

Prioritising COVID-19 vaccination in changing social and epidemiological landscapes

Peter Jentsch^{1,2}, Madhur Anand¹, and Chris T. Bauch^{2,*}

¹Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada; ²School of Environmental Sciences, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada; *cbauch@uwaterloo.ca

1 Abstract

2 During the COVID-19 pandemic, authorities must decide which groups to prioritise for vaccination. These
3 decision will occur in a constantly shifting social-epidemiological landscape where the success of large-scale
4 non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) like physical distancing requires broad population acceptance. We
5 developed a coupled social-epidemiological model of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Schools and workplaces
6 are closed and re-opened based on reported cases. We used evolutionary game theory and mobility data
7 to model individual adherence to NPIs. We explored the impact of vaccinating 60+ year-olds first; <20
8 year-olds first; uniformly by age; and a novel contact-based strategy. The last three strategies interrupt
9 transmission while the first targets a vulnerable group. Vaccination rates ranged from 0.5% to 4.5% of
10 the population per week, beginning in January or July 2021. Case notifications, NPI adherence, and
11 lockdown periods undergo successive waves during the simulated pandemic. Vaccination reduces median
12 deaths by 32% – 77% (22% – 63%) for January (July) availability, depending on the scenario. Vaccinating
13 60+ year-olds first prevents more deaths (up to 8% more) than transmission-interrupting strategies for
14 January vaccine availability across most parameter regimes. In contrast, transmission-interrupting strategies
15 prevent up to 33% more deaths than vaccinating 60+ year-olds first for July availability, due to higher
16 levels of natural immunity by that time. Sensitivity analysis supports the findings. Further research is
17 urgently needed to determine which populations can benefit from using SARS-CoV-2 vaccines to interrupt
18 transmission.

19 Introduction

20 The COVID-19 pandemic has imposed a massive global health burden as waves of infection to move
21 through populations around the world (1). Both empirical analyses and mathematical models conclude
22 that non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) are effective in reducing COVID-19 case incidence (2–4).
23 However, pharmaceutical interventions are highly desirable given the socio-economic costs of lockdown
24 and physical distancing. Hence, dozens of vaccines are in development (5), and model-based analyses are
25 exploring the question of which groups should get the COVID-19 vaccine first (6, 7).

26 When vaccines become available, we will face a very different epidemiological landscape from the early
27 pandemic. Many populations will already have experienced one or more waves of COVID-19. As a result
28 of natural immunity, the effective reproduction number R_{eff} (the average number of secondary infections
29 produced per infected person) will be reduced from its original value of approximately $R_0 = 2.2$ in the
30 absence of pre-existing immunity (8). Epidemiological theory tells us that as R (or R_0) decline toward 1,
31 the indirect benefits of transmission-blocking vaccines become stronger. For instance, if $R_{eff} \approx 1.5$, such as
32 for seasonal influenza, only an estimated 33% percent of the population needs immunity for transmission
33 to die out in a homogeneously population (9, 10). This effect was evidenced by the strong suppression of
34 influenza incidence in Australia in Spring 2020 due to NPIs targeted against COVID-19 (11).

35 This effect has stimulated a literature comparing the effects of vaccinating subpopulations that are
36 responsible for most transmission, to vaccinating subpopulations that are vulnerable to serious complications
37 from the infection but exhibit weaker immune responses to the vaccine (10, 12, 13). Natural population
38 immunity to SARS-CoV-2 will likely continue to rise for many populations on account of further infection
39 waves. Given these likely changes to the epidemiological landscape before the vaccine becomes available, we
40 suggest this question is worthy of investigation in the context of COVID-19.

41 The social landscape will also look very different when vaccines become available and this aspect is
42 crucial to understanding the pandemic. Scalable non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) like physical
43 distancing, hand-washing and masks are often one of the few available interventions when a novel pathogen
44 emerges. Flattening the COVID-19 epidemic curve was possible due to a sufficient response by populations
45 willing to adhere to public health recommendations. Therefore, pandemic waves are not simply imposed
46 on populations, but rather are also a creation of the population response to the pathogen (14?). Thus,
47 pandemics caused by novel pathogens can be characterized as coupled socio-epidemiological systems
48 exhibiting two-way feedback between disease dynamics and behavioural dynamics.

49 Approaches to modelling coupled social-epidemiological dynamics vary (15–19). Some previous models
50 have used evolutionary game theory (EGT) to model this two-way feedback in a variety of coupled human-
51 environment systems (14, 20–25). EGT is relevant to population adherence to NPIs since it captures how
52 individuals learn social behaviours from one another while weighting personal risks and benefits of different
53 choices. In this framework, individuals who do not adopt NPIs can ‘free-ride’ on the benefits of reduced
54 transmission generated by individuals who do (15).

55 Here, our objective is to compare projected COVID-19 mortality reductions under four strategies for
56 the prioritization of COVID-19 vaccines: elderly first, children first, uniform allocation, and a novel
57 strategy based on the contact structure of the population. We use an age-structured model of SARS-CoV-2
58 transmission, including an evolutionary game theory submodel for population adherence to NPIs fitted
59 to mobility data. We use extensive scenario and sensitivity analysis to identify how strategy effectiveness
60 responds to possible changes in the social-epidemiological landscape that may occur both before and vaccines
61 are available.

62 Model Overview

63 **Structure and parameterisation.** We developed an age-structured SEAIR model (Susceptible, Exposed,
64 Asymptomatic Infectious, Symptomatic Infectious, Removed) with ages in 5-year increments. Upon infection,
65 individuals enter an exposed category where they are infected but not yet infectious. After the exposed
66 stage, individuals become either symptomatically or asymptotically infectious, and enter the Removed
67 compartment when their infectious period ends. Since our focus was on vaccination, we did not model
68 testing or contact tracing. Transmission occurred through an age-specific contact matrix, susceptibility to
69 infection was age-specific, and we included seasonality due to changes in the contact patterns throughout
70 the year. Details of our model structure, parameterization, and sources appear in the Supplementary
71 Appendix (Methods and Table S1). The model was parameterized with data from Ontario, Canada.

72 Both schools and workplaces were closed when the proportion of ascertained active cases surpassed
73 50%, 100%, 150%, 200%, or 250% of the level that sparked shutdown during the first wave, and were
74 re-opened again when cases fell below that threshold. For our evolutionary game model of adherence to
75 NPIs like mask use and physical distancing, we assumed that individuals weigh the cost of practicing NPIs
76 imposed by reduced socialization, money spent on masks, *etc*, against the cost of not practicing NPIs and
77 thereby experiencing an increased perceived risk of infection according to the prevalence of ascertained cases.
78 Individuals sample other individuals and may switch between adherence and non-adherence to NPIs as a
79 result, with a probability proportional to the difference in these costs. Both school and workplace closure
80 and the proportion of the population practicing NPIs impact transmission according to their respective
81 intervention efficacy.

82 We used a Bayesian particle filtering approach to fit the model to case notification and mobility data from
83 Ontario (see Supplementary Appendix for detailed methods and literature sources). We performed particle
84 filtering on all social and epidemiological model parameters that could not be fixed at point estimates from
85 the published literature, such as the ascertainment rates for each age group, the basic reproduction number
86 R_0 , and the social submodel parameters. Posterior distributions for fitted parameters appear in Figure
87 S1. The temporal curve describing contacts under workplace closing and opening were also fit to mobility
88 data. Mobility data specific to school closure does not exist, so we assumed that outside of the normal

89 school breaks (*e.g.* summer holiday), schools exhibit similar temporal curves describing opening and closing
90 as workplace do. We used published COVID-19 case fatality rates to determine number of deaths by age
91 group based on the predicted incident cases by age group. Posterior distribution of model fits to age-specific
92 cumulative cases appear in Figure S2, and posterior model time series fits appear in Figure 1.

93 **Vaccine scenarios.** We considered two different dates for the onset of vaccination: 1 January 2021 and 1
94 July 2021. These correspond to the dates at which vaccine-derived immunity in the vaccine is achieved,
95 hence the actual administration of a two-dose course would start approximately two weeks before these
96 dates. We considered that it was possible to vaccinate 0.5%, 1.5%, 2.5%, 3, 5%, or 4.5% of the population
97 per week. Our baseline scenario assumed an all-or-none vaccine with 90% efficacy against both infection
98 and transmission.

99 The “oldest first” strategy administers the vaccine to individuals 60 years of age or older first. Re-
100 vaccination is only possible one more time if the vaccine did not “take” the first time. After all individuals
101 in this group are vaccinated, the vaccine is administered uniformly to other ages. The “youngest first”
102 strategy is similar, except it administers the vaccine to individuals younger than 20 years of age first. The
103 “uniform” strategy administers vaccine to all individuals regardless of their age from the very beginning.
104 The “contact-based” strategy allocates vaccines according to the leading eigenvector of the next-generation
105 matrix (Supplementary Appendix). This tends to prioritise ages 15-19 primarily, 20-59 secondarily, and the
106 least in older or younger ages (Figure S3). The “oldest first” strategy targets a vulnerable age group while
107 the other three strategies are designed to interrupt transmission. We also explored an optimal strategy that
108 seeks to optimize age-specific vaccine coverage to minimize the number of deaths over five years from the
109 beginning of the epidemic. This used local optimization from each of the aforementioned strategies (see
110 Supplementary Appendix).

111 **Sensitivity analysis.** Sensitivity analysis was conducted for eight scenarios corresponding to: (1) constant
112 physical distancing (instead of using evolutionary game theory to describe population behaviour), (2)
113 increased efficacy of physical distancing (+0.2) after the first wave on account of more widespread mask
114 use, (3) a higher basic reproduction number, $R_0 = 2.3$, compared to our baseline fit (4) 50% vaccine
115 efficacy in the elderly and 90% for other ages, (5) 50% vaccine efficacy in everyone, (6) no seasonality in the
116 transmission rate, (7) constant susceptibility across all ages, and (8) vaccinating only individuals without
117 pre-existing immunity.

118 Results

119 **Temporal dynamics before and after vaccination.** The Google mobility data used as a proxy for adherence
120 to NPIs closely mirrors the COVID-19 case notification data over the Spring/Summer 2020 time period
121 used for fitting (Figure 1, open circles). Since NPIs can significantly reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission
122 (2, 3) and a heightened perception of COVID-19 infection risk simulates the adoption of NPIs (26), this
123 exemplifies a social-epidemiological dynamic. Moreover, the fit of the social submodel to the mobility data
124 is as good as the fit of the epidemic submodel to the case notification (Figure 1). The social and epidemic
125 submodels have a similar number of parameters (Supplementary Appendix), and the social model consists
126 of a single equation, in contrast to the dozens of equations used for our age-structured compartmental
127 model. This shows how modelling population behaviour during a pandemic can be accomplished with
128 relatively simple mechanistic models.

129 Extrapolating beyond the fitting time window, the model predicts several pandemic waves from late Fall
130 2020 onward, not only with respect to COVID-19 cases (Figure 2A) but also population adherence to NPIs
131 (Figure 2B) and periods of school and workplace shutdown (Figure 2C). The unfolding of the pandemic
132 if the vaccine becomes available in July 2021 (vertical dashed line) and 4.5% of the population can be
133 vaccinated per week depends upon the vaccination strategy. The oldest first strategy (blue) results in a
134 large pandemic wave in late December 2021. The youngest first (orange) and uniform (green) strategies
135 result in a smaller wave in late March 2022. The contact-based strategy (red) avoids a Fall 2021/Winter

136 2022 wave altogether. In contrast, vaccinating 4.5% of the population per week starting in January hastens
137 the end of the Fall 2020/Winter 2021 wave and prevents subsequent pandemic waves (Figure S4).

138 During each wave, the percentage of individuals with natural immunity rises (Figure 2D). Once the
139 vaccine becomes available, total population immunity from the vaccine or from infection rises most slowly
140 under the youngest first strategy. However, we note that strategy effectiveness is also a function of the
141 contract structure of the population.

142 **Relative mortality reductions under the vaccine strategies.** We determined the cumulative number of
143 deaths over the duration of the pandemic for each strategy across a range of vaccine availability dates
144 and vaccination rates. Broadly speaking, if the vaccine becomes available in January 2021, the oldest first
145 strategy reduces mortality the most. But if the vaccine becomes available in July 2021, one of the other
146 three transmission-interrupting strategies is most effective (Figures 3, 4).

147 For our baseline assumption where schools and business close when active cases reach $T = 200\%$ of the
148 numbers that sparked shutdown during the first wave, and for a January vaccine availability, the oldest
149 first strategy prevents the most deaths except for a very low vaccination rate ($\psi_0 = 0.5\%$ of the population
150 vaccinated per week (Figure 3a)). But for July vaccine availability, the contact-based strategy does best,
151 except when $\psi_0 = 0.5\%$, where oldest first is best (Figure 3B). However, all strategies perform similarly at
152 high vaccination rates because population immunization occurs fast enough to prevent a Fall 2021/Winter
153 2022 wave. Across a broader range of T values from 50% to 250%, the same patterns generally hold (Figure
154 S5,6). The violin plots show a dominant lobe and a smaller secondary lobe, on account of the fact that
155 some parameter combinations generate more pandemic waves than others (Figure 3). This effect is more
156 apparent when $T = 250\%$ (Figure S5,6).

157 These results are also confirmed by a higher resolution parameter plane showing the best strategy as
158 a function of T and ψ_0 (Figure 4; the best strategy in this case is defined as the strategy that reduced
159 mortality the most across the largest number of model realizations). For January availability, the oldest
160 first strategy is most effective if $\psi_0 \gtrsim 1.5\%$, but for July availability, the contact-based strategy is best for
161 low vaccination rates and youngest first is best for medium to high vaccination rates, unless T is also high,
162 in which case uniform is best.

163 The optimized strategy always does best, by definition (Figure S5,6), but it can be instructive to study
164 how the optimized strategy allocates vaccines among the age groups. We observe that for strict shutdown
165 thresholds (small T), the optimal strategy allocates vaccines mostly to the 5-19 age group, secondly to
166 35-44, and thirdly to 70+. As the shutdown thresholds become more lenient, more vaccine is allocated to
167 70+ (Figure S7).

168 We emphasise that we are reporting percent change in mortality compared to the case of no vaccine
169 being available. Therefore, the total reduction in number of COVID-19 deaths for January availability is
170 much higher than for July availability on account of intervening pandemic waves.

171 **Role of R_0 and herd immunity.** Studying the role of the basic reproduction number, R_0 (9), and the
172 immunity profile of the population helps to explain these results. Our inferred value was $R_0 \approx 1.8$. As
173 R_0 is increased from 1.5 to 2.5 we observe that the vaccine becomes less effective in reducing mortality
174 across all strategies, as expected (Figure 5). For January availability, oldest first does best across all R_0
175 values (Figure 5A). For July availability, oldest first does worst when R_0 is small, but improves relative
176 to the other strategies as R_0 increases (Figure 5B). This occurs because the indirect protection (herd
177 immunity) offered by transmission-blocking vaccines are strongest when R_0 is small. In populations with
178 strong age-assortative mixing (27), the indirect benefits of vaccination are therefore “wasted” if vaccination
179 is first concentrated in specific age groups before being extended to the rest of the population. When R_0 is
180 larger, however, the indirect protection of vaccine-generated herd immunity is weaker (9) and so the benefit
181 of using vaccines to interrupt transmission is reduced.

182 Frequency histograms for each strategy of the percentage of the population with natural immunity
183 at the start of the vaccine program, for the simulations where that particular strategy worked best, tell

184 a similar story (Figure 6). In simulations where the oldest first strategy does best, the percentage of
185 the population with natural immunity tends to be low. This is expected, since indirect protection from
186 vaccines is weak when few people have immunity (Figure 6A). But in simulations where one of the three
187 transmission-interrupting strategies do best, more simulations exhibited a high level of natural population
188 immunity at the start of vaccination (Figure 6B-D).

189 **Sensitivity analysis results.** The relative advantage of transmission-interrupting strategies for July vaccine
190 availability generally either remained the same or improved across the nine alternative scenarios described
191 in the Model Overview section.

192 We explored a model variant where population adherence to NPIs is constant over the course of the
193 pandemic, although dynamic shutdown of schools and workplaces still occurred. We observed that the
194 youngest first strategy did best for both January and July vaccine availability, except for strict shutdown
195 thresholds $T \lesssim 75\%$ in which case the oldest first strategy did best (and also for January availability,
196 with high T and ψ_0 , Figure S8). Youngest first performed even better in a model variant where infection
197 susceptibility is constant across ages (Figure S9). In the absence of seasonality, the youngest first strategy
198 almost always does best for both January and July availability (Figure S10). Similarly, when vaccine efficacy
199 is 50% in older individuals and 90% for everyone else, the transmission-interrupting strategies generally do
200 best for both January and July availability (Figure S11).

201 Several of the sensitivity analysis scenarios produced similar outcomes to the baseline scenario, with
202 oldest first generally doing best for January availability, and one of the transmission-interrupting strategies
203 (usually, youngest first) doing best for July availability. These scenarios were: increased efficacy of NPIs in
204 the second wave to account for more widespread use of masks (Figure S12); $R_0 = 2.3$ (Figure S13); 50%
205 vaccine efficacy for everyone (Figure S14), and when individuals are tested for seropositivity before being
206 administered a vaccine (Figure S15).

207 Discussion

208 Our social-epidemiological model suggests that if a COVID-19 vaccine becomes available later in the
209 pandemic, using SARS-CoV-2 vaccines to interrupt transmission might reduce COVID-19 mortality more
210 effectively than using the vaccines to target those 60+ years of age, in many populations. This finding
211 was robust under structural and univariate sensitivity analyses, including model variants with a more
212 conventional structure lacking social dynamics or seasonality.

213 These results are driven by the fact that the vaccine may only become available after populations have
214 had one or more waves of immunizing infections. As a result, the effective reproduction number could be
215 significantly lower than the basic reproduction number $R_0 \approx 2.3$ which applies in susceptible populations.
216 In this regime, vaccines have a disproportionately large effect in terms of generating herd immunity (9).
217 This effect has also been observed in influenza, both in theoretical models and in recent experience with
218 the Spring wave of COVID-19 in Australia (10, 11). In the later case, NPIs interrupted SARS-CoV-2
219 transmission enough to flatten the curve for COVID-19 with $R_0 \approx 2.3$, but for influenza with $R_0 \approx 1.5$,
220 NPIs strongly suppressed influenza activity country-wide. In a population with several waves of COVID-19,
221 R_{eff} may come sufficiently close to 1 that immunizing to interrupt transmission will be the most effective
222 strategy to reduce mortality.

223 We opted for a coupled social-epidemiological model on account of the importance of feedback between
224 population behaviour and disease dynamics for the control of COVID-19 in the absence of preventive
225 pharmaceutical interventions. Our model generated significantly different projections in our sensitivity
226 analysis where population behaviour was assumed constant, which is similar to conventional approaches to
227 transmission modelling. Our social submodel is less complicated than the epidemic submodel and despite
228 this, the coupled social-epidemiological model fitted population-level behaviour as readily as it fitted the
229 epidemic curve. Predicting behaviour is fraught with uncertainty, but so is predicting an epidemic curve.
230 Given this, we suggest a role for more widespread use of social-epidemiological models in efforts model

231 NPIs during pandemics. We also note that the population-level behaviour and the epidemic curve closely
232 mirrored each other (Figure 1). This may reflect convergence of social-environment dynamics, as has been
233 predicted for strongly coupled systems (28).

234 Our model made simplifying assumptions that could impact its predictions. We did not stratify the
235 population by risk factors such as co-morbidities, and we did not consider outcomes such as hospitalizations
236 and ICU admissions. The model was parameterised with data from Ontario, Canada. The projected impact
237 of the four vaccine strategies may differ in settings with different epidemiological or social characteristics. At
238 the same time, we note that many populations around the world experienced a Spring 2020 wave, as Ontario
239 did. And, Ontario intensive care bed capacity resembles that of many other European countries (29). We
240 did not account for the potential role of outbreaks in long-term care facilities with high concentrations of
241 vulnerable individuals. Finally, we used baseline changes to time spent at retail and recreational outlets as
242 a proxy for population adherence to NPIs, in the absence of high resolution temporal data specific to NPI
243 adherence.

244 Future research could further explore the strategy of using the leading eigenvector of the next generation
245 matrix to tailor vaccination strategies to specific populations. Data on contact matrices specific to country,
246 age and location are increasingly available (27). Digital data sources such as from bluetooth-enabled devices
247 also show promise to enhance our understanding of population contact patterns (30). We should take
248 advantage of these data sources to optimize vaccination policies, for COVID-19 as well as other infectious
249 diseases.

250 To apply these results to COVID-19 pandemic mitigation, large-scale seroprevalence surveys before the
251 onset of vaccination could ascertain the level of a population's natural immunity. In populations where
252 SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity is high due to a Fall 2020 wave, vaccinating to interrupt transmission may
253 reduce COVID-19 mortality more effectively than targeting vulnerable groups. We also conclude that more
254 research with different types of models is urgently needed to evaluate how best to prioritise COVID-19
255 vaccination.

256 References

- 257 1. IF Miller, AD Becker, BT Grenfell, CJE Metcalf, Disease and healthcare burden of COVID-19 in the
258 United States. *Nat. Medicine* **26**, 1212–1217 (2020).
- 259 2. SC Anderson, et al., Estimating the impact of COVID-19 control measures using a bayesian model of
260 physical distancing. *medRxiv* (2020).
- 261 3. CM Peak, et al., Individual quarantine versus active monitoring of contacts for the mitigation of COVID-
262 19: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infect. Dis.* (2020).
- 263 4. AR Tuite, DN Fisman, AL Greer, Mathematical modelling of COVID-19 transmission and mitigation
264 strategies in the population of ontario, canada. *CMAJ* **192**, E497–E505 (2020).
- 265 5. N Lurie, M Saville, R Hatchett, J Halton, Developing COVID-19 vaccines at pandemic speed. *New*
266 *Engl. J. Medicine* **382**, 1969–1973 (2020).
- 267 6. KM Bubar, et al., Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and serostatus.
268 *medRxiv* (2020).
- 269 7. JH Buckner, GH Chowell, MR Springborn, Optimal dynamic prioritization of scarce COVID-19 vaccines.
270 *medRxiv* (2020).
- 271 8. J Hilton, MJ Keeling, Estimation of country-level basic reproductive ratios for novel coronavirus
272 (COVID-19) using synthetic contact matrices. *medRxiv* (2020).
- 273 9. RM Anderson, B Anderson, RM May, *Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control.* (Oxford
274 university press), (1992).
- 275 10. J Dushoff, et al., Vaccinating to protect a vulnerable subpopulation. *PLoS Med* **4**, e174 (2007).
- 276 11. Australian Government, Department of Health, Australian influenza surveillance report. **2(20 April**
277 **to 3 May 2020)** (2020).
- 278 12. S Bansal, B Pourbohloul, LA Meyers, A comparative analysis of influenza vaccination programs. *PLoS*
279 *Med* **3**, e387 (2006).

- 280 13. JS Brownstein, KP Kleinman, KD Mandl, Identifying pediatric age groups for influenza vaccination
281 using a real-time regional surveillance system. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **162**, 686–693 (2005).
- 282 14. SA Pedro, et al., Conditions for a second wave of COVID-19 due to interactions between disease
283 dynamics and social processes. *medRxiv* (2020).
- 284 15. TC Reluga, Game theory of social distancing in response to an epidemic. *PLoS Comput. Biol* **6**,
285 e1000793 (2010).
- 286 16. M Salathé, S Bonhoeffer, The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks. *J. The Royal Soc.*
287 *Interface* **5**, 1505–1508 (2008).
- 288 17. S Funk, E Gilad, C Watkins, VA Jansen, The spread of awareness and its impact on epidemic outbreaks.
289 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 6872–6877 (2009).
- 290 18. F Verelst, L Willem, P Beutels, Behavioural change models for infectious disease transmission: a
291 systematic review (2010–2015). *J. The Royal Soc. Interface* **13**, 20160820 (2016).
- 292 19. S Funk, M Salathé, VA Jansen, Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread of infectious
293 diseases: a review. *J. Royal Soc. Interface* **7**, 1247–1256 (2010).
- 294 20. CT Bauch, Imitation dynamics predict vaccinating behaviour. *Proc. Royal Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* **272**,
295 1669–1675 (2005).
- 296 21. C Innes, M Anand, CT Bauch, The impact of human-environment interactions on the stability of
297 forest-grassland mosaic ecosystems. *Sci. reports* **3**, 1–10 (2013).
- 298 22. TM Bury, CT Bauch, M Anand, Charting pathways to climate change mitigation in a coupled socio-
299 climate model. *PLoS computational biology* **15**, e1007000 (2019).
- 300 23. MA Amaral, MM de Oliveira, MA Javarone, An epidemiological model with voluntary quarantine
301 strategies governed by evolutionary game dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.05979* (2020).
- 302 24. S Zhao, et al., Imitation dynamics in the mitigation of the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19)
303 outbreak in wuhan, china from 2019 to 2020. *Annals Transl. Medicine* **8** (2020).
- 304 25. M Alam, KA Kabir, J Tanimoto, Based on mathematical epidemiology and evolutionary game theory,
305 which is more effective: quarantine or isolation policy? *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.* **2020**, 033502 (2020).
- 306 26. T Wise, TD Zbozinek, G Michellini, CC Hagan, , et al., Changes in risk perception and protective
307 behavior during the first week of the COVID-19 pandemic in the united states. (2020).
- 308 27. K Prem, AR Cook, M Jit, Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and
309 demographic data. *PLoS computational biology* **13**, e1005697 (2017).
- 310 28. R Sigdel, M Anand, CT Bauch, Convergence of socio-ecological dynamics in disparate ecological systems
311 under strong coupling to human social systems. *Theor. Ecol.* **12**, 285–296 (2019).
- 312 29. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Oecd intensive care bed capacity,
313 <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/en/data-insights/intensive-care-beds-capacity>, accessed 25 septem-
314 ber 2020 (2020).
- 315 30. M Salathe, et al., Digital epidemiology. *PLoS Comput. Biol* **8**, e1002616 (2012).




Fig. 1. A proxy for adherence to NPIs mirrors COVID-19 case reports in both data and model. (a) COVID-19 cases by date of report in Ontario (circles) and ascertained cases from best fitting model (lines). (b) Percentage change from baseline in time spent at retail and recreation destinations (orange circles) and at workplaces (green circles) from Google mobility data, and proportion of the population x practicing social distancing (orange line) and workplace shutdown curve (green line) from fitted model. See Supplementary Appendix for details on methods and data.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Vaccination begins on Jul 1, 2021, shutdown at 200.0% of first wave




Fig. 2. Social and epidemic dynamics interact to determine pandemic waves and vaccine strategy effectiveness. (a) Active ascertained COVID-19 cases, (b) proportion x of the population practicing NPIs, (c) intensity of school and workplace closure (note that curves for different vaccination strategies overlap), and (d) percentage of population with natural or vaccine-derived immunity versus time. $T = 2.0$, $\psi_0 = 1.5\%$ per week, July 2021 vaccine availability, other parameters in Table S1.




Fig. 3. A later start to vaccination favours transmission-interrupting vaccine strategies. Violin plots of the percent reduction in mortality under the four vaccine strategies, relative to no vaccination, as a function of the vaccination rate ψ_0 , for (a) January and (b) July 2021 availability. Horizontal lines represent median values of posterior model projections. Shutdown threshold $T = 2.0$ and other parameter values in Table S1.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




Fig. 4. Parameter planes showing best strategy as a function of shutdown threshold T and vaccination rate ψ_0 . Each parameter combination on the plane is colour-coded according to which of the four strategies reduced mortality most effectively in the largest number of model realizations, for (a) January and (b) July 2021 availability. Other parameter values in Table S1.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




Fig. 5. A higher R_0 diminishes the relative advantage of transmission-interrupting vaccination strategies. Median and standard deviation of the percent reduction in mortality under the four vaccine strategies, relative to no vaccination, as a function of the basic reproduction number R_0 , for (a) January and (b) July 2021 availability. Shutdown threshold $T = 2.0$, vaccination rate $\psi_0 = 1.5\%$ per week, and other parameter values in Table S1.




Fig. 6. Higher rates of pre-existing natural immunity make transmission-interrupting strategies more effective. Frequency histogram of the percentage of the population with natural immunity for each strategy, taken from simulations where that strategy reduced mortality most effectively, for (a) oldest first, (b) youngest first, (c) uniform, and (d) contact-based strategies. Parameter values in Table S1.