Estimating measures to reduce the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia to guide a 'National Plan' to reopening

- ⁴ Gerard E. Ryan^{1,2}, Freya M. Shearer², James M. McCaw^{2,3}, Jodie
- ⁵ McVernon^{4,5}, and Nick Golding^{1,6}
- 6 ¹Telethon Kids Institute, Nedlands, WA, Australia
- ⁷ ²Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global
- 8 Health, The University of Melbourne, VIC, Australia
- ⁹ ³School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia
- ¹⁰ ⁴Department of Infectious Diseases, Melbourne Medical School, University of Melbourne
- at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia
- ¹² ⁵Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference Laboratory, The Royal Melbourne Hospital at
- the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia
- ¹⁴ ⁶Curtin University, Perth, Australia

15 ABSTRACT

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

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

34 INTRODUCTION

Since early 2020, rapid dissemination of SARS-CoV-2 and subsequent emergence of variants have resulted in multiple rapidly escalating waves of infection with devastating impacts on health, society and the economy [1]. In contrast with the rest of the world, many island nations in the Western Pacific Region

- 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
- transmission (e.g. [2, 3]). These measures enabled enviable social freedoms and ongoing economic
- 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
- hopes that wide scale population immunisation would enable a return to 'life as normal' in high burden
- settings, given demonstrated impacts on infection acquisition and onward spread [5, 6, 7]. For countries
- 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
- 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].
- To address this challenge, we use the Transmission Potential (TP) [10] metric to quantify the risk 51 of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in populations based on behavioural, vaccination, and social mixing data. 52 Where the effective reproduction number R_{eff} is the average number of secondary cases arising from a 53 case in the *infected population*, TP is an estimate of what R_{eff} would be over the *whole population*, but can 54 be calculated in times of low or no transmission. TP is driven by factors that influence transmission from 55 local cases such as effectiveness of test-trace-isolate-quarantine (TTIQ) case and contact management [11], 56 as well as changes in personal distancing behaviour and mandated constraints on mixing group sizes – 57 collectively termed public health and social measures (PHSMs), and vaccination [10]. TP is not estimated 58 from cases, but instead considers how these influences alter the potential for viral transmission from a 59 baseline R_0 1. Transmission potential is explained in more detail in the Methods section *Transmission* 60 Potential and in the supplementary section The relationship of Transmission Potential, R_0 , and R_{eff} . 61 Demonstrated reductions in TP achieved by these interventions can be incorporated into future scenario 62 projections, along with anticipated impacts of vaccination on transmission. International evidence of 63 vaccine effectiveness against acquisition and onward spread of the Delta variant was used to estimate the 64 likely overlaid impact of differing levels of vaccine coverage (by age cohort) on population wide TP. 65 This approach was used in mid-2021 to help inform Australia's National Plan to transition Australia's 66 National COVID-19 response [12], by determining target vaccination thresholds for moving between its 67 four phases (table 1), including any ongoing requirement for public health responses and social measures. 68 These methods formed the basis for further collaborative work with the Australian Government Treasury 69 to determine likely economic implications of reopening at alternative thresholds based on the level of 70 adjunct PHSMs needed [13], and constituted part of a broader suite of modelling advice to the Australian 71
- 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
А	Vaccinate, Prepare and Pilot	Continue to strongly suppress the virus for the purpose
		of minimising community transmission
В	Vaccination Transition	Seek to minimise serious illness, hospitalisation and
		fatality as a result of COVID-19
С	Vaccination Consolidation	As above
D	Post-Vaccination	Manage COVID-19 consistent with public health man-
		agement 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
- (and therefore not concentrated in e.g. one demographic group with non-representative transmission
- rates). At the baseline, TP is the basic reproduction number of a population R_0 , but estimating TP also
- takes into account the multiplicative effects of transmission reducing influences such as vaccination or 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

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

hygiene advice or legislation; [10]). Transmission potential will vary among communities by differential
 average household size and age structures, and can be modulated by changes to behaviour through public

³⁰ health and social measures, time to detection and isolation of cases, and immunity through infection

and vaccination. We provide further detail on Transmission Potential in the supplementary section *The*

relationship of Transmission Potential, R_0 , and R_{eff} , while a description of the base model can be found

in Golding and colleagues [10]. Below we explain and test how varying and adding components can

modulate TP. Whilst an estimate of Transmission Potential under a given scenario of R_0 , behaviour, and

health system performance can never be a perfect predictor of a reproduction number due to epidemic

stochasticity and unaccounted sources of variation and uncertainty, it is a measure that enables prediction

of risk in the event of widespread transmission, and has been used as a systematically reported situational

assessment metric in Australia since 2020 [17, 18, 19].

99 Test, Trace, Isolate, and Quarantine

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

118 Public Health and Social Measures

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

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

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

> aware of the risk of COVID-19 (as opposed to behaviour prior to the pandemic). The other bundles reflect the behavioural effects of increasing levels of stringency. We emphasise that the TPs associated with these PHSM bundles reflect state wide population behaviours (numbers of household contacts and adherence to hygiene advice) estimated at these times. TPs are observed to differ substantially over time and between states, even within similar restrictions [10]. These periods are therefore intended to reflect achievable 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 prioritised health- and aged-care workers, elderly populations and those at increased risk of transmission 147 and/or severe outcomes [25]. When defining overall target coverage thresholds for the eligible population, 148 an important goal was to consider the distribution of doses received across age categories. While older 149 individuals are more likely to experience severe disease outcomes, young and working adults are expected 150 to make a greater contribution to transmission at the population level. So to explore the effect of age-151 structured vaccination on transmission, we explored four allocation strategies: oldest first, 40+ years first, 152 all adults, and transmission reducing, described in table 3 (the specific percentages of each age-group 153 vaccinated in these strategies can be found in [16]). These strategies were motivated by being the strategy 154 155 in place at the time (oldest first), and a series of what were considered the only other practical options. The strategies followed the Australian Therapeutic Goods Administration [26, 27] and Australian Technical 156 Advisory Group on Immunisation [28] advice on which vaccines were administered to which age-groups 157 and the dosing interval between first and second doses 4. We also assume a two week delay from 158 administration until a vaccine takes full effect 4. 159

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

> For each vaccination scenario, the reduction in transmission by age-group was calculated from the 171 average vaccination efficacy against transmission (accounting for the fractions of each vaccine type and 172 number of doses in that age-group) and the age-group coverage. Proportional reductions in transmission 173 rates for each age combination were then applied to the original 'unvaccinated' transmission matrix to 174 construct a 'vaccinated' matrix. The dominant eigenvalue, representing the population-wide reproduction 175 number was compared between these pairs of matrices to compute a percentage reduction in TP due to 176 immunisation. 177 To explore and visualise the effect of different strategies on TP reduction among age categories, we 178

> also calculated an age-group specific TP prior to and after vaccination under a given scenario. These
> 'by-age' contributions are calculated for a given homogeneous age-group (whereas other TP calculations
> use all age groups concurrently S2). Because these age-specific TP calculations exclude interactions with
> 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, priori-
	tization 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	As for national program, under which all individuals 40+ were eligible
reducing	as at the 12 th of July 2021. Within the simulation time-frame, the 30-39
	years cohort becomes eligible from the 30 th of August 2021, and 16-29
	years on the 11 th of October.

183 Time in Lockdown

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

Ongoing application of some degree of social measures through this phase to support vaccine impacts reduces the likelihood for high restrictions and preserves TTIQ effectiveness by keeping case numbers low. TP estimates with and without stringent PHSM can be used to calculate the approximate proportion of time those stringent measures would need to be in place to prevent exceedance of health sector capacity over a defined time frame. This simple static analysis can indicate the plausible societal and economic 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 eli	gibility, dosing intervals	, and assumed delay to	o efficacy.
ine	Eligible	Dosing interval	Delay to ful

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

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

Switching between more and less stringent PHSMs reflects a strategy that might be used to keep cases below a health sector capacity limit in the event that there is long-term community transmission. With the the necessary simplifying assumption that vaccination coverage is static, where one PHSM bundle leads to growing cases numbers ($TP_1 > 1$), and a second bundle leads to contracting case numbers ($TP_2 < 1$), we can calculate the fraction of time necessary under each bundle of PHSMs S1. However this strategy will not always be either necessary or possible. When cases under both bundles lead to declining case numbers (i.e. $TP_1 < 1$ and $TP_2 < 1$), the fraction is zero as the more stringent PHSM bundle is not needed.

Alternatively, where even the more stringent PHSMs still lead to growing daily case numbers $(TP_2 > 1)$

no fraction exists, because even the more stringent PHSM bundle could not control transmission.

213 Costs of PHSMs

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

225 Data Analysis

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

232 **RESULTS**

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

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



(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 of 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	Eligib	Eligible population coverage (16+)					
strategy	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	Eligib	Eligible population coverage (16+)					
strategy	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	Eligib	Eligible population coverage (16+)					
strategy	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%			

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

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

270 DISCUSSION

This work formed the basis of a significant contribution to easing of COVID-19 restrictions in Australia 271 in late 2021 by providing a structured framework to explore the effect of management decisions on 272 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia based on contemporary evidence [13, 14, 15, 16]. Specifically, 273 it covers the pandemic period up to mid-late 2021, during which time the Delta variant became established 274 in several eastern Australian states resulting in imposition of stringent lockdowns to manage transmission 275 and clinical burden, and closure of interstate borders. For those states, our recommendation of a target 276 vaccination level of at least 70% 1 was a pathway out of restrictions and a way to reconnect with 'COVID-277 zero' jurisdictions. In the other states, high vaccine coverage provided confidence that COVID-19 impacts 278 could be mitigated sufficiently to avoid substantive health system and social disruption, and at 80% 279 coverage only minimal social and behavioural measures would be required to support vaccination 1. 280 The scenarios in this study representing a single national COVID-19 epidemic were clearly (and 281

deliberately) artificial and served to inform high level policy strategy. Beyond defining threshold vaccine 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]

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

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

Our findings were aligned with and benchmarked against the UK modelling reports, including the recommendation for ongoing social constraints, but were novel in two main aspects. For the majority of Australian jurisdictions, relaxation of border restrictions would allow importation of infections into 'COVID-zero' settings, requiring high confidence in model recommendations. The use of transmission potential as a novel metric enabled anticipation of case loads in settings where there were presently none [10]. Given ongoing global discussions about competing health and economic impacts of COVID-19 and social measures for its control [36], the accompanying Treasury analyses were highly influential in whole
 of government decision making. We are unaware of similar publicly available estimates of the costs of
 PHSMs under different levels of vaccine coverage from other country settings.

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

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

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

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

345 ETHICS

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

357 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work forms part of a wider body of work around supporting Australia's plan to reopen from COVID-

19 restrictions (often known in media as 'the Doherty modelling'). We thank our many colleagues who, while largely locked in their homes, contributed to this large undertaking with unfailing good grace and

361 humour.

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

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

Protection. Additional support was provided by the National Health and Medical Research Council of

Australia through its Centres of Research Excellence (SPECTRUM, GNT1170960) and Investigator

Grant Schemes (JMcV Principal Research Fellowship, GNT1117140; FMS Emerging Leader Fellowship,
 2021/GNT2010051).

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

372 **REFERENCES**

- World Health Organisation. Weekly epidemiological update on COVID-19 10 August 2022.
 Technical report, August 2022. URL https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/
- weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---10-august-2022.
- Ilan Noy, Nguyen Doan, and Tauisi Taupo. The economic risk from COVID-19 in Pacific Island countries: very few infections but lots of pain. *New Zealand Economic Papers*, 56 (1):55–66, January 2022. ISSN 0077-9954. doi: 10.1080/00779954.2020.1827016. URL https://doi.org/10.1080/00779954.2020.1827016. Publisher: Routledge _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1080/00779954.2020.1827016.
- ^[3] Emeline Han, Melisa Mei Jin Tan, Eva Turk, Devi Sridhar, Gabriel M Leung, Kenji Shibuya, Nima Asgari, Juhwan Oh, Alberto L García-Basteiro, Johanna Hanefeld, Alex R Cook, Li Yang Hsu, Yik Ying Teo, David Heymann, Helen Clark, Martin McKee, and Helena Legido-Quigley. Lessons learnt from easing COVID-19 restrictions: an analysis of countries and regions in Asia Pacific and Europe. *The Lancet*, 396(10261):1525–1534, November 2020. ISSN 0140-6736. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32007-9. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/
- article/pii/S0140673620320079.
- ^[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.
- ^[5] Tung Le, Zacharias Andreadakis, Arun Kumar, Raúl Román, Stig Tollefsen, Melanie Saville, and
 Stephen Mayhew. The COVID-19 vaccine development landscape. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*,
 April 2020. doi: 10.1038/d41573-020-00073-5.
- ¹⁶¹ Alan D. T. Barrett, Richard W. Titball, Paul A. MacAry, Richard E. Rupp, Veronika von Messling, David H. Walker, and Nicolas V. J. Fanget. The rapid progress in COVID vaccine development and implementation. *npj Vaccines*, 7(1):1–2, February 2022. ISSN 2059-0105. doi: 10.1038/s41541-022-00442-8. URL https://www.nature.com/articles/s41541-022-00442-8. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [7] Seyed M. Moghadas, Pratha Sah, Thomas N. Vilches, and Alison P. Galvani. Can the USA
 return to pre-COVID-19 normal by July 4? *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 21(8):1073–
 1074, August 2021. ISSN 1473-3099, 1474-4457. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)003248. URL https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-
- 405 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.

^[9] Alicia Blair, Mattia de Pasquale, Valentin Gabeff, Mélanie Rufi, and Antoine Flahault. The End of the Elimination Strategy: Decisive Factors towards Sustainable Management of COVID-19 in New Zealand. *Epidemiologia*, 3(1):135–147, March 2022. ISSN 2673-3986. doi: 10.3390/
 epidemiologia3010011. URL https://www.mdpi.com/2673-3986/3/1/11. Number: 1
 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.

> ^[10] Nick Golding, David J Price, Gerard Ryan, Jodie McVernon, James M McCaw, and Freya M Shearer. 415 A modelling approach to estimate the transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 during periods of high, low, 416 and zero case incidence. eLife, 12:e78089, January 2023. ISSN 2050-084X. doi: 10.7554/eLife.78089. 417 URL https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.78089. Publisher: eLife Sciences Publications, 418 Ltd. 419 [11] Freya M. Shearer, James M. McCaw, Gerard Ryan, Tianxiao Hao, Nicholas J. Tierney, Michael 420 Lydeamore, Kate Ward, Sally Ellis, James Wood, Jodie McVernon, and Nick Golding. Esti-421 mating the impact of test-trace-isolate-quarantine systems on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in Aus-422 tralia, January 2023. URL https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.01. 423 10.23284209v1. Pages: 2023.01.10.23284209. 424 [12] Australian Government. National Plan to transition Australia's National COVID-19 Response. 425 Technical report, 2021. URL https://pmtranscripts.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/ 426 files/2022-06/national-plan-060821_0.pdf. natplan. 427 ^[13] Department of the Treasury. National Plan to Transition to Australia's National 428 COVID-19 Response: Economic Impact Analysis. Technical report, 2021. URL 429 https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-08/PDF_Economic_ 430 Impacts_COVID-19_Response_196731.pdf. 431 [14] Doherty Modelling Group. DOHERTY MODELLING -FINAL REPORT TO NATIONAL CABI-432 NET. Technical report, November 2021. URL https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/ 433 content_doc/Synthesis_DohertyModelling_FinalReport__NatCab05Nov. 434 pdf. 435 ^[15] Doherty Modelling Group. DOHERTY MODELLING INTERIM REPORT TO NATIONAL 436 CABINET. Technical report, September 2021. URL https://www.doherty.edu.au/ 437 uploads/content doc/DOHERTY MODELLING INTERIM REPORT TO NATIONAL 438 CABINET_17TH_SEPTEMBER_2021.pdf. 439 ^[16] Doherty Modelling Group. DOHERTY MODELLING REPORT REVISED. Technical re-440 port, August 2021. URL http://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/ 441 DohertyModelling_NationalPlan_and_Addendum_20210810.pdf. 442 ^[17] Department of Health and Aged Care. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Common Operating Picture - 24 443 May 2022. Technical report, May 2022. URL https://www.health.gov.au/resources/ 444 publications/coronavirus-covid-19-common-operating-picture-24-may-445 2022. 446 ^[18] Nick Golding, Freya M Shearer, Robert Moss, Peter Dawson, Dennis Liu, Joshua V Ross, Rob 447 Hyndman, Pablo Montero-Manso, Gerry Ryan, Tobin South, Jodie McVernon, David J Price, and 448 James M McCaw. Situational assessment of COVID-19 in Australia Technical Report 15 March 2021 449 (released 28 May 2021). Technical report, May 2021. 450 ^[19] James M McCaw, Robert Moss, David J Price, Freya M Shearer, Nick Golding, Tianxiao Hao, Gerry 451 Ryan, Adeshina Adekunle, Peter Dawson, Mingmei Teo, Dylan Morris, Joshua V Ross, Tobin South, 452 Rob Hyndman, Michael Lydeamore, Mitchell O'Hara-Wild, and James Wood. Situational assessment 453 of COVID-19 in Australia Technical Report 22 May 2022 (released 12 August 2022). Technical 45/ report, August 2022. URL https://mspqh.unimelb.edu.au/ data/assets/pdf 455 file/0003/4256103/2022-05-22-Technical-report-public-release.pdf. 456 [20] Don Klinkenberg, Christophe Fraser, and Hans Heesterbeek. The Effectiveness of Contact Tracing 457 in Emerging Epidemics. PLOS ONE, 1(1):e12, December 2006. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/ 458 journal.pone.0000012. URL https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10. 459 1371/journal.pone.0000012. Publisher: Public Library of Science. 460 ^[21] Lawrence O. Gostin, Ronald Bayer, and Amy L. Fairchild. Ethical and Legal Challenges Posed 461 by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome: Implications for the Control of Severe Infectious Disease 462 Threats. JAMA, 290(24):3229–3237, December 2003. ISSN 0098-7484. doi: 10.1001/jama.290.24. 463 3229. URL https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.290.24.3229. 464 ^[22] Peter Ashcroft, Sonja Lehtinen, and Sebastian Bonhoeffer. Test-trace-isolate-quarantine (TTIQ) 465 intervention strategies after symptomatic COVID-19 case identification. PLOS ONE, 17(2):e0263597, 466 February 2022. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0263597. URL https://journals. 467 plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0263597. Publisher: 468 Public Library of Science. 469

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

- 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
- https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/first-lessons-
- from-government-evaluations-of-covid-19-responses-a-synthesis-

- ^[37] Yinon M. Bar-On, Yair Goldberg, Micha Mandel, Omri Bodenheimer, Laurence Freedman, Nir
 Kalkstein, Barak Mizrahi, Sharon Alroy-Preis, Nachman Ash, Ron Milo, and Amit Huppert. Protection of BNT162b2 Vaccine Booster against Covid-19 in Israel. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 385(15):1393–1400, October 2021. ISSN 0028-4793. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2114255. URL
 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2114255. Publisher: Massachusetts Medical Society
 _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2114255.
- ⁵³⁶ [^{38]} The Lancet Infectious Diseases. COVID-19 vaccine equity and booster doses. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 21(9):1193, September 2021. ISSN 1473-3099, 1474-4457. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00486-2. URL https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/
 ⁵³⁹ PIIS1473-3099(21)00486-2/fulltext#coronavirus-linkback-header. Pub-
- 540 lisher: Elsevier.
- [39] Eamon Conway, Camelia Walker, Chris Baker, Michael Lydeamore, Gerard E. Ryan, Trish Campbell, Joel C. Miller, Max Yeung, Greg Kabashima, James Wood, Nic Rebuli, James M. Mc-Caw, Jodie McVernon, Nick Golding, David J. Price, and Freya M. Shearer. COVID-19 vaccine coverage targets to inform reopening plans in a low incidence setting, December 2022. URL https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.12.04.22282996v1. Pages: 2022.12.04.22282996v1.
- [40] David S Khoury, Deborah Cromer, Arnold Reynaldi, Timothy E Schlub, Adam K Wheatley, Jennifer A
 Juno, Kanta Subbarao, Stephen J Kent, James A Triccas, and Miles P Davenport. Neutralizing
 antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic sars-cov-2 infection.
- *Nature medicine*, 27(7):1205–1211, 2021.

^{529 483507}d6/.

551 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

564 Fraction of time in lockdown

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

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

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

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



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 $TP \le 1$ over time requires strict PHSMs for $\ge 31\%$ 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

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

	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 ² rule	2 m ² rule	2 m ² rule	2 m ² 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 ² 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.	

Table S1. Detailed description of measures implemented under PHSM 'bundles'.



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)

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

Table S2.	Proportion	of time lockdowns	are needed to	constrain tra	ansmission v	when the '	ΓTIQ public
health resp	onse is only	v partially effective,	due to high ca	aseloads			

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

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

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

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.

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	Allocation Scenario	Moderate lockdowns	Strict lockdowns
coverage		only	only
500	Oldest first	Not possible to	42%
30%	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%
	Oldest first	0%	0%
70%	40+ years first	0%	0%
	All adults	0%	0%
	Oldest first	0%	0%
80%	40+ years first	0%	0%
	All adults	0%	0%







AND BR AR BR AR AR AR AR AR AR AR AR AR AR

0 0ª







а



