

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of COVID-19 Vaccination : A review of some Vaccination Models

Rehana Naz ^{a,*}, Andrew Omame ^b, Mariano Torrisci^c

^aDepartment of Mathematics,
Lahore School of Economics
Lahore, 53200, Pakistan

^b Department of Mathematics
Federal University of Technology
Owerri, Nigeria

^c Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica
UniversitA degli Studi di Catania
Viale Andrea Doria, 6, Catania, 95125, Italy.

* Corresponding author emails: rehananaz_qau@yahoo.com,
drrehana@lahoreschool.edu.pk

January 8, 2024

Abstract

The sudden and rapid spread of the COVID-19 pandemic with its terrible consequences has put the management of governments and the various world institutions into a crisis. They have been subjected to a considerable economic effort to be taken to combat the spread of the pandemic. The economic investment for the research and purchase of vaccines intended for populations is subject to cost-benefit analyzes in various situations in different cases. In this review work, several recent models are analyzed where the appearance of the components is coupled with the economic aspect. The analysis of these models is detailed and the results discussed from different points of view.

Keywords

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, COVID-19 Vaccination models, Environmental transmission, Co-circulation of COVID-19 and Arboviruses

1 Introduction

The emergence of pandemics has revealed the vulnerability of mankind to this phenomenon. COVID-19 has rapidly spread across the globe, resulting in both fatalities and substantial social problems. The necessity to intervene to curb and control its progression has initiated significant scientific and political debates. Government initiatives not only impose restrictions on the daily life of the population but also result in substantial financial costs. The most widespread measure adopted almost everywhere was vaccination. Obtaining available vaccines from the market (and considering their cost) posed an issue. In fact, procuring sufficient quantities of vaccines to adequately cater to the population was not an easy task. Limited accessibility has posed numerous challenges for the governments of the least developed nations. We often resorted to cost-benefit analyses to understand the correct allocation of resources. Since, in general, we are dealing with a priori simulations, the development of mathematical models on pandemics has been of great help. Particularly focusing on models that incorporate economic variables into the system of equations, there is a limited amount of published material on these combined themes. Our aim in this work is to provide the reader with a brief but comprehensive overview. We have concentrated on several mathematical models that not only track the evolution of variables describing pandemics under the influence of vaccination but also incorporate a cost-effectiveness analysis. Naturally, our coverage may not be exhaustive given the dynamic nature of research boundaries.

Gold [1] is a foundational reference book providing guidelines and methodologies specific to cost-effectiveness analysis in the health and medicine domain. Muennig et al. [2] offer a practical guide for those involved in health economics, providing insights into the application of cost-effectiveness analysis in health-related decision-making. Levin et al. [3] provide a broader perspective on the application of cost-effectiveness analysis beyond healthcare; this book explores its use in education and social programs. Two distinct methods, specifically the average cost-effectiveness ratio (ACER) and the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), play a pivotal role in determining the cost-effective intervention plan among the various combinations under consideration. ACER focuses solely on comparing the single intervention technique to its baseline alternative. This involves assessing the proportion of the overall cost of the intervention to the total number of infections it prevents. The ACER formula, as presented by [4, 5], is expressed as:

$$\text{ACER} = \frac{\text{Total cost produced by intervention}}{\text{Total number of infection averted}}. \quad (1)$$

The denominator of equation (1) is derived by subtracting the number of infected people under control from the number of infectious people not under control.

On the other hand, the ICER is concerned with comparing the differences in costs and health outcomes between two alternative intervention strategies that compete for the same resources. It is the ratio of the increase or decrease in the total number of infections prevented by two different techniques to the change

in the expenses of those two treatments. Simply, ICER is determined as follows:

$$\text{ICER} = \frac{\text{Change in intervention costs}}{\text{Change in total number of infection averted}}. \quad (2)$$

We have focused on several mathematical models that not only track the evolution of variables describing pandemics under the influence of vaccination but also incorporate a cost-effectiveness analysis. Naturally, our coverage of mathematical models may not be exhaustive, given the dynamic nature of research boundaries. In their respective studies, Li et al. [6] concentrated on diabetes mellitus, Otieno et al. [7] addressed malaria control strategies, Myran et al. [8] explored hepatitis B virus, and Fesenfeld [9] investigated human papillomavirus vaccination, each performing a comprehensive cost-effectiveness analysis in their investigations. Jit and Mibe [10] conducted a systematic review that discusses the cost-effectiveness of vaccination programs, providing valuable insights into the economic value of preventive health measures. In [11, 12] an in-depth exploration of the theoretical foundations of cost-effectiveness analysis, established a conceptual framework for understanding its underlying principles. Brent [13] contributed to the field by exploring the Societal Perspective in Healthcare. The work of [14] specifically examined COVID-19 Inactivated Vaccines. References [15]-[34] investigate various case studies, both empirical and theoretical, discussing COVID-19 from cost-effectiveness perspectives, and we provide a detailed discussion of these studies in our article.

Here we tried to offer essential information on as many works as possible within the review field. In our opinion, comprehensive and exhaustive information on the contents of the works holds greater significance than the opinions of the review authors provided through in-depth analysis. The plan of the paper is outlined as follows: In Section 2, a detailed review of the cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination models is presented. The discussions and future directions are provided in Section 3.

2 Cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination models

We conducted an extensive literature search by exploring the prominent scholarly electronic database PubMed/MEDLINE/Scopus. The keywords used in the search included: “COVID-19”, “SIR”, “Epidemiological models”, “Cost-effectiveness”, and “vaccine”. Additionally, we employed “Medical Subject Headings” (MeSH) terms and truncated words when necessary. The search was confined to studies specifically conducted on COVID-19, excluding investigations on other diseases.

2.1 SEAIR framework with environmental transmission of COVID-19

Using data from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as a case study, Asamoah *et al.* [15] investigated a COVID-19 model with optimal control and thorough cost-effectiveness analysis. The model took into account four time-dependent control measures, including social segregation protocols, maintaining personal hygiene by using alcohol-based detergents to clean contaminated surfaces, implementing appropriate and secure measures for individuals who are exposed, asymptomatic, or symptomatic with infection, and carry out fumigation in educational institutions across all levels, sports facilities, commercial spaces, and places of worship. The system of equations proposed by Asamoah *et al.* [15] is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS}{dt} &= \Lambda - (\beta_1 E + \beta_2 I + \beta_3 A) \frac{S}{N} - \beta_4 B \frac{S}{N} - dS, \\
 \frac{dE}{dt} &= (\beta_1 E + \beta_2 I + \beta_3 A) \frac{S}{N} + \beta_4 B \frac{S}{N} - (d + \delta)E, \\
 \frac{dI}{dt} &= \delta(1 - \tau)E - (d + d_1 + \gamma_1)I, \\
 \frac{dA}{dt} &= \tau\delta E - (d + \gamma_2)A, \\
 \frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma_1 I + \gamma_2 A - dR, \\
 \frac{dB}{dt} &= \psi_1 E + \psi_2 I + \psi_3 A - \phi B,
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where, the model variables S , E , A , I , R are Susceptible, Exposed, Asymptomatic, Symptomatic and Recovered individuals respectively with N as the total population, $B(t)$ represents the assumed concentration of the SARS-CoV-2 in the environment. The constitutive parameters are defined in Table 1 in the Appendix:

By conducting a thorough cost-effectiveness analysis for various control scenarios, numerical simulations were performed. The results revealed that implementing protocols for physical or social distancing is the most effective and economically viable intervention in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, following a comprehensive comparison of various control measures.

In a separate study, Asamoah *et al.* [16] examined the global stability and economic viability of a COVID-19 model while taking environmental transmission into account. They employed real data from Ghana in their study. The most economically efficient way to curb the transmission of COVID-19 in Ghana, according to their study, is to combine safety measures like practicing appropriate coughing etiquette, encouraging the use of disposable tissues or clothing to cover coughs and sneezes and emphasize the importance of hand-washing after

such instances. In reference [16], the model presented below was studied

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= \Lambda - \omega S - \beta(IS + \eta AS) - \beta_1 VS + \rho R, \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta(IS + \eta AS) + \beta_1 VS - k_2(1 - \gamma)E - k_1\gamma E - \omega E, \\
\frac{dA}{dt} &= k_2(1 - \gamma)E - \omega A - v_1\phi A - v_2(1 - \phi)A, \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= k_1\gamma E + v_1\phi A - \epsilon I - (\omega + \alpha)I, \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= v_2(1 - \phi)A + \epsilon I - \rho R - \omega R, \\
\frac{dV}{dt} &= m_1 A + m_2 I - \tau_1 V,
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where, the model variables S , E , A , I and R represent the susceptible, exposed/pre asymptomatic, Asymptomatic, Symptomatic and Recovered individuals. The variable V is Virus in the Environment. The model parameters are defined in Table 2 in the Appendix section:

2.2 SEIAHRD Model for COVID-19 Analysis in Nigeria: Incorporating Real Data

Olaniyi et al [17] proposed a mathematical framework to examine the dynamics of COVID-19 transmission, with a specific emphasis on optimal and cost-effective control measures. They used actual COVID-19 data from Nigeria to fit their model. They found that in terms of reducing the burden of COVID-19, the best preventive measure-which includes immunisation, the use of face masks and hand sanitizers performed significantly better than management control. Management control includes providing adequate care for patients who are hospitalised in order to ensure a speedy recovery and prevent deaths from complications. They found that implementing both control measures together is the most cost-effective approach when compared to the individual implementation

of each control measure. Olaniyi et al [17] considered the following model:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= -\frac{\beta S (I + \varepsilon_1 A + \varepsilon_2 H)}{N - D} \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= \frac{\beta S (I + \varepsilon_1 A + \varepsilon_2 H)}{N - D} - \alpha E \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= l_1 \alpha E - (h_1 + r_1 + \delta_1) I \\
\frac{dA}{dt} &= (1 - l_1) \alpha E - (h_2 + r_2) A \\
\frac{dH}{dt} &= h_1 I + h_2 A - (\gamma + \delta_2) H \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= r_1 I + r_2 A + \gamma H \\
\frac{dD}{dt} &= \delta_1 I + \delta_2 H
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where, the model variables S , E , A , I , R , H and D represent the susceptible, exposed, Asymptomatic, Symptomatic, Recovered, Hospitalized, Death classes. Definitions of constitutive parameters can be found in Table 3 of the Appendix section.

2.3 $SEAICC_WHR$ Model: Understanding COVID-19 Dynamics in Peru

The system of differential equations governing the model proposed by Kouidere et al.[18] is as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
\frac{dS(t)}{dt} &= \Lambda - \mu S(t) - \beta_1 \frac{S(t)A(t)}{N} - \beta_2 \frac{S(t)I(t)}{N} \\
\frac{dE(t)}{dt} &= \beta_1 \frac{S(t)A(t)}{N} + \beta_2 \frac{S(t)I(t)}{N} - (\mu + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) E(t) \\
\frac{dA(t)}{dt} &= \alpha_1 E(t) - (\theta_1 + \chi + \mu) A(t) \\
\frac{dI(t)}{dt} &= \alpha_2 E(t) + \chi A(t) - (\gamma + \theta_2 + \mu) I(t) \\
\frac{dC(t)}{dt} &= (1 - \varrho) \gamma I(t) - (\eta_1 + \mu + \delta_1) C(t) \\
\frac{dC_W(t)}{dt} &= \varrho \gamma I(t) - (\eta_2 + \mu + \delta_2) C_W(t) \\
\frac{dH(t)}{dt} &= \theta_1 I(t) + \theta_2 I(t) + \eta_1 C(t) + \eta_2 C_W(t) - (\mu + \sigma + \delta_3) H(t) \\
\frac{dR(t)}{dt} &= \sigma H(t) - \mu R(t)
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{6}$$

The model variables S , E , A , I , and R represent susceptible, exposed, asymptomatic, symptomatic infected, and recovered individuals, respectively. The compartment C denotes those infected with complications, while C_W represents individuals with complications and chronic diseases. Individuals under lockdown in hospitals with follow-up and health monitoring are grouped as H . The model parameters are defined in Table 4 in the Appendix Section.

Kouidere *et al.* [18] carried out a cost-effectiveness analysis of a COVID-19 mathematical model based on data from Peru. Utilizing Pontryagin's Maximum

Principle, they demonstrated that the most effective strategy for controlling the spread of COVID-19 in Peru involves a combination of conducting awareness campaigns and implementing quarantine alongside treatment for infected individuals.

2.4 A *SEIAQHRM* model: Self-Protection, Vaccination, and Disinfectant Strategies for COVID-19 Control

The system of nonlinear ordinary differential equations for the model proposed by Nana-Kyere and Seidu [19] is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= \Lambda - \mu S - \eta_2 MS - \eta_1 \frac{IS}{N} - \frac{\psi AS}{N} \eta_1, \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= \eta_2 MS + \eta_1 \frac{IS}{N} + \frac{\psi AS}{N} \eta_1 - ((1 - \theta)\omega + \theta\rho + \delta_1 + \mu) E, \\
\frac{dI}{dt} &= (1 - \theta)\omega E - (\tau_1 + \xi_1 + \gamma + \mu) I, \\
\frac{dA}{dt} &= \theta\rho E - (\tau_2 + \mu) A, \\
\frac{dQ}{dt} &= \delta_1 E - (\phi_1 + \delta_2 + \mu) Q, \\
\frac{dH}{dt} &= \gamma I + \delta_2 Q - (\phi_2 + \xi_2 + \mu) H, \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \tau_1 I + \tau_2 A + \phi_1 Q + \phi_2 H - \mu R, \\
\frac{dM}{dt} &= q_1 I + q_2 A - q_3 M,
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where, the model variables are defined as follows: *S*: Susceptible, *E*: Exposed, *I*: Infected, *A*: asymptotically infected, *Q*: Quarantined, *H*: Hospitalized, *R*: Recovered, and *M*: virus concentration in the environment. The model parameters are defined in Table 5 in the Appendix section.

Nana-Kyere and Seidu [19] investigated a mathematical model to understand the dynamics of COVID-19 transmission. They conducted a cost-effectiveness evaluation of control measures, including self-protection, vaccination, and disinfectant spraying. Their study revealed that the most cost-effective approach to control the transmission of the virus involves the combined implementation of self-protection and environmental control measures.

2.5 The SEIHR framework to Model COVID-19 transmission Dynamics in Italy and Spain

Srivastav et al. [20] developed and analyzed a compartmental COVID-19 model that categorizes the population into old and young groups. By computing both the disease-free equilibrium and the basic reproduction number, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of the impact of COVID-19. The estimation of key parameters using real-life data from Italy and Spain, employing the

least square method, enhances the empirical validity of the model. By emphasizing parameters with a significant effect on the basic reproduction number, the sensitivity analysis provides insight into essential factors shaping transmission dynamics. To investigate the most efficient, time-dependent, and cost-effective control strategies that can lower the number of infections within a given time frame, the model is expanded to include optimal control problems. They characterized the controls as follows: mitigating the person-to-person transmission of disease through measures like social distancing, awareness campaigns, and enhanced sanitization, alongside the increase in testing facilities to identify more individuals with COVID-19. Their investigation demonstrated that the integration of these two control measures proved highly effective in curbing the spread of the virus. The model by Srivastav et al. [20] is given below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_1}{dt} &= -\beta_1 (I_1 + I_2) S_1 - \beta_3 S_1 H \\
\frac{dE_1}{dt} &= \beta_1 (I_1 + I_2) S_1 + \beta_3 S_1 H - \gamma_1 E_1 (I_1 + I_2) - \eta_1 E_1 \\
\frac{dI_1}{dt} &= \eta_1 E_1 + \gamma_1 E_1 (I_1 + I_2) - \nu_1 I_1 - \delta_1 I_1 \\
\frac{dS_2}{dt} &= -\beta_2 S_2 (I_1 + I_2) - \beta_4 S_2 H \\
\frac{dE_2}{dt} &= \beta_2 S_2 (I_1 + I_2) + \beta_4 S_2 H - \gamma_2 E_2 (I_1 + I_2) - \eta_2 E_2 \\
\frac{dI_2}{dt} &= \eta_2 E_2 + \gamma_2 E_2 (I_1 + I_2) - \delta_2 I_2 - \nu_2 I_2. \\
\frac{dH}{dt} &= \nu_1 I_1 + \nu_2 I_2 - \delta_3 H - \alpha H. \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \alpha H.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Where the model variables are defined as follows: S_1, E_1, I_1 are susceptible, exposed, and infected young individuals, while S_2, E_2, I_2 represent susceptible, exposed, and infected old individuals. Home-isolated/hospitalized infected and recovered individuals of both groups are represented by H and R respectively. The parameters are defined in Table 6 in the Appendix section.

2.6 Analyzing Cost-Effective Control Measures for Co-Infections of Dengue and COVID-19 in Brazil

Omame *et al.* [21] explored a mathematical model for COVID-19 and dengue, incorporating optimal control and cost-effectiveness analysis. The local asymptotic stability of the model was assessed under the condition that reproduction numbers remain below unity. Utilizing data collected from February 1, 2021, to September 20, 2021, the researchers fitted the model to cumulative confirmed daily COVID-19 cases and deaths in Brazil. The investigation included the estimation of several parameters, including the rates of COVID-19 transmission

and mortality, as well as the attenuation of immunity acquired from infection. The study extends the model to incorporate optimal control strategies, establishing conditions for their existence and deriving the optimality system using Pontryagin's Principle. Simulation results highlight the significant impact of dengue-only or COVID-19-only control strategies in reducing new co-infection cases. Furthermore, the findings emphasize the effectiveness of dengue prevention strategies in averting new COVID-19 infections and highlight the cost-effectiveness of controlling incident dengue infections to mitigate co-infections.

The model studied by Omame et al [21] is given below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_h}{dt} &= \omega_h - \left(\frac{\Lambda_{vd}I_{vd}}{N_h} + \frac{\Lambda_{hc}(I_{hc} + I_{dc})}{N_h} \right) S_h - \varrho_h S_h + \eta_{hd}R_{hd} + \eta_{hc}R_{hc}, \\
\frac{dI_{hd}}{dt} &= \frac{\Lambda_{vd}I_{vd}}{N_h}(S_h + R_{hc}) - (\alpha_{hd} + \varrho_h + \varphi_{hd})I_{hd} - \vartheta_1 \frac{\Lambda_{hc}(I_{hc} + I_{dc})}{N_h} I_{hd} + \alpha_{hc}I_{dc}, \\
\frac{dR_{hd}}{dt} &= \alpha_{hd}I_{hd} - \varrho_h R_{hd} - \eta_{hd}R_{hd} - \frac{\Lambda_{hc}(I_{hc} + I_{dc})}{N_h} R_{hd}, \\
\frac{dI_{hc}}{dt} &= \frac{\Lambda_{hc}(I_{hc} + I_{dc})}{N_h}(S_h + R_{hd}) - (\alpha_{hc} + \varrho_h + \varphi_{hc})I_{hc} - \vartheta_2 \frac{\Lambda_{vd}I_{vd}}{N_h} I_{hc} + \alpha_{hd}I_{dc}, \\
\frac{dR_{hc}}{dt} &= \alpha_{hc}I_{hc} - \varrho_h R_{hc} - \eta_{hc}R_{hc} - \frac{\Lambda_{vd}I_{vd}}{N_h} R_{hc}, \\
\frac{dI_{dc}}{dt} &= \vartheta_1 \frac{\Lambda_{hc}(I_{hc} + I_{dc})}{N_h} I_{hd} + \vartheta_2 \frac{\Lambda_{vd}I_{vd}}{N_h} I_{hc} - (\varrho_h + \varphi_{hd} + \varphi_{hc} + \alpha_{hd} + \alpha_{hc})I_{dc}, \\
\frac{dS_{vd}}{dt} &= \omega_d - \frac{\Lambda_{hd}(I_{hd} + I_{dc})}{N_h} S_{vd} - \varrho_v S_{vd}, \\
\frac{dI_{vd}}{dt} &= \frac{\Lambda_{hd}(I_{hd} + I_{dc})}{N_h} S_{vd} - \varrho_v I_{vd},
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The model variables are defined as follows: S_h for susceptible humans, I_{hd} and R_{hd} for infectious and recovered humans from dengue, I_{hc} and R_{hc} for infectious and recovered humans from COVID-19. Additionally, I_{dc} , S_v , and I_{vd} represent infectious individuals co-infected with dengue and COVID-19, susceptible vectors, and infectious vectors with dengue, respectively. The parameters are defined in Table 7 in the Appendix section.

2.7 Analyzing the co-dynamics of COVID-19 and Malaria

Tchoumi *et al.* [22] developed a mathematical model to investigate the co-dynamics of malaria and COVID-19, particularly addressing the challenges in tropical and subtropical regions. The stability conditions for equilibria in malaria-only and COVID-19-only sub-models were established, indicating global asymptotic stability for COVID-19 and potential backward bifurcation in malaria under specific conditions. The study explored the optimal control strategies using Pontryagin's Maximum Principle to mitigate the spread of both diseases. Simulation results indicated that concurrently applying preventive measures for

malaria and COVID-19 is more effective than implementing individual measures. While not a case study, the research emphasized the importance of future investigations considering therapeutic strategies, immunity acquisition, treatment efficacy, and cost-effectiveness in disease control. The mathematical model investigated by Tchoumi *et al.* [22] is given as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{S}_h = \Lambda_h + \omega_m I_m + \omega_c I_c + \omega_{mc} I_{mc} - (\lambda_m + \lambda_c + \mu) S_h, \\ \dot{E}_m = \lambda_m S_h - (\lambda_c + \phi_m + \mu) E_m, \\ \dot{E}_c = \lambda_c S_h - (\lambda_m + \phi_c + \mu) E_c, \\ \dot{E}_{mc} = \lambda_c E_m + \lambda_m E_c - (\phi_{mc} + \mu) E_{mc}, \\ \dot{I}_m = \phi_m E_m - (\delta \lambda_c + \omega_m + \mu) I_m, \\ \dot{I}_c = \phi_c E_c - (\epsilon \lambda_m + \omega_c + \mu) I_c, \\ \dot{I}_{mE_c} = \delta \lambda_c I_m - (\sigma + \mu) I_{mE_c}, \\ \dot{I}_{mc} = \sigma I_{mE_c} + \phi_{mc} E_{mc} + \gamma I_{cE_m} - (\omega_{mc} + \mu) I_{mc}, \\ \dot{I}_{cE_m} = \epsilon \lambda_m I_c - (\gamma + \mu) I_{cE_m}, \\ \dot{S}_v = \Lambda_v - (\lambda_v + \mu_v) S_v, \\ \dot{E}_v = \lambda_v S_v - (\phi_v + \mu_v) E_v, \\ \dot{I}_v = \phi_v E_v - \mu_v I_v \end{array} \right. \quad (10)$$

The model variables are defined as follows: S_h represents susceptible individuals, E_m and I_m denote individuals who are exposed to and infected with malaria only, respectively. Similarly, E_c and I_c refer to individuals who are exposed to and infectious with COVID-19. Additionally, the variables E_{mc} and I_{mc} represent individuals who are exposed to and infected with both malaria and COVID-19. Furthermore, the variables I_{mE_c} and I_{cE_m} represent individuals infected with malaria and exposed to COVID-19, and individuals infected with COVID-19 and exposed to malaria, respectively. The parameters are defined in Table 8 in the Appendix section.

2.8 Optimal Control Measures: Co-circulation of COVID-19 and Arboviruses in Espirito Santo, Brazil

Omame *et al.* [23] investigated the co-circulation of COVID-19 and arboviruses (dengue, chikungunya, and Zika) using a mathematical model. To calibrate their mathematical model, authors utilized recorded data on COVID-19 and arboviruses from Espirito Santo, a city in Brazil. The study employed optimal control measures, including time-dependent interventions, to minimize infectious cases and associated costs. The findings demonstrated that targeted COVID-19 prevention measures in Espirito Santo significantly reduced co-infections with Zika, Dengue, and Chikungunya. However, the study emphasized that a sole focus on COVID-19 prevention might have limited impact on arboviruses, highlighting the necessity of integrated control strategies. The research provides valuable insights into disease interactions and emphasizes the importance of comprehensive preventive strategies in regions with the co-circulation of these infectious diseases. Simulations suggested that a combined strategy against

COVID-19, Zika, Dengue, and Chikungunya is the most effective in minimizing their co-circulation within a community.

The model in [23] is given below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS^h}{dt} &= \Psi^h - \left(\frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \vartheta^h \right) S^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_C^h}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} (S^h + \mathcal{R}_C^h + \mathcal{R}_Z^h + \mathcal{R}_D^h + \mathcal{R}_K^h) - (\eta_C + \zeta_C + \vartheta^h) \mathcal{I}_C^h \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_C^h - \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_C^h - \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_C^h + \zeta_Z \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h + \zeta_D \mathcal{I}_{CD}^h + \zeta_K \mathcal{I}_{CK}^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_Z^h}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} (S^h + \mathcal{R}_C^h + \mathcal{R}_Z^h + \mathcal{R}_D^h + \mathcal{R}_K^h) - (\eta_Z + \zeta_Z + \vartheta^h) \mathcal{I}_Z^h \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_Z^h + \zeta_C \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_D^h}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} (S^h + \mathcal{R}_C^h + \mathcal{R}_Z^h + \mathcal{R}_D^h + \mathcal{R}_K^h) - (\eta_D + \zeta_D + \vartheta^h) \mathcal{I}_D^h - \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_D^h + \zeta_C \mathcal{I}_{CD}^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_K^h}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} (S^h + \mathcal{R}_C^h + \mathcal{R}_Z^h + \mathcal{R}_D^h + \mathcal{R}_K^h) - (\eta_K + \zeta_K + \vartheta^h) \mathcal{I}_K^h - \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_K^h + \zeta_C \mathcal{I}_{CK}^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_C^h + \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_Z^h - (\eta_C + \eta_Z + \zeta_C + \zeta_Z + \vartheta^h) \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_{CD}^h}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_C^h + \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_D^h - (\eta_C + \eta_D + \zeta_C + \zeta_D + \vartheta^h) \mathcal{I}_{CD}^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_{CK}^h}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_C^h + \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} \mathcal{I}_K^h - (\eta_C + \eta_K + \zeta_C + \zeta_K + \vartheta^h) \mathcal{I}_{CK}^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{R}_C^h}{dt} &= \zeta_C \mathcal{I}_C^h - \left(\vartheta^h + \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \right) \mathcal{R}_C^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{R}_Z^h}{dt} &= \zeta_Z \mathcal{I}_Z^h - \left(\vartheta^h + \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \right) \mathcal{R}_Z^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{R}_D^h}{dt} &= \zeta_D \mathcal{I}_D^h - \left(\vartheta^h + \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \right) \mathcal{R}_D^h \\
\frac{d\mathcal{R}_K^h}{dt} &= \zeta_K \mathcal{I}_K^h - \left(\vartheta^h + \frac{\beta_1 \mathcal{I}_C^h}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_2(\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h) + \beta_2^h \mathcal{I}_Z^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_3^h \mathcal{I}_D^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_4^h \mathcal{I}_K^v}{\mathcal{N}^h} \right) \mathcal{R}_K^h \\
\frac{dS^v}{dt} &= \Psi^v - \left(\frac{\beta_2^v (\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h)}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_3^v (\mathcal{I}_D^h + \mathcal{I}_{CD}^h)}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \frac{\beta_4^v (\mathcal{I}_K^h + \mathcal{I}_{CK}^h)}{\mathcal{N}^h} + \vartheta^v \right) S^v \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_Z^v}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_2^v (\mathcal{I}_Z^h + \mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h)}{\mathcal{N}^h} S^v - \vartheta^v \mathcal{I}_Z^v \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_D^v}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_3^v (\mathcal{I}_D^h + \mathcal{I}_{CD}^h)}{\mathcal{N}^h} S^v - \vartheta^v \mathcal{I}_D^v \\
\frac{d\mathcal{I}_K^v}{dt} &= \frac{\beta_4^v (\mathcal{I}_K^h + \mathcal{I}_{CK}^h)}{\mathcal{N}^h} S^v - \vartheta^v \mathcal{I}_K^v
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Where the model variables are defined as follows: S^h , \mathcal{I}_C^h , \mathcal{I}_Z^h , \mathcal{I}_D^h , \mathcal{I}_K^h , represent susceptible humans, infectious humans with COVID-19, Zika virus, Dengue

virus, and Chikungunya, respectively. $\mathcal{I}_{CZ}^h, \mathcal{I}_{CD}^h, \mathcal{I}_{CK}^h$ represent humans co-infected with Zika virus and COVID-19, co-infected with Dengue virus and COVID-19, and co-infected with Chikungunya and COVID-19, respectively. $\mathcal{R}_C^h, \mathcal{I}_Z^h, \mathcal{R}_D^h, \mathcal{R}_K^h$ represent humans who have recovered from COVID-19, Zika virus, Dengue virus, and Chikungunya, respectively. For the mosquito population, \mathcal{S}^v represents susceptible mosquitoes, while $\mathcal{I}_Z^v, \mathcal{I}_D^v, \mathcal{I}_K^v$ represent mosquitoes infected with Zika virus, Dengue virus, and Chikungunya, respectively. The model parameters are defined in Table 9 in the Appendix section.

2.9 A cost-effectiveness Analysis of COVID-19 Vaccination Strategies for Turkey

Hagens et al. (2021) [24] conducted a study exploring the economic implications of COVID-19 vaccination strategies in Turkey. Their research, as of March 2021, focused on estimating the cost-effectiveness of vaccination in comparison to a baseline without vaccination and implemented measures. Employing an enhanced SIRD model, the researchers considered different scenarios for the initial year following vaccination. The findings revealed that, in the context of healthcare, COVID-19 vaccination in Turkey is cost-effective. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICER) were observed to be 511 USD/QALY and 1045 USD/QALY under different scenarios of vaccine effectiveness. The societal perspective revealed cost savings in both scenarios, emphasizing that a minimum vaccine uptake of at least 30% is required for cost-effectiveness. Sensitivity and scenario analyses, along with iso-ICER curves, confirmed the robustness of the findings. The article proposed that COVID-19 vaccination in Turkey is highly cost-effective, potentially cost-saving, particularly when considering the economic consequences of potential lockdowns in the absence of access to vaccination. The following differential equations considered in the model by Hagens *et al.* [24].

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = \left(-\beta S_i \sum_j C_{ij} I_j / N_j \right) - V_i \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{dR_i}{dt} = f_i (F H m_i (H m_i) + F I c_i (I c_i) + F H s_i (H s_i)) + V_i$$

In the given context, V_i represents the count of vaccinated individuals, while $F H m$, $F I c$, and $F H s$ denote the inverses of the durations for staying at home, being in the ICU, and hospitalization if unwell, respectively. Additionally, $H m$, $I c$, and $H s$ represent the count of individuals experiencing illness at home, in the ICU, and in hospitals, respectively and f signifies the rate of recovery.

2.10 The cost-effectiveness and epidemiological impact of COVID-19 vaccination across diverse regions

We delve into a series of research papers, each contributing valuable insights into the cost-effectiveness and epidemiological impact of COVID-19 vaccination

across diverse regions. We have provided the main findings of these studies without going into much detail about the models and methods used in them.

2.10.1 A Case Study from Catalonia

Utilizing data from Catalonia, the authors [25] constructed and evaluated a cost-effective COVID-19 immunization model. Findings suggest that not only is the mass vaccination campaign cost-saving, but it also proves to be widely cost-effective for the health system. The efficient allocation of resources leads to substantial social and economic advantages.

2.10.2 A Case Study from Kenya

The authors [26] conducted a 1.5-year evaluation of COVID-19 vaccine cost-effectiveness in Kenya from a societal standpoint. Employing an age-structured epidemic model, they assumed a baseline of natural immunity in at least 80% of the population before the emergence of the immunological escape variety. The study explored the effects of vaccine coverage (30%, 50%, or 70%) among the adult population (> 18) through both slow and rapid roll-out scenarios, prioritizing individuals over 50 (80% uptake in all scenarios). Cost data, obtained from initial analyses, indicated vaccine delivery costs ranging from US\$3.90 to US\$6.11 per dosage and vaccine procurement costs of US\$7 per dose. The study concluded that immunizing young adults might not be cost-effective due to earlier exposure and limited protection across the majority of the Kenyan population.

2.10.3 A Case Study from Korea

The authors [27] conducted a comprehensive cost-effectiveness analysis of oral antivirals targeting SARS-CoV-2 infection in Korea, utilizing an epidemic model. Their research demonstrated that the use of oral treatment, specifically nirmatrelvir/ritonavir, among older patients with symptomatic COVID-19, emerged as the most cost-effective approach. Moreover, this therapeutic strategy was associated with a substantial reduction in the demand for new hospital admissions in Korea.

2.10.4 A Case Study from the United States

In the United States, Li et al. [28] investigated the cost-effectiveness of BNT162b2 COVID-19 booster doses. Their research concluded that administering BNT162b2 booster doses to senior Americans (aged ≥ 65 years) represented the most economical option. Furthermore, the authors observed that in regions with high viral transmission rates, even less effective COVID-19 vaccinations and booster doses might still be deemed economically viable.

2.10.5 Two Case Studies from Hong Kong

Using Hong Kong as a case study, Tao et al [29] conducted research on COVID-19 outbreak predictions and cost-effectiveness analysis. Results from their analysis indicated that the total number of patients in Hong Kong with new infections may be decreased by 83.89% by strictly enforcing quarantine measures in the third stage of COVID-19. In conjunction with the vaccine plan, vaccinating 90% of the population within a set period of time could significantly reduce the epidemic in Hong Kong. Additionally, there may be financial gains and a 10.74 percent cost reduction compared to the non-vaccination situation.

Xiong et al. [30] studied the economic impact of COVID-19 vaccination programs in Hong Kong. They used a Markov model with a susceptible–infected–recovered structure over a 1-year time horizon. The research revealed that despite a high initial cost, the vaccination program became economically justified during periods of increased infection rates, like the Omicron wave. The study emphasized the program’s effectiveness in reducing infection and mortality rates. However, it also acknowledged the substantial economic burden, highlighting the need for strategic implementation and prioritization. The study concluded that the focus should be on the elderly population to improve vaccine coverage.

2.10.6 A Case Study from Six U.S. Cities

Zang et al. [31] explored the cost-effectiveness of linked, opt-out HIV testing. Their study also explored the potential epidemiological impact of COVID-19 on HIV epidemic, employing a case study across six U.S. cities. The study’s findings revealed that in the absence of linked, opt-out HIV testing, a worst-case scenario—characterized by no behavioral change and a 50% reduction in service access—could lead to an estimated 9.0 percent increase in HIV infections. Conversely, in the best-case scenario—entailing a 50% reduction in risk behaviors and no service disruptions—the study anticipated a substantial estimated decrease of 16.5 percent in HIV infections between 2020 and 2025. Additionally, the authors predicted that implementing HIV testing at varying levels (ranging from 10 to 90 percent) might prevent a total of 576 to 7,225 new infections.

2.10.7 A Case Study from South Africa

Reddy *et al.* [32] investigated the impact of COVID-19 vaccination in South Africa. Their research findings demonstrate that ensuring vaccine coverage for at least 40% of the population and prioritizing efficient vaccine rollout resulted in a substantial preventive effect. This approach successfully averted more than 9 million new COVID-19 infections, prevented over 70,000 deaths, and contributed to cost reductions by minimizing the need for hospitalizations.

2.10.8 A Case Study from Low- and Middle-Income Countries

Utami *et al.* [33] investigated the cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination in low- and middle-income nations. Their research revealed that administering

COVID-19 vaccines proved to be both cost-effective and cost-saving in reducing mortality and limiting the spread of COVID-19 within low- and middle-income countries.

2.10.9 A Case Study from China

Zhou *et al.* [34] examined the cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination in China. According to their research, delivering the COVID-19 vaccine to the general population in mainland China might reduce the infection rate by 55% and the death rate by 3.7% compared to a no-vaccination scenario.

This comprehensive overview of diverse studies provides a nuanced understanding of the global landscape of COVID-19 vaccination strategies. Each case study contributes unique insights into the economic considerations and epidemiological outcomes of vaccination efforts across different regions.

3 Discussion and future directions

In this paper, we conducted an extensive literature review focusing on articles related to the cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination. Notably, various authors have developed diverse epidemic models to assess the cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination. The majority of research findings consistently emphasize the effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination and other preventive measures as the most cost-effective strategies against the disease. While the accumulated evidence supports the significance of enhanced vaccination and preventive strategies, it is crucial to acknowledge a significant hurdle in the form of vaccine nationalism, particularly affecting low and middle-income economies. This remains a major obstacle in realizing an effective and widespread vaccination program. Consequently, further research is warranted to delve into how vaccine nationalism might influence or hinder the success of a cost-effective vaccination program for COVID-19 and other vaccine-preventable diseases. The authors strongly advocate for a more comprehensive exploration of these dynamics to inform more inclusive and globally impactful vaccination strategies.

The economic and social impact of any pandemic cannot be overemphasized. Infectious diseases could destabilize the growth and progress of every economy. Reduced human capital is a consequential outcome, stemming from both a decline in labor supply and diminished productivity caused by sickness and mortality resulting from the infectious disease. In this review, we have presented detailed reports on COVID-19 epidemic models, specifically focusing on the cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination. Additionally, we have identified areas in the existing literature that require further investigation and improvement. These areas represent potential gaps or limitations in current research, and addressing them can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics surrounding pandemics and vaccination strategies. Moreover, we have proposed directions for future research to fortify our preparedness against the occurrence of future pandemics.

Despite the significant success in our research, notable gaps persist in our knowledge and understanding of vaccine nationalism and macroeconomic epidemiological models for COVID-19, warranting further investigation. Specifically, future research should offer a detailed review of COVID-19 vaccine nationalism, shedding light on the uneven distribution of COVID-19 vaccines between wealthy and impoverished nations during the initial rollout. Additionally, a comprehensive review of macroeconomic epidemiological models is essential to explore how these models can provide effective strategies for managing the global economy in the event of future pandemics.

Given the current state of research and the prevailing trends, future directions in the study of the cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination should explore incorporating diffusive models that consider both temporal and spatial dimensions. The existing body of literature primarily emphasizes epidemic models highlighting the efficacy of vaccination and preventive measures. However, there is a need to elevate the complexity of these models by integrating diffusion dynamics across both time and space. By infusing diffusive models, researchers can attain a more detailed grasp of how infectious diseases propagate and the ramifications of vaccination strategies across diverse geographical locations and time frames. This approach has the potential to furnish more precise predictions and insights into the cost-effectiveness of vaccination programs, particularly in light of the challenges presented by vaccine nationalism. By incorporating spatial and temporal dimensions, future research can contribute to the development of more adaptable and robust strategies that address the complexities of global health crises.

References

- [1] Gold, M. R. (Ed.). (1996). Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine. Oxford university press.
- [2] Muennig, P., & Bounthavong, M. (2016). Cost-effectiveness analysis in health: a practical approach. John Wiley & Sons.
- [3] Levin, H. M., & McEwan, P. J. (2001). Cost-effectiveness analysis: Methods and applications (Vol. 4). Sage.
- [4] Cantor SB, Ganiats TG (1999) Incremental cost-effectiveness analysis: the optimal strategy depends on the strategy set. *Clin Epidemiol* 52(6):517-522
- [5] Ghosh M, Olaniyi S, Obabiyi OS. Mathematical analysis of reinfection and relapse in malaria dynamics, *Appl Math Comput*, 2020;373:125044, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2020.125044>.
- [6] Li, R., Zhang, P., Barker, L. E., Chowdhury, F. M., & Zhang, X. (2010). Cost-effectiveness of interventions to prevent and control diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. *Diabetes care*, 33(8), 1872-1894.
- [7] Otieno, G., Koske, J. K., & Mutiso, J. M. (2016). Cost-effectiveness analysis of optimal malaria control strategies in Kenya. *Mathematics*, 4(1), 14.
- [8] Myran, D. T., Morton, R., Biggs, B. A., Veldhuijzen, I., Castelli, F., Tran, A., ... & Pottie, K. (2018). The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of screening for and vaccination against hepatitis B virus among migrants in the EU/EEA: a systematic review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 15(9), 1898.
- [9] Fesenfeld, M., Hutubessy, R., & Jit, M. (2013). Cost-effectiveness of human papillomavirus vaccination in low and middle income countries: a systematic review. *Vaccine*, 31(37), 3786-3804.
- [10] Jit, M., & Mibe, W. (2015). Discounting in the evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of a vaccination programme: a critical review. *Vaccine*, 33(32), 3788-3794.
- [11] Am, G. (1996). Theoretical foundation of cost-effectiveness analysis. *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine*, 25-53.
- [12] Meltzer, D. O., Basu, A., & Sculpher, M. J. (2016). Theoretical foundations of cost-effectiveness analysis in health and medicine. In *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine* (pp. 39-66). New York: Oxford University Press.

- [13] Brent, R. J. (2023). Cost-Benefit Analysis versus Cost-Effectiveness Analysis from a Societal Perspective in Healthcare. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(5), 4637.
- [14] Du, M., Qin, C., Liu, M., & Liu, J. (2023). Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of COVID-19 Inactivated Vaccines in Reducing the Economic Burden of Ischaemic Stroke after SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Vaccines*, 11(5), 957.
- [15] Asamoah, J. K. K., Okyere, E., Abidemi, A., Moore, S. E., Sun, G. Q., Jin, Z., ... & Gordon, J. F. (2022). Optimal control and comprehensive cost-effectiveness analysis for COVID-19. *Results in Physics*, 33, 105177.
- [16] Asamoah, J. K. K., Owusu, M. A., Jin, Z., Oduro, F. T., Abidemi, A., & Gyasi, E. O. (2020). Global stability and cost-effectiveness analysis of COVID-19 considering the impact of the environment: using data from Ghana. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 140, 110103.
- [17] Olaniyi, S., Obabiyi, O.S., Okosun, K.O. et al. Mathematical modelling and optimal cost-effective control of COVID-19 transmission dynamics. *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* 135, 938 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjp/s13360-020-00954-z>
- [18] Kouidere A, Balatif O, Rachik M, Cost-effectiveness of a mathematical modeling with optimal control approach of spread of COVID-19 pandemic: A case study in Peru, *Chaos, Solitons Fractals: X*, 2023;10:100090, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csfx.2022.100090>.
- [19] Nana-Kyere S, Seidu B, A Mathematical Evaluation of the Cost-Effectiveness of Self-Protection, Vaccination, and Disinfectant Spraying for COVID-19 Control, *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, 2022;1715414. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/1715414>.
- [20] Srivastav AK, Ghosh M, Li X-Z, Cai L, Modeling and optimal control analysis of COVID-19: case studies from Italy and Spain, *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 2021;44, no. 11, pp. 9210-9223
- [21] Omame, A., Rwezaura, H., Diagne, M. L., Inyama, S. C., & Tchuenche, J. M. (2021). COVID-19 and dengue co-infection in Brazil: optimal control and cost-effectiveness analysis. *The European Physical Journal Plus*, 136(10), 1-33.
- [22] Tchoumi SY, Diagne ML, Rwezaura H, Tchuenche J.M. Malaria and COVID-19 co-dynamics: A mathematical model and optimal control, *Appl Math Model*, 2021;99:294-327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2021.06.016>.
- [23] Omame A., Isah M. E., Abbas M., An optimal control model for COVID-19, zika, dengue, and chikungunya co-dynamics with reinfection, *Optimal Control Applications and Methods* 2023;44 (1):170-204.

- [24] Hagens, A., Inkaya, A. ., Yildirak, K., Sancar, M., van der Schans, J., Acar Sancar, A., ... & Yegenoglu, S. (2021). COVID-19 vaccination scenarios: a cost-effectiveness analysis for Turkey. *Vaccines*,9(4), 399.
- [25] Lopez, F., Catal, M., Prats, C., Estrada, O., Oliva, I., Prat, N., ... & Ara, J. (2021). A Cost-Benefit Analysis of COVID-19 Vaccination in Catalonia. *Vaccines*, 10(1), 59.
- [26] Orangi, S., Ojal, J., Brand, S. P., Orlendo, C., Kairu, A., Aziza, R., ... & Barasa, E. (2022). Epidemiological impact and cost-effectiveness analysis of COVID-19 vaccination in Kenya. medRxiv.
- [27] Jo, Y., Kim, S. B., Radnaabaatar, M., Huh, K., Yoo, J. H., Peck, K. R., ... & Jung, J. (2022). Model-based cost-effectiveness analysis of oral antivirals against SARS-CoV-2 in Korea. *Epidemiology and Health*,44.
- [28] Li, R., Liu, H., Fairley, C. K., Zou, Z., Xie, L., Li, X., ... & Zhang, L. (2022). Cost-effectiveness analysis of BNT162b2 COVID-19 booster vaccination in the United States. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 119, 87-94.
- [29] Tao, W., Guo, H., Xu, Q., & Yu, D. (2021, August). COVID-19 Epidemic Forecasting and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis: A Case Study of Hong Kong. In *INFORMS International Conference on Service Science*(pp. 351-364). Springer, Cham.
- [30] Xiong, X., Li, J., Huang, B., Tam, T., Hong, Y., Chong, K. C., & Huo, Z. (2022). Economic value of vaccines to address the COVID-19 pandemic in Hong Kong: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Vaccines*, 10(4), 495.
- [31] Zang X, Krebs E, Chen S, Piske M, Armstrong WS, Behrends CN, Del Rio C, Feaster DJ, Marshall BDL, Mehta SH, Mermin J, Metsch LR, Schackman BR, Strathdee SA, Nosyk B; Localized HIV Modeling Study. The Potential Epidemiological Impact of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) on the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Epidemic and the Cost-effectiveness of Linked, Opt-out HIV Testing: A Modeling Study in 6 US Cities. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021 Jun 1;72(11):e828-e834. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1547.
- [32] Reddy, K. P., Fitzmaurice, K. P., Scott, J. A., Harling, G., Lessells, R. J., Panella, C., ... & Siedner, M. J. (2021). Clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination in South Africa. *Nature communications*, 12(1), 1-10.
- [33] Utami, A. M., Rendrayani, F., Khoiry, Q. A., Alfiani, F., Kusuma, A. S., & Suwantika, A. A. (2022). Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of COVID-19 Vaccination in Low-and Middle-Income Countries. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 2067-2076.

- [34] Zhou H, Ding N, Han X, Zhang H, Liu Z, Jia X, Yu J, Zhang W. Cost-effectiveness analysis of vaccination against COVID-19 in China. *Front Public Health*. 2023 Mar 7;11:1037556. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1037556OP

Appendix

Parameter	Description
$B(t)$	Concentration of the SARS-CoV-2 in the environment.
$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$	Transmission rates by individuals in the infected classes $E(t), A(t), I(t)$, respectively
β_4	Propensity rate of susceptible individuals getting the virus through the environment.
$(1 - \tau)\delta$	Rate at which the exposed individuals develops symptoms
$\tau\delta$	Rate of new asymptomatic infection
d_1	Disease-induced death rate
γ_1 and γ_2	recovery rates for symptomatic and asymptomatic
ψ_1, ψ_2 and ψ_3	Virus shedding rates into the environment by the exposed, infected and asymptotically infected
ϕ	natural removal of the virus from the environment

Table 1: Description of the parameters of the model (3)

Parameter	Description
Λ	Recruitment rate
λ	Force of infection
β	Natural death rate
β_1	Transmission rate
η	Transmission rate from the environment
γ	Relative transmissibility of asymptomatic individuals
k_1	Proportion of individuals who are timely diagnosis
k_2	Progression rate from exposed to the symptomatic (severely infected) class
α	Progression rate from exposed to the asymptomatic class
ϕ	Disease induced death rate
v_1	Proportion of asymptomatic patients who later move to the symptomatic (severely infected) class
v_2	Progression from asymptomatic to the symptomatic (severely infected) class
ϵ	Progression from asymptomatic to the recovered class
ρ	The rate at which symptomatic (severely infected) patients recovers
τ_1	The rate at which the recovered individuals join the susceptible class
m_1	Natural decay rate of virus from the environment (Surfaces)
m_2	The rate of viral release into the environment by asymptomatic patients

Table 2: Description of the parameters of the model (4)

Parameter	Description
β	Effective transmission coefficient
ε_1	Modification parameter for a reduced transmission from asymptomatic humans
ε_2	Modification parameter for a more reduced transmission from hospitalized class
α	Rate of disease progression from exposed class
l_1	Proportion of exposed with symptoms after the incubation period
$1 - l_1$	Proportion of exposed without symptoms after the incubation period
h_1	Hospitalization rate for symptomatic class
h_2	Hospitalization rate for asymptomatic class after confirmation
r_1	Recovery rate for symptomatic class
r_2	Recovery rate for asymptomatic class
γ	Recovery rate for hospitalized class
δ_1	Disease-induced mortality rate for symptomatic class
δ_2	Disease-induced mortality rate for hospitalized class

Table 3: Description of the parameters of the model (5)

Parameter	Description
β_1	The rate of people who were infected by contact with infected and asymptomatic
β_2	The rate of people who were infected by contact with infected and symptomatic
α_1	The rate of exposed become infected and asymptomatic
α_2	The rate of exposed become infected and symptomatic
θ_1	The number of infected and asymptomatic who have been under lockdown
θ_2	The number of infected and symptomatic who have been under lockdown
δ_1	Mortality rate due to serious complications
δ_2	mortality rate due to serious complications and with chronic diseases
δ_3	The rate of people who died under quarantine in hospitals.
μ	Natural mortality
η_1	The rate of infection with serious complications without chronic diseases under lockdown
η_2	The rate of infection with serious complications with chronic diseases under lockdown
σ	The rate at which people recover from the virus
γ	The rate at which infected become serious complications and those without and with chronic disease
χ	The fraction of infected and asymptomatic

Table 4: Description of the parameters of the model (6)

Parameter	Description
Λ	Recruitment rate
η_1	Contact rate
ψ	transmissibility factor associated with the asymptotically infected persons.
μ	natural death rate
θ	infection following exposure
ω and ρ	incubation periods of the disease
$\tau_1, \tau_2, \phi_1, \phi_2$	Recovery rates for infected, asymptotically infected, quarantined, and hospitalized individuals
γ and δ_2	hospitalization rates for infected and quarantined individuals
ξ_1 and ξ_2	COVID-19-induced death rates
η_2	Contact rate due to a visit to the seafood market
q_1 and q_2	Coronaviruses shed rates
q_3	Rate of removal of coronaviruses from the seafood market
δ_1	Quarantine rate

Table 5: Description of the parameters of the model (7)

Parameter	Description
β_1	Transmission rate from I_1 or I_2 to S_1 ,
β_2	Transmission rate from I_1 or I_2 to S_2 ,
β_3	Transmission rate from H to S_1 ,
β_4	Transmission rate from H to S_2
δ_1	Disease related death rate in I_1 compartment,
δ_2	Disease related death rate in I_2 compartment,
δ_3	Disease related death rate in H compartment,
ν_1	Rate of detection/isolation in I_1 compartment,
ν_2	Rate of detection/isolation in I_2 compartment,
η_1	Rate of progression of individuals from E_1 to I_1 ,
η_2	Rate of progression of individuals from E_1 to I_1 ,
γ_1	Rate of reinfection in E_1 compartment,
γ_2	Rate of reinfection in E_2 compartment,
α	Recovery rate of home isolated/hospitalized people.

Table 6: Description of the parameters of the model (8)

Parameter	Interpretation
ω_h	Human recruitment rate
ω_d	Vector recruitment rate
ϱ_h	Human natural death rate
η_{hd}	Loss of infection acquired immunity to dengue
Λ_{vd}	Effective contact rate for vector to human transmission of dengue
Λ_{hd}	Effective contact rate for human to vector transmission of dengue
α_{hd}	Dengue recovery rate
Λ_{hc}	Effective contact rate for human to human transmission of COVID-19
η_{hc}	Loss of infection acquired immunity to COVID-19
φ_{hc}	COVID-19-induced death rate
α_{hc}	COVID-19 recovery rate
ϑ_1	Modification parameter accounting for susceptibility of dengue-infected Individuals to COVID-19
ϑ_2	Modification parameter accounting for susceptibility of COVID-19-infected Individuals to dengue
φ_{hd}	Dengue-induced death rate
ϱ_v	Vector removal rate

Table 7: Description of the parameters of the model (9)

Parameter	Interpretation
Λ_h	Recruitment rate of the host population
ϕ_m	Progression rate from exposed to infectious malaria state
ϕ_c	Progression rate from exposed to infectious COVID-19 state
ϕ_{mc}	Fraction of individuals moving to the co-infection I_{mc} class
ω_m	Recovery rate of malaria infected individuals
ω_c	Recovery rate of COVID-19 infected individuals
ω_{mc}	Recovery rate of malaria and COVID-19 infectious individuals
μ	Death rate of the host population
δ	Enhancement factor of acquiring COVID-19 following malaria infection
ϵ	Enhancement factor of acquiring malaria following COVID-19 infection
σ	COVID-19 infection rate of individuals already infected with malaria
γ	Malaria infection rate of individuals already infected with COVID-19
κ	Fraction of individuals employing personal protection
ζ	Efficacy of personal protection
b	Number of female mosquito bites per day
β_m	Malaria transmission probability per mosquito bite
β_c	COVID-19 transmission probability per contact
Mosquitoes	
Λ_v	Recruitment rate of vectors
ϕ_v	Progression rate from exposed to infectious class
μ_v	Natural death rate of vectors
β_v	Transmission probability in vectors from infected humans

Table 8: Description of the parameters of the model (10)

Parameter	Description
Ψ^v	vector recruitment rate
Ψ^h	human recruitment rate
β_1	contact rate for COVID-19 infection
β_2	zika infection contact rate (sexual transmission)
β_2^h	zika infection contact rate (vector human)
β_3^h	dengue infection contact rate (vector human)
β_4^h	chikungunya infection contact rate (vector human)
β_2^v	zika infection contact rate (human to vector)
β_3^v	dengue infection contact rate (human to vector)
β_4^v	chikungunya infection contact rate (human to vector)
ϑ^h	human natural death rate
ϑ^v	vector removal rate
$\eta_C, \eta_Z, \eta_D, \eta_K$	COVID-19, zika, dengue and chikungunya disease-induced death rates, respectively
ζ_C	COVID-19 recovery rate
$\zeta_Z, \zeta_D, \zeta_K$	zika, dengue, chikungunya recovery rates

Table 9: Description of parameters of the model (11)