

# 1 Maximisation of open hospital capacity under shortage of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines

2  
3 **Wolfram A. Bosbach<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Martin Heinrich<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Rainer Kolisch<sup>4</sup>, Christian Heiss<sup>1,2</sup>**

## 4 **Affiliation:**

5 <sup>1</sup>Experimental Trauma Surgery, Justus Liebig University of Giessen, Giessen, Germany

6 <sup>2</sup>Department of Trauma, Hand and Reconstructive Surgery, University Hospital of Giessen, Giessen, Germany

7 <sup>3</sup>Covid-19 Emergency Taskforce, University Hospital of Giessen, Giessen, Germany

8 <sup>4</sup>TUM School of Management, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

9 \*Correspondence: [wolfram.bosbach@med.uni-giessen.de](mailto:wolfram.bosbach@med.uni-giessen.de)

10 Received: date; Accepted: date; Published: date

## 14 **Abstract:**

15 **Motive.** The Covid-19 pandemic has led to the novel situation that hospitals must prioritise staff for a  
16 vaccine rollout while there is acute shortage of the vaccine. In spite of the availability of guidelines from  
17 state agencies, there is partial confusion about what an optimal rollout plan is. This study investigates effects  
18 in a hospital model under different rollout schemes. **Methods.** A simulation model is implemented in VBA  
19 and studied for parameter variation. The implemented code is available as open access supplement. **Main**  
20 **results.** A rollout scheme assigning vaccine doses to staff primarily by staff's pathogen exposure maximises  
21 the predicted open hospital capacity when compared to a rollout based on hierarchical prioritisation. The  
22 effect increases under resource scarcity and increasing disease activity. Nursing staff benefits most from an  
23 exposure focused rollout. **Conclusions.** The model employs SARS-CoV-2 parameters; nonetheless, effects  
24 observable in the model are transferable to other infectious diseases. Necessary future prioritisation plans  
25 need to consider pathogen characteristics and social factors.

## 29 **1. Introduction.**

30 With the availability of Covid-19 vaccinations (1,2), hospital operations management has faced worldwide  
31 the new situation that a vaccine rollout scheme for hospital staff had to be implemented. Due to scarcity of  
32 vaccine doses, prioritisation decisions have to be made during this rollout. This study makes a contribution  
33 to this topic by investigating consequences from different rollout schemes. The study's focus is the  
34 maximisation of open hospital capacity which is assumed to maximise patient benefit.  
35 Research studies from the pre-Corona age exist. Their focus was to prove benefit from vaccination policies  
36 (3–5). Shortage of vaccine supply was not a particular focus topic; it was known for e.g. yellow fever (14).  
37 Instead rather an oversupply and mandatory vaccination were discussed (6). The early 2020 vaccination  
38 framework of the World Health Organisation (WHO) already included aspects of prioritisation decisions for a  
39 vaccination rollout against the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (7). The  
40 general logistics of the large scale Covid-19 vaccine rollout currently taking place require vaccine doses,  
41 vaccinating staff administering the doses, and a process to assign it to patients (8). Rollout recommendations  
42 or deployment plans have been developed and published by state agencies (9,10), also with details on the  
43 process of vaccine recommendation decisions (11).  
44 There is a general agreement that vaccines should be used to their best potential to curb the pandemic's  
45 consequences, in particular during the early vaccine rollout phase when shortage of vaccine supply prohibits  
46 an immediate full rollout to the entire population. Decision making under shortage of resources is known  
47 from other important medical supplies in connection with the current pandemic (12,13). Insights into  
48 prioritisation decisions and their consequences have been published for studies considering the entire  
49 population (15–19). Delaying a 2<sup>nd</sup> dose if required by drug regime has been discussed as option to reduce  
50 vaccine shortage (20,21). In spite of the available material and dedicated rollout recommendations, e.g.  
51 (9,10), decision making about rollouts to hospital staff can still prove to be controversial. The weighing in of  
52 factors such as hierarchical importance (22,23), or student status (24) can lead to differences in the rollout  
53 scheme and prioritisation among hospital staff. The rollout in the United Kingdom so far has been successful  
54 (25). Subgroups of a population such as those economically worse off (26), or minorities (27) can be

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

55 requiring special attention however. Also, nursing staff who by the nature of their work are in close contact  
 56 to patients must not be forgotten in rollout schemes and prioritisation (28).  
 57 In this presented study here, a model hospital is simulated and its capacity is calculated. The hospital's  
 58 capacity is limited by available staff. Staff are exposed to the pathogen and are vaccinated after two  
 59 different rollout schemes which are compared to each other. The first rollout scheme assigns vaccine doses  
 60 in **hierarchical order top down**. It relates to arguments made in the past (22,23) that higher ranking staff are  
 61 fewer in number, more important as individuals for the functioning of the hospital, and that they are of  
 62 greater age which can increase the transmission probability of a pathogen. The alternative rollout scheme  
 63 first prioritises between hospitals units by **exposure to the pathogen**. Accidents & Emergencies (A&E) where  
 64 exposure to non-tested outpatients happens is assigned vaccine doses first and hospital wards follow  
 65 behind. On each unit, vaccines are assigned in hierarchical order.  
 66 The model is implemented as Visual Basic for Application (VBA) macro. The macro and its embedded version  
 67 in Microsoft-Excel are available as open access supplement 1 and 2 under the GNU General Public License  
 68 version 3, or any later version. We hope that the open access macro code will further exchange and make  
 69 accessibility of the study's work easier. A similar project with results for an entire population, split by age  
 70 groups, is published under (18), pre-corona work about hospital staff under (3,4,6). The study's methodology  
 71 uses an algorithm similar to known work from hospital capacity planning (29). Staff and vaccines are  
 72 modelled as streams, similar as in (30). It applies novel insights into the epidemiological spreading of SARS-  
 73 CoV-2 (31,32), and factors influencing disease spreading such as age (33,34).  
 74 The study's parameters are set to values typical for the current SARS-CoV-2. However, the methodology and  
 75 the implemented model are equally applicable to other infectious diseases. Although mostly gone unnoticed  
 76 in Europe and North America, the list of major infectious disease outbreaks in e.g. Hong Kong during the 25  
 77 years before the ongoing SARS-CoV-2 pandemic included avian flu H5N1 in 1997, SARS in 2003, swine flu  
 78 2009, and avian flu H7N9 in 2013 (35). Hence, a vaccine rollout in the general population and amongst  
 79 hospital staff against an infectious disease might be needed again in the future.

80

## 81 2. Methodology and model implementation

82 For the present study, a hypothetical hospital is modelled.

### 83 2.1. Hospital structure and staff reserve

84 The hospital is structured in 4 units. Staff is coming to work every day and is simulated for a variation of  
 85 initially available staff reserve.

86 **Hospital staff.** Hospital staff consists of doctors and nurses. Nurses are not substructured further. Doctors  
 87 are each assigned to the rank of physician, senior doctor, executive senior, or chief. The model assumes that  
 88 any staff member is qualified to work on any hospital unit. Table a summarises the staff numbers initially  
 89 available at  $t = 0$  for the simulated base case and the scenarios of staff reserve variation.

90 *Table a: Overview of staffing scenarios*

Rank	Base staffing		Reduced staffing		Increased staffing	
	Total	Reserve	Total	Reserve	Total	Reserve
Chief	1	Combined 2	1	Combined 0	1	Combined 4
Executive Senior	5		3		7	
Senior Doctor	6	2	5	1	8	4
Physician	14	4	12	2	18	8
Nurse	33	8	29	4	41	16

91

92 **Hospital units.** The hospital is structured in 4 units. It is assumed that the hospital operates under the  
 93 speciality of general internal medicine. A&E receives out-patients. In-patients are treated on wards 1-3. The  
 94 daily numbers of staff required for 100%/50% operations of each unit are shown in Table b. Nurses and  
 95 physicians are required to be present. The chief, executive seniors, and senior doctors provide background  
 96 service. Chief and executive seniors are expected during staff shortage also to work in the role of senior  
 97 doctor, they are downward compatible.

98 *Table b: Staff requirement for full or partial unit operations*

Rank	A&E		Ward 1 to 3	
	100%	50%	100%	50%
Chief	Combined 1	Combined >0	Combined 1	Combined >0
Executive Senior			Combined 1	
Senior Doctor	1		1	
Physician	4	>1	2	>0
Nurse	10	>4	5	>2

99  
100 Hospital capacity  $\Gamma$  is calculated as average of the open status of A&E, and ward 1-3 in Eq. 1.

$$\Gamma = \frac{\sum_i \gamma_i}{4} \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

$\Gamma$  : relative open hospital capacity  
 $\gamma$  : hospital unit's open status  
 $i \in [\text{A\&E}, \text{ward}_1, \text{ward}_2, \text{ward}_3]$

101  
102 **2.2. Age distribution**

103 It is known that there can be an age factor in the epidemiology of a pathogen. SARS-CoV-2 is no exception in  
 104 that regard (33,34). For each staff member, we assign an age based on a uniform distribution. Table c gives  
 105 the bounds of the distribution for the different staff roles. The impact of age on infection events is discussed  
 106 further in Section 2.4.

107 *Table c: Lower bound and upper bound for age distribution*

Rank	Lower bound	Upper bound
Chief	51	65
Executive Senior	41	50
Senior Doctor	33	40
Physician	25	32
Nurse	18	65

108  
109 **2.3. Vaccination rollout**

110 The model compares two rollout schemes. In each case, the rollout rate  $v_s$  defines the number of vaccines  
 111 per day available to the hospital. Staff are vaccinated, unless they are symptomatic, or already vaccinated.  
 112 The model is implemented for a vaccine which applies only 1 dose per person.

113 **Top down vaccine rollout.** In the case of the top down rollout scheme, the model assigns doses  
 114 hierarchically and moves top down, starting with the chief. Senior executives, senior doctors, and physicians  
 115 follow. Nurses are assigned doses last.

116 **Exposure focused vaccine rollout.** The exposure focused rollout scheme prioritises staff by their exposure to  
 117 the pathogen during their hospital shifts. Due to symptomatic and non-symptomatic out-patients walking in  
 118 at A&E, A&E staff's exposure is assumed greater than exposure of staff on the wards 1-3. A&E staff are  
 119 vaccinated first; staff on wards 1-3 follow unit by unit in chronological order. On A&E and wards 1-3, again a  
 120 hierarchical vaccine assignment is implemented.

121 **2.4. Disease status and pathogen transmission**

122 The model calculates each day for each staff member a pathogen transmission probability and the individual  
 123 disease status.

124 **2.4.1. Staff member's disease status**

125 The disease status of a staff member can be non-infected, infected and non-symptomatic, or infected and  
 126 symptomatic. After pathogen transmission, a staff member is infected, non-symptomatic and continues  
 127 working. After the passing of the incubation time  $t_{inc}$  (36), the staff member becomes symptomatic and  
 128 remains off duty for the recovery duration of  $t_{rec}$ . Whether reinfections with SARS-CoV-2 are possible and  
 129 by what probability is being investigated at the moment (37). The model assumes that staff can reinfect

130 unless vaccinated. For simplification of disease behaviour, staff being vaccinated during  $t_{inc}$  is assumed  
131 again not-infected.

### 132 2.4.2. Pathogen transmission

133 The model assumes that the pathogen transmits from infected human to non-infected human. The model  
134 assumes that vaccinated staff are immune to the pathogen and are not infectious for other staff members.  
135 For each working day, a probability  $\Pi$  is calculated for which a staff member's status is changed to infected.  
136 This probability considers the level of exposure,  $R_S$  as used in epidemiology as reproductive number (31), the  
137 age (33,34), and the reduced patient contact of greater hierarchy ranks. Eq. 2 and Eq. 3 below detail the  
138 calculation of the probabilities  $\Pi_{A\&E}$  and  $\Pi_{ward1-3}$ .

139 **Pathogen exposure on A&E and wards 1-3.** Exposure quantifies in the model the contact to infected  
140 humans. On A&E, staff comes into contact with out-patients who walk in and are positive with probability  
141 rate  $p_{pos}$ . The model assumes that on A&E each staff member has contact with 20 patients during one shift.  
142 The model adds the number of infected, non-symptomatic colleagues  $\overline{sym}_{A\&E}$  on A&E who come to work on  
143 that day and increase pathogen exposure to other staff members.

144 On wards 1-3, outside A&E, the model assumes that all patients are tested and if positive isolated so that  
145 patients cause no pathogen exposure to staff. The model adds again the number of infected, non-  
146 symptomatic colleagues  $\overline{sym}$  who come to work on that day to ward 1-3. A base probability of 1/100 is  
147 added. By this, the model accounts for the fact that pathogen intake on wards 1-3 vanishes compared to  
148 intake on A&E but that it is not nil.

149 **Infection risk  $\Pi$  due to exposure.** Infection risk due to exposure is modelled according to research insights  
150 about reproduction numbers found in (31,32) for SARS-CoV-2. These studies have provided probabilities by  
151 which an individual can expect to be infected after a specified exposure event (specified by parameters such  
152 as pathogen emission rate, breathing activity, aerosol concentration, or duration of exposure). In this  
153 context, the parameter  $R_S$  (pathogen characteristic reproduction number) is used.  $R_S$  is defined as the  
154 number of people infected by one index patient. This model now uses the values for  $R_S$  of (31), multiplies by  
155 the number of positive contacts, and divides it by factor 5 for obtaining the staff member's personal risk  $\Pi$ .  
156 The reduction by factor 5 is based on the assumption that the relevant index patient has contact to 5  
157 members of staff.

158 **Amendment for age and reduced patient contact of greater hierarchy ranks.** It is known that social status  
159 and age can influence the spreading of infectious diseases (24,26,27). The model acknowledges this and  
160 considers two additional amendment factors which are both multiplied on the infection risk  $\Pi$ .

161 The age factor  $T_S$  is a number greater or equal 1 and scales linearly between the staff age of 18 and 65,  
162 assigned for each staff in Section 2.2. Values are set to the magnitude as known so far for SARS-CoV-2  
163 (33,34).

164 In modern hospitals, higher hierarchy ranks have typically less patient contact compared to junior doctors or  
165 nurses. The model considers this by a factor  $H_S$  which is set to a value greater or equal 1. The infection risk  
166 for the hospital's chief and executive seniors is divided by  $H_S$ .

$$\Pi_{A\&E} = (20 p_{pos} + \overline{sym}_{A\&E}) \frac{R_S}{5} T_S / H_S \quad \text{Eq. 2}$$

$\Pi$  : infection risk

$p_{pos}$  : positive rate of patients on A&E unit

$\overline{sym}_{A\&E}$  : number of positive but non-symptomatic staff on A&E

$R_S$  : reproduction number

$T_S$  : age factor

$H_S$  : hierarchy factor

$$\Pi_i = \left( \frac{1}{100} + \overline{sym}_i \right) \frac{R_S}{5} T_S / H_S \quad \text{Eq. 3}$$

$i \in [\text{ward}_1, \text{ward}_2, \text{ward}_3]$

### 167 2.5. Assignment of staff to units and open/closed-status definition

168 Staff who is not symptomatic is assigned to work on the hospital's units. Available staff is by first priority  
169 assigned to A&E; followed by wards in ascending ward number. Symptomatic staff is considered off duty.

170 Open/closed status of a unit is defined for each day by the model according to staff requirements of Table b.

171

172 **2.6. VBA implementation**

173 The model has been implemented in VBA. It calculates for a period of 100 days the disease spreading under  
174 different scenarios. Each scenario is run  $n = 500$  times to account for statistical unevenness of random  
175 number function of e.g. age distribution (Section 2.2) or pathogen transmission (Section 2.4.2). The VBA  
176 macro is run for this present study in a Microsoft-Excel environment on an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-6200U CPU  
177 @ 2.30GHz with 8.00 GB memory RAM. Computation time for 500 cycles of each scenario lies at around 25  
178 minutes, increasing/decreasing with increasing/decreasing staff size.

179  
180 **3. Results and discussion**

181 The VBA implementation of the hospital model is run for different scenarios of parameter values. The  
182 meaningfulness of the study's results lies not in individual values but the trends which can be observed for  
183 parameter variation. Disease parameters or hospital parameters might change for future scenarios. The  
184 found effects are valid also for other future settings.

185 **3.1. Base case and statistical convergence**


186 Table d shows the model parameters and their values in the base case. The effect of the parameters on e.g.  
187 open hospital capacity  $\Gamma$  is discussed in relation to this base case.

188 *Table d: Parameters of the base case scenario*

Parameter	$v_S$ [1/d]	$R_S$ [-]	$p_{pos}$ [-]	$t_{inc}$ [d]	$t_{rec}$ [d]	$T_S$ [-]	$H_S$ [-]	Staffing
Value	1	7	0.25	5	10	2.5	5	Base staffing


189  
190 Figure 1 shows the output of the model for predicted open hospital capacity, averaged for  $n = 500$  runs  
191 together with its standard deviation per day for the duration  $t$  of 100 days. The figure shows that under the  
192 top down rollout scheme (blue) a greater decrease in open hospital capacity is expected than under the  
193 exposure focused rollout (green). In both cases, the minimum capacity is reached after passing of incubation  
194 time and recovery time (15 days). In the beginning, expected open capacity decreases over time as non-  
195 vaccinated staff contract the pathogen. This fall does not set in at  $t = 1$  day as staff reserves are still  
196 available initially. After incubation time and recovery time, the first staff members who contracted the  
197 pathogen return to work. The ensuing increase of open hospital capacity is the result of greater immunity of  
198 staff to the pathogen due to the vaccine rollout. The fall to the minimum capacity is steeper for the top  
199 down rollout, and the following return to full capacity after is more moderate for the top down rollout when  
200 compared to the green exposure focused rollout.

201 Figure 2 shows for predicted hospital capacity in the base case of Table d the average and the average's  
202 standard deviation per  $n$  as developing over  $n$ . Both rollout schemes converge towards a constant after  
203 around  $n = 100$ . Standard deviation lies below 0.4% and is greater for the top down vaccine rollout (blue).  
204 For both rollout schemes, standard deviation converges towards a constant value and changes only  
205 negligibly after  $n = 300$ .



206

207 *Figure 1: Open hospital capacity, predicted mean  $\pm$  standard deviation per day, for top down (blue) and exposure focused (green)*  
 208 *vaccine rollout, base case scenario of Table d*



209

210 *Figure 2: Statistical model convergence, expected relative open capacity averaged for n runs with corresponding standard deviation*  
 211 *per model run n, for top down (blue) and exposure focused (green) vaccine rollout, base case scenario of Table d*



212 **3.2. Disease activity: Influence of pathogen infectiousness and prevalence**


213 Prevalence  $p_{pos}$  of the disease in out-patients coming into A&E is the main variable determining pathogen  
 214 intake into the hospital. Infectiousness  $R_S$  decides about the number of transmission events from patients  
 215 onto staff, or between staff. To investigate the effect of increased disease spreading, a parameter study is  
 216 performed where the parameters  $R_S$  and  $p_{pos}$  are varied according to the values given in Table e while all  
 217 other parameters are kept as described in the model's base case scenario of Table d.  $R_S$  is in the magnitude  
 218 as obtained in (31) for Sars-Cov-2.  $p_{pos}$  is varied between 0.1 and 1.

219 *Table e: variation of infectiousness and exposure*


Parameter	Simulated values
$R_S$ [-]	[0.1, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 14, 20]
$p_{pos}$ [-]	[0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 0.9, 1]

220  
 221 Figure 3 shows the capacity for both rollout schemes for all resulting  $p_{pos} * R_S$ . The model predicts that for  
 222 greater disease activity the advantage of the exposure focused rollout increases until a nearly constant level  
 223 is reached at around  $p_{pos} * R_S = 5$ . At this constant level, predicted open capacity under the exposure  
 224 focused rollout is about 1.2 times greater than what is predicted for the top down rollout (orange). When  
 225 disease activity decreases, the advantage of the exposure focused rollout does so as well. Both rollout  
 226 schemes achieve approximately equal results for  $\lim_{(p_{pos} * R_S) \rightarrow 0^+}$ .

227 Figure 4 gives information about the influence of disease activity on open status on unit level. The base case  
 228 scenario ( $R_S = 7, p_{pos} = 0.25$ , Table d) leads to a temporary total closure of ward-3 and substantial closures  
 229 of ward-2 and ward-1 under the top down rollout. The prediction for exposure focused vaccine rollout of the  
 230 base case predicted a fully open ward-1. Ward-2 and 3 would be expected to lose temporarily capacity, by a  
 231 margin less than what is predicted for the top down scheme. If disease activity is increased to e.g. ( $R_S = 10$ ,  
 232  $p_{pos} = 0.75$ ) under both rollout schemes open capacity drops. Temporarily ward-1 to 3 are predicted closed  
 233 and A&E predicted not fully open under the top down rollout while A&E is predicted fully open under the  
 234 exposure focused rollout.



235  
 236 *Figure 3: Predicted open hospital capacity over product of infectiousness  $R_S$  and prevalence in A&E-patients  $p_{pos}$  for top down (blue),*  
 237 *and exposure focused rollout (green), together with their respective ratio (orange)*



238

239 *Figure 4: Relative open capacity split onto unit level for base case ( $R_S = 7$ ,  $p_{pos} = 0.25$ , Table d), and parameter variation ( $R_S = 10$ ,  
240  $p_{pos} = 0.75$ )*

241 **3.3. Influence of recovery time and social considerations**


242 The time needed by staff to recover  $t_{rec}$  [d] from the simulated pathogen can vary, based on the pathogen  
243 and predisposition of a staff member. To quantify the influence on the model's prediction,  $t_{rec}$  is simulated  
244 for the values shown in Table f while setting all other parameters to the base case of Table d. Figure 5 shows  
245 the obtained results, formatted as before Figure 3 (exposure focused rollout green, top down rollout blue,  
246 ratio of both schemes orange).

247 *Table f: variation of recovery time*

Parameter	Simulated values
$t_{rec}$ [d]	[1, 5, 10, 14, 20]


248





249

250 *Figure 5: Predicted open hospital capacity over recovery time  $t_{rec}$  [d] for top down (blue), and exposure focused rollout (green),*  
 251 *together with their respective ratio (orange)*



252

253 *Figure 6: Predicted number of infected staff by hierarchy group (Table a) over time for base case scenario (Table d)*

254 Figure 5 shows that expected open hospital capacity decreases for greater  $t_{rec}$  of infected staff. The  
 255 advantage of the exposure focused rollout increases for greater  $t_{rec}$ . Similarly to Figure 3 for disease activity,  
 256 the difference factor (orange) lies at around 1.2 for the maximum value simulated.  
 257 Figure 6 gives the expected number of infected staff over time, top down rollout scheme subtracted from  
 258 exposure focused rollout. Total numbers are shown by hierarchy group. This analysis is of importance as it  
 259 relates to work which showed that social factors must be considered during the current pandemic  
 260 (24,26,27). The greatest difference between the vaccine rollout schemes is seen for the nursing staff. Their  
 261 infection numbers are predicted by the model to increase most, once the hierarchical vaccine allocation  
 262 takes place. Executive seniors and senior doctors are predicted to in average benefit from the top down  
 263 rollout. The chief who also can work on A&E is vaccinated fairly early in both schemes and not predicted to  
 264 contract the pathogen. Interestingly, the physicians are treated favourably in each of the two rollout  
 265 schemes. Depending on progression of the rollout they benefit or not. Initially, they are worse of as doctors  
 266 of greater hierarchical rank are assigned vaccine doses. After  $t$  of 27 days, their group however benefits from

267 the top down scheme as they are assigned vaccine doses which would go alternatively to A&E nurses under  
268 the exposure focused rollout.


269 **3.4. Availability of vaccine and rollout rate**

270 A very urgent aspect of the current rollout is the scarcity of vaccine doses as a resource. Different vaccines  
271 have been approved by regulatory bodies, more are in the final stage of certification (1,2). However,  
272 production numbers do not yet provide sufficient supply for an immediate full rollout. In today's real world  
273 situation, vaccines are rationed (25). The model predicts for the two rollout schemes that the difference in  
274 expected open hospital capacity increases for greater resource scarcity, Figure 7 and Table g.

275 *Table g: variation of daily rate of vaccines*

Parameter	Simulated values
$v_S$ [1/d]	[0, 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 20, 30, 40]

276



277

278 *Figure 7: Predicted open hospital capacity over daily rate of vaccines available  $v_S$  [1/d] for top down (blue), and exposure focused*  
279 *rollout (green), together with their respective ratio (orange)*

280 The availability of vaccine doses  $v_S$  [1/d] is iterated for the values of Table g while keeping all other  
281 parameters as specified for the base case Table d. Figure 7 shows that the maximum of the relative  
282 comparison between both schemes (orange) is located at 1/d. For the staff size as specified in Table a, no  
283 measurable difference exists in the model once supply of  $v_S > 5/d$  is available. This means that in particular in  
284 situations of resource scarcity, the exposure focused rollout scheme is advantageous when measured in  
285 open hospital capacity.

286 **3.5. Influence of staff reserve**

287 Another resource in hospital operations apart from the vaccines per day available for the hospital is the  
288 staff. The model calculates a partial or full closure of units as penalty condition for staff shortage due to  
289 disease, Table b and Table h. For the variation of initial staff reserve, the model predicts that in each scenario  
290 the exposure focused rollout scheme leads to greater expected open hospital capacity.

291

292

293

294


295 *Table h: variation of staff size and initial staff reserve, numbers defined in Table a*

Parameter	Simulated values
Staffing	[Base staffing, Reduced staffing, Increased staffing]

296

297 Figure 8 shows the numbers obtained for the variation of staff reserve. Similarly as before in Figure 7 for the  
 298 availability of vaccine doses, the difference obtained for exposure focused and top down rollout is greater  
 299 when base staffing or only reduced staffing is initially available. With increased staffing, the difference  
 300 between the two rollout schemes decreases. Here again, results can be interpreted in a way that under  
 301 shortage of resources the exposure focused vaccine rollout is more vital for the hospital's ability to operate.

### Open hospital capacity over availability of vaccine doses



302

303 *Figure 8: Predicted open hospital capacity depending on initial staff reserve (Table a) for top down (blue), and exposure focused*  
 304 *rollout (green), together with their respective ratio (orange)*

### 305 3.6. Consideration of increased transmission due to age and roles in hospital hierarchy

306 In the argumentation for the case of the top down rollout scheme, the special importance of higher staff  
 307 ranks for hospital operations is one factor. On top, their typically greater age makes them more susceptible  
 308 for pathogen transmission. Their exposure to patients is typically reduced compared to nurses and junior  
 309 doctors. Higher ranks are involved in administrative tasks which during the pandemic can partially even be  
 310 done in home office. The model is iterated over  $T_S$  [-] (increased pathogen transmission probability for  
 311 greater age) and  $H_S$  [-] (reduced patient contact for the hospital's chief and executive seniors) to  
 312 demonstrate the influence of both variables. Values are shown in Table i. Both are varied between 1 and 20.


313 *Table i: variation of age factor and reduced exposure due to hierarchy*

Parameter	Simulated values
$T_S$ [-]	[1, 1.5, 2.5, 5, 10, 20]
$H_S$ [-]	[1, 2, 5, 10, 20]

314

315 Figure 9 shows the predicted open hospital capacity of the base case (Table d) for the variation of age  
 316 dependency of pathogen transmission probability,  $T_S$ . Under both rollout schemes, expected open capacity

317 decreases for greater age factor. The model predicts better outcome for the exposure focused rollout  
 318 (orange). This means that the influence of age (distribution per hierarchy group in Table c) does not serve as  
 319 an argument for the case of the top down rollout scheme but rather against it. It must not be forgotten that  
 320 the age factor applies to all hospital staff. Nurses realistically also reach age of 60 and over as the hospital's  
 321 chief when they are equally more probable to contract the pathogen.



322

323 *Figure 9: Predicted open hospital capacity over age factor  $T_S$  [-] for top down (blue), and exposure focused rollout (green), together*  
 324 *with their respective ratio (orange)*

325 The influence of  $H_S$  is found interestingly to be negligible in the hospital model as defined in the present  
 326 study. No clear influence on expected open hospital capacity or on infection numbers amongst the chief and  
 327 executive seniors is predicted in the per cent or per mill range. Increasing the number of statistical cycles to  
 328 cycle numbers greater than the applied  $n = 500$  is possible. It isn't performed as part of the present study  
 329 however as it would generate numerical results which suggest pseudo precision that is beyond the predictive  
 330 precision of the hospital model.

331 This lack of explanatory power of the hospital model with regard to  $H_S$  is explicable by the rollout schemes  
 332 as defined under Section 2.3. The chief and executive seniors are first to be vaccinated for the top down  
 333 scheme. In the exposure focused rollout scheme, the chief or the executive senior on A&E shift is the first  
 334 person of the entire staff to be vaccinated at  $t = 1$  day. Under this setting, exposure to the non-vaccinated  
 335 chief or executive seniors is minimal already and the influence of  $H_S$  does not reduce substantially further  
 336 the probability of pathogen transmission.

337

#### 338 4. Conclusions and future work.

339 The model's implementation in VBA is iterated for parameter studies. The two rollout schemes for a top  
 340 down or exposure focused assignment of vaccine doses to staff can be compared in various settings.  
 341 In this hospital model, the expected open hospital capacity which is assumed to maximise patient benefit is  
 342 generally greater for the exposure focused rollout. The model relies on the drawing of random numbers for  
 343 e.g. age and transmission events. Building statistical averages for  $n = 500$  model runs ensures convergence  
 344 of results with a constant, Figure 2. Standard deviation of open hospital capacity calculated over averages of  
 345  $n$  lies below 0.4%.

346 Results predict an increasing advantage by the exposure focused vaccine rollout scheme under increasing  
 347 disease activity defined by greater pathogen infectiousness and prevalence in patients, Figure 3. Overall  
 348 open hospital capacity can be broken down in open status of hospital units (A&E, ward-1 to 3). Trends  
 349 observable for total capacity translate into effects on unit level. Following unit prioritisation, predicted loss

350 of unit open status is more pronounced under the top down rollout scheme. Also an increasing recovery  
351 time leads to greater advantage of the exposure focused rollout, Figure 5.  
352 The results in Figure 6 demonstrate the different infection numbers per hierarchy groups. The top down  
353 rollout scheme would be most disadvantageous for nurses. Their infection numbers increase greatly under  
354 that scheme. Also nurses on A&E get vaccinated only after all doctors have been assigned doses. These  
355 comparisons between prioritisation schemes are of importance. It is known that social status, or minority  
356 status influences disease spreading (24,26,27).  
357 Shortage of resources (supply of vaccine doses, or initial staff reserve) decreases the predicted open hospital  
358 capacity. The exposure focused rollout scheme leads to better results in those scenarios and is the  
359 preferable option when compared to the top down rollout scheme, Figure 7 and Figure 8. The influence of  
360 greater pathogen transmission probability by greater age is another argument for the case of the exposure  
361 focused rollout scheme. Here again, the role of nursing staff who realistically reach ages of 60 and over must  
362 be considered.  
363 The implemented and presented model is a first step to investigate decision making strategies for a novel  
364 problem (22,23). The model's complexity is kept to a minimum. Several other ongoing hospital processes  
365 could be implemented in it. Extensions could investigate effects of staff moving between hospitals, only  
366 partial immunity of staff after a 1<sup>st</sup> vaccine dose, or the fact that tests produce false negative and false  
367 positive results. Also the organisational structure of the hospital could be extended so that it contains  
368 several medical specialities; surgery, medicine, radiology, and/or anaesthesia. For a hospital's ability to  
369 perform pre-surgical imaging diagnostics and surgery itself, staffing in radiology and in anaesthesia is  
370 essential.  
371 The mathematical evaluation in the presented model implementation builds averages over time. In a more  
372 complex implementation of a more diversified hospital model, integrating open status over time and  
373 comparison of areas (closed/open) can increase explanatory power.  
374 The model so far only quantifies impact on unit open status. This could be extended into calculations about  
375 number of procedures and number of patients affected. The number of patients treated and remuneration  
376 by diagnosis-related groups would allow a quantification of the financial impact on annual business results of  
377 the hospital.  
378 The scientific understanding of SARS-CoV-2 behaviour is expected to increase. Based on this, SARS-Cov-2  
379 mutants, and other future scenarios, new vaccine rollouts might become necessary. After 4 major outbreaks  
380 of infectious diseases in e.g. Hong Kong during the 25 years before the Corona pandemic alone (35), similar  
381 situations might repeat in the future.

382  
383  
384

385 Deposited at [doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4589332](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4589332)

386 **Supplement-1.** << macro.vba>>

387 **Supplement-2.** << macro\_in\_excel.xlsm>>

388  
389

#### 390 **Acknowledgements:**

391 The authors thank Prof Pawel Dlotko from the Dioscuri-Centre for TDA in Warsaw (Poland) for his advice on  
392 open access software licensing. The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) provided mobility funds  
393 through grant BO 4961/6-1. The DFG had no role in writing-up or decision where to submit.

394  
395

#### 396 **Declaration of interests**

397 The authors declare no competing interests.

398  
399

#### 400 **Bibliography**

- 401 1. Krammer F. SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in development. Nature [Internet]. 2020;586(7830):516–27.  
402 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2798-3>
- 403 2. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, editor. Covid-19 Vaccines [Internet]. Coronavirus Disease 2019  
404 (COVID-19). Silver Spring, MD, USA; 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 27]. Available from:

- 405 [https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines)  
406 [19/covid-19-vaccines](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines)
- 407 3. Haviari S, Bénet T, Saadatian-Elahi M, André P, Loulergue P, Vanhems P. Vaccination of healthcare  
408 workers: A review. *Hum Vaccines Immunother.* 2015;11(11):2522–37.
  - 409 4. Maltezou HC, Wicker S, Borg M, Heininger U, Puro V, Theodoridou M, et al. Vaccination policies for  
410 health-care workers in acute health-care facilities in Europe. *Vaccine* [Internet]. 2011;29(51):9557–  
411 62. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.09.076>
  - 412 5. Prematunge C, Corace K, McCarthy A, Nair RC, Pugsley R, Garber G. Factors influencing pandemic  
413 influenza vaccination of healthcare workers-A systematic review. *Vaccine* [Internet].  
414 2012;30(32):4733–43. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.05.018>
  - 415 6. Maltezou HC, Poland GA. Vaccination policies for healthcare workers in Europe. *Vaccine* [Internet].  
416 2014;32(38):4876–80. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.10.046>
  - 417 7. World Health Organization, editor. Framework for decision-making : implementation of mass  
418 vaccination campaigns in the context of COVID-19 [Internet]. Geneva, Switzerland; 2020 [cited 2021  
419 Feb 26]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Framework_Mass_Vaccination-2020.1)  
420 [Framework\\_Mass\\_Vaccination-2020.1](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Framework_Mass_Vaccination-2020.1)
  - 421 8. Mills MC, Salisbury D. The challenges of distributing COVID-19 vaccinations. *EClinicalMedicine.*  
422 2021;31(100674):1–2.
  - 423 9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, editor. CDC’s Covid-19 vaccine rollout recommendations  
424 [Internet]. Atlanta, GA, USA; 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 23]. Available from:  
425 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/recommendations.html>
  - 426 10. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, editor. Overview of the implementation of  
427 COVID-19 vaccination strategies and vaccine deployment plans in the EU/EEA [Internet]. Stockholm,  
428 Sweden; 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 26]. Available from:  
429 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Overview-of-COVID-19-vaccination-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Overview-of-COVID-19-vaccination-strategies-deployment-plans-in-the-EU-EEA.pdf)  
430 [strategies-deployment-plans-in-the-EU-EEA.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Overview-of-COVID-19-vaccination-strategies-deployment-plans-in-the-EU-EEA.pdf)
  - 431 11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, editor. How CDC Is Making COVID-19 Vaccine  
432 Recommendations [Internet]. Atlanta, GA, USA; 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 26]. Available from:  
433 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/recommendations-process.html>
  - 434 12. Burki T. Global shortage of personal protective equipment. *Lancet Infect Dis* [Internet].  
435 2020;20(7):785–6. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30501-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30501-6)
  - 436 13. Emanuel EJ, Persad G, Upshur R, Thome B, Parker M, Glickman A, et al. Fair Allocation of Scarce  
437 Medical Resources in the Time of Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(21):2049–55.
  - 438 14. Gershman MD, Angelo KM, Ritchey J, Greenberg DP, Muhammad RD, Brunette G, et al. Addressing a  
439 Yellow Fever Vaccine Shortage — United States, 2016–2017. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*  
440 2017;66(17):457–9.
  - 441 15. Rodriguez J, Paton M, Acuna JM. COVID-19 vaccination rate and protection attitudes can determine  
442 the best prioritisation strategy to reduce fatalities. *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2021;2020.10.12.20211094.  
443 Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/02/10/2020.10.12.20211094.abstract>
  - 444 16. Foy BH, Wahl B, Mehta K, Shet A, Menon GI, Britto C. Comparing COVID-19 vaccine allocation  
445 strategies in India: A mathematical modelling study. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2021;103:431–8.
  - 446 17. Piraveenan M, Sawleshwarkar S, Walsh M, Zablotska I, Bhattacharyya S, Farooqui HH, et al. Optimal  
447 governance and implementation of vaccination programs to contain the COVID-19 pandemic  
448 [preprint]. *arXiv.* 2020;2011(06455v2):1–15.
  - 449 18. Bubar KM, Kissler SM, Lipsitch M, Cobey S, Grad YH, Larremore DB, et al. Model-informed COVID-19  
450 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus. *Science.* 2021;371(6532):916–21.
  - 451 19. Mahase E. Covid-19: Vaccine roll out could take a year and will require difficult prioritisation  
452 decisions. *BMJ.* 2020;371(m3846):1.
  - 453 20. Richardson A. Accelerate COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout by Delaying the Second Dose of mRNA Vaccines.  
454 *Clin Infect Dis.* 2021;ciab068.
  - 455 21. Kadire SR, Wachter RM, Lurie N. Delayed Second Dose versus Standard Regimen for Covid-19  
456 Vaccination. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(e28).
  - 457 22. Guo E, Hao K. This is the Stanford vaccine algorithm that left out frontline doctors [Internet]. MIT  
458 Technology Review. Boston, MA, USA; [cited 2021 Feb 23]. Available from:  
459 <https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/12/21/1015303/stanford-vaccine-algorithm/>



- 460 23. Bernstein L, Beachum L, Knowles H. Stanford apologizes for coronavirus vaccine plan that left out  
461 many front-line doctors. The Washington Post [Internet]. 2020 Dec 19; Available from:  
462 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/12/18/stanford-hospital-protest-covid-vaccine/>  
463 24. Nabavi N. Covid-19 vaccination for medical students: The grey area. *BMJ Student*. 2021;372(n261).  
464 25. Baraniuk C. Covid-19 : How the UK vaccine rollout delivered success, so far. *Br Med J*.  
465 2021;372(n421).  
466 26. Schmidt H, Tathak P, Sonmez T, Unver MU. Covid-19 : how to prioritize worse-off populations in  
467 allocating safe and effective vaccines. *Br Med J*. 2020;371(m3795):1–12.  
468 27. Martin CA, Marshall C, Patel P, Goss C, Jenkins DR, Ellwood C, et al. Association of demographic and  
469 occupational factors with SARS-CoV-2 vaccine uptake in a multi-ethnic UK healthcare workforce: a  
470 rapid real-world analysis. *medRxiv*. 2021;02.11.21251548.  
471 28. Gharpure R, Guo A, Bishnoi CK, Patel U, Gifford D, Tippins A, et al. Early COVID-19 First-Dose  
472 Vaccination Coverage Among Residents and Staff Members of Skilled Nursing Facilities Participating  
473 in the Pharmacy Partnership for Long-Term Care Program — United States, December 2020–January  
474 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(5):178–82.  
475 29. Sickinger S, Kolisch R. The performance of a generalized Bailey-Welch rule for outpatient  
476 appointment scheduling under inpatient and emergency demand. *Health Care Manag Sci*.  
477 2009;12(4):408–19.  
478 30. Dray L, Evans A, Reynolds T, Schäfer AW, Vera-Morales M, Bosbach W. Airline fleet replacement  
479 funded by a carbon tax: An integrated assessment. *Transp Policy*. 2014;34.  
480 31. Kriegel M, Hartmann A. Covid-19 Ansteckung über Aerosolpartikel Vergleichende Bewertung von  
481 Innenräumen hinsichtlich des situationsbedingten R-Wertes [Preprint]. 2021;1–5.  
482 32. Hartmann A, Kriegel M. Beispielhafte Risikobewertung für verschiedene Alltagssituationen [Preprint].  
483 2020;1–8. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14279/depositonce-10714.2>  
484 33. Bundesamt für Gesundheit (BAG), editor. COVID-19 Switzerland [Internet]. Laboratory-confirmed  
485 cases-Demography. Bern, Switzerland; 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 27]. Available from:  
486 <https://www.covid19.admin.ch/en/epidemiologic/case>  
487 34. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, editor. Risk for COVID-19 Infection, Hospitalization, and  
488 Death By Age Group [Internet]. Atlanta, GA, USA; 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 23]. Available from:  
489 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-discovery/hospitalization-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-discovery/hospitalization-death-by-age.html)  
490 [death-by-age.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-discovery/hospitalization-death-by-age.html)  
491 35. Ching F. Bird Flu, SARS and Beyond. In: 130 Years of Medicine in Hong Kong. Hong Kong, PRC; 2018. p.  
492 381–434.  
493 36. Rogers K. Why Is It Important to Know the Incubation Period of a Disease [Internet]. Encyclopedia  
494 Britannica - companion. 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 20]. Available from:  
495 <https://www.britannica.com/story/why-is-it-important-to-know-the-incubation-period-of-a-disease>  
496 37. Hall VJ, Foulkes S, Charlett A, Atti A, Monk EJ, Simmons R, et al. Do Antibody Positive Healthcare  
497 Workers Have Lower SARS-CoV-2 Infection Rates than Antibody Negative Healthcare Workers? Large  
498 Multi-Centre Prospective Cohort Study (The SIREN Study), England: June to November 2020. *medRxiv*.  
499 2021;01(13):21249642.  
500  
501