

1 **Modelling the adjustment of COVID-19 response and exit from dynamic zero-COVID in China**

2 Kathy Leung ^{1,2,3*}, Gabriel M. Leung ^{1,2*}, Joseph T. Wu ^{1,2,3*}

3 ¹ WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public
4 Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

5 ² Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health Limited (D²4H), Hong Kong Science Park, Hong Kong
6 SAR, China

7 ³ The University of Hong Kong – Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, China.

8 *Contributed equally.

9 Correspondence: Kathy Leung (ksmleung@hku.hk)

10 Abstract

11 Background

12 Since the initial Wuhan outbreak, China has been containing COVID-19 outbreaks through its
13 “dynamic zero-COVID” policy. Striking a balance between sustainability and cost-benefit, China has
14 recently begun to adjust its COVID-19 response strategies, e.g. by announcing the “20 measures” on
15 11 November and further the “10 measures” on 7 December 2022. Strategies for safely exiting from
16 dynamic zero-COVID (i.e. without catastrophically overburdening health systems and/or incurring
17 unacceptably excessive morbidity and mortality) are urgently needed.

18 Methods

19 We use simulations to assess the respective and combined effectiveness of fourth-dose heterologous
20 boosting, large-scale antiviral treatment and public health and social measures (PHSMs) that might
21 allow China to further adjust COVID-19 response and exit from zero-COVID safely after 7 December
22 2022. We also assess whether local health systems can cope with the surge of COVID-19 cases posed
23 by reopening, given that *chunyun*, a 40-day period with extremely high mobility across China
24 associated with Spring Festival, will begin on 7 January 2023.

25 Findings

26 Reopening against Omicron transmission should be supported by the following interventions: 1)
27 fourth-dose heterologous boosting 30-60 days before reopening by vaccinating 4-8% of the
28 population per week with $\geq 85\%$ uptake across all ages; 2) timely antiviral treatment with $\geq 60\%$
29 coverage; 3) moderate PHSMs to reduce transmissibility by 47-69%. With fourth-dose vaccination
30 coverage of 85% and antiviral coverage of 60%, the cumulative mortality burden would be reduced
31 by 26-35% to 448-503 per million, compared with reopening without any of these interventions.
32 Simultaneously reopening all provinces under current PHSMs would still lead to hospitalisation
33 demand that are 1.5-2.5 times of surge hospital capacity (2.2 per 10,000 population per day).

34 Interpretation

35 Although the surge of disease burden posed by reopening in December 2022 – January 2023 would
36 likely overload many local health systems across the country, the combined effect of vaccination,
37 antiviral treatment and PHSMs could substantially reduce COVID-19 morbidity and mortality as
38 China transits from dynamic-zero to normality. Planning for such a nationwide, coordinated
39 reopening should be an urgent priority as part of the global exit from the acute phase of the COVID-
40 19 pandemic.

41 Funding

42 COVID-19 Vaccines Evaluation Program, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention; Health
43 and Medical Research Fund, Health Bureau, The Government of the Hong Kong SAR; General
44 Research Fund, Research Grants Council, Hong Kong

45

46 Word count: 363

47 **Research in context**

48 **Evidence before this study**

49 We searched PubMed and preprint archives for articles published up to 7 December 2021, that
50 contained information about exit strategies of zero-COVID or reopening in China after the emergence
51 of Omicron using the terms “China”, “Omicron”, “B.1.1.529”, “COVID-19”, “SARS-CoV-2”,
52 “vaccin*”, “vaccine”, “antiviral”, “control measures”, “non-pharmaceutical intervention”, “public
53 health and social measure”, “zero-COVID”, “exit strategy” and “reopen*”. We only found one study
54 by Wang et al (doi: 10.1101/2022.05.07.22274792) but they assessed the feasibility of sustaining
55 SARS-CoV-2 containment with zero-COVID strategy in China. To our knowledge, there is no
56 discussion of exit strategies of the zero-COVID strategy or assessment of feasibility of reopening in
57 China.

58 **Added value of this study**

59 Reopening against Omicron transmission should be supported by the following interventions: 1)
60 fourth-dose heterologous boosting 30-60 days before reopening by vaccinating 4-8% of the
61 population per week with $\geq 85\%$ uptake across all ages; 2) timely antiviral treatment with $\geq 60\%$
62 coverage; 3) moderate PHSMs to reduce transmissibility by 47-69%. With fourth-dose vaccination
63 coverage of 85% and antiviral coverage of 60%, the cumulative mortality burden would be reduced
64 by 26-35% to 448-503 per million, compared with reopening without any of these interventions.
65 Simultaneously reopening all provinces under current PHSMs would still lead to hospitalisation
66 demand that are 1.5-2.5 times of surge hospital capacity (2.2 per 10,000 population per day).

67 **Implications of all the available evidence**

68 Although the surge of disease burden posed by reopening in December 2022 – January 2023 would
69 likely overload many local health systems across the country, the combined effect of vaccination,
70 antiviral treatment and PHSMs could substantially reduce COVID-19 morbidity and mortality as
71 China transits from dynamic-zero to normality. Planning for such a nationwide, coordinated
72 reopening should be an urgent priority as part of the global exit from the acute phase of the COVID-
73 19 pandemic.

74

75 Introduction

76 Since March 2020, China has been containing successive sporadic clusters of COVID-19 infection
77 through its “dynamic zero-COVID” policy – by mass lockdowns, universal compulsory testing of
78 entire districts or even whole cities, stringent quarantine and isolation enforced down to the
79 neighbourhood level, universal digital contact tracing and importation controls ^{1,2}. Although this zero-
80 COVID strategy had remained effective in 2020-2021, the emergence and spread of Omicron since
81 early 2022 has triggered prolonged lockdowns and major disruptions in megacities such as Beijing
82 and Shanghai, with ramifications far beyond its own shores nationally and globally in terms of the
83 economy, trade, and commerce. Striking a balance between sustainability and cost-benefit of
84 dynamic-zero, China has recently begun to adjust its COVID-19 response strategies, notably by
85 announcing the “20 measures” on 11 November and further the “10 measures” on 7 December 2022
86 ^{3,4}.

87 Elsewhere in other parts of the world, the majority of countries are transiting to a “living with the
88 virus” strategy, having built up considerable population immunity through multiple infection waves of
89 ancestral strain and variants of concern (VOCs) and with the majority population having received two
90 or three (sometimes even four) doses of vaccines. Given the interdependency of infectious disease
91 dynamics at the meta-population level, when and how China can safely exit from its dynamic zero-
92 COVID policy (in terms of significant morbidity and mortality as well as exceedance of the surge
93 capacity of local health systems) has important implications to health security and economic stability
94 globally.

95 As of 6 December 2022, mainland China has tallied just over 349,938 confirmed COVID-19 cases
96 and 5,235 COVID-related deaths. Before the mass vaccination programme, the seroprevalence was
97 <5% in Wuhan and <1% outside Wuhan in Hubei, even though they were the epicentres of the first
98 wave in 2020 ⁵. As such, existing population immunity nationwide is primarily conferred by passive
99 immunisation with the domestically produced inactivated virus vaccines. As of 28 November 2022,
100 the vaccine uptake of two- and three-dose vaccination are 91% and 57%, respectively. Although
101 three-dose homologous vaccinations are highly effective in reducing the risk of Omicron
102 hospitalisation and death, they have limited lasting impact in boosting immunity against Omicron (or
103 future VOCs) transmission. Recent data suggests that for individuals who have received two doses of
104 inactivated vaccines, a third dose of a heterologous vaccine increases neutralising antibodies to levels
105 that correlate with substantial reduction in susceptibility to Omicron infection ⁶. Thus, our basic
106 premise is that high uptake of three-dose inactivated vaccines followed by heterologous boosters (i.e.,
107 fourth dose) would provide significant protection against Omicron transmission for 2-3 months to
108 create a time window for safer reopening.

109 Timely antiviral treatment of symptomatic Omicron patients has now been proven to be effective in
110 substantially reducing their risk of hospitalisation and death ⁷. Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir has already been
111 approved for treating COVID in mainland China whilst five domestic companies are manufacturing
112 Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir for exports ⁸. In addition, several domestic candidate oral drugs, including
113 SIM0417 (a 3CL protease inhibitor similar to Nirmatrelvir), are undergoing Phase 2/3 trials. In this
114 study, we assume that large-scale antiviral treatments are widely available by the time of reopening.

115 Here, we investigate to what extent optimal deployment of vaccines, antivirals and public health and
116 social measures (PHSMs) could allow China to further adjust COVID-19 response and exit from zero-
117 COVID safely after 7 December 2022. We also assess whether the local health systems can cope with
118 the surge of disease burden posed by reopening, given that *chunyun*, a 40-day period with extremely
119 high mobility across China associated with Spring Festival, will begin on 7 January 2023.

120 **Methods**

121 *Vaccine effectiveness (VE) of 4th-dose heterologous boosting*

122 As of 28 November 2022, the two- and three-dose vaccine uptake in mainland China was 91% and
123 57%. Since more than 95% of vaccines administered are inactivated virus vaccines, we assume that all
124 vaccinees would receive inactivated virus vaccines for their first three doses. Following the widely
125 used method developed by Khoury et al for predicting vaccine effectiveness from neutralisation
126 antibody titres, we estimate that several domestically-made vaccines have substantial VE in reducing
127 Omicron transmission (for a limited duration) if given as 4th-dose heterologous booster (see **Table S1**
128 and **Appendix** for details)⁹. We assume that VEs conferred by 4th-dose boosting in reducing
129 hospitalisations and deaths are equivalent to that from three doses of inactivated virus vaccines
130 against the Omicron wave in Hong Kong (**Table S2**)¹⁰.

131 We use a “leaky” vaccine action model to estimate vaccine-induced population immunity in reducing
132 susceptibility to infection, infectiousness, hospitalisation, and death as a function of 4th-dose uptake
133 over time (**Figure 1**). We assume that 4th-dose heterologous boosting would be delivered via two
134 hypothetical vaccines A and B, and VEs and production capacities are similar to that of V-01 and
135 NVSI-06-08 (i.e., 80% Vaccine A and 20% Vaccine B), respectively.

136 *Effectiveness and availability of oral antivirals*

137 Two oral antiviral medications, namely Molnupiravir and Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir, have been used in
138 Hong Kong since mid-March 2022 to treat COVID patients with a coverage of around 60% among
139 eligible patients (i.e., patients aged 60 or above and high-risk patients under 60 years old). Given the
140 current trajectory of COVID-19 antiviral availability and development in mainland China, we assume
141 that Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir would be used with 60% coverage when mainland China reopens, and that
142 their effectiveness in reducing hospitalisations and deaths are similar to that observed in Hong Kong
143 (**Table S3** and **Appendix**)¹¹.

144 *Effectiveness of PHSMs*

145 Hong Kong has experienced six waves of community wide COVID transmission (with the fifth and
146 sixth wave being Omicron) whereas Shanghai has had one driven by Omicron BA.2 that had led to 2
147 months of city-wide lockdown. We categorise PHSMs implemented during these waves into four
148 levels and estimate their effectiveness from the associated changes in reproductive number (**Figure S1**
149 and **Table S4**). In Hong Kong, PHSMs at Levels 1-3 reduced R_t by 15%, 47% and 55%, respectively.
150 Level 4 PHSMs reduced R_t by 69% in Hong Kong and 72% in Shanghai.

151 We map mainland China’s combinations of PHSMs and their intensity to the abovementioned PHSM
152 levels after the announcement of adjustment of COVID-19 response on 7 December 2022. We assume
153 that the current PHSMs are as effective as Level 2, which would reduce R_t by 47%. A dynamic
154 adjustment of PHSMs is anticipated during reopening, but we assume that PHSMs more stringent than
155 Level 4 would not be considered because it would lengthen the time needed for populations to attain
156 their herd immunity thresholds.

157 *Modelling the spread and disease burden of Omicron*

158 We assume that R_0 of the SARS-CoV-2 variant that spread during reopening would be similar to that
159 of the most recent prevailing strain worldwide, Omicron BA.5 (i.e., around 8.3) and 1,000 cases
160 would be seeded into the reopened populations on the first ten days of reopening. With the
161 vaccination coverage as of November 2022 as the starting point, we assess the respective and

162 combined impact of vaccination, antivirals and PHSMs in five scenarios, and the effects of
163 prioritising different age groups in four sub-scenarios (**Table 1**). We adopt a previously used age-
164 structured susceptible-exposed-infectious-removed (SEIR) meta-population model of SARS-CoV-2
165 transmission dynamics parameterized with local-specific age demographics and contact patterns^{12,13}.
166 Population movements before, during and after *chunyun* among more than 300 prefecture-level cities
167 are modelled based on previously constructed mobility networks adjusted with the relative changes in
168 provincial transportation volumes between 2020 and 2021¹⁴.

169 ***Health system capacity***

170 Among all Chinese cities, Hong Kong has one of the most well-resourced healthcare systems for
171 managing the disease burden posed by COVID-19. As a best-case scenario, we use 100% and 200%
172 of the maximum number of hospital beds designated for COVID-19 patients in Hong Kong in May
173 2022 (which correspond to its baseline/regular and surged capacity, respectively) as the benchmarks
174 for health system capacity constraints across mainland China during reopening (**Table S3**). Assuming
175 an average hospitalisation duration of 8 days^{15,16}, these constraints correspond to a daily incidence of
176 1.1 and 2.2 hospitalisations per 10,000 population, which also correspond to 21-42% of hospital beds
177 in secondary/tertiary hospitals and 15-25% of all the existing hospital beds across all Chinese
178 provinces (**Figure S2, Table S5 and Table S6**).

179 ***Reopening strategies***

180 In view of the COVID-19 response adjustments announced on 11 November and 7 December, we
181 assume that the full reopening would start in December 2022. Using simulations, we compare two
182 reopening strategies:

183 **Strategy 1:** Simultaneously reopen all provinces on 1 December 2022 for simplicity of execution and
184 to minimise the duration of the associated socio-economic disruption, including cities with major
185 outbreaks recently (e.g., Beijing, Chongqing and Guangzhou)

186 **Strategy 2:** Start mass vaccination of the 3rd dose homologous booster for the elderly and 4th dose
187 heterologous booster for other ages on 1 December 2022, and simultaneously reopen all provinces on
188 1 January 2023

189 Specifically, we simulate Strategies 1 and 2 in the following regions (**Figure S3**): (i) the greater
190 Yangtze River Delta (YRD, including cities and counties in Shanghai, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, and Anhui)
191 and greater Pearl River Delta (PRD, including cities and counties in Guangdong) as exemplars of
192 Chinese megalopolises; (ii) Henan and Guangxi as exemplars of regions with a substantial proportion
193 of rural populations.

194 **Results**

196 ***VEs and population immunity conferred by 4th-dose heterologous boosting***

197 We estimate that VE at 14 days after 4th-dose heterologous boosting in reducing Omicron
198 susceptibility (VE_S), infectiousness (VE_I), hospitalisations (VE_H) and deaths (VE_D) are: (i) 58%, 47%,
199 96% and 98% for Vaccine A; and (ii) 88%, 70%, 96% and 98% for Vaccine B, respectively (**Table**
200 **2**). However, VE_S and VE_I wane quickly such that both vaccines would have minimal effect in
201 reducing Omicron transmission 60-90 days after 4th-dose boosting (**Figure 1**). The population
202 immunity against Omicron transmission during reopening is sensitive to the start time of 4th-dose
203 boosting and the associated rollout rate (with respect to the time of reopening). Assuming that 4th-dose

204 uptake would reach 85% at a weekly rate of 8%, 6% and 4% of the population, population immunity
205 against infection and infectiousness would reach 20-30% and 15-25% within 70, 90, and 120 days,
206 respectively. Slower rollout of the 4th dose would fail to generate significant population immunity
207 against Omicron transmission (**Figure 1**). Immunity from 4th-dose boosting would be sustained at
208 peak levels for about 60 days and then drop substantially afterwards. Taken together, if population
209 immunity is one of the prerequisites for safer reopening, 4th-dose heterologous boosting should start
210 and finish within 1-2 months before the commencement of reopening by vaccinating 4-8% of the
211 population per week.

212 *Impact of combining vaccination, antiviral treatment and PHSMs*

213 We first consider status quo without 4th-dose vaccination, antivirals and PHSMs (**Scenario 1** in **Table**
214 **1**) and epidemics are simultaneously seeded in all provinces. In this case, reopening at the status quo
215 would result in a cumulative mortality burden of 684 per million (**Figure 2**).

216 We next consider vaccinations, antiviral treatments and PHSMs individually (**Figure S4**). Assuming
217 that the basic reproductive number R_0 of Omicron BA.5 is 8.3 (7.8-8.9) and a fast rollout of the 4th
218 dose would provide 25% and 20% population immunity against infection and infectiousness (**Figure**
219 **1**), R_t of Omicron BA.5 under Level 1-4 PHSMs would be around 4.2, 2.6, 2.2 and 1.5, respectively.
220 If vaccination, antiviral treatments and PHSMs are only implemented in isolation, the disease burden
221 posed by reopening would substantially exceed the health system capacity in all provinces.

222 Therefore, we consider vaccination, antiviral treatments and PHSMs in different combinations (**Table**
223 **1**). **Scenario 2** shows that with vaccination and antivirals but not PHSMs, hospitalisations and deaths
224 would again exceed by a large margin the capacity of local health systems for 2-3 weeks in all
225 provinces (**Figure 2**). Specifically, the daily number of hospitalisations would peak at 4.8 (3.8-6.2)
226 per 10,000 population which is more than twice the surge capacity constraint (i.e., 2.2 per 10,000),
227 although the cumulative number of deaths would be reduced by 26% to 503 per million compared
228 with Scenario 1.

229 Similarly, **Scenario 3** shows that, although adding PHSMs could further reduce the spread and overall
230 mortality (to 448 per million), peak hospitalisation burden would still overload the health systems for
231 weeks albeit with smaller excess margins. **Scenarios 4 and 5** show that in addition to PHSMs, faster
232 rollout of 4th-dose boosting would slightly reduce the overall mortality to 426 and 416 per million, but
233 they would be unable to completely avert overloading of the local health systems beyond the surge
234 capacity constraint.

235 Increasing booster uptake to 95% among 18-59 and 3-59 years old would further reduce the overall
236 mortality to 305 and 249 per million, respectively (**Figure 3**). However, prioritising boosting among
237 younger age groups that contribute more to transmission would only modestly reduce the peak
238 incidence of infection and hospitalisation with minimal additional indirect protection of the elderly
239 population. Peak hospitalisation incidence would still exceed the baseline capacity constraint (i.e., 1.1
240 per 10,000) even when 4th-dose uptake reaches 95% among 3-59 years old and >85% in other age
241 groups.

242 Populations with 4th-dose uptake below 85% would require more stringent PHSMs to reduce R_t
243 by >65% (entailing closure of most indoor premises and different sectors of business, amongst others)
244 in order to prevent peak daily incidence of hospitalisation from exceeding 2.2 per 10,000 (**Table S5**).
245 Populations with older age structures also require more stringent or prolonged PHSMs for safe

246 reopening, because those aged 60 or above have much higher risks of hospitalisation and death if
247 infected. In what follows, we only simulate **Scenario 4** unless specified otherwise.

248 *Simultaneous reopening of all provinces without 4th dose heterologous booster (Strategy 1)*

249 Under **Strategy 1**, simultaneous reopening of all provinces without 4th dose vaccination would result
250 in almost synchronised epidemics in both YRD and PRD, especially under their higher connectivity
251 with all provinces, cities and counties during the *chunyun* period (**Figure 4**).

252 The epidemic lasts longer and peaks slightly earlier in the cities where epidemics are first seeded. In
253 other cities within YRD and PRD, daily incidence of hospitalisation peaks at nearly the same time,
254 and the surge in hospital admissions would exceed the capacity of health systems in all cities. At peak,
255 the daily number of hospitalisations could reach 6-7 per 10,000 population which is about 3-4 times
256 the surge capacity threshold of health system capacity (2.2 hospitalisations per 10,000). The mean
257 daily incidence of deaths is 2.3-3.5 per 100,000 at peak, and the mean cumulative incidence of deaths
258 is 568-770 per million in all populations. For example, the peak daily number of deaths is 573-872
259 and the cumulative number of deaths is 14,138-19,166 in Shanghai (24.89 million population).

260 The epidemics in Henan and Guangxi would be similar to that in YRD and PRD except for a longer
261 time lag between the first epidemic wave in cities where epidemics are seeded and the subsequent
262 epidemics in other cities (which are synchronised) due to relatively weaker population mobility
263 between them (**Figure 4**).

264 *Simultaneous reopening of all provinces with 4th dose heterologous booster (Strategy 2)*

265 Under **Strategy 2**, simultaneous reopening of all provinces with 4th dose vaccination would similarly
266 result in almost synchronised epidemics in both YRD and PRD, but mass vaccination with 4th dose
267 heterologous boosting would reduce the peak incidence of hospitalisations and deaths (**Figure 5**). At
268 peak, the daily number of hospitalisations is reduced to 4-6 per 10,000 population which is about 1.5-
269 2.5 times the surge capacity threshold of health system capacity (2.2 hospitalisations per 10,000). The
270 mean daily incidence of deaths is also reduced to 1.7-2.4 per 100,000 at peak, and the mean
271 cumulative incidence of deaths is 434-615 per million in all populations. For example, the peak daily
272 number of deaths is 424-598 and the cumulative number of deaths is 10,803-14,885 in Shanghai.

273 *More stringent PHSMs are required during reopening*

274 Given that the surge of COVID-19 hospitalisations would overload health systems of all provinces in
275 Strategies 1-2, we estimate that more stringent PHSMs are required during reopening (**Figure 6**).
276 Without 4th dose heterologous boosting, implementing PHSMs at Level 4 could only reduce the peak
277 hospitalisation to 4.3 per 100,000. Therefore, more stringent PHSMs to reduce R_t by 80-88% (similar
278 to lockdown) are required to keep peak hospitalisation below the surge capacity threshold of health
279 system. There is a trade-off between higher vaccination coverage and less stringent PHSMs: if 4th
280 dose heterologous vaccination coverage could reach >75% or above nationally, PHSMs at Level 3
281 would be able to keep peak hospitalisation below the surge capacity threshold of health system.

282 **Discussion**

283 Our results suggest that local health systems across all provinces would be unable to cope with the
284 surge of COVID-19 cases posed by reopening in December 2022 – January 2023 in the context of the
285 adjusted COVID-19 responses announced on 7 December⁴. However, safer exit from dynamic zero-

286 COVID could be achieved by adopting a multi-pronged approach comprising vaccination, antiviral
287 treatment, PHSMs and sequential reopening. As of 28 November 2022, the nationwide three-dose
288 vaccine uptake was 57% and 69% among population aged <60 and ≥60. As such, it is crucial to
289 substantially boost population immunity to minimise morbidity and mortality during the reopening.

290 A high uptake of heterologous boosting with an efficacious fourth dose is the cornerstone for
291 reopening more safely. As of 7 December 2022, among all domestic vaccines under emergency use or
292 development, recombinant protein subunit vaccines (e.g., V-01, SCB-2019 and SCTV-01C) and
293 inhaled adenovirus-vectored vaccines (e.g., Ad5-nCoV-IH) have shown good potential for inducing
294 immunity against Omicron infections (**Table S1**). Boosting population immunity (especially among
295 the elderly population and high-risk groups) are current top priorities for setting the stage for safe
296 reopening. Increasing vaccine uptake in all age groups, including children aged under 3, should be
297 also considered. Given the fast waning of VEs, mass vaccination programme of the fourth dose should
298 start within 30-60 days before reopening and complete within 60 days (**Figure 1**).

299 China is a highly heterogenous country with megalopolises and developed urban areas in the East and
300 Southeast, but the majority of rural areas are in the North, Northwest, and Southwest. Economically
301 prosperous regions have relatively more abundant healthcare resources and are therefore more
302 resilient in coping with the surge of cases and hospitalisations during reopening (**Table S5**). When
303 these regions reopen, PHSMs should ideally be kept at Level 2-3 to minimise the associated socio-
304 economic disruption whenever possible, but PHSMs at Level 4 should be considered when surge of
305 hospitalisations is expected to overload the health system. Antivirals should be prescribed in a timely
306 manner in symptomatic cases at high coverage, and treatment and management of COVID-19 patients
307 should be risk stratified. For example, a primary-care supported home recovery programme could be
308 introduced for low-risk patients (i.e., those who are asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic), whereas
309 high-risk patients should be provided with necessary medical care (especially with timely antivirals)
310 and closely monitored with the help of telemedicine. In this regard, antivirals should be made more
311 widely accessible at a much lower cost.

312 In contrast, a large proportion of China's elderly population live in rural areas where treatment and
313 care are most needed during the reopening transition. Therefore, ramping up temporal hospital
314 capacity in rural areas should be emphasised in the interim. Ideally, vaccination coverage of the 3rd
315 and 4th dose should exceed 90%, and logistics infrastructure should be set up for efficient and timely
316 on-demand antiviral distribution at the household level. When these rural areas reopen, more stringent
317 PHSMs of Level 4 could be considered near the epidemic peaks to further minimise the surge demand
318 of hospital care. However, in the context of reopening, the functional aim of PHSMs is to strike an
319 optimal balance between: (i) keeping the peak hospital load just below the surge capacity constraint
320 (**Figure 6**); and (ii) allowing epidemics to infect around $1-1/R_0$ (the herd immunity threshold)
321 proportion of the population within 6 months in order for natural infections to generate enough long-
322 lasting hybrid immunity against substantial resurgence afterwards. As such, PHSMs should not be
323 overly stringent and city-wide lockdown (i.e., PHSMs above Level 4) should be avoided, because
324 cases will resurge as soon as those PHSMs are lifted otherwise.

325 Although safe reopening might reduce the surge of COVID-19 severe cases to more manageable
326 levels, reopening mainland China at an initial R_t close to 3 would still result in a large number of
327 infections that could potentially accelerate mutation, selection and evolution of SARS-CoV-2 viruses
328 ^{17,18}. Genomic surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 variants must be strengthened, particularly in
329 megalopolises that are highly connected domestically and internationally. Multidisciplinary studies of

330 the transmissibility, severity, immune/vaccine escape of variants and antiviral resistance should be
331 coordinated nationwide to track the evolution of the pandemic ¹⁹.

332 In conclusion, although the surge of disease burden posed by reopening in December 2022 – January
333 2023 would likely overload most local health systems nationwide, a reopening strategy that combines
334 vaccination, antiviral treatment and PHSMs could allow China to exit zero-COVID more safely. This
335 would require a nationally coordinated effort for reopening, including planning, execution, and
336 surveillance.

337 **Contributors**

338 All authors designed the study, developed the model, analysed data, interpreted the results, and wrote
339 the manuscript.

340 **Declaration of interests**

341 The authors declare no competing interests.

342 **Data sharing statement**

343 We collated all data from publicly available data sources. All data included in the analyses are
344 available in the main text or the supplementary materials.

345 **Funding**

346 This research was supported by the COVID-19 Vaccines Evaluation Program (COVEP) of The
347 Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention (grant no.: 2202-HK-25), Health and Medical
348 Research Fund (grant no.: 21200122, CID-HKU2 and COVID19F05), Health and Medical Research
349 Fund Research Fellowship Scheme (grant no.: 06200097), General Research Fund (grant no.:
350 17110020), and the AIR@InnoHK administered by Innovation and Technology Commission of The
351 Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. KL was supported by the Enhanced
352 New Staff Start-up Research Grant from LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong.
353 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation,
354 or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had
355 final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Table 1. Scenarios of combining pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical interventions


Scenario	Combination of vaccinations, antivirals and PHSMs
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status-quo with two-dose and three-dose vaccine uptake as of November 2022 • No 4th-dose vaccinations • No antivirals • No PHSMs
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass vaccination of 4th dose begins 30 days before the reopening and 4% of the population would receive the 4th dose per week. The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 85% and 80% and 20% of individuals would receive Vaccine A and Vaccine B as the 4th dose. • Antiviral coverage is 60%. • No PHSMs
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass vaccination of 4th dose begins 30 days before the reopening and 4% of the population would receive the 4th dose per week. The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 85% and 80% and 20% of individuals would receive Vaccine A and Vaccine B as the 4th dose. • Antiviral coverage is 60%. • PHSMs at Level 2 which reduce R_t by 47% are implemented 14 days after the seeding of epidemics, and PHSMs at Level 2 are maintained between 15 and 74 days after the seeding of epidemics, and gradually relaxed between 75 and 104 days.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass vaccination of 4th dose begins 30 days before the reopening and 6% of the population would receive the 4th dose per week. The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 85% and 80% and 20% of individuals would receive Vaccine A and Vaccine B as the 4th dose. • Antiviral coverage is 60%. • PHSMs at Level 2 which reduce R_t by 47% are implemented 14 days after the seeding of epidemics, and PHSMs at Level 2 are maintained between 15 and 74 days after the seeding of epidemics, and gradually relaxed between 75 and 104 days.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass vaccination of 4th dose begins 30 days before the reopening and 6% of the population would receive the 4th dose per week. The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 85%. Individuals would receive any of the five vaccines, including V-01, NVSI-06-08, Ad5-nCoV-IM, Ad5-nCoV-IH and BNT162b2, with equal probability as the 4th dose. • Antiviral coverage is 60%. • PHSMs at Level 2 which reduce R_t by 47% are implemented 14 days after the seeding of epidemics, and PHSMs at Level 2 are maintained between 15 and 74 days after the seeding of epidemics, and gradually relaxed between 75 and 104 days.

Scenario	Vaccination coverage of the 4 th dose and prioritisation of age groups in the vaccination programme under Scenario 4
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 85% in all age groups aged 3 or above. • Roll-out of 4th dose vaccination follows the age-specific vaccine uptake of the 3rd dose as of November 2022.
4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 85% in all age groups aged 3 or above. • Prioritise 4th-dose vaccination of older adults and seniors aged 60 or above.
4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 95% among 18-59 year olds and 85% in other age groups. • Prioritise 4th-dose vaccination of adults aged 18 to 59
4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum vaccine uptake of the 4th dose would reach 95% among 3-59 year olds and 85% in other age groups. • Prioritise 4th-dose vaccination of adults aged 3 to 59

358 **Table 2. Assumption about neutralising antibody titres (IC50) and vaccine effectiveness (VE)**
 359 **against Omicron BA.2 after the fourth dose in mainland China (with BBIBP-CorV as the first**
 360 **three doses)**

IC50 titres	Time after the 4th dose				
Vaccine	0 days	14 days	60 days	90 days	180 days
Vaccine A	5 (5, 5)	148 (101, 215)	68 (48, 100)	35 (24, 53)	5 (3, 6)
Vaccine B	5 (5, 5)	368 (296, 457)	169 (135, 208)	86 (69, 108)	10 (8, 12)
VE in reducing susceptibility	Time after the last dose				
Vaccine	0 days	14 days	60 days	90 days	180 days
Vaccine A	0	0.58	0	0	0
Vaccine B	0	0.88	0.52	0	0
VE in reducing infectiousness	Time after the last dose				
Vaccine	0 days	14 days	60 days	90 days	180 days
Vaccine A	0	0.47	0	0	0
Vaccine B	0	0.70	0.42	0	0
VE in reducing hospitalisation	Time after the last dose				
Vaccine	0 days	14 days	60 days	90 days	180 days
Vaccine A	0.80	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.95
Vaccine B	0.80	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.95
VE in reducing death	Time after the last dose				
Vaccine	0 days	14 days	60 days	90 days	180 days
Vaccine A	0.90	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.96
Vaccine B	0.90	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.96


361



362

363 **Figure 1. Vaccine effectiveness of heterologous boosting with the 4th dose against Omicron BA.2**
 364 **in reducing susceptibility (VE_S) and infectiousness (VE_I).** (A-B) VE_S and VE_I by days after the 4th
 365 dose which is assumed to be equivalent to that conferred by a heterologous booster following 2 doses
 366 of inactivated virus vaccines (which was estimated from neutralising Ab titres 14-28 days after the 3rd
 367 dose; **Table S1**). We assume that the Ab titres decay exponentially after the 3rd and 4th dose at the
 368 same rate (**Appendix**). (C-D) Population immunity against infection and infectiousness by days since
 369 the start of mass heterologous boosting at a maximum rate of vaccinating 2, 4, 6 and 8% of the
 370 population per week. Based on the national vaccination coverage data as of 28 November 2022, we
 371 assume the maximum vaccine uptake of the 3rd and 4th dose was 85%. We assume that 80% and 20%
 372 of vaccinees would be allocated with Vaccine A (with VEs similar to V-01) and Vaccine B (with VEs
 373 similar to NVSI-06-08), respectively. Assuming leaky vaccine action, we estimate population
 374 immunity as the product of vaccine uptake and VE. For example, if $VE_S = 30\%$ and vaccine uptake is
 375 68%, then population immunity against infection is 21%.


- Scenario 1: No 4th-dose vaccinations (i.e. 3rd dose vaccine uptake as of November 2022)
- Scenario 2: 4th-dose vaccinations + Antivirals
- Scenario 3: 4th-dose vaccinations + Antivirals + PHSMs
- Scenario 4: 4th-dose vaccinations (faster rollout) + Antivirals + PHSMs
- Scenario 5: 4th-dose vaccinations (faster rollout of more candidate vaccines) + Antivirals + PHSMs



376


377 **Figure 2. The impacts of 4th dose heterologous boosting, antiviral treatments and PHSMs if they**
 378 **are combined during reopening.** Please see Table 1 for descriptions of the five scenarios. (A)
 379 **Infection incidence as proportion of the population. (B) Cumulative infection attack rates by**
 380 **age. (C-D) Daily and cumulative number of cases requiring who require hospitalisation. (E-F)**
 381 **Daily and cumulative incidence of death.** Solid lines indicate the 50th percentile of the estimates
 382 and shades indicate the ranges between 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. The two horizontal dashed lines
 383 indicate the two health system capacity constraints based on the experience of Hong Kong during its
 384 Omicron wave (see Methods).

- Scenario 4.1: Final booster uptake = 85% in all age groups (aged 3 and above), vaccine rollout following the age-specific uptake of 3rd dose as of November 2022
- Scenario 4.2: Final booster uptake = 85% in all age groups (aged 3 and above), vaccinate individuals aged 60 or above first
- Scenario 4.3: Final booster uptake = 95% among 18-59 yrs old and 85% in other age groups, vaccinate individuals aged 18 to 59 first
- Scenario 4.4: Final booster uptake = 95% among 3-59 yrs old and 85% in other age groups, vaccinate individuals aged 3 to 59 first



385



386 **Figure 3. The impact of prioritising different age groups for 4th dose heterologous boosting.** We
 387 consider four prioritisation schemes for boosting (Table 1). Other parameters are the same as Scenario
 388 4 in Figure 2.




390 **Figure 4. Simultaneous reopening of Yangtze River Delta Region, Pearl River Delta Region, Henan, and Guangxi without 4th dose vaccination.** We
391 assume that mass vaccination of the 4th dose would not be implemented. Antiviral coverage is 60%. PHSMs at Level 2 are implemented 14 days after the
392 seeding of epidemics, and PHSMs at Level 2 are maintained between 15 and 74 days after the seeding of epidemics, and gradually relaxed between 75 and
393 104 days. In four regions, we assume COVID-19 outbreaks are seeded by importations in Group 1 (Shanghai, Guangzhou, Zhengzhou, and Guilin) on 1
394 December 2022. Solid lines show the 50th percentile of the estimations and shades show the ranges between 10th and 90th percentiles. Other parameters are the
395 same as Scenario 4 in **Figure 2**.

396

397



399 **Figure 5. Simultaneous reopening of Yangtze River Delta Region, Pearl River Delta Region, Henan, and Guangxi with 4th dose vaccination.** We
400 assume that mass vaccination of the 4th dose starts 30 days before the reopening to vaccinate 6% of the population per week, and uptake of the 4th dose would
401 reach 85%. Antiviral coverage is 60%. PHSMs at Level 2 are implemented 14 days after the seeding of epidemics, and PHSMs at Level 2 are maintained
402 between 15 and 74 days after the seeding of epidemics, and gradually relaxed between 75 and 104 days. In four regions, we assume COVID-19 outbreaks are
403 seeded by importations in Group 1 (Shanghai, Guangzhou, Zhengzhou, and Guilin) on 1 January 2022. Solid lines show the 50th percentile of the estimations
404 and shades show the ranges between 10th and 90th percentiles. Other parameters are the same as Scenario 4 in **Figure 2**.



405

406 **Figure 6. Peak daily incidence of hospitalisation as a function of PHSM intensity and 4th dose**
407 **uptake.** We assume that reopening would begin 30 days after the start of 4th-dose boosting and 6% of
408 the population would receive the 4th dose per week. PHSMs would be implemented 14 days after the
409 seeding of epidemics and maintained for 60 days (i.e., until day 74 after reopening has begun).
410 PHSMs would then be gradually over the next 30 days. Other parameters are the same as Scenario 4
411 in **Figure 2**.

412 **Appendix**

413

414 ***Estimating vaccine effectiveness of heterologous boosting in reducing Omicron susceptibility and*** 415 ***infectiousness***

416 As of 28 November 2022, the two- and three-dose vaccine uptake in mainland China was 91% and
417 57%, respectively. The corresponding uptake among those aged 60 or above was 86% and 69%,
418 respectively (<http://www.nhc.gov.cn/>).

419 Since more than 95% of vaccines administered in mainland China currently are inactivated virus
420 vaccines, we assume that all vaccinees would receive inactivated virus vaccines (namely, BBIBP-
421 CorV or CoronaVac) for the first three doses. The IC50 neutralising antibody (Ab) titres against
422 Omicron after the first three doses were obtained from the Brazilian study RHH-001 ⁶ and the Phase-3
423 trial of V-01 vaccine ²⁰.

424 We assume that 4th-dose heterologous boosting would be delivered via two hypothetical vaccines A
425 and B whose VEs and production capacities are similar to that of V-01 and NVSI-06-08 (**Table 2**,
426 **Table S1 and Table S2**):

- 427 1) V-01 is a recombinant SARS-CoV-2 fusion protein vaccine (i.e. RBD dimer-IFN-Pan Fc fusion
428 protein) developed by Livzon. In the Phase-3 trial of 10,218 participants in Pakistan and Malaysia
429 with a follow-up period of 60-90 days, the vaccine efficacy of V-01 as the third dose was 64%
430 (23-83) and 39% (3-62) against Omicron infection among 4,935 participants who had received
431 BBIBP-CorV or CoronaVac vaccines in their primary course ²⁰.
- 432 2) NVSI-06-08 is a recombinant COVID-19 vaccine based on the antigen of a mutation-integrated
433 trimetric RBD developed by Sinopharm. In the Phase-2 trial, the neutralising Ab titres against
434 Omicron was increased to 368 (95% CI: 296-457) among participants who had received BBIBP-
435 CorV as their primary course and NVSI-06-08 as the third dose ²¹.

436 We apply the Khoury method to predict the vaccine effectiveness (VE) in reducing Omicron
437 susceptibility and infectiousness as described in Leung et al ⁹. The prediction is based on the
438 neutralising Ab data from Brazil and Hong Kong ^{6,22,23} and the VE data from Phase-3 trial of V-01,
439 RHH-01 study from Brazil, and UKHSA reports from the UK ^{6,20,24}. Using the same method, we
440 model the waning of VE based on the following assumptions regarding the waning of Ab titres: (i)
441 The waning rate of Ab titres after the third dose is the same for inactivated virus vaccines and
442 BNT162b2; (ii) the waning rate after the third and fourth dose are the same. We estimate the waning
443 rate of Ab titres for BNT162b2 by mapping the neutralising titres after three doses of BNT162b2
444 vaccines from Cheng et al ²² to the 3-dose VEs estimates from UKHSA by Andrews et al ²⁴.

445 It is believed that the immune response after receiving the third or fourth dose of vaccine, especially
446 cellular immunity (e.g., via T cells), may provide greater and more long-lasting protection against
447 severe disease than mild or asymptomatic infection ²⁵⁻²⁹. As such, we assume that the VE against
448 severe disease, hospitalisations and death after 4th-dose heterologous boosting would be similar to the
449 corresponding VEs among recipients of three doses of CoronaVac vaccines in Hong Kong ¹⁰,
450 regardless of VE waning over time and the emergence of VOCs (**Table 2**).

451 ***Estimating the vaccine-induced population immunity***

452 We model the rollout of vaccination programme under the following assumptions:

- 453 1) The target vaccine uptake of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th dose is 90%, 85% and 85% for all age groups,
454 respectively, based on the age-specific 2-dose and 3-dose vaccine uptake in mainland China as of
455 28 November 2022.
- 456 2) For the 4th dose, we assume that 80% of vaccinees would be allocated with Vaccine A, and the
457 remaining 20% of vaccinees would be allocated with Vaccine B. According to the press release of
458 V-01 vaccine manufacturer Livzon on 12 April 2022, their Guangdong branches have been
459 approved to produce the V-01 vaccine. The annual production capacity could reach 1.5 billion
460 doses of packaged V-01 vaccines (<https://www.livzon.com.cn/> and
461 http://www.news.cn/english/2021-08/30/c_1310155999.htm). According to the press release of
462 NVSI-06-08 vaccine manufacturer Sinopharm on 3 April 2022, their factories in Beijing and
463 Gansu have been producing NVSI-06-08 vaccines. Between October and December 2021,
464 Sinopharm had produced 80 million doses of NVSI-06-08 vaccines and delivered 20 million
465 doses outside mainland China (<http://www.sinopharm.com/s/1223-4131-40132.html>). Currently,
466 the annual production capacities of the two vaccines are 1.5 billion and 0.32 billion doses and we
467 assume a similar ratio in the vaccine allocation of the 4th dose.
- 468 3) The roll-out of the 4th dose will be considered after the 3rd-dose uptake has reached 80%.
- 469 4) The time interval between the 1st and 2nd dose is 28 days.
- 470 5) The time interval between the 2nd and 3rd dose is at least 90 days.
- 471 6) The time interval between the 3rd and 4th dose is at least 180 days.
- 472 7) The maximum weekly vaccination rate is 8% of the population. During the rapid rollout of mass
473 vaccination in 2021, the maximum number of vaccine doses given to the Chinese population
474 reached 24 million per day in May 2021, which was equivalent to a weekly rate of 12% of the
475 population (<http://www.nhc.gov.cn/>).

476 *Estimating the effects of PHSMs from the past waves of COVID-19 in Hong Kong and Shanghai*

477 Since the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, various PHSMs have been used to suppress and
478 mitigate the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong. We analyse data on locally laboratory-confirmed
479 cases of the first four waves of COVID-19 outbreaks and estimated the daily effective reproductive
480 number (R_t) to estimate the changes in transmissibility over time (**Figure S1**). During each wave,
481 PHSMs were progressively tightened with the increase of reported cases. Without loss of generality,
482 we group the PHSMs into four levels in each wave using the time when civil servants were required
483 to work from home (WFH) as a cut-off:

- 484
- 485 1) **Level 1:** Voluntarily universal face masking and improved hand hygiene
 - 486 2) **Level 2:** Level 1 PHSMs + PHSMs announced or implemented before civil servants WFH, which
487 usually included tightened social distancing measures in restaurants and indoor leisure facilities,
488 and closure of kindergartens and primary schools of Grade 1-3 or Grade 1-4.
 - 489 3) **Level 3:** Level 2 PHSMs + PHSMs announced or implemented together with civil servants WFH,
490 which often included closure of most indoor leisure facilities, closure of all schools, no dine-in in
491 restaurants after 9 pm.
 - 492 4) **Level 4:** Level 3 PHSMs + PHSMs announced or implemented after civil servants WFH, which
493 included more stringent control measures of restaurants, such as no dine-in after 6 pm or all day.

494 We assume that the basic reproductive number was 2.0 for the first wave (the original virus strain),
495 2.2 for the second wave (70% of original virus and 30% of D614G mutant virus which was estimated
496 to be 30% more transmissible than the original virus), 2.6 for third and fourth wave (D614G mutant
497 virus), in the absence of any PHSMs and COVID-19 vaccination. Then we estimate the effectiveness

498 of PHSMs at Level 1-4 by overlaying these PHSMs with R_t in the first four waves (**Figure S1 and**
499 **Table S4**).

500 In the fifth wave of Omicron BA.2 in Hong Kong, we estimate the effectiveness of Level 4 PHSMs in
501 parameter inference in the epidemic model¹⁶. Similarly, we estimate the effectiveness of PHSMs in
502 Shanghai before the lockdowns of Pudong (the east of Huangpu River) on 27 March 2022 and Puxi
503 (the west of Huangpu River) on 1 April 2022.

504 *Reopening in regions with substantial proportion of rural populations*

505 We define urban, urban-rural junction and rural area as administrative regions with <64%, 64-71%
506 and >71% of sub-administrative regions coded as “rural”, based on the coding of National Bureau of
507 Statistics (<http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/tjbz/tjyqhdmhcxhfdm/2020/index.html>). The urbanisation rate
508 of China is 60% in 2019, and at the national level, the 20th, 40th, 60th and 80th percentile of the
509 proportion of sub-administrative regions coded as “rural” are 55%, 64%, 71% and 77%, respectively.

510 In Henan, we assume that the reopening starts simultaneously with the epidemics seeded in the
511 provincial capital region (Zhengzhou and Xuchang) and spread to urban area, urban-rural junction,
512 and rural area, respectively (**Table S7**). In Guangxi, we assume that the reopening starts with the
513 epidemics seeded in the area adjacent to PRD/Guangdong and spread geographically in a diffusion
514 manner to the middle of Guangxi, provincial capital, and area next to China-Vietnam border (**Figure**
515 **S3**).

516 *Impact of vaccination, antiviral treatment and PHSMs if they are singly implemented during* 517 *reopening*

518 We assess the impact of vaccination, antiviral treatments and PHSMs if they are singly implemented
519 during reopening as follows: (i) 4th-dose boosting would be rolled out at a weekly rate of 6% of
520 population; (ii) antiviral treatments would be deployed at 60% coverage; and (iii) Level 4 PHSMs
521 (which reduce R_t by 69-72%; see **Table S4**) are implemented between day 15 and 74 of reopening
522 and then gradually relaxed to normalcy by Day 104. The final cumulative infection attack rate would
523 be >95%, >95% and 79% in the three scenarios, respectively. The number of cases who require
524 hospitalisation would far exceed the local health system capacity for weeks to months with
525 cumulative incidence of 91, 266, 323 per 10,000 and cumulative deaths of 8.1, 23.5 and 33.9 per
526 10,000, respectively (**Figure S4**). Among those aged 60 or above, the cumulative number of
527 hospitalisations is 242, 714 and 868 per 10,000 and the cumulative number of deaths is 40, 116 and
528 168 per 10,000. That is, this age group accounts for more than 50% of hospitalisations and 92% of
529 deaths associated with COVID-19.

530

531 **Table S1. Neutralising antibody titres (IC50 or PRNT50 or PNAbs50) of COVID-19 vaccines**
532 **against Omicron by time and dose**

Vaccine (combination)	Time since the last dose			Source
	0 days	14/28 days	180 days	
CoronaVac × 2	--	11 (9, 15)	11 (9, 15)	Costa Clemens et al ⁶
CoronaVac × 2 + BNT162b2	10 (10, 10)	223 (108, 458)	--	
CoronaVac × 2 + Ad26.COV2-S	10 (10, 10)	138 (72, 264)	--	
CoronaVac × 2 + ChAdOx1	10 (10, 10)	102 (57, 182)	--	
CoronaVac × 3	11 (9, 15)	17 (11, 26)	--	
BBIBP-CorV × 2	--	6 (5, 8)	--	Ai et al ³⁰
BBIBP-CorV × 2 + ZF2001*	19 (11, 32)	109 (54, 221)	--	
BBIBP-CorV × 3	5 (5, 5)	48 (26, 84)	--	
CoronaVac × 2 + Ad5-nCoV-IM	--	261 (178, 382)	--	Li et al ³¹ Zhang et al ³²
CoronaVac × 2 + Ad5-nCoV-IH	--	320 (191, 538)	--	
CoronaVac × 2 + ZF2001*	--	86 (59, 127)	--	
CoronaVac × 3	--	54 (42, 71)	--	
BBIBP-CorV × 2 + NVSI-06-08*		368 (296, 457)	--	Kaabi et al ²¹
BBIBP-CorV × 3	--	45 (36, 56)	--	
BBIBP-CorV × 2 + V-01*†	--	149 (102, 207)	--	Wang et al ²⁰
CoronaVac × 2 + V-01*†	--	59 (54, 65)	--	

533 * Protein subunit vaccines

534 † Estimated from vaccine efficacy data (see Table S2)

535

536 **Table S2. Vaccine efficacy or effectiveness in preventing Omicron infection, hospitalisation,**
537 **fatal disease, and death**

Vaccine (combination)	Vaccine efficacy or effectiveness				Source	
	Infection	Hospitalisation	Fatal disease	Death		
CoronaVac × 2, 20-59 yrs	--	25% (15-34)	92% (89-94)	93% (90-96)	McMenamin et al ¹⁰	
BNT162b2 × 2, 20-59 yrs	--	35% (27-43)	96% (95-97)	97% (95-98)		
CoronaVac × 3, 20-59 yrs	--	51% (40-60)	99% (98-100)	99% (98-100)		
BNT162b2 × 3, 20-59 yrs	--	74% (67-80)	99% (98-100)	99% (98-100)		
CoronaVac × 2, ≥ 60 yrs	--	--	Age 60-69: 79% (72-85) Age 70-79: 74% (67-80) Age ≥ 80: 58% (45-68)	Age 60-69: 84% (78-89) Age 70-79: 77% (69-83) Age ≥ 80: 63% (50-73)		
BNT162b2 × 2, ≥ 60 yrs	--	--	Age 60-69: 91% (87-94) Age 70-79: 90% (85-93) Age ≥ 80: 87% (45-92)	Age 60-69: 93% (89-95) Age 70-79: 92% (88-95) Age ≥ 80: 90% (85-94)		
CoronaVac × 3, ≥ 60 yrs	--	32% (8-51)	Age 60-69: 97% (95-99) Age 70-79: 95% (92-97) Age ≥ 80: 97% (95-99)	Age 60-69: 99% (97-100) Age 70-79: 97% (94-99) Age ≥ 80: 98% (96-99)		
BNT162b2 × 3, ≥ 60 yrs	--	70% (53-82)	Age 60-69: 99% (97-100) Age 70-79: 99% (97-100) Age ≥ 80: 97% (94-99)	Age 60-69: 99% (97-100) Age 70-79: 99% (97-100) Age ≥ 80: 98% (94-99)		
BBIBP-CorV × 2 + V-01* (<60 days after the 3 rd dose)	64% (23-83)	--	--	--		Wang et al ²⁰
CoronaVac × 2 + V-01* (<60 days after the 3 rd dose)	39% (3-62)	--	--	--		

538 * Recombinant protein subunit vaccines

539

540 **Table S3. Model parameters**

Parameter	Description, assumption, and source	Value
R_0	Basic reproductive number of Omicron BA.2 in the absence of vaccination ^{16,33}	BA.2: 7.1 (6.9-7.3) BA.4/BA.5: 8.3 (7.8-8.9) We estimate R_0 of BA.2 from the epidemiological data of the fifth wave in Hong Kong, and estimate R_0 of BA.4/BA.5 from the growth rates of England published by UKHSA as follows (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/the-r-value-and-growth-rate) . We assume that 86% of the England population had immunity against infection of BA.1, BA.2 or BA.2.12.1 by 1 May (i.e., $R_t = 1$ and $1-1/7.1 = 86\%$). In the week of 24 Jun, BA.4/BA.5 became the dominant variant and the daily growth rate was 2-5%, which corresponds to the relative increase in R_t of 9.5-25.1%. The R_0 of BA.4/BA.5 is estimated to be 8.3 (7.8-8.9) accordingly.
T_{GT}	Mean generation time ³⁴	4.6 days
f_{GT}	Probability density function of generation time ³⁴	Gamma (2.20, 2.09)
VE_S	Vaccine effectiveness in reducing susceptibility	Table 1; Estimated by bootstrapping the neutralising antibody titres from Table S1
VE_I	Vaccine effectiveness in reducing infectiousness	Table 1; Assumed to be $0.8 \times VE_S$
VE_H	Vaccine effectiveness in reducing hospitalisation ¹⁰	Table 1
VE_D	Vaccine effectiveness in reducing death ¹⁰	Table 1
ϵ_S	Antiviral effectiveness in reducing susceptibility	0
ϵ_I	Antiviral effectiveness in reducing infectivity	0
ϵ_H	Antiviral effectiveness in reducing hospitalisations ¹¹	Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir: 0.24 (0.14-0.33)
ϵ_D	Antiviral effectiveness in reducing deaths ¹¹	Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir: 0.66 (0.48-0.78)
σ_{AR}	Coverage of antivirals among eligible patients ¹⁶	60%, estimated from preliminary data from Hong Kong

$\mathcal{P}_{a,death}$	Age-specific infection-fatality and infection-hospitalisation risk among unvaccinated individuals of a VOC similar to the Omicron variant ^{35,36} with no COVID-specific antivirals; assuming the hazard ratio of Delta variant was 1.45 times of that of Alpha variant and the hazard ratio of Omicron variant was 0.3 times of Delta variant ^{16,37,38} ; assuming Beta distributed with the coefficient of variation of 0.05.	Age 0-9: 0.0005% Age 10-19: 0.0005% Age 20-29: 0.0005% Age 30-39: 0.023% Age 40-49: 0.023% Age 50-59: 0.126% Age 60-69: 0.126% Age 70-79: 2.00% Age \geq 80: 8.70%
$\mathcal{P}_{a,hospitalisation}$		Age 0-9: 0.011% Age 10-19: 0.027% Age 20-29: 0.72% Age 30-39: 2.34% Age 40-49: 2.94% Age 50-59: 5.52% Age 60-69: 7.98% Age 70-79: 11.28% Age \geq 80: 12.48%
$f_{incubation}$	Probability density function of incubation period ^{39,40}	Lognormal distribution Mean: 3.5 days SD: 2.6 days
$f_{hospitalisation}$	Probability density function of the time between infection and hospitalisation ⁴¹	Gamma distribution Mean: 6.7 days SD: 3.0 days
f_{death}	Probability density function of the time between infection and death; estimated from $f_{incubation}$ and the probability density function of the time between onset and death (Mean 18.8 days and SD 8.46 days) from Verity et al ⁴¹ ; estimated from preliminary data from Hong Kong ¹⁶	Gamma distribution Mean: 22.3 days SD: 9.5 days
$\tau_{hospitalisation}$	The maximum daily incidence of hospitalisations that the health system could manage; assuming to be 100% and 200% of hospital beds designated for COVID patients in May 2022 in Hong Kong which correspond to its regular and surged capacity, respectively	1.1 and 2.2 per 10,000 population In late March 2022 when the daily incidence of hospitalisations peaked, the maximum number of hospital beds designated for COVID patients was 13,654 which corresponds to a maximum daily incidence of 2.28 hospitalisations per 10,000 population. http://www.takungpao.com.hk/news/232109/2022/0325/701676.html https://www.news.gov.hk/eng/2022/03/20220331/20220331_195929_222.html
m_{death}	Increase in IFRs when health systems are overloaded	We assume that IFRs track the number of patients who require

		<p>hospital care: IFRs would increase by 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50% when demand outstrips supply of available hospital beds by a ratio of 1-2, 2-3, 3-4, 4-5 and >5 to 1.</p> <p>Our assumptions are based on data below:</p> <p>(i) the estimated IFRs in Wuhan were about 50% higher than estimated IFRs in other provinces outside Hubei in 2020 ^{42,43};</p> <p>(ii) the incident rate ratios for hospital-based resources on COVID-19 deaths in the US between March and July 2020: geographical areas with fewer ICU beds (IRR = 0.194), nurses (IRR = 0.927) and general hospital beds (IRR = 0.800) per COVID-19 case were statistically associated with increased deaths in April 2020 ⁴⁴;</p> <p>(iii) in-hospital mortality between March and August 2020 in the US: the adjusted mortality dropped from 25.6% in March 2020 to 7.6% in August 2020, and the standardized mortality ratio dropped from 1.26 in March to 0.38 in August 2020 ⁴⁵.</p>
--	--	--

541

542

543 **Table S4. Effectiveness of PHSMs during the previous waves of COVID in Hong Kong and**
 544 **Shanghai**

Second wave in Hong Kong (Ancestral strain Wuhan-Hu-1 and D614G, 29 February to 15 April 2020)					
PHSM	Date	R_t before	R_t after	Reduction in R_t	Level
School closure (entire 2 nd wave)	2/29	2.27 (1.70-2.93)	1.28 (1.04-1.53)	44% (33-54)	2
Tightened travel control	2/29-3/20				
Civil servants work-from-home	3/21	1.28 (1.04-1.53)	0.55 (0.38-0.70)	76% (69-83)	3
Tightened measures in restaurants and indoor amenities	3/27	0.55 (0.38-0.70)	0.20 (0.09-0.38)	91%* (83-96)	4
Closure of outdoor amenities	3/27				
Closure of indoor amenities	4/1				
Third wave in Hong Kong (Ancestral strain D614G, 30 June to 20 September 2020)					
PHSM	Date	R_t before	R_t after	Reduction in R_t	Level
Tightened measures in amenities	7/9	2.60 (2.27-3.52)	1.83 (1.54-2.23)	30% (14-41)	2
Closure of kindergartens and P1-3	7/10				
Gathering in groups of 4 only	7/13	1.83 (1.54-2.23)	1.55 (1.37-1.75)	52% (46-55)	3
Closure of all indoor amenities	7/13				
No dine-in after 6 pm	7/13				
Closure of all schools	7/14	1.55 (1.37-1.75)	1.26 (1.16-1.40)	78% (73-81)	4
Civil servants work-from-home	7/20				
Gathering in groups of 2 only	7/29	1.26 (1.16-1.40)	0.57 (0.49-0.69)		
No dine-in all day (lasted 2 days)	7/29				
Fourth wave in Hong Kong (Ancestral strain D614G, 30 October 2020 to 31 January 2021)					
PHSM	Date	R_t before	R_t after	Reduction in R_t	Level
School closure (P1-P3, kindergarten)	11/20	2.26 (1.99-2.79)	1.76 (1.50-2.04)	47% (40-53)	2
Closure of singing and dancing venues incl. pubs and clubs	11/20				
Closure of most indoor amenities	11/24				
Closure of all schools	11/29	1.20 (1.06-1.36)	1.05 (0.97-1.16)	55% (51-59)	3
Civil servants work-from-home	11/30				
No dine-in after 9 pm	11/30				
No dine-in after 6 pm	12/2	1.01 (0.93-1.11)	0.69 (0.61-0.78)	69% (65-73)	4
Fifth wave in Hong Kong (Omicron BA.2, 1 January 2022 – Now)					
PHSM	Date	R_t before	R_t after	Reduction in R_t	Level
School closure	1/5	7.1 (6.9-7.3)	1.9 (1.8-2.0)	73% (71-75)	4
Closure of singing and dancing venues	1/5				
Closure of most indoor amenities	1/5				
Closure of all schools	1/5				
Civil servants work-from-home	1/5				
No dine-in after 6 pm	1/5				
Banning gathering across families	1/5				
Omicron BA.2 in Shanghai (1 March 2022 – Now)					
PHSM	Date	R_t before	R_t after	Reduction in R_t	Level
PHSMs with similar intensity of Level 4 in Hong Kong	3/8	7.1 (6.9-7.3)	2.4 (2.2-2.8)	72% (67-75)	4
Lockdown of communities with case reports (before city-wide lockdowns)	3/11-3/26		2.0 (1.77-2.32)		

545 * Overestimated because the outbreak died out

546 **Table S5. Number of hospital beds per 10,000 in the 31 provinces in mainland China in 2020***

Province	Number of hospital beds	Number of hospital beds per 10,000 population	Maximum number of hospital beds designated to COVID-19 patients per 10,000†	Maximum daily incidence of hospitalisations that the health system could manage per 10,000†
Beijing	127033	58.0	8.7	1.1
Tianjin	68275	49.2	7.4	0.9
Hebei	441962	59.2	8.9	1.1
Shanxi	223650	64.1	9.6	1.2
Inner Mongolia	162072	67.4	10.1	1.3
Liaoning	314488	73.9	11.1	1.4
Jilin	173123	72.2	10.8	1.4
Heilongjiang	253345	79.9	12.0	1.5
Shanghai	152191	61.2	9.2	1.2
Jiangsu	535006	63.1	9.5	1.2
Zhejiang	361317	55.9	8.4	1.1
Anhui	407813	66.8	10.0	1.3
Fujian	216753	52.1	7.8	1.0
Jiangxi	285847	63.3	9.5	1.2
Shandong	646863	63.6	9.5	1.2
Henan	667156	67.1	10.1	1.3
Hubei	411351	71.6	10.7	1.3
Hunan	519902	78.2	11.7	1.5
Guangdong	564773	44.7	6.7	0.8
Guangxi	295562	58.9	8.8	1.1
Hainan	58474	57.8	8.7	1.1
Chongqing	235520	73.4	11.0	1.4
Sichuan	649756	77.6	11.6	1.5
Guizhou	276379	71.6	10.7	1.3
Yunnan	325212	68.9	10.3	1.3
Tibet	18586	50.8	7.6	1.0
Shaanxi	272424	68.9	10.3	1.3
Gansu	171866	68.7	10.3	1.3
Qinghai	41285	69.6	10.4	1.3
Ningxia	41261	57.2	8.6	1.1
Xinjiang	181455	70.1	10.5	1.3

547 * Data from <https://data.cnki.net/Trade/Home/Index/Z020>

548 † Assumed to be 15% of total number of hospital beds and the average length of stay is 8 days

549

550 **Table S6. Number of secondary and tertiary hospitals in the 31 provinces in mainland China in**
551 **2020***

Province	Number of secondary hospitals	Number of tertiary hospitals	Number of secondary hospitals per 1,000,000	Number of tertiary hospitals per 1,000,000
Beijing	158	106	7.2	4.8
Tianjin	76	43	5.5	3.1
Hebei	601	99	8.1	1.3
Shanxi	381	61	10.9	1.7
Inner Mongolia	314	87	13.1	3.6
Liaoning	338	156	7.9	3.7
Jilin	280	53	11.6	2.2
Heilongjiang	364	102	11.4	3.2
Shanghai	104	44	4.2	1.8
Jiangsu	470	192	5.5	2.3
Zhejiang	220	137	3.4	2.1
Anhui	513	98	8.4	1.6
Fujian	272	87	6.5	2.1
Jiangxi	256	88	5.7	1.9
Shandong	714	197	7.0	1.9
Henan	605	115	6.1	1.2
Hubei	361	143	6.3	2.5
Hunan	519	107	7.8	1.6
Guangdong	560	231	4.4	1.8
Guangxi	311	85	6.2	1.7
Hainan	58	36	5.8	3.6
Chongqing	263	61	8.2	1.9
Sichuan	741	269	8.9	3.2
Guizhou	364	65	9.4	1.7
Yunnan	470	106	10.0	2.2
Tibet	53	14	14.5	3.8
Shaanxi	420	73	10.6	1.8
Gansu	210	47	8.4	1.9
Qinghai	88	24	14.9	4.1
Ningxia	87	15	12.1	2.1
Xinjiang	233	55	9.0	2.1

552 * Data from <https://data.cnki.net/Trade/Home/Index/Z2020>


553

554 **Table S7. Proportion of sub-administrative regions coded as “rural” in cities and counties in**
555 **Henan, Guangxi, and Guangdong (PRD).**

City/county	Code of city/county	Number of sub-administrative regions	Number of urban sub-administrative regions	Number of rural sub-administrative regions	Proportion of rural sub-administrative regions
Henan					
Zhengzhou*	4101	3206	1739	1467	46%
Kaifeng	4102	2573	916	1657	64%
Luoyang	4103	3228	984	2244	70%
Pingdingshan	4104	2828	759	2069	73%
Anyang	4105	3300	933	2367	72%
Hebi	4106	1030	413	617	60%
Xinxiang	4107	3820	1219	2601	68%
Jiaozuo	4108	2021	807	1214	60%
Puyang	4109	3201	895	2306	72%
Xuchang	4110	2492	816	1676	67%
Luohe	4111	1331	423	908	68%
Sanmenxia	4112	1379	324	1055	77%
Nanyang	4113	4960	1270	3690	74%
Shangqiu	4114	4834	1269	3565	74%
Xinyang	4115	3463	775	2688	78%
Zhoukou	4116	5099	1452	3647	72%
Zhumadian	4117	2906	550	2356	81%
Guangxi					
Nanning*	4501	1845	614	1231	67%
Liuzhou	4502	1237	461	776	63%
Guilin	4503	1924	444	1480	77%
Wuzhou	4504	1015	318	697	69%
Beihai	4505	436	122	314	72%
Fangchenggang	4506	349	84	265	76%
Qinzhou	4507	1042	213	829	80%
Guigang	4508	1179	349	830	70%
Yulin	4509	1510	434	1076	71%
Baise	4510	1897	265	1632	86%
Hezhou	4511	761	225	536	70%
Hechi	4512	1661	231	1430	86%
Laibin	4513	822	186	636	77%
Chongzuo	4514	932	147	785	84%
Guangdong					
Guangzhou*	4401	2827	2136	691	24%
Shaoguan	4402	1476	459	1017	69%
Shenzhen	4403	784	784	0	0%
Zhuhai	4404	339	254	85	25%
Shantou	4405	1089	666	423	39%
Foshan	4406	815	736	79	10%
Jiangmen	4407	1334	522	812	61%
Zhanjiang	4408	1986	565	1421	72%
Maoming	4409	1916	747	1169	61%
Zhaoqing	4412	1553	415	1138	73%
Huizhou	4413	1345	487	858	64%
Meizhou	4414	2267	696	1571	69%

Shanwei	4415	907	349	558	62%
Heyuan	4416	1443	336	1107	77%
Yangjiang	4417	871	289	582	67%
Qingyuan	4418	1230	331	899	73%
Dongguan	4419	608	572	36	7%
Zhongshan	4420	279	235	44	16%
Chaozhou	4451	1035	421	614	59%
Jieyang	4452	1651	647	1004	61%
Yunfu	4453	980	339	641	65%

556 * Provincial capital




557

558

559 **Figure S1. Correlation between R_t and public health and social measures (PHSMs)**

560 **implemented in the second, third and fourth wave in Hong Kong. R_t were estimated from**

561 **deconvoluted time series of daily number of cases in the EpiEstim model⁴³.**



562

563

Figure S2. Number of hospital beds per 10,000 in secondary hospitals or above in more than 300

564

cities in mainland China. Cities are grouped by provinces where they are located. Hospitals in

565 mainland China are classified into three levels including primary, secondary, and tertiary hospitals: 1)

566 A primary hospital is typically a township hospital that contains less than 100 beds, and primary

567 hospitals provide preventive care, minimal health care and rehabilitation services; 2) A secondary

568 hospital is one that tend to be affiliated with a medium size city, county or district and contain more

569 than 100 beds but less than 500 and secondary hospitals are responsible for providing comprehensive

570 health services; 3) A tertiary hospital is a comprehensive, referral, general hospitals at the city,

571 provincial or national level with a bed capacity exceeding 500 and tertiary hospitals serve as medical

572 hubs providing care to multiple regions. The national average number of hospital beds in secondary

573 hospitals or above is 42 per 10,000. The two dashed lines show the number of hospital beds of Service

574 A (56 per 10,000) and Service B (42 per 10,000) in 2020 in Hong Kong


575 (https://www.fhb.gov.hk/statistics/en/health_statistics.htm). Series A included all hospital beds in

576 Hospital Authority hospitals, private hospitals, nursing homes and correctional institutions. Series B

577 included only hospital beds in Hospital Authority hospitals and private hospitals excluding accident


578 and emergency observation beds, day beds and nursery beds, which followed the definition of OECD

579 Health Data.



580
581

582 **Figure S3. Simultaneous reopening of Yangtze River Delta Region, Pearl River Delta Region,**
583 **Henan, and Guangxi. (A) Yangtze River Delta:** Yangtze River Delta is assumed to be reopened
584 simultaneously in Greater Shanghai (blue), Greater Hangzhou (orange), Greater Nanjing (yellow) and
585 all cities in Anhui, Jiangsu, and Zhejiang (purple). **(B) Pearl River Delta:** Pearl River Delta is
586 assumed to be reopened simultaneously in Guangzhou-Foshan-Zhaoqing (blue), Shenzhen-Dongguan-
587 Huizhou (orange), Zhuhai-Zhongshan-Jiangmen (yellow) and all cities in Guangdong (purple). **(C)**
588 **Henan:** Henan is assumed to be reopened simultaneously in provincial capital area (blue), urban area
589 (orange), urban-rural junction (yellow) and rural area (purple). **(D) Guangxi:** Guangxi is assumed to
590 be reopened simultaneously in the areas adjacent to the most developed parts of Guangdong (blue),
591 the central areas of Guangxi (orange), the provincial capital area (yellow), and the areas next to
592 China-Vietnam border (purple).



593

594 **Figure S4. The impacts of 4th dose heterologous boosting, antiviral treatments and PHSMs if**
 595 **they are singly implemented during reopening under Strategy 1.** We assume that the three
 596 interventions would be implemented follows: 1) Increasing the vaccine uptake of the 3rd and 4th dose
 597 to 85% across all age groups aged 3 or above and the mass vaccination of the 4th dose starts 30 days
 598 before the reopening; 2) Increasing the antiviral coverage to 60%; 3) PHSMs at Level 4 which reduce
 599 R_t by 69-72% are implemented 14 days after the seeding of epidemics, and PHSMs are maintained
 600 between 15 and 74 days after the seeding of epidemics, and gradually relaxed between 75 and 104
 601 days. **(A) Infection incidence as proportion of the population. (B) Cumulative infection attack**
 602 **rates by age. (C-D) Daily and cumulative number of cases requiring who require hospitalisation.**
 603 **(E-F) Daily and cumulative incidence of death.** Figure legend and other parameters are the same as
 604 Figure 2.

605 References

- 606 1. Liu J, Liu M, Liang W. The Dynamic COVID-Zero Strategy in China. *China CDC Weekly*
607 2022; **4**(4): 74-5.
- 608 2. Li X, Zhang Z, Lyu K, Xu D. Strengthening Community Defenses to Prevent and Control the
609 Spread of COVID-19 in China. *China CDC Weekly* 2022; **4**: 1-4.
- 610 3. Xinhua. China Focus: China releases measures to optimize COVID-19 response. 2022.
611 <https://english.news.cn/20221111/d4399114a082438eaac32d08a02bf58d/c.html>.
- 612 4. Xinhua. China Focus: COVID-19 response further optimized with 10 new measures. 2022.
613 <https://english.news.cn/20221207/ca014c043bf24728b8dcbc0198565fdf/c.html>.
- 614 5. Li Z, Guan X, Mao N, et al. Antibody seroprevalence in the epicenter Wuhan, Hubei, and six
615 selected provinces after containment of the first epidemic wave of COVID-19 in China. *The Lancet*
616 *Regional Health-Western Pacific* 2021; **8**: 100094.
- 617 6. Costa Clemens SA, Weckx L, Clemens R, et al. Heterologous versus homologous COVID-19
618 booster vaccination in previous recipients of two doses of CoronaVac COVID-19 vaccine in Brazil
619 (RHH-001): a phase 4, non-inferiority, single blind, randomised study. *The Lancet* 2022; **399**(10324):
620 521-9.
- 621 7. Extance A. Covid-19: What is the evidence for the antiviral Paxlovid? *BMJ* 2022; **377**:
622 o1037.
- 623 8. Coronavirus Pandemic: Five generic manufacturers in China approved to produce low-cost
624 antiviral pill Paxlovid.
- 625 9. Leung K, Jit M, Leung GM, Wu JT. The allocation of COVID-19 vaccines and antivirals
626 against emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in East Asia and Pacific region: A modelling
627 study. *The Lancet Regional Health-Western Pacific* 2022; **21**: 100389.
- 628 10. McMenamin ME, Nealon J, Lin Y, et al. Vaccine effectiveness of one, two, and three doses
629 of BNT162b2 and CoronaVac against COVID-19 in Hong Kong: a population-based observational
630 study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2022; **22**(10): 1435-43.
- 631 11. Wong CKH, Au ICH, Lau KTK, Lau EHY, Cowling BJ, Leung GM. Real-world
632 effectiveness of molnupiravir and nirmatrelvir plus ritonavir against mortality, hospitalisation, and in-
633 hospital outcomes among community-dwelling, ambulatory patients with confirmed SARS-CoV-2
634 infection during the omicron wave in Hong Kong: an observational study. *The Lancet* 2022;
635 **400**(10359): 1213-22.
- 636 12. Mistry D, Litvinova M, Pastore y Piontti A, et al. Inferring high-resolution human mixing
637 patterns for disease modeling. *Nature Communications* 2021; **12**(1): 323.
- 638 13. Leung K, Wu JT, Leung GM. Effects of adjusting public health, travel, and social measures
639 during the roll-out of COVID-19 vaccination: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health* 2021.
- 640 14. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and
641 international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *The*
642 *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10225): 689-97.
- 643 15. Tobin RJ, Wood JG, Jayasundara D, et al. Hospital length of stay in a mixed Omicron and
644 Delta epidemic in New South Wales, Australia. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.03.16.22271361.
- 645 16. D24H@HKSTP and HKU WHO Collaborating Centre on Infectious Disease Epidemiology
646 and Modelling. Modelling the fifth wave of COVID-19 in Hong Kong.
- 647 17. Tao K, Tzou PL, Nouhin J, et al. The biological and clinical significance of emerging SARS-
648 CoV-2 variants. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 2021; **22**(12): 757-73.
- 649 18. Harvey WT, Carabelli AM, Jackson B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 variants, spike mutations and
650 immune escape. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2021; **19**(7): 409-24.
- 651 19. Tegally H, Moir M, Everatt J, et al. Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron lineages BA.4 and
652 BA.5 in South Africa. *Nature Medicine* 2022.
- 653 20. Wang XY, Mahmood SF, Jin F, et al. Efficacy of heterologous boosting against SARS-CoV-2
654 using a recombinant interferon-armed fusion protein vaccine (V-01): a randomized, double-blind and
655 placebo-controlled phase III trial. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2022; **11**(1): 1910-9.
- 656 21. Kaabi NA, Yang YK, Du LF, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of a hybrid-type vaccine
657 booster in BBIBP-CorV recipients in a randomized phase 2 trial. *Nature Communications* 2022;
658 **13**(1): 3654.

- 659 22. Cheng S, Mok CKP, Leung YW, et al. Neutralizing antibodies against the SARS-CoV-2
660 Omicron variant following homologous and heterologous CoronaVac or BNT162b2 vaccination.
661 *Nature medicine* 2022: 1-.
- 662 23. Lau EH, Tsang OT, Hui DS, et al. Neutralizing antibody titres in SARS-CoV-2 infections.
663 *Nature communications* 2021; **12**(1): 1-7.
- 664 24. Andrews N, Stowe J, Kirsebom F, et al. Covid-19 vaccine effectiveness against the Omicron
665 (B. 1.1. 529) variant. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2022; **386**(16): 1532-46.
- 666 25. Cevik M, Grubaugh ND, Iwasaki A, Openshaw P. COVID-19 vaccines: Keeping pace with
667 SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Cell*.
- 668 26. Cromer D, Steain M, Reynaldi A, et al. Neutralising antibody titres as predictors of protection
669 against SARS-CoV-2 variants and the impact of boosting: a meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe* 2022;
670 **3**(1): e52-e61.
- 671 27. Cerqueira-Silva T, Katikireddi SV, de Araujo Oliveira V, et al. Vaccine effectiveness of
672 heterologous CoronaVac plus BNT162b2 in Brazil. *Nature Medicine* 2022: 1-6.
- 673 28. Keeton R, Tincho MB, Ngomti A, et al. T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike cross-
674 recognize Omicron. *Nature* 2022: 1-5.
- 675 29. Liu J, Chandrashekar A, Sellers D, et al. Vaccines Elicit Highly Conserved Cellular Immunity
676 to SARS-CoV-2 Omicron. *Nature* 2022: 1-7.
- 677 30. Ai J, Zhang H, Zhang Y, et al. Omicron variant showed lower neutralizing sensitivity than
678 other SARS-CoV-2 variants to immune sera elicited by vaccines after boost. *Emerging microbes &*
679 *infections* 2022; **11**(1): 337-43.
- 680 31. Li J-X, Wu S-P, Guo X-L, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of heterologous boost
681 immunisation with an orally administered aerosolised Ad5-nCoV after two-dose priming with an
682 inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in Chinese adults: a randomised, open-label, single-centre trial. *The*
683 *Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 2022.
- 684 32. Zhang Z, Wu S, Liu Y, et al. Aerosolized Ad5-nCoV booster vaccination elicited potent
685 immune response against the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant after inactivated COVID-19 vaccine
686 priming. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.03.08.22271816.
- 687 33. Lyngse FP, Mortensen LH, Denwood MJ, et al. Household transmission of the SARS-CoV-2
688 Omicron variant in Denmark. *Nature Communications* 2022; **13**(1): 5573.
- 689 34. Elliott P, Bodinier B, Eales O, et al. Rapid increase in Omicron infections in England during
690 December 2021: REACT-1 study. *Science* 2022; **375**(6587): 1406-11.
- 691 35. Davies NG, Jarvis CI, Edmunds WJ, Jewell NP, Diaz-Ordaz K, Keogh RH. Increased
692 mortality in community-tested cases of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B. 1.1. 7. *Nature* 2021; **593**(7858): 270-
693 4.
- 694 36. Twohig KA, Nyberg T, Zaidi A, et al. Hospital admission and emergency care attendance risk
695 for SARS-CoV-2 delta (B.1.617.2) compared with alpha (B.1.1.7) variants of concern: a cohort study.
696 *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
- 697 37. Ferguson N, Ghani A, Hinsley W, Volz E, Imperial College COVID-19 response team.
698 Report 50: Hospitalisation risk for Omicron cases in England. 2021. [https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-50-severity-omicron/)
699 [global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-50-severity-omicron/](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-50-severity-omicron/).
- 700 38. Nyberg T, Ferguson NM, Nash SG, et al. Comparative analysis of the risks of hospitalisation
701 and death associated with SARS-CoV-2 omicron (B.1.1.529) and delta (B.1.617.2) variants in
702 England: a cohort study. *The Lancet* 2022; **399**(10332): 1303-12.
- 703 39. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel
704 Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020.
- 705 40. Jansen L. Investigation of a SARS-CoV-2 B. 1.1. 529 (Omicron) Variant Cluster—Nebraska,
706 November–December 2021. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2021; **70**.
- 707 41. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a
708 model-based analysis. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020; **20**(6): 669-77.
- 709 42. Wu JT, Leung K, Bushman M, et al. Estimating clinical severity of COVID-19 from the
710 transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China. *Nature medicine* 2020; **26**(4): 506-10.
- 711 43. Leung K, Wu JT, Liu D, Leung GM. First-wave COVID-19 transmissibility and severity in
712 China outside Hubei after control measures, and second-wave scenario planning: a modelling impact
713 assessment. *The Lancet* 2020.

- 714 44. Janke AT, Mei H, Rothenberg C, Becher RD, Lin Z, Venkatesh AK. Analysis of Hospital
715 Resource Availability and COVID-19 Mortality Across the United States. *Journal of Hospital*
716 *Medicine* 2021; **16**(4): 211-4.
- 717 45. Horwitz LI, Jones SA, Cerfolio RJ, et al. Trends in COVID-19 Risk-Adjusted Mortality
718 Rates. *Journal of Hospital Medicine* 2021; **16**(2): 90-2.
- 719