- 1 Title: Likelihood of infecting or getting infected with COVID-19 as a function of vaccination status, as
- 2 investigated with a stochastic model for New Zealand (Aotearoa) for Delta and Omicron variants
- 3

4 **Date of Submission:** 29 November 2021

- 5 **Revised:** 23 February 2022
- 6
- 7 Author: Leighton M. Watson
- 8 Postdoctoral Researcher
- 9 Department of Earth Sciences
- 10 University of Oregon
- 11 Eugene, OR, USA
- 12 <u>lwatson2@uoregon.edu</u>
- 13

14 Abstract:

15 *Aim:* The New Zealand government has transitioned from the Alert Level framework, which relied on

16 government action and population level controls, to the COVID-19 Protection Framework, which relies

17 on vaccination rates and allows for greater freedoms (for the vaccinated). Under the COVID-19

18 Protection Framework and current widespread community transmission of Omicron, there is significant

19 interest in understanding the relative risk of spreading COVID-19 posed by unvaccinated, vaccinated, and

- 20 boosted individuals.
- 21

22 *Methods:* A stochastic branching process model is used to simulate the spread of COVID-19 for

23 outbreaks seeded by unvaccinated, vaccinated, or boosted individuals. The likelihood of infecting or

24 getting infected with COVID-19 is calculated based on vaccination status. The model is applied to both

the Delta and Omicron variants.

26

27 *Results:* For the Delta variant a vaccinated traveler infected with COVID-19 is 9x less likely to seed an

28 outbreak than an unvaccinated traveler infected with COVID-19, however, for the Omicron variant there

29 is little difference between outbreaks seeded by unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals (boosted

30 individuals are slightly less likely to seed large outbreaks). For the Delta variant unvaccinated individuals

31 are responsible for 87% of all infections whereas only 3% of infections are from vaccinated to vaccinated

- 32 when normalized by population. Therefore, a vaccinated individual is 6.8x more likely to be infected by
- 33 an unvaccinated individual than by a vaccinated individual. For the Omicron variant unvaccinated
- 34 individuals are responsible for 45% of all infections compared to 39% for vaccinated (two-doses) and

15% for boosted (three-doses) individuals when normalized by population. Despite the vaccine being less effective at preventing breakthrough transmission for Omicron, only 3% of all infections are from boosted to boosted individuals when normalized by population indicating that three doses of the vaccine provide good protection from infection and breakthrough transmission. *Conclusions:* This work demonstrates that most new infections are caused by unvaccinated individuals, especially for the Delta variant. These simulations illustrate the importance of vaccination in stopping individuals from becoming infected with COVID-19 and in preventing onward transmission. For Omicron, individuals vaccinated with two doses are only slightly less likely to spread COVID-19 than those who are unvaccinated. This work suggests that for the current Omicron outbreak the COVID-19 Protection Framework should potentially be updated to distinguish between those who have received two primary doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine (vaccinated individuals) and those who have received three doses (boosted individuals).

69 Introduction:

70

/0	
71	The 2021 Delta outbreak of COVID-19 in New Zealand caused the government to transition from an
72	elimination strategy to suppression, which relies heavily on vaccination rates. Since the detection of the
73	outbreak on 17 August 2021, double-dose vaccination rates have increased from approximately 22% of
74	the eligible (over 12 years old) population to 93% on 22 January 2022, prior to the detection of Omicron
75	in the community. ^{1,2,3} As a result, the COVID-19 pandemic is turning into a pandemic of the
76	unvaccinated; only 11% of hospitalizations in the Delta outbreak were fully vaccinated (defined as more
77	than one week since the second dose of the two-dose Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine). ^{1,2,3} Under the COVID-19
78	Protection Framework, which predominantly uses vaccination certificates, instead of the Alert Level
79	system, which uses population level controls, it is important to understand the relative likelihood of
80	vaccinated/boosted versus unvaccinated individuals spreading COVID-19. This is particularly applicable
81	due to the current widespread community transmission of the Omicron variant.
82	
83	Here, I use the stochastic model developed in [4] to estimate the likely number of infections caused by an
84	outbreak seeded by an unvaccinated versus vaccinated/boosted individual. This information can help
85	inform reopening decisions and restrictions on travel (e.g., requiring vaccination or a negative test prior to
86	travel). I calculate the likelihood of infecting others or getting infected with COVID-19 based on
87	vaccination status. Mathematical modeling is a useful tool for understanding these probabilities because,
88	as the number of COVID-19 cases in the community has increased, contact tracers have prioritized
89	preventing onwards transmission compared to finding the source of infections. ⁵ As a result, the likelihood
90	of infecting others or getting infected as a function of vaccination status is not available for real-world
91	cases but can be determined from model simulations. Results are shown for both the Delta and Omicron
92	variants.
93	
94	
95	Methods
96	
97	A stochastic branching process model is used to simulate the initial spread of a COVID-19 outbreak,
98	similar to previous work by [6-8]. The model tracks the number of infections and the vaccination status of
99	the infecting and infected individuals. The stochastic model used here is the same as presented in [4],

100 which focused on the Delta variant, with the pertinent details summarized below.

- 101
- 102

103	Delta
104	
105	Each infected individual infects a random number of other individuals, N, drawn from a Poisson
106	distribution. ⁶ For symptomatic individuals, the Poisson distribution is defined by $\lambda = RC$ where R is the
107	reproduction number (chosen to be 6 for the Delta variant) and C is the effectiveness of population level
108	controls (e.g., Level 1, 2, 3, or 4 in the Alert Level Framework or Green, Orange, or Red in the COVID-
109	19 Protection Framework). ⁶ For an asymptomatic individual, the Poisson distribution is defined by λ =
110	RC/2, which assumes that asymptomatic individuals infect, on average, half as many people as
111	symptomatic individuals. ⁹ In this work, I only consider $C=I$, which is the situation without any public
112	health measures.
113	
114	The generation times between an individual becoming infected and infecting N other individuals are
115	independently sampled from a Weibull distribution with $a=5.57$ and $b=4.08$ where a is the scale
116	parameter and b is the shape parameter (mean= 5.05 days and variance= 1.94 days). ¹⁰ The model assumes
117	that 33% of new infections are asymptomatic (subclinical) with the remainder symptomatic (clinical). ¹¹⁻¹³
118	
119	The Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine, which is the only COVID-19 vaccine currently being widely administered
120	in New Zealand, is assumed to be 70% effective against infection and 50% effective against transmission
121	for breakthrough infections. ^{8,14}
122	
123	High levels of community testing have been essential in identifying cases in the community and,
124	combined with contact tracing and isolation, have been effective at preventing cases that escape from
125	MIQ becoming widespread outbreaks. ¹⁵ It is unclear how testing rates will change in a highly vaccinated
126	public; vaccinated and boosted individuals may feel less need to get tested while unvaccinated individuals
127	may not want to get tested. Therefore, I focus purely on the impact of vaccination rates, particularly on
128	the early stages of an outbreak when cases may be circulating undetected, and following the approach of
129	[4], do not consider testing, contact tracing, or isolation of cases.
130	
131	Age is not accounted for in this model, either in the vaccination rollout where older individuals are more
132	likely to be vaccinated, or in the susceptibility where older individuals are more likely to experience
133	severe disease or death. Age also plays a role in transmission with young children are less likely to
134	transmit the virus ^{16,17} as well as through different ages groups having different levels of mobility and
135	hence different numbers of contacts. See [8, 14] for a New Zealand focused model that accounts for age.
136	Other limitations include not accounting for ethnicity, either in vaccination rates or differential risk

137	factors for different ethnic groups, ¹⁸ or socio-economic status; COVID-19 spreads rapidly through
138	overcrowded households as well as posing a greater risk to those who do not have the economic resources
139	to safely isolate or the ability to work-from-home. ¹⁸
140	
141	Vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals are modelled as equally likely to interact (based on the
142	vaccination rate). This is a modeling assumption that should be explored further in future work as the
143	COVID-19 Protection Framework and use of vaccine certificates means that in public settings vaccinated
144	individuals are more likely to interact with vaccinated individuals and likewise for unvaccinated
145	individuals. This clustering effect may be more apparent in private gatherings where unvaccinated
146	individuals are potentially more likely to have unvaccinated guests than vaccinated individuals are.
147	
148	Omicron
149	
150	The model described above, originally developed in [4], was focused on the Delta variant. Given the rapid

emergence and spread of Omicron in the community, I also apply the model to the Omicron variant with the following modifications.

153

154 The population is divided into unvaccinated, vaccinated (two-doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine), and 155 boosted (three-doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine). For two doses, the vaccine is modeled as 14% 156 effective against infection of Omicron and 3% effective against transmission for breakthrough infections, 157 which corresponds to 15+ weeks since the second dose was administered. For three doses, the vaccine is 158 58% effective against infection and 26% effective against breakthrough transmission, which corresponds 159 to 2-5 weeks after the booster was administered. Vaccine effectiveness are taken from [19-21] and are 160 similar to the values used by [22] who modeled an Omicron outbreak in New Zealand. Times are chosen 161 to reflect that many people got their second dose over 3 months ago and that the booster campaign started 162 in earnest a few weeks prior to widespread community transmission of Omicron. Natural immunity from 163 previous COVID-19 infections is not included because, at this stage, the cases numbers are still relatively 164 small compared to the population of New Zealand. 165

166 Each infected individual infects a random number of other individuals drawn from a Poisson distribution

167 $\lambda = R_0$ where R_0 is the effective reproduction number in the presence of public health measures (not to be

- 168 confused with R, which is the reproduction number). Following [22], I use $R_0 = 2.6$, which accounts for
- 169 the public health measures under the Red level of the COVID-19 Protection Framework (unlike for the

170 Delta variant where I consider R=6 and do not account for public health measures, similar to previous

- 171 work by [8]). This corresponds to the baseline scenario from [22].
- 172
- 173 Omicron has a shorter incubation period than Delta^{23,24}. For Omicron, the generation time is sampled
- 174 from a normal distribution with a mean of 3.3 days and standard deviation of 1.3 days.²²
- 175
- 176 **Results**
- 177
- 178 **Delta**
- 179

180 The simulations are seeded with either one vaccinated (two doses) or one unvaccinated individual at t=0,

- 181 where t is the time in days, and are run for 31 days (\sim 1 month) with time steps of 1 day. The simulations
- are run 100,000 times for each scenario to get a representative sampling of the possible outcomes from
- 183 the stochastic model.
- 184
- 185 Vaccination Status of Seed Infection
- 186

187 During the Delta outbreak a regional boundary was enforced around Auckland to limit the spread of the 188 COVID-19 outside Auckland, which was the epicenter of the outbreak. The boundary was effective and 189 enabled much of the country to experience minimal restrictions while Auckland was at Alert Level 3 or 4. 190 The regional boundary was relaxed on 15 December 2021 and people were able to travel in and out of 191 Auckland if they were fully vaccinated or had proof of a negative test within 72 hours of traveling.²⁵ This 192 situation persisted until 17 January 2022 when the border was removed entirely. Despite these protective 193 measures, the movement of people out of Auckland resulted in COVID-19 being seeded in other locations 194 around the country including Waikato and Northland. Here, I consider the possible numbers of infections 195 in an outbreak based on the vaccination status of the seed infection (Figure 1). The simulations are 196 performed for a vaccination rate of 78.7% of the total population; this is approximately 90% of the 197 eligible population (over 12 years old), which was the government's vaccination target for all District 198 Health Boards during the Delta outbreak. Note that this work assumes that an infected individual can 199 travel and seed a new outbreak. I do not model the impact of vaccination or testing requirements on 200 preventing infected people from travelling and catching cases before they travel and seed new outbreaks. 201 202 Figure 1a shows the probability of a given number of infections 31 days into an outbreak seeded by a

203 vaccinated individual or unvaccinated individual, with the cumulative probabilities shown in Figure 1b.

204 For both vaccinated and unvaccinated seed infections, there is a small possibility of large outbreaks 205 developing within the first 31 days of an infection being seeded (5% chance of >506 cases and >657 cases 206 for the vaccinated and unvaccinated seed, respectively). However, for a vaccinated seed infection it is 207 much more likely that COVID-19 does not spread beyond the initial case; for a vaccinated seed infection 208 there is a 54% chance that COVID-19 does not spread to anyone else while for an unvaccinated seed 209 infection there is only a 6% chance. This is because the vaccine is assumed to be 50% effective at 210 preventing onward transmission.^{8,14} For an unvaccinated seed infection, there is a 54% chance that the 211 outbreak has up to 151 infections after 31 days. 212



213

214 *Figure 1:* Delta variant. (a) Histograms showing probability of number of infections 31 days into an

- 216 *(blue) one unvaccinated individual.*
- 217

218 Figure 1 shows the importance of vaccination in stopping outbreaks from being seeded. A vaccinated

traveler is 9x less likely to seed an outbreak in a community than an unvaccinated traveler (note that this

²¹⁵ outbreak and (b) cumulative probabilities for an outbreak seeded by (red) one vaccinated individual or by

- 220 model does not account for the protection provided by testing requirements prior to traveling, which
- 221 would reduce the risk factor posed by unvaccinated travelers). This illustrates the importance that
- travelers are vaccinated (or tested prior to travelling, or both), especially if travelling from regions with
- significant COVID-19 community transmission (e.g., Auckland) to regions with low vaccination rates
- 224 (e.g., Northland). Continued community testing (not modeled here) is required to rapidly identify any
- 225 outbreaks that are seeded before they grow.
- 226



- 228 Figure 2: Delta variant. Likelihood that a new infection is caused by a (U) unvaccinated or (V)
- 229 vaccinated individual and that the new infection is in an unvaccinated or vaccinated individual. (a) shows
- a total vaccination rate of 50%, where there are an equal number of vaccinated and unvaccinated
- 231 *individuals in the population, while (b) shows a total vaccination rate of 78.7%, which is approximately*
- the 90% eligible population target. (a) shows the expected result when normalizing by population.
- 233
- 234
- 235

236 Likelihood of Infection/Infecting Based on Vaccination Status

237

The model tracks the number of vaccinated and unvaccinated cases as well as the vaccination status of the individuals that cause the infections. This enables me to calculate the probability of infection based on the vaccination status of the infecting and infected individuals. The results are calculated from the mean of the 100,000 realizations.

242

243 Figure 2a shows the results for a vaccination rate of 50% of the total population, which means that there 244 are an equal number of unvaccinated individuals and vaccinated individuals in the population. 87% of all 245 infections are caused by unvaccinated individuals, with 67% of all infections being from unvaccinated 246 individuals to unvaccinated individuals. By contrast, only 13% of infections are caused by vaccinated 247 individuals, and only 3% of these are from vaccinated to vaccinated. This illustrates the importance of 248 vaccination in preventing individuals from (a) getting infected and (b) passing COVID-19 on to others. 249 Figure 2a also illustrates that while the vaccine provides significant protection from getting infected, 250 vaccinated individuals can still get infected, predominantly from unvaccinated individuals. Vaccinated 251 individuals are 6.8x more likely to be infected by an unvaccinated individual than by a vaccinated 252 individual. Although Figure 2a is calculated for a vaccination rate of 50%, it also gives the values that 253 would be observed at different vaccination rates after normalizing for population (dividing the number of 254 infections by the number of people in each category). Normalizing by population removes the influence 255 of the number of people in each category (for example, more cases amongst vaccinated individuals than 256 unvaccinated, which occurs simply because there are many more vaccinated people). This illustrates that 257 most infections are caused by unvaccinated individuals.

258

259 Figure 2b shows the results for a total vaccination rate of 78.7%. Unvaccinated individuals are

260 responsible for 65% of infections despite only making up 21.3% of the population. By contrast,

261 vaccinated individuals are only responsible for 35% of infections while making up 78.7% of the

262 population. Even at these high levels of vaccination where there are 3.7x as many vaccinated individuals

- are unvaccinated individuals, a new infection is almost twice as likely to be caused by an unvaccinated
- 264 individual. A vaccinated individual has a 65% chance of being infected by an unvaccinated individual
- compared to a 35% chance of being infected by a vaccinated individual (1.9x more likely to be infected
- 266 by unvaccinated individual even though there are far fewer unvaccinated individuals in the population).
- 267 Figure 2b illustrates that, even at high levels of vaccination, unvaccinated individuals are the main cause
- 268 for continued spread of COVID-19 with only 18% of infections from vaccinated to vaccinated. This
- 269 suggests that restricting unvaccinated individuals from high-risk locations (i.e., potential super-spreader

events) will help to minimize the spread of COVID-19, which is the goal of the COVID-19 Protection

- Framework.
- 272

273 The model assumes that unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals are equally likely to interact. In reality,

274 unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals are likely to interact with individuals with the same vaccination

status, both in private gatherings and in public spaces as mandated by the COVID-19 Protection

Framework. Therefore, the results in Figure 2 may underestimate the spread of COVID-19 between

- 277 unvaccinated individuals.
- 278
- 279 Omicron
- 280

The simulations are seeded with either one boosted (three doses), vaccinated (two doses), or unvaccinated individual at t=0, where t is the time in days, and are run for 31 days (~1 month) with time steps of 1 day. The simulations are run 100,000 times for each scenario to get a representative sampling of the possible outcomes from the stochastic model. I consider a population that is 10% unvaccinated, 40% vaccinated (two doses) and 50% boosted (three doses), although the booster uptake is varied in Figure 4 to examine the effect of increasing booster coverage.

287

288 Vaccination Status of Seed Infection

289

290 I perform a similar analysis to Figure 1 for the Omicron variant and consider outbreaks seeded by 291 unvaccinated, vaccinated, and boosted individuals with the results shown in Figure 3. Figure 3a shows the 292 probability of a given number of infections 31 days into an outbreak as a function of the vaccination 293 status of the seed infection while Figure 3b shows the cumulative probabilities. The model assumes that 294 the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine is significantly worse at preventing infection and transmission against 295 Omicron than Delta (two-dose are assumed to be 70% effective against infection and 50% effective 296 against transmission for Delta but only 14% and 3%, respectively, against Omicron). Therefore, there is 297 not much difference between the unvaccinated and vaccinated seed infections (69% and 71% chance of 298 less than 500 infections after 31 days for unvaccinated and vaccinated seeds, respectively). Three doses of 299 the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine provide decent protection from infection and transmission (58% and 26%, 300 respectively), although three doses are still less effective against Omicron than two doses were against 301 Delta. Note that vaccine effectiveness wanes with time and that model results shown here are only 302 applicable for a snapshot in time.

- 304 For a boosted seed infection, there is a 78% chance of less than 500 infections are 31 days. Boosted seed
- 305 infections are more likely to lead to small outbreaks that self-extinguish after a small number of
- 306 infections. An outbreak that starts from a boosted individual has a 56% chance of stopping after 10 or
- 307 fewer infections whereas the probability is only 42% for a vaccinated seed infection or 40% for an
- 308 unvaccinated seed infection.
- 309
- 310 This demonstrates that while the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine is less effective against preventing infection

311 and transmission of Omicron compared to Delta, those who are boosted are slightly less likely to seed a

- 312 large outbreak.
- 313



Figure 3: Omicron variant. (a) Histograms showing probability of number of infections 31 days into an outbreak and (b) cumulative probabilities for an outbreak seeded by (blue) one unvaccinated, (red) one vaccinated, and (yellow) one boosted individual.

- 318
- 319
- 517
- 320

321 Booster Vaccination Rate

322

323 I also consider the impact of increasing booster rates from 50% to 70% and 90% (assuming 10% of the 324 population remain unvaccinated). The results are shown in Figure 4 for an unvaccinated seed infection. 325 Increasing the percentage of the population who are boosted drastically reduces the likely number of 326 infections. For a booster rate of 50% there is an 47% chance of less than 100 cases after 31 days 327 compared to 77% and 98% for booster rates of 70% and 90% respectively. This clearly illustrates that 328 while three doses of the vaccine provide imperfect protection (the model presented here assumes 56% 329 effective against infection and only 26% effective against breakthrough transmission), high levels of 330 booster coverage provide good protection against infection on a population level. This demonstrates the 331 need for everyone to get boosted to provide the best possible protection for themselves and their 332 community.



333

Figure 4: Cumulative probability for number of infections 31 days after seeding an outbreak with an
unvaccinated seed infection for booster vaccination rate of (blue) 50%, (red) 70%, and (yellow) 90%.

337 Likelihood of Infection/Infecting Based on Vaccination Status

338

The Omicron version of the model tracks the number of unvaccinated, vaccinated, and boosted cases as well as the vaccination status of the individuals that cause the infections. Like the results shown in Figure for the Delta variant, I calculate the probability of infection based on the vaccination status of the infecting and infected individuals. The results are shown in Figure 5 and are calculated from the mean of the 100,000 realizations for an outbreak seeded with one unvaccinated individual, one vaccinated, and

- one boosted.
- 345

346 Figure 5a shows the result for when there are an equal number of unvaccinated, vaccinated, and boosted 347 individuals in the population. This is also the result expected when normalized for population (dividing 348 the number of infections by the number of people in each category). Unvaccinated individuals are 349 responsible for 46% of infections compared to 39% for vaccinated and 15% for boosted. Of the new 350 infections, unvaccinated individuals make up 44% of new cases while vaccinated are 38% and boosted 351 are 18%. Unvaccinated individuals are 3.1x more likely to infected others and 2.4x more likely to be 352 infected than boosted individuals. This supports the rationale of using the COVID-19 Protection 353 Framework to restrict unvaccinated individuals from high-risk settings, although the definition of "fully 354 vaccinated" should be updated to distinguish between individuals who have had two or three primary 355 doses of the vaccine. When normalized by population (as shown in Figure 5a), transmission from boosted 356 to boosted individuals is only responsible for 3% of infections. These results are sensitive to the model 357 assumptions about vaccine effectiveness but nonetheless shows that even through the Pfizer-BioNTech 358 vaccine is less effective against Omicron than Delta (particularly for two doses), boosted individuals are 359 much less likely to spread COVID-19 or be infected with COVID-19. Vaccinated individuals are only 360 slightly less likely to spread COVID-19 or get infected when compared to unvaccinated, demonstrating 361 the need to get boosted to protect against Omicron infections and prevent onward transmission.



363

364 *Figure 5: Omicron* variant. Likelihood of new infections as a function of vaccination status of the

365 infecting and infected individuals. (a) Vaccination rates of U=33% (unvaccinated), V=33% (vaccinated),

366 and *B*=33% (boosted). This shows the expected result when normalizing by population. (b) Vaccination

367 rates of U=10% (unvaccinated), V=40% (vaccinated), and B=50% (boosted).

368

369 Figure 5b shows the result for realistic vaccination rates of 10% unvaccinated, 40% vaccinated, and 50%

boosted. In this situation unvaccinated individuals are responsible for 17% of infections compared to

boosted individuals who are responsible for 27% of infections. 15% of new infections occur in

372 unvaccinated individuals compared to 32% in boosted individuals. The boosted population is 5x larger

than the number of unvaccinated individuals but only responsible for causing 1.6x as many infections and

374 receiving 2.1x as many (much less than the 5x as many that would be expected if the vaccine did not offer

375 any protection). This illustrates that three doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine are effective at

376 preventing infection and transmission.

378

379 Conclusions

380 The New Zealand government has transitioned from the Alert Level system to the COVID-19 Protection 381 Framework that replaces population level controls with vaccination certificates. As a result, there is a 382 need to better understand the risk posed by unvaccinated versus vaccinated and boosted individuals. Here, 383 I use a stochastic model to simulate the potential number of infections in an outbreak seeded by a 384 unvaccinated individual versus a vaccinated individual (for Delta) and a boosted individual (for 385 Omicron). For Delta, unvaccinated individuals are much more likely to seed an outbreak with a 54% 386 chance of causing an outbreak with over 107 cases after 31 days. By contrast, for a vaccinated seed 387 infection, there is a 54% chance that the outbreak does not spread beyond the initial seed. Vaccinated 388 travelers are 9x less likely to seed an infection than unvaccinated travelers. For Omicron, there is little 389 difference between unvaccinated and vaccinated seed infections but boosted individuals are slightly more 390 likely to result in small outbreaks that self-extinguish. Increasing booster coverage can significantly slow 391 the growth of an outbreak and makes it much more likely that outbreaks will self-extinguish after a small 392

393

number of cases.

394 I also calculate the likelihood of getting infected and of infecting others based on vaccination status for 395 Delta and Omicron variants. For Delta, unvaccinated individuals are much more likely to spread the virus 396 and, when normalized by population, are responsible for 87% of all. Transmission between vaccinated 397 individuals is rare and responsible for only 3% of all infections when normalized by population. The 398 Pfizoer-BioNTech vaccine is less effective against Omicron. Nonetheless, unvaccinated individuals are 399 more likely to spread the virus and are responsible for 46% of new infections compared to 39% for 400 vaccinated individuals (two-doses) and 15% for boosted individuals (three-doses), when normalized by 401 population. Despite three-doses of the vaccine having limited effectiveness against breakthrough 402 transmission (26%), transmission between boosted individuals is rare accounting for only 3% of all 403 infections when normalized by population. This illustrates that COVID-19 is becoming a pandemic of the 404 unvaccinated and is predominantly spread by the unvaccinated, especially for the Delta variant. For 405 Omicron, the two-dose vaccinated individuals are only slightly less likely to be infected and infect others 406 than the unvaccinated but those who are boosted (three doses) are much less likely to be infected or infect 407 others.

408

409 The COVID-19 Protection Framework and associated vaccine certificates distinguish between

410 unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals. This work suggests that for the current Omicron outbreak, the

411 COVID-19 Protection Framework should potentially be updated to further distinguish between those who

412	have received two primary doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine (vaccinated individuals) and those who		
413	have received three doses (boosted individuals).		
414			
415	Refere	ences	
416			
417	1.	COVID-19 Vaccine Data. Ministry of Health. [accessed 2022 Feb 22]. Available from	
418		https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-	
419		19-data-and-statistics/covid-19-vaccine-data.	
420	2.	United Against COVID-19. [cited 2022 Feb 22]. Available from https://covid19.govt.nz/news-	
421		and-data.	
422	3.	Singh H. The Spinoff Covid-tracker: the live graphs that tell the story of delta in Aotearoa. 2021.	
423		[accessed 2021 Nov 26]. Available from https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/30-10-2021/the-spinoff-	
424		covid-tracker/.	
425	4.	Watson LM. Simulating the impact of vaccination rates on the initial stages of a COVID-19	
426		outbreak in New Zealand (Aotearoa) with a stochastic model. Submitted to the New Zealand	
427		Medical Journal, 23 Nov 2021. Available from	
428		https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266721v1	
429	5.	New Zealand Government Press Conference on 14 October 2021. Transcript available from	
430		https://www.beehive.govt.nz/feature/covid-19-updates	
431	6.	Plank MJ, Binny RN, Hendy SC, et al. A stochastic model for COVID-19 spread and the effects	
432		of alert level 4 in Aotearoa New Zealand. medRxiv. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.08.20058743.	
433	7.	Plank MJ, Hendy SC, Binny RN, Maclaren O. Modeling the August 2021 COVID-19 outbreak in	
434		New Zealand. Technical Report, Te Pūnaha Matatini. 2021.	
435	8.	Steyn N, Plank MJ, Binny RN, et al. A COVID-19 vaccination model for Aotearoa New Zealand,	
436		Technical Report, Te Pūnaha Matatini. 2021.	
437	9.	Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, et al.; CMMID COVID-19 working group, Eggo RM. Age-	
438		dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat Med. 2020	
439		Aug;26(8):1205-1211. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9.	
440	10	. Hendy SC, Steyn N, James A, et al. Mathematical modelling to inform New Zealand's COVID-	
441		19 response. J. R. Soc. N. Z. 2021 51(S1), S86-S106, doi: 10.1080/03036758.2021.1876111.	
442	11	. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, et al. Estimating the extent of asymptomatic COVID-19 and	
443		its potential for community transmission: systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMMI. 2020	
444		Dec;5(4):223-34. doi: 10.3138/jammi-2020-0030	

445	12. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, et al.; Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team,
446	Brazzale AR, Toppo S, Trevisan M, Baldo V, Donnelly CA, Ferguson NM, Dorigatti I, Crisanti
447	A; Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the
448	Italian municipality of Vo'. Nature. 2020 Aug;584(7821):425-429. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-
449	2488-1.
450	13. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, et al; ENE-COVID Study Group. Prevalence of
451	SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological
452	study. Lancet. 2020 Aug 22;396(10250):535-544. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31483-5.
453	14. Steyn N, Plank MJ, Hendy SC. Modelling to support a future COVID-19 strategy for Aotearoa
454	New Zealand, Technical Report, Te Pūnaha Matatini. 2021.
455	15. Grout L, Katar A, Ait Ouakrim D, et al. Failures of quarantine systems for preventing COVID-19
456	outbreaks in Australia and New Zealand. Med J Aust. 2021 Oct 4;215(7):320-324. doi:
457	10.5694/mja2.51240.
458	16. Ludvigsson JF. Children are unlikely to be the main drivers of the COVID-19 pandemic – a
459	systematic review. Acta Paediatrica. 2020 Aug;109(8):1525-30. doi: 10.1111/apa.15371
460	17. Dattner I, Goldberg Y, Katriel G, et al. The role of children in the spread of COVID-19: using
461	household data from Bnei Brak, Israel, to estimate the relative susceptibility and infectivity in
462	children. PLOS Comput Biol 17(2):e1008559. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008559
463	18. Steyn, N, Binny RN, Hannah K, et al. Maori and Pacific people in New Zealand have a higher
464	risk of hospitalization for COVID-19. New Zealand Medical Journal, 134(1538),28-43.
465	19. Golding N, Lydeamore M. Analyses to predict the efficacy and waning of vaccines and previous
466	infection against transmission and clinical outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 variants. [accessed 22 Feb
467	2022]. Available from https://github.com/goldingn/neuts2efficacy.
468	20. Andrews N, Stowe J, Kirsebom F, et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against the
469	Omicron (B.1.1.529) variant of concern. medRxiv. doi: 10.1101/2021.12.14.21267615
470	21. UK Health Security Agency. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation
471	in England. Technical briefing 34. 14 Jan 2022.
472	22. Vattiato G, Maclaren O, Lustig A, et al. A preliminary assessment of the potential impact of the
473	Omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2 in Aotearoa New Zealand. Technical Report, Covid-19
474	Modelling Aotearoa. 2022.
475	23. Abbott S, Sherratt K, Gerstung M, Funk S. Estimation of the test to test distribution as a proxy for
476	generation interval distribution for the Omicron variant in England. medRxiv. 2022:
477	https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.08.22268920.

- 478 24. SPI-M-O. SPI-M-O Consensus statement on COVID-19, 6 January 2022. 2022:
- 479 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-consensus- statement-on-covid-19-6-
- 480 january-2022.
- 481 25. New Zealand Government Press Conference on 17 November 2021. Transcript available from
- 482 <u>https://www.beehive.govt.nz/feature/covid-19-updates</u>