1	
2	Impact of Vaccine Prioritization Strategies on Mitigating COVID-19: An Agent-Based
3	Simulation Study using an Urban Region in the United States
4	
5	Hanisha Tatapudi <sup>1</sup> , Rachita Das <sup>2</sup> , and Tapas K. Das <sup>1</sup>
6	
7	
8	
9	<sup>1</sup> Department of Industrial and Management System Engineering, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, USA.
10	
11	<sup>2</sup> Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Corresponding author: Hanisha Tatapudi
22	
23	
24	
25	

26	ABSTRACT
27 28	Background
29	Approval of novel vaccines for COVID-19 has brought hope and expectations, but not without additional
30	challenges. One central challenge is how to appropriately prioritize the use of limited supply of vaccines. This study
31	evaluates various prioritization strategies and the efficacy of the vaccination campaign underway in the U.S.
32	Methods
33	The study develops a granular agent-based simulation model for mimicking community spread of COVID-19 under
34	various social interventions including full and partial closures, isolation and quarantine, use of face mask and
35	contact tracing, and vaccination. The model is populated with demographic and societal data for an urban
36	community in the U.S. with 2.8 million residents as well as viral parameters. The model tracks daily numbers of
37	infected, hospitalized, and deaths for all census age-groups. Model is calibrated using parameters for viral
38	transmission and level of community circulation of individuals. Published data from the Florida COVID-19
39	dashboard is used to validate the model. Vaccination strategies are compared using hypothesis test for pairwise
40	comparisons.
41	Results

Three prioritization strategies examined are: a close variant of the CDC recommendation, an age-stratified strategy, and a random strategy. The impact of vaccination is also contrasted with a no vaccination scenario. The comparison shows that the ongoing campaign in the U.S. using vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna is expected to 1) reduce the cumulative number of infection by 10% and 2) help the pandemic to subside below a small threshold of 100 daily new reported cases sooner by approximately a month. The prioritization strategies when compared with each other showed no significant difference in their impacts on pandemic mitigation.

48 <u>Conclusions</u>

49 Recent explosive growth of the number of new COVID-19 cases in the U.S. continues to shrink the susceptible 50 population. This, we believe, will likely limit the expected number of people that could be prevented from getting 51 infected due to vaccination. A shrinking susceptible pool may also be an attributable reason for the observed lack of 52 statistical difference among the outcomes of the prioritization strategies. However, the invariance of the strategies 53 should give more latitude for decision makers in COVID-19 vaccine distribution.

- 54 Keywords: Vaccination strategies, COVID-19, Agent-based simulation model, Vaccination policies, Vaccination
- 55 prioritization
- 56 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
- 57
- 58 AB Agent-based
- $59 \qquad SEIR-Susceptible-exposed-infected-recovered/removed$
- 60 SARS-CoV-2 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
- 61 COVID-19 Coronavirus Disease 2019
- 62 USFDA United States Food and Drug Administration
- 63 CDC Centers for Disease Control
- 64 NAESM NationalAcademy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine
- 65 QALY Quality of Life Years

66

- 67
- 68
- 69

- 71
- 72
- 73
- 74
- 75
- 76
- 77
- 78
- 70
- 79

80

82	DECLARATIONS
83	Ethics approval and consent to participate: Individual human data was not used in our study. Only aggregate data
84	made available in Florida COVID-19 Dashboard was used.
85	Consent for publication: Not applicable
86	Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from
87	the corresponding author on reasonable request.
88	Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests
89	Funding: Not applicable
90	Authors' contributions:
91	Hanisha Tatapudi: Conceived and designed the model, Selection of model input parameters and data gathering,
92	Coding and testing of the model, Design and perform the experiments, Output analysis and review, Manuscript
93	preparation and review
94	
95	Rachita Das: Selection of model input parameters and data gathering, Output analysis and review, Manuscript
96	preparation and review
97	
98	Tapas K Das: Conceived and designed the model, Selection of model input parameters and data gathering, Coding
99	and testing of the model, Design and perform the experiments, Output analysis and review, Manuscript preparation
100	and review
101	Acknowledgements: Not applicable
102	Authors' information:
103	Corresponding author:
104	Hanisha Tatapudi – corresponding author

- 105 e-mail: tatapudi@mail.usf.edu.
- 106 Telephone: +1 (813) 453-3577
- 108 Rachita Das
- 109 e-mail: rachi95@gmail.com
- 110 Telephone: +1 (813) 527-1133
- 112 Tapas K. Das
- 113 e-mail: das@usf.edu
- 114 Telephone: +1 (813) 843-0285

133

# 134 INTRODUCTION

- 135 SARS-CoV-2 and resulting COVID-19 disease has been raging world-wide since early 2020, killing over 2.0
- million globally and nearly 450,000 in the United States by the end of January 2021 [12]. A significant winter swell
- 137 in cases is underway in the U.S. despite protective measures in place such as face mask usage, limited contact
- 138 tracing, travel restrictions, social distancing practices, and partial community closures. To combat this, many
- 139 promising novel vaccines have been under development, of which two (Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna) have been
- 140 authorized for emergency use since mid-December 2020 by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) [26].

141 Data from initial trials of cohorts greater than 30,000 people showed that these vaccines, given in two doses, are safe

- 142 and have ~95% effectiveness in preventing COVID-19 [23]. Vaccine deployment in the U.S. began soon after
- 143 USFDA approval.
- 144

145 Implementing an effective vaccination campaign will be essential to dramatically reduce the infection,

146 hospitalization, and death rates, but it poses many unique challenges. Vaccine prioritization and allocation strategy

147 is at the forefront of the challenges to effectively vaccinate communities. Strategy is influenced by a number of key

148 factors: 1) limited initial vaccine supply in the months following release, 2) transmission and severity of COVID-19

149 varying by segment of the population, 3) vaccine approvals only for adults, and 4) acceptability and compliance in

150 the community for two dose vaccination [4].

151

152 U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) has released an outline prioritizing healthcare personnel, first responders, 153 persons with high risk medical conditions for COVID-19, and older adults >65 years. These groups will be given 154 priority for vaccination in phase 1, defined as when vaccine supply is still limited. In phase 2 (supply increases to 155 begin to meet demand) and phase 3 (supply is greater than demand), other population groups begin to be vaccinated 156 based on age and availability [25]. Vaccine allocation structures with basic similarities and some key differences are 157 being used by countries around the world. For example, after healthcare workers, France's vaccine allocation is 158 scheduled to include other general workers regardless of age who they have determined to be at high risk of 159 contracting and spreading the virus due to contact with the general public. This includes retail, school,

160 transportation, and hospitality staff [17]. Such differences in vaccine prioritization structures are as of yet untested 161 and warrant modeling and examination.

162

163 The goal of this paper is to investigate the impact of vaccination on the pandemic via outcome measures of numbers 164 of infected, hospitalized, and dead in the months following December 15, 2020, when vaccination began in the U.S. 165 Two specific objectives of our investigation are: 1) to assess the expected impact of the vaccination program that is 166 currently underway on mitigating COVID-19, and 2) to inform public health officials on the comparative benefits, if 167 any, of the different vaccine prioritization strategies. We conduct our investigation by using our agent-based (AB) 168 simulation model for COVID-19 that was presented recently in [19]. We first extended calibration of our model till 169 December 30, 2020 to ensure that our model appropriately tracks the explosive increase in cases that started with the 170 onset of winter and the year-end holiday period. We then enhanced the model by adding a framework for 171 vaccination. This included: vaccination priorities for people based on attributes including profession and age, use of 172 two different vaccines by Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna with their contracted quantities and approximate delivery 173 timelines, acceptability of vaccines to prioritized cohorts (approximately 60% based on national survey data [3,18]), 174 transition period between each priority group, vaccination rate, and immunity growth for vaccinated starting with the 175 first dose. 176 177 As in [19], we implement our calibrated AB model, augmented with vaccination, for Miami-Dade County of the 178 U.S. with 2.8 million population, which has been an epicenter of COVID-19 in the U.S. We conduct our 179

investigation by implementing four different strategies (including no vaccination) and obtaining the corresponding

180 numbers of total infections, reported infections, hospitalizations, and deaths. We compare and contrast the numbers

181 to assess vaccination efficacy and relative performances of the priority strategies. The vaccination strategies that we

182 investigate are a close variant of the CDC recommended strategy, an age-stratified strategy, and finally a random

183 strategy. We make a number of key observations from the results, which we believe will help public health officials

184 around the world to choose effective vaccine prioritization strategies to mitigate the negative impacts of COVID-19.

185

186 LITERATURE REVIEW

187 Vaccine prioritization and allocation are among the key challenges to strategically vaccinate communities during a 188 pandemic outbreak. On a global scale, equitable and ethical distribution of vaccines for all (low, medium, and high-189 income) countries is an important question. As the world leader in promoting global health, WHO released an 190 evidence-based framework for vaccine-specific recommendations [24]. WHO proposed vaccine prioritization for 191 three potential scenarios of transmission: community transmission, sporadic cases or cluster of cases, and no cases. 192 Each scenario has three stages and focuses on different risk groups. COVID-19 pandemic resembles "community 193 transmission." For this, the first stage focuses on healthcare workers and older adults with highest risk; second stage 194 continues the focus on older adults and people with comorbidities, sociodemographic groups, and educational staff; 195 and the third stage focuses on essential workers and social/employment groups unable to physically distance 196 themselves.

197 National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAESM) developed a more comprehensive phased 198 framework for equitable allocation of COVID-19 vaccine [29]. The first phase prioritizes healthcare workers and 199 first responders, people with high risk comorbidities, and older adults in overcrowded living conditions; second 200 phase focuses on K-12 school staff and child care workers, essential workers, people with moderate risk 201 comorbidities, people living in shelters, physically and mentally disabled people and staff that provide care, 202 employment settings where social distancing is not possible, and remaining older adults; third phase prioritizes 203 young adults, children, and workers; and fourth phase includes everyone else. No specific studies have yet been 204 presented to the literature that evaluate the efficacy of the proposed vaccination priorities for mitigating COVID-19.

205 A number of studies can be found in the literature on vaccination strategies for controlling outbreaks of other 206 viruses. The work presented in [8] analyzes the effect of both CDC guided targeted vaccination strategy as well as a 207 mass vaccination strategy for seasonal Influenza outbreaks in the U.S. The study found that a mass vaccination 208 policy reaped the most benefits both in terms of cost and quality-of-life years (QALYs) lost. Authors in [15] use a 209 genetic algorithm to find optimal vaccine distribution strategies that minimize illness and death for influenza 210 pandemics with age specific attack rates similar to the 1957-1958 A(H2N2) Asian influenza pandemic and the 211 1968–1969 A(H3N2) Hong Kong influenza pandemic. They consider coverage percentage under varying vaccine 212 availability and develop an optimal vaccination approach that is 84% more effective than random vaccination. A 213 study reported in [14] examined vaccination to prevent interpandemic influenza for high-risk groups and children,

and recommended concentrating on schoolchildren, most responsible for transmission, and then extend to high-risk groups. A compartmental model in [13] was used to develop optimal strategies to reduce the morbidity and mortality of the H7N9 pandemic. The study found that age specific vaccination schedules had the most beneficial impact on mortality.

It can be concluded from the above review of relevant literature that there is no 'one size fits all' strategy for vaccination to either prevent a pandemic outbreak or mitigate one. Virus epidemiology and corresponding disease characteristics, as well as the efficacy and supply of the vaccine must be considered in developing an effective vaccination prioritization strategy. Our paper aims to address this need by presenting a detailed AB simulation modeling approach and using it to assess efficacy of vaccine prioritization strategies for COVID-19.

223

# 224 METHODOLOGY

225 Published COVID-19 modeling approaches are either data-driven models, as in [2, 5, 7, 9, 20], or variants of SEIR 226 type compartmental models as in [1, 11, 16, 21, 22]. Data driven models are very well suited for understanding the 227 past progression of a pandemic and also for estimating parameters characterizing virus epidemiology. However, 228 these models offer limited ability to predict the future progression of a pandemic that is dynamically evolving with 229 regards to virus epidemiology, disease manifestations, and sociological conditions. Compartmental models, on the 230 other hand, are aggregate in nature and do not adapt well to changing dynamics of disease transmission. An AB 231 modeling approach is considered to be more suitable for a detailed accounting of individual attributes, specific 232 disease natural history, and complex social interventions [6].

233

We use an enhanced version of our AB simulation model that was developed to examine various social intervention strategies for COVID-19 [19]. The AB simulation model replicates the dynamics of the pandemic outbreak by incorporating: 1) population demography of the outbreak region for all age groups and employment categories, 2) numbers, sizes, and compositions of households, schools, workplaces, and community places, 3) daily schedules for people of all age groups before and during the intervention orders (e.g., stay-at-home), 4) isolation of infected and quarantine of household members, 5) closure and reopening of schools, workplaces, and community places, 6) compliance to isolation and quarantine requirements, 7) face mask usage, 8) contact tracing, 9) prioritization of

people for vaccination, 10) vaccinating those willing to receive based on supply and priority windows, 11)
epidemiological parameters of the virus, 12) infection spread, and 13) disease natural history. The key
epidemiological parameters include: disease natural history with average lengths of latent, incubation, symptomatic,
and recovery periods; distribution of infectiousness; percent asymptomatic; and fatality rate.

245

246 As in the model presented in [19], each day our model tracks the following for each person: 1) hourly movements 247 and locations based on their daily schedules that depend on age, employment status, prevailing social intervention 248 orders, and quarantine/isolation status; 2) hourly contacts with other susceptible and infected; 3) vaccination status 249 and immunity, 4) force of infection accumulation; 5) start of infection; 6) visit/consult with a doctor (if symptomatic 250 and insured); 7) testing (if infected and visited/consulted a doctor or asymptomatic chosen for testing either 251 randomly or via contact tracing); 8) test reporting delay; 9) disease progression (if infected); 10) hospitalization (if 252 infected and acutely ill); and 11) recovery or death (if infected). The AB model reports daily and cumulative values 253 of actual infected, reported infections, hospitalized, and dead, for each age category. A schematic diagram depicting 254 the algorithmic sequence and parameter inputs for the AB simulation model is presented in Figure 1.

255

256 The AB simulation-based methodology is particularized using data for Miami Dade County of Florida, with 2.8 257 million population, an epicenter for COVID-19 spread in the South-Eastern United States. A step by step approach 258 for building such a model for another region can be found in [19]. The methodology begins by generating the 259 individual people according to the U.S. census data that gives population attributes including age (see Table A1 in 260 [19]) and occupational distribution (see Table A4 in [19]). Thereafter, it generates the households based on their 261 composition characterized by the number of adults and children (see Table A2 in [19]). The model also generates, 262 per census data, schools (see Table A3 in [19]) and the workplaces and other community locations (see Table A4 in 263 [19]). Each individual is assigned a household, while maintaining the average household composition, and, 264 depending on the age, either a school or a workplace (considering employment levels). A daily (hour by hour) 265 schedule is assigned to every individual, chosen from a set of alternative schedules, based on their attributes. The 266 schedules vary between weekdays and weekends and also depend on the prevailing social intervention orders (see 267 Table A5 in [19]).



Figure 1: Schematic of the AB model for mimicking COVID-19 spread under social interventions and vaccination in the U.S.

Simulation begins on the day when one or more infected people are introduced to the region (referred to as simulation day 1). Simulation model tracks hourly movements of each individual (susceptible and infected) every day, and records for each susceptible the number of infected contacts and their identification at each location. Based on the level of infectiousness of each infected contact (which depends on the day of his/her infectiousness period), the model calculates the daily force of infection received by each susceptible from all infected contacts at all hours of the day [10]. Since the exact immune response from vaccine is not known yet, we assume a linearly increasing partial immunity for susceptibles after they receive the first dose, attaining full immunity after seven days after the second dose; we have so far only considered vaccines made by Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna. Following the assumption made in [19], the daily force of infection is considered to accumulate. However, it is assumed that if a susceptible does not gather any additional force of infection (i.e., does not come in contact with any infected) for two consecutive days, the cumulative force of infection for the susceptible reduces to zero. At the end of each day, the model uses cumulative force of infection to calculate the probability of infection for each susceptible. The model updates the infection status of all individuals to account for new infections as well as disease progressions of infected individuals. A pseudo-code in Figure 2 depicts the major elements and structure of the AB simulation program. 

Ma	in								
1	<b>for</b> simulation_day = $0, \dots, max$	<u>a</u> day							
2	<b>if</b> simulation_day = $0$								
3	generate_entities()								
4	generate_businesses()								
5	initalize_oubtrea	<i>ik()</i> // Introduces a small number of infected individuals who are contagious							
6	begin_outbreak()	// Begin interaction among infected and susceptible and start community spread							
7	report (infected, tested, re	ported, hospitalized, death) // Keeps track of daily age specific numbers							
-	Eventions Commute entities								
<u>Fu</u>	Concretes nonulation in the t	agion based on consus and assigns them to household and							
2	workplace/school (including	those unemployed who stay at home)							
2	for household = 1 total household	sebold times							
1	n1 = number of adults	isenoid_types							
5	$n^2 = number of children$								
6	for i = 1 n.								
7	assign age how	schold workplace()							
8	for $i = 1$ $n_2$								
9	assign age how	sehold_school()							
-									
Fu	nction: Generate businesses								
1	// Generates businesses in the r	egion based on census data and							
2	// classifies them as essential and	nd non-essential industries and community places							
3	<b>for</b> business = 0,,total_busin	ess_types							
4	initialize_mixing_groups	) // Creates smaller mixing groups (departments) within each							
5		business and assigns employees							
Er	nction: Begin outbrook								
<u>ru</u>	// Assigns daily schedules base	d on prevailing social intervention tracks hourly social mixing accounts for							
2	viral transmission creates n	a on prevaining social intervention, tracks nourly social mixing, accounts for							
3	stay at home/hospitalization	and records recovery and death							
4	if simulation $day < lockdown$	day							
5	schedule = schedule_1	// Pre-pandemic schedule							
6	if (simulation day >= lockdow	(av) and $(simulation day < Phase I)$							
7	schedule = schedule 2	// Schedule after lockdown begins (closure of non-essential places and schools and							
8	Senedule Senedule_2	partial opening of essential places with limited capacity)							
9	if (simulation day $\geq$ Phase I	and (simulation day < Phase II)							
10	schedule = schedule $3$	// Schedule during Phase I of reopening (schools remain closed, partial opening of							
11	_	essential and non-essential with limited capacity)							
12	if (simulation day >= Phase II	and (simulation day < Full reopening)							
13	schedule = schedule_4	// Schedule during Phase II of reopening (schools remain closed, increased partial							
14	—	opening of essential and non-essential places)							
15	<b>for</b> hour = $1,, 24$								
16	disease_progress()	// Monitors disease condition along disease natural history on an hourly basis for							
17		each infected individual							
18	tracking_individuals()	// Tracks infected and susceptible in the same location (mixing group) by the hour and							
19		calculates added force of infection for susceptible and tracks viral accumulation							
20	infection_process ()	// At the end of each day, infection status of each susceptible with							
21		any viral accumulation is determined							
22	testing()	// Tests symptomatic and some selected asymptomatic based on test availability and							
23		reports outcome considering test sensitivity and reporting delay							
24	hospitalization()	// Tracks hospitalization of symptomatic developing acute condition							
25									
26	if (simulation_day = vacci	nation_begin_day)							
27	assign_vaccinati	on_willingess() // We assume 60% of the population is willing to be vaccinated							
28	assign_vaccine_	<i>priority()</i> // Vaccine priority is assigned by chosen criteria (age and profession)							
29	• • • • • • • • •	· · · · · · ·							
30	) if (simulation_day >= vaccination_begin_day)								
31	for each willing and priority engible individual								
32	1 (received first dose)								
21		administer dose 20 // Dose 2 is administered 21 down offer first dose for Dfree							
34		uuminister_uose_2() // Dose 2 is autimistered 21 days after first dose for Pfizer							
35	also	vacune and 26 days for Moderna vacune							
30	eise	administer dose 10							
38		reduce transmission coefficient() // Reduce coefficient of transmission to reach zero seven down							
30		after dose #9							
40									
41	recoverv() or death()	// Tracks recovery or death for individuals in home/hospitals							

## 302 Figure 2: Pseudo-code for agent-based simulation model of COVID-19 with implementation of two-dose vaccines



303304

Figure 3: Disease natural history of COVID-19 [19]

306 The infected people are considered to follow a disease natural history as shown in Figure 3, parameters of which can 307 be found in Table A6 of [19]. The model assumes that the recovered cases become fully immune to further COVID-308 19 infections. However, since this assumption is not fully supported yet by data, people recovered from COVID-19 309 are also considered candidates for vaccination. The duration and intensity of infectiousness is considered to be 310 guided by a lognormal density function (see Figure 4). The function is truncated at the average length of the 311 infectiousness period (which is considered to be 9.5 days). Asymptomatic cases are assumed to follow a similar 312 infectiousness intensity profile but scaled by a factor in the force of infection calculation (1) (see Table A7 in 313 [19]).



314 315

- Figure 4: Lognormal distribution function for infectiousness profile of a COVID-19 case [19]
- 316

The AB model estimates the probability of infection for a susceptible using the accumulated value of *daily force of infection* ( ), which is calculated as follows.

319 
$$\lambda_{i} = \sum_{k|h_{k}=h_{i}} \frac{I_{k}\beta_{h}\kappa(t-\tau_{k})\rho_{k}[1+C_{k}(\omega-1)]}{n_{i}^{\alpha}} + \sum_{j,k|l_{k}^{j}=l_{i}^{j}} \frac{I_{k}\beta_{p}^{j}\kappa(t-\tau_{k})\rho_{k}[1+C_{k}(\omega-1)]}{m_{i}^{j}}.$$
 (1)

320

Equation (1) is a modified version of the force of infection equation given in [10], parameters of which can be found in Table A7 of [19]. The force of infection is gathered by a susceptible individual each day from all infected contacts in his/her mixing groups (home, school/workplace, and community places). The cumulative value of  $\lambda_i$  is used at the end of each day to calculate the probability of infection as  $1 - exp^{-\lambda_i}$ .

325

326 The AB model incorporates all applicable intervention orders like stay-at-home, school and workplace closure and 327 reopening, isolation of symptomatic cases at home, and quarantine of household members of those who are infected. 328 The model also considers: varying levels of compliances for isolation and quarantine, lower on-site staffing levels of 329 essential work and community places during stay-at-home order, restricted daily schedule of people during various 330 social intervention periods, phased lifting of interventions, use of face masks, contact tracing with different target 331 levels to identify asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases, and vaccination. The timeline for social interventions 332 implemented in the model are summarized in Table 1. For many other salient features of our AB simulation model, 333 such as percentages of asymptomatic and uninsured with no access to doctor referral needed for testing during early 334 days of the pandemic, CDC's changing testing guidelines, test sensitivity and specificity, test result reporting delay, 335 etc., readers are referred to [19].

Intervention policy implemented	Date of implementation	Day of
at Miami-Dade County, Florida, U.S.	_	Simulation
Stay at home policy	March 17 2020	35
Phase I reopening	May 18 2020	97
Phase II reopening	June 5 2020	115
Mandatory usage of Face mask	June 25 2020	135
Contact tracing (assumed to begin)	June 30 2020	140
Phase III reopening	September 25 2020	227
School reopening	September 30 2020	232
Vaccination begin day	December 15 2020	308

336 337

Table 1: Social intervention order timeline for Miami-Dade County [27]

As observed in [19], though it is implemented for a specific region, our model is quite general in its usability for other urban regions with similar demography, societal characteristics, and intervention measures. In our model, demographic inputs (age and household distribution, number of schools for various age groups, and number of

workplaces of various types and sizes) are curated from both national and local census records. Social interventions vary from region to region and the related parameters can be easily updated. Similarly, the data related to epidemiology of COVID-19 are unlikely to be significantly vary from one region to another, though some adjustments of these based on population demographics may be needed.

345

## 346 Model Calibration

347 The AB model utilizes a large number of parameters, which are *demographic*, *epidemiological*, and *social* 348 intervention parameters. We kept almost all of the above parameters fixed at their respective chosen values and 349 calibrated the model by changing values for only a few. The calibrated parameters include the transmission 350 coefficients used in calculating force of infection at home, work, school, and community places ( $\beta_h$  and  $\beta_n^j$ ). The 351 choice of the values of transmission coefficients was initially guided by [10] and thereafter adjusted at different 352 points in time during the calibration period (until December 30, 2020). The only other parameters that were 353 calibrated are the number of errands in the daily schedules under various intervention conditions and the percentage 354 of workers in essential (e.g., healthcare, utility services, and grocery stores) and non-essential (e.g., offices and 355 restaurants) workplaces who physically reported to work during different intervention periods. Calibration of the 356 above parameters was done so that the daily cumulative numbers of reported infected cases from the AB simulation 357 model closely match the values published in the Florida COVID-19 dashboard until December 30, 2020. Figure 5 358 shows the daily cumulative average values (with 95% confidence intervals) for the reported infected cases, 359 hospitalizations, and deaths as obtained from the simulation model. The dotted lines represent the actual numbers 360 reported in the Florida COVID-19 dashboard for Miami-Dade County [28].

- 361
- 362
- 363
- 364
- 365
- 366
- 367
- 368



- 423 424 425 Figure 5: Validation graphs with average daily cumulative values of infected, reported, and death calibrated until 426 Dec 30, 2020 427 428 VACCINE PRIORITIZATION STRATEGIES 429 We used our AB model to examine the expected benefits of the ongoing vaccination in the U.S. using the limited 430 supply of two types of vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna, which currently have the emergency 431 approvals for distribution. We considered the number of vaccine doses that the two companies are contracted by the 432 U.S. government to supply, which include the initial contracts for 100 million doses from each company and the 433 more recent contract for an additional 100 million doses from Pfizer/BoiNTech. That makes it a total of 300 million 434 doses which can inoculate 150 million people, as both vaccines require two doses to be administered 21 days and 28 435 days apart, respectively for Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna. To our knowledge, the total supply is being apportioned 436 among the states and the counties depending on the population. Florida has approximately 6.5% of the U.S. 437 population and the Miami Dade County has 13% of Florida's population. Hence, we assumed that Miami Dade 438 County will receive approximately 2.54 million doses and be able to vaccinate 1.27 million people out of the total 439 2.8 million population. We also assumed that the vaccine deliveries will occur in batches starting in late December 440 2020 till late June 2021. Our study goal was to first determine the extent of reduction in the number of infections, 441 hospitalizations, and deaths that we can expect to realize from the vaccination process in comparison with if no 442 vaccines were available. Thereafter, we conducted a comparative study between three different vaccination priority 443 schemes to determine if the outcomes (number of reported cases, hospitalized, and dead) from those are statistically 444 significant. 445 446 447 448 449 450 451
- 452



454

151

455

	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3	Priority 4	Priority 5
Age stratified strategy	<ul> <li>Healthcare providers</li> <li>Nursing home residents</li> <li>Dec 15, 2020 – Jan 13, 2021</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>People of ages 65 and over</li> <li>Jan 14 – Feb 12 2021</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>People of ages 55 to 64</li> <li>Feb 13 – Mar 14 2021</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>People of ages 45 to 54</li> <li>Mar 15 – Apr 13, 2021</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>People of ages 16 to 44</li> <li>Apr 14 – Jul 15, 2021</li> </ul>
Minor CDC variant strategy	<ul> <li>Healthcare providers</li> <li>Nursing home residents</li> <li>Dec 15, 2020 – Jan 13, 2021</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>First responders</li> <li>Educators</li> <li>People of ages 75 and over</li> <li>Jan 14 – Feb 12, 2021</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>People of ages 65 to 74</li> <li>Feb 13 – Mar 30, 2021</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>People of ages 16 to 64</li> <li>Apr 1 – Jul 15, 2021</li> </ul>	• NA
Random strategy	<ul> <li>Healthcare providers and nursing home residents</li> <li>Dec 15 2020 – Jan 13, 2020</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>All people of ages 16 and over</li> <li>Jan 14 – Jul 15, 2021</li> </ul>	• NA	• NA	• NA

456 457

 $5\overline{7}$  Figure 6: Vaccine prioritization strategies examined using AB simulation model for COVID-19 in the U.S.

458 The priority strategies that were examined are broadly described here; a more complete description is presented in 459 Figure 6. In the absence of a declared timeline for transition of eligibility from one priority group to the next, we 460 assumed 30 days between transition. This period was extended to allow all eligible and willing to be vaccinated 461 when the phased vaccine supply fell short of the number of people in the eligible priority group. The first strategy 462 that we implemented is a close *variant of the CDC recommended strategy*: Priority 1: healthcare providers and 463 nursing home residents; Priority 2: first responders, educators, and people of ages 75 and over; Priority 3: people of 464 ages 65 to 74; Priority 4: people of ages 16 to 64. The CDC recommended strategy also includes in priority 3 people 465 of ages 16 to 64 with specific health conditions. Since we did not track health conditions in our AB model, we 466 limited our priority 3 to people of ages 65 and above only. The second strategy that we implemented is an age-467 stratified strategy: Priority 1: healthcare providers and nursing home residents; Priority 2: people of ages 65 and 468 over; Priority 3: people of ages 55 to 64; Priority 4: people of ages 45 to 54; Priority 5: people of ages 16 to 44. The 469 third strategy that we implemented is a *random strategy*: Priority 1: healthcare providers and nursing home 470 residents; Priority 2: all people of ages 16 and over. People with prior COVID-19 history were not excluded and 471 60% of the people were considered willing to vaccinate [3, 18].

Δ	7	2
-	c /	

### 473 RESULTS

The strategy based on of the CDC recommendation achieves a reduction of 9%, 10%, 9%, and 11% for total infected, reported cases, hospitalized, and dead, respectively, compared to the outcomes with no vaccination. According to our model, with the close variant of CDC strategy the pandemic is likely to subside below a small threshold (100) of new reported cases by May 16, 2021 compared to June 12, 2021 if no vaccines were available (see Figure 7). Hence the likely net impact of vaccination in the urban Miami-Dade County of Florida will include sparing approximately 5.6% of the population from infection and achieving normalcy about a month sooner. This seemingly low impact of vaccination may be attributed to the fact that the trend of explosive growth of new cases in the winter months will have significantly reduced the pool of susceptible people by late spring, possibly approaching the 'herd immunity' state. Figure 7 presents the plots of AB model predicted outcomes for four scenarios: no vaccination and the three vaccine prioritization strategies. The plots show the average cumulative cases for infected (actual number of infected, which is not observed and can only be assessed through a model), reported cases, hospitalizations, and deaths. As can be seen, vaccination, irrespective of the strategy for prioritization, yields a significant reduction in the pandemic impact. Per our model, with no vaccination, the percentage of infected population will reach nearly 61% by mid-June of 2021.

500

501

502

503

504



506 The performances of the three vaccine prioritization strategies, as seen in Figure 7 are comparable. Simple pairwise 507 comparisons of the reported number of cases using a test of hypothesis showed that the variant of the CDC policy 508 produces a statistically significant lower number of reported cases than the no vaccination (p-value 0.0204). Age-

509 stratified and random strategies also yield statistically significantly lower numbers of reported cases compared to no 510 vaccination. However, comparison among the three vaccine prioritization strategies showed no significant statistical 511 difference for reported cases between strategies (p-values near 0.4). The numbers for hospitalizations and deaths 512 also had a similar trend. The model predicted values of the cumulative numbers of infected cases, reported cases, 513 hospitalized, and dead from the three policies and their 95% confidence intervals are presented in Table 2. The table 514 also provides the time frame when the pandemic falls below the threshold of 100 new reported cases. We observed 515 from the Florida COVID-19 dashboard that reported numbers of deaths are the most inconsistent of all reported data 516 due to reasons like: the timeline for deaths occurring from COVID-19 is highly variable, and deaths occur at homes, 517 hospitals, long term care facilities for which the reporting mechanism is perhaps not as streamlined. Hence, we 518 applied the percentages of deaths of those hospitalized in various age groups in the month of November 2020 to all 519 the subsequent months of our simulation study (till end of July 2021). As expected, CDC variant strategy produced 520 statistically significant lower numbers of hospitalized and deaths compared to no vaccination (p-values 0.0014 and 521 0.0015, respectively). The differences among the three vaccination strategies, however, are not statistically 522 significant (p-values range from 0.08 to 0.3).

523

Outcome	Infected Cases	Reported	Hospitalized	Deaths	Date when new
		Cases			reported cases
Prioritization					fall below 100
Strategy					
No vaccination	1.71M	732K	18.7K	9K	June 12, 2021
	(1.66M –	(695K –	(18.3K –	(8.8K –	
	1.76M)	770K)	19.1K)	9.3K)	
Minor variant of	1.55M	659K	17K	8K	May 17, 2021
	(1.38M –	(567K –	(15.7k –	(7.2K –	
CDC	1.73M)	752K)	18.3k)	8.8K)	
Age stratified	1.58M	672K	17.6K	8.5K	May 22, 2021
	(1.43M –	(589K –	(16.6k –	(7.9k – 8.9k)	
	1.73M)	754K)	18.5k)		
Random	1.54M	649K	17.3K	8.4K	May 7, 2021
	(1.32M –	(538K –	(15.9K –	(7.6K –	-
	1.75M)	761K)	18.7K)	9.1K)	
		,			

524

526 AB model for the vaccine prioritization strategies

<sup>525</sup> Table 2. Summary of expected cumulative values (with 95% confidence intervals) on July 31, 2021 obtained by the

### 528 CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have developed a detailed AB simulation model for mimicking the spread of COVID-19 in an urban region (Miami-Dade County, Florida) of the of the U.S. The model is calibrated using transmission coefficients and daily schedules of the people and validated using the data reported in the Florida COVID-19 dashboard till December 30, 2020 (see Figure 5). On this validated model we have incorporated the vaccination process that started in the U.S. on December 15, 2020 using two different vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna with an estimated 2.54 million doses for Miami-Dade county to inoculate 1.27 million people on a 2 dose regimen, based on government contracts at the time of study.

536

Model results indicate that the use of the available vaccines can reduce the spread of the virus and help the pandemic to subside below a small threshold of daily new cases by mid-May 2021, approximately a month sooner than if no vaccines were available. Also, the vaccination is expected to reduce number of infections by approximately 10% compared to no vaccination, which translates to sparing 5.6% of the total population from being infected.

We note that, even though the vaccines were developed and approved for human use at a much faster rate than ever accomplished before, the accelerated growth of the infections, especially with the onset of the winter in the northern hemisphere, reduced the opportunities for benefits that the vaccines could have delivered. For example, by end of January 2021 a large proportion (over 41%) of the Miami-Dade population is expected to be infected, significantly reducing the pool of susceptible for vaccines to work on.

546

Another noteworthy finding of this study was that there was no statistical difference in number of reported cases between vaccination prioritization strategies tested: CDC recommendation based strategy, strictly age-based strategy, and random strategy. This information can help give more latitude for decision makers in COVID-19 vaccine distribution, as this research suggests that adhering strictly to priority groups may not be as paramount to vaccination campaign success as simply distributing the vaccines.

552

Though our AB model is well suited to study future progression of COVID-19, it has some limitations. As mentioned under vaccination strategies, our model did not include health conditions that are relevant to COVID-19 (like pulmonary disease, obesity, heart problems) as attributes for people. Hence, we were not able to implement one

556 element of the CDC recommended prioritization strategy that includes people aged 16-64 years with underlying 557 medical conditions in priority 3. Also, we did not consider any vaccine wastage due to complexities associated with 558 refrigeration, distribution, and human error. We also assumed that vaccination of all priority groups will occur 559 uniformly over the eligibility periods considered, which may not reflect the reality. Also, since, to our knowledge, 560 there is little available literature on the rate of immunity growth each day from the two dose vaccines, we assumed a 561 linear growth starting with the first dose and culminating (full immunity) seven days after the second dose. Lastly, 562 as the pandemic progresses, new strains of the virus are being identified with slightly different viral parameters that 563 may not receive full coverage from the vaccine. It is unclear how this will impact the pandemic projection presented 564 in this model, though latest research shows that those vaccinated are likely to be protected from the new strains.

565

566 Unlike highly aggregated compartmental models that are relatively easy to apply to multiple regions/countries, 567 agent-based models are highly granular and require extensive data collection for the application region. The data 568 include population in all age groups, household compositions of adults and children, essential and non-essential 569 businesses and factories of different sizes as places for employment, schools and colleges of different sizes for 570 different age groups, peoples schedule on weekdays and weekends during different social intervention phases, 571 intervention timelines, testing availability and reporting delays, quarantine, isolation, and mask usage compliance, 572 and level of contact tracing. Hence, implementing the AB model to another region is a major task (see [19] for a 573 step-by-step approach).

574

As vaccination is ramping up in earnest in the U.S. at the time of our study, we believe that our results will provide useful information for the healthcare policy makers not only for Miami-Dade County but for similar urban regions in the U.S. and perhaps elsewhere in the world with a similar demography.

- 578
- 579 BIBLIOGRAPHY

 Aleta A, Martin-Corral D, Piontti A, AJelli M, Litvinova M, Chinazzi M. Modeling the impact of social distancing, testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second-wave scenarios of the COVID-19 epidemic. Medrxiv. 2020 May 18;

Barmparis G, Tsironis G. Estimating the infection horizon of COVID-19 in eight countries with a data-driven approach. 135. 2020 May;109842.

- Beusokem M. Survey: COVID vaccine willingness waned since April. Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy [Internet]. 2020 Dec 30 [cited 2021 Jan 28]; Available from: https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/newsperspective/2020/12/survey-covid-vaccine-willingness-waned-april
- Buckner J, Chowell G, Springborn M. Optimal Dynamic Prioritization of Scarce COVID-19 Vaccines. Medrxiv. 2020 Sep;
- 5. Candido D, Claro I, Jesus J, Marciel de Souza W, Moreira F, Dellicour S. Evolution and epidemic spread of
   SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil. Science. 2020 Sep 4;369(6508):1255–60.
- 592 6. Chao D, Halloran E, Obenchain V, Longini I. FluTE, a publicly available stochastic influenza epidemic
  593 simulation model. PLoS Comput Biol. 2010 Jan 29;6(1):e1000656.
- 594 7. Chintalapudi N, Battineni G, Amentaa F. COVID-19 virus outbreak forecasting of registered and recovered
   595 cases after sixty day lockdown in Italy: A data driven model approach. J Microbiol Immunol Infect. 2020
   596 Jun;53(3):396–403.
- Sep;14(6):800–11.
  Clements K, Chancellor J, Kristin N, DeLong K, Thompson D. Cost-Effectiveness of a Recommendation of Universal Mass Vaccination for Seasonal Influenza in the United States. Value in Health. 2011
- Fang Y, Nie Y, Penny M. Transmission dynamics of the COVID □19 outbreak and effectiveness of government interventions: A data □ driven analysis. J Med Virol. 92(6):645–59.
- Ferguson N, Cummings D, Fraser C, Cajka J, Cooley P, Burke D. Estimating disease burden of a potential
   A(H7N9) pandemic influenza outbreak in the United States. Nature. 2006 Apr 26;442(7101):448–52.
- Hou C, Chen J, Zhou Y, Hua L, Yuan J, He S. The effectiveness of quarantine of Wuhan city against the
   Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID□19): A well□mixed SEIR model analysis. J Med Virol. 2020
   Jul;92(7):841–8.
- I2. Jordan A, Almukhtar S, Aufrichtig A, Barnard A, Bloch M, Cahalan S, et al. Coronavirus in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count. NYtimes.com [Internet]. 2021 Jan 25 [cited 2021 Jan 25]; Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-us-cases.html
- Knipl D, Röst G. Modelling the strategies for age specific vaccination scheduling during influenza pandemic
   outbreaks. Math Biosci Eng. 2011 Jan;8(11):123–39.
- Longini I, Halloran E. Strategy for Distribution of Influenza Vaccine to High-Risk Groups and Children.
   American Journal of Epidemiology. 2005 Feb 15;161(4):303–6.
- 614 15. Patel R, Longini I, Halloran E. Finding optimal vaccination strategies for pandemic influenza using genetic algorithms. Journal of Theoretical Biology. 2005 May 21;234(2):201–12.
- 616 16. Peng L, Yang W, Zhang D, Zhuge C, Hong L. Epidemic analysis of COVID-19 in China by dynamical
   617 modeling. MedRxiv. 2020 Feb 18;
- Roope L, Clarke P, Duch R. Who should get the coronavirus vaccine first? France and the UK have different answers. The Conservation [Internet]. 2020 Nov 16 [cited 2021 Jan 25]; Available from:
   https://theconversation.com/who-should-get-the-coronavirus-vaccine-first-france-and-the-uk-have-different-answers-149875
- 18. Saad L. U.S. Readiness to Get COVID-19 Vaccine Steadies at 65%. Gallup News [Internet]. 2021 Jan 12
  [cited 2021 Jan 28]; Available from: https://news.gallup.com/poll/328415/readiness-covid-vaccine-steadies.aspx

- Tatapudi H, Das R, Das T. Impact assessment of full and partial stay-at-home orders, face mask usage, and contact tracing: An agent-based simulation study of COVID-19 for an urban region. Global Epidemiology. 2020 Nov 1;2(100036).
- Yang S, Cao P, Du P, Wu Z, Zhang Z, Yang L. Early estimation of the case fatality rate of COVID-19 in mainland China: a data-driven analysis. Ann Transl Med. 2020 Feb;8(4):128.
- 430 21. Yang Z, Zeng Z, Wang K, Wong S, Liang W, Zanin M. Modified SEIR and AI prediction of the epidemics
  trend of COVID-19 in China under public health interventions. J Thorac Dis. 2020 Mar;12(3):165–74.
- 632 22. Zhang Y, Jiang B, Yuan J, Tao Y. The impact of social distancing and epicenter lockdown on the COVID-19
  633 epidemic in mainland China: A data-driven SEIQR model study. MedRxiv. 2020 Mar 6;
- Pfizer and BioNtech conclude Phase 3 study of COVID-19 vaccine candidate, meeting all primary efficacy
  endpoints. Pfizer [Internet]. 2020 Nov 18 [cited 2021 Jan 25]; Available from:
  https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-and-biontech-conclude-phase-3-studycovid-19-vaccine
- 638 24. Evidence to recommendations for COVID-19 vaccines: Evidence framework. WHO [Internet]. 2020 Dec 10
  639 [cited 2020 Jan 25]; Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-SAGE640 Framework-Evidence-2020-1
- 64125.How CDC Is Making COVID-19 Vaccine Recommendations. CDC [Internet]. 2020 Dec 30 [cited 2021 Jan64225]; Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/recommendations-process.html
- 643 26. COVID-19 Vaccines. US Food & Drug Administration [Internet]. 2021 Jan 12 [cited 2021 Jan 25]; Available
   644 from: https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/pfizer 645 biontech-covid-19-vaccine
- Florida. COVID-19 Updates [Internet]. The City of Miami. [cited 2021 Jan 26]. Available from: https://www.miamigov.com/Notices/News-Media/COVID-19-Updates
- Florida's COVID-19 Data and Surveillance Dashboard,. Florida Department of Health, Division of Disease
   Control and Health Protection.
- 65029.Framework for equitable allocation of COVID-19 vaccine [Internet]. The National Academy Press; [cited6512021 Jan 25]. Available from: https://www.nap.edu/read/25917/chapter/1