

Supplementary Materials

Clinical and economic outcomes and cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination in South Africa


Krishna P. Reddy, Kieran P. Fitzmaurice, Justine A. Scott, Guy Harling, Richard J. Lessells,
Christopher Panella, Fatma M. Shebl, Kenneth A. Freedberg, Mark J. Siedner

Table of Contents


Supplementary Figures	3
Supplementary Figure 1. Health states and disease paths in the Clinical and Economic Analysis of COVID-19 Interventions (CEACOV) model.	3
Supplementary Figure 2. Relationship between vaccine effectiveness and disease path probabilities among those vaccinated.	4
Supplementary Figure 3. Model validation: comparison of “reported” model-projected SARS-CoV-2 infections and reported cases to South Africa’s National Institute for Communicable Diseases. .	5
Supplementary Figure 4. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine supply, vaccination pace, and vaccination cost: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of vaccination program compared with no vaccination.	6
Supplementary Figure 5. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine supply, vaccine effectiveness against infection, and vaccination cost: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of vaccination program compared with no vaccination.	7
Supplementary Figure 6. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccination pace, vaccine effectiveness against infection, and vaccination cost: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of vaccination program compared with no vaccination.	8
Supplementary Figure 7. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine supply, vaccination pace, and effective reproduction number (R_e): number of COVID-19 deaths (in thousands) averted through a vaccination program compared with no vaccination.	9
Supplementary Figure 8. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine effectiveness against infection, vaccination pace, and prevalence of prior immunity to SARS-CoV-2: number of COVID-19 deaths (in thousands) averted through a vaccination program compared with no vaccination.	10
Supplementary Figure 9. Two-way sensitivity analysis of effective reproduction number (R_e) and vaccination pace: number of COVID-19 deaths averted by vaccination program.	11
Supplementary Figure 10. Model projection of epidemic with varying effective reproduction number (R_e).	12
Supplementary Figure 11. Modeled scenarios of epidemic growth in the absence of vaccines.	13

Supplementary Tables	14
Supplementary Table 1. Model-projected 360-day clinical outcomes and costs of a reference COVID-19 vaccination program compared with no vaccination program in South Africa.	14
Supplementary Table 2. Clinical and economic outcomes of different COVID-19 vaccination program strategies of vaccine supply and vaccination pace under scenarios of slow and rapid epidemic growth in South Africa.	16
Supplementary Table 3. Additional one-way sensitivity analyses, clinical and economic outcomes of a reference COVID-19 vaccination program compared with no vaccination program in South Africa.	17
Supplementary Table 4. Clinical and economic outcomes of different COVID-19 vaccination program strategies of vaccine supply and vaccination pace under different scenarios of epidemic growth in South Africa: applying lower costs of hospital and ICU care from Edoke et al.³	19
Supplementary Table 5. Additional model input parameters.	22
Supplementary Methods	24
Overview	24
Health states	25
Transmission	27
Disease natural history	28
Life expectancy and years-of-life lost	29
Vaccine effectiveness and outcomes	30
Costs of vaccination, hospital ward care, and ICU care	32
Model validation	33
Supplementary References	34

Supplementary Figures



Supplementary Figure 1. Health states and disease paths in the Clinical and Economic Analysis of COVID-19 Interventions (CEACOV) model. Mild/moderate COVID-19 disease is that which does not prompt hospitalization. Severe disease prompts hospitalization if hospital (non-ICU) beds are available. Critical disease prompts ICU admission if ICU beds are available.




Age-dependent disease path probabilities

- P_0 : Probability immune from infection
- P_1 : Probability of developing asymptomatic infection if exposed
- P_2 : Probability of developing mild/moderate disease if exposed
- P_3 : Probability of developing severe disease if exposed
- P_4 : Probability of developing critical disease if exposed


Vaccine effectiveness measures

- VE_I : Vaccine effectiveness in preventing infection
- VE_M : Vaccine effectiveness in preventing mild/moderate disease
- VE_H : Vaccine effectiveness in preventing severe or critical disease requiring hospitalization


Supplementary Figure 2. Relationship between vaccine effectiveness and disease path probabilities among those vaccinated. The tree diagram on the left depicts the probability of different disease paths among unvaccinated individuals exposed to SARS-CoV-2, while the diagram on the right depicts the probability of these same disease paths among vaccinated individuals. Our analysis considers three measures of vaccine effectiveness: effectiveness in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection (VE_I), in preventing mild/moderate COVID-19 disease (VE_M), and in preventing severe or critical COVID-19 disease that would prompt hospitalization (VE_H).




Supplementary Figure 3. Model validation: comparison of “reported” model-projected SARS-CoV-2 infections and reported cases to South Africa’s National Institute for Communicable Diseases. The black line represents 0.1 times the daily number of model-projected SARS-CoV-2 infections (both reported and unreported) in South Africa, reflecting an assumption that 10% of infections are reported. Accordingly, the actual model-projected total number of infections was 10 times that shown by the black line. This modeled scenario starts with 0.1% prevalence of active SARS-CoV-2 infection and 0% prevalence of prior immunity (analogous to South Africa in early 2020). The blue bars represent COVID-19 cases reported to South Africa’s National Institute for Communicable Diseases (NICD).^{1,2}




Supplementary Figure 4. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine supply, vaccination pace, and vaccination cost: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of vaccination program compared with no vaccination. Within each panel, the smaller boxes are colored according to the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER). The lightest color represents scenarios in which a reference vaccination program (vaccine supply sufficient for 67% of South Africa’s population, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day) is cost-saving compared with no vaccination program, meaning that it results in clinical benefit and reduces overall health care costs. The darker colors reflect increasing ICERs, whereby a reference vaccination program, compared with no vaccination program, results in both clinical benefit and higher overall health care costs. The ICER is the model-generated difference in costs divided by the difference in years-of-life between a reference vaccination program and no vaccination program.




Supplementary Figure 5. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine supply, vaccine effectiveness against infection, and vaccination cost: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of vaccination program compared with no vaccination. Within each panel, the smaller boxes are colored according to the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER). The lightest color represents scenarios in which a reference vaccination program (vaccine supply sufficient for 67% of South Africa’s population, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day) is cost-saving compared with no vaccination program, meaning that it results in clinical benefit and reduces overall health care costs. The darker colors reflect increasing ICERs, whereby a reference vaccination program, compared with no vaccination program, results in both clinical benefit and higher overall health care costs. The ICER is the model-generated difference in costs divided by the difference in years-of-life between a reference vaccination program and no vaccination program.




Supplementary Figure 6. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccination pace, vaccine effectiveness against infection, and vaccination cost: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of vaccination program compared with no vaccination. Within each panel, the smaller boxes are colored according to the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER). The lightest color represents scenarios in which a reference vaccination program (vaccine supply sufficient for 67% of South Africa’s population, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day) is cost-saving compared with no vaccination program, meaning that it results in clinical benefit and reduces overall health care costs. The darker colors reflect increasing ICERs, whereby a reference vaccination program, compared with no vaccination program, results in both clinical benefit and higher overall health care costs. The ICER is the model-generated difference in costs divided by the difference in years-of-life between a reference vaccination program and no vaccination program.




Supplementary Figure 7. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine supply, vaccination pace, and effective reproduction number (R_e): number of COVID-19 deaths (in thousands) averted through a vaccination program compared with no vaccination. Within each panel, the smaller boxes are colored according to the number of COVID-19 deaths averted over 360 days by a vaccination program compared with no vaccination program. In the analysis of an epidemic with two peaks, the basic reproduction number (R_0) alternates between low and high values over time, and the R_e changes day-to-day as the epidemic and vaccination program progress and there are fewer susceptible individuals. For most of the simulation horizon, R_0 is 1.6 (equivalent to an initial R_e of 1.1). However, during days 90-150 and 240-300 of the simulation, R_0 is increased to 2.6. This results in two epidemic waves with peak R_e of approximately 1.4-1.5.




Supplementary Figure 8. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of vaccine effectiveness against infection, vaccination pace, and prevalence of prior immunity to SARS-CoV-2: number of COVID-19 deaths (in thousands) averted through a vaccination program compared with no vaccination. Within each panel, the smaller boxes are colored according to the number of COVID-19 deaths averted over 360 days by a vaccination program compared with no vaccination program.



Supplementary Figure 9. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of effective reproduction number (R_e), vaccination pace, and vaccine supply: number of COVID-19 deaths averted by vaccination program. Within the heatmap, the smaller boxes are colored according to the number of COVID-19 deaths averted over 360 days by a vaccination program compared with no vaccination program.



Supplementary Figure 10. Model projection of epidemic with varying effective reproduction number (R_e). We evaluated a scenario in which there were episodic surges above a lower background basic reproduction number (R_0). We did this by alternating the R_0 between low and high values over time. This results in the R_e changing day-to-day as the epidemic and vaccination program progress and there are fewer susceptible individuals. For most of the simulation horizon, R_0 is 1.6 (equivalent to an initial R_e of 1.1). However, during days 90-150 and 240-300 of the simulation, R_0 is increased to 2.6. This results in two epidemic waves with peak R_e of approximately 1.4-1.5.



Supplementary Figure 11. Modeled scenarios of epidemic growth in the absence of vaccines. We evaluated four epidemic growth scenarios: three in which R_0 remains constant over time, resulting in an initial R_e of 1.1, 1.4, or 1.8; and one in which R_0 is modulated over time to produce an epidemic with two waves

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Model-projected 360-day clinical outcomes and costs of a reference COVID-19 vaccination program compared with no vaccination program in South Africa.

Parameter	No vaccination program	Vaccination program ^a , (% reduction compared with no vaccination program)
Cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infections, n		
Ages <20 years	7,695,800	4,355,700 (43%)
Ages 20-59 years	11,410,000	5,402,600 (53%)
Ages ≥60 years	1,906,300	826,700 (57%)
Overall	21,012,100	10,585,100 (50%)
Cumulative COVID-19 deaths, n		
Ages <20 years	500	200 (61%)
Ages 20-59 years	37,500	6,000 (84%)
Ages ≥60 years	51,300	8,500 (83%)
Overall	89,300	14,700 (84%)
Resource use		
Hospital bed-days, n	2,981,400	984,900 (67%)
ICU bed-days, n	746,300	344,700 (54%)
Peak daily hospital occupancy, n	21,100	6,400 (70%)
Peak daily ICU occupancy, n	3,300 ^b	2,200 (33%)
Health care costs, USD		
Hospital care	460,063,200	151,975,800 (67%)
ICU care	1,306,793,100	603,620,800 (54%)
Vaccinations	--	583,206,900
Cost-effectiveness		
Years-of-life lost, n	1,558,700	259,600 (83%)
Total cost, USD	1,766,856,200	1,338,803,500 (24%)
ICER compared with no vaccination program, USD per year-of-life saved	--	Cost-saving ^c

ICU: intensive care unit. USD: United States dollars. ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio.

^aIn the reference vaccination program, there is sufficient vaccine supply for 67% of South Africa's population, and 150,000 vaccinations are administered per day. Those aged ≥ 60 years are prioritized. Uptake (acceptance) of vaccine is 67% across all ages.

^bMaximum ICU capacity is reached.

^cBecause the vaccination strategy results in fewer years-of-life lost (greater clinical benefit) and lower health care costs, it is cost-saving and no ICER is displayed.

Supplementary Table 2. Clinical and economic outcomes of different COVID-19 vaccination program strategies of vaccine supply and vaccination pace under scenarios of slow and rapid epidemic growth in South Africa.

Scenario and Vaccination Strategy	Cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infections	Cumulative COVID-19 deaths	Years-of-life lost	Health care costs, USD	ICER, USD per year-of-life saved ^a
R_e = 1.1^b					
No vaccination	3,719,500	8,200	123,500	382,176,900	--
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	860,900	1,300	24,500	417,756,900	360
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	1,144,800	1,400	24,300	449,386,900	Dominated
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	718,900	1,300	21,700	652,819,400	85,290
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	1,079,100	1,500	25,400	681,669,900	Dominated
R_e = 1.8					
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	21,260,400	38,800	695,700	1,541,112,600	--
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	24,268,200	69,500	1,410,500	1,596,237,800	Dominated
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	18,511,000	33,800	593,600	1,659,492,700	1,160
No vaccination	30,173,000	179,300	3,360,700	1,673,830,400	Dominated
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	24,217,300	68,900	1,403,000	1,803,189,900	Dominated

USD: United States dollars. ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio. R_e: effective reproduction number. Dominated: the strategy results in a higher ICER than that of a more clinically effective strategy, or the strategy results in less clinical benefit (more years-of-life lost) and higher health care costs than an alternative strategy.

^aWithin each R_e scenario, vaccination strategies are ordered from lowest to highest cost per convention of cost-effectiveness analysis. ICERs are calculated compared to the next least expensive, non-dominated strategy. Displayed life-years and costs are rounded to the nearest hundred, while ICERs are calculated based on non-rounded life-years and costs and then rounded to the nearest ten.

^bBecause there are relatively few deaths in the R_e=1.1 scenario, the impact of changing vaccination program strategies is attenuated. Due to stochastic variation in simulation model results, and extrapolation from a simulated population of 1 million to South Africa's population of approximately 59 million, results indicate a slight increase in deaths when increasing vaccine supply while pace is maintained at 150,000 vaccinations per day. Also, due to differences in the ages of those who die, there can be discordance between number of deaths and number of years-of-life lost.

Supplementary Table 3. Additional one-way sensitivity analyses, clinical and economic outcomes of a reference COVID-19 vaccination program compared with no vaccination program in South Africa.

Parameter / Value	SARS-CoV-2 infections averted, compared with no vaccination	COVID-19 deaths averted, compared with no vaccination	Years-of-life saved, compared with no vaccination	Change in health care costs, compared with no vaccination, USD	ICER, compared with no vaccination, USD per YLS ^a
Relative reduction in onward transmission rate among vaccinated individuals who become infected, %					
0 (base case)	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	-428,052,700	Cost-saving
50	15,871,900	82,200	1,440,100	-741,198,800	Cost-saving
Cost of hospital and ICU care, relative to base case values					
0.5x	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	77,577,100	60
1.0x (base case)	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	-428,052,700	Cost-saving
2.0x	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	-1,439,312,400	Cost-saving
Health care costs considered					
Vaccination	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	583,206,900	450
Vaccination and hospital (non-ICU) care	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	275,119,500	210
Vaccination, hospital care, and ICU care (base case)	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	-428,052,700	Cost-saving
Time to start of rollout, days					
0 (base case)	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	-428,052,700	Cost-saving
30	8,395,100	72,900	1,287,000	-243,551,400	Cost-saving
60	6,330,900	65,900	1,151,200	6,364,700	10
Time to start of epidemic wave, days ^b					
0 (base case)	10,427,000	74,600	1,299,100	-428,052,700	Cost-saving
30	12,382,700	78,100	1,401,300	-592,758,700	Cost-saving
90 ^c	14,907,000	71,700	1,254,400	-683,697,100	Cost-saving

USD: United States dollars. ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio. YLS: year-of-life saved. R_e: effective reproduction number.

^aIn the reference vaccination program, there is sufficient vaccine supply for 67% of South Africa's population, and 150,000 vaccinations are administered per day. Those aged ≥ 60 years are prioritized. Uptake (acceptance) of vaccine is 67% across all ages. Displayed life-years and costs are rounded to the nearest hundred, while ICERs are calculated based on non-rounded life-years and costs and then rounded to the nearest ten. Cost-saving reflects more years-of-life saved (greater clinical benefit) and lower costs, and therefore ICERs are not displayed.

^bIn the analysis of a delayed epidemic wave, the basic reproduction number (R_0) is initially low but later assumes a higher value. Prior to the start of the epidemic wave, R_0 is 1.6 (equivalent to an initial R_e of 1.1). After a set number of days, R_0 increases to 2.0, resulting in an epidemic wave with initial R_e of approximately 1.4.

^cWhen the epidemic wave is delayed by 90 days, the epidemic peak occurs more than 180 days into the simulation. Because our modeled time horizon only considers outcomes occurring through day 360, this leads to a small decrease in the number of infections and deaths that are recorded in the scenario without vaccines. As a result, the absolute number of deaths prevented by vaccines decreases slightly as the time to the start of the epidemic wave is increased from 30 to 90 days, even though a greater proportion of deaths are prevented.

Supplementary Table 4. Clinical and economic outcomes of different COVID-19 vaccination program strategies of vaccine supply and vaccination pace under different scenarios of epidemic growth in South Africa: applying lower costs of hospital and ICU care from Edoaka et al.³

Scenario and Vaccination Strategy	Cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infections	Cumulative COVID-19 deaths	Years-of-life lost	Health care costs, USD	ICER, USD per year-of-life saved ^a
Vaccine supply					
$R_e = 1.4$					
Vaccine supply 40%	11,784,700	16,000	275,800	797,871,600	--
Vaccine supply 20%	15,489,500	21,800	397,300	890,934,300	Dominated
Vaccine supply 67%	10,585,100	14,700	259,600	993,638,400	Dominated
No vaccination	21,012,100	89,300	1,558,700	1,005,281,800	Dominated
Vaccine supply 80% ^b	10,410,000	12,000	217,900	1,092,247,100	5,080
Two-wave epidemic^c					
Vaccine supply 40%	7,758,800	10,600	175,100	658,380,800	--
Vaccine supply 20%	12,765,900	19,900	371,500	702,362,400	Dominated
Vaccine supply 67%	5,594,000	7,800	133,700	810,775,600	3,680
Vaccine supply 80% ^b	5,940,500	6,900	119,100	891,054,000	5,480
No vaccination	19,290,400	70,400	1,206,200	948,370,400	Dominated
Vaccination pace					
$R_e = 1.4$					
Pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	5,659,400	7,200	120,300	814,977,100	--
Pace 200,000 vaccinations per day	8,191,900	9,600	151,300	876,892,500	Dominated
Pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	10,585,100	14,700	259,600	993,638,400	Dominated
No vaccination	21,012,100	89,300	1,558,700	1,005,281,800	Dominated
Two-wave epidemic^c					
Pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	2,697,100	3,200	49,300	688,458,100	--
Pace 200,000 vaccinations per day	4,148,500	5,900	90,300	744,446,000	Dominated
Pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	5,594,000	7,800	133,700	810,775,600	Dominated
No vaccination	19,290,400	70,400	1,206,200	948,370,400	Dominated

Supplementary Table 4, continued.

Scenario and Vaccination Strategy	Cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infections	Cumulative COVID-19 deaths	Years-of-life lost	Health care costs, USD	ICER, USD per year-of-life saved ^a
Vaccine supply and vaccination pace					
R_e = 1.4					
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	9,866,800	13,000	211,300	688,324,400	--
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	11,784,700	16,000	275,800	797,871,600	Dominated
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	5,659,400	7,200	120,300	814,977,100	1,390
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	10,585,100	14,700	259,600	993,638,400	Dominated
No vaccination	21,012,100	89,300	1,558,700	1,005,281,800	Dominated
Two-wave epidemic^c					
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	6,223,600	7,200	126,900	580,478,200	--
Vaccine supply 40%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	7,758,800	10,600	175,100	658,380,800	Dominated
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 300,000 vaccinations per day	2,697,100	3,200	49,300	688,458,100	1,390
Vaccine supply 67%, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day	5,594,000	7,800	133,700	810,775,600	Dominated
No vaccination	19,290,400	70,400	1,206,200	948,370,400	Dominated

ICU: intensive care unit. USD: United States dollars. ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio. R_e: effective reproduction number. Dominated: the strategy results in a higher ICER than that of a more clinically effective strategy, or the strategy results in less clinical benefit (more years-of-life lost) and higher health care costs than an alternative strategy.

In this analysis, daily costs of hospital care (\$137) and ICU care (\$798) were applied from a report by Edoaka et al.³ These values did not include facility costs.

^aWithin each R_e scenario, vaccination strategies are ordered from lowest to highest cost per convention of cost-effectiveness analysis. ICERs are calculated compared to the next least expensive, non-dominated strategy. Displayed life-years and costs are rounded to the nearest hundred, while ICERs are calculated based on non-rounded life-years and costs and then rounded to the nearest ten.

^bWhen modeling a vaccination program that seeks to vaccinate 80% of the population, uptake among those eligible was increased to 80% to avoid a scenario in which supply exceeds uptake. If uptake is not increased beyond 67%, then the strategy of vaccinating 67% of the population provides the most clinical benefit and results in an ICER of \$12,110/YLS compared with vaccinating 40% of the population when R_e is 1.4 and \$3,680/YLS in an epidemic scenario with periodic surges.

^cIn the analysis of an epidemic with periodic surges, the basic reproduction number (R_0) alternates between low and high values over time, and the R_e changes day-to-day as the epidemic and vaccination program progress and there are fewer susceptible individuals. For most of the simulation horizon, R_0 is 1.6 (equivalent to an initial R_e of 1.1). However, during days 90-150 and 240-300 of the simulation, R_0 is increased to 2.6. This results in two epidemic waves with peak R_e of approximately 1.4-1.5.

Supplementary Table 5. Additional model input parameters.

Parameter	Base case value (Range)	Sources
Initial state		
Initial disease distribution		
Susceptible	69.9 (49.9-89.9)	Assumption
Pre-infectious incubation	0.015	Assumption
Asymptomatic	0.040	Assumption
Mild or moderate disease	0.045	Assumption
Severe disease	0.00005	Assumption
Critical disease	0.00005	Assumption
Recuperation after critical disease	0.0	Assumption
Recovered (prior immunity)	30 (10-50)	⁴⁻⁷
Transmission dynamics		
Rate of onward transmission by health state ^a , transmissions per person-day		8-12
Asymptomatic	0.1858	
Mild or moderate disease	0.1512	
Severe disease	0.0106	
Critical disease	0.0084	
Recuperation after critical disease	0.0106	

Supplementary Table 5, continued. Additional model input parameters.

Parameter	Base case value (Range)				Sources
Natural history of COVID-19 disease					
Disease path probability ^b , stratified by age, %	Asymp.	Mild / Mod	Severe	Critical	8,13–16
Ages <20 years	29.93	69.78	0.25	0.03	
Ages 20-59 years	17.90	80.38	0.80	0.93	
Ages ≥60 years	17.10	76.37	1.36	5.16	
Daily disease progression probability, stratified by path, %	Asymp.	Mild / Mod.	Severe	Critical	8–11,17
From pre-infectious incubation to asymptomatic	31.93	31.93	31.93	31.93	
From asymptomatic to mild or moderate disease	--	39.35	39.35	39.35	
From mild or moderate disease to severe disease	--	--	14.26	28.35	
From severe disease to critical disease	--	--	--	20.17	
From critical disease to recuperation	--	--	--	9.61 ^c	
Daily recovery probability, stratified by path, %	Asymp.	Mild / Mod.	Severe	Critical	8–11,17
From asymptomatic	9.99	--	--	--	
From mild or moderate disease	--	9.52	--	--	
From severe disease	--	--	9.08	5.48 ^d	
From recuperation after critical disease	--	--	--	16.09	
Daily mortality probability while critical, stratified by age, %	Ages <20 years	Ages 20-59 years	Ages ≥60 years		
Without ICU care	11.75	16.62	20.33		Assumption
With ICU care	0.0006	0.38	5.00		8–11,17

Asymp: Asymptomatic. Mod: Moderate. ICU: Intensive care unit.

^aThis corresponds to R_e of 1.4.

^bDisease path probabilities are for unvaccinated individuals susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 infection.

^cThe transition from the critical state to recuperation requires admission to an intensive care unit (ICU).

^dEarly recovery from the severe state on the critical path requires admission to a hospital.

Supplementary Methods

Overview

The Clinical and Economic Analysis of COVID-19 Interventions (CEACOV) model incorporates aspects of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, COVID-19 disease natural history, and vaccination to project epidemic growth, clinical outcomes, health care resource utilization, and costs.

Projections for each scenario examined are generated by simulating a cohort of 1 million individuals over a 360-day time horizon. Simulation outputs are subsequently scaled to reflect the mid-year 2019 population of South Africa (approximately 59 million people) to produce country-level estimates of clinical and economic outcomes.¹⁸ We measured the clinical benefit of a vaccination program in terms of the undiscounted years-of-life saved (YLS) from averted COVID-19 deaths. We considered health care costs associated with vaccination, hospital care, and intensive care unit (ICU) care from an all-payer (public and private) health sector perspective.

We calculated the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of a vaccination program. In comparisons of different levels of vaccine supply and vaccination pace, the ICER of a given strategy was calculated by dividing the change in costs by the change in clinical benefits (years-of-life) compared with the next least-expensive, non-dominated strategy. A strategy is ruled out through strong dominance if it is more expensive and less effective (resulting in more years-of-life lost) than an alternative strategy, or through extended dominance if it is less economically efficient (resulting in a higher ICER) than a more effective strategy.¹⁹ In the base case and sensitivity analyses, in which we varied factors that are less in the direct control of policymakers, such as vaccine characteristics and epidemic growth, we compared the ICER of a reference vaccination program (supply sufficient to vaccinate 67% of South Africa's population, pace 150,000 vaccinations per day) with a scenario without vaccines.

Health states

CEACOV is a dynamic microsimulation model of COVID-19 based on a stochastic susceptible-exposed-infectious-recovered (SEIR) framework. Individuals face daily state-transition probabilities that govern movement between the following health states (Supplementary Table 5, Supplementary Fig. 1):

- *Susceptible*: individuals who are not currently infected with SARS-CoV-2 but may become infected during the simulation
- *Pre-infectious incubation*: individuals who have been exposed to SARS-CoV-2 but are not yet infectious to others
- *Asymptomatic*: individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 who do not display symptoms but can transmit the virus to others
- *Mild/Moderate*: individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 who display mild/moderate symptoms but do not require hospitalization
- *Severe*: individuals with severe symptoms of COVID-19 ideally managed in a hospital but not requiring admission to an ICU
- *Critical*: individuals with life-threatening symptoms and signs of COVID-19 who require ICU care to survive
- *Recuperation*: individuals recuperating from critical illness while remaining in the hospital and can still transmit the virus to others
- *Recovered*: individuals fully recovered from COVID-19, who can no longer transmit the virus to others and are immune from reinfection for the duration of the simulation period
- *Dead*: individuals who die as a result of critical COVID-19 disease

The state transition from susceptible to infected health states depends on the prevalence of active COVID-19 disease at a given point in time. Once infected, individuals have an age-dependent probability of progressing along one of four “paths” culminating in either asymptomatic infection, mild/moderate disease, severe disease, or critical disease (Supplementary Table 5, Supplementary Fig. 1). Before reaching a more advanced disease state, individuals must first transition through intermediate states (e.g., individuals destined for severe disease must first pass through the asymptomatic and mild/moderate health states).

Hospital and ICU care reduce the probability of death for those on the critical disease path in two ways: by providing a chance at early recovery to those in the severe state who have access to a hospital bed (allowing them to bypass the critical state) and by increasing the chances of survival for those in the critical state who have access to ICU care. The CEACOV model incorporates constraints on health care resources, and in the event hospital or ICU capacity is reached, individuals default to the next highest level of treatment.

Prevalence of prior immunity

We assumed that those infected by SARS-CoV-2 prior to the emergence of the B.1.351 variant were susceptible to reinfection and those who infected after the emergence of B.1.351 were immune from reinfection for the model simulation period. We used the following approach to estimate the cumulative number of people in South Africa who were infected with the B.1.351 variant by 30 January 2021:

- 1) We assumed that 100% of infections occurring after 14 November 2020 were attributable to the B.1.351 variant. An analysis of genomic surveillance data suggested that by the end of November 2020, this variant accounted for more than 75% of new infections in four provinces.⁴

- 2) We compared the number of cases reported to South Africa's National Institute for Communicable Diseases between 14 November 2020 and 30 January 2021 (all assumed to be attributable to the B.1.351 variant) to the number of cases reported before 14 November 2020 (all assumed to be attributable to ancestral variants). In this manner, we estimated the proportion of cumulative infections attributable to B.1.351 in Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, and Northern Cape provinces.^{6,7}
- 3) For each province, we multiplied the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity among blood donors in January 2021 by the estimated proportion of cumulative infections attributable to B.1.351 to derive the prevalence of prior infection by B.1.351.⁵
- 4) Using weighted averages based on the population of each province, we estimated the proportion of people across South Africa who have been previously infected by B.1.351.¹⁸

From this approach and rounding, we estimated that 30% of individuals have previously been infected with the B.1.351 variant and are thus immune from reinfection for the simulation period. To account for uncertainty in our estimates, we varied the prevalence of prior immunity between 10% and 50% in sensitivity analyses.

Transmission

Simulated individuals in asymptomatic, mild/moderate, severe, critical, or recuperation states of COVID-19 can transmit infection to susceptible individuals at state-dependent daily rates. The number of daily infections is determined by the proportion of susceptible people in the population and the distribution of disease states among those with COVID-19. Our model assumes that the force of infection is the same for all age groups (i.e., homogeneous mixing). This assumption is supported by two large seroprevalence

studies in South Africa, which both demonstrated similar seroprevalence within age bands, both with community-based testing and with testing of blood donors.^{5,20}

As described previously, we calibrated transmission rates to correspond to a particular initial effective reproduction number (R_e), which was 1.4 in the base case of this analysis.^{21,22} In sensitivity analysis, we varied the initial R_e by changing the transmission rates. We also evaluated a scenario in which there were two surges in infections. We did this by alternating the basic reproduction number (R_0) between low and high values over time. This results in the R_e changing day-to-day as the epidemic and vaccination program progress and there are fewer susceptible individuals. For most of the simulation horizon, R_0 is 1.6 (equivalent to an initial R_e of 1.1). However, during days 90-150 and 240-300 of the simulation, R_0 is increased to 2.6. This results in two epidemic waves with peak R_e of approximately 1.4-1.5 (Figure S10).

Disease natural history

Once infected with SARS-CoV-2, an individual moves to the pre-infectious latency state and faces age-dependent probabilities of developing asymptomatic, mild/moderate, severe, or critical disease (Supplementary Table 5, Supplementary Figure 1). Those with critical disease face age-dependent daily probabilities of death. If they survive, they transition to a recuperation state (remaining infectious) before going to the recovery (immune) state. Those in other disease states can transition directly to the recovery state. “Recovered” individuals are assumed immune from repeat infection for the simulation duration and pose no risk of transmission. To capture infection transmission dynamics, all simulated individuals advance through the model simultaneously.

We calculated age-stratified disease path probabilities based on data indicating the proportion of people in each age group who developed asymptomatic infection, disease requiring hospitalization, and disease requiring ICU care.^{8,13–16} We derived the average duration that infected individuals spend in each health state based on the following sources: the pre-infectious times reported by the WHO-China Joint Mission on COVID-19⁸ and He et al.;⁹ time to development of pneumonia (Wang et al.¹⁷); time to ICU admission and time spent in the ICU (Zhou et al.¹⁰); and median time to death (Zhou et al.¹⁰). We derived the time to recovery from the durations of viral shedding based on polymerase chain reaction (PCR) detectability.^{8,10,11} After determining the average duration of each health state (measured in days), we calculated state transition rates as follows:

$$\text{Transition rate} = r = (\text{average duration of health state})^{-1} \quad (1)$$

Based on the transition rates estimated using equation (1), we then calculated daily state-transition probabilities as:

$$\text{Daily transition probability} = 1 - \exp(-r\Delta t) \quad (2)$$

Where Δt represents the chosen time step duration – in this case, one day.

Life expectancy and years-of-life lost

We quantified the clinical benefit of a vaccination program in terms of years-of-life saved (YLS) from averted COVID-19 deaths. To do this, we calculated the number of years a person would have lived subsequent to their current age had they not died of COVID-19. Our approach has been detailed elsewhere.²²

Since our model uses large age groups (<20 years, 20-59 years, ≥60 years), we calculated the average years-of-life lost per COVID-19 death in each of our model’s age groups (\overline{YLL}) by calculating a weighted

average of remaining life expectancy in five-year intervals over the age distribution of deaths within each large age group:

$$\overline{YLL} = \frac{\sum_i w_i LE_i}{\sum_i w_i} \quad (3)$$

where w_i represents the relative frequency at which someone age i is expected to die from COVID-19, and LE_i represents the remaining life expectancy among those age i . The age-stratified distribution of COVID-19 deaths was determined from data reported by South Africa's Department of Health.²³ Age-stratified life expectancy was calculated by generating a standard abridged life table for South Africa's population using the method described by Preston et al.²⁴ Mortality trends were derived from estimates of all-cause mortality for the year 2016 published by the World Health Organization and age/sex-stratified population estimates published by the United Nations World Population Prospects.^{25,26}

Vaccine effectiveness and outcomes

To reconcile the various vaccine efficacy endpoints used in vaccine clinical trials, we incorporated three measures of vaccine effectiveness into our model: effectiveness in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection (VE_I), effectiveness in preventing mild/moderate COVID-19 disease (VE_M), and effectiveness in preventing severe or critical COVID-19 disease that would prompt hospitalization (VE_H). Severe or critical COVID-19 disease was defined as illness that would ordinarily prompt non-ICU hospital care or ICU care, respectively. Of note, these definitions applied in our model are somewhat different from the definitions applied in various clinical trials.^{27–30}

We accounted for the direct benefits of vaccination by adjusting disease path probabilities among those vaccinated. Disease path probabilities are age-dependent and defined as follows:

- P_0 : probability immune to SARS-CoV-2 infection

- P_1 : probability of developing asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection if exposed
- P_2 : probability of developing mild/moderate COVID-19 disease if exposed
- P_3 : probability of developing severe COVID-19 disease if exposed
- P_4 : probability of developing critical COVID-19 disease if exposed

Disease path probabilities for unvaccinated individuals susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 infection are shown in Supplementary Table 5. Among vaccinated individuals exposed to SARS-CoV-2, the probabilities of infection, mild/moderate disease, severe disease, or critical disease are functions of vaccine effectiveness and disease path probabilities among unvaccinated individuals exposed to SARS-CoV-2:

$$P(\text{immune}) = P_0^V = 1 - ((1 - VE_I)(1 - P_0)) \quad (4)$$

$$P(\text{asymptomatic infection}) = P_1^V = 1 - (P_0^V + P_2^V + P_3^V + P_4^V) \quad (5)$$

$$P(\text{mild/moderate disease}) = P_2^V = (1 - VE_M)P_2 \quad (6)$$

$$P(\text{severe disease}) = P_3^V = (1 - VE_H)P_3 \quad (7)$$

$$P(\text{critical disease}) = P_4^V = (1 - VE_H)P_4 \quad (8)$$

Supplementary Figure 2 depicts a graphical summary of the above equations. In the base case, we assumed that those who are vaccinated but nonetheless become infected can transmit infection to susceptible people with the same probability as unvaccinated/infected people can transmit infection. In a sensitivity analysis, we reduced the probability of transmission from vaccinated/infected people by 50%.

Our modeled vaccine effectiveness values were based on efficacies reported in the Johnson & Johnson/Janssen Ad26.COVID.S vaccine trial.³⁰ Of note, because of slightly differing outcome definitions, our modeled vaccine effectiveness in preventing mild/moderate COVID-19 was adjusted in an age-dependent manner to reflect the trial's reported efficacy in preventing moderate to severe/critical COVID-19 in South Africa, and our modeled vaccine effectiveness in preventing severe/critical COVID-19

that would prompt hospitalization reflected the trial's reported efficacy in preventing COVID-19 requiring medical intervention.³⁰

Costs of vaccination, hospital ward care, and ICU care

Although we did not perform a full economic analysis of vaccination program costs, we accounted for the estimated cost of each vaccine dose and of vaccine delivery in South Africa. We applied a reported cost of US\$10 per dose for the single-dose Johnson & Johnson/Janssen Ad26.COVS vaccine in South Africa.^{31,32} We applied a service and delivery cost of US\$4.81 per dose, based on a published report of the costs of delivering human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination in South Africa.³³ In that report, the authors found that service and delivery costs for a 3-dose regimen of HPV vaccine were 180.28 South African rand (ZAR) per person (in 2014 ZAR). Converting from 2014 ZAR to 2020 ZAR, and from 2020 ZAR to 2020 US dollars, yields a cost of US\$14.42 per person.^{34,35} Dividing by three results in a cost of US\$4.81 per dose.

In the base case, we applied a daily cost of \$154 for hospital (non-ICU) ward care based on cost per inpatient day in a general ward charged by Netcare, a private hospital network.³⁶ Those in the "severe" and "recuperation" states accrued this daily cost, assuming a hospital ward bed was available. In the base case, we applied a daily cost of \$1,751 for ICU care based on a cost analysis of a public hospital in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.³⁷ Those in the "critical" state accrued this daily cost and not the hospital ward care cost, assuming an ICU bed was available. We performed sensitivity analysis in which we varied the hospital and ICU care costs to 50% and 200% of the base case values.

Additionally, we repeated the main analysis using costs reported by Edoaka et al. in the public sector.³ These were \$137/day for hospital (non-ICU) general ward care with supplemental oxygen and \$798/day

for ICU care with invasive mechanical ventilation, both excluding facility fees (when including facility fees, Edeka et al. reported costs of \$202/day for hospital ward care and \$1,314/day for ICU care). The results of this analysis are in Supplementary Table 4.

Model validation

We previously validated CEACOV model results by comparing model-projected COVID-19 deaths with those reported in South Africa.²² Here, we performed additional validation by simulating a two-wave epidemic, starting with 0.1% prevalence of active SARS-CoV-2 infection and 0% prevalence of prior immunity (analogous to South Africa in early 2020) (Figure S3). We compared the model results to COVID-19 case and death data reported to South Africa's National Institute for Communicable Diseases, assuming that reported cases represent 10% of all infections.^{1,2} Our model projected, between 1 May 2020 and 10 April 2021, 15.6 million SARS-CoV-2 infections, 1,555,900 observed cases, and 58,200 COVID-19 deaths. During this same period, 1,551,768 cases of COVID-19 were reported to the NICD. Weekly data regarding the number of reported deaths were unavailable before 18 May 2020. However, between 5 March 2020 and 10 April 2021, 52,278 COVID-19 deaths were reported to the NICD. These data suggest that our model is able to capture the general characteristics of South Africa's COVID-19 epidemic.

Supplementary References

1. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. National COVID-19 Daily Report.
<https://www.nicd.ac.za/diseases-a-z-index/covid-19/surveillance-reports/national-covid-19-daily-report/> (2021).
2. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. COVID-19 Weekly Hospital Surveillance Update - Week 14, 2021. <https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/NICD-COVID-19-Weekly-Hospital-Surveillance-update-Week-14-2021.pdf> (2021).
3. Edoka, I., Fraser, H., Jamieson, L., Meyer-Rath, G. & Mdewa, W. Inpatient care costs of COVID-19 in South Africa's public healthcare system. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* (2021).
4. Tegally, H. *et al.* Detection of a SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern in South Africa. *Nature* **592**, 438–443 (2021).
5. Sykes, W. *et al.* Prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among blood donors in Northern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape, and Free State provinces of South Africa in January 2021. Preprint at [doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-233375/v1](https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-233375/v1) (2021).
6. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. *COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiology Brief - Week 46, 2020*. <https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/COVID-19-Weekly-Epidemiology-Brief-week-46.pdf> (2020).
7. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. *COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiology Brief - Week 4, 2021*. <https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/COVID-19-Weekly-Epidemiology-Brief-week-4-2021.pdf> (2021).
8. World Health Organization. *Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)*. <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf> (2020).

9. He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* **26**, 672–675 (2020).
10. Zhou, F. *et al.* Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* **395**, 1054–1062 (2020).
11. Hu, Z. *et al.* Clinical characteristics of 24 asymptomatic infections with COVID-19 screened among close contacts in Nanjing, China. *Sci. China Life Sci.* **63**, 706–711 (2020).
12. Liu, Y., Gayle, A. A., Wilder-Smith, A. & Rocklöv, J. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *J Travel Med* **27**, taaa021 (2020).
13. Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A. & Chowell, G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro Surveill* **25**, 2000180 (2020).
14. Tao, Y. *et al.* High incidence of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection, Chongqing, China. Preprint at doi:10.1101/2020.03.16.20037259 (2020).
15. Massachusetts Department of Public Health. COVID-19 Dashboard.
<https://www.mass.gov/doc/covid-19-dashboard-april-20-2020/download> (2020).
16. Rothwell, J. Estimating COVID-19 prevalence in symptomatic Americans.
<https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/306458/estimating-covid-prevalence-symptomatic-americans.aspx> (2020).
17. Wang, D. *et al.* Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* **323**, 1061–1069 (2020).
18. *Mid-year population estimates 2019*.
<https://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022019.pdf> (2020).
19. Paulden, M. Calculating and interpreting ICERs and net benefit. *Pharmacoeconomics* **38**, 785–807 (2020).

20. Hsiao, M. *et al.* SARS-COV-2 Seroprevalence in the Cape Town Metropolitan Sub-Districts After the Peak of Infections. https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/COVID-19-Special-Public-Health-Surveillance-Bulletin_Issue-5.pdf (2020).
21. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. The Initial and Daily COVID-19 Effective Reproductive Number (R) in South Africa. <https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/The-Initial-and-Daily-COVID-19-Effective-Reproductive-Number-R-in-South-Africa-002.pdf> (2020).
22. Reddy, K. P. *et al.* Cost-effectiveness of public health strategies for COVID-19 epidemic control in South Africa: a microsimulation modelling study. *The Lancet Global Health* **9**, e120–e129 (2021).
23. Update on COVID-19 (21st June 2020) - South Africa Coronavirus Online Portal. *SA Corona Virus Online Portal* <https://sacoronavirus.co.za/2020/06/21/update-on-covid-19-21st-june-2020/> (2020).
24. Preston, S. H., Heuveline, P. & Guillot, M. *Demography: Measuring and Modeling Population Processes*. (Blackwell Publishers, Malden, 2001).
25. Disease burden and mortality estimates. *World Health Organization* http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/estimates/en/ (2018).
26. World Population Prospects. *Population Division, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs* <https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Standard/Population/> (2019).
27. Voysey, M. *et al.* Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet* **397**, 99–111 (2021).
28. Polack, F. P. *et al.* Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine. *N Engl J Med* **383**, 2603–2615 (2020).
29. Baden, L. R. *et al.* Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 403–416 (2021).

30. Sadoff, J. *et al.* Safety and efficacy of single-dose Ad26.COV2.S vaccine against Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 2187-2201 (2021).
31. Reuters Staff. J&J, African Union in deal for up to 400 million COVID-19 shots. *Reuters*
<https://www.reuters.com/article/uk-health-coronavirus-j-j-vaccine-idUSKBN2BL1V4> (2021).
32. Business Insider South Africa. SA is the first country to roll out Johnson & Johnson vaccine - what you need to know about the jab. <https://www.businessinsider.co.za/covid-19-vaccine-johnson-johnson-what-we-know-2020-12> (2021).
33. Moodley, I., Tathiah, N. & Sartorius, B. The costs of delivering human papillomavirus vaccination to Grade 4 learners in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *S Afr Med J* **106**, 497–501 (2016).
34. Consumer Price Index: All Items for South Africa. *FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis*
<https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/ZAFPCPIALLMINMEI> (2021).
35. South Africa / U.S. Foreign Exchange Rate. *FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis*
<https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/DEXSFUS> (2021).
36. Netcare Hospitals. 2019 Tariffs. <https://www.netcarehospitals.co.za/Portals/3/Images/Content-images/PDF/2019-Private-Paying-Patients.pdf> (2019).
37. Mahomed, S. & Mahomed, O. H. Cost of intensive care services at a central hospital in South Africa. *S Afr Med J* **109**, 35–39 (2019).