

Learning from the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review of mathematical vaccine prioritization models

Gilberto Gonzalez-Parra^{a,b,*}, Md Shahriar Mahmud^c, Claus Kadelka^{c,*}

^a*Instituto de Matemática Multidisciplinar, Universitat Politècnica de València, València, Spain*

^b*Department of Mathematics, New Mexico Tech, 801 Leroy Place, Socorro, 87801, NM, USA*

^c*Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, 411 Morrill Rd, Ames, 50011, IA, USA*

Abstract

As the world becomes ever more connected, the chance of pandemics increases as well. The recent COVID-19 pandemic and the concurrent global mass vaccine roll-out provides an ideal setting to learn from and refine our understanding of infectious disease models for better future preparedness. In this review, we systematically analyze and categorize mathematical models that have been developed to design optimal vaccine prioritization strategies of an initially limited vaccine. As older individuals are disproportionately affected by COVID-19, the focus is on models that take age explicitly into account. The lower mobility and activity level of older individuals gives rise to non-trivial trade-offs. Secondary research questions concern the optimal time interval between vaccine doses and spatial vaccine distribution. This review showcases the effect of various modeling assumptions on model outcomes. A solid understanding of these relationships yields better infectious disease models and thus public health decisions during the next pandemic.

Keywords: Review, mathematical model, age, COVID-19, vaccine allocation, vaccine roll-out

*Contributed equally, gilberto.gonzalezparra@nmt.edu and ckadelka@iastate.edu

Preprint submitted to XXX

March 4, 2024

1. Introduction

In December 31, 2019, the World Health Organization (WHO) was informed of several cases of a pneumonia of unknown cause occurring in Wuhan, China ([Centers for Disease Control \(CDC\)](#)). Only 71 days later, the WHO declared - after 118,000 cases in 114 countries and 4,291 deaths - COVID-19, caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2), a pandemic. Despite the widespread implementation of numerous types of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), aimed at curbing virus spread and keeping hospitals functional, COVID-19 continued to spread rapidly in the absence of a vaccine ([Odusanya et al., 2020](#)). Recent advances in mRNA vaccine technology enabled rapid development of highly effective vaccines ([Zhang et al., 2019](#)). Since the globalized world had never experienced a pandemic, nor a mass vaccine roll-out at this scale, various formerly mainly theoretical questions related to vaccine access and prioritization became all of a sudden very important. These included: Who should be vaccinated first? Should the second vaccine dose be delayed in order to provide a first dose to more people? What parameters must be taken into account to accurately determine the best prioritization strategy? Should high-income countries share some of their limited vaccine with poorer countries? For ethical reasons only, or does a more equitable vaccine coverage have even epidemiological benefits? In response to these quickly emerging questions, scientists from many fields started to collaborate and suggest answers.

Globally, by the end of 2023, there have been over 770 million confirmed COVID-19 cases and over 7 million deaths, reported to the WHO ([World Health Organization \(WHO\)](#)). Despite the development of highly effective vaccines and 13.6 billion administered COVID-19 vaccine doses, with over 72 percent of the world population having received at least one dose ([New York Times](#)), the disease still surges in waves around the world in early 2024. While the infection fatality rate is now substantially lower than in the beginning of the pandemic ([Sorensen et al., 2022](#)) and most NPIs have disappeared, large COVID-19 outbreaks and community spread still appear around the world, causing, for example, numerous individuals to suffer from so-called long COVID symptoms that can linger for years post infection ([Sudre et al., 2021](#)). Reasons COVID-19 has not disappeared after sufficient production of vaccines include the ongoing emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants, partial vaccine escape by some variants ([Chakraborty et al., 2022](#); [Wang et al., 2021](#)), issues related to vaccine access and distribution specifically in low-income

38 countries (Sheikh et al., 2021), as well as vaccine hesitancy and wariness
39 driven by rampant misinformation (Sallam, 2021). Learning from mistakes
40 made during the COVID-19 pandemic and the first global mass vaccine roll-
41 out is thus paramount for future pandemic preparedness.

42 This review identifies and analyzes a variety of studies related to finding
43 the optimal vaccine allocation given a limited supply. While the specific re-
44 search questions and settings differ from study to study, age is a crucial factor
45 in all COVID-19 vaccine prioritizations as older people have a substantially
46 higher COVID-19 fatality rate. The primary focus in this review is there-
47 fore on studies that were based on a mathematical model, which takes age
48 into consideration. Other important attributes which were used by public
49 health decision-makers to differentiate COVID-19 vaccine access and which
50 are investigated in some of the studies include, among others, occupation
51 (e.g., prioritizing healthcare and essential workers) and comorbidity status
52 (e.g., prioritizing individuals with known risk factors). Moreover, the rec-
53 ommended two-dose vaccine regimen for most COVID-19 vaccines raised the
54 related prioritization question whether it is beneficial to delay the second dose
55 in order to increase initial vaccine coverage. Another related prioritization
56 question concerns spatial aspects (e.g., the optimal distribution of limited
57 vaccine supply between different states or countries). We summarize innova-
58 tive and interesting mathematical model-based studies that investigate these
59 related prioritization questions, no matter whether the models specifically
60 consider age.

61 Given the large number of studies related to optimal COVID-19 vaccine
62 allocations, we decided to restrict ourselves to studies that employ a math-
63 ematical model for decision-making. The included studies employ several
64 modeling frameworks. Most studies are based on an ordinary differential
65 equation (ODE) model, in which the population is stratified into different
66 compartments. The simplest model, colloquially known as SIR model and
67 first studied nearly 100 years ago (Kermack and McKendrick, 1927), con-
68 tains three compartments: susceptible (S), infected (I), and recovered (R).
69 More complex models possess additional compartments for individuals that
70 are e.g. infected but not yet infectious, asymptotically versus symptomat-
71 ically infected, quarantined but not yet recovered, or dead. To account for
72 different ages and possibly other attributes (e.g., occupation), the population
73 is stratified into a finite number of sub-populations (e.g., age classes) and the
74 compartments are duplicated for each sub-population. Each sub-population
75 can have its own characteristics. This enables modelers to account for het-

erogeneity (e.g., age dependency) in contact patterns, NPI adherence, vaccine hesitancy, susceptibility to infection, as well as various factors related to disease progression. ODE-based models implicitly make a number of assumptions that are inaccurate for COVID-19 disease dynamics and hard to overcome within the ODE modeling framework. Among others, they assume that (i) the population is homogeneously mixed, (ii) the time spent in each transient compartment is exponentially distributed, and (iii) disease dynamics are deterministic.

Another modeling framework, agent-based models (ABMs; also known as individual-based models), is stochastic in nature and employed by a smaller number of studies. In ABMs, individual agents (i.e., people) are modeled; agents interact with each other and possibly spread the disease through e.g. heterogeneous interaction networks. This modeling framework is highly flexible (e.g., each individual can have its own characteristics and decision rules) and can be adaptive (e.g., the decisions of an agent can depend on other's decisions). However, ABMs inherently rely on simulations. Their stochastic nature further increases the computational needs, rendering an exhaustive exploration of a large parameter space impossible. Lastly, a few studies employ partial differential equation (PDE) models. These studies typically focus on spatial aspects of vaccine prioritization.

Contrary to other review articles on this topic ([Saadi et al., 2021](#); [Liu and Lou, 2022](#); [Noh et al., 2021](#); [Thakkar and Spinardi, 2023](#)), the focus of this review is on understanding the effect of modeling assumptions and parameters on policy recommendations. For example, while most studies agree that elderly and vulnerable should be vaccinated first due to their substantially higher infection fatality ratio, some studies suggest the opposite. We look in detail at which model parameters and assumptions cause these discrepancies.

This review includes 94 articles, which use a mathematical model to answer at least one of three questions related to COVID-19 vaccine prioritization:

1. How should a limited vaccine be optimally distributed among a population stratified by age (and possibly other factors)?
2. For limited vaccines with a two-dose regimen, should the second dose be delayed in order to provide more people with a first vaccine dose?
3. How should a limited vaccine be optimally distributed given spatial heterogeneity?

In Section 2, we briefly describe how we identified articles of interest. Sec-




Figure 1: Number of (A) investigated and (B) included studies, stratified by source.

tion 3 summarizes, at a high-level, the main findings of these articles related to vaccine prioritization. Section 4 puts these findings into context, particularly those without a clear consensus strategy. Several key COVID-19 model parameters and assumptions are introduced, with a focus on how they affect optimal vaccine prioritization strategies. Section 5 provides a brief summary of particularly interesting and noteworthy studies. Finally, Section 6 briefly presents related works that employ optimal control methods to answer questions related to vaccine prioritization.

2. Methods

To find studies of interest, we searched PubMed, the Web of Science Core Collection and MathSciNet (all in February 2024) for research articles that contain the following keywords: 'age' AND 'model' AND ('COVID-19' OR 'SARS-CoV-2') AND ('vaccine' OR 'vaccination') AND ('best' OR 'optimal' OR 'priorit*') AND ('mathematical' OR 'computational' OR 'stochastic' OR 'network'). After removing duplicates (e.g., preprints and journal articles) and non-peer-reviewed preprints, this yielded a total of 285 articles, which we manually reviewed, in addition to 43 articles known to the authors and/or referenced in one of the 285 articles (Fig. 1A). For each article, we decided if it contained a mathematical model that answers at least one of the COVID-19 vaccine prioritization questions stated above. This yielded a total of 94 articles included in this review (Fig. 1B). Any article that did not assume limited vaccine availability (e.g., studies looking into the epidemiological effect of boosters in high-income countries) was excluded.

Eighty of the included articles contain an age-stratified mathematical

137 model that provides answers to our primary research question: How should
138 a limited vaccine be optimally distributed among a population stratified by
139 age? Fifteen articles contain a mathematical model (not necessarily age-
140 stratified) to answer the secondary research question: For limited vaccines
141 with a two-dose regimen, should the second dose be delayed in order to pro-
142 vide more people with a first vaccine dose? Finally, seven articles contain
143 a mathematical model that considers spatial aspects of vaccine distribution.
144 The low number of articles related to the latter two research questions is, at
145 least partially, due to the fact that the keywords were selected to preferen-
146 tially find articles investigating our primary research question.

147 3. Summary of findings

148 Collectively, the included articles contain models that are tailored to
149 cities, states or countries from all continents except Antarctica (Fig. 2). A
150 few studies tailor their model to more than one country to showcase how
151 variability in e.g. age distributions, age-stratified contact patterns, or imple-
152 mented NPIs can affect optimal vaccine prioritization, see e.g., [Gozzi et al. \(2021\)](#);
153 [Liu et al. \(2022b\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2022\)](#); [Liu et al. \(2022a\)](#). Other stud-
154 ies employ more abstract models, frequently ABMs, which are not tailored
155 to any specific setting, see e.g., [Romero-Brufau et al. \(2021\)](#); [Grauer et al. \(2020\)](#);
156 [Kadelka and McCombs \(2021\)](#). These models contain tuneable pa-
157 rameters and are well-suited to reveal the qualitative dependence of optimal
158 allocation strategies on key parameters and assumptions.

159 While the included articles employ a variety of metrics to quantify the
160 quality of a given vaccine allocation strategy, there are several common ob-
161 jectives. In decreasing order of use (Fig. 3), these include: minimizing deaths
162 (used in 80 of the 94 included studies), cases/infections (56), hospitalizations
163 (22), and years of life lost (YLL; 10). Other, less frequently used objectives
164 include minimizing quality- and disability-adjusted life years (QALYS and
165 DALYS, respectively; used in 6 studies), minimizing the peak number of
166 hospitalized, as well as several equitable and economic considerations. While
167 technically different and considered as separate objectives in at least one
168 study ([Islam et al., 2021](#)), we do not differentiate between the objectives
169 minimizing cases and infections. Some studies attempt, furthermore, to op-
170 timize multiple objectives at the same time, e.g., through the use of optimal
171 control methods (summarized in Section 6), or an analysis of Pareto-optimal
172 allocation strategies.




Figure 2: **Number of studies that contain a model for a specific country.** Some studies include models tailored to several countries, while others are more abstract and not tailored to a specific country. Census data and age-stratified contact matrices are two examples of frequently used country-specific data.

173 When minimizing mortality is the sole objective, the majority of studies
174 (47 out of 70) agree that vaccinating older individuals, vulnerable individu-
175 als, and - if considered - health care workers first is optimal, irrespective of
176 the specific setting or assumptions (Fig. 3A, Table 1). There exists, how-
177 ever, some disagreement about the prioritization among these subpopula-
178 tions. Interestingly, 23 model-based studies (32.9%) conclude that under
179 certain circumstances a prioritization of younger people who have on aver-
180 age more contacts leads to lower death counts. Qualitatively, the optimal
181 prioritization strategies do generally not shift much when minimizing other
182 morbidity-based metrics such as YLL or hospitalizations. On the other hand,
183 most studies (41 out of 48, 85.4%) agree that to minimize the total number
184 of infections and/or the effective reproductive number younger individuals
185 should be vaccinated first since they typically have more contacts and thus
186 more chances to spread the virus (Fig. 3A).

A	when minimizing	prioritize		
		older	depends	younger
	cases/infections	2	5	41
	YLL	3	6	0
	QALYS/DALYS	3	3	0
	hospitalizations	10	4	3
	deaths	47	20	3

B	when minimizing	modify dosing interval		
		longer	depends	shorter
	cases/infections	7	1	0
	YLL	1	0	0
	QALYS/DALYS			
	hospitalizations	2	0	0
	deaths	9	3	1

Figure 3: **High-level summary of findings.** (A) Number of studies that agree at a high-level on a given prioritization strategy (columns) when minimizing a given metric (rows). Only studies that are based on a mathematical model that considers stratifying vaccine access by age are included. Note that all studies that recommend prioritization of the oldest and most vulnerable people, possibly after vaccinating health care workers, were nevertheless counted as prioritizing older. (B) Number of studies that agree at a high-level on a dosing interval strategy (columns) when minimizing a given metric (rows). (A-B) The second column (“depends”) includes all studies that present more subtle findings where the prioritization and dosing interval depends on certain assumptions. In Table 1 and Table 2, the high-level summaries are stratified by study.

Table 1: **High-level summary of COVID-19 vaccine prioritization studies.** Each row summarizes the high-level prioritization strategy identified by a given study (white: not assessed, red: prioritize older/vulnerable population, blue: prioritize younger/high-contact population, gray: prioritization depends on model assumptions). Fig. 3A provides summary counts. Only studies that were based on a mathematical model that accounts for age were included. The models are further classified by framework, type of vaccine roll-out (as specified in 4.4), as well as considered vaccine functions.

Reference	prioritization when minimizing					modeling framework			type vaccine roll-out	vaccine-induced reduction in				
	cases/infections	YLL	QALYS/DALYS	hospitalizations	deaths	ODE	ABM	optimal control		infection	symptomatic disease	hospitalization	death	onward transmission
Althobaity et al. (2022)	blue				gray				2	gray	gray			
Angelov et al. (2023)					blue			gray	2	gray				
Anupong et al. (2023)	blue				red				2	gray	gray			gray
Aruffo et al. (2022)	blue								4	gray				
Ayoub et al. (2021)	red			red	red				4	gray	gray			gray
Ben-Zuk et al. (2022)	blue			red			gray		2	gray				
Bubar et al. (2021)	blue				red				2	gray				
Buckner et al. (2021)	blue	gray			gray				2	gray				
Bushaj et al. (2023)	blue			blue	gray		gray		?	gray				
Campos et al. (2021)					red				5	gray				
Cartocci et al. (2021)	blue		gray		red				2	gray				
Cattaneo et al. (2022)					red		gray		5	gray	gray			
Chen et al. (2021)	blue			gray	gray		gray		5	gray				
Childs et al. (2022)	blue								2			gray		
Choi et al. (2021)	gray				red				2	gray				
Choi and Shim (2021)	gray			gray				gray	2	gray	gray			
Conway et al. (2023)	blue				blue		gray		4	gray				gray
Ferranna et al. (2021)	blue	gray			red		gray		2	gray			gray	gray
Ferreira et al. (2022)					red				4	gray	gray			
Foy et al. (2021)	gray				red		gray		2	gray		gray		gray
Gavish and Katriel (2022)	blue				red				?	gray			gray	
González-Parra et al. (2022)					gray				2	gray				
Gozzi et al. (2021)	blue								2	gray	gray			
Gozzi et al. (2022)	blue				red				4	gray				gray
Grundel et al. (2021)					gray			gray	2	gray				
Han et al. (2021)	blue			red	red				2	gray	gray			
Hogan et al. (2021)		red			red				5	gray	gray			

Table 1 continued

Reference	prioritization when minimizing					modeling framework			type vaccine roll-out	vaccine-induced reduction in				
	cases/infections	YLL	QALYS/DALYS	hospitalizations	deaths	ODE	ABM	optimal control		infection	symptomatic disease	hospitalization	death	onward transmission
Hong et al. (2022)									5					
Hupert et al. (2022)									5					
Islam et al. (2021)									5					
Jahn et al. (2021)									5,4					
Jentsch et al. (2021)									2					
Kadelka and McCombs (2021)									5					
Kadelka et al. (2022)									4					
Karabay et al. (2021)									2					
Kekić et al. (2023)									4					
Kiem et al. (2021)									4					
Li et al. (2021)									?					
Li et al. (2022)									4					
Liu et al. (2021)									4					
Liu et al. (2022a)									?					
Liu et al. (2022b)									2					
Luangasanatip et al. (2023)									2					
Luebben et al. (2023)									4					
Luo et al. (2022)									2					
MacIntyre et al. (2022)									2					
Makhoul et al. (2020)									5					
Mandal et al. (2021)									5					
Matrajt et al. (2021b)									2					
Matrajt et al. (2021a)									5					
McBryde et al. (2021)									5					
Miura et al. (2021)									5					
Molla et al. (2022)									2					
Moore et al. (2021a)									5					
Moore et al. (2021b)									2					
Morales-Zamora et al. (2022)									2					
Nuraini et al. (2021)									4					
Pearson et al. (2021)									4					
Penn and Donnelly (2023)									?					
Rahmandad (2022)									2					

Table 1 continued

Reference	prioritization when minimizing					modeling framework			type vaccine roll-out	vaccine-induced reduction in				
	cases/infections	YLL	QALYS/DALYS	hospitalizations	deaths	ODE	ABM	optimal control		infection	symptomatic disease	hospitalization	death	onward transmission
Rao and Brandeau (2021a)									?					
Rao and Brandeau (2021b)									5					
Rodriguez-Maroto et al. (2023)									4					
Saldaña and Scoglio (2022)									2					
Shim (2021)									5					
Stafford et al. (2023)									5					
Tatapudi et al. (2021)									4					
Tran et al. (2021)									2					
Trejo et al. (2024)									4					
Vo et al. (2023)									4					
Walker et al. (2022)									2					
Wang et al. (2022)									5					
Yasuda et al. (2022)									5					
Zanella et al. (2021)									2					
Zavrakli et al. (2023)									3					
Zhao et al. (2021b)									1					
Ziarelli et al. (2023)									4					
Zuo et al. (2022)									2					

187

188 The recommended dosage for some of the most effective and initially most
189 widely available COVID-19 vaccines, e.g., the Pfizer-BioNTech, the Moderna,
190 and the AstraZeneca vaccine, was two doses. While a single dose offers some
191 protection, two doses, spaced out at least a few weeks, induce a substan-
192 tially stronger protection. Thus, a related prioritization question concerns
193 the optimal allocation of each individual vaccine dose. If the vaccine supply
194 is limited, a delay of the second dose allows for more individuals to receive a
195 first dose. A total of 15 studies (not necessarily age-structured) investigated
196 this particular prioritization question. Most studies agree that a delay of
197 the second dose is beneficial, irrespective of the specific objective (Fig. 3B,
198 Table 2). This aligns with findings from a pooled analysis of four randomised

199 trials (Voysey et al., 2021). Several studies identify the relative protection
 200 induced by the first dose compared to the full vaccine regimen as a key pa-
 201 rameter in this decision (Romero-Brufau et al., 2021; Matrajt et al., 2021b;
 202 Souto Ferreira et al., 2022), highlighting the need for detailed vaccine effec-
 203 tiveness data.

Table 2: **High-level summary of COVID-19 vaccine dosing interval studies.** Each row summarizes the high-level dosing interval recommendation identified by a given study (indexed by reference number). White: not assessed, green: delay second dose, orange: shorten dosing interval, gray: recommendation depends on model assumptions. Fig. 3B provides summary counts. Only studies that were based on a mathematical model were included. The models are further classified by framework, type of vaccine roll-out (as specified in 4.4), as well as considered vaccine functions.

Reference	dosing interval recommendation when minimizing					modeling framework			type vaccine roll-out	vaccine-induced reduction in				
	cases/infections	YLL	QALYS/DALYS	hospitalizations	deaths	ODE	ABM	optimal control		infection	symptomatic disease	hospitalization	death	onward transmission
Barmounakis et al. (2022)									4					
Childs et al. (2022)									2					
Diarra et al. (2022)									5					
Ferreira et al. (2022)									4					
Gianatti et al. (2023)									2					
Jimenez-Rodriguez et al. (2022)									2					
Kobayashi and Nishiura (2022)									2					
Liu et al. (2022a)									?					
Mak et al. (2022)									4					
Matrajt et al. (2021b)									2					
Moghadas et al. (2021)									2					
Romero-Brufau et al. (2021)									2					
Souto Ferreira et al. (2022)									4					
Tuite et al. (2021)									5					
Zuo et al. (2022)									2					

204

205 Countries are spatially heterogeneous. Thus, spatial factors can affect
 206 the optimal allocation of limited vaccine. While not the primary objective of

207 this review, we identified a number of studies that investigate spatial aspects
 208 of vaccine distribution (Table 3). The considered questions are more diverse
 209 than in the previous two research questions; we therefore provide most details
 210 in Subsection 5.3. In summary, the investigated studies all agree that spa-
 211 tial factors are important when designing deaths-minimizing optimal vaccine
 212 prioritization plans and that non-trivial trade-offs emerge, e.g. between pri-
 213 oritizing regions with high incidence counts whose inhabitants are on average
 214 younger and regions with more retirees. Economic factors are also taken into
 215 consideration by multiple studies.

Table 3: **Summary of spatial COVID-19 vaccine distribution studies.** Each row describes a study that developed a spatial vaccine prioritization model. The models are classified by framework, type of vaccine roll-out (as specified in 4.4), as well as considered vaccine functions.

Reference	modeling framework			type vaccine roll-out	vaccine-induced reduction in				
	ODE	ABM	optimal control		infection	symptomatic disease	hospitalization	death	onward transmission
Caga-anan et al. (2023)				4					
Grauer et al. (2020)				2					
Hong et al. (2022)				5					
Lemaitre et al. (2022)				2					
Molla et al. (2022)				2					
Vo et al. (2023)				4					
Zhou et al. (2021)				5					

216

217 4. Key implementation details in vaccine prioritization models

218 Modelers make many decisions - some consciously, some unconsciously
 219 - when creating a mathematical vaccine prioritization model. Some choices
 220 can fundamentally affect the resulting optimal vaccine allocation. In this
 221 section, we focus on the studies that identify a dependence of the optimal

222 prioritization strategy (Fig. 3) to better understand the effect of certain mod-
 223 eling assumptions as well as the impact of setting-to-setting differences in key
 224 parameters.

225 4.1. Modeling framework

226 The choice of modeling framework may affect outcomes of vaccine pri-
 227 oritization models. In particular, as briefly described in the introduction,
 228 the popular ODE-based compartmental models come with several implicit
 229 assumptions. The homogeneous mixing assumption can be overcome by
 230 stratifying the population into sub-populations and accurately describing
 231 heterogeneous mixing (see Subsection 4.6). Another implicit assumption of
 232 ODE-based models is that the time spent in each transient compartment is
 233 exponentially distributed. This is frequently unrealistic. For example, upon
 234 infection with SARS-CoV-2 the virus needs time to replicate before a person
 235 becomes contagious. The latent period is therefore not exponentially dis-
 236 tributed [Zhao et al. \(2021a\)](#). While most included studies ignore this issue
 237 - likely since there exists no apparent direct effect on vaccine prioritizations
 238 -, some studies stratify a single transient compartment into multiple (see
 239 e.g., [Moore et al. \(2021b\)](#); [Childs et al. \(2022\)](#)). This has the effect that the
 240 total time spent in these compartments follows an Erlang distribution (as-
 241 suming equal average time in each of the multiple compartments) rather than
 242 an exponential distribution. The Erlang distribution, as a special case of the
 243 Gamma distribution, is more flexible and can thus describe more accurately
 244 the average time an individual is e.g. latently infected with SARS-CoV-2
 245 ([Lloyd, 2001](#)).

246 4.2. Prediction horizon

247 Public health decision makers typically operate within a defined plan-
 248 ning horizon. That is, they attempt to make decisions that yield "optimal"
 249 outcomes over the course of a given time period. Similarly, mathematical
 250 models compare outcomes (e.g., total deaths or cases under different vaccine
 251 allocation strategies) over a defined time interval whose length is known as
 252 prediction horizon. The main benefit of a short prediction horizon is reduced
 253 uncertainty since long-term disease dynamics are very difficult to predict. A
 254 German ODE-based study nicely highlights that the choice of prediction hori-
 255 zon fundamentally influences who to vaccinate first ([Grundel et al., 2021](#)).
 256 If the horizon is too short (less than 8 weeks in the study), prioritization
 257 targets may switch as the strategy suffers from shortsightedness. Another

study shows that vaccinating elderly is always preferred for a short prediction horizon, which may however yield sub-optimal long-term outcomes (Campos et al., 2021).

4.3. Vaccine eligibility

Given an initially limited COVID-19 vaccine supply, people with a known history of COVID-19 infection were excluded from early vaccine access by most public health agencies. Correspondingly, most reviewed mathematical models assume that only susceptible individuals can be initially vaccinated. Some ODE-based studies with more compartments (see e.g., Islam et al. (2021); Karabay et al. (2021); Taboe et al. (2023); Luo et al. (2022); Anupong et al. (2023); Grundel et al. (2021)) allow for vaccination of any individuals without known COVID-19 history. That means pre- or asymptotically infected as well as recovered individuals without known history of infections (e.g., through positive test results or symptoms) are also eligible for early vaccination, leading to some vaccine doses being used sub-optimally. A few studies even quantify the reduction in deaths, YLL, and infections that could be achieved through the hypothetical use of seroprevalence tests prior to vaccination (Bubar et al., 2021; Ayoub et al., 2021). While challenging to implement, these studies find, as expected, that vaccinating only seronegative individuals always leads to improved outcomes, with the difference being larger at higher levels of seroprevalence.

4.4. Vaccine roll-out

When deciding who to vaccine first, public health officials must anticipate the speed of the vaccine roll-out. In mathematical models, this results in assumptions about the daily number of vaccinations. Post-hoc analyses benefit from access to historic vaccination data and can simply ask the question: Given this number of vaccinations per day, how could these vaccines have been allocated in an optimal way? When such data is unavailable, e.g., prior to the start of a mass vaccine roll-out, modelers typically make one of the following assumptions in ODE models. Here, let $X = X(t)$ denote the subset of the population that is eligible for vaccination (e.g., all susceptibles) at time t . Then, vaccination of part of these eligible individuals can be described by

$$\frac{dX(t)}{dt} = -f(X, t). \quad (1)$$

291 Note that this equation only considers the vaccination process. The size of
 292 X may also change due to natural infection, immunity waning, etc. The rate
 293 of newly vaccinated, $f(X, t)$, typically takes one of the following forms:

- 294 1. $f(X, t) = \nu X(t)$, where $\nu \geq 0$ describes the proportion of eligible indi-
 295 viduals vaccinated per unit time. This form implies that the number
 296 of vaccinations is proportional to the size of X . Specifically, as the size
 297 of X decreases over time (due to vaccination, natural infection, etc.),
 298 the number of newly vaccinated decreases as well. Mathematically, this
 299 form guarantees that $X(t)$ remains positive for all time. This form is
 300 used in Zhao et al. (2021b); Acuña-Zegarra et al. (2021).
- 301 2. $f(X, t) = c$, where $c \geq 0$ is a constant that describes the number of
 302 vaccinations per unit time. Mathematically, this form does not guar-
 303 antee positivity of $X(t)$ for all time, as all individuals may eventually
 304 become vaccinated (or otherwise removed from X). This necessitates
 305 careful attention when numerically solving the ODE. Nevertheless, this
 306 form is used in many models (Table 1), likely due to its simplicity.
- 307 3. $f(X, t) = \nu(t)X(t)$. This form is the most complex. The proportion
 308 of eligible individuals being vaccinated may vary over time. This form
 309 has the same nice mathematical property as form 1: positivity of $X(t)$
 310 is guaranteed for all time. Contrary to form 1 and form 2, this more
 311 complex third form allows for the rate - and also the number - of vacci-
 312 nations to increase over time, as is typically the case at the beginning
 313 of a mass vaccine roll-out. Form 1 (and form 2), on the other hand,
 314 assume that the number of vaccinations decreases (remains constant,
 315 respectively) as the number of eligible individuals decreases. This form
 316 is used in a few models that employ optimal control techniques (Acuña-
 317 Zegarra et al., 2021; Zavrakli et al., 2023).
- 318 4. $f(X, t) = c(t)$. In this form, the number of vaccinations only depends
 319 on time but not on the size of X . This form is well-suited for post-hoc
 320 analyses, in which the number of vaccinations that were conducted per
 321 unit time (e.g., day or week) is known, see e.g. Islam et al. (2021);
 322 Gozzi et al. (2022); Luebben et al. (2023); Kekić et al. (2023); Aruffo
 323 et al. (2022); Ziarelli et al. (2023); Ferreira et al. (2022); Cattaneo
 324 et al. (2022). Mathematically, this form requires careful attention when
 325 solving the ODE numerically, to ensure $X(t)$ remains non-negative at
 326 all time. This can be achieved by adding a number of model constraints,
 327 as in Han et al. (2021). One study tailors an ODE model to three

different Indonesian provinces and optimizes the function $c(t)$ such that active cases remain below an acceptable threshold and total vaccination cost is minimized; interestingly, the optimal function $c(t)$ is highly non-monotonic (Nuraini et al., 2021). Another study optimizes $c(t)$ as well, by assuming that vaccines are produced at a constant speed but that vaccine stock needs not to be used immediately (Souto Ferreira et al., 2022).

5. A number of studies do not specify $f(X, t)$. Rather, they assume that all vaccinations have been completed prior to the simulation of the disease spread. This simplifying assumption decouples the vaccine roll-out from the disease spread. A modified version of this approach is implemented in Matrajt et al. (2021b) where the simulation of disease dynamics is stopped once a week when a specified number of (weekly) vaccinations occur. A similar approach is implemented in an ABM in Jahn et al. (2021).

Despite different implementations of the vaccine roll-out, model-based studies generally agree that prioritization of younger, high-contact individuals may be beneficial and even lead to fewer deaths, when the entire vaccine roll-out takes place very quickly, i.e., when vaccines for a large proportion of the population are available quickly (Matrajt et al., 2021a; Buckner et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022b; McBryde et al., 2021). In this case, the vulnerable population is protected indirectly, by reaching herd immunity and a stop of community spread. This strategy becomes particularly reasonable in situations with low community spread (i.e., the effective reproductive number $R_{\text{eff}} \approx 1$) (Chen et al., 2021; Althobaity et al., 2022; Gozzi et al., 2021) and in which the epidemic is already in decline (i.e., $dR_{\text{eff}}(t)/dt < 0$) (Molla et al., 2022). One prominent study agrees that younger individuals should only be prioritized, when minimizing deaths, if effective reproductive numbers are low but finds that a slow roll-out (and not a fast one) is an additional requirement (Bubar et al., 2021).

4.5. Vaccine function and efficacy

In theory, vaccines can improve outcomes in a variety of ways. A vaccinated individual may be less likely (than an unvaccinated individual with same characteristics) to (i) become infected, (ii) experience symptoms when infected, (iii) require hospitalization due to severe symptoms, (iv) die. In addition, a vaccinated person (v) may be less contagious (e.g., due to a lower

average viral load), and (vi) may have a shorter duration of infectiousness, i.e., faster disease progression. To illustrate how these different vaccine functions are frequently included in compartmental models, consider the following COVID-19 model, which stratifies the population by disease status (susceptible (S), recently infected but not yet infectious (E=exposed), symptomatically infected (I), asymptotically infected (A), severely infected/requiring hospitalization (H), deceased from COVID-19 (D), recovered (R)) and vaccine status (superscript v for vaccinated)):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS(t)}{dt} &= -\Lambda S, \\
 \frac{dS^v(t)}{dt} &= -(1 - \epsilon_1)\Lambda S^v, \\
 \frac{dE(t)}{dt} &= \Lambda S - \gamma_E E, \\
 \frac{dE^v(t)}{dt} &= (1 - \epsilon_1)\Lambda S^v - \gamma_E^v E^v, \\
 \frac{dI(t)}{dt} &= p_{E \rightarrow I} \gamma_E E - \gamma_I I, \\
 \frac{dI^v(t)}{dt} &= (1 - \epsilon_2)p_{E \rightarrow I} \gamma_E^v E^v - \gamma_I^v I, \\
 \frac{dA(t)}{dt} &= (1 - p_{E \rightarrow I}) \gamma_E E - \gamma_A A, \\
 \frac{dA^v(t)}{dt} &= (1 - (1 - \epsilon_2)p_{E \rightarrow I}) \gamma_E^v E^v - \gamma_A^v A, \\
 \frac{dH(t)}{dt} &= p_{I \rightarrow H} \gamma_I I - \gamma_H H, \\
 \frac{dH^v(t)}{dt} &= (1 - \epsilon_3)p_{I \rightarrow H} \gamma_I^v I - \gamma_H^v H, \\
 \frac{dD(t)}{dt} &= p_{H \rightarrow D} \gamma_H H, \\
 \frac{dD^v(t)}{dt} &= (1 - \epsilon_4)p_{H \rightarrow D} \gamma_H^v H, \\
 \frac{dR(t)}{dt} &= \gamma_A A + (1 - p_{I \rightarrow H}) \gamma_I I + (1 - p_{H \rightarrow D}) \gamma_H H, \\
 \frac{dR^v(t)}{dt} &= \gamma_A^v A^v + (1 - (1 - \epsilon_3)p_{I \rightarrow H}) \gamma_I^v I^v + (1 - (1 - \epsilon_4)p_{H \rightarrow D}) \gamma_H^v H^v,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda = \beta(A + I + \alpha A^v + \alpha I^v)$ is the force of infection, with $\alpha \in [0, 1]$

describing the vaccine-induced reduction in onward transmission. Vaccine-induced faster disease progression may be implemented by $\gamma_x^v \geq \gamma_x$ for $x \in \{E, I, A, H\}$.

Three important notes: First, this model implements a so-called leaky vaccine: any vaccinated individual may still become infected, at a lower rate than unvaccinated. A leaky vaccine represents the most frequent implementation of vaccine function. An alternative, also frequently observed assumption is an all-or-nothing vaccine. In that case, ϵ_1 determines the fraction of vaccinated individuals that are completely immune to infection, while the remaining proportion of vaccinated ($1 - \epsilon_1$) are typically assumed to be as susceptible as unvaccinated individuals. In some models, their susceptibility is reduced by a certain degree. Second, a stratification by age can easily be included by duplicating all compartments for each age group, including contact patterns in the force of infection, and considering age-dependent parameters. Third, the parameters $\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4$ describe conditional probabilities. For example, ϵ_2 describes the reduction in symptomatic disease among infected vaccinated compared to infected unvaccinated individuals. The overall vaccine-induced reduction in symptomatic disease, measured in clinical trials and commonly referred to as vaccine efficacy (Halloran et al., 1997), is thus $VE_{\text{COVID}} = 1 - (1 - \epsilon_1)(1 - \epsilon_2)$. Similarly, the overall vaccine-induced reduction in deaths is $VE_{\text{death}} = 1 - (1 - \epsilon_1)(1 - \epsilon_2)(1 - \epsilon_3)(1 - \epsilon_4)$.

Used in 90 of the 94 investigated models (Table 1), reduction in infection (ϵ_1 , implemented either as a leaky or all-or-nothing vaccine) is the most frequently considered vaccine function, followed by reduction in symptoms (ϵ_2 , used in 28 studies), reduction in severe disease (ϵ_3 , used in 22 studies), reduction in onward transmission (α , used in 17 studies), and reduction in death (ϵ_4 , used in 15 studies). Other vaccine functions considered in only a few models include a shorter period of infectiousness (Makhoul et al., 2020; Penn and Donnelly, 2023), as well as a reduced vaccine efficacy for older individuals (Bubar et al., 2021; Aruffo et al., 2022; Buckner et al., 2021) and children (Han et al., 2021). 46 out of 94 studies (48.9%) considered only one type of vaccine function, while three studies (Liu et al., 2022a; McBryde et al., 2021; Mak et al., 2022) differentiated five types (Table 1).

The range of parameter values considered for a given vaccine function also varied wildly. One study investigated optimal prioritization strategies for mass vaccinations with commonly used vaccines that had shown some beneficial heterologous effects against SARS-CoV-2 infection (Hupert et al., 2022). This study considered $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_4 \in [5\%, 15\%]$. In line with results from

COVID-19 vaccine clinical trials, most studies assumed relatively high levels of vaccine efficacy against symptomatic disease, VE_{COVID} , with the specific values varying based on vaccine product, number of doses and predominant virus variant. Moreover, the relative contribution of ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 differs, with some studies (see e.g., [Islam et al. \(2021\)](#); [Matrajt et al. \(2021b,a\)](#); [Han et al. \(2021\)](#); [Ayoub et al. \(2021\)](#); [Makhoul et al. \(2020\)](#); [Choi and Shim \(2021\)](#); [Hogan et al. \(2021\)](#); [Moore et al. \(2021a\)](#); [Liu et al. \(2022b\)](#); [Jahn et al. \(2021\)](#); [Kiem et al. \(2021\)](#)) contrasting optimal vaccination strategies for both extreme cases: $\epsilon_1 = VE_{\text{COVID}}, \epsilon_2 = 0$ (sterilizing vaccine), and $\epsilon_1 = 0, \epsilon_2 = VE_{\text{COVID}}$ (non-sterilizing vaccine). These studies agree that at a fixed (overall) vaccine efficacy against symptomatic disease, higher ϵ_1 (i.e., lower ϵ_2) leads to better outcomes. The higher ϵ_2 relative to ϵ_1 , the more important is the prioritization of older and vulnerable people when optimizing morbidity-based metrics ([Islam et al., 2021](#); [Choi and Shim, 2021](#); [Liu et al., 2022b](#); [Kiem et al., 2021](#)). Although hard to disentangle in practice, it is therefore important for optimal prioritization design to understand the relative contribution of ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 to the vaccine efficacies observed in clinical trials.

Studies which differentiate between single-dose and "fully" vaccinated individuals include two parameters for each vaccine function. One study shows that, for a fixed VE_{COVID} , delaying second doses and thus covering a larger part of the population with first doses becomes more important at higher ϵ_1 (i.e., lower ϵ_2) when minimizing mortality ([Matrajt et al., 2021b](#)). Another important factor is the speed of the vaccine roll-out. One study shows that a generally delayed second dose only leads to fewer deaths if the roll-out is slow ([Romero-Brufau et al., 2021](#)). An age-dependent strategy (providing two doses to people 65 and older but delaying the second dose for younger people) performs consistently well, irrespective of the speed of the roll-out. The most important parameter in determining whether a delay of second doses is beneficial is, however, the relative difference in the reduction in susceptibility after one dose versus two doses. As expected, all studies agree that a delay becomes more beneficial the smaller the difference, irrespective of the optimization objective ([Romero-Brufau et al., 2021](#); [Moghadas et al., 2021](#); [Mak et al., 2022](#); [Souto Ferreira et al., 2022](#); [Matrajt et al., 2021b](#); [Childs et al., 2022](#); [Gonzalez-Parra, 2021](#); [Tuite et al., 2021](#)). One noteworthy ABM-based study uses differential vaccine function parameters for the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine, and finds that to minimize cases the second Moderna dose should be delayed while a delay of the second Pfizer-

449 BioNTech dose may be detrimental if pre-existing immunity is low and if
 450 single dose-induced immunity wanes (Moghadas et al., 2021). To minimize
 451 deaths or hospitalizations, this study suggests delayed second doses, irrespec-
 452 tive of the type of vaccine.

453 The various studies differ in how the two-dose vaccination campaign is im-
 454 plemented. In compartment-based models, separate compartments for single-
 455 dose (V_1) and “fully” vaccinated (V_2) individuals are used. One common im-
 456 plementation employs two rates $\nu_1(t), \nu_2(t) \geq 0$ to describe the proportion of
 457 susceptible and single-dose vaccinated that receive a vaccine dose on a given
 458 day t (see e.g., Zhao et al. (2021b); Childs et al. (2022); Liu et al. (2022a)).
 459 That is,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS(t)}{dt} &= -\nu_1(t)S(t), \\ \frac{dV_1(t)}{dt} &= \nu_1(t)S(t) - \nu_2(t)V_1(t), \\ \frac{dV_2(t)}{dt} &= \nu_2(t)V_1(t),\end{aligned}$$

460 with constraints on $\nu_1(t)$ and $\nu_2(t)$ ensuring that only available vaccines are
 461 used. Other implementations include delay differential equations (Souto Fer-
 462 reira et al., 2022; Sepulveda et al., 2023) or weekly pulse vaccinations (Ma-
 463 trajt et al., 2021b).

464 4.6. Transmission rates and heterogeneous contact patterns

465 The rate at which susceptible individuals acquire an infection, the force
 466 of infection, depends, among others, on contact rates, the community in-
 467 cidence and the infectivity of the virus. It is well-established that human
 468 interactions are age-assortative and that older individuals have on average
 469 fewer contacts (Mosson et al., 2008). A realistic account for age-specific
 470 mixing patterns is thus of paramount importance in infectious disease mod-
 471 els that guide policy-makers to prioritize either high-contact young people
 472 or lower-contact older people. A common approach to model infection of
 473 sub-population $i, i = 1, \dots, n$ in an age-structured ODE is

$$\frac{dS_i(t)}{dt} = -\beta_i \sum_{j=1}^n C_{ij}(aA_j + I_j)S_i,$$

474 where

- 475 • $a \geq 0$ represents the relative contagiousness of asymptomatic (A) com-
476 pared to symptomatic (I) individuals. All investigated studies chose
477 $a \in (0, 1]$.
- 478 • The transmission rate β_i can account for age-dependent susceptibility
479 and risk mitigation (e.g., mask wearing). Multiple studies assumed
480 that older, more vulnerable individuals suffer from higher susceptibil-
481 ity (Davies et al., 2020; Moore et al., 2021b; Jahn et al., 2021) but also
482 engage in more risk mitigation measures (Masters et al., 2020; Kadelka
483 and McCombs, 2021; Bushaj et al., 2023; Vo et al., 2023). The trans-
484 mission rate may also vary over time, e.g., due to the emergence of more
485 transmissible SARS-CoV-2 variants (Islam et al., 2021; Moore et al.,
486 2021b), or time-varying social distancing levels (Moore et al., 2021b).
487 It may further vary from location to location in spatially distributed
488 models (Vo et al., 2023).
- 489 • The $n \times n$ -matrix C describes the average number of contacts an in-
490 dividual in sub-population i has with individuals from sub-population
491 j . Just like β_i , this matrix may also vary over time and by location to
492 account for periods of school closures, work-from-home orders, etc. A
493 reduction in activity levels of sub-population i (e.g., due to NPI adher-
494 ence) can be implemented in two ways: (i) through a reduction in β_i ,
495 or (ii) through a proportional reduction of row and column i of contact
496 matrix C . It is very important to understand the differential effect of
497 these choices on the model. Only the latter choice reduces both new
498 infections of sub-population i and onward transmission by members of
499 sub-population i . For this reason, this choice should be preferred in
500 infectious disease models.

501 The seminal, diary-based POLYMOD study surveyed roughly one thou-
502 sand individuals each in eight European countries and established country-
503 specific contact matrices for a population stratified into 15 age groups (0 –
504 4, 5 – 9, ..., 75 – 79, 80+) (Mossong et al., 2008). Contact rates were fur-
505 ther stratified by location (home, workplace, school, other). By combining
506 this data with various other data sources, age-and-location-specific synthetic
507 contact rates were obtained for 177 countries, and it was shown that syn-
508 thetic and empirical contact matrices employed in epidemiological models
509 yield similar findings (Prem et al., 2017, 2021).

Most investigated mathematical models use a country-specific contact matrix. One ODE-based study shows explicitly how the optimal prioritization strategy depends on the country-specific age pyramid and contact matrix: to minimize deaths, it is optimal to first vaccinate the oldest people in India and Italy but middle-aged people in China (Wang et al., 2022). Another study quantifies the inter-generational mixing, which is typically lower in high-income countries (Gozzi et al., 2021). Since the population in high-income countries is on average also older, non-trivial dependencies arise when designing morbidity- or mortality-minimizing vaccine allocation strategies.

One commonly stated limitation of these contact matrices is that they have been derived before the COVID-19 pandemic, during which relative mixing patterns may have shifted. Two general approaches have been used to overcome this issue. First, several studies recomputed the overall contact matrix as a linear combination of the four location-specific pre-pandemic contact matrices (Matrajt et al., 2021b; Foy et al., 2021; Kiem et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Moore et al., 2021b). That is,

$$C(t) = a_1(t)C_{\text{home}} + a_2(t)C_{\text{work}} + a_3(t)C_{\text{school}} + a_4(t)C_{\text{other}}.$$

All studies agree that during a pandemic, $a_1(t) \geq 1$ while $0 \leq a_2(t), a_3(t), a_4(t) < 1$. Cell phone mobility data (Jentsch et al., 2021; Foy et al., 2021) as well as specific policy implementations (school closures, work-from-home orders, etc) (Jentsch et al., 2021; Karabay et al., 2021) have been used to inform the weights $a_1(t), \dots, a_4(t)$. The Oxford Stringency Indices are based on information on implemented government policies related to closure and containment, health and economic policy, and provide means to quantify the time-varying level of NPIs in 180 countries - for several countries, even at the level of individual jurisdictions (Hale et al., 2021). Second, empirical contact matrices have been derived during the pandemic in several settings, and are used by a variety of studies, see e.g. (Han et al., 2021; Tran et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2021b). Comparisons of Chinese as well as Belgian diary-based pre-pandemic contact matrices with contact matrices obtained during and after the first COVID-19 lockdowns revealed not only drastic changes in the number of contacts but also in the mixing patterns (Zhang et al., 2020, 2021; Coletti et al., 2020). Contact matrices during a pandemic - specifically during periods of strong NPI adherence, e.g., a lockdown - exhibit much lower levels of age-assortativity, likely due to school and work closures.

While age-assortativity decreases during a pandemic, assortative mixing with respect to other attributes, also known as homophily (McPherson et al.,

2001), may be high or even increase, and may profoundly influence disease dynamics. High levels of homophily with respect to COVID-19 vaccine status have been reported (Are et al., 2024). Both network- and ODE-based studies show that this may lead, at a fixed level of vaccine coverage, to more frequent outbreaks and higher attack rates (Kadelka and McCombs, 2021; Hiraoka et al., 2022; Burgio et al., 2022). Another study, employing a novel approach to include homophily with respect to binary attributes in established contact matrices (Kadelka, 2023), shows that accounting for high levels of ethnic homophily in the United States, coupled with proportionately more people of color working in high-contact jobs but fewer being of old age, leads to non-trivial trade-offs in optimal vaccine prioritization design (Kadelka et al., 2022).

A less frequently mentioned limitation of contact matrices is that they are by default non-reciprocal. In empirical contact matrices, elderly tend to more frequently report a brief contact (Mosson et al., 2008), and generally provide less reliable responses in surveys Perry (1982). Physical contacts, which are required for COVID-19 spread, are however reciprocal. That is,

$$N_i C_{ij} = N_j C_{ji}$$

should hold for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, where N_i is the size of sub-population i ; otherwise, disease dynamics are inaccurate. A common procedure to generate a reciprocal contact matrix is outlined in (Funk et al., 2019; Kadelka, 2023). Several studies employ this or a similar procedure (see e.g. Matrajt et al. (2021b); Kadelka et al. (2022); Islam et al. (2021)).

4.7. Behavioral responses

The force of infection depends proportionately on the contact level. Over the course of a pandemic, implemented government policies, adherence to NPIs (e.g., social distancing), and thus contact levels differ. Variations in contact levels that affect the entire population homogeneously can be easily implemented by multiplying contact matrices with a time-varying factor, as described above. Heterogeneous behavioral responses, reported in several surveys (see e.g. Masters et al. (2020); Dryhurst et al. (2022); Pasion et al. (2020)), are often much harder to model but crucial to accurately predict, for example, the effect of a specific vaccine prioritization strategy. A variety of studies included aspects of homogeneous and heterogeneous behavioral responses.

Several studies assume that the population-wide contact level depends on the number of recent infections, hospitalizations and/or deaths ([Rahmandad, 2022](#); [Althobaity et al., 2022](#); [Gozzi et al., 2021](#)), the number of currently active cases ([Jentsch et al., 2021](#); [Islam et al., 2021](#)), recent changes in these numbers, or a combination of these factors. For example in [Islam et al. \(2021\)](#), the population-wide contact level has been modeled to depend on the number of active cases, using a sigmoidal function. Another study, expanding the ODE model by Bubar et al ([Bubar et al., 2021](#)), assumes that the contact reduction depends exponentially on the number of deaths reported a few days ago ([Rahmandad, 2022](#)). The authors argue that inclusion of this endogenous behavioral feedback loop provides a better model fit to data. This study further assumes that the level of contact reduction can depend on age/perceived risk, and specifically, that vaccinated individuals may engage in less contact reduction. This complicates the trade-off in vaccine prioritization when minimizing deaths or YLL: vaccinate high-contact, less NPI-compliant individuals first or more compliant people at higher risk. This study concludes that the answer primarily depends on the speed of the vaccine roll-out, as well as the differences in NPI compliance. Several other studies come to the same or similar conclusion ([Bushaj et al., 2023](#)). An ABM-based study employs a binary stratification of NPI compliance, and quantifies how much lower the compliance level of low-risk (versus high-risk) individuals must be for them to be the optimal prioritization target ([Kadelka and McCombs, 2021](#)). It finds that the switching point depends on the vaccine efficacy, as well as the level of homophily with respect to vaccine status and NPI adherence. An ODE-based model, first proposed in [Gozzi et al. \(2021\)](#) and then adapted to several Arab countries in [Althobaity et al. \(2022\)](#), uses the same binary classification and explicitly models dynamic shifts between these two sub-populations that depend on the vaccine coverage and the number of recent deaths. These studies find that, at $R_{\text{eff}} = 1.15$, elderly should be prioritized when minimizing deaths as long as the vaccine roll-out is sufficiently fast; the speed at which the optimal prioritization switches is country-dependent. Some studies have been even shown that a vaccine with low effectiveness may be detrimental and yield worse outcomes than in the absence of a vaccine, due to behavior adaptation and a false belief of protection ([Kadelka and McCombs, 2021](#); [Luebben et al., 2023](#)).

615 4.8. Vaccine hesitancy

616 Despite the availability of highly effective vaccines, a sizeable proportion
617 of people refuses to get vaccinated against COVID-19. When determining
618 the optimal roll-out of a limited vaccine, this factor must be taken into
619 account, either explicitly by certain modeling assumptions or implicitly by
620 only considering those roll-out solutions that appear feasible given levels of
621 vaccine hesitancy. A number of survey-based studies have accessed these lev-
622 els in different countries and at different times during the pandemic (Sallam,
623 2021; Soares et al., 2021). While vaccine hesitancy differs from country to
624 country, it generally differs more with age. As expected, older individuals
625 who are more at risk are also more willing to be vaccinated.

626 Many infectious disease models explicitly include vaccine hesitancy by
627 assuming that a proportion of each sub-population cannot be vaccinated.
628 Some models simply assume that this proportion is fixed (Bubar et al., 2021;
629 Gavish and Katriel, 2022; Islam et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022; Luebben et al.,
630 2023; Kadelka et al., 2022; Makhoul et al., 2020; Miura et al., 2021; Moore
631 et al., 2021a; Rodriguez-Maroto et al., 2023; Tatapudi et al., 2021; Walker
632 et al., 2022; Hogan et al., 2021; McBryde et al., 2021; Rahmandad, 2022),
633 while others account for lower hesitancy among older individuals (Liu et al.,
634 2022a; Moghadas et al., 2021; Han et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022b; Moore
635 et al., 2021b; Zavrakli et al., 2023). Most models in the latter category
636 differentiate hesitancy using a binary age threshold. A Greek model infers
637 age-specific values from a telephone survey (Sypsa et al., 2022; Barmounakis
638 et al., 2022). One study assumes that the level of hesitancy evolves over time
639 following an ODE formulation (Jentsch et al., 2021). An ABM-based study
640 shows that COVID-19 outbreaks are more frequent, at a given level of vaccine
641 coverage and NPI adherence, if those who comply with NPIs are also those
642 who get vaccinated, as is frequently the case (Kadelka and McCombs, 2021).

643 4.9. Effective reproductive number

644 While the basic reproductive number describes the number of secondary
645 infections caused on average by an infected individual in a fully suscepti-
646 ble population, the effective reproductive number varies over time and takes
647 into account population-wide levels of immunity, NPI adherence, emergence
648 of more infectious variants, etc. Many models have investigated how opti-
649 mal prioritization schemes depend on this key epidemiological parameter. As
650 described above, prioritization of high-contact, low-risk younger individuals

651 becomes a reasonable choice, when minimizing deaths, if the effective repro-
 652 ductive number is close to 1 (Chen et al., 2021; Althobaity et al., 2022; Gozzi
 653 et al., 2021; Bubar et al., 2021), especially if it is decreasing (Molla et al.,
 654 2022). A French study further clarifies that young individuals should only
 655 be prioritized if the vaccine acts almost entirely by reducing infections (that
 656 is, if $\epsilon_1 \gg \epsilon_2$) (Kiem et al., 2021). In these circumstances, the vulnerable,
 657 older part of the population is indirectly protected by the vaccine through
 658 herd immunity, pending no changes in NPI adherence.

659 4.10. Variant Considerations

660 Like most RNA viruses, SARS-CoV-2 evolves rapidly (Markov et al.,
 661 2023). Over the course of the last four years, a plethora of variants has
 662 emerged. These variants exhibit different phenotypes characterized e.g. by
 663 transmissibility, severity of disease and immune evasion. The vaccine roll-out
 664 happened in parallel to the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants. For exam-
 665 ple, the United States started to vaccinate individuals in December 2020. By
 666 April 2021 - when weekly vaccination counts still increased - Alpha (B.1.1.7),
 667 which was an estimated 50% more transmissible, had become the dominat-
 668 ing virus strain, followed soon after by Delta (B.1.617.2), which was even
 669 more contagious and caused also more hospitalizations and deaths (Camp-
 670 bell et al., 2021). Therefore, mathematical models used to predict optimal
 671 vaccine allocation strategies should consider the emergence of variants. In
 672 practice, the time to emergence of a new variant and its specific phenotypic
 673 characteristics can, however, not be reliably predicted. Some studies used
 674 genomic SARS-CoV-2 surveillance time-series and estimates of the pheno-
 675 typic characteristics of circulating variants to predict the future distribution
 676 of circulating virus strains (Islam et al., 2021; Childs et al., 2022). This dis-
 677 tribution can yield estimates of the time-varying transmissibility and various
 678 transition probabilities, even when the model does not account explicitly for
 679 variant-specific infections (Liu et al., 2022a). A few studies went further
 680 and even included different compartments for those infected with e.g. the
 681 wildtype and Alpha variant (Aruffo et al., 2022; Gozzi et al., 2022). Qualita-
 682 tively, accounting for the emergence of more infectious variants yields higher
 683 effective reproductive numbers (pending no changes in NPI adherence, etc)
 684 with effects as described in Subsection 4.9.

685 5. Summary of selected modeling studies

686 In the previous sections, we focused on key modeling assumptions, both
 687 explicit and implicit ones, and their impact on the outcomes of vaccine pri-
 688 oritization models. We highlighted different studies wherever suitable. In
 689 this section, we provide a brief summary of selected modeling studies that
 690 present interesting features. Only some features of the models and findings
 691 from the studies can be described. Subsection 5.1 summarizes studies that
 692 answer the question: How should a limited vaccine be optimally distributed
 693 among a population stratified by age? Subsection 5.2 summarizes studies
 694 that answer the question: Should the second COVID-19 vaccine dose be de-
 695 layed given limited vaccine availability? Subsection 5.3 summarizes spatial
 696 vaccine distribution studies.

697 5.1. Summary of studies that employ an age-structured mathematical model

698 5.1.1. Differential equation and difference equation based models

699 In Bubar et al. (2021), the authors compared five different vaccine priori-
 700 tization strategies using an age-stratified ODE-based SEIR model. Outcomes
 701 were assessed using the number of infections, deaths and YLL. The authors
 702 found that prioritizing adults aged 20 to 49 years minimized infections at all
 703 considered values of the effective reproduction number (1.1-2). Furthermore,
 704 this same prioritization provided the best way to reduce mortality and YLL
 705 when the effective reproduction number is low (≤ 1.15) and if the vaccine
 706 roll-out is slow. This study highlights the importance of the transmissibility
 707 of SARS-CoV-2 and the pace of vaccine roll-out on the choice of an opti-
 708 mal vaccination strategy. The authors also consider the potential benefit of
 709 seroprevalence tests prior to vaccination.

710 In Moore et al. (2021b), an ODE-based SEAIHR model was fitted to data
 711 from the United Kingdom. The authors show that even a vaccine as effective
 712 as those by Pfizer-BioNTech and Oxford-AstraZeneca would not suffice to
 713 contain the COVID-19 outbreak, partially due to age-varying vaccine hesi-
 714 tancy. The study further highlights that the number of deaths that appear
 715 among vaccinated will naturally increase as vaccine coverage increases. The
 716 model accounts for time-varying population-wide social distancing levels as
 717 well as the emergence of more transmissible variants.

718 In Buckner et al. (2021), the authors investigated optimal vaccination
 719 strategies by using an ODE-based SEPIAR model that takes into account
 720 essential workers. Stochastic nonlinear programming techniques were used

721 to find the vaccine prioritization. Assuming $\mathcal{R}_{\text{eff}} = 2.5$, vaccines were as-
 722 signed only to susceptible individuals and updates to the prioritization were
 723 made each month. Outcomes were assessed using the number of infections,
 724 deaths and YLL. The authors found that to minimize infections, it is opti-
 725 mal to prioritize older essential workers. However, depending on the objective
 726 and alternative model scenarios considered, younger essential workers may
 727 be prioritized to control SARS-CoV-2 spread or elderly to directly control
 728 mortality. A combination of a genetic algorithm (global) and a simulated an-
 729 nealing algorithm (local) was used to obtain the optimal vaccination strategy
 730 each month.

731 In Foy et al. (2021), the authors employed an age-structured ODE-based
 732 SEIARQ (Q = quarantined, not spreading) model to inform the optimal vac-
 733 cine roll-out in India. Assuming $\mathcal{R}_{\text{eff}} = 2.4$, four vaccine prioritizations were
 734 compared: even across the population, prioritize 20–40 year olds, 40–60 year
 735 olds, or those 60 and older. To minimize deaths, the authors found that pri-
 736 oritizing the oldest is optimal regardless of the vaccine efficacy, control mea-
 737 sures, vaccination pace, or immunity dynamics. However, this prioritization
 738 results in more symptomatic infections. To minimize infections, vaccination
 739 of 20–40 year olds should be prioritized. A faster vaccine roll-out reduces the
 740 differences between the compared vaccine prioritizations.

741 In MacIntyre et al. (2022), the authors employed an ODE-based SEPA-
 742 IQR model that was extended to include several additional classes such as
 743 traced, undiagnosed and highly infectious. The model was fitted to the Aus-
 744 tralian state New South Wales and age-targeted and ring vaccination pro-
 745 grams were compared. The population was stratified by occupation (health-
 746 care workers) and age. The authors found that vaccinating older people
 747 prevents more deaths and that herd immunity can only be reached by mass
 748 vaccination campaigns, and only if the vaccine is sufficiently effective and
 749 rolled out sufficiently fast.

750 In Hogan et al. (2021), an extended SEIR discrete-time model was used to
 751 evaluate the public health impact of vaccines using data from different coun-
 752 tries. The model uses a class of individuals with a mild infection that includes
 753 both symptomatic and asymptomatic but that does not require hospitaliza-
 754 tion. The authors identified death-minimizing vaccine allocation strategies
 755 within- and between-countries. They found if less than 20% vaccine coverage
 756 is available, it is better to prioritize the elderly. However, in less limited
 757 settings, high transmitters should be prioritized.

758 In Moore et al. (2021a), an ODE-based SEAIR model was used to in-

investigate optimal vaccine allocations in the UK. Outcomes were assessed by deaths and loss in QALYs. For a range of model assumptions, the authors found elderly should be prioritized. However for vaccines that have low efficacy among the elderly ($< 20\%$), other prioritizations proved more effective.

In Shim (2021), an ODE-based SEIAR model was calibrated South Korea. The authors found that to minimize deaths (infections) older (younger) individuals should be prioritized. Interestingly, the YLL-minimizing strategy is sensitive to vaccine efficacy and the number of vaccine doses available. When vaccine efficacy (assuming a vaccine that only reduces infections) is relatively low ($\leq 30\%$) groups with high case-fatality rates should be prioritized, thereby maximizing the direct benefit of vaccines. However, with vaccines that have higher efficacy, prioritization shifts toward younger age groups: 40–69 year olds at 50–70% efficacy or 30–59 year olds at 90% efficacy.

In Islam et al. (2021), a detailed ODE-based model was calibrated to evaluate the U.S. vaccine roll-out. The population was stratified by age, comorbidity status, job type and living situation. The model also accounts for time-varying population-wide social distancing levels as well as the emergence of more transmissible variants. The authors compared 17.5 million 4-phased vaccine allocation strategies and found that a strategy that prioritizes people with comorbidities in all age groups is Pareto-optimal, yielding slightly fewer deaths, infections and YLL than the strategy recommended by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC).

In Penn and Donnelly (2023), an ODE-based SIR model was used to study the effect of the basic reproduction number \mathcal{R}_0 on the optimal vaccination plan. An interesting counter-intuitive result was found: It is better to prioritize 45–49 year olds than 55–59 year olds despite higher case fatality rates in the latter group. The authors explained this by the fact that the latter group has much fewer contacts with those 75 and older (as parents of those 55–59 years old have already died to a large degree). Thus, prioritization of 45–49 year olds substantially increases the secondary protection of the elderly. This result shows the importance of the age-stratified contact matrices.

In Zhao et al. (2021b), three different ODE-based SEIAR models were used to find the optimal vaccination strategy against COVID-19 in Wuhan City, China. The authors used the effective reproduction number to estimate the SARS-CoV-2 transmission between age groups. They found that, before NPIs were implemented, the highest transmissibility existed among those

797 15-44 years old. In order to control transmission, this age group should be
798 prioritized. To minimize deaths, those ≥ 65 years old should be prioritized,
799 irrespective of their lower contact rates.

800 In [Matrajt et al. \(2021a\)](#), an ODE-based model with many compartments
801 was used to determine which age group(s) should be vaccinated assuming in-
802 stantaneous vaccination and 10-100% vaccine coverage. The authors studied
803 many scenarios and found that for low vaccine effectiveness (10-50%), regard-
804 less of vaccination coverage, it is optimal to prioritize elderly people when
805 minimizing deaths. However, for higher vaccine effectiveness and if the basic
806 reproductive number is low, it is better to prioritize younger people, espe-
807 cially if available vaccination coverage is $\geq 40\%$. The optimization routine
808 includes a coarse global search algorithm, coupled with a fast optimizer, to
809 explore the entire space of possible combinations of vaccine allocations.

810 In [Kadelka et al. \(2022\)](#), an age-and-ethnicity-stratified ODE-based model
811 was used to study the optimal distribution of available vaccines in the United
812 States to two different groups: White and Asian persons and all others. Dif-
813 ferent levels of ethnic homophily were considered. The authors found that
814 vaccine allocations that stratify vaccine access by ethnicity could have pre-
815 vented a number of deaths, especially assuming high levels of ethnic ho-
816 mophily. Moreover, the authors highlight a second trade-off when designing
817 mortality-minimizing vaccination plans and accounting for ethnic homophily:
818 the elderly population is predominantly White and Asian, while those em-
819 ployed in high-contact occupations are predominantly from the other ethnic
820 groups.

821 In [Stafford et al. \(2023\)](#), an age-and-race-stratified ODE-based model was
822 used to study the distribution of available vaccines in the United States to
823 two different groups: non-Hispanic White persons and all others. Several
824 objective functions that include mortality, YLLs, measures of inequity and
825 joint disease burden were considered. The authors found that there exists
826 a trade-off between minimizing disease burden and minimizing inequity, es-
827 pecially if vaccine is very limited (e.g., 10%). If vaccine coverage is $\geq 30\%$,
828 both inequity and mortality can be optimized at the same time.

829 In [Zuo et al. \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based SEIQR model was used, combined
830 with google mobility data to modify contact matrices. This study highlights
831 that the optimal vaccine prioritization depends on particular parameters re-
832 lated to the transmission rates. Assuming fixed daily doses, the authors
833 found that in a scenario with low infection rate and low vaccine availability,
834 vaccinating first people over 60 minimizes deaths, but that with more vaccine

835 availability vaccinating first those 51-60 year old is preferable due to their
836 higher contacts.

837 In [Gavish and Katriel \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based model is used to investigate
838 whether children should have been vaccinated earlier. The authors found that
839 prioritization strategies that include vaccination of children lead to Pareto-
840 optimal outcomes regarding minimizing deaths and infections, especially if
841 the basic reproductive number is high.

842 In [Rao and Brandeau \(2021b\)](#), an ODE-based SIR model with two age
843 groups (with age threshold 65) was used to study which vaccine allocation
844 minimizes the effective reproduction number. Assuming that all vaccinations
845 take place at once, the authors found that the answer depends on available
846 vaccine coverage, vaccination pace and the initial effective reproduction num-
847 ber. In [Rao and Brandeau \(2021a\)](#), the same authors used the model to
848 minimize infections, deaths, YLL and loss in QALY. They found that it is
849 better to prioritize the young group to minimize infections, but the older in-
850 dividuals for all other metrics. This result was obtained by simple analytical
851 conditions that describe the optimal vaccine allocation for each objective.

852 In [Rahmandad \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based SEIR model was used to study the
853 effects of behavioral responses to risk by means of an endogenous feedback
854 loop. Specifically, the author assumed that population-wide social distancing
855 levels fluctuate depending on the recently reported numbers of COVID-19
856 deaths. The author argues that high-contact individuals should be prioritized
857 to minimize deaths or YLLs, as long as the vaccine roll-out happens fast
858 enough. This is because the vulnerable population is already more risk-averse
859 and thus engages in more risk mitigation.

860 In [Han et al. \(2021\)](#), an ODE-based SIR model was used to study optimal
861 vaccine prioritization plans in China. The authors show that a time-varying
862 vaccination program (i.e., allocating vaccines to different target groups as
863 the epidemic evolves) can yield much better outcomes since it is capable
864 to simultaneously achieve different objectives (e.g., minimizing deaths and
865 infections). In addition, a high vaccination pace in the early phase of the
866 vaccination plan is better. In a sensitivity analysis, the authors employed a
867 contact matrix derived from contact diaries collected in Shanghai in March
868 2020, at a time when the lockdown was over, but severe NPIs were still in
869 place. The “pandemic” contact matrix exhibits much less age-assortativity.

870 In [Makhoul et al. \(2020\)](#), an ODE-based model was used and the authors
871 found that a vaccine with efficacy against infection $\geq 70\%$ would eliminate
872 COVID-19. Outcomes were assessed over the course of ten years and the

873 authors assumed full vaccine protection over this time course, which appears
874 too high retrospectively. The authors studied two vaccination programs:
875 80% coverage before the onset of the epidemic and 80% coverage within one
876 month of the onset of the epidemic.

877 In [Campos et al. \(2021\)](#), an ODE-based SIR model was used to predict
878 the COVID-19 dynamics and compare with out-of-sample data from Rio de
879 Janeiro. In addition, numerical simulations were used to compare age-based
880 vaccine allocation strategies policies. Three age groups of similar size were
881 considered as vaccination targets. In in all the tested scenarios, prioritization
882 should be given to either those 15-34 or 50 year and older. The optimal choice
883 depends on the evaluation time period, vaccination schedules and efficacy of
884 the vaccine.

885 In [Angelov et al. \(2023\)](#), a non-standard age-structured ODE-based model
886 was proposed that differentiates between isolated and non-isolated as well as
887 symptomatically and asymptotically infected. The model further takes
888 into account the heterogeneity of the infected sub-population with respect to
889 the time since infection. Solving an optimal control problem, which considers
890 as one of the constraints the hospital capacity, the authors found that deaths
891 in Austria are minimized if those 18-30 years old (highest transmitters) are
892 vaccinated first, followed by those 80 and older (most at risk), followed by
893 other age groups.

894 In [Babus et al. \(2023\)](#), a linear programming problem is solved in order
895 to find a U.S. vaccination plan that minimizes deaths and the economic
896 cost of a stay-at-home order. The study considered occupation-based risk
897 exposure (454 occupations). The authors compared three different plans.
898 Under the only considered plan without a stay-at-home order, the largest
899 number of vaccines should be allocated to those 50–59 years old, followed by
900 those 60–69. In general, the best plans focused on age-based risk rather than
901 occupation-based risk exposure.

902 In [Miura et al. \(2021\)](#), the age-specific transmission intensities (i.e., the
903 next generation matrix) are reconstructed using an approximation method.
904 This enables the inference of the expected impact of vaccinating each sub-
905 group from data on incidence and force of infection. This unique approach
906 requires only routine surveillance data on the number of cases to determine
907 the best possible allocation of vaccines, and can be employed in data-scarce
908 environments. The method is tested with data from the Netherlands. The
909 authors conclude that the optimal timing of changing from vaccinating one
910 age group to another depends on the specific objective.

911 In [Cartocci et al. \(2021\)](#) an ODE-based SIR model that considers time-
 912 varying parameters and sex was used to compare Italian vaccination pro-
 913 grams, using the outcomes YLL, deaths and infections. According to the
 914 model, deaths (infections) are minimized by prioritizing elderly (younger).
 915 However, the optimal YLL-minimizing strategy depends on the effective re-
 916 productive number. If it is high, younger individuals should be prioritized.

917 In [Galli et al. \(2023\)](#) an ODE-based SIR model was used to predict
 918 COVID-19 dynamics and evaluate vaccination plans in the Southwest Shewa
 919 Zone in Ethiopia. A plan that prioritizes those 50 years and older was found
 920 to avoid more critical cases than a random vaccine allocation.

921 In [González-Parra et al. \(2022\)](#), two ODE-based SIAR models were used
 922 to study vaccine allocation strategies. Different scenarios related to the speed
 923 of the vaccine roll-out were compared. The authors found that generally
 924 those 55 years and older should be prioritized to minimize deaths. However,
 925 whenever the transmission rate is relatively high and elderly have a substan-
 926 tially lower transmission rate than younger people, the optimal prioritization
 927 switches.

928 In [Aruffo et al. \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based model with many compartments
 929 is used to study different Canadian vaccine roll-out and NPI-lifting scenar-
 930 ios. To minimize infections and shorten the time until NPIs can be lifted,
 931 those 20-59 years old should be prioritized. Different reopening scenarios
 932 and strategies were compared, with total cases and deaths depending on the
 933 timing of lifting NPIs.

934 5.1.2. *Agent-based models (ABMs)*

935 ABMs offer more flexibility and potential realism than ODE-based models
 936 but a proper analysis of these stochastic models requires simulations and is
 937 thus computationally expensive.

938 In [Jahn et al. \(2021\)](#), an ABM was developed to derive optimal vaccine
 939 allocation strategies for Austria. The model contains 9 million agents, one
 940 for each Austrian resident. Each agent possesses an associated state variable
 941 that describes its disease state. The model further accounts for age, occupa-
 942 tion (health care workers), testing and notification delays. The probability of
 943 an infection occurring during a single contact between an infected and a sus-
 944 ceptible was determined by calibrating the model to the number of detected
 945 Austrian COVID-19 cases in March 2020. The authors found that hospital-
 946 ization and deaths were minimized if elderly and vulnerable were prioritized,
 947 assuming very limited vaccine availability. To assign more vaccines, the au-

thors highlight the usefulness of a stepwise optimal allocation technique, in which small batches of vaccine are assigned at a time.

In [Ben-Zuk et al. \(2022\)](#), an ABM was used to derive and compare optimal vaccine allocation strategies for two Israeli cities of similar size but with different household size and age distributions. The authors compared two strategies: vaccinate those prioritized by public health decision makers, or dynamically prioritize neighborhoods with a high estimated reproductive number. Using infections and deaths as outcomes, the study highlights that optimal vaccination plans depend on subpopulation-specific infection rates and unique demographic characteristics.

In [Kadelka and McCombs \(2021\)](#), an ABM was used to highlight the effect of homophily and correlation between attitudes and opinions on vaccine prioritization. The authors argue that the U.S. society exhibits high levels of homophily w.r.t. to vaccine willingness and NPI adherence and that these two attributes are correlated, i.e., that people who get vaccinated are also more likely to engage in other risk mitigation. The authors found that these attributes must be taken into account to inform the optimal vaccine prioritization strategy, as they influence at which relative contact level of older compared to younger individuals the optimal prioritization target switches.

In [Tatapudi et al. \(2021\)](#), an ABM that considers various NPIs was developed to track the number of COVID-19 cases, hospitalized, and deaths for all age groups. 2.8 million agents were used to represent each resident in Miami Dade County, United States. Three vaccine allocation strategies were compared: (i) random allocation, (ii) prioritization by age, (iii) a minor variant of the CDC strategy, which prioritizes health care workers in addition to elderly. The authors found that a random allocation minimizes infections, while the CDC strategy minimizes deaths and YLL, although it proved only slightly better than the other two strategies.

In [Bushaj et al. \(2023\)](#), the Covasim ABM from [Kerr et al. \(2021\)](#) was expanded to compare a random with an age-structured vaccine allocation strategy. The authors show that a “governor Deep Reinforcement Learning agent” can learn effective strategies and suggest, based on a multi-objective reward structure, optimal ABM interventions when presented with a specific epidemic situation. Moreover, the study shows that focused vaccination of super-spreaders can substantially reduce infections at the expense of marginally more total deaths. The model was tested with data from the U.S. states New Jersey and Kansas.

In [Cattaneo et al. \(2022\)](#), the Covasim model is used to determine the

number of infections and deaths prevented by vaccines in the Italian region Lombardy, and to retrospectively evaluate vaccine allocation strategies. Prioritization of the elderly and at-risk categories, as used in Italy, was validated as the most effective in reducing deaths, however only as long as the vaccine roll-out happens fast enough.

5.2. Summary of optimal COVID-19 vaccine dosing interval studies that employ a mathematical model

The following studies all use a mathematical model that differentiates between those vaccinated with a single dose and two doses (i.e., fully vaccinated). The fundamental vaccine prioritization trade-off is between vaccinating more people at lower levels of protection or inducing higher protection for fewer individuals.

In Moghadas et al. (2021), an age-structured ABM with compartments SEPIAR was used that differentiated between the Pfizer and the Moderna vaccine. Varying rates of vaccine-induced immunity waning were considered. In addition, maximum vaccine coverage (i.e., vaccine hesitancy) was assumed to be age-dependent. Model parameters were informed by data from the United States. Outcomes were assessed by infections, hospitalizations, and deaths. The authors found that a delay of the second dose of at least 9 weeks would have averted deaths and hospitalizations compared to the recommended 4-week interval. For infections, the results differed for the two considered vaccines: while a delay of the second dose of Moderna vaccines would have reduced infections, delaying second doses of Pfizer vaccines may have caused more infections if pre-existing immunity is below 30% and if vaccine-induced one-dose immunity wanes.

In Tuite et al. (2021), a decision analytic cohort model was used to assess strategies for dose allocation (assuming a steady vaccine supply). The authors found that variants of a flexible strategy that keeps only 10% of the supply for second doses during the first 3 weeks are better than the fixed strategy employed by the United States.

In Souto Ferreira et al. (2022), an age-structured SEAIHR delay differential equation model was used to study the optimal timing between first and second dose. A constant vaccine production rate was assumed and vaccination rates were optimized using linear programming, with outcomes assessed by deaths. The authors found that the best strategy depends on an interplay between the vaccine production rate and the relative efficacy of the first dose.

1022 In [Ferreira et al. \(2022\)](#), a discrete-time compartmental model, fitted
1023 to Brazil and differentiating between three different vaccines, was used to
1024 investigate the optimal vaccine prioritization and dosing interval, which was
1025 varied from 8 to 12 weeks. The authors found that a shorter time interval
1026 between first and second dose for the AstraZeneca vaccine would minimize
1027 deaths. However, in their analysis, it appears that the vaccine availability is
1028 not fixed, i.e., a shorter time interval corresponds to more available vaccine,
1029 which is obviously beneficial. Moreover, the authors assumed large differences
1030 in vaccine efficacy between the first and the second doses, contrary to many
1031 other studies.

1032 In [Zuo et al. \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based SEIQR model was fitted to South
1033 Africa and used to answer questions related to vaccine prioritization and
1034 delay of the second dose. The authors found that, assuming limited vaccine
1035 availability, a delay of second doses leads to fewer severe COVID-19 cases.

1036 In [Gianatti et al. \(2023\)](#), a discrete-time model with compartments SEPIHR
1037 (no age groups) is fitted to data from the city of Tandil, Argentina. Assuming
1038 constant numbers of daily available vaccines, different fixed delays between
1039 the vaccine doses (28, 42, 72 days) were compared using death as the out-
1040 come metric. An optimal control problem was solved to determine the best
1041 way to administrate the available vaccines, by considering two controls that
1042 represent the number of first and second doses applied each day. The authors
1043 found that delaying the second dose as long as possible (72 days in the study)
1044 was optimal.

1045 In [Mak et al. \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based SEPAIHR model was used to in-
1046 vestigate three different policies related to vaccine roll-out: holding back
1047 second doses, releasing second doses, and delaying the time between doses.
1048 The authors found that releasing second doses reduces infections. However,
1049 stretching the between-dose time flattens the infection curve and reduces
1050 both hospitalizations and mortality compared with a strategy that releases
1051 second doses. The model includes details related to the inventory dynamics
1052 of the vaccine roll-out process not found in other models. The authors further
1053 conduct extensive sensitivity analyses related to age composition, risk-based
1054 prioritization, supply disruptions, and disease transmissibility.

1055 In [Romero-Brufau et al. \(2021\)](#), an age-structured ABM was used to in-
1056 vestigate the effect of a delayed second dose on deaths, infections and hospi-
1057 talizations. A total of 100k agents interact in 3 types of networks (occupation,
1058 family and random) over a period of six months. In all compared vaccina-
1059 tion plans, the allocation started with the oldest group and proceeded by

decreasing age. The authors found that a delayed second dose yields lower deaths as long as the first dose is sufficiently effective ($\geq 80\%$) but that a delay does not affect the YLL and infections much.

In [Diarra et al. \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based SEIARQ model, an adaptation of the CoMo model ([Aguas et al., 2020](#)), was used to study vaccination strategies in Senegal. Three particular vaccination strategies were evaluated, using deaths as outcome metric. The authors found the second dose should be delayed for those 40 years or younger.

In [Childs et al. \(2022\)](#), an age-structured ODE-based SEIS model that considers reinfections and immunity was used to determine questions related to vaccine prioritization and delay of the second dose in Canada. The authors found that a delay, as well as earlier vaccination of 15-19 year olds would both yield lower infections numbers.

5.3. Summary of spatial vaccine distribution studies that employ a mathematical model

In [Grauer et al. \(2020\)](#), a computational model with Brownian agents moving randomly through a continuous square space with periodic boundary conditions was introduced. Each agent has an internal state variable describing its disease state (e.g., S, I, or R). A statistical mean-field model was applied to study three vaccine allocation strategies: (i) distribution of vaccines proportional to population density, (ii) an “infection weighted strategy” that distributes vaccines proportional to the quantitative value of the bi-linear incidence rate βSI , and (iii) a “focusing strategy” that distributes the vaccines sequentially by prioritizing the regions with the highest incidence rate. The authors found that the last strategy minimized deaths; age was however not considered.

In [Molla et al. \(2022\)](#), a spatial ODE-based model was developed to model COVID-19 disease dynamics in five different Finnish regions. The authors combined age-specific contact data with geographic movement data to investigate the optimal vaccination strategies. Using optimal control methods, the authors found that allocating vaccines demographically and in an age-descending order is not optimal for minimizing deaths or infection cases. Instead, it proved optimal to prioritize high-incidence regions and allocate vaccines at the same time to different age groups.

In [Zhou et al. \(2021\)](#), the authors used cell phone data from a Chinese city to develop a spatial ABM for a realistic urban scenario. To compare seven different scenarios related to vaccine allocation, the authors assigned

the vaccines by fulfilling the priority group before advancing to the next priority group. The authors found that the vaccine coverage to reach herd immunity varies strongly across locations, highlighting the immense usefulness of knowledge of the spatial heterogeneity when designing vaccine allocation strategies.

In [Lemaitre et al. \(2022\)](#), an ODE-based spatial model of the 107 Italian provinces, originally developed in [Gatto et al. \(2020\)](#), was used to study optimal vaccine distribution across space. Google Community Mobility Reports was used to estimate the variations in mobility across provinces and as a proxy for changes in social contacts. The authors developed a novel optimal control framework that yields the best vaccination strategy under realistic supply and logistics constraints. The identified optimal strategy, which substantially outperforms standard strategies, has a complex structure: while mainly dependent on the projected incidence of each province, it also takes into account the spatial connectivity between provinces.

In [Vo et al. \(2023\)](#), an age-stratified ODE-based spatial SEIR model of the 50 U.S. states was used to illustrate the utility of mechanistic expressions for the basic and effective reproductive number, as well as to compare two vaccine prioritization strategies: a uniform allocation and an allocation along the gradient of the effective reproductive number. The authors showed that the latter approach yields fewer infections but they acknowledged that this would come at the expense of more hospitalizations and deaths.

6. Related studies that employ optimal control methods

The majority of studies included in this review identified vaccine allocation strategies that optimize a given metric, e.g. minimizing deaths or infections. Some studies went further and identified strategies that are Pareto-optimal with respect to multiple objectives, see e.g. [Islam et al. \(2021\)](#); [Gavish and Katriel \(2022\)](#); [Diarra et al. \(2022\)](#). A number of studies, some already described above, went even further and employed classical optimal control theory to find vaccination strategies that minimize a variety of health and/or economic outcomes. Some of these studies even consider age-dependent vaccine access.

These studies define a functional - often a linear combination of different metrics - that is optimized given some constraints, e.g., to account for limited vaccine availability. A general challenge of optimal control approaches is the high sensitivity of the resulting optimal vaccination strategy on the choice

of weights in the functional. Moreover, the choice of functional itself affects the results. Nevertheless, these studies can provide important insights as the setup is more flexible, and we briefly describe some interesting approaches and note that several others (e.g., [Lemaitre et al. \(2022\)](#); [Angelov et al. \(2023\)](#)) are already summarized above.

In [Acuña-Zegarra et al. \(2021\)](#), an ODE-based SEAIR model (no age structure) was used to show that the optimal vaccination strategy depends on the speed of the vaccine roll-out and the length of natural immunity. The transmission contact rates and proportion of symptomatic cases were estimated by calibrating the model to observed death counts. The basic reproductive number was estimated to be in the range of $[3.30, 4.84]$. The authors minimized a functional that was a linear combination of YLL and Years Lost due to Disability. The authors found that varying the number of doses during the vaccine roll-out (if supply allows) yields to better outcomes than an approach with fixed number of vaccinations per day.

In [Tu et al. \(2023\)](#), the authors proposed a reaction-diffusion COVID-19 model (no age structure) to investigate how different vaccination-isolation strategies impact the COVID-19 pandemic. The functional included three metrics: social cost, social benefit, and the basic reproduction number. The authors found that for a given social cost or benefit, there are many Pareto-optimal vaccination-isolation strategies. The proposed model considered also a spatial variable, in addition to parameters related to social distancing and vaccination.

In [Olivares and Staffetti \(2021a\)](#), two control variables, vaccination and testing, were used to find the optimal strategy that minimizes a functional that accounts for the number of infected people with life-threatening symptoms and the number of deaths. The underlying model is ODE-based with a variety of compartments. Several optimal control problems were solved for different scenarios. Among others, the authors found that it is optimal to roll-out a vaccine as fast as possible. In [Olivares and Staffetti \(2021b\)](#), the same authors studied scenarios with different vaccine availability. The functional here depends on the number of symptomatic and asymptomatic infectious. The authors found again that early implementation of vaccination and testing reduces the number of symptomatically infected the most. However, if vaccine availability increases gradually, the optimal vaccination strategy differs quite strongly from other scenarios. Finally in [Olivares and Staffetti \(2021c\)](#), the same authors considered a mass vaccination plan, and polynomial chaos expansion was used to assess the uncertainty of the mod-

eling outcomes.

In [Ziarelli et al. \(2023\)](#), an age-stratified two-dose ODE-based SIR model was calibrated to death counts from Italy, and several optimal control problems were solved, minimizing deaths, infections and hospitalizations independently. In each problem, the total number of vaccine doses was fixed but the distribution of the available doses among susceptibles and those who already received their first dose was optimized. The authors found that the deaths-minimizing strategy prioritized those 80 years and older, followed, interestingly, by those 20-39 years old. On the other hand, the infections-minimizing vaccination strategy prioritizes the 20-39 and 40-59 age groups but not children and teenagers despite them having the most contacts. This work nicely highlights the complexities of designing optimal age-based vaccine prioritization strategies.

In [Choi and Shim \(2021\)](#), an age-structured ODE-based model for South Korea was developed. Solving an optimal control problem with a functional that considers the cost of vaccination, as well as the cost of symptomatic and hospitalized infected, the authors found that the optimal vaccination strategy depends on the way the vaccine functions. While “susceptibility-reducing” vaccines should be allocated relatively evenly. On the other hand, “symptom-reducing” vaccines should, surprisingly, be allocated to those 20-29 and 50 and older but not to those 30-49 years old. The impact of vaccine function proved particular strong if the roll-out was assumed to be fast.

In [Libotte et al. \(2020\)](#), an SIR model was calibrated to data from China. An inverse problem was solved to determine the transmission rate, infectious period, initial number of infecteds and basic reproduction number (\mathcal{R}_0). The authors developed a multi-objective optimal control problem, in which the number of vaccines and the total number of infected are simultaneously minimized. This problem is solved using Differential Evolution, yielding a set of Pareto-optimal vaccination strategies.

In [Zhang et al. \(2024\)](#), an optimal control problem was solved with the aim of minimizing deaths and conserving vaccines at the same time. The population was divided into four subpopulations: health workers, young individuals, middle-aged individuals, and the elderly. The authors found that the optimal vaccination strategy substantially improved upon a proportional vaccine roll-out.

There exist numerous other works that use classical optimal control to identify optimal COVID-19 vaccination strategies, most of them minimizing an objective functional which accounts for infected cases, deaths or the num-

ber of vaccines [Agossou et al. \(2021\)](#); [Al-arydah \(2023\)](#); [Salcedo-Varela et al. \(2023\)](#); [Shen et al. \(2021\)](#); [Zaitri et al. \(2022\)](#). In particular, some works have combined optimal control with age-structured models to find the optimal vaccination allocation [Avci and Yurtoğlu \(2023\)](#); [Chhetri et al. \(2022\)](#); [Kumar et al. \(2021\)](#). Optimal control employed on infectious disease models represents a powerful tool to identify optimal vaccine allocation strategies. However, setting up the optimal control problem including the constraints regarding vaccine availability is crucial but it is challenging to restrict the search to vaccination programs that can be implemented in the real world. The choice of the functional to be minimized is also crucial, as strongly affects the optimal outcomes, see e.g., [Ledzewicz and Schättler \(2020\)](#).

7. Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic constitutes one of the worst pandemics humankind has ever endured, both in terms of lives lost and economic repercussions. It is also the first pandemic in a globalized world. The rapid spread of the disease around the world was enabled by high levels of connection, transport and travel between distant parts of the world. This is not going to change, which is why the world will eventually face another pandemic. Whether this will be caused by a highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 that has evolved to evade immune defenses or by an entirely novel pathogen cannot be predicted. However, we can learn from mistakes made during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure better preparedness for a future pandemic. On the mathematical modeling front, this includes fully understanding the effect realistic human behavior and social processes have on the outcomes in infectious disease models. Specifically for models designed to inform prioritization strategies for a vaccine that will initially always be limited, we need to look beyond the details of specific models and understand the greater connections behind explicit and implicit model assumptions and outcomes. This is what we attempted in this systematic review of mathematical models designed to find optimal COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies.

Acknowledgments

G.G.-P. acknowledges funding from Maria Zambrano (UPV, Ministry of Universities of Spain by the European Union-Next generation EU) and an

Institutional Development Award (IDeA) from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under grant number P20GM103451. C.K. was partially supported by a travel grant (712537) from the Simons Foundation.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Acuña-Zegarra, M.A., Díaz-Infante, S., Baca-Carrasco, D., Olmos-Liceaga, D., 2021. COVID-19 optimal vaccination policies: a modeling study on efficacy, natural and vaccine-induced immunity responses. *Mathematical Biosciences* 337, 108614.
- Agossou, O., Atchadé, M.N., Djibril, A.M., 2021. Modeling the effects of preventive measures and vaccination on the COVID-19 spread in Benin Republic with optimal control. *Results in Physics* 31, 104969.
- Aguas, R., White, L., Hupert, N., Shretta, R., Pan-Ngum, W., Celhay, O., Moldokmatova, A., Arifi, F., Mirzazadeh, A., Sharifi, H., et al., 2020. Modelling the COVID-19 pandemic in context: an international participatory approach. *BMJ global health* 5, e003126.
- Al-arydah, M., 2023. Mathematical modeling and optimal control for COVID-19 with population behavior. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences* 46, 19184–19198.
- Althobaity, Y., Wu, J., Tildesley, M.J., 2022. Non-pharmaceutical interventions and their relevance in the COVID-19 vaccine rollout in Saudi Arabia and Arab Gulf countries. *Infectious Disease Modelling* 7, 545–560.
- Angelov, G., Kovacevic, R., Stilianakis, N.I., Veliov, V.M., 2023. Optimal vaccination strategies using a distributed model applied to COVID-19. *Central Europe an Journal of Operations Research* 31, 499–521.
- Anupong, S., Chantanasaro, T., Wilasang, C., Jitsuk, N.C., Sararat, C., Sornbundit, K., Pattanasiri, B., Wannigama, D.L., Amarasiri, M., Chadsuthi, S., et al., 2023. Modeling vaccination strategies with limited

1272 early COVID-19 vaccine access in low-and middle-income countries: A case
1273 study of Thailand. *Infectious Disease Modelling* 8, 1177–1189.

1274 Are, E.B., Card, K.G., Colijn, C., 2024. The role of vaccine status homophily
1275 in the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional survey with modelling. *BMC*
1276 *Public Health* 24, 1–16.

1277 Aruffo, E., Yuan, P., Tan, Y., Gatov, E., Moyles, I., Bélair, J., Watmough, J.,
1278 Collier, S., Arino, J., Zhu, H., 2022. Mathematical modelling of vaccination
1279 rollout and NPIs lifting on COVID-19 transmission with VOC: a case study
1280 in Toronto, Canada. *BMC public health* 22, 1–12.

1281 Avcı, D., Yurtoğlu, M., 2023. An optimal vaccination scenario for COVID-19
1282 transmission between children and adults, in: *Mathematical Modeling and*
1283 *Intelligent Control for Combating Pandemics*. Springer, pp. 93–108.

1284 Ayoub, H.H., Chemaitelly, H., Makhoul, M., Al Kanaani, Z., Al Kuwari, E.,
1285 Butt, A.A., Coyle, P., Jeremijenko, A., Kaleeckal, A.H., Latif, A.N., et al.,
1286 2021. Epidemiological impact of prioritising SARS-CoV-2 vaccination by
1287 antibody status: mathematical modelling analyses. *BMJ innovations* 7.

1288 Babus, A., Das, S., Lee, S., 2023. The optimal allocation of COVID-19
1289 vaccines. *Economics Letters* 224, 111008.

1290 Barmounakis, P., Demiris, N., Kontoyiannis, I., Pavlakis, G.N., Sypsa, V.,
1291 2022. Evaluating the effects of second-dose vaccine-delay policies in Europe
1292 an countries: A simulation study based on data from Greece. *PLOS One*
1293 17, e0263977.

1294 Ben-Zuk, N., Daon, Y., Sasson, A., Ben-Adi, D., Huppert, A., Nevo, D.,
1295 Obolski, U., 2022. Assessing COVID-19 vaccination strategies in varied
1296 demographics using an individual-based model. *Frontiers in public health*
1297 10, 966756.

1298 Bubar, K.M., Reinholt, K., Kissler, S.M., Lipsitch, M., Cobey, S., Grad,
1299 Y.H., Larremore, D.B., 2021. Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization
1300 strategies by age and serostatus. *Science* 371, 916–921.

1301 Buckner, J.H., Chowell, G., Springborn, M.R., 2021. Dynamic prioritization
1302 of COVID-19 vaccines when social distancing is limited for essential work-
1303 ers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118, e2025786118.

- 1304 Burgio, G., Steinegger, B., Arenas, A., 2022. Homophily impacts the success
1305 of vaccine roll-outs. *Communications Physics* 5, 70.
- 1306 Bushaj, S., Yin, X., Beqiri, A., Andrews, D., Büyüktaktın, I.E., 2023.
1307 A simulation-deep reinforcement learning (SiRL) approach for epidemic
1308 control optimization. *Annals of Operations Research* 328, 245–277.
- 1309 Caga-anan, R.L., Macalisang, J.M., Dalisay, J.L.M., Raza, M.N., Martinez,
1310 J.G.T., Arcede, J.P., 2023. Optimal vaccination control for COVID-19 in
1311 a metapopulation model: a case of the philippines. *Frontiers in Applied*
1312 *Mathematics and Statistics* 9, 1154634.
- 1313 Campbell, F., Archer, B., Laurenson-Schafer, H., Jinnai, Y., Konings, F.,
1314 Batra, N., Pavlin, B., Vandemaele, K., Van Kerkhove, M.D., Jombart, T.,
1315 et al., 2021. Increased transmissibility and global spread of SARS-CoV-2
1316 variants of concern as at June 2021. *Eurosurveillance* 26, 2100509.
- 1317 Campos, E.L., Cysne, R.P., Madureira, A.L., Mendes, G.L., 2021. Multi-
1318 generational SIR modeling: Determination of parameters, epidemiologi-
1319 cal forecasting and age-dependent vaccination policies. *Infectious Disease*
1320 *Modelling* 6, 751–765.
- 1321 Cartocci, A., Cevenini, G., Barbini, P., 2021. A compartment modeling
1322 approach to reconstruct and analyze gender and age-grouped COVID-19
1323 Italian data for decision-making strategies. *Journal of Biomedical Inform-*
1324 *atics* 118, 103793.
- 1325 Cattaneo, A., Vitali, A., Mazzoleni, M., Previdi, F., 2022. An agent-based
1326 model to assess large-scale COVID-19 vaccination campaigns for the Italian
1327 territory: The case study of Lombardy region. *Computer Methods and*
1328 *Programs in Biomedicine* 224, 107029.
- 1329 Centers for Disease Control (CDC), . <https://www.cdc.gov/museum/timeline/covid19.html>
1330 [accessed: 01/14/2024].
- 1331 Chakraborty, C., Sharma, A.R., Bhattacharya, M., Lee, S.S., 2022. A de-
1332 tailed overview of immune escape, antibody escape, partial vaccine escape
1333 of SARS-CoV-2 and their emerging variants with escape mutations. *Fron-*
1334 *tiers in Immunology* 13, 801522.

1335 Chen, X., Zhu, G., Zhang, L., Fang, Y., Guo, L., Chen, X., 2021. Design and
1336 analysis of network behaviors for optimizing network energy efficiency in 5g
1337 mmwave systems. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*
1338 8, 1862–1872.

1339 Chhetri, B., Vamsi, D., Prakash, D.B., Balasubramanian, S., Sanjeevi, C.B.,
1340 2022. Age structured mathematical modeling studies on COVID-19 with
1341 respect to combined vaccination and medical treatment strategies. *Com-
1342 putational and Mathematical Biophysics* 10, 281–303.

1343 Childs, L., Dick, D.W., Feng, Z., Heffernan, J.M., Li, J., Röst, G., 2022.
1344 Modeling waning and boosting of COVID-19 in Canada with vaccination.
1345 *Epidemics* 39, 100583.

1346 Choi, W., Shim, E., 2021. Vaccine effects on susceptibility and symptoma-
1347 tology can change the optimal allocation of COVID-19 vaccines: South
1348 Korea as an example. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 10, 2813.

1349 Choi, Y., Kim, J.S., Kim, J.E., Choi, H., Lee, C.H., 2021. Vaccination
1350 prioritization strategies for COVID-19 in Korea: a mathematical modeling
1351 approach. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
1352 Health* 18, 4240.

1353 Coletti, P., Wambua, J., Gimma, A., Willem, L., Vercruysse, S., Vanhoutte,
1354 B., Jarvis, C.I., Van Zandvoort, K., Edmunds, J., Beutels, P., et al., 2020.
1355 CoMix: comparing mixing patterns in the belgian population during and
1356 after lockdown. *Scientific reports* 10, 21885.

1357 Conway, E., Walker, C.R., Baker, C., Lydeamore, M.J., Ryan, G.E., Camp-
1358 bell, T., Miller, J.C., Rebuli, N., Yeung, M., Kabashima, G., et al., 2023.
1359 COVID-19 vaccine coverage targets to inform reopening plans in a low
1360 incidence setting. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 290, 20231437.

1361 Davies, N.G., Klepac, P., Liu, Y., Prem, K., Jit, M., Eggo, R.M., 2020. Age-
1362 dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics.
1363 *Nature medicine* 26, 1205–1211.

1364 Diarra, M., Kebir, A., Talla, C., Barry, A., Faye, J., Louati, D., Opatowski,
1365 L., Diop, M., White, L.J., Loucoubar, C., et al., 2022. Non-pharmaceutical
1366 interventions and COVID-19 vaccination strategies in Senegal: a modelling
1367 study. *BMJ global health* 7, e007236.

- 1368 Dryhurst, S., Schneider, C.R., Kerr, J., Freeman, A.L., Recchia, G., Van
1369 Der Bles, A.M., Spiegelhalter, D., Van Der Linden, S., 2022. Risk per-
1370 ceptions of COVID-19 around the world, in: COVID-19. Routledge, pp.
1371 162–174.
- 1372 Ferranna, M., Cadarette, D., Bloom, D.E., 2021. COVID-19 vaccine allo-
1373 cation: Modeling health outcomes and equity implications of alternative
1374 strategies. *Engineering* 7, 924–935.
- 1375 Ferreira, L.S., de Almeida, G.B., Borges, M.E., Simon, L.M., Poloni, S.,
1376 Bagattini, Â.M., da Rosa, M.Q.M., Diniz Filho, J.A.F., de Souza Kuchen-
1377 becker, R., Camey, S.A., et al., 2022. Modelling optimal vaccination strate-
1378 gies against COVID-19 in a context of Gamma variant predominance in
1379 Brazil. *Vaccine* 40, 6616–6624.
- 1380 Foy, B.H., Wahl, B., Mehta, K., Shet, A., Menon, G.I., Britto, C., 2021.
1381 Comparing COVID-19 vaccine allocation strategies in India: A mathe-
1382 matical modelling study. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 103,
1383 431–438.
- 1384 Funk, S., Knapp, J.K., Lebo, E., Reef, S.E., Dabbagh, A.J., Kretsinger, K.,
1385 Jit, M., Edmunds, W.J., Strebel, P.M., 2019. Combining serological and
1386 contact data to derive target immunity levels for achieving and maintaining
1387 measles elimination. *BMC medicine* 17, 1–12.
- 1388 Galli, M., Zardini, A., Gamshie, W.N., Santini, S., Tsegaye, A., Trentini,
1389 F., Marziano, V., Guzzetta, G., Manica, M., d’Andrea, V., et al., 2023.
1390 Priority age targets for COVID-19 vaccination in Ethiopia under limited
1391 vaccine supply. *Scientific Reports* 13, 5586.
- 1392 Gatto, M., Bertuzzo, E., Mari, L., Miccoli, S., Carraro, L., Casagrandi, R.,
1393 Rinaldo, A., 2020. Spread and dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in
1394 Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures. *Proceedings of the*
1395 *National Academy of Sciences* 117, 10484–10491.
- 1396 Gavish, N., Katriel, G., 2022. The role of childrens’ vaccination for COVID-
1397 19—Pareto-optimal allocations of vaccines. *PLoS Computational Biology*
1398 18, e1009872.

- 1399 Gianatti, J., Lotito, P., Neder, J., Núñez, P., Parente, L., 2023. Optimal
1400 vaccination policies for covid-19 considering vaccine doses delays. Trends
1401 in Computational and Applied Mathematics 24, 121–139.
- 1402 Gonzalez-Parra, G., 2021. Analysis of delayed vaccination regimens: A math-
1403 ematical modeling approach. Epidemiologia 2, 271–293.
- 1404 González-Parra, G., Cogollo, M.R., Arenas, A.J., 2022. Mathematical mod-
1405 eling to study optimal allocation of vaccines against COVID-19 using an
1406 age-structured population. Axioms 11, 109.
- 1407 Gozzi, N., Bajardi, P., Perra, N., 2021. The importance of non-
1408 pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 vaccine rollout. PLoS
1409 computational biology 17, e1009346.
- 1410 Gozzi, N., Chinazzi, M., Davis, J.T., Mu, K., Pastore y Piontti, A., Ajelli,
1411 M., Perra, N., Vespignani, A., 2022. Anatomy of the first six months of
1412 COVID-19 vaccination campaign in Italy. PLoS Computational Biology
1413 18, e1010146.
- 1414 Grauer, J., Löwen, H., Liebchen, B., 2020. Strategic spatiotemporal vaccine
1415 distribution increases the survival rate in an infectious disease like COVID-
1416 19. Scientific reports 10, 1–10.
- 1417 Grundel, S.M., Heyder, S., Hotz, T., Ritschel, T.K., Sauerteig, P., Worth-
1418 mann, K., 2021. How to coordinate vaccination and social distancing to
1419 mitigate SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks. SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical
1420 Systems 20, 1135–1157.
- 1421 Hale, T., Angrist, N., Goldszmidt, R., Kira, B., Petherick, A., Phillips, T.,
1422 Webster, S., Cameron-Blake, E., Hallas, L., Majumdar, S., et al., 2021.
1423 A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Govern-
1424 ment Response Tracker). Nature human behaviour 5, 529–538.
- 1425 Halloran, M.E., Struchiner, C.J., Longini Jr, I.M., 1997. Study designs for
1426 evaluating different efficacy and effectiveness aspects of vaccines. American
1427 journal of epidemiology 146, 789–803.
- 1428 Han, S., Cai, J., Yang, J., Zhang, J., Wu, Q., Zheng, W., Shi, H., Ajelli,
1429 M., Zhou, X.H., Yu, H., 2021. Time-varying optimization of COVID-19

1430 vaccine prioritization in the context of limited vaccination capacity. *Nature*
1431 *communications* 12, 4673.

1432 Hiraoka, T., Rizi, A.K., Kivelä, M., Saramäki, J., 2022. Herd immunity and
1433 epidemic size in networks with vaccination homophily. *Physical Review E*
1434 105, L052301.

1435 Hogan, A.B., Winskill, P., Watson, O.J., Walker, P.G., Whittaker, C.,
1436 Baguelin, M., Brazeau, N.F., Charles, G.D., Gaythorpe, K.A., Hamlet,
1437 A., et al., 2021. Within-country age-based prioritisation, global allocation,
1438 and public health impact of a vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: A mathematical
1439 modelling analysis. *Vaccine* 39, 2995–3006.

1440 Hong, Z., Li, Y., Gong, Y., Chen, W., 2022. A data-driven spatially-specific
1441 vaccine allocation framework for COVID-19. *Annals of Operations Re-*
1442 *search* , 1–24.

1443 Hupert, N., Marín-Hernández, D., Gao, B., Águas, R., Nixon, D.F., 2022.
1444 Heterologous vaccination interventions to reduce pandemic morbidity and
1445 mortality: Modeling the US winter 2020 COVID-19 wave. *Proceedings of*
1446 *the National Academy of Sciences* 119, e2025448119.

1447 Islam, M.R., Oraby, T., McCombs, A., Chowdhury, M.M., Al-Mamun, M.,
1448 Tyshenko, M.G., Kadelka, C., 2021. Evaluation of the United States
1449 COVID-19 vaccine allocation strategy. *PLOS One* 16, e0259700.

1450 Jahn, B., Sroczynski, G., Bicher, M., Rippinger, C., Mühlberger, N., Santa-
1451 maria, J., Urach, C., Schomaker, M., Stojkov, I., Schmid, D., et al., 2021.
1452 Targeted COVID-19 Vaccination (TAV-COVID) Considering Limited Vac-
1453 cination Capacities—An Agent-Based Modeling Evaluation. *Vaccines* 9,
1454 434.

1455 Jentsch, P.C., Anand, M., Bauch, C.T., 2021. Prioritising COVID-19 vacci-
1456 nation in changing social and epidemiological landscapes: a mathematical
1457 modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 21, 1097–1106.

1458 Jimenez-Rodriguez, P., Munoz-Fernandez, G.A., Rodrigo-Chocano, J.C.,
1459 Seoane-Sepulveda, J.B., Weber, A., 2022. A population structure-sensitive
1460 mathematical model assessing the effects of vaccination during the third
1461 surge of COVID-19 in Italy. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Appli-*
1462 *cations* 514, 125975.

1463 Kadelka, C., 2023. Projecting social contact matrices to populations stratified
1464 by binary attributes with known homophily. *Mathematical biosciences and*
1465 *engineering: MBE* 20, 3282–3300.

1466 Kadelka, C., Islam, M.R., McCombs, A., Alston, J., Morton, N., 2022. Ethnic
1467 homophily affects vaccine prioritization strategies. *Journal of Theoretical*
1468 *Biology* 555, 111295.

1469 Kadelka, C., McCombs, A., 2021. Effect of homophily and correlation of
1470 beliefs on COVID-19 and general infectious disease outbreaks. *PLOS One*
1471 16, e0260973.

1472 Karabay, A., Kuzdeuov, A., Ospanova, S., Lewis, M., Varol, H.A., 2021.
1473 A vaccination simulator for COVID-19: Effective and sterilizing immu-
1474 nization cases. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* 25,
1475 4317–4327.

1476 Kekić, A., Dehning, J., Gresele, L., von Kügelgen, J., Priesemann, V.,
1477 Schölkopf, B., 2023. Evaluating vaccine allocation strategies using
1478 simulation-assisted causal modeling. *Patterns* 4, 100739.

1479 Kermack, W.O., McKendrick, A.G., 1927. A contribution to the mathe-
1480 matical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London.*
1481 *Series A, Containing papers of a mathematical and physical character* 115,
1482 700–721.

1483 Kerr, C.C., Stuart, R.M., Mistry, D., Abeysuriya, R.G., Rosenfeld, K., Hart,
1484 G.R., Núñez, R.C., Cohen, J.A., Selvaraj, P., Hagedorn, B., et al., 2021.
1485 Covasim: an agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions.
1486 *PLOS Computational Biology* 17, e1009149.

1487 Kiem, C.T., Massonnaud, C.R., Levy-Bruhl, D., Poletto, C., Colizza, V.,
1488 Bosetti, P., Fontanet, A., Gabet, A., Olié, V., Zanetti, L., et al., 2021.
1489 A modelling study investigating short and medium-term challenges for
1490 COVID-19 vaccination: From prioritisation to the relaxation of measures.
1491 *EClinicalMedicine* 38.

1492 Kobayashi, T., Nishiura, H., 2022. Prioritizing COVID-19 vaccination. part
1493 2: Real-time comparison between single-dose and double-dose in Japan.
1494 *Math. Biosci. Eng* 19, 7410–7424.

1495 Kumar, A., Viswakarma, N.K., Adlakha, A., Mukherjee, K., 2021. How
1496 successful have the lockdowns been in controlling the (COVID-19/SARS-
1497 CoV-2) pandemic—A simulation-based analysis. *International Journal of*
1498 *Modeling, Simulation, and Scientific Computing* , 2041002.

1499 Ledzewicz, U., Schättler, H., 2020. On the role of the objective in the op-
1500 timization of compartmental models for biomedical therapies. *Journal of*
1501 *optimization theory and applications* 187, 305–335.

1502 Lemaitre, J.C., Pasetto, D., Zanon, M., Bertuzzo, E., Mari, L., Miccoli, S.,
1503 Casagrandi, R., Gatto, M., Rinaldo, A., 2022. Optimal control of the
1504 spatial allocation of COVID-19 vaccines: Italy as a case study. *PLoS*
1505 *computational biology* 18, e1010237.

1506 Li, M., Zu, J., Zhang, Y., Ma, L., Shen, M., Li, Z., Ji, F., 2022. COVID-19
1507 epidemic in New York City: development of an age group-specific math-
1508 ematical model to predict the outcome of various vaccination strategies.
1509 *Virology Journal* 19, 1–13.

1510 Li, R., Bjørnstad, O.N., Stenseth, N.C., 2021. Prioritizing vaccination by
1511 age and social activity to advance societal health benefits in Norway: a
1512 modelling study. *The Lancet Regional Health–Europe* 10.

1513 Libotte, G.B., Lobato, F.S., Platt, G.M., Neto, A.J.S., 2020. Determination
1514 of an optimal control strategy for vaccine administration in COVID-19
1515 pandemic treatment. *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine*
1516 196, 105664.

1517 Liu, K., Lou, Y., 2022. Optimizing COVID-19 vaccination programs during
1518 vaccine shortages. *Infectious Disease Modelling* 7, 286–298.

1519 Liu, Y., Pearson, C.A., Sandmann, F.G., Barnard, R.C., Kim, J.H., Flasche,
1520 S., Jit, M., Abbas, K., 2022a. Dosing interval strategies for two-dose
1521 COVID-19 vaccination in 13 middle-income countries of Europe: Health
1522 impact modelling and benefit-risk analysis. *The Lancet Regional Health–*
1523 *Europe* 17.

1524 Liu, Y., Sandmann, F.G., Barnard, R.C., Pearson, C.A., Pastore, R., Pebody,
1525 R., Flasche, S., Jit, M., 2022b. Optimising health and economic impacts of
1526 COVID-19 vaccine prioritisation strategies in the WHO European Region:
1527 a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Regional Health–Europe* 12.

1528 Liu, Z., Omayrat, M., Stursberg, O., 2021. A study on model-based optimiza-
1529 tion of vaccination strategies against epidemic virus spread., in: ICINCO,
1530 pp. 630–637.

1531 Lloyd, A.L., 2001. Realistic distributions of infectious periods in epidemic
1532 models: changing patterns of persistence and dynamics. *Theoretical pop-*
1533 *ulation biology* 60, 59–71.

1534 Luangasanatip, N., Painter, C., Pan-ngum, W., Saralamba, S., Wichaita,
1535 T., White, L., Aguas, R., Clapham, H., Wang, Y., Isaranuwachai, W.,
1536 et al., 2023. How to model the impact of vaccines for policymaking when
1537 the characteristics are uncertain: A case study in Thailand prior to the
1538 vaccine rollout during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Vaccine* 41, 4854–4860.

1539 Luebben, G., González-Parra, G., Cervantes, B., 2023. Study of optimal vac-
1540 cination strategies for early COVID-19 pandemic using an age-structured
1541 mathematical model: A case study of the USA. *Mathematical Biosciences*
1542 *and Engineering* 20, 10828–10865.

1543 Luo, Q., Weightman, R., Mcquade, S., Díaz, M., Trélat, E., Barbour, W.,
1544 Work, D., Samaranayake, S., Piccoli, B., 2022. Optimization of vaccination
1545 for COVID-19 in the midst of a pandemic. *Networks and Heterogeneous*
1546 *Media* 17, 443–466.

1547 MacIntyre, C.R., Costantino, V., Trent, M., 2022. Modelling of COVID-19
1548 vaccination strategies and herd immunity, in scenarios of limited and full
1549 vaccine supply in NSW, Australia. *Vaccine* 40, 2506–2513.

1550 Mak, H.Y., Dai, T., Tang, C.S., 2022. Managing two-dose COVID-19 vaccine
1551 rollouts with limited supply: Operations strategies for distributing time-
1552 sensitive resources. *Production and Operations Management* 31, 4424–
1553 4442.

1554 Makhoul, M., Ayoub, H.H., Chemaitelly, H., Seedat, S., Mumtaz, G.R.,
1555 Al-Omari, S., Abu-Raddad, L.J., 2020. Epidemiological impact of SARS-
1556 CoV-2 vaccination: Mathematical modeling analyses. *Vaccines* 8, 668.

1557 Mandal, S., Arinaminpathy, N., Bhargava, B., Panda, S., 2021. India’s prag-
1558 matic vaccination strategy against COVID-19: a mathematical modelling-
1559 based analysis. *BMJ open* 11, e048874.

1560 Markov, P.V., Ghafari, M., Beer, M., Lythgoe, K., Simmonds, P., Stilianakis,
1561 N.I., Katzourakis, A., 2023. The evolution of SARS-CoV-2. *Nature Re-*
1562 *views Microbiology* 21, 361–379.

1563 Masters, N.B., Shih, S.F., Bukoff, A., Akel, K.B., Kobayashi, L.C., Miller,
1564 A.L., Harapan, H., Lu, Y., Wagner, A.L., 2020. Social distancing in re-
1565 sponse to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) in the United States. *PLOS*
1566 *One* 15, e0239025.

1567 Matrajt, L., Eaton, J., Leung, T., Brown, E.R., 2021a. Vaccine optimization
1568 for COVID-19: Who to vaccinate first? *Science Advances* 7, eabf1374.

1569 Matrajt, L., Eaton, J., Leung, T., Dimitrov, D., Schiffer, J.T., Swan, D.A.,
1570 Janes, H., 2021b. Optimizing vaccine allocation for COVID-19 vaccines
1571 shows the potential role of single-dose vaccination. *Nature communications*
1572 12, 3449.

1573 McBryde, E.S., Meehan, M.T., Caldwell, J.M., Adekunle, A.I., Ogunlade,
1574 S.T., Kuddus, M.A., Ragonnet, R., Jayasundara, P., Trauer, J.M., Cope,
1575 R.C., 2021. Modelling direct and herd protection effects of vaccination
1576 against the SARS-CoV-2 delta variant in Australia. *Medical Journal of*
1577 *Australia* 215, 427–432.

1578 McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., Cook, J.M., 2001. Birds of a feather:
1579 Homophily in social networks. *Annual review of sociology* 27, 415–444.

1580 Miura, F., Leung, K.Y., Klinkenberg, D., Ainslie, K.E., Wallinga, J., 2021.
1581 Optimal vaccine allocation for COVID-19 in the Netherlands: A data-
1582 driven prioritization. *PLoS computational biology* 17, e1009697.

1583 Moghadas, S.M., Vilches, T.N., Zhang, K., Nourbakhsh, S., Sah, P., Fitz-
1584 patrick, M.C., Galvani, A.P., 2021. Evaluation of COVID-19 vaccination
1585 strategies with a delayed second dose. *PLoS Biology* 19, e3001211.

1586 Molla, J., Ponce de León Chávez, A., Hiraoka, T., Ala-Nissila, T., Kivelä,
1587 M., Leskelä, L., 2022. Adaptive and optimized COVID-19 vaccination
1588 strategies across geographical regions and age groups. *PLoS computational*
1589 *biology* 18, e1009974.

1590 Moore, S., Hill, E.M., Dyson, L., Tildesley, M.J., Keeling, M.J., 2021a. Mod-
1591 elling optimal vaccination strategy for SARS-CoV-2 in the UK. PLoS
1592 computational biology 17, e1008849.

1593 Moore, S., Hill, E.M., Tildesley, M.J., Dyson, L., Keeling, M.J., 2021b. Vac-
1594 cination and non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19: a mathe-
1595 matical modelling study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases 21, 793–802.

1596 Morales-Zamora, G., Espinosa, O., Puertas, E., Fernández, J.C., Hernández,
1597 J., Zakzuk, V., Cepeda, M., Alvis-Gúzman, N., Castañeda-Orjuela, C.,
1598 Paternina-Cacedo, A., 2022. Cost-effectiveness analysis of strategies of
1599 COVID-19 vaccination in Colombia: comparison of high-risk prioritization
1600 and no prioritization strategies with the absence of a vaccination plan.
1601 Value in Health Regional Issues 31, 101–110.

1602 Mossong, J., Hens, N., Jit, M., Beutels, P., Auranen, K., Mikolajczyk, R.,
1603 Massari, M., Salmaso, S., Tomba, G.S., Wallinga, J., et al., 2008. Social
1604 contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases.
1605 PLoS medicine 5, e74.

1606 New York Times, . [https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/covid-](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/covid-vaccinations-tracker.html)
1607 [vaccinations-tracker.html](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/covid-vaccinations-tracker.html) [accessed: 01/14/2024].

1608 Noh, E.B., Nam, H.K., Lee, H., 2021. Which group should be vaccinated
1609 first?: A systematic review. Infection & chemotherapy 53, 261–270.

1610 Nuraini, N., Sukandar, K., Hadisoemarto, P., Susanto, H., Hasan, A.,
1611 Sumarti, N., 2021. Mathematical models for assessing vaccination sce-
1612 narios in several provinces in Indonesia. Infectious Disease Modelling 6,
1613 1236–1258.

1614 Odusanya, O.O., Odugbemi, B.A., Odugbemi, T.O., Ajisegiri, W.S., 2020.
1615 COVID-19: A review of the effectiveness of non-pharmacological interven-
1616 tions. Nigerian Postgraduate Medical Journal 27, 261–267.

1617 Olivares, A., Staffetti, E., 2021a. Optimal control applied to vaccination and
1618 testing policies for COVID-19. Mathematics 9, 3100.

1619 Olivares, A., Staffetti, E., 2021b. Optimal control-based vaccination and
1620 testing strategies for COVID-19. Computer Methods and Programs in
1621 Biomedicine 211, 106411.

- 1622 Olivares, A., Staffetti, E., 2021c. Uncertainty quantification of a mathe-
1623 matical model of COVID-19 transmission dynamics with mass vaccination
1624 strategy. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 146, 110895.
- 1625 Pasion, R., Paiva, T.O., Fernandes, C., Barbosa, F., 2020. The age ef-
1626 fect on protective behaviors during the COVID-19 outbreak: Sociodemo-
1627 graphic, perceptions and psychological accounts. *Frontiers in psychology*
1628 11, 561785.
- 1629 Pearson, C.A., Bozzani, F., Procter, S.R., Davies, N.G., Huda, M., Jensen,
1630 H.T., Keogh-Brown, M., Khalid, M., Sweeney, S., Torres-Rueda, S., et al.,
1631 2021. COVID-19 vaccination in Sindh Province, Pakistan: A modelling
1632 study of health impact and cost-effectiveness. *PLoS Medicine* 18, e1003815.
- 1633 Penn, M.J., Donnelly, C.A., 2023. Asymptotic analysis of optimal vaccination
1634 policies. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 85, 15.
- 1635 Perry, B.C., 1982. Validity and reliability of responses of the aged to surveys
1636 and questionnaires. *The Journal of Family Practice* 15, 182–183.
- 1637 Prem, K., Cook, A.R., Jit, M., 2017. Projecting social contact matrices in
1638 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLoS compu-
1639 tational biology* 13, e1005697.
- 1640 Prem, K., Zandvoort, K.v., Klepac, P., Eggo, R.M., Davies, N.G., Centre
1641 for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working
1642 Group and Cook, A.R., Jit, M., 2021. Projecting contact matrices in 177
1643 geographical regions: an update and comparison with empirical data for
1644 the covid-19 era. *PLoS computational biology* 17, e1009098.
- 1645 Rahmandad, H., 2022. Behavioral responses to risk promote vaccinating
1646 high-contact individuals first. *System Dynamics Review* 38, 246–263.
- 1647 Rao, I.J., Brandeau, M.L., 2021a. Optimal allocation of limited vaccine to
1648 control an infectious disease: Simple analytical conditions. *Mathematical
1649 biosciences* 337, 108621.
- 1650 Rao, I.J., Brandeau, M.L., 2021b. Optimal allocation of limited vaccine to
1651 minimize the effective reproduction number. *Mathematical Biosciences*
1652 339, 108654.

1653 Rodriguez-Maroto, G., Atienza-Diez, I., Ares, S., Manrubia, S., 2023. Vacci-
1654 nation strategies in structured populations under partial immunity and re-
1655 infection. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 56, 204003.

1656 Romero-Brufau, S., Chopra, A., Ryu, A.J., Gel, E., Raskar, R., Kremers, W.,
1657 Anderson, K.S., Subramanian, J., Krishnamurthy, B., Singh, A., et al.,
1658 2021. Public health impact of delaying second dose of BNT162b2 or
1659 mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine: simulation agent based modeling study.
1660 *bmj* 373.

1661 Saadi, N., Chi, Y.L., Ghosh, S., Eggo, R.M., McCarthy, C.V., Quaife, M.,
1662 Dawa, J., Jit, M., Vassall, A., 2021. Models of COVID-19 vaccine priorit-
1663 isation: a systematic literature search and narrative review. *BMC medicine*
1664 19, 1–11.

1665 Salcedo-Varela, G.A., Peñuñuri, F., González-Sánchez, D., Díaz-Infante, S.,
1666 2023. Synchronizing lockdown and vaccination policies for COVID-19: An
1667 optimal control approach based on piecewise constant strategies. *Optimal*
1668 *Control Applications and Methods* .

1669 Saldaña, J., Scoglio, C., 2022. Influence of heterogeneous age-group contact
1670 patterns on critical vaccination rates for herd immunity to SARS-CoV-2.
1671 *Scientific Reports* 12, 2640.

1672 Sallam, M., 2021. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy worldwide: a concise system-
1673 atic review of vaccine acceptance rates. *Vaccines* 9, 160.

1674 Sepulveda, G., Arenas, A.J., González-Parra, G., 2023. Mathematical model-
1675 ing of COVID-19 dynamics under two vaccination doses and delay effects.
1676 *Mathematics* 11, 369.

1677 Sheikh, A.B., Pal, S., Javed, N., Shekhar, R., 2021. COVID-19 vaccination in
1678 developing nations: challenges and opportunities for innovation. *Infectious*
1679 *disease reports* 13, 429–436.

1680 Shen, Z.H., Chu, Y.M., Khan, M.A., Muhammad, S., Al-Hartomy, O.A.,
1681 Higazy, M., 2021. Mathematical modeling and optimal control of the
1682 COVID-19 dynamics. *Results in Physics* 31, 105028.

1683 Shim, E., 2021. Optimal allocation of the limited COVID-19 vaccine supply
1684 in South Korea. *Journal of clinical medicine* 10, 591.

1685 Soares, P., Rocha, J.V., Moniz, M., Gama, A., Laires, P.A., Pedro, A.R.,
1686 Dias, S., Leite, A., Nunes, C., 2021. Factors associated with COVID-19
1687 vaccine hesitancy. *Vaccines* 9, 300.

1688 Sorensen, R., Barber, R., Pigott, D., Carter, A., Spencer, C., Ostroff, S.,
1689 Reiner, R., Abbafati, C., Adolph, C., Allorant, A., et al., 2022. Variation in
1690 the COVID-19 infection-fatality ratio by age, time, and geography during
1691 the pre-vaccine era: A systematic analysis. *The Lancet* 399, 1469–1488.

1692 Souto Ferreira, L., Canton, O., da Silva, R.L.P., Poloni, S., Sudbrack, V.,
1693 Borges, M.E., Franco, C., Marquitti, F.M.D., de Moraes, J.C., Veras,
1694 M.A.d.S.M., et al., 2022. Assessing the best time interval between doses in
1695 a two-dose vaccination regimen to reduce the number of deaths in an ongoing
1696 epidemic of SARS-CoV-2. *PLoS computational biology* 18, e1009978.

1697 Stafford, E., Dimitrov, D., Ceballos, R., Campelia, G., Matrajt, L., 2023.
1698 Retrospective analysis of equity-based optimization for COVID-19 vaccine
1699 allocation. *PNAS Nexus* 2, pgad283.

1700 Sudre, C.H., Murray, B., Varsavsky, T., Graham, M.S., Penfold, R.S.,
1701 Bowyer, R.C., Pujol, J.C., Klaser, K., Antonelli, M., Canas, L.S., et al.,
1702 2021. Attributes and predictors of long COVID. *Nature medicine* 27,
1703 626–631.

1704 Sypsa, V., Roussos, S., Engeli, V., Paraskevis, D., Tsiodras, S., Hatzakis, A.,
1705 2022. Trends in COVID-19 vaccination intent, determinants and reasons
1706 for vaccine hesitancy: Results from repeated cross-sectional surveys in
1707 the adult general population of Greece during November 2020–June 2021.
1708 *Vaccines* 10, 470.

1709 Taboe, H.B., Asare-Baah, M., Iboi, E.A., Ngonghala, C.N., 2023. Critical
1710 assessment of the impact of vaccine-type and immunity on the burden of
1711 COVID-19. *Mathematical Biosciences* , 108981.

1712 Tatapudi, H., Das, R., Das, T.K., 2021. Impact of vaccine prioritization
1713 strategies on mitigating COVID-19: an agent-based simulation study using
1714 an urban region in the United States. *BMC medical research methodology*
1715 21, 1–14.

1716 Thakkar, K., Spinardi, J.R., 2023. Impact of vaccination and non-
1717 pharmacological interventions on covid-19: a review of simulation mod-
1718 eling studies in asia. *Frontiers in Public Health* 11, 1252719.

1719 Tran, T.N.A., Winkle, N.B., Albert, E., Inam, H., Strong, E., Brinda, K.,
1720 Leighow, S.M., Yang, F., Hossain, S., Pritchard, J.R., et al., 2021. Optimal
1721 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine allocation using real-time attack-rate estimates in
1722 Rhode Island and Massachusetts. *BMC medicine* 19, 1–14.

1723 Trejo, I., Hung, P.Y., Matrajt, L., 2024. Covid19Vaxplorer: a free, online,
1724 user-friendly COVID-19 vaccine allocation comparison tool. *PLOS Global*
1725 *Public Health* 4, e0002136.

1726 Tu, Y., Hayat, T., Hobiny, A., Meng, X., 2023. Modeling and multi-objective
1727 optimal control of reaction-diffusion COVID-19 system due to vaccination
1728 and patient isolation. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 118, 556–591.

1729 Tuite, A.R., Zhu, L., Fisman, D.N., Salomon, J.A., 2021. Alternative dose al-
1730 location strategies to increase benefits from constrained COVID-19 vaccine
1731 supply. *Annals of internal medicine* .

1732 Vo, M., Feng, Z., Glasser, J.W., Clarke, K.E., Jones, J.N., 2023. Analysis of
1733 metapopulation models of the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the United
1734 States. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 87, 24.

1735 Voysey, M., Clemens, S.A.C., Madhi, S.A., Weckx, L.Y., Folegatti, P.M.,
1736 Aley, P.K., Angus, B., Baillie, V.L., Barnabas, S.L., Bhorat, Q.E., et al.,
1737 2021. Single-dose administration and the influence of the timing of
1738 the booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-1
1739 (AZD1222) vaccine: a pooled analysis of four randomised trials. *The*
1740 *Lancet* 397, 881–891.

1741 Walker, J., Paul, P., Dooling, K., Oliver, S., Prasad, P., Steele, M.,
1742 Gastañaduy, P.A., Johansson, M.A., Biggerstaff, M., Slayton, R.B., 2022.
1743 Modeling strategies for the allocation of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in the
1744 United States. *Vaccine* 40, 2134–2139.

1745 Wang, R., Chen, J., Gao, K., Wei, G.W., 2021. Vaccine-escape and fast-
1746 growing mutations in the United Kingdom, the United States, Singapore,
1747 Spain, India, and other COVID-19-devastated countries. *Genomics* 113,
1748 2158–2170.

- 1749 Wang, X., Wu, H., Tang, S., 2022. Assessing age-specific vaccination strate-
1750 gies and post-vaccination reopening policies for COVID-19 control using
1751 SEIR modeling approach. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 84, 108.
- 1752 World Health Organization (WHO), . <https://data.who.int/dashboards/covid19/cases>
1753 [accessed: 01/14/2024].
- 1754 Yasuda, H., Ito, F., Hanaki, K.i., Suzuki, K., 2022. COVID-19 pandemic
1755 vaccination strategies of early 2021 based on behavioral differences between
1756 residents of Tokyo and Osaka, Japan. *Archives of Public Health* 80, 180.
- 1757 Zaitri, M.A., Bibi, M.O., Torres, D.F., 2022. Transport and optimal con-
1758 trol of vaccination dynamics for COVID-19, in: *Mathematical Analysis of*
1759 *Infectious Diseases*. Elsevier, pp. 27–39.
- 1760 Zanella, M., Bardelli, C., Dimarco, G., Deandrea, S., Perotti, P., Azzi, M.,
1761 Figini, S., Toscani, G., 2021. A data-driven epidemic model with social
1762 structure for understanding the COVID-19 infection on a heavily affected
1763 Italian province. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*
1764 31, 2533–2570.
- 1765 Zavrakli, E., Parnell, A., Malone, D., Duffy, K., Dey, S., 2023. Optimal
1766 age-specific vaccination control for COVID-19: An Irish case study. *PLOS*
1767 *One* 18, e0290974.
- 1768 Zhang, C., Maruggi, G., Shan, H., Li, J., 2019. Advances in mRNA vaccines
1769 for infectious diseases. *Frontiers in immunology* 10, 594.
- 1770 Zhang, J., Litvinova, M., Liang, Y., Wang, Y., Wang, W., Zhao, S., Wu, Q.,
1771 Merler, S., Viboud, C., Vespignani, A., et al., 2020. Changes in contact
1772 patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science*
1773 368, 1481–1486.
- 1774 Zhang, J., Litvinova, M., Liang, Y., Zheng, W., Shi, H., Vespignani, A., Vi-
1775 boud, C., Ajelli, M., Yu, H., 2021. The impact of relaxing interventions on
1776 human contact patterns and SARS-CoV-2 transmission in China. *Science*
1777 *Advances* 7, eabe2584.
- 1778 Zhang, J., Wang, X., Rong, L., Pan, Q., Bao, C., Zheng, Q., 2024. Plan-
1779 ning for the optimal vaccination sequence in the context of a population-
1780 stratified model. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* , 101847.

- 1781 Zhao, S., Tang, B., Musa, S.S., Ma, S., Zhang, J., Zeng, M., Yun, Q., Guo,
1782 W., Zheng, Y., Yang, Z., et al., 2021a. Estimating the generation interval
1783 and inferring the latent period of COVID-19 from the contact tracing data.
1784 *Epidemics* 36, 100482.
- 1785 Zhao, Z.y., Niu, Y., Luo, L., Hu, Q.q., Yang, T.l., Chu, M.j., Chen, Q.p.,
1786 Lei, Z., Rui, J., Song, C.l., et al., 2021b. The optimal vaccination strategy
1787 to control COVID-19: a modeling study in Wuhan City, China. *Infectious*
1788 *diseases of poverty* 10, 48–73.
- 1789 Zhou, S., Zhou, S., Zheng, Z., Lu, J., 2021. Optimizing spatial allocation of
1790 COVID-19 vaccine by agent-based spatiotemporal simulations. *GeoHealth*
1791 5, e2021GH000427.
- 1792 Ziarelli, G., Parolini, N., Verani, M., Quarteroni, A., et al., 2023. Optimized
1793 numerical solutions of SIRDVW multiage model controlling SARS-CoV-2
1794 vaccine roll out: An application to the Italian scenario. *Infectious Disease*
1795 *Modelling* .
- 1796 Zuo, C., Meng, Z., Zhu, F., Zheng, Y., Ling, Y., 2022. Assessing vacci-
1797 nation prioritization strategies for COVID-19 in South Africa based on
1798 age-specific compartment model. *Frontiers in public health* 10.