

## Mitigation policies and vaccination in the COVID-19 pandemic: a modelling study

Naiara C.M. Valiati<sup>1</sup>, Daniel A.M. Villela<sup>2\*</sup>

**1** Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Seropédica, RJ, Brazil

**2** Programa de Computação Científica, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

\* [daniel.villela@fiocruz.br](mailto:daniel.villela@fiocruz.br)

## Summary

The perspective of vaccination to protect human population from infection of SARS-CoV-2 virus has great potential to control the pandemic. Nevertheless, vaccine planning requires phased introduction with age groups, health workers, and vulnerable people. We developed a mathematical model capable of capturing the dynamics of the SARS-CoV-2 dissemination aligned with social distancing, isolation measures, and vaccination. The city of Rio de Janeiro provides a case study to analyze possible scenarios including non-pharmaceutical interventions and vaccination in the epidemic scenario. Our results shows that a combination of different policies such as case isolation and social distancing are more effective for mitigating the epidemics. Furthermore, these policies will still be necessary in a phased vaccination program. Therefore, health surveillance activities should be maintained along with vaccination planning in scheduled groups until a large vaccinated coverage is reached.

# 1 Introduction

2 Since the emergence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, the COVID-19 pandemic reached many countries  
3 causing millions of severe cases and deaths. The need of interventions were necessary to mitigate  
4 the pandemic by reducing dissemination and in the next phase by starting vaccination. Even with a  
5 phased vaccination, some measures remain important such as social distancing and isolation of cases  
6 until large vaccine coverage is achieved.

7 A number of models studied the impact of social distancing [1]. Models range from understanding  
8 the epidemiological mechanisms behind SARS-CoV-2 and also to predict the dynamics of epidemic.  
9 A schematic review by Wynants evaluates diverse models against their predictive capabilities [2].

10 Among the effects expected from these interventions, the first one is delaying the peak of the  
11 pandemic, which is important in order to healthcare organizations better prepare methods, personnel  
12 and equipment to deal with the coming hospitalizations and cases. The second and most wanted is  
13 flattening the pandemic curve once it starts, the goal of this objective is to open ease the resources  
14 allocation and to give more time to the healthcare system to handle the pandemic and its effects.  
15 Vaccination should provide the approach for controlling it, depending on the vaccine efficacy.

16 In this work, we evaluate how different scenarios of interventions compare to each other in order  
17 to better deal with the ongoing SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Results also consider the city of Rio de  
18 Janeiro, Brazil, as case study. Implications of the results, however, are general, such that could be  
19 extended to other similar cities. Also, as non-pharmaceutical measures are key to mitigate effects of  
20 the pandemic, the perspective of controlling it comes with vaccination. Yet, its policies and methods  
21 for application need yet to be systematically addressed. At present, there is already the surge of  
22 a second-wave in many countries [3, 4]. Health surveillance should be maintained along with the  
23 planning for effective vaccination.

## 24 2 Methods

### 25 2.1 Model

26 We modeled different scenarios with an ODE-based compartmental model. In the model, susceptible  
27 individuals (S) can evolve to exposed (E) conditions when in contact with infected individuals. The  
28 group of infected individuals is divided between asymptomatic cases (Y), symptomatic cases (C),  
29 which includes both mild and moderate cases, and severe cases (H). This last group occurs from the  
30 evolution of the symptomatic group and, therefore, is considered hospitalized. All infected individuals  
31 can evolve to death (D) or recovered (R). Each one of these model classes is stratified by age group

32 ranging from 5 to 5 years, from 0 to 100 years, added by one last age group of higher than 100 years,  
33 in a total of 21 groups of distinct age ranges for each compartment of the model.

34 We also included the possibility of vaccination in our model. Susceptible individuals are vaccinated  
35 at a coverage rate of  $\eta$ . These vaccinated individuals will take a pre-determined time  $\tau_{immun}$  to  
36 develop immunity at a probability of  $\rho_I$  when they evolve to immunized status (I). Due to incomplete  
37 vaccine efficacy, we included the possibility of the vaccinated individual not developing the required  
38 immunization and, therefore, being a susceptible-but-deemed-immunized individual (Im). These  
39 individuals are in a separate compartment apart from susceptible individuals because the former  
40 might lessen their social distancing and isolation measures, thinking that now they are immunized  
41 and somewhat away from the danger.

42 The infection rate between susceptible individuals and symptomatic is  $\beta$ , and with asymptomatic  
43 individuals is  $\beta_A$ . When they become exposed individuals, the time to evolve to infected is the  
44 incubation time  $\tau_{inc}$ . At the end of this time, the individual has a probability  $\rho_S$  of developing  
45 symptoms.

46 The time for an asymptomatic individual might evolve to death is  $\alpha_A^{-1}$ , whereas for the symptomatic  
47 cases is  $\alpha^{-1}$ ,  $\alpha > \alpha_A$  due to expected morbidity in these groups, including that asymptomatic  
48 individuals do not present themselves as clinical cases. The symptomatic individual can evolve to a  
49 severe case with a risk probability of  $\alpha_H$ .

50 The recovery of infected individuals (symptomatic and severe) is controlled by the recovery rate  
51  $\gamma$ , being modified to  $\gamma_H$  in the case of severe cases. Severe case are hospitalized and thus receiving  
52 proper assistance confronting the sickness. The hospitalized individual can recover after a determined  
53 period, controlled by the discharge time  $\tau_{disc}$  and dyspnea time  $\tau_{disp}$ .

The ODE system which resumes this model is:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta(C + H)S - \beta_A YS - \eta S \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \beta(C + H)S + \beta_A YS + \beta_{Im}(C + H)S + \beta_{Im,A}YS - \frac{E}{\tau_{inc}} \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \eta S \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \rho_I \frac{V}{\tau_{immun}} \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dIm}{dt} = (1 - \rho_I) \frac{V}{\tau_{immun}} - \beta_{Im}(C + H)S - \beta_{Im,A}YS \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = \rho_S \frac{E}{\tau_{inc}} - \frac{\alpha\gamma C}{1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)} - \frac{\alpha_H\gamma C}{1 - \alpha_H(1 - \gamma)} - \gamma C \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dY}{dt} = (1 - \rho_S) \frac{E}{\tau_{inc}} - \frac{\alpha_A\gamma C}{1 - \alpha_A(1 - \gamma)} - \gamma Y \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_H\gamma C}{1 - \alpha_H(1 - \gamma)} - \frac{H}{\tau_{disc} - \tau_{dysp}} - \frac{\alpha\gamma_H H}{1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma_H)} \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = \frac{\alpha\gamma C}{1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)} + \frac{\alpha_A\gamma C}{1 - \alpha_A(1 - \gamma)} + \frac{\alpha\gamma_H H}{1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma_H)} \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma C + \gamma Y + \frac{H}{\tau_{disc} - \tau_{dysp}} \quad (10)$$

### 54 2.1.1 Social distancing interventions

55 The model enables the application of intervention measures with the social distancing of specific age  
56 groups. Social distancing affects people in reducing the probability of encounters between infected  
57 and susceptible individuals. Thus, we simulate this condition by reducing the infection rates  $\beta$ ,  $\beta_A$ ,  
58  $\beta_I$  and  $\beta_{Im}$  for the specific age groups. Due to imperfect application of social distancing intervention,  
59 each intervention is controlled by a success rate.

60 The fact that the model is stratified by age groups opens a new range of different scenarios, e.g.,  
61 when applying the social distancing intervention to younger age groups, we can simulate a closed  
62 schools condition. The reduction is applied to the  $R_0$ , from which the infection rates are calculated,  
63 value multiplying it by the reduction factor  $\kappa$  with a pre-defined value. The social distancing applied  
64 to the 0-20 years old age groups is labeled SD-Y, when applied to the age groups higher than 60 years  
65 old is labeled SD-E, and when we apply the reduction to all age groups, we label this condition as  
66 SD-A.

### 67 2.1.2 Isolation interventions

68 The application of isolation interventions is made by reducing the encounter probability between  
69 susceptible and infected individuals. Different scenarios are tested in this work. In the lockdown  
70 scenario (L), we alter the susceptible flow equation to

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta(1 - \sigma_L)(C + H)S - \beta_A(1 - \sigma_L)YS - \eta S \quad (11)$$

71 Another intervention possibility is when tests are applied to the individuals, and a quarantine  
72 is applied where symptomatic cases are isolated with a probability  $\sigma$  and asymptomatic with a  
73 probability  $\sigma_A$ , this condition is labeled as TQ-C. In this scenario, we modify the susceptible flow  
74 equation to

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta(1 - \sigma)(C + H)S - \beta_A(1 - \sigma_A)YS - \eta S \quad (12)$$

75 If we only isolate the severe cases (scenario TQ), we change the susceptible individuals flow  
76 equation to

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta(1 - \sigma)(C + H)S - \beta_A(1 - \sigma_A)YS - \eta S \quad (13)$$

77 The scenario where we only isolate the severe cases is termed TS, and we modify the susceptible  
78 flow equation to

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta(C + \sigma H)S - \beta_A YS - \eta S \quad (14)$$

79 The exposed, vaccinated, and falsely immunized are changed just like the susceptible flow,  
80 depending on the scenario.

81 The Table 1 summarizes the parameters used in the model with their respective values and  
82 references.

83 The parameter  $\beta$  is calculated from the previous definition of  $R_0$  value, the asymptomatic value  
84  $f_A$ , the probability of developing symptoms  $\rho_S$ , and the incubation time  $\tau_{inc}$  with

$$\beta = \frac{R_0}{\tau_{inc}(\rho_S + (1 - \rho_S)f_A)} \quad (15)$$

85 The infection rate regarding asymptomatic individuals is obtained by the product of  $\beta$  with  $f_A$ ,  
86 while the infection rate regarding symptomatic individuals is obtained from the product of  $\beta$  with

Table 1: Description of parameters in the model and values used in simulations with references, if available.

Parameter	Description	Value
$\beta$	Infection rate	Calculated using $R_0$
$f_A$	Asymptomatic factor	0.42 [5]
$\beta_A$	Asymptomatic infection rate	$f_A \cdot \beta$
$\sigma$	Probability of successful isolation of symptomatic individuals	0.30 – 0.80
$\sigma_A$	Probability of successful isolation of asymptomatic individuals	0.20
$\sigma_L$	Probability of successful isolation during lockdown	0.75
$\rho_S$	Probability of developing symptoms	0.83 [5]
$\alpha$	Death risk	Depends on age group [6]
$\alpha_H$	Hospitalization risk	Depends on age group [7]
$\tau_{dysp}$	Time for dyspnea	7 days [8]
$\tau_{disc}$	Discharge time	22 days [8]
$\tau_{inc}$	Incubation time	5.1 days [9]
$\gamma$	Recovery rate	1/6.5
$\gamma_H$	Recovery rate for hospitalized individuals	Calculated using $\tau_{disc}$ and $\tau_{dysp}$

87  $f_I$ . Fig. 1 depicts a schematic diagram showing the model compartments.




Figure 1: Schematic diagram of the model compartments.

### 88 2.1.3 Stochastic implementation

89 The model is implemented with a discrete-time fashion. Typically, for each time step all transitions  
90 are evaluated as probabilities and the number flowing from a compartment to the other linked  
91 compartments, including keeping the state, are drawn from a multinomial distribution.

## 92 2.2 Case study

93 Parameters of the model were adjusted to number of cases and the dynamics observed in the  
94 municipality of Rio de Janeiro. Data from Severe Acute Respiratory Illness (SARI) are compared  
95 to the results of new daily hospitalizations. In contrast, data from Acute Respiratory Illness (ARI)  
96 notified cases are compared to the results of new daily cases. All notified data is retrieved from the  
97 public database OpenDataSus (available at <https://opendatasus.saude.gov.br/dataset>).

98 Throughout the pandemic, the scenario was altered several times due to governmental decisions  
99 of applying the interventions or making them more flexible and the incomplete adherence of the  
100 population. In this section, we evaluate how the model behaves when we use the same quarantine  
101 severity as applied by the government for each period while comparing the results to real-time data.  
102 Our approach is based on the Rio de Janeiro municipality and state real pandemic decrees, with



103 small adjustments. We consider no intervention done between 01 January 2020 and 15 March 2020  
104 (day 1 to day 74). Starting from 16 March 2020 until 27 March 2020 (day 75 to day 86), we consider  
105 that this is the beginning of the pandemic, where the government started to apply some intervention  
106 measures. However, the population was still not impacted by the severity of the pandemic. Therefore  
107 we considered the social distancing of young age and elderly groups, together with the quarantine of  
108 only severe cases.

109 From 28 March 2020 to 4 April 2020 (day 87 to day 107), social distancing becomes more  
110 widespread, and therefore we consider a social distancing of all age groups. From 5 April 2020 to  
111 14 May 2020, the interventions become more restrictive, and now the isolation of cases extends to  
112 symptomatic cases when confirmed by testing. A higher isolation rate is considered between the dates  
113 of 15 May 2020 and 29 May 2020. On 30 May 2020, up to 2 June 2020, intervention measures start  
114 to loosen, and the isolation is loosened to the isolation of symptomatic, asymptomatic, and severe  
115 cases. To reflect this change, the probability of successful isolating symptomatic cases varies from  
116 0.75 to 0.60. Proceeding with flexibilization, from 3 June 2020 to 12 July 2020, the quarantine of  
117 asymptomatic cases is abandoned. The last intervention change is from 13 July 2020 to 31 October  
118 2020, when social distancing is loosened to only social distancing of young and elderly groups.

119 To better fit the model to the real notification data, we estimated  $R_0 = 2.6$ , the reduction factor  
120 of the social distancing to be 0.72, the success in isolating symptomatic cases to be 0.60, while 0.20 for  
121 the asymptomatic cases. Also, we considered that the first cases were imported on 11 February 2020..  
122 Reporting rate of severe cases (SARI) are 96% of the real cases, accounting for small under-reporting,  
123 whereas under-reporting of notified ARI disease cases are 20% of the actual number of ARI cases.

124 The number of SARI cases notified in the city of Rio de Janeiro, daily aggregated, is evaluated  
125 from January to the end of October of 2020. Regarding the ARI notified cases, the data is evaluated  
126 from January to the end of September of 2020. This data range is considered an acceptable range to  
127 avoid the effect of dramatic sub notification due to notification delay.

## 128 **2.3 Vaccination Program**

129 Vaccination schedules are still being studied for SARS-CoV-2, with different strategies being applied  
130 due to diverse factors [10]. However, we expect that this schedule might closely follow other  
131 respiratory syndromes' vaccination, like influenza. In this work, we will consider an effective, tight,  
132 and compromised vaccination program to assess if this would be enough to halt the pandemic  
133 effectively. Therefore, our vaccination schedule is comprised of 4 phases, each lasting for 15 days.  
134 In the first phase, individuals older than 60 years old are vaccinated at a rate of 1.0%. Critical

135 risk workers and people with comorbidities and underlying conditions (in the age of 21 to 59 years  
136 old) are not specifically modeled but these other adult ages are vaccinated at 0.1% per day. In the  
137 second phase, more young adults are included (more critical risk workers, school staff, individuals  
138 with disabilities), raising the group's vaccination rate to 0.5%. In the third phase, all young adults  
139 and children are included at a rate of 1.0% per day, whilst individuals older than 60 years old are  
140 vaccinated at a rate of 0.1% per day. In the fourth and final phase, individuals of all groups are  
141 allowed to be vaccinated at a rate of 1.0% per day.

### 142 3 Results

143 In order to better evaluate the effect of different interventions separately, we compare the number of  
144 daily deaths and daily hospitalizations for different interventions using a population of the size of the  
145 city of Rio de Janeiro.




Figure 2: Different scenarios model comparison. A different color identifies each intervention. The points represent the stochastic calculation done with the model considering the given probabilities with 100 iterations per day. The red lines are means of each intervention. The used parameters are given in Table 1, with the exception of  $R_0$ , which is 3.5.

146 As shown in Fig.2, there is a marked difference in the effectiveness of each intervention alone.  
147 All the cases in which social distancing was applied alone had a less pronounced effect than the  
148 quarantine of cases scenarios, except for the quarantine of only the severe cases (TS), which had a

149 minimal delaying effect at the peak. A combination of mitigation policies makes significant impact in  
150 the peak of number of cases.

151 As our model is stratified by age groups, we also observe how the different interventions change  
152 the number of deaths and hospitalizations by age, as shown by Fig.3. The quarantine of all cases, the  
153 social distancing of all individuals, and the combination of this intervention with the quarantine of  
154 symptomatic cases are the three most effective interventions, as also seen by Fig.2. In all cases, despite  
155 isolating or distancing different age groups, the pattern of hospitalizations and deaths regarding age  
156 groups is very similar. The major difference is observed in delaying the pandemic peak and the  
157 pandemic's length, broadening its profile through time, but not through age groups. Hospitalizations  
158 are centered around older groups, mainly individuals around 60 years old and older, in all interventions.  
159 Concerning hospitalizations, there is a more even distribution among age groups. However, it is  
160 essential to note that hospitalizations of young age individuals (younger than 30 years old) are  
161 considerably pronounced.

162 Also, in Figure 3, despite profile similarity across age groups, some age groups are more affected  
163 since the beginning of the pandemic and at the end. There is a distortion of the profile's rectangular  
164 shape observed in almost all scenarios, in favor of a more oval-oriented shape, which is more pronounced  
165 in the SD-A and TQ, only TQ, and only TQ-C scenarios.

166 Regarding the case study of Rio de Janeiro municipality, as shown by Fig. 4, the model presents  
167 an excellent fit given number of SARI and ARI cases. The model captured the dynamics in Rio de  
168 Janeiro successfully regarding the hospitalizations compared to SARI notified cases. Regarding the  
169 influenza-like illness, the model does not account for all influenza-like illness, but it is limited to  
170 SARS-CoV-2 cases. Therefore, its reporting parameter being only 0.80.

171 The results from evaluating different scenarios of flexibilization are shown in Fig.4. Maintaining  
172 the actual quarantine and social distancing status as of the end of October still gives the pandemic the  
173 chance to be on the rise, reaching a peak only in few months. If the social distancing is abandoned,  
174 then there is a stronger rise in the pandemic. Halting the cases rise and changing its course happens  
175 when both the quarantine and social distancing are enforced.

176 Even though a second peak is not yet reached in Rio de Janeiro as of now by the official notified  
177 data, it is seen in Fig. 4 that ARI notified cases are on the rise.

178 Fig.5 shows the comparison between two vaccination dates to be studied. As expected, the sooner  
179 the vaccination program begins, the sooner the number of new daily hospitalizations and deaths start  
180 to fall. However, it is worth mentioning that social distancing and quarantine are still maintained in  
181 all three scenarios.

182 To answer the question of how the pandemic would behave if we modified the intervention status




Figure 3: Normalized death and hospitalization profiles for different intervention scenarios. Normalized values are calculated by the quotient of each daily new hospitalization or death by the highest hospitalization or death of the group with most hospitalizations or death through the pandemic.




Figure 4: Model results for new daily hospitalizations and cases of SARI in Rio de Janeiro (A). Model results for new daily symptomatic cases and ARI notified cases in Rio de Janeiro (B). Notified cases of SARI and ARI in Rio de Janeiro are represented by black lines, other colors represent the different simulated scenarios: social distancing is abandoned (orange), the quarantine strengthening together with the social distancing of all groups and isolation of both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals (pink), and current social distancing with symptomatic isolation scenario is maintained (green). Red lines represents the median values in each scenario.




Figure 5: Model results and cases of SARI and ARI in Rio de Janeiro accounting for vaccination events. The black line represents notified cases of SARI and ARI in Rio de Janeiro. The other symbols represent the different simulated scenarios calculated by the model. The blue symbols represent a scenario in which vaccination begins on 15 January 2020. The pink symbols represent a scenario in which vaccination begins on 1 March 2020, while the green symbols represent a scenario without vaccination




Figure 6: Comparison of the vaccination under different NPI. Black lines represent SARI notified cases. Green symbols represents a scenario without the vaccination, while the blue line represents the same conditions, but also applying the vaccine at 15 January 2020

183 during the vaccination rollout, we simulated the conditions presented at Fig.6. Fig.6 also shows that  
 184 in the scenarios in which social distancing and quarantine are present, and in the case of only the  
 185 quarantine is considered, vaccination plays a fundamental role. When vaccination starts, this downfall  
 186 is advanced and accelerated, which is evidenced by the observed inflection point. Abandoning social  
 187 distancing, however, generates an increase in the number of expected SARI cases.

## 188 4 Discussion

189 The main objective of NPI interventions is to mitigate the effect of the pandemic for a proper health  
 190 care attention to mild and severe cases. As shown by Fig.2 independently from the nature of the  
 191 intervention (social distancing or isolation of cases), as expected and seen in many studies [1, 11–13],  
 192 delaying the epidemic peak is a consequence of the reduction in transmission intensity.

193 When comparing the different interventions, the combination of social distancing and isolation  
 194 showed the best results, as demonstrated in Fig.2. When comparing the isolation interventions, there  
 195 is a huge difference between the isolation of both symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, and isolating  
 196 only the symptomatic cases, with the first one being the most successful application. This result  
 197 highlights the importance of an enforced isolation measure, as the asymptomatic cases also impact in  
 198 the transmission dynamics. The correct identification and consequently isolation of these cases pose a

199 problem which has been discussed in the actual pandemic [14,15], in some cases, following the correct  
200 procedure to identify and isolate these cases were responsible for ending the pandemic [16]. The  
201 isolation of only the severe cases did not do much to alter the behavior of the pandemic, demonstrating  
202 the importance of having a model in which mild and severe cases are studied separately, as they  
203 have marked differences in their epidemiology [17,18] besides having some studies indicating some  
204 similarities [19,20]. The only case in which the isolation of only the symptomatic cases was effective,  
205 was when it was applied altogether with the social distancing of all age groups. Therefore, it is  
206 imperative to recognize the importance of transmission by asymptomatic individuals.

207 Comparing the applied social distancing measures, results here show a very marked difference  
208 between the isolation of all age groups against the isolation of only young or elderly individuals  
209 and the severity of SARS-CoV-2 among elderly individuals higher than younger individuals [18,20].  
210 However, there must be a very careful distinction between the severity of cases and the epidemiological  
211 dynamic imposed by the different groups, the isolation of only the elder individuals is not sufficient  
212 to significantly halt the pandemic. As shown in our model, isolating the elderly group may give a  
213 false impression of protection to these individuals, as this intervention is not sufficient to effectively  
214 stop the epidemic, they are not effectively protected and still being subjected to be infected, and  
215 therefore, develop a severe case. Therefore, only the social distancing of all age groups at an early  
216 stage acts to avoid severe cases.

217 The social distancing of all age groups had similar performance compared to the isolation of  
218 both symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, as shown by Fig.2. This interesting result indicates  
219 that the early recognition and application of broad interventions to the population are the most  
220 effective measures to be studied. That is, acting with the objective of diminishing the number of  
221 possible infections through social distancing of healthy individuals or at the successful isolation of  
222 infected individuals is, as expected, equally important. The most important observation to be taken  
223 into account is that this intervention should be broad. In regard to the social distancing, all age  
224 groups should be taken into account, in agreement with other modeling studies [11,12]. Regarding  
225 the isolation intervention, all cases should be included in the measure, including asymptomatic cases,  
226 which can only be reached through successful testing. This highlights the importance of mass testing  
227 individuals exposed to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

228 Despite the great number of interventions, either a social distancing or isolation intervention,  
229 the best approach is clearly the combination of both measures. This is shown in 2 where the SD-A  
230 intervention combined with the TQ isolation measure produced the best results.

231 Despite all of the interventions, combined or not, act in a way to suppress the pandemic with  
232 different success rates, it is important to remember that there is a growing concern about the social



233 and economic distress of a population during interventions [21, 22]. It is imperative to also observe  
234 and develop pharmaceutical interventions that are capable of reducing and really ending the posed  
235 a threat by the virus. Also, initiatives such as the vaccines being developed and the fundamental  
236 understanding of how the virus acts biologically are important to this end. Therefore, it is important  
237 to model beyond the dynamics of only non-pharmaceutical interventions.

238 Non-pharmaceutical interventions also demonstrate through Fig.4 that they have the merit of  
239 controlling the direction, evolution, and severity of the pandemic and should be studied and applied  
240 whenever possible. However, as shown by Figs.5 and 6, pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical  
241 interventions need to be considered altogether during the pandemic. Considering these results, it is  
242 clear that the vaccine has a long-term effect on the population. The vaccination schedule in this work  
243 is likely optimistic, mainly regarding the period of only 15 days between each phase and the vaccine  
244 requiring only one dose to be effective, while works in the literature already point out that two doses  
245 are going to be the required minimum for a good number of vaccine candidates [23, 24]. However,  
246 we wanted to test how a large, focused, and effective vaccination schedule would behave, and we see  
247 that not even a program with these characteristics is not subjected to the need of allowing NPI to be  
248 taken into account.

249 In all scenarios, the phased rollout of the vaccination program should be along with maintaining  
250 social distancing and case isolation. Abandoning the quarantine shows to be a most critical scenario,  
251 in which there is a considerable increase in the number of hospitalizations. The only condition where  
252 the pandemic maintains its downward strategy during the vaccination program is combining social  
253 distancing and quarantine. The scenario in which social distancing is more flexible shows an increase  
254 in the number of hospitalizations.

255 This is a crucial moment to study and show that we must yet consider the application of strict  
256 interventions of social distancing, isolation, and vaccination as the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
257 is present in multiple countries. The modelling in this work shows that effective control of the  
258 COVID-19 pandemic requires a combination of these efforts.

## Data Availability Statement

All SARI and ARI notification data are publicly available at OpenDataSUS database, maintained by the Ministry of Health, located at <https://opendatasus.saude.gov.br/>.

## References

- [1] Matrajt L, Leung T. Evaluating the effectiveness of social distancing interventions to delay or flatten the epidemic curve of coronavirus disease. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2020;26(8):1740.
- [2] Wynants L, Van Calster B, Collins GS, Riley RD, Heinze G, Schuit E, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19: systematic review and critical appraisal. *bmj*. 2020;369.
- [3] Acuna-Zegarra MA, Diaz-Infante S, Baca-Carrasco D, Liceaga DO. COVID-19 optimal vaccination policies: a modeling study on efficacy, natural and vaccine-induced immunity responses. *medRxiv*. 2020;.
- [4] Cacciapaglia G, Cot C, Sannino F. Second wave COVID-19 pandemics in Europe: a temporal playbook. *Scientific reports*. 2020;10(1):1–8.
- [5] Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, Clark J, McLaws ML, Glasziou P. Estimating the extent of true asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: systematic review and meta-analysis. Available at SSRN 3586675. 2020;.
- [6] Novel CPERE, et al. The epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-19) in China. *Zhonghua liu xing bing xue za zhi= Zhonghua liuxingbingxue zazhi*. 2020;41(2):145.
- [7] Stokes EK, Zambrano LD, Anderson KN, Marder EP, Raz KM, Felix SEB, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 case surveillance—United States, January 22–May 30, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020;69(24):759.
- [8] Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The lancet*. 2020;.
- [9] Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2020;172(9):577–582.
- [10] Jeyanathan M, Afkhami S, Smaill F, Miller MS, Lichty BD, Xing Z. Immunological considerations for COVID-19 vaccine strategies. *Nature Reviews Immunology*. 2020;20(10):615–632.
- [11] Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand. Imperial College London. 2020;10:77482.

- [12] Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin H, Coupland H, Mellan T, et al. Report 13: Estimating the number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in 11 European countries. Imperial College London. 2020;.
- [13] Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020;.
- [14] Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic transmission, the Achilles' heel of current strategies to control COVID-19. *Mass Medical Soc*; 2020.
- [15] Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Miyama T, Suzuki A, Jung Sm, Hayashi K, et al. Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). *International journal of infectious diseases*. 2020;94:154.
- [16] Day M. Covid-19: identifying and isolating asymptomatic people helped eliminate virus in Italian village. *BMJ: British Medical Journal (Online)*. 2020;368.
- [17] Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, Xiang TX, Le A, Liu JM, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;.
- [18] Siordia Jr JA. Epidemiology and clinical features of COVID-19: A review of current literature. *Journal of Clinical Virology*. 2020;p. 104357.
- [19] Yilmaz A, Marklund E, Andersson M, Nilsson S, Andersson LM, Lindh M, et al. Upper respiratory tract levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and duration of viral RNA shedding do not differ between patients with mild and severe/critical COVID-19. *The Journal of infectious diseases*. 2020;.
- [20] Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *Jama*. 2020;323(13):1239–1242.
- [21] Ashraf BN. Economic impact of government interventions during the COVID-19 pandemic: International evidence from financial markets. *Journal of behavioral and experimental finance*. 2020;27:100371.
- [22] Fernandes N. Economic effects of coronavirus outbreak (COVID-19) on the world economy. Available at SSRN 3557504. 2020;.
- [23] Ramasamy MN, Minassian AM, Ewer KJ, Flaxman AL, Folegatti PM, Owens DR, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine administered in a prime-boost regimen in

young and old adults (COV002): a single-blind, randomised, controlled, phase 2/3 trial. The Lancet. 2020;.

- [24] Walsh EE, Frenck Jr RW, Falsey AR, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of two RNA-based Covid-19 vaccine candidates. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020;.