	7.0
24.0	18.0	14.0	10.0	8.0	5.0

Prioritizing distribution by age