1	Full title:
2	Smallpox bioterrorism scenarios and reactive intervention protocol: mathematical model-based
3	analysis
4	
5	Short title:
6	Mathematical model-based analysis of smallpox bioterrorism
7	
8	Author list:
9	Youngsuk Ko <sup>1</sup> , Yubin Seo <sup>3</sup> , Jin Ju Park <sup>3</sup> , Eun Jung Kim <sup>4</sup> , Jong Youn Moon <sup>5</sup> , Tark Kim <sup>6</sup> , Joong Sik
10	Eom <sup>7</sup> , Hong Sang Oh <sup>8</sup> , Arim Kim <sup>9</sup> , Jin Yong Kim <sup>10</sup> , Jacob Lee <sup>3*</sup> , and Eunok Jung <sup>2*</sup>
11	
12	<sup>1</sup> Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Konkuk University, Seoul, Korea
13	<sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics, Konkuk University, Seoul, Korea
14	<sup>3</sup> Division of Infectious Disease, Department of Internal Medicine, Kangnam Sacred Heart Hospital, College of
15	Medicine, Hallym University, Seoul, Korea
16	<sup>4</sup> National Assembly Research Service, Seoul, Korea
17	<sup>5</sup> Department of preventive medicine, College of medicine, Gachon University, Incheon, Korea
18	<sup>6</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases, Soonchunhyang University Bucheon Hospital, Bucheon, Korea
19	<sup>7</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine, Gil Medical Center, College of Medicine,
20	Gachon University, Incheon, Korea
21	<sup>8</sup> Division of Infectious Disease, Department of Internal Medicine, Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital,
22	Gyeonggi-do, Korea
23	<sup>9</sup> Gachon Biomedical Convergence Institute, Gachon, Korea
24	<sup>10</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine, Incheon Medical Center, Incheon, Korea
25	*Corresponding author

#### 27 Abstract

28 Smallpox, caused by the variola virus, is one of the most devastating diseases in human history and 29 was eradicated through global vaccination efforts by 1980. Despite its eradication, the virus remains in high-security laboratories for research purposes, posing the potential risk of bioterrorism. This 30 31 study developed a mathematical model to analyze potential smallpox epidemics by incorporating 32 factors such as age groups, heterogeneous contact patterns, and various intervention strategies 33 including contact tracing, ring vaccination, and mass vaccination. The model simulations indicated 34 that the Republic of Korea's current plans for negative-pressure isolation beds should suffice under 35 most scenarios, but extreme worst-case scenarios could overwhelm healthcare capacity. This study 36 highlights the critical importance of non-pharmaceutical interventions and strategic vaccination prioritization for controlling outbreaks. These findings provide valuable guidance for public health 37 38 officials and policymakers in preparing for potential bioterrorism threats and emerging infectious 39 diseases. Furthermore, emphasizes the need for comprehensive preparedness and robust response 40 strategies. The proposed framework applies to smallpox and to other infectious diseases, offering 41 insights for future outbreak management.

## 43 Abbreviations

- 44 NPIs: Non-pharmaceutical interventions
- 45 PEP: Post-exposure prophylaxis
- 46 ROK: Republic of Korea
- 47 CrI: Credible interval
- 48 PRCC: Partial Rank Correlation Coefficient
- 49

Smallpox, caused by the variola virus, is one of the most devastating diseases affecting humans(1).

#### 50 Introduction

51

52 With its origins traced back to ancient civilizations, smallpox has spread across continents. The 53 disease is characterized by a high fever, severe skin eruptions, and a significant fatality rate 54 (approximately 30%), making it a formidable threat to populations worldwide. 55 The pioneering findings of Jenner and concerted global efforts, including mass vaccination 56 campaigns, surveillance, and implementation of ring vaccination strategies, led to the gradual decline 57 of smallpox cases. Non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), such as disease surveillance, case 58 finding, and contact tracing, are also crucial for containing the spread of the virus(2). Ring 59 vaccination involves vaccinating all individuals near a detected case to prevent the spread of the virus. 60 Additionally, post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) has been used to vaccinate individuals exposed to the virus, further preventing outbreaks(3.4). The World Health Organization (WHO) launched an 61 62 intensified eradication program in 1967, which culminated in the declaration of smallpox eradication 63 in 1980. 64 Despite its eradication, the variola virus remains in two high-security laboratories: the Centers for 65 Disease Control and Prevention in the United States and the State Research Center of Virology and 66 Biotechnology in Russia(5). The virus is retained for research purposes, including developing new 67 vaccines and treatments. However, the presence of these viral stocks poses the potential risk of 68 bioterrorism. Given the lack of widespread immunity in the current global population, the deliberate 69 release of the smallpox virus could lead to a catastrophic outbreak. Two notable laboratory-related 70 smallpox incidents underscored the importance of maintaining vigilance. In 1971, the Aral Smallpox 71 incident in Soviet Russia led to ten infections and three deaths(6). Similarly, in 1978, a laboratory 72 accident in Birmingham, England resulted in two infections and one death(7). 73 A notable scenario that underscores the potential threat of smallpox as a bioterrorism agent is Dark 74 Winter exercises (8). This senior-level bioterrorist attack simulation depicted a covert smallpox attack 75 in the United States starting in Oklahoma City and rapidly spreading to other states. The exercise 76 revealed significant gaps in the national emergency response, highlighting the challenges of

77 containing the outbreak, managing public panic, and maintaining essential services. Winter's findings 78 emphasize the need for robust preparedness plans, including sufficient vaccine stockpiles, effective 79 communication strategies, and coordinated efforts between public health and security agencies, to 80 mitigate the impact of such a bioterrorism event. 81 Mathematical models are crucial in understanding and controlling infectious disease outbreaks, 82 including smallpox, as demonstrated in various studies. Ferguson emphasized the effectiveness of 83 targeted surveillance and containment interventions such as ring vaccination in controlling smallpox 84 outbreaks, underscoring the need for a rapid response (9). Meltzer constructed a model to evaluate 85 quarantine and vaccination interventions after a bioterrorist attack and demonstrated that a 86 combination of these strategies was effective in halting disease transmission (10). Ohushima 87 developed a model to predict smallpox outbreaks in Japan, evaluated the control measures, and found 88 that mass vaccination was more effective than ring vaccination under certain conditions (11). Chun

89 used epidemic modeling and tabletop exercises to prepare public health officials in the ROK for

90 potential outbreaks, highlighting the importance of these tools in estimating cases, deaths, and

91 resource shortages (12).

92 In this study, we developed a mathematical model to analyze potential smallpox epidemics by 93 incorporating various realistic factors such as age groups and heterogeneous contact patterns. The 94 model includes contact tracing, ring vaccination, and mass vaccination strategies and distinguishes 95 severe cases among infected individuals to discuss the required capacity for severe patients in 96 emergency scenarios. The insights gained from vaccination prioritization during the COVID-19 97 pandemic were also analyzed in relation to potential smallpox scenarios. Given the threat of smallpox 98 as a bioterrorism agent, this study evaluated reactive intervention protocols by simulating various 99 outbreak scenarios and assessing the effectiveness of NPIs, vaccination strategies, and isolation 100 facilities. These findings highlight the importance of early detection, rapid response, and strategic 101 vaccination prioritization. The proposed framework addresses smallpox and offers insights applicable 102 to other emerging infectious diseases, emphasizing the need for comprehensive preparedness in the 103 face of potential bioterrorism threats.

### 104 Materials and Methods

## 105 Mathematical modeling of smallpox epidemic

- 106 To investigate the transmission dynamics of potential smallpox epidemics, we developed a
- 107 susceptible-infectious-recovered-type mathematical model that reflects contact tracing, disease
- 108 severity, age group, and ring/mass vaccination. The mathematical model is shown as a flow diagram
- in Figure 1. Age groups are denoted by subscript (*i*) for each variable, and vaccinated individuals are
- 110 denoted by superscript (v). In this study, we categorized the population into 16 age groups, each
- spanning 5 years, ranging from 0–4 years to 65 years and older in the Republic of Korea (13).
- 112
- 113
- 114

115 Figure 1. Flow diagram of the mathematical model of the smallpox epidemic.

117 In general, Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered type models have the transmission rate, typically 118 denoted by the symbol  $\beta$ , which consists of the contact rate per unit time (c) and the probability of 119 successful disease transmission (p), that is,  $\beta = pc$ . In this study, we distinguished between those 120 who had contact with infectious hosts but were not infected ( $C_i$ ) and those who were infected after contact ( $E_i$ ). We also considered both close contact ( $\lambda_i^A$ ) and social contact ( $\lambda_i^B$ ). Close contacts were 121 122 incorporated based on a study by Prem et al.(14). Social contacts were assumed to be four times the 123 number of contacts, excluding household contacts. The probability of successful disease transmission 124 through close contact was set to 60%(15). Using this value and the next-generation matrix method, the 125 basic reproductive number through close contact was calculated to be approximately four (16). 126 Considering that the recorded basic reproductive number of smallpox is approximately six, the 127 probability of successful disease transmission through casual contact was set at 10%(17). 128 To incorporate contact tracing regardless of infection status, we used the symbol (q) to represent the 129 proportion of contact-traced individuals. Those who were traced after contact and those who were not 130 traced were distinguished using a tilde symbol ( $\sim$ ). Here, casual contact was not traced. The infection 131 transmission periods for traced and non-traced individuals were set based on the time from symptom onset to isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic in the ROK (18). We assumed that contact-traced 132 133 individuals would be hospitalized/isolated relatively quickly (within 2.3 days,  $1/\alpha$ ) after symptom onset, while non-traced individuals would be isolated after 6.8 days  $(1/\tilde{\alpha})$ , considering the time to the 134 135 appearance of definitive smallpox symptoms (lesions)(19). The severity rate in the model  $(z_i)$  was set to twice the infection fatality ratio. Thus, in the model simulations, half of the severe patients died, 136 137 whereas there were no deaths among non-severe patients. Vaccination was applied in two forms in the model: mass vaccination  $(\mu_m)$  and ring vaccination  $(\mu_r)$ . 138 139 Ring vaccination was prioritized and administered after case isolation but not in those who had 140 already developed symptoms. Patients exposed to the infection either recovered or continued to show

141 symptoms depending on the effectiveness of PEP ( $e_{PEP}$ ). Even those who did not directly receive the

142 effects of PEP experienced a reduction in severity/fatality rates due to partial effects. Mass

143 vaccination was administered to the entire population outside the ring vaccination targets, and those

144 who had already been vaccinated were not revaccinated even if they were contact-traced. Those who 145 were isolated without infection or ring vaccination were discharged 19 days (1/l) after isolation(20). 146 In response to the smallpox epidemic, we assumed that vaccinating 40 million people (approximately 80% of the population) would be necessary to achieve herd immunity. Vaccination can be slow 147 148 initially owing to the lack of available personnel who are educated and vaccinated. In the ROK, there 149 was a small-scale vaccination for healthcare workers during the global Mpox outbreak in 2022 in 150 response to the domestic influx (21). These individuals would be the first to start vaccination during a 151 smallpox epidemic and could vaccinate other healthcare workers and target populations. Thus, we 152 assumed the daily vaccination capacity follows a logistic growth model, considering the maximum 153 daily vaccination capacity during the COVID-19 pandemic, set at 1 million ( $\mu_{ub}$ ). The vaccination 154 process started with 1,000 vaccinations per day, with a logistic growth rate  $(r_v)$  of 0.1, and all 40 155 million people were vaccinated after 110 days.

156 The model is formulated using ordinary differential equations as follows:

~ ~

157 
$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -(\lambda_i^A + \lambda_i^B)S_i - \mu_m(S), \quad \frac{dS_i^{\nu}}{dt} = \mu_m(S) + \mu_m(\tilde{C}_i) + \mu_r(Q_i^S) + lQ_i^{S\nu} - (\lambda_i^A + \lambda_i^B)S_i^{\nu},$$

158 
$$\frac{dC_i}{dt} = (1-p^A)(1-q)\lambda_i^A(S_i+\tilde{C}_i) + (1-p^B)\lambda_i^B(S_i+\tilde{C}_i) - (\lambda_i^A+\lambda_i^B)\tilde{C}_i - \mu_m(\tilde{C}_i),$$

159 
$$\frac{dC_i}{dt} = (1-p^A)q\lambda_i^A(S_i+\tilde{C}_i) + (1-p^A)\lambda_i^AC_i + (1-p^B)\lambda_i^BC_i - (\lambda_i^A+\lambda_i^B)C_i - \sigma C_i,$$

160 
$$\frac{dC_i^{\nu}}{dt} = (1 - p_v^A)(1 - q)\lambda_i^A \left(S_i^{\nu} + \tilde{C}_i^{\nu}\right) + (1 - p_v^B)\lambda_i^B \left(S_i^{\nu} + \tilde{C}_i^{\nu}\right) - (\lambda_i^A + \lambda_i^B)\tilde{C}_i^{\nu},$$

161 
$$\frac{dC_{i}^{v}}{dt} = (1 - p_{v}^{A})q\lambda_{i}^{A}(S_{i}^{v} + \tilde{C}_{i}^{v}) + (1 - p_{v}^{A})\lambda_{i}^{A}C_{i}^{v} + (1 - p_{v}^{B})\lambda_{i}^{B}C_{i}^{v} - (\lambda_{i}^{A} + \lambda_{i}^{B})C_{i}^{v} - \sigma C_{i}^{v},$$

162 
$$\frac{d\tilde{E}_i}{dt} = p^A (1-q)\lambda_i^A (S_i + \tilde{C}_i) + p^B \lambda_i^B (S_i + \tilde{C}_i) - \kappa \tilde{E}_i - \mu_m (\tilde{E}_i),$$

163 
$$\frac{dE_i}{dt} = p^A q \lambda_i^A (S_i + \tilde{C}_i) + p^A \lambda_i^A C_i + p^B \lambda_i^B C_i - \kappa E_i - \sigma E_i,$$

164 
$$\frac{d\tilde{E}_i^{\nu}}{dt} = (1 - e_{pep})\mu_m(\tilde{E}_i) + p_{\nu}^A(1 - q)\lambda_i^A(S_i^{\nu} + \tilde{C}_i^{\nu}) + p_{\nu}^B\lambda_i^B(S_i^{\nu} + \tilde{C}_i^{\nu}) - \kappa\tilde{E}_i^{\nu},$$

165 
$$\frac{dE_i^{\nu}}{dt} = p_{\nu}^A q \lambda_i^A \left( S_i^{\nu} + \tilde{C}_i^{\nu} \right) + p_{\nu}^A \lambda_i^A C_i^{\nu} + p_{\nu}^B \lambda_i^B C_i^{\nu} - \kappa E_i^{\nu} - \sigma E_i^{\nu} ,$$

166 
$$\frac{d\tilde{I}_i}{dt} = \kappa \tilde{E}_i - \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{I}_i, \quad \frac{dI_i}{dt} = \kappa E_i - \alpha I_i,$$

167 
$$\frac{d\tilde{I}_{i}^{\nu}}{dt} = \kappa \tilde{E}_{i}^{\nu} - \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{I}_{i}^{\nu}, \quad \frac{dI_{i}^{\nu}}{dt} = \kappa E_{i}^{\nu} - \alpha I_{i}^{\nu},$$

168 
$$\frac{dQ_i^s}{dt} = \sigma C_i - \mu_r(Q_i^s), \quad \frac{dQ_i^{sv}}{dt} = \sigma C_i^v - lQ_i^{sv}, \quad \frac{dQ_i^e}{dt} = \sigma E_i - \mu_r(Q_i^e),$$

169 
$$\frac{dQ_i}{dt} = (1 - z_i)(\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{I}_i + \alpha I_i) - \gamma_Q Q_i,$$

170 
$$\frac{dQ_i^v}{dt} = (1 - z_i^v) \big( (1 - e_{PEP}) \mu_r (Q_i^e) + \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{I}_i^v + \alpha I_i^v + \sigma E_i^v \big) - \gamma_Q Q_i^v,$$

171 
$$\frac{dH_i}{dt} = z_i (\tilde{\alpha} \tilde{I}_i + \alpha I_i) - \gamma_H H_i,$$

172 
$$\frac{dH_i^v}{dt} = z_i^v \left( (1 - e_{PEP}) \mu_r (Q_i^e) + \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{I}_i^v + \alpha I_i^v + \sigma E_i^v \right) - \gamma_H H_i^v,$$

173 
$$\frac{dR}{dt} = e_{PEP}(\mu_m(\tilde{E}_i) + \mu_r(Q_i^e)) + \gamma_Q(Q_i + Q_i^v) + (1 - f)\gamma_H(H_i + H_i^v),$$

174 
$$\lambda_{i}^{A} = \sum_{j} \frac{c_{ij}^{A} (I_{j} + I_{j}^{v} + \tilde{I}_{j} + \tilde{I}_{j}^{v})}{N}, \ \lambda_{i}^{B} = \sum_{j} \frac{c_{ij}^{B} (I_{j} + I_{j}^{v} + \tilde{I}_{j} + \tilde{I}_{j}^{v})}{N},$$

175 
$$N = \sum_{i} S_{i} + S_{i}^{\nu} + \tilde{C}_{i} + C_{i} + \tilde{C}_{i}^{\nu} + C_{i}^{\nu} + \tilde{E}_{i} + E_{i} + \tilde{E}_{i}^{\nu} + E_{i}^{\nu} + \tilde{I}_{i} + I_{i} + \tilde{I}_{i}^{\nu} + I_{i}^{\nu} + R_{i},$$

176 
$$\mu(t) = \frac{\mu_{ub}}{1 + \exp(-r_v(t - t_0))}$$

177 
$$\mu_r^* = \min\left(\mu(t), \sum_i Q_i^s + Q_i^e\right),$$

178 
$$\mu_r(X) = \mu_r^* \frac{X}{\sum_i Q_i^s + Q_i^e} ,$$

179 
$$\mu_m(X) = \left(\mu(t) - \mu_r^*\right) \frac{X}{\sum_i S_i + \tilde{C}_i + \tilde{E}_i} \quad .$$

180 The model parameters are listed in Table 1. As experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic, the scale of the potential outbreaks remains uncertain. To reflect this, model simulations were conducted as a 181

- 182 stochastic process using the Tau-leaping method. We ran 1000 simulations for each model setting. As
- 183 an initial condition for the model simulation, all population groups were assumed to be in a
- 184 susceptible state. The number of exposed hosts was set to 100 and proportionally distributed
- according to the population ratio of each group. Table 2 lists the population numbers in each group.

### 187 Table 1. Model parameters

Symbol	Description	Value	Reference
$1/\tilde{\alpha}$	Infectious period of contact-unidentified hosts	6.8 days	(18,19)
1/α	Infectious period of contact-identified hosts	2.3 days	(18)
$p_A$	Probability of successful disease transmission per close contact	0.6	(15,16,18)
$p_B$	Probability of successful disease transmission per casual contact	0.1	(15,16,18)
q	Contact-identification ratio	0.8	Assumed
1/l	Isolation duration of uninfected case	19 days	(20)
1/σ	Contact tracing duration	2 days	Assumed
1/κ	Incubation period	12 days	(22)
$1/\gamma_Q$	Isolation duration of non-severe case	28 days	(22)
$1/\gamma_H$	Duration from hospitalization to recovery (or death) of severe case	13 days	(1)
Zi	Age dependent severity rate	0.83 (1) 0.47 (2,3) 0.61 (4,5) 0.59 (6-10) 0.64 (11-16)	(23)
f	Fatality rate of severe case	0.5	Assumed, (1)
е	Preventive vaccine effectiveness against infection	0.78	(24)
e <sub>H</sub>	Vaccine effectiveness against severity	0.97	(24)
$e_{pep}$	Post-exposure prophylaxis vaccine effectiveness against infection	0.5	(25)

#### 189 Table 2. Population size by age group

Age group	Age range	Population size
1	0-4 years	1455094
2	5-9 years	2151118
3	10-14 years	2368657
4	15-19 years	2330189
5	20-24 years	3011576
6	25-29 years	3501534
7	30-34 years	3278501
8	35-39 years	3362054
9	40-44 years	4047017
10	45-49 years	4075006
11	50-54 years	4543049
12	55-59 years	4102783
13	60-64 years	4185467
14	65-69 years	3118100
15	70-74 years	2192898
16	Age over 75 years	3835398

#### 191 Baseline model simulation scenario

The simulation time was set as 365 days. The baseline model simulation scenario consisted of threephases following the initial exposure:

- Pre-declaration (Phase 1): This phase represents the period during which the occurrence of the
  outbreak has not yet been recognized. No NPIs or vaccination measures were in place during
  this phase, which lasted for 28 days after the initial exposure. This is the worst-case scenario,
  set at a realistic level, considering the incubation period, initial symptoms, and occurrence of
  rashes.
- Post-declaration (Phase 2): This phase begins when the outbreak is first recognized, and
  contact tracing and social distancing (NPIs) are implemented. However, vaccination is not yet
  feasible because of the time required for preparation, e.g., training for medical personnel. This
  phase lasted for three days. It was assumed that social distancing would reduce the total
  contact rate by 60%.
- Post-vaccination (Phase 3): This phase marks the beginning of vaccination. Vaccination
  continued until 40 million people had been vaccinated. This phase lasted for 334 days.
  Vaccination was administered simultaneously to all age groups, and the amount of vaccines
  administered was proportional to the population of each group; that is, there was no vaccine
  prioritization.

209

#### 210 Scenarios considering vaccine prioritization

211 Vaccination was not prioritized in the baseline scenario considered in this study. However, as

212 experienced by most countries during the COVID-19 pandemic, prioritizing vaccination may be a

- 213 more realistic approach. We defined four criteria for the prioritization scenarios: ascending age,
- descending age, prioritizing age groups with higher transmission risk, and prioritizing age groups with

215 higher severity/death risk. The age groups with higher transmission risk were calculated based on the

- 216 contact rate and the probability of successful disease transmission, and the order was as follows: age
- 217 groups 4 (15-19 year), 3 (10-14 year), 9 (40-44 year), 8 (35-39 year), 7 (30-34 year), 6 (25-29 year),

- 218 10 (45-49 year), 11 (50-54 year), 5 (20-24 year), 2 (5-9 year), 12 (55-59 year), 13 (60-64 year), 1 (0-4
- 219 year), 14 (65-69 year), 15 (70-74 year), 16 (75+ year).

#### 220 Results

#### 221 **Baseline scenario simulation**

- 222 Figure 2 shows the model simulation results for the confirmed cases (transition from infectious to
- 223 isolated) and isolated patients. The curves represent the mean values of the model simulations, and
- 224 shaded areas indicate the 95% credible interval (CrI). The red graph shows the daily confirmed cases,
- 225 whereas the blue curves represent isolated patients. Among the blue curves, the solid and dashed lines
- 226 indicate patients with non-severe and severe patients.
- 227 Daily confirmed cases increased sharply (mean 1167, maximum 1602 in 95% CrI) owing to contact
- tracing implemented at the initial outbreak recognition, and then decreased, followed by a gradual 228
- 229 increase, and finally decreased again owing to herd immunity from vaccination. The number of non-
- severe patients reached a mean of 3750 (maximum 5422 in 95% CrI) after 114 days of spread, 230
- 231 whereas that of severe patients reached a mean of 1235 (maximum 1838 in 95% CrI) after 99 days of exposure.
- 232
- 233
- 234
- 235
- 236 Figure 2. Baseline scenario simulation results. Curves indicate mean simulation results and shaded 237 areas indicate the 95% credible interval.

238

- 240 The confirmed cases and deaths observed in the simulation runs are presented in Figure 3 using box-
- and-whisker plots. Panels A and B show the confirmed cases, and panels C and D show the number of
- deaths. The total number of confirmed cases was 36600 (95% CrI [24253, 51500]) and the total
- 243 number of deaths was 5345 (95% CrI [3472, 7545]). Age group 9 (40–44 years) had the highest
- number of confirmed cases, with a mean of 4241 (95% CrI [2846, 5969]). Group 11 (50–54 years)
- had the highest number of deaths, with a mean age of 677 years (95% CrI [447, 936]). The age group
- 246 0–4 years had the lowest number of confirmed cases (mean 361, 95% CrI 237, 513]) and deaths
- 247 (mean 68, 95% CrI [41, 101]).
- 248 In addition to the baseline scenario, the results for different initial numbers and logistic growth rates
- 249 for vaccinations and the varying effects of social distancing on contact reduction are listed in Tables
- 250 3–5.

252

- Figure 3. Outbreak outcomes from the baseline scenario simulations: Distribution of the number of
- confirmed cases by age (A) and total (B), deaths by age (C) and total (D).

- Table 3. Mean and 95% CrI of outbreak outcomes with a 50% reduction in contacts due to social
- 257 distancing.

Initial	Growth rate	Confirmed cases	Deaths	Peak severe
vaccination				patients
number				
1000	0.05	260458 [170462,	34255 [22388,	7608 [4983,
(baseline)		354688]	46734]	10423]
	0.1 (baseline)	90947 [60018,	11890 [7842,	3182 [2080,
		127048]	16516]	4452]
	0.5	29323 [19519,	3816 [2588,	1260 [000 1015]
		40916]	5298]	1309 [909, 1913]
5000	0.05	144457 [94173,	19008 [12540,	4411 [2875,
		199367]	25960]	6109]
	0.1 (baseline)	64585 [41862,	8451 [5588,	2381 [1562,
		90666]	11793]	3349]
	0.5	26828 [17542,	3491 [2316,	1292 [940 1706]
		37368]	4847]	1282 [849, 1790]
10000	0.05	111421 [73076,	14671 [9640,	3507 [2303,
		157301]	20653]	4973]
	0.1 (baseline)	56267 [38326,	7358 [5030,	2135 [1458,
		76475]	9959]	2922]
	0.5	26075 [17039,	3391 [2269,	1261 [810 1750]
		37098]	4682]	1201 [019, 1739]

- Table 4. Mean and 95% CrI of outbreak outcomes with a 60% reduction in contacts due to social
- distancing.

Initial	Growth rate	Confirmed cases	Deaths	Peak severe	
vaccination				patients	
number					
1000	0.05	60356 [40271,	8894 [5950,	1475 [085 2004]	
(baseline)		84492]	12436]	1475 [985, 2094]	
	0.1 (baseline)	36886 [24398,	5391 [3581,	1201 [020 1706]	
		51467]	7513]	1281 [838, 1780]	
	0.5	18611 [12524,	2676 [1827,	1049 [707 1455]	
		25865]	3706]	1048 [707, 1433]	
5000	0.05	46071 [30001,	6784 [4461,	1210 [040 1000]	
		63246]	9343]	1318 [848, 1808]	
	0.1 (baseline)	30803 [20538,	4495 [2996,	1209 [707 1692]	
		42278]	6173]	1208 [797, 1082]	
	0.5	17614 [11806,	2530 [1713,	1028 [601 1411]	
		24104]	3410]	1028 [091, 1411]	
10000	0.05	40645 [26835,	5981 [3918,	1261 [827 1787]	
		56652]	8371]	1201 [827, 1787]	
	0.1 (baseline)	28100 [19317,	4098 [2792,	1168 [700 1642]	
		39537]	5702]	1100 [790, 1042]	
	0.5	17103 [11403,	2457 [1669,	1012 [694 1404]	
		23652]	3365]	1012 [084, 1404]	

262

- Table 5. Mean and 95% CrI of outbreak outcomes with a 70% reduction in contacts due to social
- distancing.

Initial	Growth rate	Confirmed cases	Deaths	Peak severe
vaccination				patients
number				
1000	0.05	20749 [13713,	3370 [2225,	804 [602 1256]
(baseline)		29494]	4805]	894 [002, 1230]
	0.1 (baseline)	17565 [11933,	2851 [1947,	881 [605 1186]
		23971]	3852]	881 [005, 1180]
	0.5	12510 [8588,	1985 [1358,	800 [611 1224]
		17000]	2681]	890 [011, 1224]
5000	0.05	19069 [13225,	3101 [2105,	801 [625 1227]
		26800]	4343]	891 [023, 1237]
	0.1 (baseline)	16446 [11093,	2663 [1853,	803 [506 1228]
		22420]	3608]	893 [390, 1228]
	0.5	12006 [8172,	1898 [1321,	884 [508 1215]
		16475]	2584]	864 [396, 1213]
10000	0.05	18288 [12598,	2975 [2042,	801 [625 1210]
		25139]	4084]	891 [025, 1210]
	0.1 (baseline)	15724 [11007,	2545 [1781,	880 [600 1224]
		21809]	3533]	009 [009, 1224]
	0.5	11900 [8028,	1879 [1285,	800 [506 1228]
		16371]	2577]	070 [390, 1228]

266

268	Figure 4 shows the distribution of hosts who had contact with infected individuals at outbreak
269	recognition 28 days after initial exposure. The average numbers of hosts who had contact (whether
270	they were infected or not), hosts during the incubation period, and hosts in the contagious stage were
271	5618 (95% CrI [3786, 7776]), 3401 (95% CrI [2288, 4706]), and 926 (95% CrI [623, 1275]),
272	respectively.
273	
274	
275	
276	Figure 4. Distribution of the number of hosts who had hazardous contact until the outbreak
277	recognition in different stages.

279	Figure 5 shows the mean daily vaccination number (panel A), the distribution of administered ring
280	vaccinations in the simulation runs (panel B), and the ring vaccination period (panel C). In this study,
281	the ring vaccination period was considered the point at which the mass vaccination exceeded the
282	amount of ring vaccination. The average number of ring vaccinations administered was 28750 (95%
283	CrI [19145,40218]), and the vaccination period lasted an average of 5.53 days (95% CrI [3.5, 8]).
284	
285	
286	
287	Figure 5. Vaccination number in the baseline scenario simulations: Mean daily vaccination number
288	(A), distribution of administered ring vaccination, and period (B,C).
289	
290	

### 291 Impact of vaccine prioritization

- 292 The simulation results, including the baseline scenario and scenarios with vaccine prioritization, are
- shown in Figure 6. Panels A and B show the daily numbers of confirmed and severe cases,
- respectively. Compared with the baseline scenario, prioritizing vaccination for age groups with a
- higher transmission risk (purple) showed a decrease, whereas prioritizing vaccination for older age
- 296 groups (yellow) showed a significant increase. Table 5 lists the odds ratios for cumulative confirmed
- 297 cases, deaths, and the peak number of severe patients compared to the baseline scenario. When
- 298 prioritization based on transmissibility was applied, the odds ratios for all metrics were below one,
- within the confidence interval. Conversely, when prioritization based on descending age was applied,
- 300 the odds ratios for all metrics exceeded one.
- 301
- 302
- 303
- 304 Figure 6. Simulation results considering vaccine prioritization: Daily confirmed cases (A),
- 305 administered to severe patients (B).
- 306

- 307 Table 6. Odds ratios and confidence intervals for scenarios considering vaccine prioritization
- 308 compared to the baseline scenario.

Vaccine prioritization	Confirmed cases	Deaths	Peak number of
			administered patients
Ascending age	0.97, [0.95 0.98]	0.98, [0.96 0.99]	1.02, [1.00 1.03]
Descending age	1.07, [1.06 1.09]	1.08, [1.06 1.09]	1.04, [1.02 1.06]
Transmissibility	0.89, [0.87 0.90]	0.90, [0.89 0.92]	0.96, [0.94 0.97]
Fatality	1.03, [1.02 1.05]	1.03, [1.01 1.05]	1.00, [0.98 1.01]

309

#### 311 Sensitivity analysis

312 To address the inherent uncertainties in these values and conduct a comprehensive sensitivity analysis 313 of the model outcomes, we measured the partial rank correlation coefficient (PRCC) values using 314 Latin hypercube sampling. PRCC is a statistical measure used to determine the strength and direction 315 of the relationship between two variables while controlling for the effects of other variables. In 316 sensitivity analysis, it is particularly useful to identify the parameters that have the most significant 317 impact on the output of a model. A detailed description of this method is provided in reference (26). 318 We considered the following model inputs: outbreak recognition timing, impact of social distancing 319 on contact number, infectious period of traced and non-traced cases, contact identification ratio, and 320 logistic growth rate of the daily vaccination number. The model outputs were set as the cumulative 321 confirmed cases and deaths, and the peak number of administered severe patients. 322 Figure 7 shows the measured absolute values of PRCC over time. The colors in the graph represent 323 the model inputs. Solid curves indicate the values for cumulative confirmed cases, whereas solid 324 curves indicate the values for cumulative deaths. The order of the absolute PRCC values for the model 325 inputs was the same regardless of whether the model output was cumulative confirmed cases or deaths. Based on the final absolute PRCC values, the timing of outbreak recognition had the highest 326 327 value, with 0.90 for cumulative confirmed cases and deaths. The contact identification ratio initially had a relatively high absolute PRCC (0.29) for cumulative confirmed cases but decreased to 0.01, 328 329 resulting in the lowest PRCC. Table 7 lists the ranges of PRCC values. In contrast to Figure 7, the absolute value of the PRCC for the growth rate of daily vaccination was the second smallest when the 330 considered model output peaked for severe patients. Additionally, outbreak recognition timing had the 331 332 highest absolute PRCC. 333

334

Figure 7. Absolute value of PRCC over time. Solid lines represent the value for cumulative confirmedcases, while dashed lines represent the value for cumulative deaths.

- Table 7. The final value and range of PRCC of model inputs considering different model outputs.
- 339 There is no range if the target model output is the peak number of severe patients as there is a one-
- time point of it.

Model input	Model output		
	Cumulative confirmed	Cumulative deaths	Peak severe
	cases		patients
Outbreak recognition	0.90 [0, 0.93]	0.90 [-0.19, 0.93]	0.88
timing			
Impact of social	-0.93 [-0.93, 0.01]	-0.91 [-0.91, 0]	-0.85
distancing			
Isolation rate for traced	-0.28 [-0.28, 0]	-0.32 [-0.32, 0.04]	-0.27
cases			
Isolation rate for non-	-0.89 [-0.89, -0.26]	-0.88 [-0.88, 0.2]	-0.81
traced cases			
Contact-identification	-0.01 [-0.29, -0.01]	-0.01 [-0.01, 0.01]	-0.02
ratio			
Growth rate of the daily	-0.31 [-0.31, 0]	-0.33 [-0.33, 0]	-0.16
vaccination			

#### 342 Discussion

343 The model simulation showed a rapid increase in confirmed cases upon initial detection, followed by 344 a gradual increase in the number of severely ill patients. By 2024, the ROK plans to expand the 345 number of negative-pressure isolation beds to 3500 to respond to emerging infectious diseases(27). According to the baseline scenario results, even in the worst case within the 95% CrI, the peak 346 347 administered to severely ill patients was 1800 (Figure 2), indicating that the current plan should 348 prevent a shortage of beds. However, in an extreme worst-case scenario, where the vaccination rate is 349 low and the impact of social distancing is weak (upper row in Table 3), the number of administered 350 severe cases could reach up to 7600, posing a significant risk. However, if the effectiveness of social 351 distancing reaches at least 0.6, dangerous situations are avoided. Therefore, the results suggest that a 352 minimum level of NPIs required during a smallpox outbreak. This level was measured to be near the 353 level of social distancing stage 2 in previous COVID-19 studies and is not an unrealistic measure in a 354 bioterrorism situation where nationwide interventions would be stricter. 355 The parameter sensitivity analysis results provided additional support for the basic model simulation 356 outcomes. The analysis revealed that both deaths and confirmed cases were highly sensitive to 357 recognition timing, impact of social distancing, and isolation rate for non-traced cases (Figure 7 and 358 Table 7). This underscores the significant role of NPIs in achieving herd immunity through 359 vaccination. 360 The distribution of hosts with contagious contacts at the initial outbreak recognition (Figure 4) represents the minimum number of ring vaccination targets that need to be considered immediately. 361

362 Considering the additional real-time increase in the number of contacts and exposed individuals, the

distribution shown in Figure 5 indicates the overall scope of the ring vaccination plan. Although these

individuals represented a small proportion (approximately 0.1%) of the total vaccination scale, ring

365 vaccination was primarily conducted during the first week of the initial vaccination period. Our

366 findings serve as a basis for determining the operation and number of distribution points during this

367 period.

368 Determining vaccine priorities is challenging because of various social, economic, and ethical issues.

369 Similar problems have been encountered during the COVID-19 pandemic. Prioritizing vaccination for 370 the elderly, who have higher severity/fatality rates, was the best strategy for minimizing deaths when 371 social distancing measures were in place to reduce the effective reproduction number to 372 approximately one (28,29). However, if the effective reproduction number increases, prioritizing the 373 elderly would be less effective than vaccinating younger adults in minimizing deaths. The study was 374 based on the original strain of COVID-19, which had a basic reproductive number of approximately 375 three, roughly half of that of smallpox. This implies that strong NPIs can effectively suppress the spread. Conversely, for smallpox, for which moderate levels of NPIs were not sufficient to control the 376 377 spread, prioritizing vaccination for groups with higher transmission rates was more effective in 378 reducing deaths. Prioritizing the elderly yielded the least favorable results. If the vaccination history 379 of the elderly, which was not considered in this study, were accounted for, they would likely have a 380 relatively lower severity/fatality rate compared to other age groups, further diminishing the 381 effectiveness of the first vaccination strategy. 382 The limitations of this study are as follows. For social contacts, we only used estimates based on close 383 contacts. Age-specific severity rates were derived from data that included both vaccinated and 384 unvaccinated individuals, which may differ from the actual values. We did consider the smallpox 385 vaccinations administered in the ROK until the early 1970s and rather assumed that all population 386 groups were susceptible. However, despite the lack of vaccine effectiveness against infection, the 387 elderly might have a lower severe/fatality rate than other age groups due to their vaccination history. 388 Finally, although the smallpox vaccine can have significant side effects, we did not incorporate these 389 side effects into our model. This was because vaccination coverage was fixed. Future studies will 390 focus on analyzing optimal vaccination strategies, taking into account side effects, spatial 391 heterogeneity, and regional lockdowns.

#### 392 Conclusion

393 Based on the findings of this study and considering realistic intervention scenarios and outbreak 394 situations, we propose an appropriate number of isolation facilities for severely ill patients and the 395 necessary level of initial social distancing. Various simulations have highlighted the critical 396 importance of early detection and rapid responses to mitigate the impact of smallpox outbreaks. These 397 results underscore the need for robust preparedness plans that include vaccination and NPIs. 398 Our study emphasizes the importance of strategic vaccination prioritization and the role of NPIs in 399 controlling outbreaks. The insights gained from this study provide valuable guidance to public health 400 officials and policymakers in preparing for and responding to potential bioterrorism threats and 401 emerging infectious diseases. The critical importance of early detection, rapid response, and 402 comprehensive preparedness cannot be overstated when safeguarding public health. 403 The overall framework of this study applies to smallpox and other emerging infectious diseases that 404 may spread to humans in the future. By incorporating parameters similar to those applied in this 405 study, response strategy scenarios can be developed for diseases that can be controlled using currently 406 available vaccines. Conversely, for novel diseases with significant time requirements for vaccine 407 development, this framework can be adapted to simulate the post-declaration phase responses.

## 409 Acknowledgement

- 410 This research was supported by the Government-wide R&D Fund Project for Infectious Disease
- 411 Research (GFID), Republic of Korea (grant No. HG23C1629). This work was supported by the
- 412 Research Program funded by the Korea Disease Control and Prevention Agency (정책, 150).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317777; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

#### 414 Reference

- 415 1. Fenner F, Henderson DA, Arita I, Ježek Z, Ladnyi ID. Smallpox and its eradication continued. 416 1988
- 417 2. Henderson DA. Principles and lessons from the smallpox eradication programme. Bull World 418 Health Organ. 1987;65(4):535.
- 419 3. Kretzschmar M, Van den Hof S, Wallinga J, Van Wijngaarden J. Ring vaccination and 420 smallpox control. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004;10(5):832.
- 421 4 Keckler MS, Reynolds MG, Damon IK, Karem KL. The effects of post-exposure smallpox 422 vaccination on clinical disease presentation: addressing the data gaps between historical 423 epidemiology and modern surrogate model data. Vaccine. 2013;31(45):5192-201.
- 424 5. Tucker JB. Breaking the deadlock over destruction of the smallpox virus stocks. Biosecur 425 Bioterror. 2011;9(1):55-67.
- 426 6. Zelicoff AP. An epidemiological analysis of the 1971 smallpox outbreak in Aralsk, 427 Kazakhstan. Crit Rev Microbiol. 2003;29(2):97-108.
- 428 7. Harling R, Morgan D, Edmunds WJ, Campbell H. Interim smallpox guidelines for the United 429 Kingdom: Developing new policies from old evidence. Vol. 325, BMJ. British Medical 430 Journal Publishing Group; 2002. p. 1371-2.
- 431 8. O'Toole T, Mair M, Inglesby T V. Shining light on" Dark Winter". Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2002;972-83. 432
- 433 9. Ferguson NM, Keeling MJ, John Edmunds W, Gani R, Grenfell BT, Anderson RM, et al. 434 Planning for smallpox outbreaks. Nature. 2003;425(6959):681-5.
- 435 10. Meltzer MI, Damon I, LeDuc JW, Millar JD. Modeling potential responses to smallpox as a 436 bioterrorist weapon. Emerg Infect Dis. 2001;7(6):959.
- 437 11. Ohkusa Y, Taniguchi K, Okubo I. Prediction of smallpox outbreak and evaluation of control-438 measure policy in Japan, using a mathematical model. Journal of Infection and Chemotherapy. 2005;11(2):71-80. 439
- 440 12. Chun BC. Epidemic modeling and Table-top Exercise for Emerging Infectious Diseases in 441 Korea. Epidemiol Health. 2006;28(1):47-63.
- 442 13. Ministry of the Interior and Safety. Population Status by Age and Administrative District 443 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 23]. Available from: https://jumin.mois.go.kr/ageStatMonth.do
- 444 14. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact 445 surveys and demographic data. PLoS Comput Biol. 2017;13(9):e1005697.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Smallpox-Transmission [Internet]. [cited 2024 446 15. 447 Sep 23]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/smallpox/transmission/index.html
- 448 16. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Roberts MG. The construction of next-generation matrices for 449 compartmental epidemic models. J R Soc Interface. 2010;7(47):873-85.
- 450 17. Gani R, Leach S. Transmission potential of smallpox in contemporary populations. Nature. 451 2001;414(6865):748-51.
- 452 18. Shim E, Choi W, Song Y. Clinical time delay distributions of COVID-19 in 2020–2022 in the 453 Republic of Korea: inferences from a nationwide database analysis. J Clin Med. 454 2022;11(12):3269.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317777; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

455 456	19.	G. Bras. The Morbid Anatomy of Smallpox. 4th ed. Vol. 4. Documenta de Medicina Geographica et Tropica; 1952. 303–351 p.
457 458 459	20.	Korea Disease Control and Prevention Agency. Guidelines for Responding to Class 1 Infectious Diseases [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Sep 23]. Available from: https://www.kdca.go.kr/contents.es?mid=a20301110100
460 461 462	21.	Yonhap News Agency. First vaccination of medical staff against monkeypox Vaccination is tricky [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 23]. Available from: https://www.yna.co.kr/view/MYH20220627014500641
463 464	22.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Smallpox-symptoms [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 23]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/smallpox/symptoms/index.html
465	23.	Mazumder DNG, De S, Mitra AC, Mukherjee MK. Clinical observations on smallpox: a study

- ıdy of 1233 patients admitted to the Infectious Diseases Hospital, Calcutta, during 1973. Bull 466 World Health Organ. 1975;52(3):301. 467
- 468 24. Eichner M. Analysis of historical data suggests long-lasting protective effects of smallpox vaccination. Am J Epidemiol. 2003;158(8):717-23. 469
- 470 25. Mohanty B, Costantino V, Narain J, Chughtai AA, Das A, MacIntyre CR. Modelling the 471 impact of a smallpox attack in India and influence of disease control measures. BMJ Open. 472 2020;10(12):e038480.
- 473 Helton JC, Davis FJ. Latin hypercube sampling and the propagation of uncertainty in analyses 26. of complex systems. Reliab Eng Syst Saf. 2003;81(1):23-69. 474
- 475 27. Korea Disease Control and Prevention Agency. [May 11th, Thursday, Regular Briefing Press 476 Release] Promoting the Return to Normal Life from the COVID-19 Crisis [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 23]. Available from: 477
- https://www.kdca.go.kr/board/board.es?mid=a20501010000&bid=0015&list\_no=722503&cg 478 code=&act=view&nPage=1 479
- 480 28. Bubar KM, Reinholt K, Kissler SM, Lipsitch M, Cobey S, Grad YH, et al. Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus. Science (1979). 481 2021;371(6352):916-21. 482
- 483 29. Ko Y, Lee J, Kim Y, Kwon D, Jung E. COVID-19 vaccine priority strategy using a heterogenous transmission model based on maximum likelihood estimation in the Republic of 484 485 Korea. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(12):6469.

486









Outbreak recognition timing
 Impact of social distancing
 Isolation rate for traced cases
 Isolation rate for non-traced cases
 Contact-identification ratio
 Growth rate of the daily vaccination









