| 1 | The Balancing Role of Distribution Speed against Varying Efficacy Levels of COVID-19 |
|----|--|
| 2 | Vaccines under Variants |
| 3 | |
| 4 | Daniel Kim |
| 5 | H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of |
| 6 | Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, email: <u>dkim608@gatech.edu</u> |
| 7 | |
| 8 | Pınar Keskinocak |
| 9 | H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of |
| 10 | Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, email: <u>pinar@isye.gatech.edu</u> |
| 11 | |
| 12 | Pelin Pekgün |
| 13 | Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, |
| 14 | email: <u>pelin.pekgun@moore.sc.edu</u> |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Inci Yildirim |
| 17 | Department of Pediatrics, Section of Infectious Diseases and Global Health, Yale School of |
| 18 | Medicine and Yale Institute of Global Health, 1 Church Street, New Haven, CT 06510, |
| 19 | email: <u>inci.yildirim@yale.edu</u> |
| 20 | |
| 21 | Corresponding Author: |
| 22 | Pınar Keskinocak |
| 23 | H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of |
| 24 | Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, email: <u>pinar@isye.gatech.edu</u> |

26 Abstract

27

| 27 | |
|----|--|
| 28 | Objective: Recent mutations in SARS-CoV-2 raised concerns about diminishing vaccine |
| 29 | effectiveness against COVID-19 caused by particular variants. Even with a high initial efficacy, |
| 30 | if a vaccine's efficacy drops significantly against variants, or if it cannot be distributed quickly, it |
| 31 | is uncertain whether the vaccine can provide better health outcomes than other vaccines. Hence, |
| 32 | we evaluated the trade-offs between speed of distribution vs. efficacy of multiple vaccines when |
| 33 | variants emerge. |
| 34 | |
| 35 | Methods: We utilized a Susceptible-Infected-Recovered-Deceased (SIR-D) model to simulate the |
| 36 | impact of immunization using different vaccines with varying efficacies and assessed the level of |
| 37 | infection attack rate (IAR) under different speeds of vaccine distribution. |
| 38 | |
| 39 | Results: We found that a vaccine with low efficacy both before and after variants may |
| 40 | outperform a vaccine with high efficacy if the former can be distributed more quickly. |
| 41 | Particularly, a vaccine with 65% and 60% efficacy before and after the variants, respectively, can |
| 42 | outperform a vaccine with 95% and 90% efficacy, if its distribution is 46% to 48% faster (with |
| 43 | the selected study parameters). |
| 44 | |
| 45 | Conclusions: Our results show that speed is a key factor to a successful immunization strategy to |
| 46 | control the COVID-19 pandemic even when the emerging variants may reduce the efficacy of a |
| 47 | vaccine. |
| | |

- 49 Keywords: vaccination; disease modeling; COVID-19; vaccine efficacy; distribution speed
- 50 **Preference for colors** in Table 2, Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3: Online Only
- 51 Word Count
- 52 Word Count (Abstract): 200 Word Count (Text): 3404
- 53 Figure/Table Count: 5 References Count: 36

55 Introduction

Since the initial reports of a cluster of pneumonia cases of unidentified origin in Wuhan, 56 China, in December 2019, more than 133 million people around the world have been infected 57 58 with the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Despite the 59 development of effective vaccines in unprecedented speed, concerns have been raised on the potential reduction in efficacy of these vaccines against the new SARS-CoV-2 variants due to 60 61 possible evasion from antibody recognition [1]. Most of the vaccines were developed and tested 62 before the new variants of SARS-CoV-2 emerged. In order to reach herd immunity, effective implementation of a vaccine with sufficient efficacy against the circulating dominant variants is 63 essential. Subsequently, it becomes a trivial decision for policymakers and governments to favor 64 65 a vaccine with high efficacy for distribution. However, if the vaccine cannot be dispensed 66 quickly and/or if its efficacy drops significantly against the emerging variants compared to other 67 vaccines, the question of which vaccine should be favored is no longer trivial. Hence, the goal of 68 this study is to understand the tradeoffs between the speed of distribution vs. the change in the 69 efficacy levels of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines before and after the emergence of variants, which we 70 refer to as "initial efficacy" and "final efficacy", respectively, hereafter.

As of March 2021, twelve vaccines have received authorizations for emergency use around the world [2]. Pfizer-BioNTech's mRNA vaccine, which was the first authorized vaccine in the United States, has an initial efficacy of 95% and needs to be stored at about minus 70 degrees Celsius [3, 4]. Moderna's mRNA vaccine has an initial efficacy of 94.5% and needs to be stored at about minus 25 degrees Celsius [5]. Both mRNA vaccines require two doses with three to four weeks apart application. Johnson & Johnson's adenovirus-vectored vaccine has an average initial efficacy of 66.3%, requires only a single dose, and needs to be stored at about 2-8 degrees

78 Celsius [6]. Even though there are multiple authorized vaccines, their distribution and 79 administration have been slow. By the end of 2020, only 2.8 million people received the *first* 80 dose of COVID-19 mRNA vaccines in the United States [7]. Moreover, the Centers for Disease 81 Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that only about 10% of the population have been fully 82 vaccinated as of March 11, 2021 [8]. In addition to distributional challenges, reduction in efficacy of vaccines against emerging 83 84 variants has raised concerns. As of March 2021, three main SARS-CoV-2 variants have been 85 identified. The B.1.1.7 variant, first identified in the United Kingdom in September 2020, caused 86 more than 28% of the infected cases in the United Kingdom in late December 2020, spread 56% 87 more quickly than other variants, and has become dominant in the United States [9, 10]. Another 88 variant B.1.351, first identified in South Africa in December 2020, has become dominant,

89 making up to 90% of infections, in South Africa and has been detected in several countries. The

90 last variant P.1 has been identified in Japan from travelers from Brazil in January 2021. In

91 response, scientists and vaccine manufactures have been testing the efficacy of the vaccines

against the variants and report that the B.1.1.7 variant is neutralized by most of the vaccines,

93 supporting the retention of the efficacy [11]. However, in vitro studies show that the vaccines'

94 neutralization of B.1.351 variant is significantly lower than that of other variants [12, 13]. In

95 particular, the distribution of AstraZeneca's adenovirus-vectored vaccine in South Africa has

96 been halted due to its low efficacy against the B.1.351 variant. Similarly, Novavax states that its

protein-based vaccine is 85.6% effective against the B.1.1.7 variant but 60% effective against the
B.1.351 variant [14].

In this paper, we study the trade-offs between vaccines' efficacy levels, which are subject toreduction due to emerging variants and speed of vaccine distribution by using a modified

Susceptible-Infected-Recovered-Deceased (SIR-D) model and simulating the *infection attack rate* (IAR) under different times that the virus variants emerge. Throughout this paper, we refer to vaccine distribution as the entire distribution process of a vaccine including delivery to the dispensation sites and administration to the population. The results of this study are aimed to guide decision-makers in vaccine ordering during a pandemic when there are multiple types of vaccines, facing reduced efficacies as variants emerge.

107 Methods

108 To compare different vaccine types, we categorized the level of the vaccine efficacy into three ranges: "H" (High) if 90% or above, M (Moderate) if higher than 70% and lower than 90%, 109 and L (Low) if lower than 70%. We assumed that the final efficacy was always lower than the 110 initial efficacy. In our main simulation, we considered three initial efficacy levels ($H_i = 95\%$, 111 $M_i = 75\%$, and $L_i = 65\%$) and three final efficacy levels ($H_f = 90\%$, $M_f = 70\%$, and $L_f = 60\%$). 112 Consequently, we obtained six types of vaccines, defined by a particular initial and final efficacy, 113 114 as summarized in Table 1. These modeling choices were motivated by recent studies on vaccine 115 efficacy against variants. The recently updated analysis of Pfizer-BioNTech's phase 3 clinical 116 trials showed that their vaccine is effective against the B.1.351 variant [15]. The clinical trials of 117 Johnson & Johnson's adenovirus-vectored vaccine showed an efficacy of 57% in South Africa, where the B.1.351 variant is dominant [16]. Hence, in our model, vaccine- H_iH_f or vaccine- H_iM_f 118 may represent Pfizer-BioNTech's mRNA vaccine and vaccine- $L_i L_f$ may represent Johnson & 119 120 Johnson's adenovirus-vectored vaccine.

122 Table 1: Vaccine Efficacy

| accine Type | Initial Efficacy | Final Efficacy |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| $H_i H_f$ | 95% | 90% |
| $H_i M_f$ | 95% | 70% |
| $H_i L_f$ | 95% | 60% |
| $M_i M_f$ | 75% | 70% |
| $M_i L_f$ | 75% | 60% |
| $L_i L_f$ | 65% | 60% |

123 Even though all authorized COVID-19 vaccines, except for Johnson & Johnson's adenovirus-124 vectored vaccine, require two doses, we assumed in our simulations that all vaccines require a 125 single dose and an individual who receives an *effective* vaccine becomes immunized immediately. 126 In each simulation, only a single type of vaccine was administered, and the daily vaccine 127 distribution capacity was kept constant at $\lambda \cdot K$, where K represents base capacity and λ is a 128 multiplier. We fixed the base capacity, K_1 at 500,000, motivated from the average number of 129 vaccine recipients in each day in the United States from December 14, 2020 to March 2, 2021, 130 and we set a range of 1.0 to 3.0 with increments of 0.2 for the capacity multiplier λ to represent 131 the speed of distribution in our simulations [8].

In our study, we utilized a modified SIR-D (Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered-Deceased) compartmental model, which is a simplified mathematical model of infectious diseases. In this model, individuals are moving among compartments, and transitions between compartments are governed by ordinary differential equations given epidemiological and vaccine parameters. We implemented seven compartments: Susceptible, Immunized, Vaccinated-susceptible,

137 Symptomatic-infectious, Asymptomatic-infectious, Recovered, and Deceased. When *Susceptible*

138 population receives vaccines, they enter either the *Immunized* compartment if the vaccine is 139 effective, or the Vaccinated-susceptible compartment, otherwise. Both Susceptible and 140 Vaccinated-susceptible populations enter either the *Symptomatic-infectious* or *Asymptomatic-*141 *infectious* compartment, depending on whether they show symptoms or not, once they make 142 infectious contacts with the infected population. Symptomatic-infectious population moves to 143 either the *Recovered* or *Deceased* compartment. Asymptomatic-infectious population, on the 144 other hand, moves only to the Recovered compartment. 145 We chose the epidemiological parameter values that govern the transitions in the 146 compartment model based on the estimated SARS-CoV-2 characteristics in various studies. You 147 et al. (2020) and Byrne et al. (2020) reported that the infectious period of a symptomatic patient 148 and an asymptomatic patient was around 14 days and 8 days, respectively [17, 18]. Therefore, 149 we set the recovery rates of symptomatic patients (γ_s) and asymptomatic patients (γ_a) at 1/14 and 150 1/8, respectively. In addition, the CDC has developed COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios 151 and provided parameter values to use in a mathematical model [19]. Accordingly, we assumed 152 that 60% of the susceptible population who make infectious contacts become symptomatic. In 153 addition, we used 2.3 for the reproduction number, which is often employed by epidemiologists 154 to represent the severity of a disease. Even though the CDC's planning scenarios, lastly updated 155 in September 2020, specify a reproduction number of 2.5 as the best planning estimate, we 156 expect a lower reproduction number due to an increase in mask use and the implementation of 157 various non-pharmaceutical interventions [20]. Basu (2020) reported that the symptomatic 158 infection fatality rate (IFR-S) of COVID-19, the proportion of deaths among symptomatic 159 infected individuals, was estimated to be 1.3% [21]. Given the reproduction number of 2.3 and 160 the IFR-S, we set the symptomatic-transmission rate (β_s) to be 0.22031 and the death rate (μ) to

be 0.0032. We assumed that the asymptomatic-transmission rate (β_a) was 75% of the 161 162 symptomatic-transmission rate [22]. We used R-software to run the simulations with a 163 population size of 330 million (approximate population of the United States). Since our main 164 goal is to analyze the trade-offs between distribution speed and vaccine's efficacy under variants, 165 we started the simulation only after when the vaccine becomes available and initialized it such 166 that around 28% of the population had already been infected. Thus, we set 2.90% of the 167 population as symptomatic-infected, 1.15% as asymptomatic-infected, 24.44% as recovered, and 168 0.14% as deceased. These estimates were motivated by the *confirmed* cumulative cases and 169 deaths as of December 14, 2020, the first day of vaccine distribution in the United States [23]. However, we multiplied the number of *confirmed* infections by six and increased the number of 170 171 confirmed deaths by 35% in line with the findings of Wu et al. (2020) and Noh and Danuser 172 (2021), who reported that the number of COVID-19 confirmed cumulative cases was 173 underestimated, and Kung et al. (2020), who showed the same for confirmed deaths [24-26]. The 174 initial values in other compartments were estimated using the epidemiological parameters 175 defined previously. We ran the simulation on a one-year planning horizon under different *mutation times* (i.e., the time at which the emerging variants cause a decrease in a vaccine's 176 177 efficacy) within the range of day 5 to day 40 with a discrete step size of 5 days, and different *capacity multipliers* (λ) within the range of 1.0 to 3.0 with a discrete step size of 0.2 to capture 178 179 the vaccine distribution speed. We evaluated the impact of each vaccine type using IAR as the 180 main health outcome.

181 **Results**

We first ran our simulation without the presence of any vaccines, which gave an estimatedIAR of approximately 81% and IFR-S of 2%. The daily infection peak (i.e., the highest

184 percentage of the population who get newly infected on a single day) occurred on day 24, at

185 which 1% of the population got newly infected.

186 Table 2 shows the estimated IAR under different capacity multipliers (λ) when the mutation

- times are day 5 and day 25. We report additional results with different mutation times in
- 188 Supplemental Materials. When the mutation time is day 5, the level of IAR is between 60% and
- 189 65% when the capacity multiplier is 3.0 (1.5M doses/day) and between 72% and 75% when the
- 190 capacity multiplier is 1.0 (0.5M doses/day), depending on the selected vaccine type. When the
- 191 mutation time is day 25, the level of IAR is smaller compared to when the mutation time is day 5,
- and the decrease in IAR due to the increase in capacity multiplier is larger.
- 193 Table 2: Infection attack rate (%) under different capacity multipliers and vaccine types when

194 *mutation time is day 5 and day 25*

| Capacity | Mutation Time = Day 5 | | | | | Mutation Time = Day 25 | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Multiplier (λ) | $H_i H_f$ | $H_i M_f$ | $H_i L_f$ | $M_i M_f$ | $M_i L_f$ | $L_i L_f$ | $H_i H_f$ | $H_i M_f$ | $H_i L_f$ | $M_i M_f$ | $M_i L_f$ | $L_i L_f$ |
| 3.0 | 60.19 | 63.02 | 64.63 | 63.55 | 65.17 | 65.45 | 59.81 | 60.98 | 61.64 | 63.13 | 63.86 | 65.01 |
| 2.8 | 61.16 | 63.92 | 65.48 | 64.43 | 65.99 | 66.25 | 60.80 | 61.96 | 62.63 | 64.02 | 64.74 | 65.83 |
| 2.6 | 62.18 | 64.86 | 66.36 | 65.34 | 66.84 | 67.09 | 61.84 | 63.00 | 63.65 | 64.95 | 65.66 | 66.69 |
| 2.4 | 63.25 | 65.84 | 67.27 | 66.28 | 67.72 | 67.95 | 62.92 | 64.07 | 64.72 | 65.92 | 66.61 | 67.58 |
| 2.2 | 64.38 | 66.86 | 68.22 | 67.27 | 68.64 | 68.85 | 64.06 | 65.20 | 65.83 | 66.93 | 67.60 | 68.50 |
| 2.0 | 65.55 | 67.91 | 69.20 | 68.29 | 69.58 | 69.78 | 65.26 | 66.37 | 66.98 | 67.98 | 68.62 | 69.45 |
| 1.8 | 66.79 | 69.01 | 70.22 | 69.36 | 70.56 | 70.74 | 66.52 | 67.59 | 68.18 | 69.07 | 69.68 | 70.44 |
| 1.6 | 68.08 | 70.16 | 71.27 | 70.47 | 71.58 | 71.74 | 67.83 | 68.86 | 69.42 | 70.20 | 70.78 | 71.47 |
| 1.4 | 69.44 | 71.35 | 72.36 | 71.62 | 72.63 | 72.77 | 69.22 | 70.19 | 70.71 | 71.38 | 71.92 | 72.53 |
| 1.2 | 70.87 | 72.58 | 73.48 | 72.82 | 73.72 | 73.84 | 70.67 | 71.57 | 72.05 | 72.61 | 73.10 | 73.63 |
| 1.0 | 72.37 | 73.86 | 74.65 | 74.06 | 74.85 | 74.95 | 72.20 | 73.00 | 73.43 | 73.89 | 74.32 | 74.77 |

| 196 | Figure 1 and Figure 2 present the contour plot and the two-dimensional plot of the IAR in |
|-----|---|
| 197 | Table 2, respectively. Figure 1 shows that even vaccine- $L_i L_f$ can achieve a lower IAR than |
| 198 | vaccine- H_iH_f if the capacity multiplier of vaccine- L_iL_f is high compared to that of vaccine- H_iH_f . |
| 199 | For instance, when the capacity multiplier of vaccine- H_iH_f is 1.0 and the mutation time is day 5, |
| 200 | 72.3% of the population is infected. However, if the capacity multiplier of vaccine- $L_i L_f$ is 1.48 |
| 201 | (or higher), 72.2% (or less) of the population is infected. We present the minimum required |
| 202 | capacity multiplier of all vaccine types to achieve a lower IAR than vaccine- H_iH_f with the |
| 203 | capacity multiplier of 1.0 and 1.6 under different mutation times in Supplemental Materials. |
| 204 | Figure 3 compares the daily new infections from day 5 to day 50 with vaccine- $H_i L_f$ vs. |
| 205 | vaccine- $M_i M_f$. In this figure, the mutation time is early (on day 5) and comes before the daily |
| 206 | infection peak, and thus, vaccine- $M_i M_f$ results in a better IAR than vaccine- $H_i L_f$ for all capacity |
| 207 | multipliers. Specifically, after the peak of daily new infections is reached for each vaccine, the |
| 208 | number of daily infections drops at a faster rate when vaccine- $M_i M_f$ is administered. On the |
| 209 | other hand, when the mutation time comes after the daily infection peak (not shown in the figure), |
| 210 | vaccine- $H_i L_f$ achieves a lower IAR than vaccine- $M_i M_f$ for all capacity multipliers. |



Figure 1: Contour plot of infection attack rate under different capacity multipliers with different
vaccine types when mutation time is (a) day 5 and (b) day 25



Figure 2: Two-dimensional plot of infection attack rate under different capacity multipliers with
different vaccine types when mutation time is (a) day 5 and (b) day 25



216Figure 3: Daily new infections from day 5 to day 50 with vaccine-and vaccine-when

217 *the capacity multiplier (is 3 and the mutation time is day 5*

218 Discussion

215

219 In this study, we utilized a modified SIR-D model to simulate the trajectory of an infectious disease under the intervention of different kinds of vaccines of which efficacies decrease against 220 221 the variants of the disease. We have demonstrated that the speed of the vaccine distribution is a 222 key factor to achieve low IAR levels, even though the vaccine may have high efficacy both 223 before and after the variants emerge. There have been many studies examining the trade-offs 224 between speed and efficacy [27, 28]. These studies emphasize the importance of wide 225 vaccination coverage, which is consistent with our study's findings. However, we considered a 226 decrease in efficacy of each vaccine type in the midst of the pandemic and reaffirmed the 227 importance of a rapid implementation of vaccination even under emerging variants. 228 Our study shows that a vaccine with low initial and final efficacy levels (vaccine-) can achieve a lower IAR than a vaccine with high initial and final efficacy levels (vaccine-229) if 230 the former can be distributed more quickly than the latter, regardless of the mutation time. For

231 instance, when the mutation time was day 25 and the capacity multiplier of vaccine- H_iH_f was 232 1.0 (0.5M doses/day), 72.2% of the population got infected. If the capacity multiplier of vaccine- $L_i L_f$ was 1.47 (0.73M doses/day or higher), 72.1% (or less) of the population was infected. Even 233 234 for vaccines with the same initial efficacy, such as vaccine- H_iH_f and vaccine- H_iL_f , this result 235 remained robust—vaccine- H_iL_f with a capacity multiplier of 1.18 (0.59M doses/day) or higher achieved a lower IAR than vaccine- H_iH_f with a capacity multiplier of 1.0 (0.5M doses/day). 236 237 Since the start of the COVID-19 vaccination process, the speed of the vaccine distribution has 238 been slow due to numerous reasons, including limited and uncertain vaccine supply and various 239 logistics and storage challenges. Despite the continuing effort of increasing production capacities, 240 vaccine manufacturers, especially those who produce mRNA vaccines with new technology, 241 have been struggling to secure sufficient supply of vaccine ingredients, storage containers, and 242 more, due to the demand from billions of people around the world [29]. In addition, mRNA 243 vaccines need to be stored in ultra-cold freezers under specific expiration dates, although many 244 facilities lack or cannot afford such expensive ultra-cold freezers, leading to a limited number of 245 administration sites. Even the sites with the ability to administer these vaccine types need to 246 dispose the vaccines if they cannot be administered by the expiration date or stored at the 247 appropriate temperature [30, 31]. Unlike the mRNA vaccines, Johnson & Johnson's adenovirus-248 vectored vaccine only requires a single dose and can be stored at the same temperature as the 249 seasonal flu vaccine. These characteristics prevent vaccine wastage, enable efficient production 250 and distribution using the existing vaccine supply chain, and facilitate a faster rate of vaccination 251 [32]. Hence, despite the lower efficacy, adenovirus-vectored vaccines that have the potential for 252 faster distribution may be more beneficial.

253 Increasing the doses distributed per day, i.e., the capacity multiplier (λ), of any vaccine type is always beneficial as it reduces the size of the susceptible population and can, eventually, 254 achieve herd immunity. Our study showed that the level of IAR always decreased when the 255 256 capacity multiplier was higher, with the largest impact observed for vaccine- H_iH_f . In particular, 257 when we compared the impact of changing the capacity multiplier from 1.0 to 3.0 for vaccine-258 H_iH_f , vaccine- M_iM_f , and vaccine- L_iL_f , IAR changed from 72.20% to 59.81% for H_iH_f , from 73.89% to 63.13% for $M_i M_f$, and from 74.77% to 65.01% for $L_i L_f$, when the difference between 259 260 the initial and final efficacy was 5% for all the vaccine types and the mutation time was day 25. 261 In addition, if vaccine- H_iH_f could be distributed at a faster rate, the minimum required capacity multiplier (λ) of vaccine- L_iL_f to achieve a lower IAR than vaccine- H_iH_f was even larger. For 262 example, when the mutation time was day 25, the capacity multiplier of vaccine- $L_i L_f$ needed to 263 264 be at least 1.47 to achieve a lower IAR than vaccine- H_iH_f with the capacity multiplier of 1.0. On the other hand, when the vaccine- H_iH_f 's capacity multiplier was 1.6, the capacity multiplier of 265 vaccine- $L_i L_f$ needed to be at least 2.35. Thus, even though the difference in the capacity 266 267 multiplier of vaccine- H_iH_f was only 0.60, that of vaccine- L_iL_f was 0.88. However, increasing 268 the capacity multiplier, i.e., the speed of distribution, for vaccine- H_iH_f , which represents mRNA vaccines in our model, may be much more challenging than that for vaccine- $L_i L_f$, as described 269 270 above, including economic burden, complications in vaccination programs, and unsophisticated 271 infrastructure. In such cases, it may be more beneficial to allocate resources towards distributing 272 a lower efficacy vaccine at a faster rate as our study shows. 273 Forecasting the daily infection peak and the mutation time also plays an important role when

choosing which type of vaccine to distribute. If the mutation time comes after the daily infection
peak, a vaccine with a higher initial efficacy always achieves a lower IAR than a vaccine with

276 lower initial efficacy. However, if the mutation time comes before the daily infection peak, the 277 final efficacy level determines which vaccine type achieves a lower IAR under the same capacity 278 multiplier. For example, when we compared vaccine- H_iH_f and vaccine- M_iM_f with a capacity 279 multiplier of 1.0 for each, the daily infection peak occurred on day 22 for both vaccines. Then, 280 the administration of vaccine- $M_i M_f$, which has an initial efficacy of 75% and final efficacy of 70%, resulted in an IAR of 74.06%, whereas the administration of vaccine- $H_i L_f$, which has an 281 282 initial efficacy of 95% and final efficacy of 60%, resulted in an IAR of 74.65%. This is because 283 an effective vaccination program achieves the highest reduction in the number of new infections 284 before the daily infection peak. Afterwards, even with a higher initial efficacy, a vaccine with a 285 lower final efficacy cannot reduce the size of the susceptible population as much as a vaccine 286 with a lower initial efficacy and a higher final efficacy. Different variants of SARS-CoV-2 that 287 reduces the efficacy of the authorized vaccines have been identified and their potentially higher 288 transmissibility may cause future waves of infections. Thus, careful in vitro and clinical trials 289 against variants are essential before making decisions on vaccine ordering. 290 We acknowledge some limitations of this study. First, our SIR-D model did not capture the 291 full trajectory of SARS-CoV-2. Tindale et al. (2020) reported that the transmission of SARS-292 CoV-2 starts prior to symptom onset and Cevik et al. (2020) reported that the COVID-19 is most 293 contagious in the first five days of illness, which we did not incorporate into our model [33, 34]. 294 In addition, we assumed that the population gains immunity as soon as they receive effective 295 vaccines and that every type of vaccine requires a single dose. In practice, all the authorized 296 vaccines, except Johnson & Johnson's adenovirus-vectored vaccine, require two doses with three 297 to four weeks apart application and it may take several days to gain immunity after vaccination. 298 Moreover, we did not consider any type of non-pharmaceutical interventions. Depending on the

299 number of people who conform to the interventions, such as social distancing and mask 300 mandates, the probability of infectious contacts may vary over time. Lastly, variants may be 301 more transmissible, but we assumed a constant transmission rate in each simulation. 302 Overall, our results suggest that the administration of a vaccine with high efficacy against 303 both the original strain and the variants may not always lead to a low number of cumulative 304 infections if it cannot be distributed as quickly as other vaccine types with lower efficacies. 305 Despite the vast efforts for worldwide vaccination, the vaccine distribution has been an ongoing 306 challenge due to production shortages, economic constraints and the lack of ultra-cold-chain 307 infrastructure, which is critical to distribute some of the early-authorized vaccines. Due to these 308 challenges, especially many low- and middle-income countries have not received a single dose of 309 a vaccine as of mid-February, 2021 [35, 36]. It is critical to distribute available vaccines as 310 quickly as possible and vaccinate more people to reach herd immunity before new variants 311 spread. Our study demonstrates that a vaccine with a relatively lower efficacy can achieve at 312 least as good health outcomes as their higher efficacy counterparts, as long as it can be 313 distributed more quickly. We hope that our study provides guidance to decision makers on the tradeoffs between speed and efficacy, highlighting the critical role of speed of vaccination during 314 a pandemic as variants that decrease efficacy of vaccines emerge. 315 316 Acknowledgement

This research has been supported in part by the following Georgia Tech benefactors: William W.
George, Andrea Laliberte, Claudia L. and J. Paul Raines, and Richard E. "Rick" and Charlene
Zalesky.

Dr. İnci Yildirim reported being a member of the mRNA-1273 Study Group. Dr. Yildirim has received funding to her institution to conduct clinical research from BioFire, MedImmune, Regeneron, PaxVax, Pfizer, GSK, Merck, Novavax, Sanofi-Pasteur, and Micron. Dr. Pinar Keskinocak received funding to her institution from Merck to conduct non-clinical research. The funders played no role in the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, or in writing the manuscript.

320 **References**

- 321 1. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2020
- 322 [cited 2021 Apr. 9]; Available from: <u>https://covid19.who.int</u>.
- 323 2. Zimmer, C., J. Corum, and S.-L. Wee. Coronavirus Vaccine Tracker. New York Times
- 324 2020 Jan 9 [cited 2021 Apr. 9]; Available from:
- 325 <u>https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html</u>.
- 326 3. Pfizer. Pfizer and BioNTech Announce Vaccine Candidate Against COVID-19 Achieved
- 327 Success in First Interim Analysis from Phase-3 Study. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar. 3];
- 328 Available from: <u>https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-</u>
- 329 <u>and-biontech-announce-vaccine-candidate-against</u>.
- 4. Holm, M.R. and G.A. Poland, *Critical aspects of packaging, storage, preparation, and*
- 331 administration of mRNA and adenovirus-vectored COVID-19 vaccines for optimal
- 332 *efficacy*. Vaccine, 2021. **39**(3): p. 457.
- 333 5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine*. 2020 Dec 20,
- 334 2020 [cited 2021 Apr. 2]; Available from: <u>https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/info-</u>
- 335 <u>by-product/moderna/downloads/storage-summary.pdf</u>.
- 336 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Information About Johnson & Johnson's*
- 337 Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. 2021 Mar. 4, 2021 [cited 2021 Mar. 4]; Available from:
- 338 <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/different-vaccines/janssen.html.</u>
- 339 7. Spalding, R. and C. O'Donnell. U.S. vaccinations in 2020 fall far short of target of 20
- 340 *million people*. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar. 12]; Available from:
- 341 <u>https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-usa-vaccinations/u-s-vaccinations-</u>
- 342 <u>in-2020-fall-far-short-of-target-of-20-million-people-idUSKBN29512W</u>.

- 343 8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *COVID-19 Vaccinations in the United States*.
- 344 2020 [cited 2021 Mar. 2]; Available from: <u>https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-</u>
- 345 <u>tracker/#vaccinations</u>.
- 346 9. Lauring, A.S. and E.B. Hodcroft, *Genetic Variants of SARS-CoV-2—What Do They Mean?*
- 347 JAMA, 2021.
- 348 10. Smith-Schoenwalder, C. CDC: Coronavirus Variant First Found in U.K. Now Dominant
- 349 *Strain in U.S.* 2021 [cited 2021 Apr. 9]; Available from:
- 350 <u>https://www.usnews.com/news/health-news/articles/2021-04-07/cdc-coronavirus-variant-</u>
- 351 <u>first-found-in-uk-now-dominant-strain-in-us</u>.
- Liu, Y., et al., *Neutralizing Activity of BNT162b2-Elicited Serum—Preliminary Report.*New England Journal of Medicine, 2021.
- 12. Rauseo, A.M. and J.A. O'Halloran, What Are the Clinical Implications of the SARS-CoV-
- 355 2 Variants: 5 Things Every Cardiologist Should Know. JACC: Basic to Translational
 356 Science, 2021.
- 357 13. Sanders, R.W. and M.D. de Jong, *Pandemic moves and countermoves: vaccines and viral*358 *variants.* The Lancet, 2021.
- 359 14. Mahase, E., *Covid-19: Novavax vaccine efficacy is* 86% against UK variant and 60%
- *against South African variant*. 2021, British Medical Journal Publishing Group.
- 361 15. Pfizer. Pfizer and BioNTech Confirm High Efficacy and No Serious Safety Concerns
- 362 Through Up to Six Months Following Second Dose in Updated Topline Analysis of
- 363 *Landmark COVID-19 Vaccine Study*. 2021 [cited 2021 Apr. 1]; Available from:
- 364 https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-and-biontech-
- 365 <u>confirm-high-efficacy-and-no-serious</u>.

| 366 | 16. | Food and Drug Administration. Fact Sheet for Healthcare Providers Administering |
|-----|-----|--|
| 367 | | Vaccine (Vaccine Providers) Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) of the Janssen |
| 368 | | COVID-19 Vaccine to Prevent Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). 2021 Feb. 27, |
| 369 | | 2021. |
| 370 | 17. | You, C., et al., Estimation of the time-varying reproduction number of COVID-19 |
| 371 | | outbreak in China. International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 2020. |
| 372 | | 228 : p. 113555. |
| 373 | 18. | Byrne, A.W., et al., Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping |
| 374 | | review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19 |
| 375 | | cases. BMJ open, 2020. 10(8): p. e039856. |
| 376 | 19. | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. |
| 377 | | 2020 [cited 2021 Mar. 3]; Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019- |
| 378 | | ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html. |
| 379 | 20. | Peeples, L., Face masks: what the data say. Nature, 2020. 586(7828): p. 186-189. |
| 380 | 21. | Basu, A., Estimating The Infection Fatality Rate Among Symptomatic COVID-19 Cases |
| 381 | | In The United States: Study estimates the COVID-19 infection fatality rate at the US |
| 382 | | county level. Health Affairs, 2020. 39(7): p. 1229-1236. |
| 383 | 22. | Oran, D.P. and E.J. Topol, Prevalence of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection: a |
| 384 | | narrative review. Annals of internal medicine, 2020. 173(5): p. 362-367. |
| 385 | 23. | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID Data Tracker. 2020 [cited 2021 |
| 386 | | Mar. 2]; Available from: https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home. |
| 387 | 24. | Kung, S., et al., Underestimation of COVID-19 mortality during the pandemic. ERJ open |
| 388 | | research, 2021. 7 (1). |
| | | |

- 389 25. Wu, S.L., et al., *Substantial underestimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the United*
- 390 *States.* Nature communications, 2020. **11**(1): p. 1-10.
- 391 26. Noh, J. and G. Danuser, *Estimation of the fraction of COVID-19 infected people in US*
- 392 *states and countries worldwide*. PloS one, 2021. **16**(2): p. e0246772.
- 393 27. Paltiel, A.D., et al., Clinical Outcomes Of A COVID-19 Vaccine: Implementation Over
- 394 *Efficacy: Study examines how definitions and thresholds of vaccine efficacy, coupled with*
- 395 *different levels of implementation effectiveness and background epidemic severity,*
- *translate into outcomes.* Health Affairs, 2021: p. 10.1377/hlthaff. 2020.02054.
- 397 28. Paltiel, A.D., A. Zheng, and J.L. Schwartz, *Speed versus efficacy: quantifying potential*
- *tradeoffs in COVID-19 vaccine deployment*. Annals of internal medicine, 2021.
- 399 29. Bushwick, S. Why COVID Vaccines Are Taking So Long to Reach You. 2021 Feb. 11,
- 400 2021 [cited 2021 Mar. 6]; Available from:
- 401 <u>https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/why-covid-vaccines-are-taking-so-long-to-</u>
- 402 <u>reach-you/</u>.
- 403 30. Gabrielson, R., C. Chen, and M. Simon. *How Many Vaccine Shots Go to Waste? Several*
- 404 *States Aren't Counting*. 2021 [cited 2021 Mar. 6]; Available from:
- 405 <u>https://www.propublica.org/article/covid-vaccine-wastage</u>.
- 406 31. Farmer, B. Accidentally Trashed, Thawed or Expired: Reports of Covid Vaccine Spoilage.
- 407 2021 Mar. 4, 2021 [cited 2021 Mar. 12]; Available from:
- 408 <u>https://khn.org/news/article/covid-vaccine-waste-accidentally-thawed-expired-spoilage-</u>
- 409 <u>reports-nationwide/</u>.
- 410 32. Johnson & Johnson & Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 Vaccine Authorized by U.S. FDA for
- 411 *Emergency Use First Single-Shot Vaccine in Fight Against Global Pandemic.* 2021

| 412 | [cited 2021 Mar. 3 |]; Available from: | https://wv | ww.jnj.com/ | johnson-j | johnson-covid-19- |
|-----|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|
|-----|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|

- 413 <u>vaccine-authorized-by-u-s-fda-for-emergency-usefirst-single-shot-vaccine-in-fight-</u>
- 414 <u>against-global-pandemic</u>.
- 415 33. Tindale, L.C., et al., Evidence for transmission of COVID-19 prior to symptom onset.
- 416 Elife, 2020. **9**: p. e57149.
- 417 34. Cevik, M., et al., SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics,
- 418 *duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis.*
- 419 The Lancet Microbe, 2020.
- 420 35. Dyer, O., Covid-19: Many poor countries will see almost no vaccine next year, aid
- 421 *groups warn*. BMJ: British Medical Journal (Online), 2020. **371**.
- 422 36. Andrew, S. More than 130 countries don't have a single Covid-19 vaccine, while 10
- 423 *countries have already dispersed 75% of all vaccines, the UN says.* 2021 [cited 2021
- 424 Mar. 11]; Available from: <u>https://www.cnn.com/2021/02/18/world/united-nations-130-</u>
- 425 <u>countries-no-vaccine-trnd/index.html</u>.
- 426