

Modelling the impact of hybrid immunity on future COVID-19 epidemic waves

Thao P. Le^{1,2,3}, Isobel Abell^{1,2}, Eamon Conway⁴, Patricia T. Campbell^{5,6}, Alexandra B. Hogan⁷, Michael J. Lydeamore⁸, Jodie McVernon^{5,6,9}, Ivo Mueller^{4,10}, Camelia R. Walker¹, Christopher M. Baker^{1,2,3}

1 School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

2 Melbourne Centre for Data Science, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

3 Centre of Excellence for Biosecurity Risk Analysis, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

4 Population Health & Immunity Division, Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

5 Department of Infectious Diseases, University of Melbourne, at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Victoria, 3000, Australia

6 Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

7 School of Population Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

8 Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

9 Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference Laboratory Epidemiology Unit, The Royal Melbourne Hospital at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

10 Department of Medical Biology, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Abstract

Since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19), there have been multiple waves of infection and multiple rounds of vaccination rollouts. Both prior infection and vaccination can prevent future infection and reduce severity of outcomes, combining to form hybrid immunity against COVID-19 at the individual and population level. Here, we explore how different combinations of hybrid immunity affect the size and severity of near-future Omicron waves. To investigate the role of hybrid immunity, we use an agent-based model of COVID-19 transmission with waning immunity to simulate outbreaks in populations with

varied past attack rates and past vaccine coverages, basing the demographics and past histories on the World Health Organization (WHO) Western Pacific Region (WPR). We find that if the past infection immunity is high but vaccination levels are low, then the secondary outbreak with the same variant can occur within a few months after the first outbreak; meanwhile, high vaccination levels can suppress near-term outbreaks and delay the second wave. Additionally, hybrid immunity has limited impact on future COVID-19 waves with immune-escape variants. Enhanced understanding of the interplay between infection and vaccine exposure can aid anticipation of future epidemic activity due to current and emergent variants, including the likely impact of responsive vaccine interventions.

Key words: epidemiology, mathematical modelling, vaccination, variants

1 Introduction

The global spread of SARS-CoV-2, causing COVID-19 disease, has fundamentally changed society. Multiple epidemic waves have been experienced, beginning with the wild-type virus in early 2020, and followed by the emergence of variants such as Alpha (B.1.1.7), Delta (B.1.617.2), and more recently Omicron (B.1.1.529, subvariants BA.1, BA.2, BA.3, BA.4, BA.5 and descendent lineages) [1]. In the absence of specific preventive or disease modifying agents, the only initially effective measures to reduce the impact and burden of COVID-19 were case and contact management, restrictions to limit the number of social interactions and personal protective behaviours to reduce the per-contact likelihood of transmission. The initial hope was that vaccines might provide long lasting immunity against infection, with definitive impacts on transmission. However, while efficacy against severe disease appears to be relatively robust and long lasting, efficacy against infection acquisition and onwards transmission are lower and shorter lived—especially against the Omicron variant [2]. In response to repeated epidemic waves in highly immune populations, one or more booster doses have been recommended for sustained protection [3]. Omicron and its subvariants have caused high levels of exposure in multiple populations world-wide, even in highly vaccinated populations [4], and has led to complex “immune landscapes” across the world with varying levels of so-called “hybrid immunity” [5] in vaccinated and infected populations, consisting of immunity derived from both past infection and past vaccination.

Both infection and vaccination provide immunity boosting effects to individuals [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] and indirect benefits to others in the population, regardless of vaccination status, through reduction in onwards transmission [14]. This immunity directly reduces the risk of infection, and, if infection does occur, reduces disease severity and lowers onward transmission. Neutralising antibody titres, which are boosted by exposure to infection and/or vaccination, are correlated with efficacy against clinical endpoints of infection, symptoms and severe disease outcomes [15, 16, 17]. However, infection and vaccination can give different levels of protection [18], which are variable across demographics (especially with respect to age) [19]. Increased breadth and duration of antibody responses have been observed in individuals who have been both infected and vaccinated, termed “hybrid immunity” [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25]. Crucially though, all forms of immunity *decay over time*, with additional complexity arising

from observations of differential antibody waning following infection, vaccination or a combination of the two [26, 27]. Furthermore, the recent Omicron subvariants have shown immune escape in relation to immunity derived from past infections and vaccinations [28, 29, 2, 30, 31], and even infection from earlier Omicron subvariants (BA.1, BA.2) has been shown to have reduced protection against later Omicron subvariants (BA.4, BA.5) [32].

Overall, populations have hybrid immunity containing multiple groups of individuals with different vaccination and past-infection statuses. It is a challenging process to synthesise information about individual-level immunity to population-level protection and make predictions about the severity of future COVID-19 waves and optimisation of primary and booster vaccine allocation [33, 34, 35, 36, 37]. Modelling has been used to support decision making around the world in regards to managing COVID-19 [38, 39, 40]. It has been used extensively to compare different vaccination strategies [41, 42, 43], but many either do not include waning of immunity [44], or do not take a hybrid-immunity approach [45]. However, the inclusion of both of these factors is key in understanding the combined population-level effect of vaccination and prior exposure upon future transmission dynamics [34, 46]. Furthermore, two populations with apparently similar levels of past-infection and vaccination coverage could still have different responses, as *epidemic history*, including the SARS-CoV-2 strain(s) and exposure sequence, also play an important role [47]. Hence, different populations and regions with unique epidemic histories require individual analysis.

In this study, we focus on dynamics of immunity in the World Health Organization (WHO) Western Pacific Region (WPR). Prior to the rollout of vaccination, the WPR region had low seroprevalence compared to other regions such as Europe [48]. As such, infection-derived immunity within this region is now largely a result of the recent Omicron wave, with relatively few infections caused by previous variant strains, unlike the populations with high prior Delta exposure pre-Omicron [34, 44]. Hence, our focus will be on analysing scenarios where a population's past infection-derived immunity is due to Omicron.

We use an agent-based (individual-based) model of COVID-19 to consider how combinations of vaccination coverage and prior Omicron infection exposure can protect a population from future near-term Omicron waves, in the context of fixed public health measures (or lack thereof), no TTIQ (test, trace, isolate, quarantine), and with a constant vaccination capacity. We focus on the interplay between younger and older population demographics—as a proxy for two populations with different high-risk group sizes—along with a range of vaccination coverages and prior infection rates. Understanding hybrid immunity is necessary to develop efficient allocation of vaccine resources to achieve equity of outcomes across different populations with unique hybrid immunity statuses, and will also allow us to understand larger-scale future societal impacts, such as worker absenteeism and overloaded health systems. Given that past infection and vaccination provide unequal levels of immunity, we aim to identify the most advantageous strategies to protect populations from infection and severe disease outcomes in future, taking into account the current population immunity profile.

2 Methods

The overall simulation procedure is comprised of an infection transmission/dynamics model that is linked to a mechanical agent-based model [49, 50]. Outputs from this model feed into a clinical pathways model. The simulation process is depicted in Fig 1, with individual model components described in more detail below.




Figure 1: **Diagram of overall simulation procedure.** The core of the simulation uses an agent-based model with an underlying infection transmission model, with multiple primary inputs including immunological parameters and scenario-demography setups. The outputs are then fed into a clinical pathways model that produces clinical outcomes for infected individuals.

Agent-based transmission model

We use the agent-based COVID-19 model of Conway et al. [49, 50]. In the agent-based model, each individual has a specific age, unique neutralising antibody titre, vaccination history and own compartment label susceptible/exposed/infected. At the beginning of each simulation, all individuals have zero neutralising antibody titre. An individual's neutralising antibody titre can be boosted due to infection and/or vaccination and decay over time, with different levels of boosting depending on vaccine product and infection variant.

In the model, infection transmission occurs due to contact between infectious and susceptible individuals, which is dependent on input contact matrices and the individuals' ages. Once infected, the model randomly samples to determine whether an individual is asymptomatic or symptomatic, as well as generating when they become infectious, time of symptom onset, time of isolation (if isolation or quarantine is included), and time of recovery, based on parameter values in Table 1. In each simulation, this information can be exported as a line list of infections.

Clinical pathways model

We use the stochastic COVID-19 clinical pathways model by Conway et al. [49]. The clinical pathways model relates demographic information and neutralising antibody titre to clinical outcomes. For each symptomatic infection occurrence, the clinical pathways model takes in age and neutralising antibody titre at time of infection of the infected person and generates a clinical trajectory for each symptomatic infection, including whether the individual will require hospital admission, or will die.

Note that the clinical pathways model is independent of the main agent-based model described above, which allows for greater flexibility in the overall simulation process and also allows the clinical pathways model to be used for multiple epidemic models. However, due to this independence, it is possible that patients who die, according to the clinical pathways model, remain in the agent-based simulation. Due to the low number of deaths, relative to infections, this should not have major effect on the two models' outcomes [49].

Immunological model

Neutralising antibodies are one of the many biomarkers associated with COVID-19 immunity [51, 18, 52], so we use them to regulate each agent/individual's interaction with the SARS-CoV-2 virus, including each individual's level of protection against infection and severe clinical outcomes [53, 15, 16]. In particular, we use the model from [15, 16] to use neutralising antibodies to determine each individual's level of protection against infection, symptomatic disease, onward transmission given breakthrough infection, hospitalisation and ICU admission, and death. The antibodies follow exponential decay over time, with our model assuming that the decay rate is the same across all forms of initial antibody boosting (whether vaccination or prior infection).

When an antibody boosting event occurs, the individual gets a new antibody titre, a^0 , that is sampled from:

$$\log_{10}(a^0) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_j^x, \sigma^2), \quad (1)$$

where μ_j^x is the mean neutralising antibody titre against strain x (Delta or Omicron) after boosting process j (infection or vaccination), and σ^2 is the variance of antibodies across the population (Table 1). Note that infection prior or post vaccination results in the same titre. The neutralising antibody titre boosting occurs with the booster dose, and does not rise with extra infections. There is an upper limit on titre, which is equivalent to either two vaccinations and an infection, or three vaccinations. (For further details on how the titres for determined for combinations of infection and vaccination, see Table 1 of [50].)

Note that there is an additional scaling as many of the parameters in Table 1 are for strain 0, i.e. the Delta strain. To convert to neutralising antibodies against the Omicron strain, the fold change f_{Omicron} is used:

$$\mu_j^{\text{Omicron}} = \mu_j^0 + \log_{10}(f_{\text{Omicron}}). \quad (2)$$

To convert an individuals' Omicron BA.1 titres, $a^{Omicron}$, to titres against the BA.4/5-like variant:

$$\log_{10}(a^{Omicron-escape}) = \log_{10}(a^{Omicron}) + \log_{10}(f_{Omicron-escape}) + \log_{10}(f_{Omicron}). \quad (3)$$

The immunological model parameters are drawn from Refs. [49, 53, 50] (Table 1). The model parameters broadly follow the characteristics for the Omicron BA.1 subtype. We include two additional parameters in the case of an Omicron BA.4/BA.5-like immune escape variant: 1) R_0 ratio between the original Omicron variant (BA1/2-like) and the BA4/BA5-like immune escape variant to account for an inherent increase in transmissibility; and 2) $\log_{10}(f_{Omicron-escape})$ to account for an approximately three-fold reduction in neutralising antibody protection derived from preceding immunising exposures [54, 53].

The relationship between neutralising antibody titre a_i of an individual to protection against some disease outcome ρ_α (hospitalisation, death, acquisition etc.) is [49, 50]:

$$\rho_\alpha = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-k(\log_{10}(a_i) - c_\alpha))}, \quad (4)$$

where k determines the steepness and c_α corresponds to the midpoint of the logistic function for a particular disease outcome (α = hospitalisation, death etc...) (see Table 1).

Fixed input parameters

In the WPR scenarios we consider, the following components are fixed:

Vaccine type: We assume that all primary doses are ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AstraZeneca) and booster doses are BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech).

No **TTIQ** (Test, Trace, Isolate and Quarantine). This means there are no public health measures in these scenarios.

Timeline: We assume a fixed schedule for vaccination and the seeding of infection (depicted in Fig 2).

There are three vaccination stages that take 26 weeks each: the first dose stage, the second dose stage, and the mixed booster and new primary course stage. In the first stage, first doses are given to the allocated population, and in the second stage, the second dose is given to the same groups. Within the first and second stages, the 65+ age group always gets their first dose or second dose first, followed by randomly assigned vaccinations among the 5 – 64 age group. At the end of the second stage, $V\%$ of the population have received the primary course, where $V = 20, 50, 80$. In the third stage, 80% of the fully vaccinated population receive a booster dose, while remaining available doses are given out as new primary doses. An example of this is given in Fig. 9.

We seed two infection waves with 100 infections each: one at time $t = 225$ (approximately 32nd week), such that the first wave is largely over by the end of the second vaccination stage, and one at time $t = 450$, where protection from the first wave has waned enough such that a second wave could possibly

Table 1: **Model parameters.** Note that the age brackets for probabilities of symptomatic infection (prob_symptoms), relative infectiousness once infectious (relative_infectiousness), and susceptibility to becoming infected upon contact with an infected individual correspond to [0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75, 80]. “ c_{50} ” corresponds to the midpoint of the logistic function for a particular disease outcome (hospitalisation, death etc...). Source: Refs. [49, 50, 53].

Parameter: description	Value
c_h : c_{50} of hospitalisation	-1.22
c_d : c_{50} of death	-1.18
c_ξ : c_{50} of acquisition	-0.472
c_τ : c_{50} of transmission	0.0295
c_q : c_{50} of symptoms	-0.644
μ_{AZ1}^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after the first dose of AstraZeneca (no infection)	-0.530
μ_{AZ2}^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after the second dose of AstraZeneca (no infection)	-0.120
μ_{PB2}^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after the second dose of Pfizer (no infection); also the mean titre after one AZ dose and one infection	0.154
μ_B^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after the first mRNA booster dose (both with and without infection); also the mean titre after two AZ doses and one infection	0.323
μ_U^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after infection whilst unvaccinated	0
$\log(k)$: governs the logistic curve steepness relating antibodies to protection against disease outcome	1.69
k_a : decay rate of neutralising antibodies	0.00824
$\log_{10}(f_{\text{Omicron}})$: \log_{10} of the fold change in neutralising antibody titre between Delta and Omicron (BA1- like)	-0.692
σ : standard deviation of the \log_{10} of neutralising antibodies across the population	0.465
probability of symptoms across age groups	[0.29, 0.29, 0.21, 0.21, 0.27, 0.27, 0.33, 0.33, 0.4, 0.4, 0.49, 0.49, 0.63, 0.63, 0.69, 0.69, 0.69]
relative infectiousness across age groups	[0.799, 0.688, 0.675, 0.756, 0.918, 0.965, 0.947, 0.932, 0.934, 0.940, 0.954, 0.982, 1.0, 0.998, 0.990, 0.974, 0.944]
susceptibility across age groups	[0.301, 0.367, 0.433, 0.527, 0.764, 0.924, 0.983, 0.974, 0.932, 0.915, 0.929, 0.962, 1.0, 0.972, 0.882, 0.824, 0.802]
$\log_{10}(f_{\text{Omicron-escape}})$: \log_{10} of the fold change in neutralising antibody titre between Delta and the BA4/5-like immune escape variant	-1.18
R_0 ratio between the original Omicron variant (BA1/2-like) and the BA4/5-like immune escape variant	1.3

occur. Any infection that occurs before $t = 450$ is marked as a “past” infection, while anything after $t = 450$ (and before $t = 650$) is marked as a “near-future” infection.

Note that we end our analysis at time $t = 650$, which is approximately three months after the final vaccination stage finishes. We do not run simulations for any extra time until all second waves are finished in situations where the second seeding does not spark a second wave immediately. This is because if we do continue to run the simulation, immunity will continue to wane, and in some situations, we would see a third wave. Furthermore, we would expect that some populations would continue a fourth vaccination stage and so forth.




Figure 2: **Timeline of vaccination schedule and infection seedings with examples of infection time series.** There is a vaccination rollout that occurs in three consecutive stages, starting at $t = 0$, $t = 182$, and $t = 364$ and ending at $t = 546$. The first wave and the second wave are generated by randomly seeding 100 infections in the population (which could occur due to a super-spreader event, for example) at times $t = 225$ and $t = 450$. The example time series are for a second wave due to the same variant as the first wave.

Scenarios

The scenarios and demographics that we change across different simulations are as follows.

Population age demographics: see Fig. 3(a) and (b). We generate populations with 100,000 people. We consider “older” and “younger” populations, which are derived from averaged age-proportions across the majority of countries in the Western Pacific regions, using the population data acquired through <https://population.un.org/wpp/DataQuery/> [55] for the year 2021. We defined “older” countries as those with an $OADR \geq 15$ and “younger” countries as having an $OADR \leq 12$, where $OADR$ is

the *old-age to working-age demographic ratio*, which we calculate as a ratio between the +65 year old population and the 20-64 year old population. The individual country-level data used can be seen in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7.

Additionally, each older/younger demographic has a different **contact matrix**, which governs the social mixing (and thus infection spread) in the model. To derive some exemplar contact matrices, we used aggregated contact matrices from “older” ($OADR \geq 15$) and “younger” ($OADR \leq 12$) countries that could be found on <http://www.socialcontactdata.org/> [56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66] (where for “older” countries we included Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland; and “younger” included Viet Nam and Zimbabwe. These countries fell into the appropriate OADR values and had contact matrix values for all the age-groups we required.)

Vaccination coverage: see Fig. 3(c), (d), (e), and (f). The vaccine allocation broadly follows WHO guidelines [3], which recommends prioritising the vaccination of older and higher-risk groups. Aside from the zero-vaccination scenario, either 20%, 50%, or 80% total vaccination coverage is achieved at the end of the second stage, i.e. $t = 364$, reflecting differing levels of vaccine access/health sector capacity. At the lower vaccination rate of 20%, we first allocate doses such that 80% of the 65+ age group are fully vaccinated by the end of the first two stages. At the higher vaccination rates of 50% and 80%, we allocate initial doses such that 95% of the 65+ age group are fully vaccinated by the end of the first two stages—a fully vaccinated cohort is unrealistic. The remaining available doses in the first two stages are then equally (proportionately) allocated to the 5 – 64 age groups. In the third stage, 80% of all vaccinated individuals are allocated booster doses (no prioritisation of any age groups), with the remaining doses given equally across the age-groups to unvaccinated individuals. An example of this is given in Fig. 10.

Second wave variant type. We considered scenarios with either a second wave caused by the same Omicron variant as the in the first wave (default scenario), or with a *new* immune escape variant. The variant in the first wave is broadly referable to the characteristics of the Omicron BA.1 variant. The immune escape variant is Omicron ‘BA.4/5-like’, as it is currently one of the variants of most global concern. The immunological parameters were determined using the methods described in [53] (also see the methods described in [49, 50]).

Inherent transmissibility of the variant in that particular population. Different countries do not have the same R_{eff} or R_0 for the same virus. Furthermore, changes in social mixing patterns, due to social distancing measures for example, will change the population level of transmission. Therefore, rather than fixing the transmissibility across all simulations, we *vary* it ($R_0 \in [0.85, 0.9, 0.95, 1., 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2, 1.25, 1.3, 1.35, 1.4, 1.45, 1.5, 1.55, 1.6, 1.65, 1.7, 1.75, 1.8, 1.85, 1.9, 1.95, 2.0, 2.05]$), which gives rise to different attack rates in the population. We assume that the populations act the same during both waves (at whatever level of restrictions they may have). If the second wave is due to the same COVID-19 variant, then the transmissibility remains the same, i.e., within any individual simulation, the level of transmission is constant over time. If the second wave is due to an immune-escape variant with increased transmissibility, then the original transmissibility is multiplied up by the value given in

Table 1.




Figure 3: Scenarios considered: (a) exemplar ‘younger’ population demographics, (b) ‘older’ population demographics (see Appendix A for the construction of these exemplar populations), (c) no vaccination, (d) 20% vaccination coverage, (e) 50% vaccination coverage, (f) 80% vaccination coverage, where the coverage value corresponds to primary vaccination coverage by time $t = 364$.

For each scenario and set of input parameters, we ran 10 simulations, each producing a single infection

history with information about the number and times of infection and vaccinations for each individual in the population. From each individual simulation, we produced five different clinical outcome histories with information about number of infections, severe cases, hospital admissions, ICU admissions, and deaths per day. We aggregated the total cases, ICU admissions, and deaths per day for each simulation.

3 Results

Fig. 4 presents results for the scenarios where both waves are due to the same Omicron BA.1-like variant. Fig. 5 presents results for the case with the immune-escape variant during the second wave. Extended figures are given in Appendix A.3.

Reinfection with the same Omicron BA.1-like variant

In the absence of vaccination, immunity from infection alone wanes rapidly enabling a second wave. Assuming that the variant characteristics are unchanged, we observe a consistent relationship linear relationship between the size of the first and second wave, especially at transmissibility values that lead to a first-wave attack rate of 50% or above. At high attack rates, the immunity derived from the first wave only gives a modest constraint on the size of the second wave (for example, a past attack rate of 80% during the first wave leads to an attack rate of 60% in the second wave) (Fig. 4 a, b).

There is little difference in the protection provided by different vaccination coverage levels when the past attack rate is 50% or lower. The past attack rate size is largely determined by the inherent transmissibility of the Omicron variant in the population. This means that for a lower past attack rate, the virus is less transmissible in that population, due to some inherent properties of the population. In countries with lower transmission, high vaccination is not as important provided that only the same variant is in circulation (Fig. 4).

For scenarios where the past attack rate is higher than 50%, we observed that different vaccination coverage levels have noticeable effects. Increasing vaccination coverage from 20% to 50% can delay the next wave in the immediate future. If vaccination coverage is only 20% then a high past attack rate is insufficient to ensure a low future resurgence of infections with the same variant. This is most likely due to the high intrinsic disease spread which caused the high past attack rate and similarly caused the high near-future attack rate, as well as the short-lived nature of immunity derived only from natural infection.

We observed little difference in total infections at vaccine coverage levels between 50% and 80%. This could be due to the fixed assumption that for each of these coverage scenarios, takeup within the 65+ age group is the same (at 95% in-group coverage). In terms of more severe clinical outcomes such as death, older populations have consistently worse clinical outcomes than the example younger population. Furthermore, a very high vaccination rate of 80% does have noticeably better clinical outcomes than




Figure 4: **Near-future outcomes given past immunity.** (a) Younger population, near-future attack rate; (b) Older population, near-future attack-rate (the diagonal line represents where past and near-future attack rates are equal); (c) Younger population, near-future deaths; (d) Older population, near-future deaths.

Note that past attack rate is calculated between $t \in (0, 450)$. Past attack rate is dependent on transmission potential, which is different for various simulations, reflecting different populations' intrinsic transmission. Near-future attack rate and near-future deaths are calculated between $t \in [450, 650]$. Note that we have only included simulation results in which the past attack rate is between 20% and 80%.

50%, especially in older populations. Since the high-risk coverage is the same in both scenarios, this indicated that there is benefit to vaccinating low-risk groups (Fig. 4 c, d).




Figure 5: Near-future attack rate and deaths given past immunity, for a second wave due to a BA.4/BA.5-like immune escape variant. The diagonal line represents where past and near-future attack rates are equal. Note that we have only included simulation results in which the past attack rate is between 20% and 80%.

Reinfection with an Omicron BA4/BA5-like immune escape variant

In general, we found that for scenarios where the second wave is dominated by the Omicron BA.4/BA.5-like immune escape variant, the previously observed protective effects of vaccination against the second

wave were substantially reduced, as the efficacy against transmission and severe disease is impacted by the immune escape. For these immune escape scenarios, we observed a linear relationship between past attack rate and future attack rate. Furthermore, future attack rates are often *higher* than past attack rates (Fig. 5 a, b).

We found that older populations have slightly greater near-future attack rates given the same past hybrid immunity as younger populations, but overall we did not observe a substantial difference between peak sizes, similar to the previous scenarios where transmission is dominated by a single viral strain. For severe outcomes such as death in the second wave, we found that the protective effect of vaccination was substantially reduced, with much smaller differences in clinical outcomes between different vaccination coverages. Once again, older populations (i.e. populations with larger high-risk groups) experienced consistently worse clinical outcomes than the younger populations (Fig. 5 c, d).

4 Discussion

The Omicron variant of COVID-19 has spread across the world. Unlike previous variants, Omicron has increased transmissibility and immune escape [28, 29, 2, 30, 31], meaning that both vaccination and past infection confer a lower level of protection against Omicron (re)infection. We considered different populations with either ‘older’ or ‘younger’ demographics and with varying existing hybrid immunity. These populations were then subjected to a second wave of either the same prior variant (BA.1 like) or a different immune escape variant (BA.4/BA.5 like). We find that high vaccination coverage makes a noticeable difference in reducing the number of infections and severe outcomes in populations. Additionally, a population with a high past attack rate—reflecting a society with certain mixing and environmental factors that increase disease spread—is likely to have a high future attack rate and will benefit from higher vaccination coverage. In contrast, if populations with a low past attack rate—reflecting different intrinsic society mixing and limited disease spread, including potential public health measures—continue to behave the same going forward, then high vaccination does not have high impact against a second wave.

We find that higher vaccination coverage is more important for older populations, that is, populations with larger high-risk groups. Even if older and younger populations have the same future wave size—i.e. in terms of infection numbers—the older populations consistently have worse clinical outcomes. This work highlights that populations with large high-risk groups must do more to protect themselves in order to achieve the same outcomes compared to those populations with smaller high-risk groups.

We also found that high vaccination coverage can *delay* the emergence of a second wave. This delay is important because a longer time between waves allows more time to vaccinate populations, fewer infections and deaths across the same time frame, less economic disruption, and so forth. If there is a sufficient interval between campaigns, a fourth booster dose may be able to mitigate against some of these outcomes in the older population by “resetting” short term protection to a higher level, but that

has not been simulated here. For example, Hogan et al. [34] created a model to predict how protection from past infection, vaccination and boosting declines over time. They found that in partially vaccinated populations, (first) boosters should be preferentially given to high-risk/older groups instead of giving new primary doses to low-risk/younger age groups; considering waning immunity, we can expect this reasoning to apply for second and subsequent boosters.

A strength of our study is that using our agent-based transmission model, we have been able to systematically model complex exposure histories for various populations with differing overall levels of waning hybrid immunity and compare how different populations fare under various scenarios. As vaccinations and exposures increase over time, the hybrid immunity landscape of populations will become more complex, further increasing the utility of models that have the ability to capture diverse exposure and vaccination histories. Many of the earlier studies did not include flexible hybrid immunity arrangements and/or did not include waning immunity or multiple reinfections (e.g. [44, 45, 43]), which here we show is key to the occurrence, size and timing of the second wave. While we did not include heterologous vaccination schedules, such as was modelled in [67], our modelling framework has the ability to support these scenarios.

There are several limitations to our study. First, our model did not have two variants circulating at the same time, instead using a sharp change point where all new infections following a certain time were with the immune escape strain. However, given that new variants have historically replaced currently circulating variants over relatively short time periods [68, 69], we do not envisage this would greatly change our results. Second, we did not consider the breadth of antibody response; we assume that while natural infection and vaccination boost antibodies by different amounts, the model then wanes both at the same rate instead of different rates. The next generation of vaccines will very likely be bivalent, as they are more broadly cross reactive and provide more durable protection. With all the increasing *breadth* of protection becoming important, a single antibody value may no longer be sufficient, instead requiring a multidimensional approach. Thirdly, in the absence of robust population level evidence to the contrary, our model assumes that neutralising antibody titres are the only proxy correlate of protection against both infection and clinical outcomes. However, we expect there exist other correlates of protection [70, 71], and as evidence regarding these mechanisms accrues, we will incorporate them into future model development.

Our study clearly shows how waning immunity and emergence of vaccine escape variants limits the impact of COVID-19 vaccines against transmission. The benefits of vaccination and past infection derived protection against COVID-19 disease depend critically on many factors, including demography, health systems capacity, vaccine efficacy, and breadth of protection, especially against new variants. Protection against severe disease is more robust, with achievable gains depend on underlying population demographics and risk. Ideally, vaccines would be allocated after assessing hybrid immunity at both the individual and population level in order to maximise the protection against future waves especially if vaccine stocks are limited. Our results suggest that populations with low vaccination coverage and high past infection rate should still consider vaccination if public health measures are not enforced or social

mixing is not reduced.

The hybrid immunity landscape will only become increasingly complex as time goes on: with more circulating variants and with more vaccinations and more unique and individual exposure histories. How this can be robustly incorporated into mathematical models—especially in cases of limited available data—will be an ongoing challenge. As we move from the initial pandemic stage of COVID-19 to ongoing endemic transmission, we need tailored responses, sustainable long term protection and vaccination schedules to protect those at risk of severe disease and have equity of outcomes going forward. The role of future vaccines for resilience to ‘endemic’ disease and response to variants of concern remains to be determined for each individual country context.

Acknowledgments

We thank Gerry Ryan for various neutralising antibody titre parameters used in the immunological model.

Funding

This work was supported by the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade Indo-Pacific Centre for Health Security (Supporting Preparedness in the Asia-Pacific Region through Knowledge). ABH and IM are funded by an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Investigator Grants.

5 Bibliography

- [1] Tracking SARS-CoV-2 variants, Accessed 2022. URL: <https://www.who.int/activities/tracking-SARS-CoV-2-variants>.
- [2] Hiam Chemaitelly, Houssein H. Ayoub, Sawsan AlMukdad, et al. Duration of mRNA vaccine protection against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 subvariants in Qatar. *Nature Communications*, 2022. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-30895-3.
- [3] World Health Organization. 2022. WHO Reference Number: WHO/2019-nCoV/Vaccines/SAGE/Prioritization/2022.1. URL: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccines-SAGE-Prioritization-2022.1>.
- [4] Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Weekly Epidemiological Update and Weekly Operational Update. URL: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/>.

- [5] World Health Organization. Interim statement on hybrid immunity and increasing population seroprevalence rates, 2022. URL: <https://www.who.int/news/item/01-06-2022-interim-statement-on-hybrid-immunity-and-increasing-population-seroprevalence>
- [6] Maria Deloria Knoll and Chizoba Wonodi. Oxford–AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine efficacy. *The Lancet*, 2021. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)32623-4.
- [7] Fernando P. Polack, Stephen J. Thomas, Nicholas Kitchin, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2020. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2034577.
- [8] Ian McDonald, Sam M. Murray, Catherine J. Reynolds, et al. Comparative systematic review and meta-analysis of reactogenicity, immunogenicity and efficacy of vaccines against SARS-CoV-2. *npj Vaccines*, 2021. doi:10.1038/s41541-021-00336-1.
- [9] Paddy Ssentongo, Anna E. Ssentongo, Navya Voleti, et al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine effectiveness against infection, symptomatic and severe COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 2022. doi:10.1186/s12879-022-07418-y.
- [10] Stefan Pilz, Verena Theiler-Schwetz, Christian Trummer, et al. SARS-CoV-2 reinfections: Overview of efficacy and duration of natural and hybrid immunity. *Environmental Research*, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2022.112911.
- [11] Noah Kojima and Jeffrey D Klausner. Protective immunity after recovery from SARS-CoV-2 infection. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 2022. doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(21)00676-9.
- [12] Heba N. Altarawneh, Hiam Chemaitelly, Mohammad R. Hasan, et al. Protection against the Omicron Variant from Previous SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2022. doi:10.1056/nejmc2200133.
- [13] Priscilla Kim, Steven M Gordon, Megan M Sheehan, and Michael B Rothberg. Duration of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Natural Immunity and Protection Against the Delta Variant: A Retrospective Cohort Study. 2021. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab999.
- [14] Nir Gavish, Rami Yaari, Amit Huppert, and Guy Katriel. Population-level implications of the Israeli booster campaign to curtail COVID-19 resurgence. *Science Translational Medicine*, 2022. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.abn9836.
- [15] David S. Khoury, Deborah Cromer, Arnold Reynaldi, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature Medicine*, 2021. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01377-8.
- [16] Deborah Cromer, Megan Steain, Arnold Reynaldi, et al. Neutralising antibody titres as predictors of protection against SARS-CoV-2 variants and the impact of boosting: a meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe*, 2022. doi:10.1016/s2666-5247(21)00267-6.

- [17] Deborah Cromer, Megan Steain, Arnold Reynaldi, et al. Neutralising antibodies predict protection from severe COVID-19. 2022. [doi:10.1101/2022.06.09.22275942](https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.09.22275942).
- [18] Jamie A. Cohen, Robyn M. Stuart, Katherine Rosenfeld, et al. Quantifying the role of naturally- and vaccine-derived neutralizing antibodies as a correlate of protection against COVID-19 variants. 2021. [doi:10.1101/2021.05.31.21258018](https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.31.21258018).
- [19] Jia Wei, Philippa C. Matthews, Nicole Stoesser, et al. Anti-spike antibody response to natural SARS-CoV-2 infection in the general population. *Nature Communications*, 2021. [doi:10.1038/s41467-021-26479-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26479-2).
- [20] Peter Nordström, Marcel Ballin, and Anna Nordström. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection and COVID-19 hospitalisation in individuals with natural and hybrid immunity: a retrospective, total population cohort study in Sweden. 2022. [doi:10.1016/s1473-3099\(22\)00143-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(22)00143-8).
- [21] Victoria Hall, Sarah Foulkes, Ferdinando Insalata, et al. Protection against SARS-CoV-2 after Covid-19 Vaccination and Previous Infection. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2022. [doi:10.1056/nejmoa2118691](https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa2118691).
- [22] Heba N. Altarawneh, Hiam Chemaitelly, Houssein Ayoub, et al. Effect of prior infection, vaccination, and hybrid immunity against symptomatic BA.1 and BA.2 Omicron infections and severe COVID-19 in Qatar. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2022. [doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2203965](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2203965).
- [23] Thiago Cerqueira-Silva, Jason R Andrews, Viviane S Boaventura, et al. Effectiveness of CoronaVac, ChAdOx1 nCoV-19, BNT162b2, and ad26.COV2.s among individuals with previous SARS-CoV-2 infection in Brazil: a test-negative, case-control study. 2022. [doi:10.1016/s1473-3099\(22\)00140-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(22)00140-2).
- [24] Catherine J. Reynolds, Corinna Pade, Joseph M. Gibbons, et al. Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection rescues B and T cell responses to variants after first vaccine dose. *Science*, 2021. [doi:10.1126/science.abh1282](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abh1282).
- [25] Sheila F Lumley, Gillian Rodger, Bede Constantinides, et al. An Observational Cohort Study on the Incidence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection and B.1.1.7 Variant Infection in Healthcare Workers by Antibody and Vaccination Status. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2021. [doi:10.1093/cid/ciab608](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab608).
- [26] Yair Goldberg, Micha Mandel, Yinon M. Bar-On, et al. Protection and Waning of Natural and Hybrid Immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2022. [doi:10.1056/nejmoa2118946](https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa2118946).
- [27] Yuezhou Chen, Pei Tong, Noah B. Whiteman, et al. 2021. [doi:10.1101/2021.09.09.459504](https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.09.459504).

- [28] Nick Andrews, Julia Stowe, Freja Kirsebom, et al. Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron (B.1.1.529) Variant. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2022. doi:[10.1056/nejmoa2119451](https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa2119451).
- [29] Sandile Cele, Laurelle Jackson, David S. Khoury, et al. Omicron extensively but incompletely escapes Pfizer BNT162b2 neutralization. *Nature*, 2021. doi:[10.1038/s41586-021-04387-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04387-1).
- [30] Juliet R. C. Pulliam, Cari van Schalkwyk, Nevashan Govender, et al. Increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection associated with emergence of omicron in South Africa. *Science*, 2022. doi:[10.1126/science.abn4947](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn4947).
- [31] Jing Zou, Hongjie Xia, Xuping Xie, et al. Neutralization against Omicron SARS-CoV-2 from previous non-Omicron infection. *Nature Communications*, 2022. doi:[10.1038/s41467-022-28544-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28544-w).
- [32] Nicole P. Hachmann, Jessica Miller, Aisling Y. Collier, et al. Neutralization Escape by SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Subvariants BA.2.12.1, BA.4, and BA.5. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2022. doi:[10.1056/nejmc2206576](https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmc2206576).
- [33] Alexandra B. Hogan, Peter Winskill, Oliver J. Watson, et al. Within-country age-based prioritisation, global allocation, and public health impact of a vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: A mathematical modelling analysis. *Vaccine*, 2021. doi:[10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.002).
- [34] Alexandra B. Hogan, Sean L. Wu, Jaspreet Toor, et al. Long Term Vaccination Strategies to Mitigate the Global Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission: A Modelling Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2022. doi:[10.2139/ssrn.4135323](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4135323).
- [35] Natsuko Imai, Alexandra B. Hogan, Lucy Williams, et al. Interpreting estimates of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) vaccine efficacy and effectiveness to inform simulation studies of vaccine impact: a systematic review. *Wellcome Open Research*, 2021. doi:[10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16992.1](https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16992.1).
- [36] Gerard E. Ryan, Freya M. Shearer, James M. McCaw, et al. Estimating measures to reduce the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia to guide a ‘National Plan’ to reopening. 2023. doi:[10.1101/2022.12.15.22282869](https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.15.22282869).
- [37] Eamon Conway, Camelia Walker, Chris Baker, et al. COVID-19 vaccine coverage targets to inform reopening plans in a low incidence setting. 2022. doi:[10.1101/2022.12.04.22282996](https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.04.22282996).
- [38] Commonwealth Government of Australia. National Plan to transition Australia’s National COVID-19 Response, 2021. URL: <https://www.australia.gov.au/national-plan>.
- [39] Le Khanh Ngan Nguyen, Itamar Megiddo, and Susan Howick. Hybrid simulation modelling of networks of heterogeneous care homes and the inter-facility spread of Covid-19 by sharing staff. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 2022. doi:[10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009780](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009780).

- [40] COVID-19 Scenario Modeling Hub, 2022. URL: <https://covid19scenariomodellinghub.org/>.
- [41] Natsuko Imai, Thomas Rawson, Edward S Knock, et al. Quantifying the impact of delaying the second COVID-19 vaccine dose in England: a mathematical modelling study. 2022. doi: [10.1101/2022.08.08.22278528](https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.08.22278528).
- [42] Thomas N. Vilches, Kevin Zhang, Robert Van Exan, et al. Projecting the impact of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccination campaign in Ontario, Canada. *Vaccine*, 2021. doi:[10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.03.058](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.03.058).
- [43] Laura Matrajt, Julia Eaton, Tiffany Leung, and Elizabeth R. Brown. Vaccine optimization for COVID-19: Who to vaccinate first? *Science Advances*, 2021. doi:[10.1126/sciadv.abf1374](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abf1374).
- [44] Farhina Mozaffer, Philip Cherian, Sandeep Krishna, et al. Effect of hybrid immunity, school reopening, and the Omicron variant on trajectory of COVID-19 epidemic in India: A modelling study. *The Lancet Regional Health – Southeast Asia*, 2023. doi:[10.1016/j.lansea.2022.100095](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lansea.2022.100095).
- [45] Anastasia Angelopoulou and Konstantinos Mykoniatis. Hybrid modelling and simulation of the effect of vaccination on the COVID-19 transmission. *Journal of Simulation*, 2022. doi:[10.1080/17477778.2022.2062260](https://doi.org/10.1080/17477778.2022.2062260).
- [46] Hemaho B. Taboe, Michael Asare-Baah, Afsana Yesmin, and Calistus N. Ngonghala. Impact of age structure and vaccine prioritization on COVID-19 in West Africa. 2022. doi:[10.1016/j.idm.2022.08.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2022.08.006).
- [47] Catherine J. Reynolds, Corinna Pade, Joseph M. Gibbons, et al. Immune boosting by B.1.1.529 (Omicron) depends on previous SARS-CoV-2 exposure. *Science*, 2022. doi:[10.1126/science.abq1841](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abq1841).
- [48] Isabel Bergeri, Mairead G. Whelan, Harriet Ware, et al. Global SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence from January 2020 to April 2022: A systematic review and meta-analysis of standardized population-based studies. *PLOS Medicine*, 2022. doi:[10.1371/journal.pmed.1004107](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004107).
- [49] Eamon Conway et al. In preparation. 2023.
- [50] Eamon Conway et al. COVID IBM: Waning Immunity, 2023. URL: <https://spectrum-spark.github.io/covid-IBM/>.
- [51] Jennifer M. Dan, Jose Mateus, Yu Kato, et al. Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science*, 2021. doi:[10.1126/science.abf4063](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf4063).
- [52] Sheila F. Lumley, Denise O’Donnell, Nicole E. Stoesser, et al. Antibody Status and Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Health Care Workers. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2021. doi: [10.1056/nejmoa2034545](https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa2034545).

- [53] Nick Golding, Gerry Ryan, and Michael Lydeamore. Analyses to predict the efficacy and waning of vaccines and previous infection against transmission and clinical outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 variants., 2022. Github repository. URL: <https://github.com/goldingn/neuts2efficacy>.
- [54] Khadija Khan, Farina Karim, Yashica Ganga, et al. Omicron BA.4/BA.5 escape neutralizing immunity elicited by BA.1 infection. *Nature Communications*, 2022. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-32396-9.
- [55] United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World Population Prospects 2019, custom data acquired via website., 2019.
- [56] Lander Willem, Thang Van Hoang, Sebastian Funk, et al. SOCRATES: an online tool leveraging a social contact data sharing initiative to assess mitigation strategies for COVID-19. *BMC Research Notes*, 2020. doi:10.1186/s13104-020-05136-9.
- [57] Amy Gimma, Kerry LM Wong, Pietro Coletti, and Christopher I Jarvis. CoMix social contact data (Poland), 2021. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.5041128.
- [58] Amy Gimma, Kerry LM Wong, Pietro Coletti, and Christopher I Jarvis. CoMix social contact data (Italy), 2021. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.5041112.
- [59] Amy Gimma, Kerry LM Wong, Pietro Coletti, and Christopher I Jarvis. CoMix social contact data (France), 2021. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.5040870.
- [60] Pietro Coletti, James Wambua, Amy Gimma, et al. CoMix social contact data (Belgium), 2020. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.4035001.
- [61] Alessia Melegaro, Emanuele Del Fava, Piero Poletti, et al. Social contact data for Zimbabwe, 2020. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.1127693.
- [62] Guillaume Béraud, Sabine Kazmerczak, Philippe Beutels, et al. Social contact data for France, 2020. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.1157918.
- [63] Kathy Leung, Mark Jit, Eric H. Y. Lau, and Joseph T. Wu. Social contact data for Hong Kong, 2020. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.1165561.
- [64] Horby Peter, Pham Quang Thai, Hens Niel, et al. Social contact data for Vietnam, 2018. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.1289474.
- [65] Hens Niel, Goeyvaerts Nele, Aerts Marc, et al. Social contact data for Belgium (2006), 2020. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.4059863.
- [66] Willem Lander, Kim Van Kerckhove, L. Chao Dennis, et al. Social contact data for Belgium (2010-2011), 2020. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.4059825.

- [67] Suparinthon Anupong, Tanakorn Chantanasaro, Chaiwat Wilasang, et al. 2022. doi:10.1101/2022.08.05.22278489.
- [68] Priyal Mistry, Fatima Barmania, Juanita Mellet, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Variants, Vaccines, and Host Immunity. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 2022. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8761766/>, doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.809244.
- [69] Vineet Sharma, Himanshu Rai, Dev N. S. Gautam, et al. Emerging evidence on Omicron (B.1.1.529) SARS-CoV-2 variant. *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2022. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9015596/>, doi:10.1002/jmv.27626.
- [70] David Goldblatt, Galit Alter, Shane Crotty, and Stanley A. Plotkin. Correlates of protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 disease. *Immunological Reviews*, 2022. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9348242/>, doi:10.1111/imr.13091.
- [71] Manish Sadarangani, Arnaud Marchant, and Tobias R. Kollmann. Immunological mechanisms of vaccine-induced protection against COVID-19 in humans. *Nature Reviews. Immunology*, 21(8):475–484, 2021. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8246128/>, doi:10.1038/s41577-021-00578-z.
- [72] UN. Population Division. *World Population Ageing 2019 Highlights*. Population studies. 2019. URL: <https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WorldPopulationAgeing2019-Highlights.pdf>.
- [73] Sergei Scherbov and Warren Sanderson. *New Measures of Population Ageing*, 2019. URL: https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/unpd_egm_201902_s1_sergeischerbov.pdf.

A Simulation details and results

A.1 Constructing the exemplar ‘younger’ and ‘older’ populations

There are multiple methods to measure population aging, especially in light of increasing life expectancies and extended working age across the world [72, 73]. For our populations, we use the old-age to working-age demographic ratio, OADR, which is calculated as:

$$\text{OADR} = \frac{\text{population aged 65 and over}}{\text{population aged 20 – 64}} \times 100. \quad (5)$$

As mentioned in the main text, our exemplar “younger” and “older” populations are constructed from the averaged age distribution across multiple countries in the WHO-defined Western Pacific Regions. To obtain two different age distributions—which is also a proxy for size of high-risk group—we defined “younger” countries as having an $\text{OADR} \leq 12$ and “older” countries as those with an $\text{OADR} \geq 15$ (we do not include countries whose OADR lay between 12 and 15). Coupled with the international population data available at [55] for the year 2021, the countries we included in the “younger” and “older” groups were:

1. “Younger”: Mongolia, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Philippines, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Kiribati, Micronesia (Fed. States of), Samoa, and Tonga (see Fig. 6).
2. “Older”: China, Hong Kong SAR, Macao SAR, Japan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, New Caledonia, Guam, and French Polynesia (see Fig. 7).

A.2 Detailed vaccination allocation and schedule

There are two components to the vaccination program in our simulations: (1) the vaccine schedule, and (2) the vaccine allocation (which also defines the vaccine capacity).

The vaccine schedule has three different stages, each 26 weeks each—roughly half a year. An example of the schedule is given in Fig. 9.

1. In the first stage, first doses are given to the allocated groups that will be vaccinated during the first year. The 65+ individuals are vaccinated first, followed by randomly assigned vaccinations among the 5 – 64 age group.
2. In the second stage, the second dose is given to the same individuals as the first stage. The 65+ individuals receive their second doses first (though their exact dates are random). Once all the 65+ individuals that will be vaccinated are vaccinated, the 5 – 64 groups are vaccinated at random




Figure 6: Countries used to create the exemplar ‘younger’ population distribution: relative proportions across age groups were averaged.

days. At the end of the second stage, $V\%$ of the population have received the primary course, where in the main paper, $V = 20, 50, 80$.

3. In the third stage, 80% of the fully vaccinated population receive a booster dose, while remaining available doses are given out as new primary course doses. During the third stage, 80% of daily doses are used as booster doses (for any age group 5+), while 20% of daily doses are used as new primary course doses (for any age group 5+).

Suppose we want an initial $V\%$ vaccination coverage. We assume that the per-stage vaccination capacity is $VC = 100,000 \times V\%$ doses, that is, we will have VC doses per stage, or $VC/26$ doses per week. Thus,




Figure 7: **Countries used to create the exemplar ‘older’ population distribution:** relative proportions across age groups were averaged.

in the first stage, we have VC first doses. In the second stage, we have VC second doses. And in the third stage, we have $VC \times 80\%$ booster doses and $VC \times 20\%$ new primary course doses (which means $VC \times 10\%$ new first doses and $VC \times 10\%$ new second doses).

The vaccine allocation broadly follows WHO guidelines, which recommends prioritising the vaccination of older and higher-risk groups. At the lower vaccination rate of 20%, we ensure 80% of the 65+ age group are fully vaccinated by the first year. At the higher vaccination rates of 50% and 80%, we ensure that 95% of the 65+ age group are fully vaccinated by the end of the first year. Remaining doses available are distributed evenly among the lower age groups. An example of this allocation is given in Fig. 10.

A.3 Extended results

Fig. 11 shows the near-future ICU admissions for the various populations and scenarios. Overall, the trends in ICU admission reflect the trends for deaths: that older populations typically have worse outcomes, and that vaccination can modestly reduce ICU admission numbers in all scenarios provided




Figure 8: **Contact matrices used.**

that vaccination coverage was 50% or above.

Fig. 12 demonstrates the range of outcomes of multiple simulations. Fig. 12(a) and (b) show infections averted by vaccination compared with scenarios representing the baseline no-vaccination case, while Fig. 12(c) and (d) show deaths averted by vaccination compared with scenarios representing the baseline no-vaccination case.

At 80% vaccine coverage, the number of infections averted increases steadily in relation to the first wave attack rate which reflects the degree of transmission in the population. As vaccine coverage falls, the modelled maximum number of infections averted starts to decline for higher transmission pressures/attack rates.

Overall, in an older population more deaths can potentially be prevented by vaccination than in a younger population. At 80% vaccine coverage, the number of deaths averted increases steadily in relation to the first wave attack rate which reflects the degree of transmission in the population. As vaccine coverage falls, the modelled maximum number of deaths averted starts to decline for higher transmission pressures/attack rates.

Fig. 13 shows the avoided infections and avoided deaths due to vaccination compared with scenarios representing the baseline no-vaccination case, in the scenarios where the second wave is due to an immune escape variant. We see that as vaccination coverage increases, we have increases in averted infections.




Figure 9: **Vaccine schedule and distribution example:** older population with 50% vaccination coverage after the first year. In the top panel, we see that doses are given out in the order of first doses, second doses, then jointly boosters and new primary doses. In the bottom panel, we see that during the first two stages, the older population 65+ are given their dose (numbered one or two) first, followed by the rest of the population. Meanwhile during the third (booster) stage, multiple different age groups are vaccinated daily, either with boosters or with new primary doses (with no age prioritisation for the booster dose).

A.4 50% vs 80% booster coverage

In the main text, 80% of the initially vaccinated population were given boosters, while the remaining vaccination capacity was used to give new primary doses to previously unvaccinated individuals (note that all individuals vaccinated during the first year prior to boosters received the full primary course). In an alternative scenario, we could provide boosters to only 50% of the initially vaccinated population and try to vaccinate more people who had not yet been vaccinated. Fig. 14 shows the total difference in infection numbers and death numbers between the two scenarios, of which there is not a large noticeable difference.




Figure 10: **Vaccine distribution example:** older and younger population with 50% vaccination coverage. The 65+ age group can be vaccinated to a maximum in-group coverage of 95%, while remaining available doses are distributed uniformly to the remaining 5-64 year old groups.

B If vaccination efficacy was worse

Vaccine efficacy is important in determining just how much effect vaccination can have on future outcomes. In this section, we briefly consider a scenario where vaccine efficacy is lowered, with the new parameters given in Table 2. The results are given in Fig. 15. With a worse vaccine, we find less difference in future infection/future attack rate given different vaccine coverages. Compared to the results in the main paper with a better vaccine, in the scenarios here, there are higher future attack rates and also higher numbers of severe outcomes.




Figure 11: **Near-future ICU admissions** ($450 \leq t \leq 650$) given past attack rate ($t < 450$). Increased vaccination coverage reduces the upper limit of ICU admissions. Top row: second wave due to the same variant. Bottom row: second wave due to a BA4/5-like variant.




Figure 12: **Total avoided infections and total avoided deaths (where the second wave is due to the same variant).** We compare the vaccination scenarios with the scenario with no vaccination throughout the full simulation. The horizontal axis is the past (first wave) attack rate of the scenario with no vaccination. Note that the upper limit in total avoided deaths is the same within each plot (c) and (d), as there exists some simulations where no deaths occur. The width of each colour band reflects the minimum/maximum of simulations exploring three levels of vaccine coverage (the lines show the median).




Figure 13: **Total avoided infections and total avoided deaths (where the second wave is due to a BA4/5-like immune escape variant).** We compare the vaccination scenarios with the scenario with no vaccination throughout the full simulation. The horizontal axis is the past (first wave) attack rate of the scenario with no vaccination. The width of each colour band reflects the minimum/maximum of simulations exploring three levels of vaccine coverage (the black lines show the median).




Figure 14: **Difference between infections and deaths for 50% vs 80% booster coverage allocation** (and where remaining doses are given out as new primary doses). Assumes that the second wave is due to the same variant.

Table 2: **Changed model parameters used for a lower efficacy vaccine.** Source: Ref. [53]

Parameter: description	Value
c_h : c_{50} of hospitalisation	-1.206211545
c_d : c_{50} of death	-1.183605217
c_ξ : c_{50} of acquisition	-0.471657741
c_τ : c_{50} of transmission	0.018459279
c_q : c_{50} of symptoms	-0.634901845
μ_{AZ1}^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after the first dose of AstraZeneca	-1.318173846
μ_{AZ2}^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after the second dose of AstraZeneca	-0.939262177
μ_{P3}^0 : \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre after the first booster dose of Pfizer	-0.336224683
$\log(k)$: governs the steepness of the logistic curve relating antibodies to protection against disease outcome	1.707366579
k_a : decay rate of neutralising antibodies	0.008502135
$\mu_{infection}$: \log_{10} of the mean neutralising antibody titre additionally gained after infection	1.158362492




Figure 15: Near-future attack rate and deaths given past immunity, for a worse vaccine. Assuming a second wave due to the same Omicron BA.1 like variant.