

The COVID-19 vaccination campaign in Switzerland and its impact on disease spread

MODEL – regions only Y_{rt} , transmission weights $w = (w_{r,r',t})$

M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar and L. Held

Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute, University of Zurich

E-mail: maria.dunbar@uzh.ch

- 1 This document contains additional models to those outlined in the study protocol [1].
 2 Knowledge of the analyses from the main manuscript is assumed. The models introduced
 3 here have only regional effects. This means we are comparing the models:

$$\log(\nu_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\nu)} + \gamma^{(\nu)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\nu)} \quad (\text{neither})$$

$$\log(\phi_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\phi)} + \gamma^{(\phi)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\phi)}$$

$$\log(\nu_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\nu)} + \beta_r^{(\nu)} \log(1 - x_{rt}) + \gamma^{(\nu)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\nu)} \quad (\text{endemic})$$

$$\log(\phi_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\phi)} + \gamma^{(\phi)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\phi)}$$

$$\log(\nu_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\nu)} + \gamma^{(\nu)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\nu)} \quad (\text{epidemic})$$

$$\log(\phi_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\phi)} + \beta_r^{(\phi)} \log(1 - x_{rt}) + \gamma^{(\phi)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\phi)}$$

$$\log(\nu_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\nu)} + \beta_r^{(\nu)} \log(1 - x_{rt}) + \gamma^{(\nu)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\nu)} \quad (\text{both})$$

$$\log(\phi_{rt}) = \alpha_r^{(\phi)} + \beta_r^{(\phi)} \log(1 - x_{rt}) + \gamma^{(\phi)\top} \mathbf{z}_{rt}^{(\phi)}$$


- 4 \mathbf{z}_{rt} is as given in the main manuscript.

5 1 Setup


6 The study period is 1st January 2021 to 30th November 2021 given by ISO weeks
7 2020-53 to 2021-48, both weeks included. This is a deviation from the protocol. The new
8 study period is chosen on the basis of the epidemic calendar. This is similar to influenza
9 research in the northern hemisphere; we want our years to start and end such that the en-
10 tire expected wave is captured in a single year. Furthermore, the latter cut-off was chosen
11 due to the presence of Omicron variant COVID-19 in the original study period. The rea-
12 son for this is that the vaccines considered in this work were not created with this variant
13 in mind and may provide less protection against this disease. The study period covers 49
14 observations.

15 1.1 Outcome

16 The outcome variable is cases. Here we consider all cases (i.e. not limited to hospitali-
17 sations). The cases are not equally distributed across cantons:




18



19

20 Taking into account that different cantons have different populations, differences in
 21 burden of disease are still evident




22

23 1.2 Covariates


24 The vaccination coverage looks as follows

Coverage (second dose and booster with waning taken into account)



25


Vaccination coverage




26

27

Transformed by $f(x) = \log(1 - x)$ this looks like



28



29

30 2 Results overview

31 The following table provides the estimated effects of vaccination coverage for models
 32 with and without time-varying transmission weights.

```
## ! Non-convergence message from optimizer: iteration limit reached without converge
## Update of regression coefficients in iteration 1 unreliable
## ! Non-convergence message from optimizer: iteration limit reached without converge
## Update of regression coefficients in iteration 1 unreliable
```

Weights	Model	Endemic	Epidemic	ℓ	DSS
Constant	Neither			-7198.294	15.253
Constant	Endemic	4.401 (SE 1.343)		-7190.34	15.337
Constant	Epidemic		3.251 (SE 0.216)	-7096.772	15.236
Constant	Both	1.677 (SE 1.038)	3.206 (SE 0.216)	-7093.356	15.241
Varying	Neither			-7091.831	13.787
Varying	Endemic	3.312 (SE 1.035)		-7084.242	13.742
Varying	Epidemic		2.688 (SE 0.201)	-7010.947	17.084
Varying	Both	1.739 (SE 0.846)	2.642 (SE 0.2)	-7006.704	16.988

33

34 2.1 Time-constant regional transmission weights



35

First we present the results of the modelling with the time-constant transmission weights.


	neither	endemic	epidemic	both
$\gamma_{\sin(2\pi t/52)}^\phi$	0.405 (SE 0.043)	0.43 (SE 0.043)	-0.132 (SE 0.053)	-0.123 (SE 0.053)
$\gamma_{\cos(2\pi t/52)}^\phi$	0.335 (SE 0.025)	0.352 (SE 0.025)	0.45 (SE 0.026)	0.451 (SE 0.026)
$\gamma_{\text{gravity}}^\phi$	0.915 (SE 0.043)	0.918 (SE 0.043)	0.984 (SE 0.036)	0.984 (SE 0.036)
$\gamma_{\text{time}}^\phi$	0.029 (SE 0.002)	0.03 (SE 0.002)	0.087 (SE 0.004)	0.086 (SE 0.004)
$\alpha_{\text{region}}^\phi$	-1.568 (SE 0.17)	-1.57 (SE 0.171)	0.03 (SE 0.176)	0.01 (SE 0.177)
$\gamma_{\sin(2\pi t/52)}^\nu$	-9.468 (SE 0.69)	-11.773 (SE 1.015)	-9.282 (SE 0.487)	-10.29 (SE 0.795)
$\gamma_{\cos(2\pi t/52)}^\nu$	-3.993 (SE 0.499)	-4.646 (SE 0.534)	-3.623 (SE 0.317)	-3.991 (SE 0.393)
γ_{time}^ν	-0.467 (SE 0.045)	-0.446 (SE 0.042)	-0.424 (SE 0.03)	-0.426 (SE 0.03)
$\alpha_{\text{region}}^\nu$	2.932 (SE 0.492)	4.259 (SE 0.593)	3.36 (SE 0.339)	3.751 (SE 0.423)
ψ	0.141 (SE 0.006)	0.138 (SE 0.006)	0.119 (SE 0.005)	0.118 (SE 0.005)
$\beta^{(\nu)}$		4.401 (SE 1.343)		1.677 (SE 1.038)
$\beta^{(\phi)}$			3.251 (SE 0.216)	3.206 (SE 0.216)

36


37




38




39




40




41




42




43




44




45




46




47




48




49




50




51




52




53




54




55




56




57




58




59




60




61



62




63



64

65 **2.2 Time-varying regional transmission weights**


66 Now the model contains the time-varying transmission weights. A snapshot is shown
 67 below




68

	neither	endemic	epidemic	both
$\gamma_{\sin(2\pi t/52)}^\phi$	0.674 (SE 0.04)	0.687 (SE 0.039)	0.247 (SE 0.049)	0.255 (SE 0.049)
$\gamma_{\cos(2\pi t/52)}^\phi$	0.708 (SE 0.023)	0.722 (SE 0.023)	0.818 (SE 0.024)	0.821 (SE 0.024)
$\gamma_{\text{gravity}}^\phi$	0.779 (SE 0.033)	0.782 (SE 0.033)	0.838 (SE 0.029)	0.838 (SE 0.029)
$\gamma_{\text{time}}^\phi$	0.036 (SE 0.002)	0.036 (SE 0.002)	0.085 (SE 0.004)	0.084 (SE 0.004)
$\alpha_{\text{region}}^\phi$	0.798 (SE 0.131)	0.802 (SE 0.13)	2.118 (SE 0.15)	2.099 (SE 0.15)
$\gamma_{\sin(2\pi t/52)}^\nu$	-9.588 (SE 0.564)	-11.467 (SE 0.832)	-9.393 (SE 0.425)	-10.438 (SE 0.669)
$\gamma_{\cos(2\pi t/52)}^\nu$	-3.972 (SE 0.402)	-4.586 (SE 0.45)	-3.621 (SE 0.281)	-4.004 (SE 0.342)
γ_{time}^ν	-0.48 (SE 0.036)	-0.475 (SE 0.035)	-0.446 (SE 0.026)	-0.448 (SE 0.026)
$\alpha_{\text{region}}^\nu$	3.208 (SE 0.397)	4.092 (SE 0.471)	3.575 (SE 0.294)	3.982 (SE 0.358)
ψ	0.117 (SE 0.005)	0.115 (SE 0.005)	0.101 (SE 0.005)	0.101 (SE 0.005)
$\beta(\nu)$		3.312 (SE 1.035)		1.739 (SE 0.846)
$\beta(\phi)$			2.688 (SE 0.201)	2.642 (SE 0.2)


69




70




71




72




73




74




75




76




77




78




79




80




81




82




83




84




85




86




87




88




89




90




91




92




93




94



95



96




97


98 3 Scenario analysis

99 Now we consider the effects of vaccination coverage which is the maximum across re-
 100 gions, $\max_r x_{rt}$

Coverage (second dose and booster with waning taken into account)



101



102


103 3.1 Predicted cases

104 Under the assumption that the study period covers the outbreak, we calculate the pre-
 105 dicted number of COVID-19 cases under the alternative vaccination coverage scenario
 106 scenario. This is using the same methods we have considered in previous work [see 2–4]. The
 107 final size of the outbreak is given (Table 1). The weekly predicted cases for the model with
 108 vaccination coverage in the endemic component with time-varying weights are presented as
 109 this was the best fitting model as measured by DSS. We compare the predictions under the
 110 true vaccination coverage (as observed by BAG) and the alternative scenario of maximum
 111 coverage. The ratio is the ratio of predicted cases under the alternative vaccination cover-
 112 age scenario against predicted cases under the observed vaccination coverage scenario.


113 Below we show predicted cases under the two vaccination coverages (as observed and
 114 maximum coverage across regions) and ratio between the two

Table 1: Final size estimates based on path forecasts


	Original coverage				Alternative coverage		
	True	Endemic	Epidemic	Both	Endemic	Epidemic	Both
AG	24208	42919	23073	22502	31254	8402	6924
AI	1288	1925	1339	1292	1385	192	154
AR	3687	4795	3086	2988	3481	537	432
BE	37976	58133	28781	28026	42970	11296	9738
BL	10983	16992	9262	8999	12751	3810	3410
BS	7531	11523	5482	5341	8757	3007	2724
FR	10182	21343	9765	9495	15612	3234	2659
GE	19107	41614	21638	21308	30515	9968	8516
GL	2413	3541	2433	2423	2407	790	589
GR	9279	13867	7458	7290	10029	2480	2012
JU	2586	5798	3493	3410	4168	879	695
LU	18050	30844	16897	16602	22215	5761	4676
NE	4708	11888	5779	5611	8727	2022	1693
NW	2377	3684	2027	1969	2681	469	381
OW	2571	4049	2491	2430	2898	486	376
SG	30828	43552	27724	27038	31215	7094	5608
SH	3411	5272	2966	2884	3897	1087	938
SO	9357	16315	8919	8702	11941	3390	2856
SZ	10431	15106	10235	10068	10690	2467	1902
TG	16314	20355	13565	13226	14548	3399	2709
TI	6105	16835	8746	8485	12644	3754	3341
UR	1860	3762	2497	2410	2747	404	333
VD	23841	56845	25277	24551	42101	10648	9175
VS	10502	24863	13690	13375	18077	4157	3441
ZG	5337	9020	4908	4759	6702	2055	1775
ZH	55763	97121	44679	42971	73768	23259	20912




115




116




117




118




119




120




121




122




123




124




125




126




127




128




129




130




131




132




133




134




135




136




137




138



139



140



141

142 References

- 143 [1] M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar and L. Held. STUDY PROTOCOL: The COVID-19 vaccina-
 144 tion campaign in Switzerland and its impact on disease spread. *Open Science Founda-*
 145 *tion*, 2022. DOI:[10.17605/OSF.IO/6X4VK](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/6X4VK).
- 146 [2] M. Grimée, M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar (joint first authors), F. Hofmann, and L. Held.
 147 Modelling the effect of a border closure between Switzerland and Italy on the spa-
 148 tiotemporal spread of COVID-19 in Switzerland. *Spatial Statistics*, page 100552, 2021.
 149 DOI:[10.1016/j.spasta.2021.100552](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spasta.2021.100552).
- 150 [3] M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar, F. Hoffmann, and L. Held. Assessing the effect of school
 151 closures on the spread of COVID-19 in Zurich. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*
 152 *Series A*, 2022. DOI:[10.1111/rssa.12910](https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12910).
- 153 [4] M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar, F. Hofmann, S. Meyer, and L. Held (joint last authors).
 154 Endemic-epidemic modelling of school closure to prevent spread of COVID-19 in

155 Switzerland (protocol available at DOI:[10.17605/osf.io/qh3gd](https://doi.org/10.17605/osf.io/qh3gd)). *medRxiv*, 2023.

156 DOI:[10.1101/2023.03.21.23287519](https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.21.23287519).