1

1 Optimal vaccine allocation for COVID-19 in the Netherlands: a data-driven

2 prioritization

- 3
- 4 Fuminari Miura^{1,2}, Ka Yin Leung¹, Don Klinkenberg¹, Kylie E. C. Ainslie^{1,3,4}, Jacco Wallinga^{1,5}
- 5
- 6 ¹ Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment
- 7 (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands
- 8 ² Center for Marine Environmental Studies (CMES), Ehime University, Ehime, Japan
- 9 ³ School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
- 10 ⁴MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis and Abdul Latif Jameel Institute for Disease
- 11 and Emergency Analytics, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
- ⁵ Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC), Leiden, the
- 13 Netherlands
- 14
- 15
- 16 *Corresponding author
- 17 Email: fuminari.miura@rivm.nl
- 18 19

20 Author contributions

- 21 Conceptualization: FM JW.
- 22 Data curation: FM.
- 23 Formal analysis: FM KL JW.
- 24 Investigation: FM.
- 25 Methodology: FM KL DK JW.
- 26 Software: FM.
- 27 Validation: FM KL JW.
- 28 Visualization: FM.
- 29 Writing original draft: FM KL DK KA JW.
- 30 Writing review & editing: FM KL DK KA JW.
- 31

32 Data Availability

- All data are available from GitHub repository (https://github.com/fmiura/VacAllo_2021).
- 34 35 Funding
- 36 FM acknowledges funding from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS KAKENHI,
- 37 Grant Number 20J00793). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon
- 2020 research and innovation programme project EpiPose (grant agreement number 101003688).
- 39
- 40 **Competing interests**
- 41 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.
- 42

43 Acknowledgement

- 44 We thank Jantien Backer for sharing the data on contact matrices in the Netherlands, and Scott NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
- 45 McDonald for helpful discussions.

2

46 Abstract

For the control of COVID-19, vaccination programmes provide a long-term solution. The
amount of available vaccines is often limited, and thus it is crucial to determine the allocation
strategy. While mathematical modelling approaches have been used to find an optimal
distribution of vaccines, there is an excessively large number of possible schemes to be simulated.

Here, we propose an algorithm to find a near-optimal allocation scheme given an 51 intervention objective such as minimization of new infections, hospitalizations, or deaths, where 52 multiple vaccines are available. The proposed principle for allocating vaccines is to target 53 subgroups with the largest reduction in the outcome of interest, such as new infections, due to 54 vaccination that fully immunizes a single individual. We express the expected impact of 55 vaccinating each subgroup in terms of the observed incidence of infection and force of infection. 56 57 The proposed approach is firstly evaluated with a simulated epidemic and then applied to the epidemiological data on COVID-19 in the Netherlands. 58

59 Our results reveal how the optimal allocation depends on the objective of infection control. 60 In the case of COVID-19, if we wish to minimize deaths, the optimal allocation strategy is not 61 efficient for minimizing other outcomes, such as infections. In simulated epidemics, an allocation 62 strategy optimized for an outcome outperforms other strategies such as the allocation from young 63 to old, from old to young, and at random. Our simulations clarify that the current policy in the 64 Netherlands (i.e., allocation from old to young) was concordant with the allocation scheme that 65 minimizes deaths.

The proposed method provides an optimal allocation scheme, given routine surveillance
data that reflect ongoing transmissions. The principle of allocation is useful for providing plausible
simulation scenarios for complex models, which give a more robust basis to determine
intervention strategies.

70 71

72 Author summary

73 Vaccination is the key to controlling the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. In the early stages of 74 an epidemic, there is shortage of vaccine stocks. Here, we propose an algorithm that computes an optimal vaccine distribution among groups for each intervention objective (e.g., minimizing new 75 76 infections, hospitalizations, or deaths). Unlike existing approaches that use detailed information on 77 at-risk contacts between and among groups, the proposed algorithm requires only routine surveillance data on the number of cases. This method is applicable even when multiple vaccines 78 79 are available. Simulation results show that the allocation scheme optimized by our algorithm performed the best compared with other strategies such as allocating vaccines at random and in 80 the order of age. Our results also reveal that an allocation scheme optimized for one specific 81 82 objective is not necessarily efficient for another, indicating the importance of the decision-making 83 at the early phase of distributions. 84

3

85 Introduction

SARS-CoV-2 has posed a great threat to public health. As of 8 July 2021, 33,270,049 cases
and 740,809 deaths with COVID-19 have been reported in the EU/EEA (1), and globally there have
been 4,006,882 deaths reported (2). While non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) reduce
transmission (3,4), the societal cost of implementing these measures is enormous (5,6), and the
effect is short-lived. Vaccination offers a long-term approach to control COVID-19.

Currently, sixteen vaccines have been approved for use, 99 companies are still conducting
clinical trials to develop next generation vaccines (7). There is a limited amount of vaccine
available, especially in low- and middle-income countries, because of narrow production capacity
and logistics (2,8,9). There is an urgent need to optimize the allocation of scarce vaccines.

95 The optimal allocation depends on the objective of infection control. If the objective is to minimize hospitalizations, it might be best to target those with the highest risk of severe illness 96 upon infection. If the objective is to reduce transmission of infection, it might be best to target the 97 98 individuals who contribute most to future infections. Similar allocation problems were previously 99 explored for influenza vaccination programmes (10-12). The allocation of COVID-19 vaccines has 100 been evaluated in combination with NPIs (13-15), with age-varying vaccine efficacy (16), and with 101 different sizes of the vaccine stockpile (17,18). These studies examined plausible scenarios with 102 numerous combinations of models and parameters; however, the challenge here is that there are innumerable possible allocation schemes to compare. 103

Here we show a data-driven approach to find optimal allocation schemes, by age group and vaccine type, that minimize either new infections, hospitalizations, or deaths. As per previous studies (13–18), we stratify the population by age, because age is shown to be an important risk factor for susceptibility (19,20), severe illness (21,22), and mortality (21,23,24). We apply the proposed approach to a simulated epidemic to evaluate its performance. We also test it with epidemiological data of COVID-19 in the Netherlands, in order to find optimal allocation schemes for different types of vaccines.

4

(Eq.1)

Results 112

Impact of a single unit of vaccination 113

We are interested in prioritizing a subgroup, to target vaccination of individuals in group i, 114 115 by considering within- and between-subgroup transmissions. To find optimal allocation schemes, the proposed approach relies on establishing the impact of a single unit of vaccine (i.e., the number 116 of doses to fully immunize a single individual), as described in the following three steps. 117

First, we write an age-stratified transmission process in matrix form by introducing the 118 next generation matrix *K* (25–27). The next generation matrix *K* gives the number of new infections 119 in a successive generation, such that the number of new infections at time t + 1 after one 120 121 generation of infections is $\mathbf{x}(t + 1) = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}(t)$. Note that **K** is a $m \times m$ matrix, and we have *m* age 122 groups. We start with a $m \times 1$ vector of age-specific infection at time t, x(t).

Second, we define the "impact" of a single unit of vaccination as the reduction in the 123 number of new infections generated by an infected individual. A decrease in the number of 124 infected individuals at time t + 1, x(t + 1), is expressed as a result of changes in the next 125 generation matrix **K** and in the number of infected individuals x(t) due to vaccinating one 126 individual. With simplified notation, we can write this as $\mathbf{x}'(t+1) = \mathbf{K}'\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}'(t)$, where \mathbf{K}' 127 and x'(t) are derivatives with respect to the number of vaccinated individuals; K'x(t) is the direct 128 129 effect of vaccinating an individual and removing them from the susceptible population and Kx'(t)is the indirect effect of vaccinating a single individual by reducing onward infections (see Eq.S4 130 131 and Eq.S7 for full notation).

Third, the main interest here is to approximate the next generation matrix **K** using 132 observed epidemiological data. By approximating K, we can calculate above-defined changes 133 without knowing the detailed contact information between groups. To derive the approximated 134 form, we require that at-risk contacts are reciprocal. With this condition, the next generation 135 matrix **K** can be safely approximated by the combination of the force of infection $\frac{x_i(t)}{s_i(t)}$ (i.e., 136 incidence rate of new infections $x_i(t)$ per susceptible individual $s_i(t)$ and the incidence rate of 137 new infections per individual $\frac{x_i(t)}{n_i}$, and its approximation error is guaranteed to be small if the 138 observation interval for new infections is more than two generation intervals (28) (see detailed 139 140 derivation in SI Text-1).

Using the above results, when age group *i* is targeted for vaccination, its impact can be 141 measured as the contribution of the change in group *i* to the relative reduction in the number of 142 new infections after one generation of infection (see Eq. S11 in SI Text-1). As a result, we can 143 define this quantity as the "importance weight" of infection $y_i^{(I)}$, given by $y_i^{(I)} = Rfg\left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)}\right) \frac{c_i}{a_i} \frac{x_i(t)}{s_i(t)} \frac{x_i(t)}{n_i}$ 144

- 145
 - where *R* is the reproduction number, *f* and *g* are normalizing constants, $q_i^{(S)}$ and $q_i^{(T)}$ are vaccine 146 efficacies for susceptibility and transmissibility in age group i, c_i is per contact probability of 147 transmitting infection for age group i, and a_i is per contact probability of acquiring infection for 148 age group *i*. We can interpret the quantity $y_i^{(l)}$ as the expected reduction in the number of new 149 infections generated by an infected individual after introducing a single unit of vaccine in group *i*, 150 151 compared with the counterfactual situation where no vaccine is introduced.

The importance weight can be generalized for other disease outcomes. We find that the 152 generalized form of *Eq.*1 for other disease outcomes can be written as the product of the relative 153 change in the number of new infections $y_i^{(l)}$ and a disease progression rate (see the derivation in **SI** 154 **Text-1**). To illustrate its application, we introduce the importance weight of hospitalization $y_i^{(H)}$ 155 and death $y_i^{(D)}$, which are defined as the relative reduction in the number of hospitalizations and 156

5

157 deaths;

and

158
$$y_i^{(H)} = \eta_i y_i^{(I)}$$
 (Eq.2)

159 160

$$y_i^{(D)} = \mu_i y_i^{(I)}$$
 (Eq.3)

where η_i is the infection hospitalization rate and μ_i is the infection mortality rate for age group *i*.

163 *Prioritization algorithm*

Given a limited stockpile of vaccines, we assess the expected impacts of a single vaccination 164 on the number of new infections, hospitalization, or deaths, with importance weights (i.e., $y_i^{(l)}$, 165 $y_i^{(H)}$ and $y_i^{(D)}$ shown in Eq.1-3). In the case that there are multiple types of vaccines, we can define 166 importance weights by vaccine type. To illustrate the algorithm proposed in this study, we use the 167 example of minimization of hospitalization, letting $y_i^{(H)(j)}$ denote the importance weight of 168 169 hospitalization (H) for vaccine type *j* in age group *i*. By comparing age and vaccine type specific 170 importance weights, the sequential allocation is performed as described below: Step-1: Decide the objective of infection control (in this example, minimizing hospitalization (H)) 171 Step-2: Calculate importance weights $y_i^{(H)(j)}$ per age-group *i* and vaccine type *j* 172 Step-3: Find a combination of age-group *i* and vaccine type *j* that has the largest importance 173 174 weight; this provides the selected age group and selected vaccine type. Step-4: Allocate a single unit of the selected vaccine to the selected age-group 175 Step-5: Re-calculate importance weights by decreasing the weights in the targeted age-group, as 176

177 $y_i^{(H)(j)} + \frac{dy_i^{(H)(j)}}{du_i}$. Others remain the same.

178 Step-6: Repeat above until the end of vaccine stockpile.

Note that in step-5 all the importance weights of the age group *i* are updated. This is because the
allocation of one vaccine type depletes susceptible and infectious individuals in the targeted age
group, and thus it affects the expected impacts of other vaccines from next iterations (see detailed
derivation in SI Text-1). The pseudo code for this algorithm is provided in Table-S2.

There are four conditions that should be met; (i) the epidemic grows exponentially over the time interval, (ii) at-risk contacts are reciprocal, (iii) the observation interval for new infections is sufficiently long, and (iv) there is no major change in the age distribution of the risk of infection. With these assumptions, we can reconstruct the (approximated) next generation matrix and calculate the expected impact on each outcome due to vaccination, without detailed information about contacts between groups (28).

189

190 *Test against simulated data*

191 We test the performance of the proposed algorithm using a simulated epidemic. Figure-192 **1(A)** illustrates the generated epidemic curve where we set the basic reproduction number R_0 to 1.2 and the generation time as 5 days, based on the estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections, following 193 194 previous modelling studies (13,16) (see **Method** for details of simulation settings). Although only partial observations on the incidence and force of infection are used as inputs, the allocation 195 strategies yielded by our algorithm perform better than other strategies that we tested in most 196 cases (i.e., random allocation, allocation from young to old groups, allocation from old to young 197 198 groups, and no vaccination) (Figure-1(D)-(F)).

6

200 Age distribution of allocated vaccines by prioritization scheme

We apply the proposed approach to epidemiological data on COVID-19 in the Netherlands. Higher efficacious vaccines are allocated first, and then lower efficacious vaccines are distributed later on (**Figure 2** and **Figure S2**). **Figure 2** shows the detailed breakdown of allocated vaccines by age group and vaccine type in each allocation scheme, and all the schemes start with the highest efficacious vaccine (i.e., Pfizer vaccine). Since high vaccine efficacy results in larger impacts per vaccination (**Eq-2**), it is natural to prioritize the allocation of higher efficacious vaccines.

Depending on the objective of infection control, the type of vaccines that each age group receives would differ. If a specific age group is significantly contributing to the objective, it is better to distribute higher efficacious vaccines to that group. For example, there is a large contribution of age 21-30 for the number of infections (**Figure S1**), and thus higher efficacious vaccines are distributed to that group if the objective is to minimize the number of infections (top row in **Figure 2**). If we wish to minimize the number of hospitalizations or deaths, those vaccines would be distributed to the elderly (second and third rows in **Figure 2**).

The optimal timing of switching from one age group to another also varies by objective. 214 When we set the objective as the minimization of the number of infections or hospitalizations, the 215 selected allocation orders for these two objectives suggest to distribute vaccines to several age-216 groups in parallel (first and second rows in Figure 2 and Figure S3). By contrast, when we set the 217 objective as the minimization of the number of deaths, the allocation scheme generally focused on 218 219 one age group, from old to young, and did not switch to the next age group until the vaccination of 220 the first age group (i.e., age 60+) is finished (third row in Figure 2 and Figure S3). In terms of the 221 order and the switching timing, the selected allocation scheme that minimizes deaths is concordant 222 with the current allocation policy in the Netherlands (29).

223

224 Different benefits between vaccine prioritization strategies

Allocation schemes that are optimized for one objective may not be optimal with respect to 225 another, as illustrated by our simulations. If we choose to minimize the number of infections, that 226 227 allocation scheme is not efficient for the minimization of deaths (Figure 3 (A)). In contrast, if we wish to minimize the number of hospitalizations or deaths (Figure 3 (B) and (C)), those strategies 228 229 are not efficient for minimizing infections. Especially, the difference in the expected reduction is larger at the early phase of allocations; this is because mainly younger age groups are drivers of 230 231 transmission (Figure S1 (A)), while younger individuals are not in high-risk groups in terms of 232 hospitalization or death (Figure S1 (F) and (G)).

The proposed algorithm finds the best solution at each allocation step. This results in an optimal solution for small stockpiles, but this local optimal solution is not necessarily optimal for larger stockpiles (so called "greedy algorithm" (30)). To elucidate this property, we simulate an alternative situation, before the approval of the Janssen vaccine, where the breakdown of the stock is Pfizer (40%), AstraZeneca (40%), and Moderna (20%). **Figure S4** illustrates that the allocation scheme to minimize infections results in nearly equal reduction of infections at the end of allocations compared to the other two schemes, although it performed best at the beginning phase.

241

242 Discussion

The present study proposes a prioritization algorithm that can find an optimal allocation of vaccines to different age groups, even with a limited amount of data. Our simulation results show how optimal allocation differs depending on the objective. We apply the algorithm to available

7

Dutch epidemiological data on COVID-19, and the allocation scheme that minimizes deaths is
concordant with the current policy in the Netherlands that allocates vaccines from old to young
(29).

The proposed method provides first principles to find optimal allocation schemes with 249 limited data, and the output can also be used as a complementary tool to existing computational 250 approaches. Previous studies hinged on dynamic modeling to determine the prioritization of 251 vaccine allocation (13,16,17), and our algorithm can inform a near-optimal distribution of vaccines 252 as input values for those simulations. The proposed method can be used as a cross-check of 253 assumptions in dynamic models, because it does not require the detailed information on contact 254 matrices or non-pharmaceutical interventions. In the COVID-19 pandemic, we have already 255 256 observed immediate changes of the age distribution of reported cases (20,31), and contact patterns during lockdown are different from usual patterns (32). The strength of our approach is that it 257 258 relies only on routine surveillance data.

Choosing a different objective for COVID-19 control implies choosing a different optimal 259 260 allocation scheme. In the case of SARS-CoV-2 infection, individuals who are at higher risk of 261 severe illness and who transmit are different (19,22). Our results (Fig-1 and Fig-3) illustrated that, if we weigh an objective (e.g., minimization of infections) and choose a strategy, the selected 262 263 scheme is not necessarily efficient for the other objectives (e.g., minimization of hospitalizations 264 and deaths). In our analysis, the difference in the reduction of each outcome was larger at the 265 earlier phase of vaccinations (Fig-3), indicating the importance of decision-making in the beginning stage of allocations. While vaccine rollout has progressed rapidly in the first half of 2021 266 in high-income countries, there is large vaccine inequity globally (33). In many low- and middle-267 income countries vaccine rollout is hindered by limited supply. An algorithm, such as the one 268 presented here, can be very useful to prioritize vaccine allocation in those countries where 269 maximum impact on disease outcomes must be achieved by a small supply of vaccines. Besides, 270 the proposed method can be easily generalized for a wider range of objectives, by multiplying a 271 disease progression rate (SI Text-1). The contribution of this study is to provide a solution how to 272 determine the subgroup with the largest contribution to different outcomes, given limited data. 273

274 When the proposed algorithm is applied, several assumptions and underlying conditions of input values should be checked. First, confirmed case counts may not reflect the actual infection 275 276 dynamics in the population, depending on the level of ascertainment (34,35). Our approach relies on the estimates of group-specific incidence and force of infection, as the best proxy of ongoing 277 transmission, and thus potential biases in the surveillance should be carefully scrutinized. Second, 278 our modelling simplified offering vaccine doses as a single event and parameterized vaccine 279 efficacies as the ability of reducing infections (Q_s) and blocking transmissions (Q_r), separately. 280 While there is an advantage to be able to evaluate various characteristics of vaccines by 281 incorporating both the marginal benefit and direct protection, additional supportive evidence on 282 the vaccine efficacy is required. Third, we assume that risk contacts are reciprocal and that 283 individuals are randomly mixing in each group. Although the reciprocity is not violated by a 284 broad class of diseases (32,36), if there were a specific age group that refuses vaccinations, and if its 285 proportion became significantly large, that kind of clustering effect might influence the result of 286 287 approximation of transmission processes.

In conclusion, the present study proposes an approach to find an optimal allocation of vaccines for various objectives, given routine surveillance data. The principle of allocation is simple and interpretable. These features are essential for decision making and for answering to ethical questions that are inherent to allocation of scarce resources. In the context of COVID-19 control, the ability to base important decisions on real-time data, rather than the assumed effect of

- 293 contact patterns and non-pharmaceutical interventions, might provide a more robust scientific
- 294 basis for COVID-19 control.

9

References 296

1.

297

ECDC. COVID-19 situation update for the EU/EEA, as of week 26. European Centre for Disease 298 Prevention and Control (ECDC). [cited 2021 Jul 9]. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/cases-299 2019-ncov-eueea WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. [cited 2021 Jul 9]. Available from: https://covid19.who.int/ 300 2. 301 3. Kucharski AJ, Klepac P, Conlan AJK, Kissler SM, Tang ML, Fry H, et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different 302 303 settings: a mathematical modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020 Oct;20(10):1151-60. 304 Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 4. 305 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. Science. 2020 May 8;368(6491). Available 306 from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.abb6936 307 Sandmann FG, Davies NG, Vassall A, Edmunds WJ, Jit M, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of 5. 308 Infectious Diseases COVID-19 working group. The potential health and economic value of SARS-CoV-2 309 vaccination alongside physical distancing in the UK: a transmission model-based future scenario analysis 310 and economic evaluation. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021 Mar 18; Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-311 3099(21)00079-7 312 6. Cutler DM, Summers LH. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the \$16 Trillion Virus. JAMA. 2020 Oct 313 20;324(15):1495-6. Shrotri M, Swinnen T, Kampmann B, Parker EPK. An interactive website tracking COVID-19 vaccine 314 7. 315 development. Lancet Glob Health. 2021 Mar 2; Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-316 109X(21)00043-7 317 8. Kluge H, McKee M. COVID-19 vaccines for the European region: an unprecedented challenge. Lancet. 318 2021 Mar 25; Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00709-1 Cowling BJ, Lim WW, Cobey S. Fractionation of COVID-19 vaccine doses could extend limited supplies 319 9. 320 and reduce mortality. Nat Med. 2021 Jul 5;1-2. 321 10. Mylius SD, Hagenaars TJ, Lugnér AK, Wallinga J. Optimal allocation of pandemic influenza vaccine 322 depends on age, risk and timing. Vaccine. 2008 Jul 4;26(29-30):3742-9. 323 11. Medlock J, Galvani AP. Optimizing influenza vaccine distribution. Science. 2009 Sep 25;325(5948):1705– 324 8. 325 12. Bansal S, Pourbohloul B, Meyers LA. A comparative analysis of influenza vaccination programs. PLoS 326 Med. 2006 Oct;3(10):e387. 327 13. Moore S, Hill EM, Tildesley MJ, Dyson L, Keeling MJ. Vaccination and non-pharmaceutical 328 interventions for COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021 Mar 18; Available 329 from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1473309921001432 330 14. Viana J, van Dorp CH, Nunes A, Gomes MC, van Boven M, Kretzschmar ME, et al. Controlling the 331 pandemic during the SARS-CoV-2 vaccination rollout: a modeling study. medRxiv, 2021. 332 Available from: http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.03.24.21254188 333 15. Giordano G, Colaneri M, Di Filippo A, Blanchini F, Bolzern P, De Nicolao G, et al. Modeling vaccination 334 rollouts, SARS-CoV-2 variants and the requirement for non-pharmaceutical interventions in Italy. Nat Med. 335 2021 Apr 16; Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01334-5 336 16. Bubar KM, Reinholt K, Kissler SM, Lipsitch M, Cobey S, Grad YH, et al. Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus. Science. 2021 Jan 21 [cited 2021 Jan 22]; Available 337 338 from: https://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2021/01/21/science.abe6959 17. Matrajt L, Eaton J, Leung T, Brown ER. Vaccine optimization for COVID-19: Who to vaccinate first? 339 340 Science Advances. 2020 Feb 1;7(6):eabf1374. 341 18. Buckner JH, Chowell G, Springborn MR. Dynamic prioritization of COVID-19 vaccines when social 342 distancing is limited for essential workers. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021 Apr 20;118(16). Available from: 343 http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2025786118 344 19. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, CMMID COVID-19 working group, et al. Age-dependent 345 effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat Med. 2020 Aug;26(8):1205–11. 346 20. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the 347 dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. Science. 2020 Jun 26;368(6498):1481-6.

- **348** 21. Salje H, Tran Kiem C, Lefrancq N, Courtejoie N, Bosetti P, Paireau J, et al. Estimating the burden of
- **349** SARS-CoV-2 in France. Science. 2020 Jul 10;369(6500):208–11.
- 22. Walker PGT, Whittaker C, Watson OJ, Baguelin M, Winskill P, Hamlet A, et al. The impact of COVID-
- 351 19 and strategies for mitigation and suppression in low- and middle-income countries. Science. 2020 Jul
 352 24;369(6502):413–22.
- 23. Levin AT, Hanage WP, Owusu-Boaitey N, Cochran KB, Walsh SP, Meyerowitz-Katz G. Assessing the
- age specificity of infection fatality rates for COVID-19: systematic review, meta-analysis, and public policy
- implications. Eur J Epidemiol. 2020 Dec 8; Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10654-020-00698-1
 Of Driscoll M. Bibeiro Dec Sentes C. Wang L. Cummings DAT. A group AS. Brigger Let al. Assessories
- 24. O'Driscoll M, Ribeiro Dos Santos G, Wang L, Cummings DAT, Azman AS, Paireau J, et al. Age-specific
 mortality and immunity patterns of SARS-CoV-2. Nature. 2020 Nov 2; Available from:
 http://dv.doi.org/10.1028/s41586.020.2018.0
- 358 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2918-0
- 25. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP. Mathematical Epidemiology of Infectious Diseases: Model Building,360 Analysis and Interpretation. John Wiley & Sons; 2000. 303 p.
- 361 26. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Roberts MG. The construction of next-generation matrices for
 362 compartmental epidemic models. J R Soc Interface. 2010 Jun 6;7(47):873–85.
- 363 27. van den Driessche P. Reproduction numbers of infectious disease models. Infect Dis Model. 2017
 364 Aug;2(3):288–303.
- 28. Wallinga J, van Boven M, Lipsitch M. Optimizing infectious disease interventions during an emerging
 epidemic. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2010 Jan 12;107(2):923–8.
- **29**. Government of the Netherlands. Approach to corona vaccination in the Netherlands. 2021 [cited 2021
- Jul 9]. Available from: https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/coronavirus-vaccinatie/aanpak-coronavaccinatie/kinderen-en-jongeren
- 370 30. Cormen TH, Leiserson CE, Rivest RL, Stein C. Introduction To Algorithms. MIT Press; 2001. 1180 p.
- 371 31. Feehan DM, Mahmud AS. Quantifying population contact patterns in the United States during the
 372 COVID-19 pandemic. Nat Commun. 2021 Feb 9;12(1):1–9.
- 373 32. Backer JA, Mollema L, Vos ER, Klinkenberg D, van der Klis FR, de Melker HE, et al. Impact of physical
- distancing measures against COVID-19 on contacts and mixing patterns: repeated cross-sectional surveys,
- the Netherlands, 2016-17, April 2020 and June 2020. Euro Surveill. 2021 Feb;26(8). Available from:
- **376** http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.8.2000994
- 377 33. Roser M, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Hasell J. Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19). OurWorldInData.org.
 378 2021 [cited 2021 Jul 12]. Available from: https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus
- 379 34. Russell TW, Golding N, Hellewell J, Abbott S, Wright L, Pearson CAB, et al. Reconstructing the early
- **380** global dynamics of under-ascertained COVID-19 cases and infections. BMC Med. 2020 Oct 22;18(1):332.
- 381 35. Omori R, Mizumoto K, Nishiura H. Ascertainment rate of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in
 382 Japan. Int J Infect Dis. 2020 Jul;96:673–5.
- 383 36. Wallinga J, Teunis P, Kretzschmar M. Using data on social contacts to estimate age-specific
- transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents. Am J Epidemiol. 2006 Nov 15;164(10):936–
 44.
- 386 37. Vos ERA, van Boven M, den Hartog G, Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, van Hagen CCE, et al. Associations
- between measures of social distancing and SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity: a nationwide population-based study
 in the Netherlands. medRxiv; 2021. Available from:
- 389 http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.02.10.21251477
- 390 38. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the
- 391 BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2020 Dec 10; Available from:
- 392 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2034577
- 39. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, Kotloff K, Frey S, Novak R, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-
- 394 1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2020 Dec 30; Available from:
- 395 http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2035389
- 40. Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, Aley PK, et al. Safety and efficacy of the
- ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised
 controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. Lancet. 2021 Jan 9;397(10269):99–111.
- 41. Oliver SE, Gargano JW, Scobie H, Wallace M, Hadler SC, Leung J, et al. The Advisory Committee on
- 400 Immunization Practices' Interim Recommendation for Use of Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine United States,
- 401 February 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021 Mar 5;70(9):329–32.

- 402 42. Caswell H. Sensitivity Analysis: Matrix Methods in Demography and Ecology. Springer, Cham; 2019.
- 403 43. Blower SM, Dowlatabadi H. Sensitivity and Uncertainty Analysis of Complex Models of Disease
- 404 Transmission: An HIV Model, as an Example. Int Stat Rev. 1994;62(2):229–43.
- 405 44. Inaba H. Age-Structured Population Dynamics in Demography and Epidemiology. Springer; 2017. 555
 406 p.
- 407 45. Magnus JR, Neudecker H. Matrix Differential Calculus with Applications in Statistics and
- 408 Econometrics. Wiley; 1988. 393 p.
- 409 46. Caswell H. Matrix population models. Vol. 1. Sinauer Sunderland, MA, USA; 2000.
- 410 47. Golub GH, Van Loan CF. Matrix computations (3rd ed.). USA: Johns Hopkins University Press; 1996.

412 Figures and Tables





414 Fig-1. Simulated epidemic and evaluation of the impact of vaccination by allocation strategy. The 415 epidemic is simulated by an age-structured SIR model. Ro and generation time were set as 1.2 and 416 5 days, respectively. The population was stratified by 10-year age bin, and a contact matrix of the 417 418 Netherlands in June 2020 was used for the simulation (32). Panel (A) illustrates the total incidence of infection in the population, and age-specific incidences (B) and the force of infection (C) reflect 419 heterogeneous contacts between age-groups. The impact of vaccination on the number of 420 421 infections (D), hospitalizations (E), and deaths (F) was compared under five different strategies; no vaccination (red), allocation from old to young groups (yellow), young to old groups (purple), at 422 random (blue), and optimized allocation (green). For simplicity, the vaccination coverage was set 423 424 as 40%, and the effect of vaccines was in place at day 50 (from the initial time point of the simulation), resulting in the immediate depletion of susceptible and infected individuals on that 425 426 day.







432 that the X-axis shows the percentage of allocated vaccines.



433

Fig-3. Performance of allocation schemes on different objectives for a stockpile that suffices to 434 vaccinate 80% of the population. The Y-axis shows the percentage reduction in the number of 435 infections (A), hospitalizations (B), and deaths (C), and the X-axis is the percentage of allocated 436 vaccines. Red, light blue, and dark blue plots indicate the allocation strategies to minimize the 437 number of infections, hospitalizations, and deaths respectively. The starting point of effective 438 439 reproduction number (i.e., the reference point without any vaccination) was set as 1.2.

440 441

14

442 Materials and Methods

443 *Covid-19 epidemic data in the Netherlands*

The population data was stratified into six age groups [<20, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 60+]. 444 For each age group, we used data on the population size, seroprevalence, incidence of notified 445 cases, maximum vaccine uptake (i.e., willingness to be vaccinated), COVID-19 hospitalization rate, 446 447 COVID-19 mortality rate, and vaccine efficacy against infection and transmission (Figure S1). The 448 seroprevalence data was obtained from the Pienter-Corona study among a representative sample of the Dutch population, collected in June 2020 (37). We used this data to calculate the proportion 449 of susceptible individuals per group, that is, 1 – seropositive rate. We used infection 450 hospitalization rate and infection mortality rate that were estimated by published studies based on 451 pooled analyses over 45 countries (22,24) rather than specific estimates for the Netherlands. 452

The maximum vaccine uptake was assumed to be 80% for all age groups. The vaccine efficacy was assumed constant over age-groups (38–41). We assumed the same vaccine efficacies against infection and transmission (**Figure-S1**). To calculate the expected decrease in the number of new infections, hospitalizations, and deaths, as a function of the number of allocated vaccines, the starting point of effective reproduction number *R* (i.e., the reference point without any vaccination) was set to 1.2.

We allocated a vaccine stockpile that covers 80% of the total population. The breakdown of the stock is Pfizer (46%), AstraZeneca (22%), Moderna (8%), and Janssen (24%). Note that we considered the unit of vaccines as a set of full doses; for example, the Pfizer vaccine needs to be administered twice, and the set of those two doses was defined as a single unit here. We assumed that one person can receive only one type of vaccines. Thus, 80% of the population was vaccinated when all vaccines were allocated.

465

466 *Performance evaluation with simulated epidemics*

We simulated an epidemic, using a deterministic SIR model, where all parameters were 467 known a priori. We evaluated five different allocation strategies: optimal allocation for each 468 objective (i.e., minimization of infections, hospitalizations, and deaths) determined by the 469 proposed algorithm; random allocation; allocation from young to old groups; allocation from old 470 to young groups; and no vaccination. To quantify the impact of vaccinations in each strategy, we 471 took the "no vaccination" scenario as a natural reference point. The population was stratified by 10 472 year age group, since a contact matrix of the Netherlands in June 2020 was available with those age 473 bins and used for the simulation (32). An age-structured SIR model was used to generate an 474 epidemic curve where R_0 was set as 1.2 with the fixed generation time as 5 days, based on the 475 estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections following previous modelling studies (13,16). For simplicity, 476 per contact probability of acquiring infection (a_i) and per contact of transmitting infection (c_i) were 477 assumed to be equal, and the vaccine efficacy was 0.946 based on the estimate for Pfizer (38). The 478 479 available vaccine stock was set as 40% coverage of the population, which covers a half of the population that are willing to get vaccinated. 480

As a practical application, observable information (i.e., the incidence of infection and the
force of infection) until day 45 was used as inputs, where day 0 is the initial time point of a
simulated SIR epidemic. The optimal distribution of vaccines to each age group was yielded by the
proposed algorithm. Note that the algorithm does not use the contact matrix. In each scenario, the
effect of allocated vaccines became in place at day 50 all at once, resulting in the immediate
depletion of susceptible and infected individuals in the population. Replication code is available
on GitHub (https://github.com/fmiura/VacAllo_2021).

15

489 Derivation of importance weights

For a broad class of compartmental models, the disease transmission is described as 490 transitions from discrete states (e.g., susceptible-infectious-recovered states in the SIR model), and 491 the dynamics is generated by a system of nonlinear ordinary differential equations (ODEs) that 492 depicts the change over time. By linearizing ODEs, any (linear) system can be described by a 493 494 matrix form (26). Within this linearized subsystem, one can determine the reproduction number R 495 as the dominant eigenvalue of the next generation matrix K (25–27).

496 The first step is to relate the observed data to the next generation matrix **K**. If at-risk 497 contacts are reciprocal, the next generation matrix K becomes a product of symmetric matrices and 498 diagonalizable. This condition allows the decomposition of K, and thus we can approximate K by the top left and right eigenvectors that can be (approximately) described by the incidence of new 499 500 infections and force of infection (28).

Once the matrices are specified, we can evaluate the impact of a single unit of vaccination, 501 as the sensitivity (or elasticity) of the transition matrix (see the general idea of the sensitivity of a 502 503 matrix in (42), and its application in infectious disease epidemiology in (27,43)). The change in the 504 number of infections per single vaccination can be formulated as the result of depletion of susceptible and infectious individuals from the population (Eq-S4 in Text-S1), and subsequently, 505 we obtain its effect on the dominant eigenvalue of the next generation matrix that was already 506 introduced in the first step as an approximation with observed data. The expected impact here is 507 defined as the importance weight; if we allocate a single unit of vaccine to the group with the 508 509 largest importance weight, that results in the minimization of the dominant eigenvalue, that is, the 510 expected number of infections, hospitalizations, or deaths in total.

16

512 Supporting information

- 513 Figure S1. Age-specific input data
- 514 **Figure S2.** Simulated vaccine allocations by age and by vaccine type
- 515 Figure S3. Simulated prioritization of age-group by allocation scheme
- 516 Figure S4. Simulated impact of vaccinations
- 517
- **Table S1.** Notation and meaning of variables
- 519 **Table S2.** Pseudo code of the allocation algorithm
- 520



schemes. (A) Population structure in the Netherlands in 2019 (B) Seroprevalence observed in the

Incidence of notified cases, in 30 days before October 19, 2020 (D) Vaccine Efficacy by vaccine type.

Pienter-Corona study among a representative sample of the Dutch population in June (37). (C)

From lighter to darker blue, bars indicate Pfizer Moderna, Janssen, AstraZeneca. Note that the

constant efficacy by age here is an assumption, based on reported over all vaccine efficacies (38-

41). (E) Maximum vaccine uptake per age group. 80% for all groups is assumed here. (F) COVID-

19 hospitalization rate. These values are based on (22). (G) COVID-19 mortality rate. These values



522

525

526

527

528

529 530

531

532

are based on (24).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.20.21260889; this version posted July 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.



Figure S2. Vaccine allocations based on simulated data when the objective is to minimize the 534 number of infections ((A) and (B)), hospitalizations ((C) and (D)), and deaths ((E) and (F)). In left 535 536 three panels, from lighter to darker blue, bars indicate Pfizer Moderna, Janssen, AstraZeneca. In right three panels, the darker color shows the older age groups, and age bins are [20<,21-30,31-537 40,41-50,51-60,60+].

538

539

533

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.20.21260889; this version posted July 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.



541 **Figure S3.** Vaccine allocation based on simulated data when the objective is to minimize the

- 542 number of infections (A), hospitalizations (B), and deaths (C). The darker color shows the older age
- 543 groups, and age bins are [20<,21-30,31-40,41-50,51-60,60+].

544



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.20.21260889; this version posted July 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.



Figure S4. Performance of allocation schemes on different objectives for a stockpile that suffices to
vaccinate 80% of the population. The breakdown of the stock is Pfizer (40%), AstraZeneca (40%),
and Moderna (20%). The Y-axis shows the percentage reduction in the number of infections (A),
hospitalizations (B), and deaths (C), and the X-axis is the percentage of allocated vaccines. Red,
light blue, and dark blue plots indicate the allocation strategies to minimize the number of
infections, hospitalizations, and deaths respectively. The starting point of effective reproduction
number (i.e., the reference point without any vaccination) was set as 1.2.

Symbol	Meaning
K	Next generation matrix with elements k_{ij}
S	Matrix with group-specific number of susceptible individuals
	$s_i(t)$ in group <i>i</i> at time <i>t</i>
Α	Matrix with per contact probability of acquiring infection a_i for group i
В	Matrix with group-specific contact parameter
	b_{ij} (i.e., the proportion of group <i>i</i> contacted by an infective in group <i>j</i>)
С	Matrix with per contact probability of transmitting infection
	<i>c_i</i> for group <i>i</i>
Ν	Matrix with the population size n_i of group i
D	Matrix with group-specific infection mortality rate μ_i on the diagonal
Н	Matrix with group-specific infection hospitalization rate η_i on the diagonal
U	Matrix with the number of vaccinations u_i given to group i on the diagonal
$P^{(I)}$	Projection matrix that describes expected reductions in new infections in group <i>i</i> with
	the dominant eigenvalue $\lambda_1^{(l)}$
Q_S	Matrix with vaccine efficacy against acquiring infection $q_i^{(S)}$ on the diagonal
Q_T	Matrix with vaccine efficacy against transmission $q_i^{(T)}$ on the diagonal
u	Vector with the number of vaccinated individuals u_i in group i
$\boldsymbol{x}(\boldsymbol{t})$	Vector with group-specific number of new infections $x_i(t)$ in group <i>i</i> at time <i>t</i>
h(t)	Vector with group-specific number of new infections $h_i(t)$ in group <i>i</i> at time <i>t</i>
f,g	Normalization constants
R	Reproduction number (top eigenvalue of the next generation matrix K)
τ	Generation interval of infections
Z ^(j)	Number of available vaccine stocks for type <i>j</i>

558 Table S2. Pseudo code of the allocation algorithm

Algorit	hm	l	1	
	•	1	1	

- Input variables:
 - Number of available vaccine stocks $z^{(j)}$ for each vaccine type j
 - Group-specific probability of acquiring infection per contact *a_i* and of transmitting infection per contact *c_i*
 - Group-specific population size n_i
 - Group-specific number of new infections $x_i(t)$ in group *i* at time *t*
 - Group-specific number of susceptible individuals $s_i(t)$ in group *i* at time *t*
 - Group- and vaccine type-specific vaccine efficacy against acquiring infection $q_i^{(S)(j)}$
 - Group- and vaccine type-specific vaccine efficacy against transmission $q_i^{(T)(j)}$
 - Initial value of the effective reproduction number *R*

Pseudo code:

- Define the objective of infection control (e.g., the number of hospitalizations)
- Calculate initial importance weights $y_i^{(H)(j)}$ per age group *i* per vaccine type *j*
- Set the number of allocated vaccine type *j* for age group *i* as $0: u_i^{(j)} \leftarrow 0$
- Run loops below until (i) all $z^{(j)}$ becomes zero OR (ii) all group reach the maximum uptake:

For j = 1, 2, ..., J do:

For i = 1, 2, ..., I do:

Find the largest importance weight $y_{i*}^{(H)(j*)}$

If
$$y_{i*}^{(H)(j*)} = y_i^{(H)(j)}$$
 then:

Allocate a single unit of vaccine type *j* to the selected group *i*: $u_i^{(j)} \leftarrow u_i^{(j)} + 1$; $z^{(j)} \leftarrow z^{(j)} - 1$

Update all importance weights of the selected group *i*: $y_i^{(H)(j)} \leftarrow y_i^{(H)(j)} + \frac{dy_{i*}^{(H)(j*)}}{dy_{i*}}$

Else:

Keep the importance weights in the unselected group *i*: $y_i^{(H)(j)} \leftarrow y_i^{(H)(j)}$

If $z^{(j)} = 0$ then:

Update all importance weights of the vaccine type *j* that is out of stock: $y_i^{(H)(j)} \leftarrow 0$

If $\sum_{i} u_{i}^{(j)} = (maximum vaccine updake of group i)$ then:

Update all importance weights of the selected group *i* that reaches the max uptake: $y_i^{(H)(j)} \leftarrow 0$ End

End

Output variables:

- The number of allocated vaccine type j for age group i as a function of iteration $l: u_i^{(j)}(l)$
- Importance weights per age group *i* per vaccine type *j* as a function of iteration *l*: $y_i^{(H)(j)}(l)$

559

21

561 Text S1. Mathematical details

- 563 1. Mathematical details
- 564 1.1 Objective

562

The aim of following calculations is to formulate the expected impact of targeted vaccinations. We firstly present our approach to relate the expected changes in the next generation matrix *K* to the observed epidemiological data (i.e., the number of new infections per group). We then generalize the argument to quantify the expected impact in the number of hospitalizations and deaths.

The following analysis is known as "perturbation analysis" of a matrix in demography and population ecology (42,44), and we will refer to theorems and proofs introduced by those exiting literatures. For consistent notations, we follow Magnus and Neudecker (1988) (45); matrices are denoted by upper case bold symbols (e.g., **A**), and vectors are denoted by lower case bold symbols (**n**). Note that we define the derivatives of a matrix (or vector) as the matrix (or vector) of derivatives of the elements (e.g., $\frac{dY}{dx} = \left(\frac{dy_{ij}}{dx_{ij}}\right)$ and $\frac{dy}{dx} = \left(\frac{dy_i}{dx_i}\right)$). All notations and definitions of variables are shown in **Table-S2**.

577

578 1.2 Next generation matrix

The host population is subdivided into *m* groups. The next generation matrix *K* gives the number of new infections in a successive generation, such that the number of new infections at time t + 1 after 1 generations of infections is x(t + 1) = Kx(t). For a large class of transmission models such as susceptible-infected-recovered model (SIR) model, the next generation matrix *K* can be written as

584

K = SABC

where matrices *S*, *A*, *B*, and *C* have the following epidemiological interpretation: *S* is a matrix with 585 586 group-specific number of susceptible individuals $s_i(t)$ on the diagonal, A is a matrix with per contact probability of acquiring infection a_i on the diagonal, **B** is a contact matrix with elements 587 588 b_{ii} , and **C** is a matrix with group-specific per contact probability of transmitting infection c_i on the 589 diagonal. Note that only **S** is time-dependent (and thus **K** is also time-dependent). For readability, when it is obvious from the context, we do not write the dependency on time. We require that at-590 591 risk contacts are reciprocal, and thus the matrix **B** is assumed to be symmetric. Thus, the next 592 generation matrix *K* becomes a product of symmetric matrices and diagonalizable.

593

595

596

607

594 *1.3 Approximation by observed infections*

By diagonalizing the next generation matrix **K**, we have

$K = W \Lambda W^{-1}$

597 where Λ is a diagonal matrix that has eigenvalues R, λ_2 , λ_2 , ..., λ_m as its elements and zeros 598 elsewhere, where R is the dominant eigenvalue and is often referred to as the reproduction 599 number. The matrix W has as columns the right eigenvectors w_1 , w_2 ,..., w_m . The matrix W^{-1} is the 600 inverse of the matrix W that has the left eigenvectors v_1 , v_2 ,..., v_m as its rows. We require that an 601 infector introduced in an arbitrary group reproduces a finite number of new infections in every 602 group, and this condition ensures that the next generation matrix K is primitive. In such condition, 603 the Perron-Frobenius Theorem guarantees that R, w_1 , and v_1 are real and non-negative (25,42).

604 After τ generations of infections, the number of new infections at time $t + \tau$ is given by $\mathbf{x}(t + \tau) = \mathbf{K}^{\tau} \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{W} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{\tau} \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{x}(t)$. By using both right and left eigenvectors, we can rewrite the formula as

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t+\tau) = \sum_{i} \lambda_{i}^{\tau} \boldsymbol{w}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{T} \boldsymbol{x}(t).$$

Note that x(t) is a vector that has the number of new infections in age group *i* as its elements,

22

denoted as $x_i(t)$ and that the dominant eigenvalue λ_1 is the reproduction number *R*. If the 609 dominant eigenvalue is strictly greater than other eigenvalues, the first term $R w_1 v_1^T$ will eventually 610 dominate other terms, and other all the terms will become negligible. This characteristic yields the 611 approximated next generation matrix 612 $\overline{\mathbf{K}} = R\mathbf{w}_1\mathbf{v}_1^T.$ 613 (Eq.S1)Now it is of interest to approximate the top right and left eigenvectors, \mathbf{w}_1 and \mathbf{v}_1 , by 614 observations. If the observation interval is long enough (typically longer than two generations of 615 infections), we can safely approximate the top right eigenvector w_1 with the number of new 616 617 infections x(t) (28). Thus, we have $w_1 \approx f x(t)$ (Eq. where *f* is the normalizing constant given by $f = \frac{1}{\sum_i x_i(t)}$. This result is also known as the strong (Eq.S2)618 619 ergodic theorem (see ref (46), p.86). Since the contact matrix **B** is symmetric and thus the next 620 generation matrix **K** is a product of symmetric matrices, there exists a transformation matrix **M** 621 that transposes *K*, such that $MKM^{-1} = K^T$. With this relationship, we can project the top left 622 eigenvector \mathbf{v}_1 along the top right eigenvector \mathbf{w}_1 , and subsequently 623 $\mathbf{v}_1 \approx \frac{g}{f} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{w}_1 \approx g \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{x}(t).$ (Eq.S3)624 where *g* is the normalization constant given by $g = \frac{\sum_i x_i(t)}{\sum_{\substack{c_i x_i(t)^2 \\ \tau_{a_i}, s_i(t)}}}$. See detailed derivation in the section 625 3.4. of supporting info in (28). 626 627 1.4 Sensitivity of the number of new infections to targeted vaccinations 628 1.4.1 Changes in the number of new infections due to vaccinations 629 630 A decrease in x(t + 1) is expressed as a result of changes in the next generation matrix **K** and in the number of infected individuals x(t): 631 $\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t+1)}{d\mathbf{u}} = \frac{d\mathbf{K}}{d\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{K}\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t)}{d\mathbf{u}}$ 632 (Eq. S4)where $\frac{dK}{dH}x(t)$ is the direct effect of vaccinating an individual and removing them from the 633 susceptible population and $K \frac{dx(t)}{du}$ is the indirect effect of vaccinating a single individual by 634 reducing onward infections. 635 636 1.4.2 Perturbation in the next generation matrix **K** 637 We focus on the impact of vaccinations when vaccines are allocated to the group that can 638 be immune or susceptible. The perturbation of next generation matrix $\frac{dK}{dU}$ is expressed in terms of 639 the change in the number of susceptible individuals $\frac{dS}{dU}$ due to vaccinations, such that $\frac{dK}{dU}$ = 640 $\left(\frac{dS}{dH}\right)$ (**ABC**). We denote the vaccine efficacy on susceptibility as **Q**_S, and the depletion of susceptible 641 642 individual is written as

643

648

608

$$\frac{dS}{dU} = -Q_S S N^{-1}$$

644 where **N** is a diagonal matrix that has elements of total population in each age group n_i . Since $\frac{dK}{dU} = \left(\frac{dS}{dU}\right)(ABC) = \left(\frac{dS}{dU}\right)(S^{-1}K)$, the perturbation of the next generation matrix is

$$\frac{dK}{dU} = (-Q_S S N^{-1})(S^{-1} K)$$

647 and thus

$$\frac{dK}{dU} = -Q_s N^{-1} K \tag{Eq. S5}$$

23

(*Eq*.*S*11)

649 because **S** and **N** are diagonal matrices and thus commutative. The derivation is same as that of section 3.5. of supporting info in (28). Note that the vaccine efficacy of susceptibility here (i.e., Q_s) 650

is defined as the probability of protecting infection per infectious contact (see next section 1.4.3 for 651 another effect of vaccinations, which considers the prevention of transmission from an infectious 652 individual). 653

654

658

660

664

674

1.4.3 Perturbation in the number of infected individuals $\mathbf{x}(t)$ 655

If vaccines are allocated also to infected individuals $\mathbf{x}(t)$ at time t, the change in the 656

number of infected (infectious) individuals is 657

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{x}(t)}{d\boldsymbol{u}} = -\boldsymbol{Q}_{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{N}^{-1}\boldsymbol{x}(t). \qquad (Eq.S6)$$

where $Q_{\rm T}$ is the vaccine efficacy against the transmissibility. 659

661 1.4.4 Importance weight of infection

By substituting Eq.S5 and Eq.S6 to Eq.S4, the decrease in the number of new infections after 662 663 one generation is rewritten as

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{x}(t+1)}{d\boldsymbol{u}} = -\boldsymbol{Q}_{S}\boldsymbol{N}^{-1}\boldsymbol{K}\boldsymbol{x}(t) - \boldsymbol{K}\boldsymbol{Q}_{T}\boldsymbol{N}^{-1}\boldsymbol{x}(t).$$
(Eq. S7)
direct effect indirect effect

The interpretation of first term is the reduction in the number of new infections because 665

susceptible individuals were depleted (i.e., direct effect), and that of second term is the effect 666 preventing onward infections because infectious individuals are depleted (i.e., indirect effect). 667

Now we can relate this sensitivity $\frac{dx(t+1)}{du}$ to observations. By approximating the next 668 generation matrix by dominant right and left eigenvectors (i.e., $\overline{K} = R w_1 v_1^T$), the above equation is 669 670 rewritten as

671
$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t+1)}{d\mathbf{u}} \approx -\mathbf{Q}_{S} \mathbf{N}^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{x}(t) - \overline{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{Q}_{T} \mathbf{N}^{-1} \mathbf{x}(t) = -(\mathbf{Q}_{S} \mathbf{N}^{-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{w}_{1} \mathbf{v}_{1}^{T} + \mathbf{R} \mathbf{w}_{1} \mathbf{v}_{1}^{T} \mathbf{Q}_{T} \mathbf{N}^{-1}) \mathbf{x}(t). \quad (Eq. S8)$$

We set a projection matrix as $P^{(l)} = Q_S N^{-1} R w_1 v_1^T + R w_1 v_1^T Q_T N^{-1}$ and its dominant eigenvalue as 672 $\lambda_1^{(R)}$. When the vaccination is targeted to the group *i*, using Eq.S2 and S3, we obtain 673

$$Rw_{1i}v_{i1} \approx Rfg\frac{c_i}{a_i}\frac{x_i(t)^2}{s_i(t)}.$$
(Eq. S9)

We use the same approximation method as section 1.3 for the projection matrix $P^{(I)}$ and its top 675 right eigenvector $w_1^{(l)}$. Given the sufficient length of observation intervals, we can safely 676 approximate $w_1^{(l)}$ by the number of new infections x(t) such that $w_1^{(l)} \approx f x(t)$ (see ref (46), p.86). 677 Since $P^{(I)}w_1^{(I)} = \lambda_1^{(I)}w_1^{(I)}$, the contribution of age group *i* to the dominant eigenvalue $\lambda_1^{(I)}$ is: 678

679
$$\lambda_1^{(I)} w_{i1}^{(I)} = \boldsymbol{P}_i^{(I)} w_{i1}^{(I)} \approx \left(Rfg\left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)}\right) \frac{c_i}{a_i} \frac{x_i(t)}{s_i(t)} \frac{x_i(t)}{n_i} \right) w_{i1}^{(I)}. \quad (Eq.S10)$$

We can interpret the quantity $Rfg\left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)}\right)\frac{c_i}{a_i}\frac{x_i(t)}{s_i(t)}\frac{x_i(t)}{n_i}$ as the expected reduction in the number 680 of new infections generated by a typical infected individual in group *i* after introducing a single 681 unit of vaccine. Thus, we define this expected impact of a single vaccination in group *i* on the 682 dominant eigenvalue $\lambda_1^{(l)}$ as the importance weight of infection: 683 $y_{i}^{(I)} = Rfg\left(q_{i}^{(S)} + q_{i}^{(T)}\right)\frac{c_{i}x_{i}(t)x_{i}(t)}{a_{i}s_{i}(t)n_{i}}$

684 685

1.5 Sensitivity of the number of hospitalizations to targeted vaccinations 686

1.5.1 Changes in the number of hospitalizations due to vaccinations 687

The number of hospitalized individuals h(t) at time t (i.e., $m \times 1$ vector with elements h_1 , 688 689 $h_2, ..., h_m$) is defined as 690

$$\boldsymbol{h}(t) = \boldsymbol{H}\boldsymbol{x}(t)$$

24

- 691 where *H* is a diagonal matrix with group-specific hospitalization rate $\eta_1, \eta_2, ..., \eta_m$. Suppose that
- we wish to predict the number of hospitalizations after one generation of infections. We can write 692 the number of new hospitalizations as 693
 - $\boldsymbol{h}(t+1) = \boldsymbol{H}\boldsymbol{x}(t+1) = \boldsymbol{H}\boldsymbol{K}\boldsymbol{x}(t).$

Over the observation interval from t to t + 1, we assume the group-specific probability of 695 696 hospitalization is constant.

Here we look at the perturbation of the expected number of hospitalizations h(t + 1) due to

vaccinations. Since the infection hospitalization rate matrix **H** is constant, the perturbation in x(t + t)698

1) is of interest. Therefore, using Eq.S4, the decrease in the number of hospitalizations can be 699 written as

700

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{h}(t+1)}{d\boldsymbol{u}} = \frac{d\boldsymbol{H}\boldsymbol{x}(t+1)}{d\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{H}\left(\frac{d\boldsymbol{K}}{d\boldsymbol{U}}\boldsymbol{x}(t) + \boldsymbol{K}\frac{d\boldsymbol{x}(t)}{d\boldsymbol{u}}\right).$$
 (Eq.S12)

701 702

706

694

697

1.5.2 Importance weight of hospitalization 703

Using Eq.S12 and the result of section 1.4.4 such as Eq.S8, the small change in the expected 704 705 number of hospitalizations after one generation is now written as

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{h}(t+1)}{d\boldsymbol{u}} = \frac{d\boldsymbol{H}\boldsymbol{x}(t+1)}{d\boldsymbol{u}} = -\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{Q}_{S}\boldsymbol{N}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{w}_{1}\boldsymbol{v}_{1}^{T} + \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{w}_{1}\boldsymbol{v}_{1}^{T}\boldsymbol{Q}_{T}\boldsymbol{N}^{-1})\boldsymbol{x}(t).$$

Again, we set a projection matrix as $P^{(H)} = H(Q_S N^{-1} R w_1 v_1^T + R w_1 v_1^T Q_T N^{-1})$ and its dominant 707 eigenvalue as $\lambda_1^{(H)}$. When the vaccination is targeted to the group *i*, the relative change in the 708 dominant eigenvalue $\lambda_1^{(H)}$ is 709

710
$$\lambda_1^{(H)} w_{i1}^{(H)} = \left(\eta_i Rfg\left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)} \right) \frac{c_i}{a_i} \frac{x_i(t)}{s_i(t)} \frac{x_i(t)}{n_i} \right) fx_i(t). \quad (Eq. S13)$$

We define this expected impact of a single vaccination in group *i* on the dominant eigenvalue $\lambda_1^{(H)}$ 711 as the importance weight of hospitalization: 712

713
$$y_i^{(H)} = \eta_i Rfg \left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)} \right) \frac{c_i x_i(t) x_i(t)}{a_i s_i(t) n_i}.$$
 (Eq.S14)

We can interpret this quantity $y_i^{(H)}$ as the expected reduction in the number of new 714

hospitalizations generated by a typical infected individual in group *i* after introducing a single unit 715 of vaccine. 716

717

1.6 Importance weights for other objectives 718

We can replace the matrix H (i.e., a diagonal matrix with the elements of infection 719

- hospitalization rates per group *i*) with different rate matrices for other objectives. In this study, we 720
- also aimed to test an allocation strategy to minimize the number of deaths. Thus, we introduced a 721
- diagonal matrix **D** with group-specific infection mortality rate μ_i on the diagonal, and the 722
- importance weight of death $y_i^{(D)}$ can be derived in the same manner as the section 1.5; 723

724
$$y_i^{(D)} = \mu_i Rfg\left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)}\right) \frac{c_i x_i(t) x_i(t)}{a_i s_i(t) n_i}.$$
 (Eq. S15)

We can interpret this quantity $y_i^{(D)}$ as the expected reduction in the number of new deaths 725

- generated by a typical infected individual in group *i* after introducing a single unit of vaccine. 726
- 727

1.7 Changes in importance weights during the allocation of vaccines 728

Since importance weights are dependent on the number of allocated vaccines, we need to 729 update them at each allocation step. We denote the changes in importance weights in group *i* per 730

single allocation as $\frac{dy_i^{(I)}}{du_i}$, $\frac{dy_i^{(H)}}{du_i}$, and $\frac{dy_i^{(D)}}{du_i}$ for each objective. 731

25

732 When vaccines are allocated, the eigenvector w_1 is perturbed, and its small change $\frac{dw_1}{du}$ can 733 be approximated using the Power iteration with the new matrix $K + \frac{dK}{dU}$ (see (47), p.331):

734
735

$$w_1 + \frac{dw_1}{du} \sim \left(K + \frac{dK}{dU}\right) w_1$$

 $\propto Kw_1 + \frac{dK}{dU} w_1$

736

 $\propto R \boldsymbol{w}_1 - \boldsymbol{Q}_s \boldsymbol{N}^{-1} R \boldsymbol{w}_1$

737 where the sign \propto means "proportional to" and the sign \sim means "approximately proportional to". 738 The same derivation has been introduced elsewhere (see section 3.6. of supporting info in (28)). If

739 the allocation of vaccines is targeted to the group i, this results in the change in the i th element of 740 the top right eigenvector, such as

741
$$w_{i1} + \frac{dw_{i1}}{du_i} \sim w_{i1} - \frac{q_i^{(S)}}{n_i} w_{i1}$$
 (Eq.S16)

And all other elements remain unchanged (28). We use this equation to quantify the changes in

importance weights after the allocation of a single unit of vaccines. By multiplying both sides of

Final Field Field

745 obtain

746

$$y_i^{(l)} + \frac{dy_i^{(l)}}{du_i} \sim y_i^{(l)} - \frac{q_i^{(S)}}{n_i} y_i^{(l)}.$$

Subsequently, we can define the change in the importance weights of hospitalization and death. By multiplying both sides of Eq.S16 by factors $\eta_i Rg\left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)}\right) \frac{c_i x_i(t)}{a_i s_i(t) n_i}$ and $\mu_i Rg\left(q_i^{(S)} + q_i^{(T)}\right)$

749
$$q_i^{(T)} \Big) \frac{c_i x_i(t)}{a_i s_i(t) n_i}$$
 respectively, from Eq.S2 and Eq.S14-15, we obtain

750
$$y_i^{(H)} + \frac{dy_i^{(H)}}{du_i} \sim y_i^{(H)} - \frac{q_i^{(S)}}{n_i} y_i^{(H)}$$

751 and

752
$$y_i^{(D)} + \frac{dy_i^{(D)}}{du_i} \sim y_i^{(D)} - \frac{q_i^{(S)}}{n_i} y_i^{(D)}.$$

753 The perturbation due to vaccination in group *i* does not affect other groups.

754