

1  
2 Immune boosting bridges leaky and polarized  
3 vaccination models

4  
5 Sang Woo Park<sup>1,\*</sup>, Michael Li<sup>2,3</sup>, C. Jessica E. Metcalf<sup>1,4</sup>, Bryan T.  
6 Grenfell<sup>1,4</sup>, Jonathan Dushoff<sup>3,5,6</sup>

7 **1** Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University,  
8 Princeton, NJ, USA

9 **2** Public Health Risk Science Division, National Microbiology Laboratory,  
10 Public Health Agency of Canada, Guelph, Ontario, Canada

11 **3** Department of Mathematics & Statistics, McMaster University,  
12 Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

13 **4** Princeton School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton  
14 University, Princeton, NJ, USA

15 **5** Department of Biology, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

16 **6** M. G. DeGroot Institute for Infectious Disease Research, McMaster  
17 University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

18 \*Corresponding author: [swp2@princeton.edu](mailto:swp2@princeton.edu)

19 **Abstract**

20 Two different epidemiological models of vaccination are commonly used in  
21 dynamical modeling studies. The leaky vaccination model assumes that all  
22 vaccinated individuals experience a reduced force of infection by the same  
23 amount. The polarized vaccination model assumes that some fraction of vac-  
24 cinated individuals are completely protected, while the remaining fraction re-  
25 mains completely susceptible; this seemingly extreme assumption causes the  
26 polarized model to always predict lower final epidemic size than the leaky  
27 model under the same vaccine efficacy. However, the leaky model also makes  
28 an implicit, unrealistic assumption: vaccinated individuals who are exposed  
29 to infection but not infected remain just as susceptible as they were prior  
30 to exposures (i.e., independent of previous exposures). To resolve the inde-  
31 pendence assumption, we introduce an immune boosting mechanism, through  
32 which vaccinated, yet susceptible, individuals can gain protection without de-  
33 veloping a transmissible infection. The boosting model further predicts iden-  
34 tical epidemic dynamics as the polarized vaccination model, thereby bridging

35 the differences between two models. We further develop a generalized vac-  
36 cination model to explore how the assumptions of immunity affect epidemic  
37 dynamics and estimates of vaccine effectiveness.

## 38 **Significance statement**

39 Different assumptions about the long- and medium-term effects of protective  
40 vaccination can predict sharply different epidemiological dynamics. However,  
41 there has been limited discussion about which assumptions are more realistic  
42 and therefore more appropriate for making public health decisions. Here, we  
43 show that the differences between the two most common assumptions (the  
44 “leaky” and “polarized” vaccination models) are bridged by immune boost-  
45 ing, a mechanism by which individuals who resist infectious challenge due  
46 to partial immunity have their immunity increased. We demonstrate that  
47 this mechanism has important implications for measuring vaccine effective-  
48 ness. Our study challenges fundamental assumptions about commonly used  
49 vaccination models and provides a novel framework for understanding the  
50 epidemiological impact of vaccination.

## 51 Introduction

52 Vaccination plays a critical role in controlling infectious disease outbreaks by  
53 protecting against new infections and associated disease (Iwasaki and Omer,  
54 2020). In particular, if a critical vaccination threshold is reached, the re-  
55 production number (defined as the average number of secondary infections  
56 caused by an infected individual) is reduced to below 1, and future epidemics  
57 can be prevented (Anderson and May, 1985). But reaching a critical vacci-  
58 nation threshold can be challenging, and vaccines often provide imperfect  
59 protections (Gandon et al., 2003; Anderson et al., 2020).

60 There are two main ways of modeling vaccines with imperfect protec-  
61 tions: “leaky” and “all-or-nothing” vaccine (Smith et al., 1984). The leaky  
62 vaccination model assumes that vaccinated individuals experience a reduced  
63 force of infection (e.g., multiplied by a factor  $1 - VE_L < 1$ ). The “all-or-  
64 nothing” vaccination model assumes that the proportion  $VE_P$  of vaccinated  
65 individuals are completely protected and the remaining proportion  $1 - VE_P$   
66 of vaccinated individuals are completely susceptible. This model is analogous  
67 to the polarized immunity model, in which infection from one strain gives  
68 complete or no protection against other strains (Gog and Grenfell, 2002)—we  
69 thus refer to this model as the polarized vaccination model (Gomes et al.,  
70 2014). Here, both  $VE_L$  and  $VE_P$  represent vaccine efficacy, which we define  
71 as the proportion of people protected from their first challenge.

72 When these two models are used with the same nominal vaccine efficacy  
73  $VE_L = VE_P$ , they predict different epidemic dynamics, including the final  
74 size (Smith et al., 1984): for high force of infection, almost all individuals  
75 eventually get infected in the leaky model, whereas many individuals are  
76 permanently protected in the polarized model. Modelers tend to rely on the  
77 leaky assumption, including throughout the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (Dyson  
78 et al., 2021; Gozzi et al., 2021; Marziano et al., 2021; Matrajt et al., 2021;  
79 Park et al., 2022) with some exceptions (Bubar et al., 2021; Buckner et al.,  
80 2021). Various reasons have been given, but most likely is a combination of  
81 convenience and tradition.

82 Both models represent simplifications of reality. The leaky model in  
83 particular overlooks a potentially important mechanism: individuals in this  
84 model do not lose any susceptibility when (implicitly) exposed to a challenge  
85 that does not result in infection. In fact, vaccinated individuals who success-  
86 fully fight off exposures can experience immune boosting, thus becoming less  
87 susceptible to future infections without becoming infectious or developing

88 symptoms from the exposure (Lavine et al., 2011; Yang et al., 2020).

89 In this study, we compare different approaches to dynamical modeling of  
90 vaccination and immunity. First, we construct a model with leaky vaccina-  
91 tion and boosting, and show that the transmission dynamics of this model  
92 can bridge from the dynamics of the standard leaky model (with no boosting)  
93 to those of the polarized model (with perfect boosting). Then, we construct  
94 a generalized vaccination model, which includes all three mechanisms, and  
95 explore its dynamics. Finally, we use our framework to compare measures of  
96 vaccine efficacy.

## 97 **Mathematical models of vaccine-induced im-** 98 **munity**

Throughout the paper, we assume that a population mixes homogeneously and that there is no loss of immunity; the latter assumption essentially corresponds to focusing on a single outbreak. We begin with a standard SIR model with a leaky vaccine, in which all vaccinated individuals experience a reduced force of infection by a factor of  $1 - \text{VE}_L$ :

$$\frac{dS_u}{dt} = -\lambda(t)S_u - \rho S_u \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dI_u}{dt} = \lambda(t)S_u - \gamma_u I_u \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dR_u}{dt} = \gamma_u I_u \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dS_v}{dt} = -(1 - \text{VE}_L)\lambda(t)S_v + \rho S_u \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dI_v}{dt} = (1 - \text{VE}_L)\lambda(t)S_v - \gamma_v I_v \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{dR_v}{dt} = \gamma_v I_v \quad (6)$$

99 where subscripts  $u$  and  $v$  indicate the unvaccinated and vaccinated individu-  
100 als;  $\lambda$  represents the baseline force of infection experienced by unvaccinated  
101 individuals;  $\rho$  represents vaccination rate;  $\gamma$  represents the recovery rate;  
102 and  $\text{VE}_L$  represents the vaccine efficacy, which also captures the amount of  
103 reduction in the probability of infection. This kind of model is sometimes  
104 called “history-based”, since susceptibility of an individual depends only on




Figure 1: **A schematic diagram of four different vaccination models.**  $S$  represents susceptible individuals.  $I$  represents infected individuals.  $R$  represents recovered individuals.  $\lambda$  represents force of infection.  $\rho$  represents the rate of vaccination.  $p$  represents vaccine efficacy.  $\gamma$  represents recovery rate.  $\theta$  represents the proportion of individuals that remain partially susceptible after vaccination.  $q$  represents the proportion of unsuccessful challenges that result in immune boosting. Subscripts  $u$  and  $v$  represents unvaccinated and vaccinated.

105 their history of infections (or vaccination) (Gog and Grenfell, 2002; Gog and  
 106 Swinton, 2002; Kucharski et al., 2016).

Conversely, the polarized vaccination model assumes that a proportion  $VE_p$  of vaccinated individuals become fully immune, whereas the remaining

proportion  $1 - \text{VE}_P$  remain susceptible:

$$\frac{dS_u}{dt} = -\lambda(t)S_u - \rho S_u \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{dI_u}{dt} = \lambda(t)S_u - \gamma_u I_u \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{dR_u}{dt} = \gamma_u I_u \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{dS_v}{dt} = -\lambda(t)S_v + (1 - \text{VE}_P)\rho S_u \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{dI_v}{dt} = \lambda(t)S_v - \gamma_v I_v \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{dR_v}{dt} = \gamma_v I_v + \text{VE}_P \rho S_u \quad (12)$$

107 This is the approach used in “status-based” models of cross immunity—such  
108 models keep track of immune statuses of individuals, rather than their in-  
109 fection histories (Gog and Grenfell, 2002; Gog and Swinton, 2002; Kucharski  
110 et al., 2016). For this model, the parameter  $\text{VE}_P$  is the measure of vaccine  
111 efficacy.

112 These two widely used models have important dynamical differences. For  
113 a given set of shared parameters, and the same value of vaccine efficacy, initial  
114 dynamics will be the same, but the permanent protection of individuals in  
115 the polarized model will always result in a lower final outbreak size than  
116 the leaky vaccination model. When both  $\text{VE}$  and the initial value of  $\mathcal{R}$  are  
117 relatively high, this difference is large.

To better understand this gap, we consider an immune-boosting model. The leaky vaccination model assumes that vaccinated individuals are challenged with a lower force of infection  $(1 - \text{VE}_L)\lambda(t)$ , but in general it is not realistic to assume that challenges would completely disappear only because of immune status. In a homogeneously mixing population, we expect both vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals to be challenged with identical forces of infection  $\lambda$ . Therefore, the leaky vaccination model implicitly assumes that vaccinated individuals have an *independent* probability  $(1 - \text{VE}_L)$  of infection for every challenge. Instead, the immune-boosting model assumes that unsuccessful challenges elicit immune response, moving individuals from  $S_v$  to  $R_v$  compartment at rate  $\text{VE}_L\lambda(t)$  and thereby breaking the independence

assumption of the leaky vaccine model:

$$\frac{dS_u}{dt} = -\lambda(t)S_u - \rho S_u \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{dI_u}{dt} = \lambda(t)S_u - \gamma_u I_u \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{dR_u}{dt} = \gamma_u I_u \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{dS_v}{dt} = -\lambda(t)S_v + \rho S_u \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{dI_v}{dt} = (1 - \text{VE}_L)\lambda(t)S_v - \gamma_v I_v \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{dR_v}{dt} = \text{VE}_L\lambda(t)S_v + \gamma_v I_v \quad (18)$$

118 In this model, both unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals are subject to  
119 identical forces of infection, which represent the per capita rate of challenges,  
120 but the outcome of challenges differ.

121 The epidemiological dynamics (i.e., trajectories of  $I_u$  and  $I_v$ ) predicted  
122 by the immune-boosting model (based on leaky vaccination) and the polar-  
123 ized vaccination model are identical: both models assume that individuals  
124 become vaccinated at rate  $\rho$  and move out of the  $S_v$  compartment at rate  
125  $\lambda$  and only differ in when individuals get sorted based on the result of their  
126 next challenge. This equivalence allows us to bridge the difference between  
127 the leaky and polarized vaccination models. The equivalence holds regard-  
128 less of infection characteristics of vaccinated individuals (i.e., the duration  
129 of their infection and their transmissibility). In Supplementary Materials,  
130 we further show that epidemic dynamics are independent of the shape of the  
131 susceptibility distribution under immune boosting (and instead only depends  
132 on the mean susceptibility); under a leaky vaccination model, however, epi-  
133 demic dynamics are sensitive to the susceptibility distribution (Gomes et al.,  
134 2014).

Finally, we consider a generalized model that encompasses all three mech-  
anisms above (dichotomous vaccine responses, partial protection, and im-

mune boosting):

$$\frac{dS_u}{dt} = -\lambda(t)S_u - \rho S_u \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{dI_u}{dt} = \lambda(t)S_u - \gamma_u I_u \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{dR_u}{dt} = \gamma_u I_u \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{dS_v}{dt} = -[1 - (1 - q)\text{VE}_L]\lambda(t)S_v + (1 - \text{VE}_P)\rho S_u \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{dI_v}{dt} = (1 - \text{VE}_L)\lambda(t)S_v - \gamma_v I_v \quad (23)$$

$$\frac{dR_v}{dt} = \text{VE}_P\rho S_u + q\text{VE}_L\lambda(t)S_v + \gamma_v I_v \quad (24)$$

135 This model includes one new parameter,  $q$ , which represents the proportion  
 136 of unsuccessful challenges that result in immune boosting. When  $q = 0$  (i.e.,  
 137 in the absence of boosting), setting  $\text{VE}_P = 0$  gives us the leaky vaccination  
 138 model. When  $q = 1$  (i.e., in the presence of full boosting), setting  $\text{VE}_P = 0$   
 139 gives us the immune-boosting model, whereas setting  $\text{VE}_L = 0$  gives us the  
 140 polarized vaccination model. The relationship between these four models are  
 141 summarized in Fig. 1. The generalized vaccination model has a combined  
 142 vaccine efficacy of  $\text{VE} = 1 - (1 - \text{VE}_L)(1 - \text{VE}_P)$ . We later analyze the  
 143 dynamics of the generalized vaccination model while keeping  $\text{VE}$  fixed.

## 144 Model simulations

145 We begin by comparing the dynamics of three individual models: leaky vacci-  
 146 nation, polarized vaccination, and immune-boosting models. As an example,  
 147 we consider a homogeneously mixing population. In this case, the force of  
 148 infection is given by:

$$\lambda = \beta_u I_u + \beta_v I_v \quad (25)$$

149 For simplicity, we assume that, once infected, both unvaccinated and vac-  
 150 cinated individuals transmit at the same rate  $\beta_u = \beta_v = 0.5/\text{day}$  for an  
 151 average of  $1/\gamma = 5$  days. We also assume that  $\phi = 0.5$  proportion of in-  
 152 dividuals are vaccinated at the beginning of an epidemic with 60% efficacy  
 153 ( $\text{VE}_P$  or  $\text{VE}_L = 0.6$ ) and that vaccination does not continue during the out-  
 154 break ( $\rho = 0$ ). For the leaky vaccination model and the immune-boosting



155 model, we set  $S_v(0) = 1 - \phi$  and  $R_v(0) = \phi$ . For consistency, we then  
156 set  $S_v(0) = \phi(1 - \text{VE}_P)$  and  $R_v(0) = \phi\text{VE}_P$  as our initial condition for the  
157 polarized vaccination model.

158 Fig. 2 compares epidemiological (A–C) and immune-status (D–F) trajec-  
159 tories predicted by the three models. As explained earlier, the leaky vac-  
160 cination model predicts more infections among vaccinated individuals than  
161 the other two models, which predict identical incidence trajectories. The  
162 leaky vaccination model also predicts more among unvaccinated individuals  
163 because a larger outbreak among vaccinated individuals causes unvaccinated  
164 individuals to experience a greater forces of infection over time.

165 We further find that all three models predict different immune-status tra-  
166 jectories. (Fig. 2D–F). Here, we do not distinguish the sources of antibodies  
167 (whether derived from natural infections or vaccinations) and assume that  
168 individuals in  $R_u$ ,  $S_v$ , and  $R_v$  compartments are seropositive, except in the  
169 case of polarized vaccination: in such case, we assume individuals in the  $S_v$   
170 compartment are seronegative because they have not retained any immunity  
171 from the vaccination. The leaky vaccination model predicts the largest out-  
172 break and therefore the highest levels of seroprevalence (89.7% by the end of  
173 the simulation). The immune-boosting model predicts lower seroprevalence  
174 (85.6%), reflecting the lower final size, while the polarized vaccination model  
175 predicts a still lower seroprevalence (79.9%) because of our assumption that  
176 people not protected by polarized vaccination do not are not seropositive.

177 We next use the generalized vaccination model to further investigate  
178 how the final size of the an epidemic among vaccinated individuals depends  
179 on assumptions about vaccine-derived immunity across a wide range of as-  
180 sumptions about the basic reproduction number  $\mathcal{R}_0$  and vaccine efficacy  $\text{VE}$   
181 (Fig. 3). In particular, we factor vaccine efficacy  $\text{VE}$  in terms of leaky vaccine  
182 efficacy  $\text{VE}_L$  and polarized vaccine efficacy  $\text{VE}_P$ , and consider an interme-  
183 diate case, in which  $\text{VE}_L = \text{VE}_P = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \text{VE}}$ , as well as the extreme  
184 cases, in which case  $\text{VE}_L = \text{VE}$  or  $\text{VE}_P = \text{VE}$ . First, when  $\text{VE}_L = \text{VE}$ , all  
185 vaccinated individuals have identical susceptibility; in this case, increasing  
186 the amount of boosting  $q$  reduces the final size as expected (see first column  
187 of Fig. 3). We observe biggest effects of boosting at intermediate vaccine  
188 efficacy,  $\text{VE}$ , and high basic reproduction number,  $\mathcal{R}_0$  (see bottom left panel  
189 of Fig. 3). When vaccine efficacy is too low (or too high), then boosting  
190 has negligible effects because virtually everyone (or virtually no one) gets  
191 infected. As we increase  $\mathcal{R}_0$ , the leaky vaccination model predicts that all  
192 vaccinated individuals will eventually get infected. On the other hand, the





Figure 2: **Simulations of three different vaccination models.** (A–C) Incidence of infection among unvaccinated (blue solid) and vaccinated (red dashed) individuals. (D–F) Immune status over time (compartments  $R_u$ ,  $S_v$ , and  $R_v$ ). The  $S_v$  compartment is not included in the polarized vaccination model because it represents a set of individuals who have not retained any immunity from vaccination. Simulations are performed assuming  $\beta_u = \beta_v = 0.5/\text{day}$  for an average infectious periods of  $1/\gamma = 5$  days. We also assume that  $\phi = 0.5$  proportion of individuals are vaccinated at the beginning of an epidemic with 60% efficacy ( $VE_P = VE_L = 0.6$ ) and that vaccination does not continue during the outbreak ( $\rho = 0$ ).

193 final size predicted by the immune-boosting model cannot be greater than  
 194  $1 - VE$ . As we increase  $VE_P$  (and decrease  $VE_L$  accordingly), the generalized  
 195 vaccination model collapses to the polarized vaccination model, and the final  
 196 size becomes insensitive to the boosting parameter  $q$ .

197 So far, we have limited our discussions to vaccine efficacy, which we de-  
 198 fined as the proportion of people protected from their first challenge. We  
 199 distinguish this from vaccine *effectiveness*, which is measured empirically  
 200 (Halloran et al., 2009). Here, we compare two ways of estimating vaccine  
 201 effectiveness: using cumulative incidence or instantaneous hazard. Several  
 202 factors can cause vaccine effectiveness to systematically differ from vaccine  
 203 efficacy—in our case, the main reason is the fact that some vaccinated indi-  
 204 viduals may be challenged multiple times.



**Figure 3: Sensitivity of the final size of an outbreak among vaccinated individuals to assumptions about vaccine-derived immunity**  
 Final size of an outbreak was calculated by simulating the generalized vaccination model for 220 days. All other parameters are the same as in Fig. 2.

Cumulative incidence refers to the cumulative proportion of infections among unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals; this is commonly used for measuring the vaccine effectiveness in real outbreaks (Farrington, 1993). Since we are modeling a single epidemic without a loss of immunity or multiple infections, we consider the reduction in cumulative incidence throughout the entire epidemic. To do so, we add two additional compartments, which keep track of cumulative incidence among unvaccinated  $C_u$  and vaccinated

$C_v$  individuals:

$$\frac{dC_u}{dt} = \lambda S_u \quad (26)$$

$$\frac{dC_v}{dt} = (1 - \text{VE}_L)\lambda S_v \quad (27)$$

Since we are neglecting vaccinations that occur during the outbreak ( $\rho = 0$ ), the cumulative proportion of infections among vaccinated  $p_v(t)$  and unvaccinated  $p_u(t)$  individuals can be expressed as:

$$p_u(t) = C_u(t)/S_u(0) \quad (28)$$

$$p_v(t) = C_v(t)/S_v(0) \quad (29)$$

205 Then, the estimated vaccine effectiveness at time  $t$  is:

$$1 - \frac{p_v(t)}{p_u(t)}. \quad (30)$$

206 On the other hand, instantaneous hazard refers to the per-capita rate at  
207 which unvaccinated  $h_u(t)$  and vaccinated  $h_v(t)$  individuals get infected if they  
208 have not yet been infected yet. These quantities can be calculated by dividing  
209 the incidence of new infection by the number of uninfected individuals. The  
210 per-capita rate of infection  $h_v(t)$  among vaccinated individuals is then given  
211 by:

$$h_v(t) = \frac{(1 - \text{VE}_L)\lambda(t)S_v(t)}{S_v(0) - C_v(t)}, \quad (31)$$

212 where  $S_v(0) - C_v(t) \geq S_v(t)$  because vaccinated individuals can leave the  $S_v(t)$   
213 compartment via boosting; in other words, we are assuming that boosting is  
214 not observed, and that boosted individuals are neither counted as infected,  
215 nor removed from the denominator. The per-capita rate of infection  $h_u(t)$   
216 among unvaccinated individuals is straightforward:

$$h_u(t) = \frac{\lambda(t)S_u(t)}{S_u(t)} = \lambda(t). \quad (32)$$

217 Then, the estimated reduction in hazard at time  $t$  is:

$$1 - \frac{h_v(t)}{h_u(t)}. \quad (33)$$

218 We compare two estimates of vaccine effectiveness across a wide range of  
219 assumptions about vaccine-derived immunity in Fig. 4. We assume 60% effi-  
220 cacy throughout (therefore  $VE = 0.6$ ). Under polarized vaccination ( $VE_P =$   
221  $VE$ ,  $VE_L = 0$ ), the cumulative-incidence reduction always gives correct an-  
222 swers throughout the epidemic—since the susceptible pool among unvacci-  
223 nated and vaccinated individuals is depleted at the same rate  $\lambda$ , the ra-  
224 tios of their proportions of cumulative infections remain constant. Likewise,  
225 the cumulative-incidence reduction also gives correct answers under immune  
226 boosting ( $q = 1$ ).

227 Likewise, the cumulative-incidence reduction also give correct answers  
228 for the polarized vaccination model ( $VE_L = 0$ ,  $VE_P = VE$ ). However, when  
229 some challenges are not boosted ( $q < 1$ ), using cumulative incidence under-  
230 estimates the vaccine efficacy beyond the exponential growth phase. This is  
231 because vaccinated individuals who have been exposed but are not boosted  
232 or infected still remain susceptible to future infections; larger final epidemic  
233 sizes predicted by these models (Fig. 3) then translate to a seemingly lower  
234 vaccine efficacy.

235 The hazard reduction gives correct answers for the leaky vaccine model  
236 (when  $q = 0$ ,  $VE_L = VE$ , and  $VE_P = 0$ ) because the ratios of force of  
237 infection that unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals experience are always  
238 constant. However, the hazard reduction overestimates vaccine efficacy in the  
239 presence of immune boosting: since boosted individuals have not yet been  
240 infected, the susceptible pool in the vaccinated group appears to be bigger  
241 than it really is, causing the per-capita rate of infection to seem smaller.  
242 Vaccine efficacy is also overestimated for polarized vaccination for similar  
243 reasons.

244 We note that both estimates give correct answers during the exponential  
245 growth phase, regardless of underlying assumptions about immunity. More  
246 generally, we expect both estimates to give unbiased estimates as long as  
247 the depletion of susceptible pool is negligible among both vaccinated and  
248 unvaccinated individuals; in trial settings, where incidence is relatively low,  
249 this assumption may hold. But estimating vaccine effectiveness from real  
250 outbreaks is expected to be more difficult.




Figure 4: **Estimates of vaccine effectiveness using reduction in cumulative incidence (A) and hazard (B) over time.** Vaccine effectiveness was calculated by simulating the generalized vaccination model for 220 days. Colored lines represent the estimated vaccine effectiveness. Dashed lines represent the assumed vaccine efficacy. We assume  $\mathcal{R}_0 = 2.5$  and a combined efficacy of  $VE = 0.6$  throughout. All other parameters are the same as in Fig. 2.

## 251 Discussion

252 Understanding the degree to which vaccination provides protection against  
 253 infections is critical to predicting epidemic dynamics. The polarized model  
 254 has been largely neglected in epidemiological modeling, in part due to its  
 255 apparently extreme assumption that a fraction of vaccinated individuals do  
 256 not receive any protection. But the leaky vaccination model also makes an  
 257 unrealistic assumption: that vaccinated individuals who are exposed to in-

258 fections can still remain susceptible, independent of previous exposures. This  
259 assumption causes the leaky vaccination model to always predict a larger epi-  
260 demic final size. This difference can be bridged with immune boosting. With  
261 boosting, vaccinated individuals can attain protection without developing a  
262 transmissible infection. In particular, the leaky model with perfect immune-  
263 boosting model predicts identical epidemic dynamics to the polarized vacci-  
264 nation model because individuals in both cases are completely immune after  
265 surviving a single challenge.

266 Even though immune boosting and polarized vaccination models predict  
267 the same epidemic dynamics, they may have different immune-status dynam-  
268 ics. We investigate both aspects using a generalized vaccination model, which  
269 encompasses the mechanisms of all three models. The generalized vaccina-  
270 tion model includes one additional parameter, which determines the amount  
271 of immune boosting. We use this model to show that the epidemic dynamics  
272 are most sensitive to the assumptions about vaccine-derived immunity at an  
273 intermediate vaccine efficacy.

274 Finally, assumptions about vaccine-derived immunity also have impor-  
275 tant implications for estimating vaccine effectiveness. Vaccine effectiveness  
276 can be estimated based either on cumulative incidence or on hazard rates.  
277 Cumulative-incidence-based effectiveness estimates will reflect initial efficacy  
278 for polarized vaccination and immune-boosting models, whereas hazard-based  
279 estimates reflect efficacy for the leaky vaccination model. Neither method  
280 reflects efficacy for intermediate cases. These differences are driven by differ-  
281 ent assumptions about what happens when individuals are challenged more  
282 than once; thus both methods reflect efficacy when the cumulative hazard of  
283 infection is low. Conversely, interpretation of effectiveness estimates when  
284 a large fraction of unvaccinated individuals have been infected depends on  
285 (usually unknown) details of immune dynamics.

286 We rely above on a simplifying assumption that natural infections (as well  
287 as polarized vaccination and immune boosting) provide permanent protec-  
288 tion against future infections. In practice, both infection- and vaccine-derived  
289 immunity wane over time for many pathogens (Heffernan and Keeling, 2009;  
290 Lewnard and Grad, 2018; Pérez-Alós et al., 2022). When immunity wanes,  
291 polarized vaccination and immune-boosting models may not necessarily pre-  
292 dict identical dynamics. In particular, individuals who gain complete protec-  
293 tion through polarized immunity may immediately enter the  $R_v$  compartment  
294 upon vaccination, whereas those who gain complete protection through im-  
295 mune boosting take longer to enter the  $R_v$  compartment because they need

296 to be exposed to infections. These differences can translate to shorter delays  
297 between reinfection events for the polarized immunity model, which in turn  
298 can lead to dynamical differences at the population level.

299 There are also other complexities that need to be considered. For exam-  
300 ple, individuals who are boosted after vaccination can have different immu-  
301 nity profiles compared to those who attained strong protection from vacci-  
302 nation alone. These individuals also likely have different immunity profiles  
303 from those who have been infected but never been vaccinated. These dif-  
304 ferences can also cause polarized vaccination and immune-boosting models  
305 to behave differently. Despite these limitations, immune boosting, which is  
306 often neglected in epidemic models of vaccination, is still expected to be an  
307 important mechanism for understanding dynamics of many pathogens.

308 We have provided a unifying framework for understanding the impact of  
309 vaccination on the spread of infectious disease. The specifics of how vaccina-  
310 tion translates into immunization defines the population burden of infection  
311 via its effect on the epidemic final size. Yet discussion of how the two extreme  
312 models commonly used (leaky and polarized) are related has been lacking.  
313 By making this link, we both illustrate the spectrum of trajectories expected  
314 for a range of configurations, and illuminate the effects of these assumptions  
315 on medium-term vaccine effectiveness.



## 316 Supplementary Text

Here, we show that, in the presence of immune boosting, epidemic dynamics are independent of the shape of the susceptibility distribution (depending only on mean susceptibility). To do so, consider an immune-boosting model that allows for heterogeneity in vaccine-derived immunity. We assume that a vaccinated individual's susceptibility  $0 \leq p \leq 1$  follows some distribution  $f(p)$ :

$$\frac{dS_u}{dt} = -\lambda(t)S_u - \rho S_u \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{dI_u}{dt} = \lambda(t)S_u - \gamma_u I_u \quad (35)$$

$$\frac{dR_u}{dt} = \gamma_u I_u \quad (36)$$

$$\frac{\partial S_v(p)}{\partial t} = -\lambda(t)S_v(p) + f(p)\rho S_u \quad (37)$$

$$\frac{\partial I_v(p)}{\partial t} = p\lambda(t)S_v(p) - \gamma_v I_v(p) \quad (38)$$

$$\frac{dR_v}{dt} = \int_0^1 [(1-p)\lambda(t)S_v(p) + \gamma_v I_v(p)] dp \quad (39)$$

Due to immune boosting,  $S_v(p)$  is always depleted at a per-capita rate of  $\lambda(t)$  regardless of the values of  $p$ , meaning that the (normalized) distribution of  $S_v(p)$  will always follow  $f(p)$ . To obtain the dynamics of total prevalence  $I_v = \int I_v(p) dp$ , we can integrate  $\partial I_v(p)/\partial t$  across  $p$ :

$$\frac{dI_v}{dt} = \int_0^1 \left[ \frac{\partial I_v(p)}{\partial t} \right] dp \quad (40)$$

$$= \int_0^1 [p\lambda(t)S_v(p) - \gamma_v I_v(p)] dp \quad (41)$$

$$= \int_0^1 [pf(p)\lambda(t)S_v - \gamma_v I_v(p)] dp \quad (42)$$

$$= \bar{p}\lambda(t)S_v - \gamma_v I_v, \quad (43)$$

317 where  $\bar{p}$  represents the mean of the distribution  $f(p)$ , and  $S_v = \int S_v(p) dp$   
 318 represents the proportion of total susceptible, vaccinated individuals. There-  
 319 fore, the dynamics of total prevalence  $I_v$  depends only on the mean sus-

320 ceptibility  $\bar{p}$  and not on the shape of the distribution  $f(p)$  under immune  
321 boosting.

## 322 References

- 323 Anderson, R. M. and R. M. May (1985). Vaccination and herd immunity to  
324 infectious diseases. *Nature* 318(6044), 323–329.
- 325 Anderson, R. M., C. Vegvari, J. Truscott, and B. S. Collyer (2020). Chal-  
326 lenges in creating herd immunity to SARS-CoV-2 infection by mass vacci-  
327 nation. *The Lancet* 396(10263), 1614–1616.
- 328 Bubar, K. M., K. Reinholt, S. M. Kissler, M. Lipsitch, S. Cobey, Y. H.  
329 Grad, and D. B. Larremore (2021). Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine  
330 prioritization strategies by age and serostatus. *Science* 371(6532), 916–  
331 921.
- 332 Buckner, J. H., G. Chowell, and M. R. Springborn (2021). Dynamic priori-  
333 tization of COVID-19 vaccines when social distancing is limited for essen-  
334 tial workers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(16),  
335 e2025786118.
- 336 Dyson, L., E. M. Hill, S. Moore, J. Curran-Sebastian, M. J. Tildesley, K. A.  
337 Lythgoe, T. House, L. Pellis, and M. J. Keeling (2021). Possible future  
338 waves of SARS-CoV-2 infection generated by variants of concern with a  
339 range of characteristics. *Nature communications* 12(1), 1–13.
- 340 Farrington, C. (1993). Estimation of vaccine effectiveness using the screening  
341 method. *International journal of epidemiology* 22(4), 742–746.
- 342 Gandon, S., M. Mackinnon, S. Nee, and A. Read (2003). Imperfect vacci-  
343 nation: some epidemiological and evolutionary consequences. *Proceedings*  
344 *of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 270(1520),  
345 1129–1136.
- 346 Gog, J. and J. Swinton (2002). A status-based approach to multiple strain  
347 dynamics. *Journal of mathematical biology* 44(2), 169–184.
- 348 Gog, J. R. and B. T. Grenfell (2002). Dynamics and selection of many-  
349 strain pathogens. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99(26),  
350 17209–17214.
- 351 Gomes, M. G. M., M. Lipsitch, A. R. Wargo, G. Kurath, C. Rebelo, G. F.  
352 Medley, and A. Coutinho (2014). A missing dimension in measures of  
353 vaccination impacts. *PLoS pathogens* 10(3), e1003849.

- 354 Gozzi, N., P. Bajardi, and N. Perra (2021). The importance of non-  
355 pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 vaccine rollout. *PLoS*  
356 *computational biology* 17(9), e1009346.
- 357 Halloran, M., I. Longini, and C. Struchiner (2009). *Design and Analysis of*  
358 *Vaccine Studies*. Statistics for Biology and Health. Springer New York.
- 359 Heffernan, J. and M. Keeling (2009). Implications of vaccination and  
360 waning immunity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sci-*  
361 *ences* 276(1664), 2071–2080.
- 362 Iwasaki, A. and S. B. Omer (2020). Why and how vaccines work. *Cell* 183(2),  
363 290–295.
- 364 Kucharski, A. J., V. Andreasen, and J. R. Gog (2016). Capturing the dynam-  
365 ics of pathogens with many strains. *Journal of mathematical biology* 72(1),  
366 1–24.
- 367 Lavine, J. S., A. A. King, and O. N. Bjørnstad (2011). Natural immune  
368 boosting in pertussis dynamics and the potential for long-term vaccine  
369 failure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108(17), 7259–  
370 7264.
- 371 Lewnard, J. A. and Y. H. Grad (2018). Vaccine waning and mumps re-  
372 emergence in the United States. *Science translational medicine* 10(433),  
373 eaa05945.
- 374 Marziano, V., G. Guzzetta, A. Mammone, F. Riccardo, P. Poletti, F. Tren-  
375 tini, M. Manica, A. Siddu, A. Bella, P. Stefanelli, P. Pezzotti, M. Ajelli,  
376 S. Brusaferrero, G. Rezza, and S. Merler (2021). The effect of COVID-19  
377 vaccination in Italy and perspectives for living with the virus. *Nature*  
378 *Communications* 12(1), 7272.
- 379 Matrajt, L., J. Eaton, T. Leung, and E. R. Brown (2021). Vaccine opti-  
380 mization for COVID-19: Who to vaccinate first? *Science Advances* 7(6),  
381 eabf1374.
- 382 Park, S. W., J. Dushoff, B. Grenfell, and J. S. Weitz (2022). Intermedi-  
383 ate levels of asymptomatic transmission can lead to the highest levels of  
384 epidemic fatalities. *medRxiv*.

- 385 Pérez-Alós, L., J. J. A. Armenteros, J. R. Madsen, C. B. Hansen, I. Jarlhelt,  
386 S. R. Hamm, L. D. Heftdal, M. M. Pries-Heje, D. L. Møller, K. Fogh, R. B.  
387 Hasselbalch, A. Rosbjerg, S. Brunak, E. Sørensen, M. A. H. Larsen, S. R.  
388 Ostrowski, R. Frikke-Schmidt, R. Bayarri-Olmos, L. M. Hilsted, K. K.  
389 Iversen, H. Bundgaard, S. D. Nielsen, and P. Garred (2022). Modeling of  
390 waning immunity after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination and influencing factors.  
391 *Nature Communications* 13(1), 1614.
- 392 Smith, P., L. Rodrigues, and P. Fine (1984). Assessment of the protective  
393 efficacy of vaccines against common diseases using case-control and cohort  
394 studies. *International journal of epidemiology* 13(1), 87–93.
- 395 Yang, L., B. T. Grenfell, and M. J. Mina (2020). Waning immunity and  
396 re-emergence of measles and mumps in the vaccine era. *Current opinion*  
397 *in virology* 40, 48–54.