

1 Modeling the use of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination to safely relax
2 non-pharmaceutical interventions

3 Alicia N.M. Kraay, Molly E. Gallagher, Yang Ge, Peichun Han, Julia M. Baker,
4 Katia Koelle, Andreas Handel*, Benjamin A Lopman*

5 March 12, 2021

6 1

7 **Abstract**

8 In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, widespread non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), in-
9 cluding physical distancing, mask wearing, and enhanced hygiene, have been implemented. As of
10 March 2021, three effective vaccines have been approved for emergency use in the United States, with
11 several other vaccines in the pipeline. We use a transmission model to study when and how NPIs
12 could be relaxed in the United States with relative safety as vaccination becomes more widespread.
13 We compare different relaxation scenarios where NPIs begin to relax 0-9 months after vaccination
14 begins for both a one dose and two dose strategy, with historical levels of social interactions being
15 reached within 1 month to 1 year. In our model, vaccination can allow widespread relaxation of
16 NPIs to begin safely within 2 to 9 months, greatly reducing deaths and peak health system burden
17 compared to relaxing NPIs without vaccination. Vaccinated individuals can safely begin to relax
18 NPIs sooner than unvaccinated individuals. The extent of delay needed to safely reopen depends
19 primarily on the rate of vaccine rollout, with the degree of protection against asymptomatic infec-
20 tion playing a secondary role. If a vaccination rate of 3 million doses/day can be achieved, similar
21 to the typical rollout speed of seasonal influenza vaccination, NPIs could begin to be safely relaxed
22 in 2-3 months. With a vaccination rate of 1 million doses/day, a 6–9-month delay is needed. A
23 one dose strategy is preferred if relative efficacy is similar to a two-dose series, but the relative
24 benefit of this strategy is minimal when vaccine rollout is fast. Due to the urgent need to pursue
25 strategies that enable safe relaxation of NPIs, we recommend a two-dose strategy with an initial

¹*Authors contributed equally

26 delay of at least 3 months in relaxing restrictions further, and that the speed of vaccine rollout be
27 given immediate priority.

28 Introduction

29 The COVID-19 pandemic has caused catastrophic loss of life and health system strain in the United
30 States, with 506,373 deaths as of March 3, 2021 [1]. Widespread non-pharmaceutical interventions
31 (NPIs) initially reduced the spread [2]. However, such interventions have significant social and
32 economic costs and are not sustainable in the long-term. As a result, these NPIs have been slowly
33 relaxed which has led to increased community transmission [3]. In fall and winter 2020, cases began
34 to rise again, leading to renewed restrictions in many parts of the country in an effort to slow
35 transmission.

36 At the same time, vaccine development has been proceeding at a rapid pace, with three vaccines
37 approved for emergency use in the United States as of March 2021, about one year after the first
38 cases occurred in the United States [4, 5, 6]. Two mRNA vaccines, one by Pfizer/BioNTech and
39 one by Moderna, are given in a 2-dose regimen and have efficacy against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2
40 of 90% or greater. The most recently approved Johnson and Johnson vaccine is given as a single
41 dose and has a somewhat lower efficacy (66% against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 and 85% against
42 severe disease) [7, 8, 6]. As vaccination is rolled out in the United States, there is an imperative to
43 relax social distancing and other NPIs without causing a resurgence in transmission.

44 Due to the initially limited supply, using one dose instead of two for the mRNA vaccines has been
45 discussed as a potential strategy to allow more people to be vaccinated more quickly [9, 10]. Such
46 a strategy has previously been used during a yellow fever epidemic [11] and has been considered
47 as a possibility for pandemic flu [12]. In general, the utility of this strategy depends on both the
48 baseline transmission rate, the relative performance of 1 vs. 2 doses, and the vaccine mechanism of
49 action [12], which is presently unknown for SARS-CoV-2. The UK has already chosen this strategy,
50 and top officials in the United States are discussing this possibility as well as other modified dosing
51 schedules. We therefore explicitly model the potential use of a one dose strategy to extend supply
52 in a context where non-pharmaceutical interventions are also being relaxed.

53 The potential impact of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination depends not only on individual protection
54 against severe disease and/or mortality, but also the indirect effects of vaccination, which act on
55 transmission. Higher levels of indirect effects could greatly enhance the population level impact
56 of vaccination [13, 14]. In clinical trials for SARS-CoV-2, efficacy has been measured against
57 symptomatic COVID-19, which is determined by both protection against infection and subsequent
58 protection against severe disease if infected [15]. Less data is available on protection against in-
59 fection and transmission, both of which influence the strength of indirect effects and benefits for
60 unvaccinated individuals. Given both the very high efficacy of currently used SARS-CoV-2 vac-

61 cines and promising initial data from field studies, some protection against infection is likely, but
62 its degree is unknown [16, 17].

63 Given that vaccinated individuals are likely to have a reduced likelihood of infection, NPIs
64 might be able to be safely relaxed sooner for this group, particularly for younger adults who are
65 not at high risk of severe disease. In practice, individuals are likely to begin engaging in higher
66 risk behavior soon after completing their vaccine series. Indeed, the Centers for Disease Control
67 and Prevention (CDC) is already recommending the certain activities are safe for fully vaccinated
68 people [18]. We therefore explicitly model preferential relaxation of NPIs for vaccinated compared
69 with unvaccinated individuals, exploring how this change influences population risk.

70 In this analysis, we study whether and how non-pharmaceutical interventions can be relaxed
71 safely. We assess whether vaccinated individuals might be able to regain their social contacts more
72 quickly without greatly increasing population transmission risk. To explore potential trade-offs in
73 speed and efficacy, we compare a two dose vaccination strategy for the two mRNA vaccines with
74 the potential impacts if a 1-dose strategy were used. We do not consider the Johnson and Johnson
75 vaccine separately, as most of the initial vaccine supply is focused on the mRNA vaccines, but the
76 potential impact of the Johnson and Johnson vaccine is approximated by our one dose scenarios
77 with high efficacy. We also explore how the vaccine mechanism of action, including the extent
78 to which vaccination reduces infection (and therefore, the level of indirect effects), affects overall
79 impacts.

80 **Methods**

81 **Model structure**

82 Our base model includes seven compartments. Initially, most individuals are susceptible to infection
83 (S). Upon exposure, they enter a latent period (E), during which time they cannot transmit.
84 They can then develop asymptomatic infection (entering the A class) or symptomatic infection
85 (entering the I class). We assume that all asymptomatic individuals will recover (R). Those with
86 symptomatic infections can either recover or require hospitalization (entering the H class). Some
87 of those hospitalized will die (entering the deceased class D), and the rest will recover. Due to the
88 short time scale of our simulations, we do not model births or deaths from non-COVID causes or
89 waning of immunity.

90 To account for heterogeneity in susceptibility to both infection and severe disease, we further
91 stratify this seven compartment transmission model by both age (<20 years, $20-64$ years, and ≥ 65
92 years) and risk (high vs. low risk). The high risk group was parameterized to capture individuals
93 who are at high risk of infection either because of their occupational exposure level (for example,
94 due to working as a healthcare worker or teacher) or due to underlying health conditions. The

95 size of the high risk group for each age group based on underlying health conditions was estimated
96 based on data from Clark et al [19], and the fraction of individuals with occupational exposure was
97 calculated based on the National Academy of Sciences [20]. The relative risk of infection for those
98 with high risk underlying conditions compared to low risk individuals without these risk factors was
99 estimated based on data from Clark et al. [19]. For simplicity, individuals with high occupational
100 exposure were assumed to have the same relative risk of infection as individuals with underlying
101 health conditions. See SI for relative parameter values.

102 **Baseline immunity by age group**

103 We assume that the level of baseline immunity is 32%, roughly 4x the number of reported cases
104 in the United States as of February 23, 2021 [1]. As a sensitivity analysis, we also considered
105 simulations with a lower level of starting immunity (16%). For both scenarios, we consider starting
106 baseline immunity to confer protection against infection for the duration of the simulation. While
107 other types and degrees of baseline immunity are possible [21], we focus on this scenario as a reason-
108 able approximation, particularly for the short time scale of our simulations. The age distribution of
109 immunity was calculated based on seroprevalence data from CDC for four states: Georgia, Califor-
110 nia, Wisconsin, and New York [22]. These four sites were chosen to represent different regions of the
111 country. For the full US model, the age distribution of prior infections (as measured by serological
112 data) was averaged across these sites and assumed to be a proxy for the relative level of immunity
113 for each age group as of early February, 2021. Our calculations accounted for unequal probability
114 of sampling by age based on the 2019 American Community Survey data for each state [23].

115 **Implementing vaccination**

116 We implement vaccination by adding a daily overall rate of vaccination λ and additional compart-
117 ments for vaccinated individuals, which mirror the compartments in the base model: S_V , E_V , A_V ,
118 I_V , R_V , H_V , and D_V . We assume that antibody testing will not be used to assess whether an in-
119 dividual has already been exposed, and therefore susceptible and recovered individuals are equally
120 likely to receive the vaccine. For simplicity, we assume that individuals in the other 5 compartments
121 E , A , I , H , and D will not be vaccinated. Following vaccination, susceptible individuals S move into
122 the susceptible vaccinated compartment S_V , and all recovered individuals move into the recovered
123 vaccinated compartment R_V . A diagram of our model is shown in Figure 1.

124




Figure 1: Schematic of the base transmission model with vaccination. Individuals are classified as susceptible, S , exposed E , infectious and asymptomatic, A , infectious and symptomatic, I , hospitalized, H , recovered, R , or deceased, D . We assume that recovered individuals are equally as likely as susceptible individuals to receive the vaccine, effectively resulting in wasted doses (red arrows). Vaccinated individuals enter a reduced risk state, in which they are less likely to become infected and may also be less likely to develop symptoms, depending on the modeled mechanism of action.

125 The rate of vaccination was calculated by assuming that vaccines will preferentially be dis-
 126 tributed to high risk groups and to the elderly based on the prioritization scheme proposed by the
 127 National Academy of Sciences and the CDC [20, 24]. In our framework, elderly individuals with
 128 underlying health conditions have the highest priority followed by low-risk elderly, high risk adults,
 129 and low risk adults. Given that children were not included in the initial trials, we do not model
 130 vaccination of children. While older teenagers are eligible for vaccination (16-17 year olds could
 131 receive the Pfizer vaccine and 18-19 year olds could receive all three vaccines approved for emer-
 132 gency use [6, 5, 4]), we do not model vaccination of this group due to its relatively small size, the

133 initial low rate of vaccine distribution in this age group, and for simplicity. Because identification
134 of high risk groups is likely to be difficult to achieve in real time, we assumed that vaccines would
135 be distributed to all four of these groups (high risk elderly, low risk elderly, high risk adults, low
136 risk adults), with more doses initially being allocated to the higher risk groups. Once vaccine cov-
137 erage reached 80% in a given group, the remaining doses were redistributed among the remaining
138 vaccine-eligible groups. This 80% coverage threshold is consistent with vaccine acceptance from
139 recent surveys in the United States [25, 26]. Parameter values for the model are shown in Tables S2
140 and S1.

141 We model a vaccine that reduces symptomatic infection by 90% (approximately in line with vac-
142 cine efficacy of the Pfizer and Moderna mRNA vaccines) in two ways: 1) by reducing infection but
143 not impacting disease progression ($VE_{susceptibility} = 0.9, VE_{infectiousness} = 0, VE_{progression} = 0$),
144 hereafter referred to as ‘susceptibility-only vaccine’ or by 2) reducing both infection and the prob-
145 ability of symptoms given infection ($VE_{susceptibility} = 0.67, VE_{infectiousness} = 0, VE_{progression} =$
146 0.70), hereafter referred to as a ‘susceptibility and severity vaccine.’ These quantities were chosen
147 so that the observed impact on symptomatic disease is the same (i.e., $(1 - VE_{susceptibility}) \times (1 -$
148 $VE_{progression})$), so $(1 - 0.67) \times (1 - 0.7) = (1 - 0.9)$). We conservatively assume that vaccination
149 does not reduce infectiousness once infected. Given that efficacy against symptomatic COVID-19
150 is so high, a scenario where vaccination only reduces symptoms but not infection is unlikely, so
151 we did not consider this possibility in our models. Dagan et al recently showed a 90% reduc-
152 tion in COVID-19 infection without recorded symptoms following 2 doses of vaccine, a proxy for
153 asymptomatic infection, consistent with the susceptibility only vaccine [16].

154 We considered an aggressive vaccination rate of 3 million doses/day as the upper bound of
155 rollout speed (similar to what is achieved for seasonal influenza each season) [27] and a lower bound
156 of 1 million/day, corresponding to the Biden administration’s initial rollout goal [28]. As of March
157 4, 2021, current data indicate a daily rate of 1.7 million doses/day, intermediate between these two
158 scenarios [1], with plans to scale up vaccine rollout as additional supplies of the newly approved
159 Johnson and Johnson vaccine become available [29].

160 These two rates were converted to the number of complete two dose series available each month,
161 (dividing by two for a two-dose series). The number of doses was then converted to a time-varying
162 rate of vaccination for each age and risk group. We assume that all individuals age 20 and older will
163 eventually have access to vaccination, such that vaccine coverage will eventually reach 80% in both
164 strategies, but that a one dose strategy can achieve this coverage level more quickly. The efficacy
165 of a one dose vaccine has not been tested at large scale in Phase III clinical trials, so we varied
166 this quantity, assuming the relative efficacy (RE) of 1 dose compared with 2 doses was 100%, 80%,
167 or 60%. We focus on results for an 80% RE vaccine in the main text, as this value is similar to
168 the relative efficacy of the Johnson and Johnson vaccine compared with the two mRNA vaccines
169 ($\frac{63}{90} = 0.73$) and because preliminary trial data have suggested that the 80% threshold is most

170 similar to the level of protection observed between the first and second doses for the Pfizer vaccine
171 in a large field study in Israel ($\frac{66}{94} = 0.70$) [16]. Additional simulations with lower relative efficacy
172 values are shown in SI.

173 **Relaxing non-pharmaceutical interventions**

174 Age stratified contact patterns were based on US data from Prem et al. [30]. We assume that
175 at the start of the simulation individuals have 45% of their baseline social contacts, which was
176 calibrated to achieve transmission rates that matched hospitalization data in the United States
177 in early February. This reduction in baseline social contacts is meant to capture not only the
178 reduction in number of interactions, but also their propensity to cause transmission due to mask
179 wearing, surface disinfection, and enhanced hand hygiene. We model the relaxation of NPIs by
180 having all individuals gradually recover more of their social contacts, with the fraction increasing
181 to pre-pandemic levels at a linear rate. We assumed that both vaccinated elderly individuals and all
182 unvaccinated individuals have a delay in relaxation. We vary both the time until relaxation begins
183 for unvaccinated/vaccinated elderly (beginning 0-240 days after vaccination begins) and the time at
184 which pre-pandemic contact rates are restored (for both vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals,
185 ranging from 1 month-1 year after vaccination begins).

186 For vaccinated individuals, we considered two possibilities. First, we considered what might
187 happen if vaccinated adults began to regain social contacts after receiving their full series instead of
188 waiting a specified number of months. Second, we considered a scenario where vaccinated individ-
189 uals waited to relax with the general population. In the first scenario, while vaccinated individuals
190 begin to relax NPIs sooner than unvaccinated people, we assume that their social contacts are not
191 fully restored until the general population relaxes due to ongoing restrictions likely to shape social
192 contact patterns. When comparing between relaxation scenarios, we assume that pre-pandemic
193 contact rates are restored at the same time point, such that scenarios in which reopening is delayed
194 have a quicker relaxation process (see Figure 2).

195 **Model calibration**

196 We parameterized the model's reporting rate for symptomatic cases reported and the baseline level
197 of social distancing against US hospitalization data in early February. We found that a reporting
198 rate of 75% combined with a 55% baseline reduction in social contacts closely matched the observed
199 hospitalization data. See Figure S1 for comparisons of incidence between modeled and observed
200 hospitalizations.




Figure 2: An illustrative example of contact levels over time while relaxing social contacts. Under this scenario, pre-pandemic social contact rates are regained after 150 days for everyone, but the rate of relaxation varies by vaccine status and age. Vaccinated adults (solid line) begin to relax as vaccination begins but unvaccinated individuals and the elderly begin to relax 90 days after vaccination starts (dashed line). Model scenarios considered ranged in both the time at which social contacts were restored to pre-pandemic levels ($t = 30$ to 365) and the initial time at which NPIs started to be relaxed for both vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals (0-240 days).

201 Results

202 Because relaxing NPIs increases transmission rates (with 100% of social contacts corresponding to
203 an estimated \mathcal{R}_0 value of 2.5), the benefits of vaccination in the context of relaxing NPIs depend
204 on both the timescale of relaxation and the speed of vaccine rollout, as both shape the level of
205 population immunity (Figure 3). Relaxing NPIs prematurely, before a substantial fraction of the
206 population has been vaccinated, could lead to dramatic increases in deaths and hospitalizations.
207 For example, beginning to relax NPIs immediately and reaching pre-pandemic contact levels in
208 30 days, without vaccination, could lead to 1.2 million additional deaths. Even with an effective
209 susceptibility only two dose vaccine, nearly 1 million additional deaths are predicted if NPIs were
210 relaxed over the next month (Figure 3).

211 However, delaying reopening for three months while vaccinating rapidly (3 million doses/day)
212 with a susceptibility only vaccine and then rapidly relaxing could reduce deaths to 84,200 and allow
213 social interactions to be fully restored within 3 months. In contrast, due to the slow acquisition of
214 natural immunity with ongoing NPIs, delaying reopening without vaccination results in 1.1 million
215 deaths. Therefore, vaccination can yield a 93% reduction over expected deaths under the same
216 relaxation scale without vaccination. Moreover, in this case, the number of deaths expected are
217 similar to what would be predicted if NPIs were sustained at their current level for the duration
218 of the epidemic (80,000 deaths predicted, see Figure S2), suggesting that early relaxation produces
219 no additional risk. Vaccination also shortens the duration of the epidemic, with incidence falling to
220 near zero within about 3 months with rapid vaccination (Figure 4) compared with about 7 months
221 without vaccination (Figure S3). A one-dose strategy can allow safe relaxation to be achieved
222 more quickly, but could also become a liability if relative efficacy is low (less than 80%) (Figure 3,
223 Figure S4), necessitating a slower relaxation to allow more of the population to be vaccinated.
224 Moreover, speed is less of a benefit if rapid vaccine rollout can be achieved at 3 million doses/day.

225 While waiting for adequate coverage to be achieved before widespread NPI relaxation begins,
226 we found that allowing vaccinated individuals to begin to relax immediately does not substantially
227 increase population transmission (Figure 5). For example, our model predicted using a 2-dose
228 susceptibility only vaccine with a fast rollout, waiting 3 months to relax, and then doing so com-
229 pletely would lead to 84,200 deaths if vaccinated individuals begin to relax sooner, or 83,700 if
230 vaccinated individuals waited to relax with the general population. This slight increase in risk was
231 more pronounced if both a one dose strategy were used and the vaccine was less protective against
232 asymptomatic infection (susceptibility and severity vaccine).

233 The extent of delay and speed of reopening needed to safely relax NPIs for unvaccinated individ-
234 uals and the elderly depends primarily on the rate of vaccine rollout and the dosing strategy (one
235 or two doses) (Figure 3). If a two dose strategy is used with a rollout rate of 3 million doses/day,
236 a three month delay in reopening provides the most benefit, with a return to normal interactions




Figure 3: Interaction between time to regain pre-pandemic social interactions and the start time of relaxation by vaccine strategy and rollout speed. The x-axis shows the number of days between February 1, 2021 and the start of further NPI relaxation and the y-axis shows when normal interactions are restored after reopening begins (corresponding to the speed of relaxation). Colors show expected deaths for each reopening strategy. For these simulations, vaccinated individuals are assumed to begin relaxing immediately and a susceptibility only vaccine is modeled. See Figure S4 for expected impacts at lower relative efficacy.




Figure 4: Number of hospitalized cases over time if non-pharmaceutical interventions begin to be relaxed after 90 days based on dosing strategy and speed of reopening. The black line shows the number of individuals hospitalized on January 12, 2021 (131,326), which was the peak of US hospitalizations.




Figure 5: Expected deaths after one year if vaccinated individuals begin to relax immediately (black line) or wait to relax with the general population (yellow line) by the rate of vaccine rollout (solid=1 million doses/day, dashed=3 million doses/day). The top row (A and B) shows impacts for a two dose vaccine and the bottom row (C and D) shows impacts for a one dose vaccine with 80% relative efficacy. Column 1 shows impacts for a susceptibility only vaccine (A and C) and column shows impacts for a susceptibility and severity vaccine (B and D). In panel (A), the black and yellow lines overlap.

237 immediately after 3 months resulting in 84,200 deaths, similar to if NPIs were sustained at their
238 current level of the duration of the epidemic. At this rapid rollout rate, any potential benefit from
239 a one dose strategy is minimal. This three month delay roughly corresponds to the estimated time
240 required to vaccinate 40% of the eligible population, allowing herd immunity to be achieved through
241 a combination of natural and vaccine derived immunity. In contrast, with a slower vaccination rate
242 of 1 million doses/day, the epidemic would not be shortened and NPIs would need to be sustained
243 for the duration of the epidemic, with relaxation not beginning until 7 months after vaccine rollout.
244 A one dose strategy allows high levels of vaccine coverage to be achieved more quickly, but this
245 strategy could be a liability if relative efficacy is low and NPIs are relaxed too quickly (Figure S4).

246 Delaying relaxation also allows NPIs to be relaxed more quickly without increasing population
247 risk. For example, if relaxation began immediately, it would need to be prolonged over the course
248 of the next year to maintain low levels of incidence, whereas NPIs could be relaxed very rapidly
249 with a modest delay of at least 3 months if the rate of vaccine rollout is fast.

250 Delaying reopening and prioritizing the speed of vaccine rollout can also help reduce the burden
251 on the US healthcare system, preventing or reducing a second wave of hospitalizations. If relaxation
252 begins immediately or the vaccine primarily protects against severe disease rather than infection, a
253 new wave of hospitalizations is expected unless vaccine rollout can be achieved at 3 million doses/day
254 and a two dose strategy is used (Figure S5, Figure S6). Moreover, this wave of hospitalizations
255 would be expected to exceed the levels of burden seen in early January 2021 at the slower rollout
256 speed unless the rate of relaxation is slow, even with a two dose strategy. However, if relaxation
257 is delayed for unvaccinated individuals for 3 months, a second wave of hospitalizations can be
258 prevented if vaccination can be rolled out quickly and vaccine efficacy is high or if vaccine rollout is
259 slower and relaxation occurs gradually over a 3-5 month period (Figure 4). Delays greater than 3
260 months can allow NPIs to be relaxed more quickly once reopening occurs without risking a second
261 wave.

262 If baseline immunity is lower than we have modeled, a slightly longer delay in relaxation would
263 be needed (Figure S7). For a two dose vaccine with fast rollout, a 3 month delay brought expected
264 additional deaths to under 178,000, but waiting an additional 2 months (reopening after 150 days)
265 could save an additional 62,000 lives, dropping expected deaths to 116,000. Delays less than 3
266 months led to dramatic increases in expected deaths, with a complete reopening after 60 days
267 leading to 314,000 deaths. If vaccine rollout was only 1 million doses/day, a delay of at least 7
268 months was needed to minimize deaths.

269 Discussion

270 Widespread vaccination has the potential to greatly reduce the adverse health consequences of the
271 COVID-19 pandemic and allow a quicker return to normal social interactions with relative safety.

272 If NPIs were relaxed quickly and no vaccination were used, 1.2 million more deaths over the next
273 year would be expected, with a high level of ongoing transmission occurring throughout the next
274 year. In contrast, vaccination with a two dose series coupled with a delayed relaxation of NPIs
275 could reduce deaths by up to 93% (with expected additional deaths between February 1, 2021 and
276 February 1, 2022 falling to 84,200), and the epidemic largely being over within 3 months. This
277 shortening of the epidemic depends on a rapid rate of vaccination, with a substantially prolonged
278 epidemic being expected if only 1 million doses/day can be achieved. For example, with a 90 day
279 delay in reopening and a slow reopening speed, transmission would be ongoing over the next year,
280 even if a two dose strategy is used.

281 Compared with beginning to relax NPIs immediately, a delay of at least 3 months could greatly
282 enhance the impact of vaccination, with reopening speed playing a smaller role. Society at large
283 may consider a more rapid reopening after a modest delay optimal, given the social, economic,
284 and public health implications of a sustained shutdown. Delaying reopening allows time to improve
285 treatment, which could reduce mortality. Preliminary evidence suggests that case fatality rates have
286 already begun to decline [31], and preserving health care capacity through a controlled reopening
287 plan can help this pattern continue.

288 Moreover, even while delaying widespread reopening, our model suggests that allowing vacci-
289 nated individuals to begin relaxing social distancing as soon as they complete their vaccine series
290 poses limited population risk, and could allow a substantial fraction of the population to return
291 to normal activities more quickly, alleviating some of the social and economic costs of delaying
292 reopening further. In practice, given that front-line workers have been prioritized for vaccination,
293 allowing these individuals to relax first might lead to further reductions in risk than we have mod-
294 eled if these individuals ultimately constitute more of social interactions, serving as immune shields
295 [32, 33].

296 Additional interventions might enable the US epidemic to end sooner, ultimately enabling a
297 quicker return to normal activity levels. We have not modeled vaccination of children because they
298 have so far not been included in clinical trials [34]. However, if pediatric vaccination is shown to
299 be safe and effective, child vaccination could also allow herd immunity to be reached more quickly
300 and for it to be sustained in the long term. Other NPIs could also enhance the potential benefits
301 of vaccination. For example, increased nationwide mask usage might also be contributing to the
302 observed decline in cases [35].

303 While the indirect effects of COVID-19 vaccines are uncertain, we find that the expected impacts
304 of vaccination are similar when impacts on transmission were at least moderate (70% reduction in
305 susceptibility). Given the high level of impact against symptomatic COVID-19, we expect that
306 there will be a degree of protection against infection. If protection against infection is far lower, the
307 potential benefits of vaccination will be reduced. Post-licensure studies could help provide clarity
308 on the mechanism of action for approved vaccines, including whether or not vaccination reduces

309 infectiousness or susceptibility to infection, either of which would provide indirect benefits to un-
310 vaccinated individuals [13, 14]. Already, preliminary evidence from the Pfizer vaccine suggests that
311 effectiveness against asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 is high and may be similar to impacts observed
312 for symptomatic infection [16].

313 Two crucial factors might have led us to overestimate the total impact of vaccination. First,
314 if new strains of COVID-19 emerge against which available vaccines are not protective, vaccine
315 impact could be reduced. Additionally, even if vaccination is effective, if these strains are more
316 transmissible, ongoing NPIs might be needed for longer to prevent surges in cases and vaccine
317 coverage might need to be higher before restrictions can be safely relaxed. Some have cautioned
318 that pursuing a one-dose strategy might increase the risk of evolution of vaccine-resistant strains,
319 but this concern remains speculative [36]. As of early March 2021, at least three new variants of
320 concern have emerged, including the UK strain, the South African strain, and the Brazilian strain.
321 At present, all three vaccines approved for emergency use appear to be protective against these
322 strains, but possibly to a lesser extent than the initial variants circulating at the time of vaccine
323 development [37, 38]. Follow-up studies are planned to determine vaccine effectiveness against these
324 and potentially future variants of concern. However, immune escape is still a distinct possibility.

325 Second, due to a lack of data and the short time scale of our simulations, we did not account for
326 waning immunity in our models either for natural infection or for vaccination. Depending on the
327 duration and degree of immunity, additional waves of transmission are possible, particularly if many
328 individuals choose not to become vaccinated [39]. If immunity is relatively short, high vaccination
329 rates combined with follow up booster doses for vaccinated individuals might be necessary to prevent
330 future transmission waves [39].

331 In conclusion, we have found that widespread vaccination has the potential to reduce deaths
332 from COVID-19, lessen health system strain, and shorten the length of the COVID-19 pandemic,
333 even as non-pharmaceutical interventions continue to be relaxed. Based on currently available
334 data, we find that using the full recommended series for approved vaccines is likely to make a
335 substantial impact. A one dose series could outperform a two dose series, but if vaccine rollout can
336 be achieved at 3 million doses/day, the additional benefit of a one dose strategy is minimal and the
337 potential risk is high, particularly if VE is low. Using this strategy, a three month delay in further
338 reopening followed by gradual relaxation provides the best opportunity to minimize deaths, with
339 normal interactions being restored within 4 months. Our findings support quick return to normal
340 social interactions for vaccinated people. Additional data on the indirect effects of vaccination and
341 the extent and duration of naturally-acquired and vaccine-derived immunity are urgently needed
342 to help guide policy at this critical stage of the US epidemic. Monitoring circulating strains of
343 COVID-19 as well as vaccine efficacy against them is also critical to ensure ongoing efficacy and
344 determine if vaccine reformulation will be necessary.

345 1 Supplementary information

346 1.1 Model equations

347 In the equations below, the subscript i denotes age group, the subscript j denotes risk group (high or
348 low) and the subscripts vax and nv indicate equations for vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals,
349 respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_{i,j,nv}}{dt} &= -S_{i,j,nv}\beta_{j,nv}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{C_{i,e}}{N_c} [(I_{c,j,nv} + A_{c,j,nv} + I_{c,j,vax} + A_{c,j,vax}) + & (1) \\ &\frac{C_{i,a}}{N_a} (I_{a,j,nv} + A_{a,j,nv} + I_{a,j,vax} + A_{a,j,vax}) + & (2) \\ &\frac{C_{i,e}}{N_e} (I_{e,j,nv} + A_{e,j,k} + I_{e,j,vax} + A_{e,j,vax})] - \lambda_{i,j} \frac{vax_{i,j}}{N_{i,j}} S_{i,j,k} & (3) \\ \frac{dE_{i,j,nv}}{dt} &= S_{i,j,nv}\beta_{j,nv}\sum_{j=1}^n [\frac{C_{i,e}}{N_c} (I_{c,j,nv} + A_{c,j,nv} + I_{c,j,vax} + A_{c,j,vax}) + & (4) \\ &\frac{C_{i,a}}{N_a} (I_{a,j,nv} + A_{a,j,nv} + I_{a,j,vax} + A_{a,j,vax}) + & (5) \\ &\frac{C_{i,e}}{N_e} (I_{e,j,nv} + A_{e,j,k} + I_{e,j,vax} + A_{e,j,vax})] - \sigma_i E_{i,j,nv} & (6) \\ \frac{dA_{i,j,nv}}{dt} &= (1 - \nu_k)\sigma_i E_{i,j,nv} - \gamma_A A_{i,j,nv} & (7) \\ \frac{dI_{i,j,nv}}{dt} &= \nu\sigma_i E_{i,j,nv} - \gamma_I I_{i,j,nv} & (8) \\ \frac{dH_{i,j,nv}}{dt} &= \phi_{i,k}\gamma_I I_{i,j,nv} - \gamma_H H_{i,j,nv} & (9) \\ \frac{dR_{i,j,nv}}{dt} &= \gamma_A A_{i,j,nv} + (1 - \phi_i)\gamma_I I_{i,j,nv} + (1 - \rho_i)\gamma_H H_{i,j,nv} - \lambda_{i,j} \frac{vax_{i,j}}{N_{i,j}} R_{i,j,nv} & (10) \\ \frac{dM_{i,j,nv}}{dt} &= \rho_i \gamma_H H_{i,j,nv} & (11) \\ \frac{dcum(I_{i,j,nv})}{dt} &= \nu_k \sigma_i E_{i,j,nv} & (12) \\ \frac{dcum(H_{i,j,nv})}{dt} &= \phi_i \gamma_I I_{i,j,nv} & (13) \\ \frac{dS_{i,j,vax}}{dt} &= -S_{i,j,vax}\beta_{j,k}\sum_{j=1}^n [\frac{C_{i,c}}{N_c} (I_{c,j,nv} + A_{c,j,nv} + I_{c,j,vax} + A_{c,j,vax}) + & (14) \\ &\frac{C_{i,a}}{N_a} (I_{a,j,nv} + A_{a,j,nv} + I_{a,j,vax} + A_{a,j,vax}) + & (15) \\ &\frac{C_{i,e}}{N_e} (I_{e,j,nv} + A_{e,j,k} + I_{e,j,vax} + A_{e,j,vax})] + \lambda_{i,j} \frac{vax_{i,j}}{N_{i,j}} S_{i,j,nv} & (16) \\ \frac{dE_{i,j,vax}}{dt} &= S_{i,j,vax}\beta_{j,k}\sum_{j=1}^n [\frac{C_{i,c}}{N_c} (I_{c,j,nv} + A_{c,j,nv} + I_{c,j,vax} + A_{c,j,vax}) + & (17) \\ &\frac{C_{i,a}}{N_a} (I_{a,j,nv} + A_{a,j,nv} + I_{a,j,vax} + A_{a,j,vax}) + & (18) \\ &\frac{C_{i,e}}{N_e} (I_{e,j,nv} + A_{e,j,k} + I_{e,j,vax} + A_{e,j,vax})] - \sigma_i E_{i,j,vax} & (19) \\ \frac{dA_{i,j,vax}}{dt} &= (1 - \nu_{i,v})\sigma_i E_{i,j,vax} - \gamma_{Av} A_{i,j,vax} & (20) \\ \frac{dI_{i,j,vax}}{dt} &= \nu_{i,v}\sigma_{i,v} E_{i,j,vax} - \gamma_{Iv} I_{i,j,vax} & (21) \\ \frac{dH_{i,j,vax}}{dt} &= \phi_{i,v}\gamma_{I,v} I_{i,j,vax} - \gamma_{Hv} H_{i,j,vax} & (22) \\ \frac{dR_{i,j,vax}}{dt} &= \gamma_{Av} A_{i,vax} + (1 - \phi_{i,vax})\gamma_{Iv} I_{i,v} + (1 - \rho_{i,vax})\gamma_{Hv} H_{i,vax} + \lambda_{i,j} \frac{vax_{i,j}}{N_{i,j}} R_{i,j,nv} & (23) \\ \frac{dM_{i,j,vax}}{dt} &= \rho_{i,v}\gamma_{H,v} H_{i,v} & (24) \\ \frac{dcum(I_{i,v})}{dt} &= \nu_{i,v}\sigma_{i,v} E_{i,vax} & (25) \\ \frac{dcum(H_{i,v})}{dt} &= \phi_{i,v}\gamma_{I,v} I_{i,vax} & (26) \end{aligned}$$

350 **1.2 Model parameters**

351 **1.2.1 Overall model parameters**

352 **Parameter values**

Abbreviation	Name	Value (Range)	Source(s)
\mathcal{R}_0	basic reproduction number	2.5 (2-4)	[40] [41] [42]
β	transmission rate for low risk group †	0.0186	Calibrated*
$\frac{1}{\sigma}$	latent period (days)	5.5 (3.0, 6.7)	[43] [44] [45]
ν	probability of symptomatic infection	0.6 (0.3, 0.9)	[46] [47] [48]
$\frac{1}{\gamma_I}$	infectious period, symptomatic (days)	7	[49]
$\frac{1}{\gamma_A}$	infectious period, asymptomatic (days)	7	[49]
$\frac{1}{\gamma_H}$	Hospital LOS in US (days)	5 (3-9)	[50]
ϕ	probability of hospitalization	0.18 (0.099, 0.298)	[51]
	probability of hospitalization (children)	0.0075	
	probability of hospitalization (adults)	0.15	
	probability of hospitalization (elderly)	0.45	
ρ	probability of death (children)	0.0	[52]
	probability of death (adults)	0.0465	[52]
	probability of death (elderly)	0.266	[52]
λ	vaccination doses available (per month) $\beta\beta$	30-92 million	[27]
$vax_{e,h}$	fraction of initial doses received (elderly, high risk)	40%	assumption
$vax_{e,l}$	fraction of initial doses received (elderly, low risk)	30%	assumption
$vax_{a,h}$	fraction of initial doses received	20%	assumption
$vax_{a,l}$	fraction of initial doses received	10%	assumption
v_{max}	maximum vaccine coverage in any age group	80%	assumption
κ	Reporting rate for symptomatic cases (fraction)	0.75	assumption
Initial conditions			
N	Total population size	328 million	[53]
$R(0)$	Number recovered at $t = 0$	32.8 million	
$I(0)$	Number symptomatically infected at $t = 0$	$839,291 \times \frac{1}{\kappa}$	[54]
$A(0)$	Number asymptotically infected at $t = 0$	$\frac{1}{\nu} \times I(0) \times (1 - \nu)$	[54]
$H(0)$	Number hospitalized at $t = 0$	104,600	[54]
$S(0)$	Number susceptible at $t = 0$	$N - (R + I + A + H)$	[54, 53]

Table S1: Parameter values for the model are informed by the current best estimates in the SARS-CoV-2 literature.

353 *Calibrated to $\mathcal{R}_0 = 2.5$. This assumes that the baseline transmission rate is the same by age
 354 group

355

356 1.2.2 Model stratification

357 The relative size of each age group was estimated using the US Census data. Within each age group,
 358 the fraction of the population considered occupationally exposed was estimated based on the NAP
 359 report for prioritization of frontline workers. Both the fraction of the population with high levels
 360 of susceptibility and the relative risk of infection for high susceptible individuals was taken from
 361 Clark et al. To produce an upper bound on the size of the high risk group, the size of these two
 362 groups were summed (used in model runs in the main text). The lower bound can be estimated
 363 by assuming that all high susceptibility individuals are also occupationally exposed. There is no
 364 difference between these two assumptions for the elderly or for children (because neither age group
 365 is occupationally exposed).

Parameter	Age group		
	Children (<20 years)	Adults (20-64 years)	Elderly (≥ 65 years)
Fraction of overall population in age group ¹	18.7%	68.7%	12.6%
Fraction high susceptibility ²	2.5%	13.5%	75%
Relative risk of severe disease high susceptibility vs. low (reference group) ²	2.0	2.55	2.55
Fraction occupationally exposed ³	0	23%	0
Fraction in high risk group	2.5%	23.0%-36.5%	75%

1. Based on US Census population in 2019 [53]

2. Parameters taken from Clark et al, 2020 for the US using the spreadsheet tool [19]

3. Based on NAP report for prioritization for front-line workers[20]

Table S2: Parameter values by group

366 1.3 Model calibration

367 Overall, the modeled hospitalizations were consistent with observed data in late February. For
 368 model calibration, we assumed the higher bound of baseline immunity (32%) and one million doses
 369 of vaccine per day.

370 1.4 Relative one-dose efficacy

371 Where one dose efficacy was less than 100%, the corresponding efficacy values were calculated sep-
 372 arately for a susceptibility only and a susceptibility and severity vaccine. For the susceptibility and
 373 severity vaccine, $VE_{susceptibility}$ and $VE_{progression}$ were calculated as follows, by relative efficacy
 374 (RE) values:




Figure S1: Consistency between modeled hospitalizations (black line) and observed data (points) from the Covid Tracking Project [1]




Figure S2: Deaths between February 1, 2021 and February 1, 2022 for different vaccination strategies and relative performance with no relaxation of NPIs. This figure shows performance for a susceptibility only vaccine, but results for a susceptibility and severity vaccine were similar.

$$(1 - RE \times VE) = (1 - RE \times VE_{susceptibility})(1 - a \times VE_{progression})$$

375 We then solved for the value of a that satisfied the equation to get the appropriate VE values.
 376 In the main text, we focus on a one dose vaccine with an 80% relative efficacy, as this is similar to
 377 initial data for Pfizer [16].

378 1.5 Hospitalization with constant NPIs

379 1.6 Sensitivity analyses

380 In sensitivity analysis, we assessed the sensitivity of model conclusions to: 1) the level of baseline
 381 immunity, 2) lower RE values, 3) the extent of delay in reopening, and 4) vaccine mechanism of




Figure S3: Predicted hospitalizations if NPIs are sustained at their current level for the duration of the simulation (2 years)

382 action.

383 1.6.1 Varying RE value

384 To illustrate the impact of relaxation under different RE scenarios, we re-ran the heat map in the
385 main text showing results for 100% and 60% relative efficacy. In general, results were similar, but
386 a 60% relative efficacy vaccine requires a longer delay before further relaxation begins, with a delay
387 of 4-7 months being needed, depending on the rate of vaccination.

388 1.6.2 Hospitalizations if no delay in reopening

389 Without delaying reopening, the model predicts that the US healthcare system would quickly
390 surpass levels seen in early January 2021 at the peak health system load unless vaccination can be
391 rolled out at 3 million doses/day or relaxation occurred gradually over a 6-12 month period.

392 1.6.3 Susceptibility and severity vaccine

393 Similar to reopening without a delay, the model predicts that if protection against asymptomatic
394 infection is less pronounced, the US healthcare system would quickly surpass levels seen in early
395 January at the peak health system load unless vaccination can be rolled out at 3 million doses/day
396 or relaxation occurred gradually over a 6-12 month period.




Figure S4: Relaxation tradeoff for varying levels of relative efficacy and rollout speeds for a susceptibility only vaccine.




Figure S5: Number of hospitalized cases over time if non-pharmaceutical interventions begin to be relaxed for everyone of February 1, 2021 based on dosing strategy and speed of reopening for a susceptibility only vaccine. The black line shows the number of individuals hospitalized on January 12, 2021 (131,326), which was the peak of US hospitalizations.




Figure S6: Number of hospitalized cases over time if non-pharmaceutical interventions begin to be relaxed for unvaccinated individuals after 90 days based on dosing strategy and speed of reopening for a susceptibility and severity vaccine. Vaccinated individuals relax as soon as they complete their vaccine series. The black line shows the number of individuals hospitalized on January 12, 2021 (131,326), which was the peak of US hospitalizations.




Figure S7: Relaxation tradeoff for deaths for varying relaxation speeds for a susceptibility only vaccine assuming baseline immunity is 16%.

397 **1.6.4 Lower baseline immunity (16%)**

398 With a lower level of baseline immunity, the delay needed to minimize deaths is slightly longer, and
399 expected deaths are higher.

400 References

- 401 [1] Covid tracking project, howpublished = <https://covidtracking.com/data>, note = Accessed:
402 2021-01-16.
- 403 [2] Nadir Yehya, Atheendar Venkataramani, and Michael O Harhay. Statewide interventions and
404 covid-19 mortality in the united states: An observational study. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*,
405 page ciaa923, 2020.
- 406 [3] Y Li, H Campbell, D Kulkarni, A Harpur, M Nundy, and X Wang. The temporal association of
407 introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with the time-varying reproduction
408 number (r) of sars-cov-2: a modelling study across 131 countries. *Lancet Infectious Diseases*,
409 2020.
- 410 [4] Food and Drug Administration. Fda news release: Fda takes key action in fight against covid-
411 19 by issuing emergency use authorization for first covid-19 vaccine, 2020.
- 412 [5] Food and Drug Administration. Fda news release: Fda takes additional action in fight against
413 covid-19 by issuing emergency use authorization for second covid-19 vaccine, 2020.
- 414 [6] Food and Drug Administration. Fda issues emergency use authorization for third covid-19
415 vaccine, 2021.
- 416 [7] Fernando P Pollack, Stephen J Thomas, Nicholas Kitchin, Judith Absalon, Alejandra Gurtman,
417 Stephen Lockhart, John L Perez, Gonzalo P Marc, and et al. Safety and efficacy of the bnt162b2
418 mrna covid-19 vaccine. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383:2603–2615, 2020.
- 419 [8] Lindsay R Baden, Hana M ElSahly, Brandon Essink, Karen Kotloff, Sharon Frey, Rick Novak,
420 David Diemert, Stephen A Spector, Nadine Roupheal, Buddy Creech, John McGettigan, and
421 et al. Khetan, Shishir. Efficacy and safety of the mrna-1273 sars-cov-2 vaccine. *New England*
422 *Journal of Medicine*, 2020.
- 423 [9] Laura Matrajt, Julia Eaton, Tiffany Leung, Dobromir Dimitrov, Joshua T Schiffer, and Holly
424 Janes. Optimizing vaccine allocation for covid-19 vaccines: potential role of single-dose vacci-
425 nation. *Medrxiv*, 2021.
- 426 [10] A David Paltiel, Amy Zhang, and Jason L Schwartz. Speed versus efficacy: Quantifying
427 potential tradeoffs in covid-19 vaccine deployment. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 2021.
- 428 [11] Joseph T Wu, Corey M Peak, Gabriel M Leung, and Lipsitch Marc. Fractional dosing of yellow
429 fever vaccine to extend supply: A modeling study. *Lancet*, 388(10062):2904–2911, 2016.

- 430 [12] Laura Matrajt, Tom Britton, M Elizabeth Halloran, and Ira M Longini. One versus two doses:
431 what is the best use of vaccine in an influenza pandemic? *Epidemics*, Dec(13):17–27, 2015.
- 432 [13] Molly E Gallagher, Andrew J Sieben, Kristin N Nelson, Alicia N M Kraay, Walter A Orenstein,
433 Ben Lopman, Andreas Handel, and Katia Koelle. Indirect benefits are a crucial consideration
434 when evaluating sars-cov-2 vaccine candidates. *Nature Medicine*, 27:4–5, 2021.
- 435 [14] Marc Lipsitch and Natalie Dean. Understanding covid-19 vaccine efficacy. *Science*, 370:763–
436 765, 2020.
- 437 [15] M Elizabeth Halloran, Claudio J Struchiner, and Ira J Longini. Study designs for evaluating
438 different efficacy and effectiveness aspects of vaccines. *American Journal of Epidemiology*,
439 146:789–803, 1997.
- 440 [16] Noa Dagan, Noam Barda, Eldad Keptan, Orden Miron, Shay Perchik, Mark A Katz, Miguel A
441 Hernan, Marc Lipsitch, Ben Reis, and Ran D Balicer. Bnt162b2 mrna covid-19 vaccine in a
442 nationwide mass vaccination setting. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2021.
- 443 [17] Marc Lipsitch and Rebecca Kahn. Interpreting vaccine efficacy trial results for infection and
444 transmission. *Medrxiv*.
- 445 [18] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim public health recommendations for fully
446 vaccinated people, 2021.
- 447 [19] Andrew Clark, Mark Jit, Charlotte Warren-Gash, Bruce Guthrie, Stewart W Mercer, Colin
448 Sanderson, Martin McKee, Christopher Troeger, Kanyin L Ong, Francesco Checchi, Pablo
449 Perel, Sarah Joseph, Hamish P Gibbs, Amitava Banerjee, and Rosalind M Eggo. Global,
450 regional, and national estimates of the population at increased risk of severe covid-19 due to
451 underlying health conditions in 2020: a modelling study. *Lancet Global Health*, 8:e1003–e1017,
452 2020.
- 453 [20] Engineering National Academies of Sciences and Medicine. *Framework for Equitable Allocation*
454 *of COVID-19 Vaccine*. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2020.
- 455 [21] Jennie S Lavine, Ottar N Bjornstad, and Rustom Antia. Immunological characteristics govern
456 the transition of covid-19 to endemicity. *Science*, 371:741–745, 2021.
- 457 [22] Nationwide commercial laboratory seroprevalence survey, 2021.
- 458 [23] American Community Survey. 2019: Acs 1-year estimates subject tables, 2021.
- 459 [24] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Cdc’s covid-19 vaccine rollout recommendations,
460 2021.

- 461 [25] Kimberly A Fisher, Sarah J Bloomstone, Jeremy Walder, Sybil Crawford, Hassan Fouayzi, and
462 Kathleen M Mazor. Attitudes toward a potential sars-cov-2 vaccine : A survey of u.s. adults.
463 *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 173:964–973, 2020.
- 464 [26] Jagdish Khubchandani, Sushil Sharma, James H Price, Michael J Wiblishauser, Manoj Sharma,
465 and Fern J Webb. Covid-19 vaccination hesitancy in the united states: A rapid national
466 assessment. *J Community Health*, Jan 3:1–8, 2021.
- 467 [27] CDC. Weekly national flu vaccination dashboard, 2021.
- 468 [28] Joseph Biden. Remarks by president Biden on the fight to contain the covid-19 pandemic,
469 2021.
- 470 [29] National Public Radio Alana Wise. The coronavirus crisis: Biden says u.s. will have vaccine
471 supply for all adults by may, prioritizes teachers, 2021.
- 472 [30] Keisha Prem, Alex R Cook, and Mark Jit. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries
473 using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13:e1005697, 2017.
- 474 [31] John M Dennis, Andrew P McGovern, Sebastian J Vollmer, and Bilal A Mateen. Improving
475 survival of critical care patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in england: A national cohort
476 study, march to june 2020*. *Critical Care Medicine*, 49:209–214, 2021.
- 477 [32] Joshua S Weitz, Stephen J Beckett, Ashley R Coenen, David Demory, Marian Dominguez-
478 Mirazo, Jonathan Dushoff, Chung-Yin Leung, Guanlin Li, and et al. Modeling shield immunity
479 to reduce covid-19 epidemic spread. *Nature Medicine*, 26:849–854, 2020.
- 480 [33] Alicia N M Kraay, Kristin N Nelson, Conan Y Zhao, David Demory, Joshua S Weitz, and
481 Benjamin A Lopman. Modeling serological testing to inform relaxation of social distancing for
482 covid-19 control. *Medrxiv*, 2020.
- 483 [34] Evan J Anderson, James D Campbell, C Buddy Creech, Robert Frenck, Satoshi Kamidani,
484 Flor M Munoz, Sharon Nachman, and Paul Spearman. Warp speed for covid-19 vaccines: Why
485 are children stuck in neutral? *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2020.
- 486 [35] Executive order on protecting the federal workforce and requiring mask-wearing, 2021.
- 487 [36] Sarah Cobey, Daniel B Larremore, Yonatan H Grad, and Marc Lipsitch. Concerns about sars-
488 cov-2 evolution should not hold back efforts to expand vaccination. *DASH Pre-print Server*,
489 2021.
- 490 [37] Xuping Xie, Jing Zou, Camila R. Fontes-Garfias, Hongjie Xia, Kena A. Swanson, Mark Cutler,
491 David Cooper, Vineet D. Menachery, Scott Weaver, Philip R. Dormitzer, and Pei-Yong Shi.
492 Neutralization of n501y mutant sars-cov-2 by bnt162b2 vaccine-elicited sera. *bioRxiv*, 2021.

- 493 [38] Moderna. Statement on variants of the sars-cov-2 virus, 2020.
- 494 [39] Chadi M Saad-Roy, Caroline E Wagner, Rachel E Baker, Sinead E Morris, Jeremy Farrar,
495 Jeremy L Graham, Simon A Levin, Michael J Mina, Jessica E Metcalf, and Bryan T Grenfell.
496 Immune life history, vaccination, and the dynamics of sars-cov-2 over the next 5 years. *Science*,
497 370:811–818, 2020.
- 498 [40] Matteo Chinazzi, Jessica T Davis, Marco Ajelli, Corrado Gioannini, Maria Litvinova, Stefano
499 Merler, Ana Pastore y Piontti, Kumpeng Mu, Luca Rossi, Kaiyuan Sun, et al. The effect of
500 travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (covid-19) outbreak. *Science*,
501 368(6489):395–400, 2020.
- 502 [41] Qun Li, Xuhua Guan, Peng Wu, Xiaoye Wang, Lei Zhou, Yeqing Tong, Ruiqi Ren, Kathy SM
503 Leung, Eric HY Lau, Jessica Y Wong, et al. Early transmission dynamics in wuhan, china, of
504 novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2020.
- 505 [42] César V Munayco, Amna Tariq, Richard Rothenberg, Gabriela G Soto-Cabezas, Mary F Reyes,
506 Andree Valle, Leonardo Rojas-Mezarina, César Cabezas, Manuel Loayza, Gerardo Chowell,
507 et al. Early transmission dynamics of covid-19 in a southern hemisphere setting: Lima-peru:
508 February 29th–march 30th, 2020. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 2020.
- 509 [43] Stephen A Lauer, Kyra H Grantz, Qifang Bi, Forrest K Jones, Qulu Zheng, Hannah R Meredith,
510 Andrew S Azman, Nicholas G Reich, and Justin Lessler. The incubation period of corona-
511 virus disease 2019 (covid-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and appli-
512 cation. *Annals of internal medicine*, 172(9):577–582, 2020.
- 513 [44] Conor McAloon, Áine Collins, Kevin Hunt, Ann Barber, Andrew W Byrne, Francis Butler,
514 Miriam Casey, John Griffin, Elizabeth Lane, David McEvoy, Patrick Wall, Martin Green, Luke
515 O’Grady, and Simon J More. Incubation period of covid-19: a rapid systematic review and
516 meta-analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open*, 10(8), 2020.
- 517 [45] Xi He, Eric HY Lau, Peng Wu, Xilong Deng, Jian Wang, Xinxin Hao, Yiu Chung Lau, Jes-
518 sica Y Wong, Yujuan Guan, Xinghua Tan, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and
519 transmissibility of covid-19. *Nature Medicine*, 26(5):672–675, 2020.
- 520 [46] Oyungerel Byambasuren, Magnolia Cardona, Katy Bell, Justin Clark, Mary-Louise McLaws,
521 and Paul Glasziou. Estimating the extent of true asymptomatic covid-19 and its potential for
522 community transmission: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Available at SSRN 3586675*,
523 2020.
- 524 [47] Piero Poletti, Marcello Tirani, Danilo Cereda, Filippo Trentini, Giorgio Guzzetta, Giuliana
525 Sabatino, Valentina Marziano, Ambra Castrofino, Francesca Grosso, Gabriele Del Castillo,

- 526 Raffaella Piccarreta, ATS Lombardy COVID-19 Task Force, Aida Andreassi, Alessia Melegaro,
527 Maria Gramegna, Marco Ajelli, and Stefano Merler. Probability of symptoms and critical
528 disease after sars-cov-2 infection, 2020.
- 529 [48] Daniel P Oran and Eric J Topol. Prevalence of asymptomatic sars-cov-2 infection: A narrative
530 review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 2020.
- 531 [49] Stephen M. Kissler, Christine Tedijanto, Edward Goldstein, Yonatan H. Grad, and Marc Lip-
532 sitch. Projecting the transmission dynamics of sars-cov-2 through the postpandemic period.
533 *Science*, 368(6493):860–868, 2020.
- 534 [50] Eleanor M Rees, Emily S Nightingale, Yalda Jafari, Naomi Waterlow, Samuel Clifford, Carl
535 A B Pearson, Thibaut Jombert, Simon R Procter, and Gwenan M Knight. Covid-19 length of
536 hospital stay: a systematic review and data synthesis. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- 537 [51] Joseph Chadi Lemaitre, Kyra H Grantz, Joshua Kaminsky, Hannah R Meredith, Shaun A
538 Truelove, Stephen A Lauer, Lindsay T Keegan, Sam Shah, Josh Wills, Kathryn Kaminsky,
539 Javier Perez-Saez, Justin Lessler, and Elizabeth C Lee. A scenario modeling pipeline for
540 COVID-19 emergency planning. *medRxiv*, June 2020.
- 541 [52] CDC. COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios, 2020.
- 542 [53] US Census Bureau. Age and Sex Composition in the United States: 2018.
- 543 [54] Covid Tracking Project. The Covid tracking project national overview, 2021.