

# Vaccination and collective action under social norms

Bryce Morsky

Department of Mathematics, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL,  
32306, USA

[bmorsky@fsu.edu](mailto:bmorsky@fsu.edu)

March 31, 2024

## 1 Abstract

2 Social dynamics are an integral part of the  
3 spread of disease affecting contact rates  
4 as well as the adoption of pharmaceuti-  
5 cal and non-pharmaceutical interventions.  
6 When vaccines provide waning immunity,  
7 efficient and timely uptake of boosters is  
8 required to maintain protection and flat-  
9 ten the curve of infections. How then  
10 do social dynamics affect the timely up-  
11 take of vaccines and thereby the course  
12 of an epidemic? To explore this scenario,  
13 a behavioural-epidemiological is developed  
14 here. It features a tipping-point dynamic  
15 for the uptake of vaccines that combines the  
16 risk of infection, perceived morbidity risk  
17 of the vaccine, and social payoffs for deviat-  
18 ing from the vaccination decision making of  
19 others. The social payoffs are derived from

a social norm of conformity, and they cre- 20  
ate a collective action problem. A key find- 21  
ing driven by this dilemma is that waves of 22  
vaccine uptake and infections can occur due 23  
to inefficient and delayed uptake of boost- 24  
ers. This results in a nonlinear response of 25  
the infection load to the transmission rate: 26  
an intermediate transmission rate can result 27  
in greater prevalence of disease relative to 28  
more or less transmissible diseases. Further, 29  
global information about the prevalence of 30  
the disease and vaccine uptake increases the 31  
infection load and peak relative to informa- 32  
tion restricted to individuals' contact net- 33  
works. Thus, decisions driven by local in- 34  
formation can mitigate the collective action 35  
problem across the population. Finally, the 36  
optimal public policy program to promote 37  
boosters is shown to be one that focuses on 38  
overcoming the social inertia to vaccinate at 39

40 the start of an epidemic.

41 **Keywords:** disease awareness, public  
42 health policy, social behaviour, tipping-  
43 point, vaccination, waning immunity

## 44 1 Introduction

45 Human behaviour modulated by social  
46 norms and other informal social rules is  
47 a major driver of disease spread [12, 22].  
48 The uptake vaccines and the use of masks  
49 can be determined by social norms and  
50 group identity. Herd immunity suffers  
51 from a collective action problem, since non-  
52 vaccinators can free-ride on the vaccina-  
53 tion of others. Because such social factors  
54 are so important to the spread of disease,  
55 it is critical to incorporate them into dis-  
56 ease models. There is a wealth of litera-  
57 ture on epidemiological models addressing  
58 this research topic [1, 10, 13, 17, 20, 21, 45–  
59 47, 49, 50]. And, during the COVID-19 pan-  
60 demic, this literature has grown immensely.  
61 These models include individuals’ aware-  
62 ness of the the death rate or infection rates  
63 [32, 48] as well as individual decision mak-  
64 ing about uptake of non-pharmaceutical in-  
65 terventions [32, 37, 39]. Such models have  
66 shown that public policy makers face dif-  
67 ficult decisions in light of the role of social  
68 dynamics. One example is that optimal so-  
69 cial distancing levels can be highly sensitive  
70 to the  $R_0$  of the disease [32], and another  
71 is that misinformation can undermine the  
72 efficacy of public policy [43]. More gen-  
73 erally, public policy makers cannot assume

that individuals are purely rational deci- 74  
sion makers. Rather, their decision making 75  
will be impacted by social and psychological 76  
factors. In the economics literature, these 77  
have been modelled by social payoffs (or 78  
relational utility), which have been shown 79  
to fundamentally change the qualitative na- 80  
ture of games and decision making [9, 44]. 81  
Social payoffs can measure feelings of guilt, 82  
joy, anger, and frustration that are gener- 83  
ated by social interactions. With respect to 84  
the spread of disease, these could be gener- 85  
ated by individuals’ decisions to be vacci- 86  
nated or use non-pharmaceutical interven- 87  
tions given the behaviours of their friends, 88  
family, and others in society. 89

Heterogeneity, and in particular hetero- 90  
geneous behaviour, is another fundamental 91  
determinant of disease spread. It is well- 92  
established that heterogeneity in contact 93  
patterns [5] and age structure [28] can dra- 94  
matically affect infectious disease dynamics. 95  
Likewise, individual variation in suscepti- 96  
bility to disease can also alter how a disease 97  
spreads through a community and what the 98  
final distribution of outcomes are. Individ- 99  
ual risk perception can also vary when it is 100  
determined by an individual’s social envi- 101  
ronment. In the example of ring vaccina- 102  
tion, local dynamics can be beneficial in re- 103  
ducing the spread of disease: individuals 104  
with infectious neighbours choose to vacci- 105  
nate to protect themselves and thereby over- 106  
come the social dilemma arising from a vol- 107  
untary vaccination policy [11, 31, 34, 35]. 108

An important epidemiological concern 109

110 that can be influenced by social factors is  
111 waning vaccine immunity given an endemic  
112 disease [15, 16, 18]. How do social dynam-  
113 ics impact the uptake of booster shots and  
114 what recommendations are there to pub-  
115 lic policy makers to minimize the spread  
116 of disease? To explore these questions,  
117 this paper presents a compartmental epi-  
118 demiological model that incorporates so-  
119 cial behaviour, waning vaccines, and vac-  
120 cine boosters. Individuals weigh the pros  
121 and cons of deciding to be vaccinated/-  
122 boosted while knowing the current infec-  
123 tion rate of either their contact network on  
124 which the disease spreads or the popula-  
125 tion as a whole. The vaccine is assumed  
126 to include a real or perceived cost (this  
127 could be monetary or a risk of morbid-  
128 ity). Additionally, a negative social payoff  
129 (i.e. a social cost) is generated from devi-  
130 ating from others' behaviour, since individ-  
131 uals are assumed to be conformists. It has  
132 been found that such conformity can result  
133 in non-monotonicity of the attack rate with  
134 respect to key epidemiological parameters  
135 such as the transmission rate and the ef-  
136 ficacy of non-pharmaceutical interventions  
137 [32]. Together, these factors determine indi-  
138 vidual's vaccine decision making, and thus  
139 the course of the disease.

140 In addition to understanding how such  
141 dynamics impact the spread of disease, this  
142 paper explores the role of public policy in  
143 promoting boosters. Specifically, optimal  
144 control theory, which has been widely ap-  
145 plied to epidemiology [2–4, 14, 19, 29, 42],

is employed to find the optimal strategy in  
promoting the vaccine to the total amount  
of infections over time.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 ODE model

Consider a compartmental epidemiological  
model coupled with a behavioural dynamic  
to model the rate of vaccine uptake by the  
population. The compartments for indi-  
viduals include susceptibles, infectious, and  
protected. By assuming that natural and  
vaccine immunity are equivalent, the pro-  
tected class represents both recovered in-  
dividuals and those who have been vacci-  
nated. The system of differential equations  
then takes the form:

$$\dot{S}(t) = \alpha P(t) - \beta S(t)I(t) - \epsilon v(t)S(t), \quad (1a)$$

$$\dot{I}(t) = \beta S(t)I(t) - \gamma I(t), \quad (1b)$$

$$\dot{P}(t) = \gamma I(t) + \epsilon v(t)S(t) - \alpha P(t), \quad (1c)$$

$$\dot{v}(t) = f(\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t))) - v(t). \quad (1d)$$

Here  $S(t)$ ,  $I(t)$ , and  $P(t)$  are the frequencies  
of susceptibles, infectious, and protected at  
time  $t$ , respectively.  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  are the resus-  
ceptibility, transmission, and recovery rates,  
respectively.

The state variable  $v(t) \in [0, 1]$  is the  
degree to which individuals' want to be  
vaccinated.  $1/\epsilon$  represents the time it  
takes for an individual to be vaccinated  
(e.g. the time until a vaccination appoint-  
ment can be met), and thus  $\epsilon v(t)$  is the

173 vaccination rate. The change in  $v(t)$  is  
 174 determined by the Granovetter-Schelling  
 175 social dynamic, Equation 1d. This dy-  
 176 namic was originally developed in the so-  
 177 cial science literature to model collective  
 178 action [23–26, 30, 40, 41], and has re-  
 179 cently been employed to model the uptake  
 180 of non-pharmaceutical interventions during  
 181 an epidemic [32].  $f(\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t))) \in [0, 1]$   
 182 is a smoothed best response function of the  
 183 difference between the payoffs to choosing  
 184 to be vaccinated and choosing not to be vac-  
 185 cinated,  $\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t))$  (which in turn is a  
 186 function of the prevalence of infection and  
 187 vaccination rate as discussed below). This  
 188 best response function represents the prob-  
 189 ability that an individual will choose to be  
 190 vaccinated, and thus is an increasing func-  
 191 tion with respect to  $\Delta\pi$ , and is assumed to  
 192 be a sigmoid function. An example of such a  
 193 function and the one used in the numerical  
 194 simulations in this paper is

$$f(\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t))) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\kappa\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t)))}. \quad (2)$$

195  $\kappa > 0$  is the sensitivity to the payoff differ-  
 196 ence. The greater it is, the sharper the tran-  
 197 sition in vaccination decision-making.

198 When comparing the payoff differ-  
 199 ence between being vaccinated and not,  
 200  $\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t))$ , individuals weigh the costs  
 201 and benefits of choosing to be vaccinated  
 202 including social ones. Specifically, indi-  
 203 viduals will consider their risk of being  
 204 infected (frequency of infectious, the trans-

mission rate, and whether or not they are  
 vaccinated), the (perceived) cost of the  
 vaccine (this can be monetary or a risk of  
 morbidity), and a social cost for deviating  
 from the behaviour of others. The latter  
 is derived from assuming a social norm of  
 conformity: individuals pay a social cost  
 for not behaving like the average behaviour  
 in the population. Social costs derived from  
 norms in this way have been studied within  
 the psychological game theory literature  
 [6–9, 38, 44]. Summing together these  
 components, the payoff for vaccinating  
 $\tilde{v} \in \{0, 1\}$  is

$$\pi(I(t), v(t), \tilde{v}) = - (1 - \tilde{v})\beta I(t) - \rho\tilde{v} - \theta(v(t) - \tilde{v})^2. \quad (3)$$

219 It is assumed that the protection provided  
 220 by the vaccine wanes, but that there is no  
 221 vaccine failure, hence the first term  $-(1 -$   
 $\tilde{v})\beta I(t)$ .  $\rho$  is the risk or cost to be vaccinated.  
 222  $\theta(v(t) - \tilde{v})^2$  is the social cost, which is posi-  
 223 tive if  $\tilde{v} \neq v$ . The payoff difference is there-  
 224 fore  
 225

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\pi(I(t), v(t)) &= \pi(I(t), v(t), 1) - \pi(I(t), v(t), 0) \\ &= \beta I(t) - \rho - \theta(1 - 2v(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

226 A similar type of payoff difference has  
 227 been previously used to model the adoption  
 228 of non-pharmaceutical interventions, which  
 229 change the transmission rate [32].

## 2.2 Agent-based model

In addition to the above system of ODEs, an agent-based small-world network model is also considered here. The network, an Erdős-Rényi random network, plays two roles. For one, the disease can spread along it node to node. For another, it determines the information that individuals have and the social pressures they experience (individuals pay a social cost from deviating from the behaviour of their neighbours). Thus the payoff comparisons individuals make between choosing to be vaccinated or not depend on the infection status and preferences of an their neighbourhood, which is either their immediate neighbours (the local scenario) or all individuals in the network (the global scenario).

Each turn in the agent-based model is one day, and individuals are selected in a random order to determine the outcome for them that day. On day  $t$ , a susceptible individual  $n$  is infected with probability

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{inf}}(n, t) = \beta I'_n(t) \quad (5)$$

where  $I'_n(t)$  is the frequency of infectious individuals in  $n$ 's local neighbourhood on day  $t$  (i.e. those with whom they share an edge). If a susceptible is not infected, they may choose to be vaccinated/boosted. When making this decision, individuals observe the infection status and vaccination preferences of their neighbourhood,  $\mathcal{N}$ . Using Equation 2, individual  $n$  chooses to vacci-

nate with probability

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{vax}}(n, t) = \epsilon f(I_n(t), v_n(t)) \quad (6)$$

where  $f$  is Equation 2.  $I_n(t)$  is the frequency of infectious individuals in  $n$ 's neighbourhood (e.g.  $I_n(t) = I'_n(t)$  in the case of local information).  $v_n(t)$  is the average preference to be vaccinated in  $n$ 's neighbourhood. Specifically,

$$v_n(t) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_n} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\text{vax}}(m, t)}{\epsilon |\mathcal{N}_n|} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_n$  is  $n$ 's neighbourhood and  $|\mathcal{N}_n|$  its size. Note that any infectious or protected individuals in  $n$ 's neighbourhood affect these values, since it is their opinions rather than their statuses that affect  $n$ 's preference. Each day an infected individual may recover with probability  $\gamma$ . And, a protected individual will lose protection and become susceptible with probability  $\alpha$ .

Parameter	Definition
$1/\alpha = 100$ days	resistance period
$\beta = 0.4$ /day	transmission rate
$1/\gamma = 7$ days	recovery period
$\delta$ neighbours	mean node degree
$1/\epsilon = 3$ days	time to be vaccinated
$\kappa = 1000$	payoff sensitivity
$\theta = 0.01$	relational cost
$\rho = 0.01$	risk of vaccine morbidity

Table 1: Parameters for numerical simulations.

For both simulations of the agent-based model and numerical solutions of the system of ODEs, the parameter values from Ta-

281 ble 1 were used.  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  were chosen  
 282 to roughly match the values for the SARS-  
 283 CoV-2 virus. An exposed category for in-  
 284 fected individuals is omitted for analytical  
 285 tractability and because numerical simula-  
 286 tions showed qualitatively similar results.  
 287 The mean node degree for the agent-based  
 288 model is  $\delta$ , which was explored over the val-  
 289 ues 10 and 100 in a population of 10,000 in-  
 290 dividuals. Though vaccines can be adminis-  
 291 tered through walk-ins, the delay of  $1/\epsilon = 3$   
 292 was chosen to represent a delay between  
 293 when an individual decides to be vaccinated  
 294 and when they may schedule and make an  
 295 appointment.  $\kappa = 1000$  is chosen so that  
 296 there is a smooth but abrupt change in be-  
 297 haviour. A magnitude higher or lower  $\kappa$   
 298 has a marginal effect on the results. Finally,  
 299 the magnitude of  $\theta$  and  $\rho$  were taken from  
 300 [32], which were found to be the range in  
 301 which oscillations in preferences during an  
 302 epidemic can occur.

### 303 3 Results

#### 304 3.1 Equilibria analyses

305 First consider the ODE model. Given that  
 306  $S(t) + I(t) + P(t) = 1$ , we may reduce it to  
 307 the three dimensional system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{S}(t) &= \alpha(1 - S(t) - I(t)) - \beta S(t)I(t) \\ &\quad - \epsilon v(t)S(t), \end{aligned} \quad (8a)$$

$$\dot{I}(t) = \beta S(t)I(t) - \gamma I(t), \quad (8b)$$

$$\dot{v}(t) = f(\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t))) - v(t). \quad (8c)$$

Here, we find the equilibria of this re- 308  
 duced system and analyze their stability. 309  
 To start, consider the disease free equilib- 310  
 rium (DFE). There are a set of DFE corre- 311  
 sponding to different equilibrium vaccina- 312  
 tion rates:  $(\bar{S}, \bar{I}, \bar{v}) = (\alpha/(\alpha + \epsilon\bar{v}), 0, \bar{v})$ . 313

**Theorem 3.1.** *If  $\beta/\gamma < 1 + \epsilon\bar{v}/\alpha$  and  $\partial f/\partial v < 1$  at a DFE, then it is stable.* 314  
 315

*Proof.* Let  $f = f(\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t)))$  for no- 316  
 tational simplicity. Linearizing about the 317  
 DFE, we have the following Jacobian matrix: 318

$$J_{\text{DFE}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha - \epsilon\bar{v} & -\alpha - \beta\bar{S} & -\epsilon\bar{S} \\ 0 & \beta\bar{S} - \gamma & 0 \\ 0 & \beta f' & \partial f/\partial v - 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

which has eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 = -\alpha - \epsilon\bar{v} < 0$ , 319

$$\lambda_2 = \beta\bar{S} - \gamma = \gamma\bar{S} \left( \frac{\beta}{\gamma} - 1 - \frac{\epsilon\bar{v}}{\alpha} \right), \quad (10)$$

and  $\lambda_3 = \partial f/\partial v - 1$ . Thus the DFE can 320  
 be stable so long as:  $\beta/\gamma < 1 + \epsilon\bar{v}/\alpha$  and 321  
 $\partial f/\partial v = 2\theta f' < 1$ . Since  $f \in [0, 1]$  is a sig- 322  
 moidal function, there may be at most three 323  
 equilibria for  $f(0, \bar{v})$  for  $\bar{v} \in [0, 1]$  and a min- 324  
 imum of one. And for at least one of these 325  
 equilibria  $\partial f/\partial v|_{\text{DFE}} = \partial f(0, v)/\partial v|_{v=\bar{v}} < 326$   
 1.  $\square$  327

Next consider the endemic equilibrium 328  
 (EE). Here,  $\bar{S} = \gamma/\beta$  and 329

$$\bar{I} = \frac{\alpha - (\alpha + \epsilon\bar{v})\gamma/\beta}{\alpha + \gamma}. \quad (11)$$

Note that  $\bar{I} \in (0, 1)$  if and only if  $\beta/\gamma > 1 + 330$   
 $\epsilon\bar{v}/\alpha$ , which leads to the next theorem. 331

332 **Theorem 3.2.** If  $\beta/\gamma > 1 + \epsilon\bar{v}/\alpha$ ,  $\partial f/\partial v < 1$ ,  
 333 and  $\partial f/\partial I < \alpha\beta(\alpha + \beta + \epsilon\bar{v})/\gamma\epsilon$  at an EE, then  
 334 it is stable.

335 *Proof.* Linearizing about the EE, we have the  
 336 following Jacobian matrix

$$J_{EE} = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha - \beta\bar{I} - \epsilon\bar{v} & -\alpha - \gamma & -\epsilon\gamma/\beta \\ \beta\bar{I} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta f' & 2\theta f' - 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

337 and characteristic polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda^3 + (1 - 2\theta f' + \alpha + \beta\bar{I} + \epsilon\bar{v})\lambda^2 \\ &+ ((1 - 2\theta f')(\alpha + \beta\bar{I} + \epsilon\bar{v}) + (\alpha + \gamma)\beta\bar{I})\lambda \\ &+ (\gamma\epsilon f' + (\alpha + \gamma)(1 - 2\theta f'))\beta\bar{I} = 0. \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

338 Note that if  $\partial f/\partial v = 2\theta f' < 1$ , then all of  
 339 the coefficients are positive, which is a nec-  
 340 essary though not sufficient condition for  
 341 stability by the Routh-Hurwitz criteria. We  
 342 further require that  $c_2c_1 - c_0 > 0$  for coeffi-  
 343 cients  $c_i$  of  $\lambda^i$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_2c_1 - c_0 = &(\alpha + \beta\bar{I} + \epsilon\bar{v})^2 \left(1 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}\right) \\ &+ (\alpha + \beta\bar{I} + \epsilon\bar{v}) \left(1 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}\right)^2 \\ &+ \gamma\epsilon\bar{I} \left(\frac{\alpha\beta(\alpha + \beta + \epsilon\bar{v})}{\gamma\epsilon} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial I}\right) > 0. \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

344 Conversely,  $\partial f/\partial v > 1$  or  $\partial f/\partial I > \alpha\beta(\alpha +$   
 345  $\beta + \epsilon\bar{v})/\gamma\epsilon$  are necessary conditions for an EE  
 346 to be unstable.  $\square$

347 When there are no stable DFE and EE, cy-  
 348 cles can occur. Figure 1 depicts an example.

349 With an initially highly susceptible popula-  
 350 tion, the infection spreads inducing vacci-  
 351 nation. However, due to the social cost of  
 352 not conforming, vaccination rates rise more  
 353 slowly than they would only computing the  
 354 risk of the infection and the cost to vacci-  
 355 nate. Once vaccination rates are high, they  
 356 remain so even after the disease has been  
 357 controlled. In this case, conformity aides in  
 358 sustaining vaccination rates. Once the vac-  
 359 cination rates do drop, susceptibility rises  
 360 due to waning immunity, which leads to an-  
 361 other outbreak.




Figure 1: A representative example of observed cycles. Rising infections sway susceptibles to become vaccinated, which drives down infections. In turn, the vaccination rate declines. As immunity wanes, susceptibles rise and the process repeats. Initial conditions are  $S_0 = 0.99$ ,  $I_0 = 0.01$ , and  $v_0 = 0.01$  and parameter values are taken from Table 1.

### 3.2 Parameter analyses

Figure 2 shows the effects of various parameters on the infection load, i.e. the total amount of infectious individuals. The infection load is calculated by summing up the number of infectious from time  $t = 0$  to  $t = 400$  in increments of 1. In each panel, a single parameter is varied while the remainder are taken from Table 1.




Figure 2: Infection load ( $y$  axes) for varying parameters  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \epsilon, \theta$ , and  $\rho$ . When varying a parameter, the others are fixed and taken from Table 1.

Recent studies have shown non-monotonicity in outcomes from epidemics for changing parameters [32, 37], which is

also observed for several parameters here. For example, the highest infection load occurs for an intermediate transmission rate  $\beta$ . When  $\beta$  is sufficiently low, individuals do not want to be vaccinated. Thus, increasing  $\beta$  will increase the infection load up until the vaccine is widely desired at which point the infection load drops. In addition to this general observation, there are also smaller variations in the infection load for varying  $\beta$ ; specifically, a sawtooth like pattern. This result is due to the tipping point dynamic, which leads to the nonlinear uptake of vaccines and thus the non-monotonicity observed.

Varying the social cost  $\theta$  also results in non-monotonicity, since there is a trade-off between low and high values of it. If  $\theta$  is low, there is little social resistance to increasing the vaccine uptake when vaccinations are infrequent and infections are low but rising. At the start of an epidemic with a largely unvaccinated population, this is beneficial. On the other hand, there is also little social resistance to decreasing the vaccine uptake when infections are reduced, which reduces the rate at which individuals receive boosters and leaves the population susceptible to a resurgence of the disease. When  $\theta$  is large, social resistance retards vaccine uptake at the start of the epidemic, but can sustain individuals receiving boosters. Altering the other parameters generally results in monotonic changes in infection load. Increasing  $\alpha$  and  $\rho$  increases the infection load nonlinearly while increasing  $\gamma$  and  $\epsilon$  decreases it.



### 3.3 Optimal control

Conformity due to the social norm results in a slow sub-optimal uptake of vaccines at the beginning of the epidemic. This is because the descriptive norm (the norm that describes the behaviour of others) is, correctly, that vaccine uptake is low. Can a public policy campaign that adjusts this belief alter the outcome of the epidemic when it is endemic? To explore this possibility, consider a control variable  $u(t)$  for the system that represents the degree to which public policy promotes individuals' desires to be vaccinated. Assuming that there is some upper bound its strength, we have that  $0 \leq u(t) \leq u_{\max} \leq 1$ . Payoffs are thus adjusted by replacing  $v(t)$  (the true vaccine preference of individuals) with  $(1-u(t))v(t)+u(t)$  (the promoted one) into the payoffs. The state equations for the optimal control problem are thus those of Equations 8a-8c with  $\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t))$  replaced with

$$\Delta\pi(I(t), v(t), u(t)) = \beta I(t) - \rho - \theta(1 - 2((1 - u(t))v(t) + u(t))). \quad (15)$$

Assume then that we wish to minimize the infection load as well as the control  $u(t)$ . This gives us the cost functional

$$\mathcal{J}(I(t), u(t)) = \int_0^T I(t) + wu(t)dt \quad (16)$$

to minimize where  $w > 0$  is the weighting of the control. Though the epidemic is endemic and thus the time horizon is infinite

( $T \rightarrow \infty$ ), we can truncate the time for the numerical solutions to  $T = 400$ . Using Pontryagin's minimizing principle, we have the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}(S(t), I(t), v(t), u(t)) = I(t) + wu(t) + \lambda_S(t)\dot{S}(t) + \lambda_I(t)\dot{I}(t) + \lambda_v(t)\dot{v}(t). \quad (17)$$

The optimality condition is

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial u} = w + \lambda_v(t)2\theta(1 - v(t))f' = 0, \quad (18)$$

and the adjoint equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\lambda}_S(t) &= \lambda_S(t)(\alpha + \beta I(t) + \epsilon v(t)) \\ &\quad - \lambda_I(t)\beta I(t), \end{aligned} \quad (19a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\lambda}_I(t) &= -1 + \lambda_S(t)(\alpha + \beta S(t)) \\ &\quad - \lambda_I(t)(\beta S(t) - \gamma) - \lambda_v(t)\beta f', \end{aligned} \quad (19b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\lambda}_v(t) &= \lambda_S(t)\epsilon S(t) \\ &\quad - \lambda_v(t)(2\theta(1 - u(t))f' - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (19c)$$

Since we are assuming a finite time horizon problem, we have the transversality conditions:  $\lambda_S(T) = \lambda_I(T) = \lambda_v(T) = 0$ .

Figure 3 depicts a numerically solution using Julia and the InfiniteOpt.jl package [36] for the optimal control along with the resulting trajectories for the state variables for the first 200 days. The weight and maximum control are  $w = 0.01$ , and  $u_{\max} = 0.8$ , respectively. All other parameters are taken from Table 1. At the start of the epidemic, the control is maximized to overcome social resistance to vaccination and thereby blunt the initial spread of the disease. Once vaccination rates are high, the control can be

459 removed, since vaccinations are bolstered  
 460 by social pressure. As this pressure wanes,  
 461 the control must be reintroduced at sev-  
 462 eral times as the vaccination levels dip to  
 463 sustain boosting and control of the disease.  
 464 Long term, this must be sustained to pre-  
 465 vent reemergence of the disease.




Figure 3: Numerically solved optimal control solution. Initial conditions are  $S_0 = 0.99$ ,  $I_0 = 0.01$ , and  $v_0 = 0.01$ .  $w = 0.01$  and  $u_{\max} = 0.8$ . Other parameter values are taken from Table 1.

### 466 3.4 Networks and heterogeneity

467 Here is reported the results for the net-  
 468 work model that incorporates heterogene-  
 469 ity. Figure 4 depicts representative time se-  
 470 ries for the different cases of local or global

471 knowledge of the disease and vaccine up-  
 472 take rates as well as different neighborhood  
 473 sizes (with the mean node degree  $\delta = 10$  and  
 474 100). The population size is 10,000 individ-  
 475 uals with initially 1% infected and the pref-  
 476 erence to be vaccinated at 0.01 for all indi-  
 477 viduals.

478 Localness results in fewer infections and  
 479 flatter waves of infection than globalness.  
 480 For individuals near the locus of the in-  
 481 fection, the perceived and real risk of be-  
 482 ing infected is high and thus they vacci-  
 483 nate preventing the spread of disease to oth-  
 484 ers. This phenomenon is known as ring vac-  
 485 cination and is a means by which volun-  
 486 tary vaccination strategies can be effective  
 487 [27, 31, 33–35]. More information leads to  
 488 steeper switches in desires to become vac-  
 489 cinated as can be seen in panels b-d. Indi-  
 490 viduals become coordinated and synchro-  
 491 nized in their decision about whether or  
 492 not to be vaccinated, which results in larger  
 493 swings in vaccine uptake levels and peaks  
 494 in infections. The social payoff from the  
 495 norm retards uptake of the vaccine, initially.  
 496 This effect allows the disease to progress  
 497 more than under local information, which  
 498 spreads out the decision making and vacci-  
 499 nation in space and time preventing these  
 500 swings of behaviour.

## 501 4 Discussion

502 This paper has explored the effect of a so-  
 503 cial norm of conformity on decisions to vac-  
 504 cinate when the vaccine has a waning im-




Figure 4: Representative time series for the network model with local or global knowledge of disease prevalence and vaccine uptake levels. Initial conditions are  $S_0 = 0.99$ ,  $I_0 = 0.01$ , and  $v_0 = 0.01$ . Parameter values are from Table 1.

505 munity. It has been shown that this can lead to both disease free and endemic equilibria 510  
 506 to both disease free and endemic equilibria followed by a relaxation and then a return 511  
 507 as well as a nonlinear response to varying parameters. Further, it has shown that there 512  
 508 to promote boosting at regular intervals to keep the disease under control. 513  
 509 is an optimal public policy in promoting the 514

515 Mirror results in [32, 37], varying key pa-  
516 rameters of this system is non-monotonic  
517 and nonlinear. In particular, changing the  
518 transmission rate does not always increase  
519 the number of infectious individuals. For  
520 a high transmission rate, individuals will  
521 regularly receive boosters thus limiting the  
522 spread of the disease. However, there is an  
523 intermediate level of transmission in which  
524 the social dynamic frustrates efficient and  
525 timely uptake of the vaccine resulting in a  
526 high infection load. Another key parame-  
527 ter with a nonlinear response to variations  
528 is the weight of the social cost  $\theta$ . For a very  
529 low social cost, there is little social imped-  
530 iment to being an early adopter of the vac-  
531 cine. However, there is also little social pres-  
532 sure to sustain adoption of boosters. In-  
533 creasing the social cost from such a low level  
534 can be beneficial. Since, although it impedes  
535 the initial adoption of the disease, it pro-  
536 motes sustained boosters and thus reduces  
537 future waves of infection.

538 Heterogeneity in behaviour stemming  
539 from heterogeneity in information and local  
540 conditions can promote a low infection load  
541 and flatten the curve of infections. Global  
542 information, on the other hand, synchron-  
543 izes the behaviour of individuals leading  
544 to mass uptake of the vaccine as well as mass  
545 abandonment of receiving boosters. This ef-  
546 fect results in a greater infection load and  
547 larger peaks of infections as vaccination lev-  
548 els wane and individuals choose to be vacci-  
549 nated too late in response to a resurging epi-  
550 demic. Boosters are thus taken in response

to rising infections rather than in prepara- 551  
tion for them. Nonetheless, global informa- 552  
tion may be useful in some scenarios not 553  
covered here. Synchronization of behaviour 554  
may be effective when information is inac- 555  
curate or when the disease can be eradi- 556  
cated. Though shaping of information has 557  
been explore to some degree here, future 558  
work could more deeply explore this idea. 559

A further limitation of the model and di- 560  
rection of future research include the as- 561  
sumption that vaccination decision making 562  
is not modulated by the duration of the epi- 563  
demic. The population can repeatedly be 564  
activated to choose to be vaccinated. In 565  
reality, individuals could become disillusioned 566  
with receiving boosters regardless 567  
of the levels of infections in the popula- 568  
tion. This could be especially true if there 569  
is inaccurate information and group dy- 570  
namics that drive vaccination decision mak- 571  
ing. Here individuals are “rational” with 572  
respect to social pressures, and these pres- 573  
sures are essentially the same. Although, in 574  
the agent-based model, they can vary as the 575  
neighbourhoods vary. However, individu- 576  
als could have different social pressures de- 577  
pending on different social norms. e.g. in- 578  
dividuals may only wish to conform with 579  
those who share a similar identity to them. 580  
Or, they may be driven to take the oppo- 581  
site behaviour of those different from them. 582  
There are many such scenarios that could be 583  
explored. 584

Given the model and results here, what 585  
recommendations are there for public pol- 586

587 icy makers? For one, when vaccine uptake  
588 is low and uncommon, vaccination should  
589 be promoted heavily and to a degree greater  
590 than the current infection rates warrant so  
591 as to overcome social resistance. However,  
592 resources used for such promotion can be  
593 saved once vaccination becomes common,  
594 since social dynamics can sustain it in the  
595 short term. As the disease prevalence de-  
596 creases, however, it is key to promote the  
597 vaccine again to prevent following waves  
598 of infection. Additionally, it may be use-  
599 ful to promote vaccination more locally than  
600 globally. Though this may be a futile ef-  
601 fort, if individuals' behaviours can be de-  
602 coupled from the global dynamics and the  
603 behaviours of peers outside of their locality,  
604 that would promote a steadier and more lo-  
605 calized uptake of the vaccine and promote  
606 fewer infections.

## 607 Declaration of competing interest

608 None.

## 609 References

- 610 [1] Grace O Agaba, Yuliya N Kyrychko,  
611 and Konstantin B Blyuss. Mathemat-  
612 ical model for the impact of aware-  
613 ness on the dynamics of infectious dis-  
614 eases. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 286:22–  
615 30, 2017.
- 616 [2] Marco A Amaral, Marcelo M  
617 de Oliveira, and Marco A Javarone.

An epidemiological model with vol- 618  
untary quarantine strategies governed 619  
by evolutionary game dynamics. 620  
*Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 143:110616,  
2021. 622

- [3] Emmanuel Afolabi Bakare, 623  
A Nwagwo, and E Danso-Addo. 624  
Optimal control analysis of an sir 625  
epidemic model with constant recruit- 626  
ment. *International Journal of Applied* 627  
*Mathematics Research*, 3(3):273, 2014. 628
- [4] Rocío Balderrama, Javier Peressutti, 629  
Juan Pablo Pinasco, Federico Vazquez, 630  
and Constanza Sánchez de la Vega. 631  
Optimal control for a sir epidemic 632  
model with limited quarantine. *Scien-* 633  
*tific Reports*, 12(1):12583, 2022. 634
- [5] Shweta Bansal, Bryan T Grenfell, and 635  
Lauren Ancel Meyers. When individ- 636  
ual behaviour matters: homogeneous 637  
and network models in epidemiology. 638  
*Journal of the Royal Society Interface*,  
4(16):879–891, 2007. 639 640
- [6] Pierpaolo Battigalli, Gary Charness, 641  
and Martin Dufwenberg. Deception: 642  
The role of guilt. *Journal of Economic* 643  
*Behavior & Organization*, 93:227–232,  
2013. 644 645
- [7] Pierpaolo Battigalli, Roberto Corrao, 646  
and Martin Dufwenberg. Incorpor- 647  
ating belief-dependent motivation in 648  
games. *Journal of Economic Behavior &* 649  
*Organization*, 167:185–218, 2019. 650

- 651 [8] Pierpaolo Battigalli and Martin  
652 Dufwenberg. Guilt in games. *Amer-*  
653 *ican Economic Review*, 97(2):170–176,  
654 2007.
- 655 [9] Pierpaolo Battigalli and Martin  
656 Dufwenberg. Belief-dependent mo-  
657 tivations and psychological game  
658 theory. *Journal of Economic Literature*,  
659 60(3):833–82, 2022.
- 660 [10] Chris T Bauch. Imitation dynamics  
661 predict vaccinating behaviour. *Pro-*  
662 *ceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
663 *Sciences*, 272(1573):1669–1675, 2005.
- 664 [11] Chris T Bauch and David JD Earn. Vac-  
665 cination and the theory of games. *Pro-*  
666 *ceedings of the National Academy of Sci-*  
667 *ences*, 101(36):13391–13394, 2004.
- 668 [12] Chris T Bauch and Alison P Galvani.  
669 Social factors in epidemiology. *Science*,  
670 342(6154):47–49, 2013.
- 671 [13] Samit Bhattacharyya, Chris T Bauch,  
672 and Romulus Breban. Role of word-of-  
673 mouth for programs of voluntary vac-  
674 cination: A game-theoretic approach. *Mathematical biosciences*, 269:130–134,  
675 2015.
- 676
- 677 [14] Luca Bolzoni, Elena Bonacini, Cinzia  
678 Soresina, and Maria Groppi. Time-  
679 optimal control strategies in sir epi-  
680 demic models. *Mathematical bio-*  
681 *sciences*, 292:86–96, 2017.
- 682 [15] Daniela Calvetti and Erkki J Somer-  
683 salo. Post-pandemic modeling of  
covid-19: Waning immunity deter- 684  
mines recurrence frequency. *Mathe-* 685  
*matical Biosciences*, 365:109067, 2023. 686
- [16] Xingru Chen and Feng Fu. Imperfect 687  
vaccine and hysteresis. *Proceedings of* 688  
*the royal society B*, 286(1894):20182406,  
2019. 689  
690
- [17] Alberto d’Onofrio and Piero Manfredi. 691  
The interplay between voluntary vac- 692  
cination and reduction of risky be- 693  
havior: a general behavior-implicit sir 694  
model for vaccine preventable infec- 695  
tions. *Current trends in dynamical* 696  
*systems in biology and natural sciences*,  
pages 185–203, 2020. 697  
698
- [18] Elamin H Elbasha, Chandra N Pod- 699  
der, and Abba B Gumel. Analyz- 700  
ing the dynamics of an sirs vaccina- 701  
tion model with waning natural and 702  
vaccine-induced immunity. *Nonlin-* 703  
*ear Analysis: Real World Applications*,  
12(5):2692–2705, 2011. 704  
705
- [19] Mohamed Elhia, Mostafa Rachik, and 706  
Elhabib Benlahmar. Optimal control 707  
of an sir model with delay in state and 708  
control variables. *International scholarly* 709  
*research notices*, 2013, 2013. 710
- [20] Xue Feng, Bin Wu, and Long Wang. 711  
Voluntary vaccination dilemma with 712  
evolving psychological perceptions. 713  
*Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 439:65–75,  
2018. 714  
715

- 716 [21] Feng Fu, Nicholas A Christakis, and  
717 James H Fowler. Dueling biological  
718 and social contagions. *Scientific reports*,  
719 7(1):1–9, 2017.
- 720 [22] Sebastian Funk, Marcel Salathé, and  
721 Vincent AA Jansen. Modelling the  
722 influence of human behaviour on the  
723 spread of infectious diseases: a re-  
724 view. *Journal of the Royal Society Inter-  
725 face*, 7(50):1247–1256, 2010.
- 726 [23] Mark Granovetter. Threshold models  
727 of collective behavior. *American journal  
728 of sociology*, 83(6):1420–1443, 1978.
- 729 [24] Mark Granovetter and Roland Soong.  
730 Threshold models of diffusion and col-  
731 lective behavior. *Journal of Mathemati-  
732 cal sociology*, 9(3):165–179, 1983.
- 733 [25] Mark Granovetter and Roland Soong.  
734 Threshold models of interpersonal ef-  
735 fects in consumer demand. *Journal  
736 of Economic Behavior & Organization*,  
737 7(1):83–99, 1986.
- 738 [26] Mark Granovetter and Roland Soong.  
739 Threshold models of diversity: Chi-  
740 nese restaurants, residential segrega-  
741 tion, and the spiral of silence. *Sociolog-  
742 ical methodology*, pages 69–104, 1988.
- 743 [27] David Greenhalgh. Optimal control  
744 of an epidemic by ring vaccination.  
745 *Stochastic Models*, 2(3):339–363, 1986.
- 746 [28] Matthew J Keeling. Correlation equa-  
747 tions for endemic diseases: externally  
imposed and internally generated het- 748  
erogeneity. *Proceedings of the Royal So- 749  
ciety of London. Series B: Biological Sci- 750  
ences*, 266(1422):953–960, 1999. 751
- [29] David I Ketcheson. Optimal control 752  
of an sir epidemic through finite-time 753  
non-pharmaceutical intervention. 754  
*Journal of mathematical biology*, 83(1):7, 755  
2021. 756
- [30] Bryce Morsky and Erol Akçay. False 757  
beliefs can bootstrap cooperative com- 758  
munities through social norms. *Evolu- 759  
tionary Human Sciences*, 3, 2021. 760
- [31] Bryce Morsky and Chris T Bauch. Out- 761  
come inelasticity and outcome vari- 762  
ability in behaviour-incidence models: 763  
an example from an seir infection on 764  
a dynamic network. *Computational and  
mathematical methods in medicine*, 2012. 765  
766
- [32] Bryce Morsky, Felicia Magpantay, Troy 767  
Day, and Erol Akçay. The impact 768  
of threshold decision mechanisms of 769  
collective behavior on disease spread. 770  
*Proceedings of the National Academy of  
Sciences*, 120(19):e2221479120, 2023. 771  
772
- [33] Johannes Müller, Birgitt Schönfisch, 773  
and Markus Kirkilionis. Ring vacci- 774  
nation. *Journal of mathematical biology*, 775  
41:143–171, 2000. 776
- [34] Ana Perisic and Chris T Bauch. A 777  
simulation analysis to characterize the 778  
dynamics of vaccinating behaviour on 779

- 780 contact networks. *BMC Infectious Dis-* [40] Thomas C Schelling. Models of segre- 814  
781 *eases*, 9:1–15, 2009. gation. *The American Economic Review*,  
59(2):488–493, 1969. 815  
816
- 782 [35] Ana Perisic and Chris T Bauch. So- 817  
783 cial contact networks and disease [41] Thomas C Schelling. Dynamic models  
784 eradicability under voluntary vacci- 818  
785 nation. *PLoS computational biology*, 819  
786 5(2):e1000280, 2009.
- 787 [36] Joshua L. Pulsipher, Weiqi Zhang, 820  
788 Tyler J. Hongisto, and Victor M. [42] Oluwaseun Sharomi and Tufail Malik.  
789 Zavala. A unifying modeling ab- 821  
790 straction for infinite-dimensional Optimal control in epidemiology. *An-*  
791 optimization. *Computers & Chemical 822*
- 792 *Engineering*, 156, 2022. 823
- 793 [37] Zirou Qiu, Baltazar Espinoza, Vi- 824  
794 tor V Vasconcelos, Chen Chen, [43] Andrei Sontag, Tim Rogers, and Chris-  
795 Sara M Constantino, Stefani A Crab- 825  
796 tree, Luojun Yang, Anil Vullikanti, 826  
797 Jiangzhuo Chen, Jörgen Weibull, Misinformation can  
798 et al. Understanding the coevolution prevent the suppression of epidemics.  
799 of mask wearing and epidemics: A *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*,  
800 network perspective. *Proceedings 19(188):20210668, 2022.* 827  
801 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 828  
802 119(26):e2123355119, 2022.
- 803 [38] Matthew Rabin. Incorporating fair- 829  
804 ness into game theory and economics. [44] Ruiyang Su and Bryce Morsky. Re-  
805 *The American economic review*, pages 830  
806 1281–1302, 1993. lational utility and social norms in  
831  
832
- 807 [39] Chadi M Saad-Roy and Arne 833  
808 Traulsen. Dynamics in a behavioral- [45] Chengjun Sun and Wei Yang. Global  
809 epidemiological model for individual results for an sirs model with vaccina-  
810 adherence to a nonpharmaceuti- 834  
811 cal intervention. *Proceedings of tion and isolation. Nonlinear Analysis:*  
812 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 835  
813 120(44):e2311584120, 2023. *Real World Applications*, 11(5):4223–  
4237, 2010. 836  
837
- [46] Xueying Wang, Daozhou Gao, and Jin 838  
Wang. Influence of human behavior 839  
on cholera dynamics. *Mathematical bio-* 840  
*sciences*, 267:41–52, 2015. 841
- [47] Zhen Wang, Michael A Andrews, 842  
Zhi-Xi Wu, Lin Wang, and Chris T 843  
Bauch. Coupled disease–behavior dy- 844  
namics on complex networks: A re- 845



846 view. *Physics of life reviews*, 15:1–29,  
847 2015.

848 [48] Joshua S Weitz, Sang Woo Park, Cey-  
849 hun Eksin, and Jonathan Dushoff.  
850 Awareness-driven behavior changes  
851 can shift the shape of epidemics  
852 away from peaks and toward plateaus,  
853 shoulders, and oscillations. *Proceed-*  
854 *ings of the National Academy of Sciences*,  
855 117(51):32764–32771, 2020.

856 [49] Dale Weston, Katharina Hauck, and  
857 Richard Amlôt. Infection prevention  
858 behaviour and infectious disease mod-  
859 elling: a review of the literature and  
860 recommendations for the future. *BMC*  
861 *public health*, 18:1–16, 2018.

862 [50] Hai-Feng Zhang, Zhi-Xi Wu, Ming  
863 Tang, and Ying-Cheng Lai. Effects  
864 of behavioral response and vaccina-  
865 tion policy on epidemic spreading-an  
866 approach based on evolutionary-game  
867 dynamics. *Scientific reports*, 4(1):5666,  
868 2014.