

# 1 Estimating measures to reduce the 2 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia to 3 guide a ‘National Plan’ to reopening

4 Gerard E. Ryan<sup>1,2</sup>, Freya M. Shearer<sup>2</sup>, James M. McCaw<sup>2,3</sup>, Jodie  
5 McVernon<sup>4,5</sup>, and Nick Golding<sup>1,6</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Telethon Kids Institute, Nedlands, WA, Australia

7 <sup>2</sup>Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global  
8 Health, The University of Melbourne, VIC, Australia

9 <sup>3</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

10 <sup>4</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, Melbourne Medical School, University of Melbourne  
11 at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

12 <sup>5</sup>Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference Laboratory, The Royal Melbourne Hospital at  
13 the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

14 <sup>6</sup>Curtin University, Perth, Australia

## 15 ABSTRACT

16 The availability of COVID-19 vaccines promised a reduction in the severity of disease and relief from the  
17 strict public health and social measures (PHSMs) imposed in many countries to limit spread and burden  
18 of COVID-19. We were asked to define vaccine coverage thresholds for Australia’s transition to easing  
19 restrictions and reopening international borders. Using evidence of vaccine effectiveness against the  
20 then-circulating Delta variant, we used a mathematical model to determine coverage targets. The absence  
21 of any COVID-19 infections in many sub-national jurisdictions in Australia posed particular methodological  
22 challenges. We used a novel metric called Transmission Potential (TP) as a proxy measure of the  
23 population-level effective reproduction number. We estimated TP of the Delta variant under a range  
24 of PHSMs, test-trace-isolate-quarantine (TTIQ) efficiencies, vaccination coverage thresholds, and age-  
25 based vaccine allocation strategies. We found that high coverage across all ages ( $\geq 70\%$ ) combined with  
26 ongoing TTIQ and minimal PHSMs was sufficient to avoid lockdowns. At lesser coverage ( $\leq 60\%$ ) rapid  
27 case escalation risked overwhelming of the health sector or the need to reimpose stricter restrictions.  
28 Maintaining low case numbers was most beneficial for health and the economy, and at higher coverage  
29 levels ( $\geq 80\%$ ) further easing of restrictions was deemed possible. These results directly informed easing  
30 of COVID-19 restrictions in Australia.

31 Keywords: COVID-19, Australia, transmission potential, vaccination, public health, intervention,  
32 economic modelling

## 34 INTRODUCTION

35 Since early 2020, rapid dissemination of SARS-CoV-2 and subsequent emergence of variants have resulted  
36 in multiple rapidly escalating waves of infection with devastating impacts on health, society and the  
37 economy [1]. In contrast with the rest of the world, many island nations in the Western Pacific Region  
38 remained relatively COVID free through the first two years of the pandemic as a result of strong border  
39 controls to prevent importation, and reactive imposition of social restrictions to constrain community  
40 transmission (e.g. [2, 3]). These measures enabled enviable social freedoms and ongoing economic  
41 activity, but such disconnection from the international community was not a sustainable strategy over the  
42 longer term [4].

43 Global concerted efforts to accelerate development and licensure of safe and effective vaccines raised  
44 hopes that wide scale population immunisation would enable a return to ‘life as normal’ in high burden  
45 settings, given demonstrated impacts on infection acquisition and onward spread [5, 6, 7]. For countries  
46 that had pursued a low or zero-COVID strategy, ‘living with COVID’ seemed an achievable goal if

47 vaccines could constrain transmission and mitigate disease outcomes sufficiently to avoid overwhelming  
48 the health system following SARS-CoV-2 importation, while maintaining near normal societal functioning  
49 [8, 9]. However, anticipating the likely impacts of introducing COVID-19 into an environment without  
50 established SARS-CoV-2 transmission is difficult [10].

51 To address this challenge, we use the Transmission Potential (TP) [10] metric to quantify the risk  
52 of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in populations based on behavioural, vaccination, and social mixing data.  
53 Where the effective reproduction number  $R_{eff}$  is the average number of secondary cases arising from a  
54 case in the *infected population*, TP is an estimate of what  $R_{eff}$  would be over the *whole population*, but can  
55 be calculated in times of low or no transmission. TP is driven by factors that influence transmission from  
56 local cases such as effectiveness of test-trace-isolate-quarantine (TTIQ) case and contact management [11],  
57 as well as changes in personal distancing behaviour and mandated constraints on mixing group sizes —  
58 collectively termed public health and social measures (PHSMs), and vaccination [10]. TP is not estimated  
59 from cases, but instead considers how these influences alter the potential for viral transmission from a  
60 baseline  $R_0$  1. Transmission potential is explained in more detail in the Methods section *Transmission*  
61 *Potential* and in the supplementary section *The relationship of Transmission Potential,  $R_0$ , and  $R_{eff}$* .  
62 Demonstrated reductions in TP achieved by these interventions can be incorporated into future scenario  
63 projections, along with anticipated impacts of vaccination on transmission. International evidence of  
64 vaccine effectiveness against acquisition and onward spread of the Delta variant was used to estimate the  
65 likely overlaid impact of differing levels of vaccine coverage (by age cohort) on population wide TP.

66 This approach was used in mid-2021 to help inform Australia’s National Plan to transition Australia’s  
67 National COVID-19 response[12], by determining target vaccination thresholds for moving between its  
68 four phases (table 1), including any ongoing requirement for public health responses and social measures.  
69 These methods formed the basis for further collaborative work with the Australian Government Treasury  
70 to determine likely economic implications of reopening at alternative thresholds based on the level of  
71 adjunct PHSMs needed [13], and constituted part of a broader suite of modelling advice to the Australian  
72 Government to inform management of the pandemic and a shift away from strict lockdown measures  
73 [14, 15, 16]. From the outset, it was anticipated that reopening targets in populations naïve to COVID-19  
74 would be higher than for those with a history of prior circulation resulting in some degree of established  
75 immunity to the virus.

**Table 1.** Phases of the “National Plan to transition Australia’s National COVID-19 Response”[12]. Our modelling analysis focuses on the transition from ‘phase A’ in which strong suppression and no community transmission is the goal, to ‘phase B’ where vaccine coverage is high and SARS-CoV-2 infection is allowed to establish in the population. Scenarios therefore examine the epidemic dynamics and clinical consequences of infections following seeding of an epidemic at different vaccination coverage thresholds achieved through alternative age prioritisation strategies.

Phase	Description	Activities
A	Vaccinate, Prepare and Pilot	Continue to strongly suppress the virus for the purpose of minimising community transmission
B	Vaccination Transition	Seek to minimise serious illness, hospitalisation and fatality as a result of COVID-19
C	Vaccination Consolidation	As above
D	Post-Vaccination	Manage COVID-19 consistent with public health management of other infectious diseases

## 76 METHODS

### 77 Transmission Potential

78 Transmission potential (TP) is a measure of the average potential for a virus to spread at the population  
79 level [10]. It can be considered as an estimate of the reproduction number, if transmission were widespread  
80 (and therefore not concentrated in e.g. one demographic group with non-representative transmission  
81 rates). At the baseline, TP is the basic reproduction number of a population  $R_0$ , but estimating TP also  
82 takes into account the multiplicative effects of transmission reducing influences such as vaccination or  
83 behavioural change to produce an estimate of potential transmission specific to a context. The base

84 model consists of three sub-models involving time to detection and isolation of cases, and two types of  
85 physical distancing behaviour: we differentiate “macro-distancing” as the reduction in the average rate of  
86 non-household contacts (e.g. in response to lockdown-type restrictions), while “micro-distancing” is the  
87 reduction in transmission probability per non-household contact (e.g. adherence to social-distancing and  
88 hygiene advice or legislation; [10]). Transmission potential will vary among communities by differential  
89 average household size and age structures, and can be modulated by changes to behaviour through public  
90 health and social measures, time to detection and isolation of cases, and immunity through infection  
91 and vaccination. We provide further detail on Transmission Potential in the supplementary section *The*  
92 *relationship of Transmission Potential,  $R_0$ , and  $R_{eff}$* , while a description of the base model can be found  
93 in Golding and colleagues [10]. Below we explain and test how varying and adding components can  
94 modulate TP. Whilst an estimate of Transmission Potential under a given scenario of  $R_0$ , behaviour, and  
95 health system performance can never be a perfect predictor of a reproduction number due to epidemic  
96 stochasticity and unaccounted sources of variation and uncertainty, it is a measure that enables prediction  
97 of risk in the event of widespread transmission, and has been used as a systematically reported situational  
98 assessment metric in Australia since 2020 [17, 18, 19].

### 99 **Test, Trace, Isolate, and Quarantine**

100 Test-trace-isolate-quarantine (TTIQ) strategies are key non-pharmaceutical interventions used globally  
101 to manage infectious disease outbreaks [20, 21] including frequently during the COVID-19 pandemic  
102 [22, 23]. TTIQ operates through isolating cases identified by testing, and tracing and pre-emptive  
103 quarantining of their close contacts to prevent further onward transmission. We adapted our TP model  
104 to include an explicit effect of reducing the time to case isolation achievable through intensive contact  
105 tracing, in addition to the time to case detection effect already included [11]. The empirical distribution of  
106 times from symptom onset to case isolation under an ‘optimal’ TTIQ capacity (i.e. with a health system  
107 that had enough capacity to rapidly contact trace all cases) was estimated using a limited time series of  
108 case data from the state of New South Wales between July 2020 and January 2021, for which dates of  
109 isolation were known with a high level of data completeness. This distribution was then calibrated to  
110 estimate the distribution of times to isolation in other times and states by assuming improvements in TTIQ  
111 are proportional to improvements in times to detection. We characterised a second level of ‘partially’  
112 efficacious TTIQ based on observations from the state of Victoria on 4 August 2020. This date was the  
113 then-peak of daily locally-acquired COVID-19 cases in Australia representing a contact-tracing system  
114 under resource constraints. These data were used to estimate the effect of ‘partial’ TTIQ on transmission  
115 potential to estimate a baseline TP under community transmission. These estimates of ‘optimal’ and  
116 ‘partial’ TTIQ correspond to a 54% and 42% reduction in transmission respectively; the full details of this  
117 estimation are found in [11].

### 118 **Public Health and Social Measures**

119 In the presence of ongoing viral transmission, it is necessary to keep the rate of virus reproduction,  $R_{eff}$ ,  
120 below or close to 1, as any extended periods where  $R_{eff} > 1$  can quickly lead to significant numbers of  
121 cases, causing stressors on health systems. So maintenance of  $R_{eff}$  near or below 1 is needed both to  
122 contain community transmission in the suppression phase, and to prevent cases from exceeding health  
123 sector capacity after re-opening. Regulated or advised risk reduction behaviours and constraints on social  
124 mixing described collectively as public health and social measures (PHSMs) are the levers that may be  
125 employed to manage  $R_{eff}$  in response to incursions and outbreaks. Behaviours change over time either  
126 spontaneously because of heightened concern or complacency, or in response to mandated public health  
127 orders invoking various elements of PHSMs.

128 Here we investigated what level of PHSMs would be required to bring TP to near or below 1 under  
129 different scenarios of vaccination coverage. In collaboration with the Australian Government Treasury  
130 we defined four ‘bundles’ of PHSM restrictions: baseline, low, medium and high. Each bundle is drawn  
131 from a specific time and place in Australia’s pandemic experience, thereby capturing both real-world  
132 behavioural responses and the proportional reduction in TP achievable by PHSMs in this context. They  
133 therefore represent differing degrees of social constraints for which the impact on TP and economic  
134 activity could be defined from historical observations.

135 Full descriptions of measures included in these bundles are in table S1. These bundles are intended to  
136 reflect the plausible behavioural consequences of different levels of stringency of PHSM. As such, the  
137 ‘Baseline PHSM’ bundle reflects behaviours during a period with minimal restrictions, and a population

138 aware of the risk of COVID-19 (as opposed to behaviour prior to the pandemic). The other bundles reflect  
139 the behavioural effects of increasing levels of stringency. We emphasise that the TPs associated with these  
140 PHSM bundles reflect state wide population behaviours (numbers of household contacts and adherence to  
141 hygiene advice) estimated at these times. TPs are observed to differ substantially over time and between  
142 states, even within similar restrictions [10]. These periods are therefore intended to reflect achievable  
143 levels of reduction in TP via PHSMs, rather than inference about the particular impacts of these sets of  
144 restrictions.

**Table 2.** Description of measures implemented under different ‘bundles’ of public health and social measures (PHSMs). Each bundle relates to a specific time and place in Australia’s pandemic experience up to mid-2021 — thereby capturing behavioural responses and the proportional reduction in TP achievable by PHSMs in the Australian context. The proportional reductions in TP observed at each time and place can therefore be related to similar reductions achieved via other combinations of PHSMs (not limited to the “bundles” in place during the reference period). Similarly, the imposition of any given combination of PHSMs at different times and places may result in variable population responses and thus reductions in TP. More detailed descriptions of the bundles can be found in S1

PHSM bundle	Description
Baseline	Minimal density/capacity restrictions and no major outbreaks as in NSW March 2021
Low	More stringent capacity restrictions compared to baseline ( <i>e.g.</i> , hospitality venues limited to 10 customers per booking), as in NSW 23 August 2020
Medium	Stringent capacity restrictions, group size limits ( <i>e.g.</i> , fewer than five people outdoors), stay-at-home orders (except work, study, essential purposes), as in NSW 1 July 2021
High	No household visitors, curfew, stay-at-home orders (except essential purposes and permitted work), schools closed (remote learning only), as in VIC 23 August 2020

### 145 **Age-structured Vaccination Impact on Transmission**

146 In keeping with WHO guidance [24] and many other countries, Australia’s immunisation program initially  
147 prioritised health- and aged-care workers, elderly populations and those at increased risk of transmission  
148 and/or severe outcomes [25]. When defining overall target coverage thresholds for the eligible population,  
149 an important goal was to consider the distribution of doses received across age categories. While older  
150 individuals are more likely to experience severe disease outcomes, young and working adults are expected  
151 to make a greater contribution to transmission at the population level. So to explore the effect of age-  
152 structured vaccination on transmission, we explored four allocation strategies: oldest first, 40+ years first,  
153 all adults, and transmission reducing, described in table 3 (the specific percentages of each age-group  
154 vaccinated in these strategies can be found in [16]). These strategies were motivated by being the strategy  
155 in place at the time (oldest first), and a series of what were considered the only other practical options. The  
156 strategies followed the Australian Therapeutic Goods Administration [26, 27] and Australian Technical  
157 Advisory Group on Immunisation [28] advice on which vaccines were administered to which age-groups  
158 and the dosing interval between first and second doses 4. We also assume a two week delay from  
159 administration until a vaccine takes full effect 4.

160 We estimated the percentage reduction in TP that could be expected under different vaccination  
161 coverages and distributions by age, vaccine type, and the number of doses received, via static analysis  
162 of an age-based transmission matrix, S2, [29]. Age-specific susceptibility and transmissibility estimates  
163 [30] are used and transmission rates have been calibrated to a baseline population-wide TP of 3.6. TP  
164 will be influenced by spontaneous and imposed changes in physical distancing behaviours, the number of  
165 social contacts on average between individuals and the timeliness of TTIQ measures. We use a baseline  
166 TP of 3.6 for the Delta variant based on averaged observations from the state of New South Wales in  
167 March 2021, a period with minimal social restrictions and no major outbreaks. Although good practice  
168 estimation of TP would consider uncertainty in this estimate, the result of this would be to simply shift the  
169 scenario estimates up or down the scale. Due to the urgency and nature of the application of this work in  
170 providing advice for immediate decision-making, we present the best-estimates only, as used at the time.

171 For each vaccination scenario, the reduction in transmission by age-group was calculated from the  
 172 average vaccination efficacy against transmission (accounting for the fractions of each vaccine type and  
 173 number of doses in that age-group) and the age-group coverage. Proportional reductions in transmission  
 174 rates for each age combination were then applied to the original ‘unvaccinated’ transmission matrix to  
 175 construct a ‘vaccinated’ matrix. The dominant eigenvalue, representing the population-wide reproduction  
 176 number was compared between these pairs of matrices to compute a percentage reduction in TP due to  
 177 immunisation.

178 To explore and visualise the effect of different strategies on TP reduction among age categories, we  
 179 also calculated an age-group specific TP prior to and after vaccination under a given scenario. These  
 180 ‘by-age’ contributions are calculated for a given homogeneous age-group (whereas other TP calculations  
 181 use all age groups concurrently S2). Because these age-specific TP calculations exclude interactions with  
 182 other age-groups, they are not equivalent to the partial contribution of that age group to the overall TP.

**Table 3.** Vaccine allocation strategies and allocation sequence by age-group. The specific modelled percentages of each age-group vaccinated in these strategies can be found in [16].

Strategy	Allocation sequence
Oldest first	Vaccinations are prioritised from oldest to youngest. Specifically, prioritization occurs in the following order: 80+, 70-79, 60-69, 50-59, 40-49, 30-39, 20-29, 16-19
40+ years first	Vaccinations are prioritised from 40+ upwards, then 16+. Specifically, prioritization occurs in the following order: 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, 80+, 16-19, 20-29, 30-39
All adults	Vaccinations are not prioritised in any particular order by age
Transmission reducing	As for national program, under which all individuals 40+ were eligible as at the 12 <sup>th</sup> of July 2021. Within the simulation time-frame, the 30-39 years cohort becomes eligible from the 30 <sup>th</sup> of August 2021, and 16-29 years on the 11 <sup>th</sup> of October.

### 183 Time in Lockdown

184 During outbreak suppression in Australia, early and stringent lockdowns were used to bring TP below 1  
 185 for the purposes of driving even a handful of local cases from an outbreak to zero, in the context of an  
 186 optimal TTIQ response. The goal of transitioning to phase B 1 was to minimise the requirement for such  
 187 stringent PHSMs, restricting their use to meet the explicit objective of prevention of overwhelming the  
 188 health sector in the face of escalating case loads.

189 Ongoing application of some degree of social measures through this phase to support vaccine impacts  
 190 reduces the likelihood for high restrictions and preserves TTIQ effectiveness by keeping case numbers  
 191 low. TP estimates with and without stringent PHSM can be used to calculate the approximate proportion  
 192 of time those stringent measures would need to be in place to prevent exceedance of health sector capacity  
 193 over a defined time frame. This simple static analysis can indicate the plausible societal and economic  
 194 impacts of the PHSM required to constrain transmission under each scenario and coverage.

195 Where a vaccination scenario leads to either a  $TP_1 > 1$  with one PHSM bundle and  $TP_2 < 1$  with  
 196 a more stringent bundle, the long-term average TP can be maintained at 1, i.e. with daily case counts  
 197 neither growing nor shrinking over the long term, by alternating between the two PHSM bundle states.  
 198 Whilst the first PHSM bundle is in place cases will grow, and whilst the more stringent bundle is in place  
 199 cases will shrink, leading to an oscillation of case counts around some average level S1. This fraction of  
 200 time under more stringent PHSMs is independent of the sequence or duration of the periods under more  
 201 stringent restrictions; a strategy of rapid switching on and off of restrictions, or one of alternating long

**Table 4.** Vaccine eligibility, dosing intervals, and assumed delay to efficacy.

Vaccine	Eligible population	Dosing interval	Delay to full efficacy
Vaxzevria (ChAdOx1-S) (AZ) [27]	60+ years [28]	12 weeks	2 weeks
Comirnaty (BNT162b2) (Pf) [26]	16+ years	3 weeks	2 weeks

202 periods with or without restrictions would both lead to long-term maintenance of  $TP = 1$ , provided the  
203 fraction of time in each condition is the same S1.

204 Switching between more and less stringent PHSMs reflects a strategy that might be used to keep cases  
205 below a health sector capacity limit in the event that there is long-term community transmission. With the  
206 the necessary simplifying assumption that vaccination coverage is static, where one PHSM bundle leads  
207 to growing cases numbers ( $TP_1 > 1$ ), and a second bundle leads to contracting case numbers ( $TP_2 < 1$ ),  
208 we can calculate the fraction of time necessary under each bundle of PHSMs S1. However this strategy  
209 will not always be either necessary or possible. When cases under both bundles lead to declining case  
210 numbers (i.e.  $TP_1 < 1$  and  $TP_2 < 1$ ), the fraction is zero as the more stringent PHSM bundle is not needed.  
211 Alternatively, where even the more stringent PHSMs still lead to growing daily case numbers ( $TP_2 > 1$ )  
212 no fraction exists, because even the more stringent PHSM bundle could not control transmission.

### 213 **Costs of PHSMs**

214 The Australian Government Treasury estimated the direct economic costs of alternative COVID-19  
215 management scenarios explored in this analysis. Estimates included the expected average weekly costs  
216 of activity restrictions and lockdowns for each of the bundled levels of restrictions, multiplied by their  
217 duration of application over the specified timeframe. These figures were derived by analysing the impact  
218 on hours worked across the economy during lockdown periods in 2020, compared with the pre-COVID  
219 baseline. They did not include indirect confidence effects, labour market impacts, social, fiscal or health  
220 economic costs. For all scenarios it was assumed that case numbers would be constrained by social  
221 measures to avoid overwhelming the health system. An objective of maintaining low case numbers in this  
222 way was to avoid the significant behavioural changes and related economic impacts that were observed  
223 in other country settings where severe and widespread outbreaks occurred in the absence of mixing  
224 restrictions. [13].


### 225 **Data Analysis**

226 All data analyses for this work were carried out in R [31]. R code to reproduce these analyses are available  
227 at <https://github.com/aus-covid-modelling/NationalCabinetModelling>. This  
228 code uses outputs from regular situational assessment work [19, 18] that are conducted using data provided  
229 under confidential agreement from the Australian Commonwealth Government (see also statement in  
230 Ethics), and that the authors are not authorised to make available. Code to create figures 3 and S1 can be  
231 found in [32].


## 232 **RESULTS**

233 From an  $R_0$  of 8 for the Delta variant, with baseline PHSMs and partial TTIQ in place TP is reduced  
234 to 3.6, which serves as a baseline to which other interventions are added 1. The effects of vaccination  
235 and more stringent PHSMs on TP are mathematically multiplicative, so the results displayed in figure 1  
236 use a logarithmic y-axis in order to easily see the relative magnitude of each intervention. The results  
237 demonstrate that as vaccination coverage increases, less stringent PHSMs are required to bring TP  
238 below 1 and thus control epidemic activity (figure 1). Maintaining a rapid and highly effective TTIQ  
239 response capacity is critical for ongoing epidemic control. Should TTIQ responses become only partially  
240 effective due to high caseloads, high PHSM would be needed to curb transmission at the 50% and  
241 60% coverage thresholds, whilst low PHSMs may be sufficient for control at 80% coverage (figure  
242 1). More optimistically, the combination of 70% vaccine coverage and ongoing low PHSMs would  
243 likely be sufficient for control, if optimal TTIQ can be maintained (figure 1). Note that compliance with  
244 imposed measures will vary their effectiveness between populations and time-points. This uncertainty is  
245 conceptually represented by the upper and lower bounds of each 'box' for each set of restrictions in figure  
246 1.

247 The choice of age-structured vaccine allocation strategy has a slight effect on Transmission Potential,  
248 though this varies with level of vaccine coverage (table 5). The contribution varies considerably by  
249 age-group due to differential mixing rates (figure 2, and figures S3, S4, and S5), and while a transmission  
250 reducing allocation strategy tends to best reduce TP as intended the effect is slight, and the advantage  
251 depends on the overall coverage level of vaccination. Vaccinating the 40+ years first tended to perform  
252 worst at lower levels of coverage, requiring the largest proportion of time under strict PHSMs, however  
253 this became unimportant at higher levels of vaccination.




(a) Partial TTIQ.



(b) Optimal TTIQ.

**Figure 1.** Combined effects of vaccination and PHSM scenarios on COVID-19 transmission potential under the ‘Transmission reducing’ vaccination scenario assuming only partial (a) or optimal (b) TTIQ effectiveness, due to high caseloads. (NB the logarithmic scale of the y-axis enables comparison of the multiplicative effect sizes of these measures without depending on the order in which they are plotted.)



**Figure 2.** Impact of the four different vaccine allocation strategies on TP by age category, resulting in the overall TP achieved by 70% age eligible population coverage. Dark grey represents TP contribution after vaccination, and light grey in the absence of vaccination. Other coverage levels (50, 60 and 80% are in figures S2a-c). Dashed lines correspond to whole population differences in TP with age-group interactions included.)

**Table 5.** Scaled values of Delta variant transmission potential (TP) for 50%, 60%, 70% and 80% population vaccination coverage for each allocation strategy, with vaccines delivered per 4. We use a baseline TP of 3.6, which corresponds to TP under baseline PHSMs and partial TTIQ.

Allocation strategy	Eligible population coverage (16+)			
	50%	60%	70%	80%
Oldest first	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.3
40+ years first	2.1	1.9	1.6	1.3
All adults	2	1.7	1.5	1.3
Transmission reducing	2.1	1.8	1.4	1.3



**Table 6.** Percentage of time high PHSM would need to be in place for long-term control, with reversion to low PHSM at other times, for 50%, 60%, 70% and 80% population coverage achieved under the three age-based allocation strategies. These scenarios assume partial TTIQ effectiveness, under high caseloads. Standard age (60+) and dosing interval (12 weeks) recommendations are assumed for AZ vaccine.

Allocation strategy	Eligible population coverage (16+)			
	50%	60%	70%	80%
Oldest first	82%	49%	18%	0%
40+ years first	89%	67%	39%	2%
All adults	75%	46%	22%	0%
Transmission reducing	87%	52%	10%	0%

**Table 7.** Percentage of time high PHSM would need to be in place for long-term control, with reversion to low PHSM at other times, for 50%, 60%, 70% and 80% population coverage achieved under the three age-based allocation strategies. These scenarios assume optimal TTIQ effectiveness, under high caseloads. Standard age (60+) and dosing interval (12 weeks) recommendations are assumed for AZ vaccine.

Allocation strategy	Eligible population coverage (16+)			
	50%	60%	70%	80%
Oldest first	42%	9%	0%	0%
40+ years first	49%	27%	0%	0%
All adults	35%	6%	0%	0%
Transmission reducing	47%	12%	0%	0%


254 Tables 6 and 7 compare the proportion of time that would need to be spent with high PHSM on top  
255 of ongoing light restrictions to maintain case counts at some level, by vaccine coverage and allocation  
256 strategy. We assume periodic switching between low PHSM and high PHSM over a long period with  
257 the same vaccination coverage. With long-term coverage held at 50%, 60%, or 70%, high PHSM would  
258 be needed for significant fractions of time (18-89%) if caseloads escalate, leading to ‘partial’ TTIQ  
259 effectiveness. For the ‘optimal’ TTIQ scenario and an achieved adult population coverage of 70%, high  
260 PHSM would be needed rarely if at all.

261 Figure 3 represents the proportion of time spent under each of the restriction stringency settings  
262 for different levels of vaccine coverage and intensity of case finding and management strategies, with  
263 corresponding costs of these restrictions as estimated by Treasury shown on the right of the figure  
264 [13]. These combined outputs demonstrate the substantive cost savings associated with avoidance of  
265 lockdown and provided additional justification for delaying reopening until achieving 70% threshold  
266 vaccine coverage. The overlay of some degree of social measures at this threshold supported transmission  
267 reduction and helped to maintain the effectiveness of an active case finding strategy focused on minimising  
268 health impacts. At 80% coverage these restrictions could be eased without any envisaged lockdown  
269 requirement.

## 270 DISCUSSION

271 This work formed the basis of a significant contribution to easing of COVID-19 restrictions in Australia  
272 in late 2021 by providing a structured framework to explore the effect of management decisions on  
273 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia based on contemporary evidence [13, 14, 15, 16]. Specifically,  
274 it covers the pandemic period up to mid-late 2021, during which time the Delta variant became established  
275 in several eastern Australian states resulting in imposition of stringent lockdowns to manage transmission  
276 and clinical burden, and closure of interstate borders. For those states, our recommendation of a target  
277 vaccination level of at least 70% 1 was a pathway out of restrictions and a way to reconnect with ‘COVID-  
278 zero’ jurisdictions. In the other states, high vaccine coverage provided confidence that COVID-19 impacts  
279 could be mitigated sufficiently to avoid substantive health system and social disruption, and at 80%  
280 coverage only minimal social and behavioural measures would be required to support vaccination 1.

281 The scenarios in this study representing a single national COVID-19 epidemic were clearly (and  
282 deliberately) artificial and served to inform high level policy strategy. Beyond defining threshold vaccine  
283 targets, they highlighted the importance of a combination of timely public health responses (TTIQ)



**Figure 3.** Percentage of time necessary under PHSMs to constrain outbreaks (a) and cost (in millions of Australian dollars per week) of the least expensive PHSM bundle able to constrain outbreaks (b) under each combination of TTIQ effectiveness and ongoing PHSMs, at 50, 60, 70, and 80% vaccination coverage of the 16+ adult population, and an "All adults" vaccine allocation scenario. Data in (a) from S2, S3, S4, and S5, and (b) from [13]

284 and ongoing social and behavioural measures (PHSMs) to constrain SARS-CoV-2 transmission. It was  
 285 recognised that at high caseloads, maintenance of optimal TTIQ was likely infeasible. In such instances,  
 286 jurisdictions retained the flexibility to strengthen PHSMs generally or locally (as envisaged in the National  
 287 Plan [12]) to regain local epidemic control 3. Although our work found little impact of age-structured  
 288 vaccination on transmission outcomes 5, it is likely that such structure does have an effect on other  
 289 outcomes like severe disease or death. A further limitation of the need for high-level policy advice was a  
 290 reliance on best-estimates rather than considering the broader suite of uncertainty around these parameters.  
 291 Due to the dynamic pandemic situation, uncertainty was instead managed by ongoing surveillance, with  
 292 the ultimate required intensity and duration of measures informed by ongoing situational assessment of  
 293 transmission and its related health impacts [19].

294 In August 2021 when these analyses were first reported, evidence of vaccine efficacy against acquisi-  
 295 tion and onward spread of infection had raised hopes that equitable vaccine distribution could substantially  
 296 limit global transmission and burden of COVID-19 disease [33]. However, studies undertaken by multiple  
 297 modelling groups supporting decision making to ease UK lockdowns during the Delta era similarly  
 298 cautioned against the lifting of all restrictions ('freedom day') following achievement of vaccine targets,  
 299 given imperfect vaccine protection and potential for resurgence [34]. In support of this position, a rapid  
 300 rebound of Delta infections following reopening in the Netherlands had necessitated re-imposition of  
 301 social measures within only weeks of easing. At that time, global concern about driving emergence  
 302 of further variants remained high and strong suppression strategies were favoured by the World Health  
 303 Organisation [35].

304 Our findings were aligned with and benchmarked against the UK modelling reports, including the  
 305 recommendation for ongoing social constraints, but were novel in two main aspects. For the majority  
 306 of Australian jurisdictions, relaxation of border restrictions would allow importation of infections into  
 307 'COVID-zero' settings, requiring high confidence in model recommendations. The use of transmission  
 308 potential as a novel metric enabled anticipation of case loads in settings where there were presently none  
 309 [10]. Given ongoing global discussions about competing health and economic impacts of COVID-19 and

310 social measures for its control [36], the accompanying Treasury analyses were highly influential in whole  
311 of government decision making. We are unaware of similar publicly available estimates of the costs of  
312 PHSMs under different levels of vaccine coverage from other country settings.

313 The model assumed fixed efficacy of vaccine protection against transmission and disease at a single  
314 time point and did not incorporate waning immunity. At the time of analysis, longevity of population  
315 experience with COVID-19 vaccines was limited and evidence of the rate of loss of protection was sparse.  
316 Israel was the first country to approve booster doses on July 30 2021, initially for individuals aged 60 and  
317 above. This recommendation was prompted by observation of breakthrough infections following primary  
318 vaccination consistent with waning immunity [37]. Booster requirements were then a contentious issue,  
319 with many arguing that broad provision of a third vaccine dose was unnecessary in highly immunised  
320 populations. There were particular concerns about impacts on supply for global vaccine equity, given  
321 persistently low primary vaccine coverage and access in many low and middle income countries [38].

322 Note that the visualisations and metrics presented in this paper were used to evaluate the general  
323 viability of different suites of measures, under a very uncertain future epidemiological situation and period  
324 of time. These metrics were not sufficient to calculate the likely morbidity and mortality outcomes of  
325 COVID-19 under specific rollout strategies and changes given the dynamic nature of vaccination and  
326 transmission. Related work extended our initial findings on transmission potential into an agent based  
327 model framework to estimate those impacts and is reported elsewhere [39].

328 It was further recognised that the national COVID-19 epidemic had been, and would continue to  
329 be, a ‘fire’ fought on multiple fronts across Australia’s geographically distributed population, largely  
330 concentrated in coastal urban cities. We recommended that particular attention be paid to groups in whom  
331 socioeconomic, cultural and other determinants were anticipated to result in higher transmission and/or  
332 disease outcomes. In addition, achievements of vaccination targets at small area level was critical to  
333 ensure equity of program impact, as ongoing outbreaks in under-vaccinated populations were considered  
334 likely, and would need to be supported by optimisation of localised public health responses. These issues  
335 were the focus of subsequent work [11, 39].

336 In reality, the applicability of these defined thresholds to reopening goals was made redundant by im-  
337 portation and rapid transmission of the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant in December 2021. Dissemination  
338 of this and subsequent immune escape variants has led to global reconsideration of the role of vaccination  
339 in the control of COVID-19. Moreover, vaccine protection against severe disease appears more robust  
340 and sustained than that against transmission, particularly in the context of waning post-immunisation  
341 neutralising antibody titres [40]. This emerging understanding has reoriented strategic vaccine use towards  
342 promoting population resilience against severe disease outcomes, rather than transmission reduction.  
343 Subsequent work focuses on the implications of variant emergence for deployment of vaccines and other  
344 control measures in the era of Omicron and beyond.

## 345 ETHICS

346 The study was undertaken as urgent public health action to support Australia’s COVID-19 pandemic  
347 response. The study used data from the Australian National Notifiable Disease Surveillance System  
348 (NNDSS) provided to the Australian Government Department of Health under the National Health Security  
349 Agreement for the purposes of national communicable disease surveillance. Data from the NNDSS were  
350 supplied after de-identification to the investigator team for the purposes of provision of epidemiological  
351 advice to government. Contractual obligations established strict data protection protocols agreed between  
352 the University of Melbourne and sub-contractors and the Australian Government Department of Health,  
353 with oversight and approval for use in supporting Australia’s pandemic response and for publication  
354 provided by the data custodians represented by the Communicable Diseases Network of Australia. The  
355 ethics of the use of these data for these purposes, including publication, was agreed by the Department of  
356 Health with the Communicable Diseases Network of Australia.

## 357 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

358 This work forms part of a wider body of work around supporting Australia’s plan to reopen from COVID-  
359 19 restrictions (often known in media as ‘the Doherty modelling’). We thank our many colleagues who,  
360 while largely locked in their homes, contributed to this large undertaking with unflinching good grace and  
361 humour.

362 We also thank many colleagues at Treasury who helped advise and focus this work, in particular  
363 including those contributing to [13].

364 Thanks to David Price for helpful comments on the manuscript.

365 This work was directly funded by the Australian Government Department of Health Office of Health  
366 Protection. Additional support was provided by the National Health and Medical Research Council of  
367 Australia through its Centres of Research Excellence (SPECTRUM, GNT1170960) and Investigator  
368 Grant Schemes (JMcV Principal Research Fellowship, GNT1117140; FMS Emerging Leader Fellowship,  
369 2021/GNT2010051).

370 This research was supported by The University of Melbourne's Research Computing Services and the  
371 Petascale Campus Initiative.

## 372 REFERENCES

- 373 [1] World Health Organisation. Weekly epidemiological update on COVID-19 - 10 August 2022.  
374 Technical report, August 2022. URL [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/  
375 weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---10-august-2022](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---10-august-2022).
- 376 [2] Ilan Noy, Nguyen Doan, and Tausi Taupo. The economic risk from COVID-19 in Pacific  
377 Island countries: very few infections but lots of pain. *New Zealand Economic Papers*, 56  
378 (1):55–66, January 2022. ISSN 0077-9954. doi: 10.1080/00779954.2020.1827016. URL  
379 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00779954.2020.1827016>. Publisher: Routledge .eprint:  
380 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00779954.2020.1827016>.
- 381 [3] Emeline Han, Melisa Mei Jin Tan, Eva Turk, Devi Sridhar, Gabriel M Leung, Kenji Shibuya,  
382 Nima Asgari, Juhwan Oh, Alberto L García-Basteiro, Johanna Hanefeld, Alex R Cook, Li Yang  
383 Hsu, Yik Ying Teo, David Heymann, Helen Clark, Martin McKee, and Helena Legido-Quigley.  
384 Lessons learnt from easing COVID-19 restrictions: an analysis of countries and regions in Asia  
385 Pacific and Europe. *The Lancet*, 396(10261):1525–1534, November 2020. ISSN 0140-6736. doi:  
386 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32007-9. URL [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/  
387 article/pii/S0140673620320079](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673620320079).
- 388 [4] Kathina Ali, Matthew Iasiello, Joep van Agteren, Teri Mavrangelos, Michael Kyrios, and Daniel B.  
389 Fassnacht. A cross-sectional investigation of the mental health and wellbeing among individuals  
390 who have been negatively impacted by the COVID-19 international border closure in Australia.  
391 *Globalization and Health*, 18(1):12, February 2022. ISSN 1744-8603. doi: 10.1186/s12992-022-  
392 00807-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-022-00807-7>.
- 393 [5] Tung Le, Zacharias Andreadakis, Arun Kumar, Raúl Román, Stig Tollefsen, Melanie Saville, and  
394 Stephen Mayhew. The COVID-19 vaccine development landscape. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*,  
395 April 2020. doi: 10.1038/d41573-020-00073-5.
- 396 [6] Alan D. T. Barrett, Richard W. Titball, Paul A. MacAry, Richard E. Rupp, Veronika von Messling,  
397 David H. Walker, and Nicolas V. J. Fanget. The rapid progress in COVID vaccine development and  
398 implementation. *npj Vaccines*, 7(1):1–2, February 2022. ISSN 2059-0105. doi: 10.1038/s41541-022-  
399 00442-8. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41541-022-00442-8>. Num-  
400 ber: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- 401 [7] Seyed M. Moghadas, Pratha Sah, Thomas N. Vilches, and Alison P. Galvani. Can the USA  
402 return to pre-COVID-19 normal by July 4? *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 21(8):1073–  
403 1074, August 2021. ISSN 1473-3099, 1474-4457. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00324-  
404 8. URL [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-  
405 3099\(21\)00324-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(21)00324-8/fulltext). Publisher: Elsevier.
- 406 [8] Grace Ho. Zero-Covid strategy no longer feasible due to highly infectious Delta  
407 variant: PM Lee. *The Straits Times*, October 2021. ISSN 0585-3923. URL  
408 [https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/politics/spore-must-press-  
409 on-with-strategy-of-living-with-covid-19-and-not-be-paralysed-by](https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/politics/spore-must-press-on-with-strategy-of-living-with-covid-19-and-not-be-paralysed-by).
- 410 [9] Alicia Blair, Mattia de Pasquale, Valentin Gabeff, Mélanie Rufi, and Antoine Flahault. The End  
411 of the Elimination Strategy: Decisive Factors towards Sustainable Management of COVID-19  
412 in New Zealand. *Epidemiologia*, 3(1):135–147, March 2022. ISSN 2673-3986. doi: 10.3390/  
413 epidemiologia3010011. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2673-3986/3/1/11>. Number: 1  
414 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.

- 415 [10] Nick Golding, David J Price, Gerard Ryan, Jodie McVernon, James M McCaw, and Freya M Shearer.  
416 A modelling approach to estimate the transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 during periods of high, low,  
417 and zero case incidence. *eLife*, 12:e78089, January 2023. ISSN 2050-084X. doi: 10.7554/eLife.78089.  
418 URL <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.78089>. Publisher: eLife Sciences Publications,  
419 Ltd.
- 420 [11] Freya M. Shearer, James M. McCaw, Gerard Ryan, Tianxiao Hao, Nicholas J. Tierney, Michael  
421 Lydeamore, Kate Ward, Sally Ellis, James Wood, Jodie McVernon, and Nick Golding. Esti-  
422 mating the impact of test-trace-isolate-quarantine systems on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in Aus-  
423 tralia, January 2023. URL [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.01.](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.01.10.23284209v1)  
424 [10.23284209v1](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.01.10.23284209v1). Pages: 2023.01.10.23284209.
- 425 [12] Australian Government. National Plan to transition Australia’s National COVID-19 Response.  
426 Technical report, 2021. URL [https://pmtranscripts.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/](https://pmtranscripts.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-06/national-plan-060821_0.pdf)  
427 [files/2022-06/national-plan-060821\\_0.pdf](https://pmtranscripts.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-06/national-plan-060821_0.pdf). natplan.
- 428 [13] Department of the Treasury. National Plan to Transition to Australia’s National  
429 COVID-19 Response: Economic Impact Analysis. Technical report, 2021. URL  
430 [https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-08/PDF\\_Economic\\_](https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-08/PDF_Economic_Impacts_COVID-19_Response_196731.pdf)  
431 [Impacts\\_COVID-19\\_Response\\_196731.pdf](https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-08/PDF_Economic_Impacts_COVID-19_Response_196731.pdf).
- 432 [14] Doherty Modelling Group. DOHERTY MODELLING –FINAL REPORT TO NATIONAL CABI-  
433 NET. Technical report, November 2021. URL [https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/](https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/Synthesis_DohertyModelling_FinalReport__NatCab05Nov.pdf)  
434 [content\\_doc/Synthesis\\_DohertyModelling\\_FinalReport\\_\\_NatCab05Nov.](https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/Synthesis_DohertyModelling_FinalReport__NatCab05Nov.pdf)  
435 pdf.
- 436 [15] Doherty Modelling Group. DOHERTY MODELLING INTERIM REPORT TO NATIONAL  
437 CABINET. Technical report, September 2021. URL [https://www.doherty.edu.au/](https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/DOHERTY_MODELLING_INTERIM_REPORT_TO_NATIONAL_CABINET_17TH_SEPTMBER_2021.pdf)  
438 [uploads/content\\_doc/DOHERTY\\_MODELLING\\_INTERIM\\_REPORT\\_TO\\_NATIONAL\\_](https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/DOHERTY_MODELLING_INTERIM_REPORT_TO_NATIONAL_CABINET_17TH_SEPTMBER_2021.pdf)  
439 [CABINET\\_17TH\\_SEPTMBER\\_2021.pdf](https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/DOHERTY_MODELLING_INTERIM_REPORT_TO_NATIONAL_CABINET_17TH_SEPTMBER_2021.pdf).
- 440 [16] Doherty Modelling Group. DOHERTY MODELLING REPORT REVISED. Technical re-  
441 port, August 2021. URL [http://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content\\_doc/](http://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/DohertyModelling_NationalPlan_and_Addendum_20210810.pdf)  
442 [DohertyModelling\\_NationalPlan\\_and\\_Addendum\\_20210810.pdf](http://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/DohertyModelling_NationalPlan_and_Addendum_20210810.pdf).
- 443 [17] Department of Health and Aged Care. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Common Operating Picture - 24  
444 May 2022. Technical report, May 2022. URL [https://www.health.gov.au/resources/](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-common-operating-picture-24-may-2022)  
445 [publications/coronavirus-covid-19-common-operating-picture-24-may-](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-common-operating-picture-24-may-2022)  
446 [2022](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-common-operating-picture-24-may-2022).
- 447 [18] Nick Golding, Freya M Shearer, Robert Moss, Peter Dawson, Dennis Liu, Joshua V Ross, Rob  
448 Hyndman, Pablo Montero-Manso, Gerry Ryan, Tobin South, Jodie McVernon, David J Price, and  
449 James M McCaw. Situational assessment of COVID-19 in Australia Technical Report 15 March 2021  
450 (released 28 May 2021). Technical report, May 2021.
- 451 [19] James M McCaw, Robert Moss, David J Price, Freya M Shearer, Nick Golding, Tianxiao Hao, Gerry  
452 Ryan, Adeshina Adekunle, Peter Dawson, Mingmei Teo, Dylan Morris, Joshua V Ross, Tobin South,  
453 Rob Hyndman, Michael Lydeamore, Mitchell O’Hara-Wild, and James Wood. Situational assessment  
454 of COVID-19 in Australia Technical Report 22 May 2022 (released 12 August 2022). Technical  
455 report, August 2022. URL [https://mspgh.unimelb.edu.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_](https://mspgh.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/4256103/2022-05-22-Technical-report-public-release.pdf)  
456 [file/0003/4256103/2022-05-22-Technical-report-public-release.pdf](https://mspgh.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/4256103/2022-05-22-Technical-report-public-release.pdf).
- 457 [20] Don Klinkenberg, Christophe Fraser, and Hans Heesterbeek. The Effectiveness of Contact Tracing  
458 in Emerging Epidemics. *PLOS ONE*, 1(1):e12, December 2006. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/  
459 [journal.pone.0000012](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000012). URL [https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000012)  
460 [1371/journal.pone.0000012](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000012). Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- 461 [21] Lawrence O. Gostin, Ronald Bayer, and Amy L. Fairchild. Ethical and Legal Challenges Posed  
462 by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome: Implications for the Control of Severe Infectious Disease  
463 Threats. *JAMA*, 290(24):3229–3237, December 2003. ISSN 0098-7484. doi: 10.1001/jama.290.24.  
464 [3229](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.290.24.3229). URL <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.290.24.3229>.
- 465 [22] Peter Ashcroft, Sonja Lehtinen, and Sebastian Bonhoeffer. Test-trace-isolate-quarantine (TTIQ)  
466 intervention strategies after symptomatic COVID-19 case identification. *PLOS ONE*, 17(2):e0263597,  
467 February 2022. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0263597. URL [https://journals.](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0263597)  
468 [plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0263597](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0263597). Publisher:  
469 Public Library of Science.

- 470 [23] Marcel Salathé, Christian L. Althaus, Richard Neher, Silvia Stringhini, Emma Hodcroft, Jacques  
471 Fellay, Marcel Zwahlen, Gabriela Senti, Manuel Battegay, Annelies Wilder-Smith, Isabella Eckerle,  
472 Matthias Egger, and Nicola Low. COVID-19 epidemic in Switzerland: on the importance of testing,  
473 contact tracing and isolation. *Swiss Medical Weekly*, (11), March 2020. doi: 10.4414/smw.2020.20225.  
474 URL <https://smw.ch/article/doi/smw.2020.20225>. Publisher: EMH Media.
- 475 [24] World Health Organisation. WHO SAGE roadmap for prioritizing uses of COVID-19 vaccines in  
476 the context of limited supply: an approach to inform planning and subsequent recommendations  
477 based on epidemiological setting and vaccine supply scenarios, first issued 20 October 2020, latest  
478 update 16 July 2021. Technical report, World Health Organization, July 2021. URL <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/342917>.
- 480 [25] Department of Health and Aged Care. Op COVID SHIELD National COVID Vaccine Campaign  
481 Plan. Technical report, August 2021. URL [https://www.health.gov.au/resources/  
482 publications/op-covid-shield-national-covid-vaccine-campaign-plan](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/op-covid-shield-national-covid-vaccine-campaign-plan).
- 483 [26] Therapeutic Goods Administration. AUSTRALIAN PRODUCT INFORMATION –  
484 COMIRNATY® (tozinameran) COVID-19 VACCINE [Tris/Sucrose Presentation], 2022.  
485 URL [https://www.tga.gov.au/covid-19-vaccine-pfizer-australia-  
486 comirnaty-tozinameran-mrna#documents](https://www.tga.gov.au/covid-19-vaccine-pfizer-australia-comirnaty-tozinameran-mrna#documents).
- 487 [27] Therapeutic Goods Administration. AUSTRALIAN PRODUCT INFORMATION VAXZEVRIA®  
488 (previously COVID-19 Vaccine AstraZeneca) (ChAdOx1-S) solution for injection, 2022. URL  
489 <https://www.tga.gov.au/covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca-vaxzevria>.
- 490 [28] Australian Technical Advisory Group on Immunisation. ATAGI statement on revised rec-  
491 ommendations on the use of COVID-19 Vaccine AstraZeneca, 17 June 2021, June 2021.  
492 URL [https://www.health.gov.au/news/atagi-statement-on-revised-  
493 recommendations-on-the-use-of-covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca-17-  
494 june-2021](https://www.health.gov.au/news/atagi-statement-on-revised-recommendations-on-the-use-of-covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca-17-june-2021). Publisher: Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care.
- 495 [29] Kiesha Prem, Alex R. Cook, and Mark Jit. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using  
496 contact surveys and demographic data. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13(9):e1005697, Septem-  
497 ber 2017. ISSN 1553-7358. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697. URL [https://journals.  
498 plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697](https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697). Pub-  
499 lisher: Public Library of Science.
- 500 [30] Nicholas G. Davies, Petra Klepac, Yang Liu, Kiesha Prem, Mark Jit, and Rosalind M. Eggo. Age-  
501 dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nature Medicine*,  
502 26(8):1205–1211, August 2020. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9. URL  
503 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-0962-9>. Number: 8 Publisher:  
504 Nature Publishing Group.
- 505 [31] R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical  
506 Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2021. URL <https://www.R-project.org>.
- 507 [32] Gerard Ryan and Nick Golding. geryan/nat\_plan\_figs: Citable version for national plan paper,  
508 September 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7117840>.
- 509 [33] Alexandra B. Hogan, Peter Winskill, Oliver J. Watson, Patrick G. T. Walker, Charles Whittaker, Marc  
510 Baguelin, Nicholas F. Brazeau, Giovanni D. Charles, Katy A. M. Gaythorpe, Arran Hamlet, Edward  
511 Knock, Daniel J. Laydon, John A. Lees, Alessandra Løchen, Robert Verity, Lilith K. Whittles,  
512 Farzana Muhib, Katharina Hauck, Neil M. Ferguson, and Azra C. Ghani. Within-country age-  
513 based prioritisation, global allocation, and public health impact of a vaccine against SARS-CoV-2:  
514 A mathematical modelling analysis. *Vaccine*, 39(22):2995–3006, May 2021. ISSN 0264-410X.  
515 doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.002. URL [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/  
516 article/pii/S0264410X21004278](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264410X21004278).
- 517 [34] Gareth Iacobucci. Covid-19: “Freedom day” in England could lead to “significant third wave of  
518 hospitalisations and deaths,” modelling predicts. *BMJ*, 374:n1789, July 2021. ISSN 1756-1833. doi:  
519 10.1136/bmj.n1789. URL <https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n1789>. Publisher:  
520 British Medical Journal Publishing Group Section: News.
- 521 [35] Philip Ball. Why England’s COVID ‘freedom day’ alarms researchers. *Nature*, 595(7868):479–480,  
522 July 2021. doi: 10.1038/d41586-021-01938-4. URL [https://www.nature.com/articles/  
523 d41586-021-01938-4](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-01938-4). Bandiera\_abtest: a Cg\_type: News Number: 7868 Publisher: Nature  
524 Publishing Group Subject.term: Epidemiology, Virology.

- 525 [36] OECD. First lessons from government evaluations of COVID-19 responses: A synthesis.  
526 Technical report, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, January 2022. URL  
527 [https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/first-lessons-](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/first-lessons-from-government-evaluations-of-covid-19-responses-a-synthesis-483507d6/)  
528 [from-government-evaluations-of-covid-19-responses-a-synthesis-](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/first-lessons-from-government-evaluations-of-covid-19-responses-a-synthesis-483507d6/)  
529 [483507d6/](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/first-lessons-from-government-evaluations-of-covid-19-responses-a-synthesis-483507d6/).
- 530 [37] Yinon M. Bar-On, Yair Goldberg, Micha Mandel, Omri Bodenheimer, Laurence Freedman, Nir  
531 Kalkstein, Barak Mizrahi, Sharon Alroy-Preis, Nachman Ash, Ron Milo, and Amit Huppert. Protec-  
532 tion of BNT162b2 Vaccine Booster against Covid-19 in Israel. *New England Journal of Medicine*,  
533 385(15):1393–1400, October 2021. ISSN 0028-4793. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2114255. URL  
534 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2114255>. Publisher: Massachusetts Medical Society  
535 [\\_eprint: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2114255](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2114255).
- 536 [38] The Lancet Infectious Diseases. COVID-19 vaccine equity and booster doses. *The Lancet Infec-*  
537 *tious Diseases*, 21(9):1193, September 2021. ISSN 1473-3099, 1474-4457. doi: 10.1016/S1473-  
538 3099(21)00486-2. URL [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(21)00486-2/fulltext#coronavirus-linkback-header)  
539 [PIIS1473-3099\(21\)00486-2/fulltext#coronavirus-linkback-header](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(21)00486-2/fulltext#coronavirus-linkback-header). Pub-  
540 lisher: Elsevier.
- 541 [39] Eamon Conway, Camelia Walker, Chris Baker, Michael Lydeamore, Gerard E. Ryan, Trish Camp-  
542 bell, Joel C. Miller, Max Yeung, Greg Kabashima, James Wood, Nic Rebuli, James M. Mc-  
543 Caw, Jodie McVernon, Nick Golding, David J. Price, and Freya M. Shearer. COVID-19 vaccine  
544 coverage targets to inform reopening plans in a low incidence setting, December 2022. URL  
545 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.12.04.22282996v1>. Pages:  
546 2022.12.04.22282996.
- 547 [40] David S Khoury, Deborah Cromer, Arnold Reynaldi, Timothy E Schlub, Adam K Wheatley, Jennifer A  
548 Juno, Kanta Subbarao, Stephen J Kent, James A Triccas, and Miles P Davenport. Neutralizing  
549 antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic sars-cov-2 infection.  
550 *Nature medicine*, 27(7):1205–1211, 2021.

## 551 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

### 552 The relationship of Transmission Potential, $R_0$ , and $R_{eff}$

553  $R_0$  is the number of secondary infections from an infection in a given, fully susceptible population under  
554 standard mixing behaviours.

555  $R_{eff}$  is the average number of secondary infections from an infection in the *infected population* at a  
556 given point in time. In a fully susceptible population this is likely to approximate  $R_0$  but will vary due to  
557 levels of immunity in the population, changes in behaviour, and the specific infected population.  $R_{eff}$  is a  
558 real, occurring quantity which is can be estimated from records of infections.

559 Transmission potential,  $TP$ , is an estimate of the expected  $R_{eff}$  over *whole population*.  $TP$  is a  
560 theoretical quantity used to understand transmission risk over a broader population, in particular in times  
561 when transmission is low or zero [10]. Where transmission is widespread,  $R_{eff}$  may be similar to  $TP$ ,  
562 and where a population is fully susceptible, and no measures are in place to reduce transmission,  $TP$  will  
563 equate to  $R_0$  (e.g. in main text figure 1, without PHSMs, TTIQ, or vaccination).

### 564 Fraction of time in lockdown

565 Where a vaccination scenario leads to either a  $TP_1 > 1$  with one PHSM bundle and  $TP_2 < 1$  with a more  
566 stringent bundle, the long-term average TP can be maintained at 1, i.e. with daily case counts neither  
567 growing nor shrinking over the long term, by alternating between the two PHSM bundle states. Whilst  
568 the first PHSM bundle is in place cases will grow, and whilst the more stringent bundle is in place cases  
569 will shrink, leading to an oscillation of case counts around some average level S1. This reflects a strategy  
570 that might be used to keep cases below a health sector capacity limit in the event that there is long-term  
571 community transmission and under the necessary simplifying assumption that vaccination coverage is  
572 static.


573 Where  $TP_1 > 1$  and  $TP_2 < 1$ , we can calculate the fraction of time spent under more stringent PHSMs  
574 as:

$$fraction = -\frac{\log(TP_1)}{\log(TP_2) - \log(TP_1)} \quad (S1)$$

575 Where  $TP_1 < 1$  the fraction is zero, and as the more stringent PHSM bundle is not needed. Where  $TP_2 > 1$   
576 no fraction exists, because even the more stringent PHSM bundle could not control transmission.

577 Note that this fraction of time under more stringent PHSMs is independent of the sequence or duration  
578 of the periods under more stringent restrictions; a strategy of rapid switching on and off of restrictions, or  
579 one of alternating long periods with or without restrictions would both lead to long-term maintenance  
580 of  $TP = 1$ , provided the fraction of time in each condition is the same and that daily case numbers are  
581 either growing or contracting exponentially (i.e., no significant susceptible depletion alters the growth  
582 rate), e.g. S1. However for practical reasons, a rapid switching between states is unlikely to be used. The  
583 overall number of cases (as opposed to the long-term average TP) will however be dependant on the rate  
584 of switching, but it is assumed in all calculations in this paper that switching is sufficient to maintain total  
585 case numbers below a level which would result in overwhelming of the public healthcare system.






**Figure S1.** Example of how daily cases may fluctuate over time in response to stringency of PHSMs using 80% vaccination coverage, partial TTIQ and reversion to baseline PHSMs, with either long or short intervals between switching PHSMs. In this example, to maintain a stable  $TP \leq 1$  over time requires strict PHSMs for  $\geq 31\%$  of the time  $3, S2$ . Starting with strict PHSMs as here results in cases fluctuating below the initial daily case number ( $N_0$ , dotted line). The length of intervals under respective PHSMs (left vs. right) will not alter the overall average TP (though may affect total case numbers).

586 **Transmission matrix**

587 Population mixing within and between age groups is configured based on widely accepted social contact  
588 matrices published by [29]. It has been expanded to include an 80+ age class (assumed to have the same  
589 mixing rates as 75-79 years) S2. Age-specific susceptibility and transmissibility estimates from [30] are  
590 used and transmission rates have been calibrated to our baseline population-wide TP of 3.6.

591 The greatest mixing intensities are anticipated between individuals aged from 15-24 years, remaining  
592 high through adults of working age. While intense school-based mixing is anticipated between children  
593 aged 5-14, the transmission matrix accounts for the relatively low observed infectiousness of this age  
594 group, associated with a high proportion of asymptomatic infections.




**Figure S2.** Age-based transmission matrix derived from [29].


595 **Supplementary figures and tables**

**Table S1.** Detailed description of measures implemented under PHSM ‘bundles’.


	High PHSM	Medium PHSM	Low PHSM	Baseline PHSM
Reference period	VIC 23 August 2020	NSW 1 July 2021	NSW 23 August 2020	NSW March 2021
Stay at home orders	Stay-at-home except essential purposes	Stay-at-home except for work, study and essential purposes	No stay-at-home orders	No stay-at-home orders
Density restrictions	4 m <sup>2</sup> rule	2 m <sup>2</sup> rule	2 m <sup>2</sup> rule	2 m <sup>2</sup> rule
Retail trade	Non-essential retailers and venues closed to public. Take away and home delivery only	Increased retail activity, subject to density restrictions. Seated dining for small groups at cafes/restaurants	Social distancing rules apply. Larger groups allowed.	Social distancing rules apply
Work	Only workplaces categorised as permitted work allowed to operate on-site and subject to restrictions	Work from home if possible, capacity limits and restrictions on office space apply	Return to work, but social distancing and capacity restrictions on office space apply	1.5 m <sup>2</sup> rule
Schools and childcare	Closed – remote learning only	Closed or graduated return	Open	Open
Capacity restrictions	No gatherings - Non-essential venues etc closed.	Indoor venues closed. Capacity limits restricted to small groups outdoors	Recreational activities allowed and venues open but social distancing and capacity limits apply	Large sporting venues to operate at 70 per cent capacity
Travel restrictions	Essential movements only within 5 or 10 km radius. No intra- or inter-state travel	Non-essential travel limited. No intra- or inter-state travel	No travel restrictions. Interstate travel allowed	No travel restrictions. Interstate travel allowed
Other	Curfew. No household visitors and 2-person limit on exercise	5 visitors to household and limited outdoor gatherings e.g., 10 people	Requirements for record keeping, COVID-safe plans etc.	



**Figure S3.** Impact of the four different vaccine allocation strategies on TP by age category, resulting in the overall TP achieved by 50% age eligible population coverage. Dark grey represents TP contribution after vaccination, and light grey in the absence of vaccination. Dashed lines correspond to whole population differences in TP with age-group interactions included (is marginal contribution of each age-group / column sums of transmission matrix)



**Figure S4.** Impact of the four different vaccine allocation strategies on TP by age category, resulting in the overall TP achieved by 60% age eligible population coverage. Dark grey represents TP contribution after vaccination, and light grey in the absence of vaccination. Other coverage levels (50, 60 and 80% are in figures S2a-c). Dashed lines correspond to whole population differences in TP with age-group interactions included (is marginal contribution of each age-group / column sums of transmission matrix)



**Figure S5.** Impact of the four different vaccine allocation strategies on TP by age category, resulting in the overall TP achieved by 80% age eligible population coverage. Dark grey represents TP contribution after vaccination, and light grey in the absence of vaccination. Dashed lines correspond to whole population differences in TP with age-group interactions included (is marginal contribution of each age-group / column sums of transmission matrix)

**Table S2.** Proportion of time lockdowns are needed to constrain transmission when the TTIQ public health response is only partially effective, due to high caseloads

Vaccine coverage	Allocation Scenario	Light restrictions only	Moderate lockdowns only	Strict lockdowns only
50%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	89%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	93%
	All adults	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	84%
60%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	67%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	78%
	All adults	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	65%
70%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	77%	47%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	99%	60%
	All adults	Not possible to constrain outbreak	81%	49%
80%	Oldest first	82%	47%	29%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	59%	36%
	All adults	89%	51%	31%

**Table S3.** Proportion of time lockdowns are needed to constrain transmission when the TTIQ public health response is optimally effective.

Vaccine coverage	Allocation Scenario	Light restrictions only	Moderate lockdowns only	Strict lockdowns only
50%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	63%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	Not possible to constrain outbreak	67%
	All adults	Not possible to constrain outbreak	94%	58%
60%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	67%	41%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	86%	52%
	All adults	Not possible to constrain outbreak	64%	39%
70%	Oldest first	60%	34%	21%
	40+ years first	97%	56%	34%
	All adults	67%	38%	23%
80%	Oldest first	7%	4%	3%
	40+ years first	29%	17%	10%
	All adults	15%	8%	5%


**Table S4.** Proportion of time lockdowns needed to constrain transmission when the TTIQ public health response is only partially effective, due to high caseloads, and where light restrictions are always in place.


Vaccine coverage	Allocation Scenario	Moderate lockdowns only	Strict lockdowns only
50%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	82%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	89%
	All adults	Not possible to constrain outbreak	75%
60%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	49%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	67%
	All adults	Not possible to constrain outbreak	46%
70%	Oldest first	46%	18%
	40+ years first	97%	39%
	All adults	55%	22%
80%	Oldest first	0%	0%
	40+ years first	4%	2%
	All adults	0%	0%

**Table S5.** Proportion of time lockdowns needed to constrain transmission when the TTIQ public health response is optimally effective and where light restrictions are always in place.


Vaccine coverage	Allocation Scenario	Moderate lockdowns only	Strict lockdowns only
50%	Oldest first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	42%
	40+ years first	Not possible to constrain outbreak	49%
	All adults	87%	35%
60%	Oldest first	23%	9%
	40+ years first	66%	27%
	All adults	15%	6%
70%	Oldest first	0%	0%
	40+ years first	0%	0%
	All adults	0%	0%
80%	Oldest first	0%	0%
	40+ years first	0%	0%
	All adults	0%	0%









Oldest first




Middle years first




All ages







a



b

