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Abstract

The importance of vaccination and the logistics involved in the procurement, storage and distribution of vaccines across their cold chain has come to the forefront during the COVID-19 pandemic. In this paper, we present a decision support framework for optimizing multiple aspects of vaccine distribution across a multi-tier cold chain network. We propose two multi-period optimization formulations within this framework: first to minimize inventory, ordering, transportation, personnel and shortage costs associated with a single vaccine; the second being an extension of the first for the case when multiple vaccines with differing efficacies and costs are available for the same disease. Vaccine transportation and administration lead times are also incorporated within the models. We use the case of the Indian state of Bihar and COVID-19 vaccines to illustrate the implementation of the framework. We present computational experiments to demonstrate: (a) the organization of the model outputs; (b) how the models can be used to assess the impact of storage capacities (at the cold chain points, transportation vehicle capacities) and manufacturer capacities on the optimal vaccine distribution pattern; and (c) the impact of vaccine efficacies and associated costs such as ordering and transportation costs on the vaccine selection decision informed by the model. We then consider the computational expense of the framework for realistic problem instances, and suggest multiple preprocessing techniques to reduce their computational burden. Our study presents public health authorities and other stakeholders with a vaccine distribution and capacity planning tool for multi-tier cold chain networks.
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1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic that originated in China rapidly spread throughout the world, and has caused more than four million deaths worldwide (Worldometers.info, 2021) and an estimated economic loss of nearly four trillion US dollars (Statista.com, 2021). While moderately effective treatments have been developed, vaccines offer the best chance for a long-term solution to the pandemic. Therefore, a number of vaccines have been successfully developed and vaccination programmes across the world are being operationalized, with multiple large countries having vaccinated more than half their populations (World Health Organization, 2021). Successfully conducting a vaccination programme for a large population entails significant operational challenges (NCCVMRC, 2014; Azadi et al., 2020); in particular, ensuring efficient distribution of the vaccines from the manufacturer to the medical centers where they are administered to eligible recipients among the public involves logistical challenges multiple fronts, especially when multiple tiers of the vaccine cold chain need to be traversed. In this context, we present in this paper a decision support tool, based on an integer linear programming framework, that facilitates optimal distribution of vaccines from the manufacturer to the point of administration across a multi-tier vaccine cold chain network. We demonstrate the applicability of this decision support framework for the case of the distribution of COVID-19 vaccines across the state of Bihar in India.

In most countries, vaccines are typically ordered from their manufacturer by a central planning authority such as the central or state government. The vaccines are then routed through one or more storage/distribution facilities before they are delivered to the point of administration, typically a medical center such as a primary health center. Each of these storage/distribution facilities are referred to as a cold chain point, because most vaccines must be stored and transported in refrigerated or sub-zero conditions. For example, in India, the vaccine cold chain of the public health system has multiple tiers: large government medical store depots (GMSDs) maintained by the central government, state level state vaccine stores (SVSs), regional vaccine stores (RVSs), and district vaccine stores (DVSs). The vaccines themselves are typically administered at medical facilities within a district which can be subcenters, primary health centers, community health centers, or district hospitals (NCCVMRC, 2014). Such multi-tier cold chains can be found in many countries. For example, Bangladesh has a four-tier vaccine chain: central vaccine store, district vaccine stores, Upazila or subdistrict vaccine stores, with vaccines being administered at the next tier (unions and wards) (Guichard et al., 2010). Niger also has a four-tier vaccine cold chain similar to that of Bangladesh (Assi et al., 2013). The Indian multi-tier vaccine cold chain is depicted in Figure 1. Given this, it is evident that a comprehensive decision support framework for optimizing vaccine distribution across multi-tier cold chain networks can prove useful for health planning authorities.

In this paper, we develop such an integer linear programming (ILP) based decision support framework that can optimize, given a planning horizon with discrete time units (e.g., an eight week period) and vaccine demand by recipient subgroup (e.g., of different age groups) for each time unit, the following aspects of vaccine distribution across the cold chain: (a) the cold chain facility from which the next lower-tier cold
chain facility must order (if an order is to be placed in a given time unit); (b) quantities of each vaccine (from a set of multiple vaccines available for a given disease) to be ordered at each cold chain tier in each time unit; (c) number of vehicles required to transport the vaccine quantities ordered in each time unit; (d) inventory levels at each cold chain facility in the network; (e) the number of vaccination staff required in each facility in each time unit; and (f) the number of vaccines to be administered to each subgroup in each time unit. The decision support framework attempts to optimize the above decisions by minimizing a total vaccine distribution cost objective function that takes into account fixed and variable costs (where applicable) associated with each of the above decisions. For example, we consider fixed and variable ordering and transportation costs, inventory holding costs, and vaccination workforce resizing costs. We incorporate measures for the priority of each vaccine recipient subgroup by incorporating a shortage cost per recipient in each subgroup: higher the shortage cost, higher the priority of recipients in that subgroup. Vaccine costs and efficacies are also considered, facilitating decisions regarding which vaccine to order for a given disease.

Previous work involving the use of operations research methods to optimize various aspects of vaccine distribution have focused on three main areas, as discussed in Section 2. Briefly, the first area involves optimizing timing of vaccine development (e.g., which strain of the virus to incorporate in the vaccine, as studied by Kornish & Keeney (2008)), and determining vial size and vaccine inventory replenishment schedules so that open vial wastage is minimized Azadi et al. (2019, 2020). The second area involves optimizing vaccine allocation across multiple recipient subgroups or geographical regions to minimize the impact of a disease Chick et al. 2008 Yarmand et al. 2014. The third area involves optimizing aspects of production and distribution of vaccines. For example, Hovav & Tsadikovich 2015 develop a nonlinear integer programming model to optimize distribution of a single vaccine across three tiers, wherein they consider recipient priorities as well. As described above, our work is concerned with the third area. Our research contributions with respect to previous work in this area are described in detail in the subsequent section.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the following section, we present the relevant literature on the application of operations research methods for optimizing various aspects of vaccine composition, allocation, production, and distribution. In section 3, we describe the vaccine distribution problem that we attempt to solve, the single-vaccine and multi-vaccine integer programming formulations that we develop, and describe the process of estimating the model parameters for the Indian state of Bihar. In section 4, we illustrate the application of the single vaccine and multi-vaccine formulations (for two vaccines) for the COVID-19 case, and potential methods to accelerate solution times for the models within the framework. In section 5, we conclude the paper with a discussion of its potential impact, limitations, and avenues for future research.
2. Literature Review

The vaccine supply chain in India (which we refer to in this paper as the vaccine cold chain) consists of multiple echelons starting from the vaccine manufacturer to the recipient in the vaccine administration facility, as shown in Figure 1. In this work, we attempt to optimize vaccine distribution across such a supply chain, and also consider the inherent challenges involved in such an endeavour, especially with regard to handling the uncertainty in the parameters of models developed for this purpose. In this section, we motivate our work with respect to the extant vaccine supply chain management literature. In the vaccine supply chain literature, researchers have focused on the following main research directions: a) vaccine composition, b) production and distribution of vaccines, and c) allocation of vaccines among the target population. In the following paragraphs, we discuss the literature within each of the these areas, and conclude with an account of the literature on handling parameter uncertainty associated with supply chain models.

2.1. Composition of Vaccines

In the context of composition of vaccines, policymakers are interested in determining the vaccines to be used for a particular disease, since a disease might have multiple vaccines. The problems studied in this case can be for a single disease (e.g., for the annual influenza vaccine, decisions regarding which strains are to be included in the vaccine for a particular year need to be made) or for multiple diseases (for example, pentavalent vaccines that target diptheria, tetanus, pertussis, hepatitis B and Haemophilus influenzae type B). Since this decision has to be taken before the onset of the disease due to long production times of vaccines, there is substantial uncertainty regarding demand for the vaccine and the schedule of vaccination. Researchers have studied multiple strategies to take better decisions to aid decision makers in this scenario. Wu et al. (2007) suggests that including only the predicted strain of influenza for vaccine development is only slightly suboptimal. The authors call it the “follow - policy”. Kornish & Keeney (2008) study the “commit or defer” policy, in which the vaccine manufacturer at any time period commits to produce or defers the production decision until more information about the incoming demand is available. Cho (2010) extended the work of Kornish & Keeney (2008) by incorporating production yield of vaccines and efficacy of vaccines in their study. The author derive an optimal dynamic policy for the problem, and show that there is an optimal threshold policy for when to retain the current strain, changing to a new strain, or defer production. Both studies only consider the possibility of choosing between the most prevalent circulating strain and the current strain. Ozaltın et al. (2011) studied the possibility of choosing multiple strains for inclusion in the vaccine. The authors present a multistage stochastic mixed integer program to address the problem. The authors show that incorporating more than three strains in a vaccine shot can improve societal welfare significantly.

A closely related problem to the composition of vaccines is the vial size determination. Vaccine vial sizes plays a major role in avoiding vaccine wastage, because a vial has multiple doses and once opened the vial have to be used within a specific time. Azadi et al. (2020) present a case study from Niger and Nigeria,
in which they study the effect of parameters like number of echelons in the supply chain, vaccine vial size and vaccine technologies on coverage rates and vaccine availability in clinics. The main focus of this study is to increase coverage rates by reducing vial wastage. One limitation of the study is that operational costs have not been included. Azadi et al. (2019) present a case study from Bangladesh in which the authors are interested in minimization of inventory replenishment and open vial wastage costs. The authors developed a two-stage stochastic programming model to address the problem. At the first level of the stochastic programming model, vaccine vial size is determined, while at the second stage clinics decide on opening vials in the event of uncertain patient arrivals. The authors show that a combination of vial sizes is more effective in reducing open vial wastage than the prevalent practice of using single-sized multi-dose vials. Dhamodharan & Proano (2012) considered both vaccine vial size determination and inventory management in which they studied optimal vaccine vial size determination and inventory re-ordering points to devise a policy that provides best trade-off between procurement costs and coverage levels.

2.2. Allocation of Vaccines

Allocation of vaccines in the target population is also a problem of significant complexity. Here, the decision maker is interested in deciding which group in the population should be vaccinated and which group should not be. Another variant of the problem also deals with allocating resources to different regions or different stakeholders to mitigate the spread of the disease. The problem accordingly takes a multi-player or a single player setting. Sun et al. (2009) studied a multi-player version of the problem in which different countries have their own vaccine stockpiles and at the onset of the pandemic, they have to decide how best to allocate the stock within their population and with other countries. The authors identify the conditions under which the optimal solution of a central planner (WHO) is optimal to all countries. Such a solution is to agree on an allocation scheme that will benefit every stakeholder. Mamani et al. (2013) studied the problem of vaccine allocation between countries in which there are both international as well as intranational transmissions of the disease. The authors propose a contract which reduces both the financial burden and also the number of infected people due to the influenza pandemic.

Under single decision maker setting, Uribe-Sánchez et al. (2011) studied a simulation optimization model to devise dynamic mitigation strategies to contain an influenza pandemic. Using historical data from a pandemic outbreak, the authors parameterize their model and generate useful insights for policymakers. Yarmand et al. (2014) study a vaccine allocation model in which vaccine allocation is done in two phases. At the first phase, a limited number of doses are allocated to each region, while at the second phase additional doses are allocated so as to contain the pandemic efficiently. The authors present a two phase stochastic linear program to solve the problem. The authors show that the two phase procedure is very cost efficient and yields considerably lower attack rates.
2.3. Production and Distribution of Vaccines

Vaccine production is characterised by uncertain production yields and demand, longer manufacturing times and frequent changes in composition of vaccines. Federgruen & Yang (2008) study a problem in which the decision maker has to satisfy uncertain demand by sourcing vaccines from multiple suppliers who in turn have uncertain production yields. The objective of the study is to devise a sourcing plan so as to minimize cost while the demand is satisfied with a certain probability. One way to manage uncertainty in production yields and demands is to adjust the pricing and selling strategies. Cho & Tang (2013) studied three selling strategies namely, advance, regular and dynamic selling. In the advance selling option, the manufacturer fixes the price before realisation of supply and demand, while in regular selling prices are fixed after the realisation of the uncertain parameters. The dynamic pricing option is a hybrid of the two options. The authors analyse and present the options that are beneficial to the manufacturer and the retailer. Eskandarzadeh et al. (2016) extended the work for a risk averse supplier in which the risk of lower production yield is controlled through pricing and quantity as decision variables.

In the context of inventory management in vaccine supply chains, Hovav & Tsadikovich (2015) present a multi-echelon (cost-benefit) model for inventory management of an influenza vaccine supply chain in Israel. The objective of the model is to minimize vaccination costs. The authors present a network flow approach to model the distribution of vaccines across their supply chain. The echelons considered in their model are manufacturers, distribution centers and recipients. A key drawback of their study is that they formulate their problem as a mixed-integer nonlinear optimization problem. Further, they do not consider fixed costs associated with transportation (e.g., the cost of booking a vehicle for transporting vaccines from one cold chain tier to another cold chain tier), or vaccination staffing decisions (they assume a fixed vaccination staff size). They also do not consider the possibility of other stakeholders like governmental entities in their model, which are highly likely to be present in larger countries such as India, Bangladesh, and in other regions of the developing world. Our work addresses these shortcomings by: (a) developing an integer linear program of vaccine distribution across the vaccine cold chain, (b) integrating fixed transportation costs and staffing decisions within our model, and (c) developing a more comprehensive multi-tier (multi-echelon in supply chain terminology) model of vaccine distribution by considering various intermediate public entities like regional vaccine stores, district vaccine stores and primary health centers. We also modify their conceptualization of shortage costs associated with not receiving a vaccine, which we discuss in Section 3.4.

2.4. Contributions of Our Study

The main contributions of our work with respect to the literature discussed above are listed below.

1. To the best of our knowledge, our model represents the most comprehensive multi-echelon inventory flow optimization model for a vaccine cold chain.
2. Our model is an integer linear program model of the network flow in a vaccine cold chain which, in contrast to the existing nonlinear integer program models developed for similar vaccine cold chain networks (Hovav & Tsadikovich 2015), can yield exact optimal solutions.
3. Our study is the first inventory flow model for the vaccine cold chain network in the Indian context that incorporates entities at government, state, region, district and clinic levels.

4. Our model provides a framework for integrating both fixed and variable vaccine transportation costs.

5. The model allows for determining the optimal vaccination staff levels required to satisfy the vaccine demand in a given time frame.

6. The model incorporates lead times associated with transportation between cold chain entities as well as the time required to prepare and administer newly arrived batches of vaccines at the clinic tier in the cold chain network.

7. To the best of our knowledge, our model provides the most comprehensive accounting of vaccine recipient subgroup prioritization considerations to date.

Our model can be extended to any vaccine or even multiple vaccines together taking into account the respective capacity requirements of each vaccine. We deal with the tactical decisions of allocation-location as well as strategic decisions of capacity planning, inventory level management, and vaccine recipient subgroup choice.


In this section, we first describe the decision problem that our framework addresses, and then describe the mathematical models within our framework. We then outline the model parameter estimation process to conclude this section.

3.1. Decision Problem Description

We develop an integer linear programming based framework for optimizing the decisions that need to be taken with regard to vaccine distribution across a hierarchical cold chain network. We consider decisions associated with the logistics of ordering, transporting, storing, and administering vaccine doses across the cold chain network. In addition to the above set of logistical decisions that are key to any supply chain network, we also introduce vaccination staff capacity planning at the last tier of the cold chain as the number of vaccine units that can be administered at any health centre would depend on the availability of the health workers responsible for doing so. We also consider decisions regarding the prioritization of subgroups of eligible recipients of vaccine units within our framework by associating subgroup-specific unit costs of not vaccinating a recipient belonging to each subgroup. We illustrate this by categorizing potential recipients by age. We consider this particular criterion for subgroup formation given its wide use in vaccination policies across the world.

Decision-making in our framework starts from when the vaccines are ready to be transported from the manufacturer(s) through the subsequent tiers at different time periods. We associate one or more costs with every decision that we consider in our model, and hence the models within our framework aim to minimize a stylized total cost of operating a vaccine cold chain subject to cold chain storage capacity, transportation
capacity, vaccination staff capacity, and administrative constraints. Given that we illustrate the application of our framework to the cold chain network in India, we now provide a brief overview of the same.

In India, the vaccine cold chain consists of the following tiers after the manufacturer, listed from the highest tier onwards to the lowest tier: GMSD (Government Medical Store Depot), SVS (State Vaccine Store), RVS (Regional Vaccine Store), DVS (District Vaccine Store) and the clinics (PHCs, CHCs and DHs) where the vaccines are actually administered to the intended recipients. The schematic of the flow of vaccines through the cold chain is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Flow of vaccines in Indian vaccine cold chain. This figure is adapted from Pg 3, National Cold Chain Assessment India, 2014 by UNICEF](NCCVMRC (2014))

India has 7 GMSDs located mostly in major cities: Mumbai, New Delhi, Chennai, Kolkata, Hyderabad, Guwahati and Karnal. It has 39 state vaccine stores, 123 regional vaccine stores, 644 district vaccine stores, and 20000+ public health centres (which include primary and secondary care facilities) spread across the country ([Inclentrust (2011)]). For our analysis, we consider the Indian state of Bihar, which has one state vaccine store (SVS) located at its capital city, Patna. We construct a framework that encompasses all the cold chain tiers in Figure 1, however, our framework can be utilized even if, in practice, one or more tiers do not play a role in a given region in vaccine distribution. However, in order to develop a comprehensive decision support framework, we assume that vaccine manufacturers ship vaccine doses to the GMSDs, which in turn ship to the SVS in the state under consideration. These supply vaccines to the entire state through intermediate levels or tiers comprising of regional vaccine stores (RVS) and district vaccine stores (DVS). DVSs then transport the vaccines to primary health centres (PHCs) and community health centres (CHCs) which actually administer the vaccine doses to the local population.

In the total operating cost of the cold chain we include vaccine inventory holding costs at each CCP,
fixed and variable transportation costs where fixed costs account for the one-time ordering cost of the vaccine transport vehicles, and the variable costs depend on the distance between CCPs and include fuel, costs of maintaining cold storage in the vehicles, etc. As mentioned earlier, we also include the cost of vaccines, and shortage costs associated with not vaccinating an eligible recipient which are different for different population subgroups. We also consider wages, hiring, and firing costs of health workers to facilitate vaccination staff capacity planning. We describe how these parameters were estimated later in this section.

We develop integer linear programs that consider a single vaccine for a given disease as well as multiple vaccines for a disease. We begin by describing the single-vaccine formulation.

3.2. Single Vaccine Model

We first list all the cold chain tiers included in the single-vaccine vaccine distribution model.

- Manufacturer index, $m \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, M\}$
- Government Medical Store Depot (GMSD) index, $g \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, G\}$
- State Vaccine Store (SVS) index, $s \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, S\}$
- Regional Vaccine Store (RVS) index, $r \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, R\}$
- District Vaccine Store (DVS) index, $d \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, D\}$
- Primary Health Centre (PHC) index, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, I\}$
- Customer group index, $j \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, J\}$
- Time period index, $t \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, T\}$

Parameters

The parameters associated with the single commodity optimal vaccine distribution network model are given below.

- Inventory holding cost parameters at each cold chain point: $h^g_t, h^s_t, h^r_t, h^d_t, h^i_t$. Units: INR/dose/week.
- Transportation cost (fixed + variable) per vehicle transporting vaccines from one cold chain point to another cold chain point at the next tier (e.g., manufacturer ‘m’ to GMSD ‘g’, or DVS ‘d’ to clinic ‘i’): $K^{mg}, K^{gs}, K^{sr}, K^{rd}, K^{di}$. Units: INR/truck. NOTE: Transportation cost = (Variable costs [Diesel costs + Labour costs + Refrigeration costs] + Fixed ordering cost) × Number of trucks.
- Vaccine inventory holding capacity at each CCP: $B^g_t, B^s_t, B^r_t, B^d_t, B^i_t$. Units: doses.
- Capacity of each vehicle transporting vaccines from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., manufacturer ‘m’ to GMSD ‘g’, or DVS ‘d’ to clinic ‘i’): $C^{mg}_t, C^{gs}_t, C^{sr}_t, C^{rd}_t, C^{di}_t$. Units: doses/truck.
• Fixed cost (ordering) of ordering vaccine by a CCP at a given level from the next higher-tier CCP (e.g., GMSD ‘g’ from manufacturer ‘m’, or clinic ‘i’ from DVS ‘d’): $S_{t}^{mg}$, $S_{t}^{gs}$, $S_{t}^{sr}$, $S_{t}^{rd}$, $S_{t}^{di}$. Units: INR/delivery.

• Maximum number of trucks available for transportation from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., manufacturer ‘m’ to GMSD ‘g’, or DVS ‘d’ to clinic ‘i’): $N_{mg}$, $N_{gs}$, $N_{sr}$, $N_{rd}$, $N_{di}$. Units: trucks/week.

• Lead times of delivery of vaccines from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., manufacturer ‘m’ to GMSD ‘g’, or DVS ‘d’ to clinic ‘i’): $L_{mg}$, $L_{gs}$, $L_{sr}$, $L_{rd}$, $L_{di}$. Units: weeks.

• Lead times of administration of vaccines at the clinics (‘i’): $L^{ij}$. Units: weeks.

• Initial vaccine inventory held at the CCPs: $I_{g0}$, $I_{s0}$, $I_{r0}$, $I_{d0}$, $I_{i0}$ Units: doses.

• Miscellaneous parameters:
  - Demand by sub-group ‘j’ at clinic ‘i’ at time $t$ (in doses/week): $D_{ij}^{t}$
  - Shortage cost (INR) of not vaccinating a customer in subgroup ‘j’ at time $t$: $P_{t}^{j}$
  - Clinical services cost per customer in subgroup ‘j’ (e.g., INR/dose): $V_{j}$
  - Average time (e.g., minutes/dose) required for administration of one vaccine dose: $T_{o}$
  - Availability of a health worker in hours at clinic ‘i’ for time period $t$ (e.g., 40 hours/week): $N_{i}^{t}$
  - The production capacity of manufacturer ‘m’ at time $t$ (in doses): $B_{mt}^{n}$
  - Wastage factor (proportion of each dose wasted; that is, effective dose volume required per dose is $\frac{1}{w}$): $w$
  - Wages of health workers per time period (e.g., INR/week): $L$
  - Fixed cost (INR) of hiring one health worker: $E$
  - Fixed cost (INR) of firing one health worker: $F$
  - Probability of getting exposed to the disease causing pathogen: $p$
  - Probability of developing the disease after vaccination upon exposure to the pathogen: $\eta$

**Total Demand**

The following is the total demand by all the sub-groups at all the clinics across the entire planning horizon.

$$Q = \sum_{t}^{T} \sum_{i}^{T} \sum_{j}^{J} \frac{D_{ij}^{t}}{w}$$

**Decision Variables**
In the single commodity formulation, we make decisions regarding the amount of inventory to be held at each CCP across the planning horizon, the number of doses to be ordered by a lower-tier CCP from a higher-tier CCP at each time period, number of trucks required for transporting the vaccine units from one CCP to a lower-tier CCP, vaccination staff numbers at each clinic, the number of doses to be administered, and the number of people to be vaccinated in each subgroup in each time period.

- Number of vaccine doses held at each CCP at the end of time $t$: $I^g_t$, $I^s_t$, $I^r_t$, $I^d_t$, $I^i_t$.
- Number of vaccine doses delivered from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP at the beginning of time $t$ (e.g., from manufacturer $m$ to GMSD $g$, or from DVS $d$ to clinic $i$): $q^{mg}_t$, $q^{gs}_t$, $q^{sr}_t$, $q^{rd}_t$, $q^{di}_t$.
- Number of trucks required for transporting vaccines from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP at time $t$ (e.g., manufacturer $m$ to GMSD $g$, or DVS $d$ to clinic $i$): $n^{mg}_t$, $n^{gs}_t$, $n^{sr}_t$, $n^{rd}_t$, $n^{di}_t$.
- Binary assignment variable indicating whether an order has been placed from a CCP by the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., order placed by GMSD $g$ from manufacturer $m$): $x^{mg}_t$, $x^{gs}_t$, $x^{sr}_t$, $x^{rd}_t$, $x^{di}_t$.
- Number of persons not vaccinated (i.e., number of shortages) and number of vaccine doses administered in subgroup $j$ in clinic $i$ at time $t$, respectively: $s^{ij}_t$, $w^{ij}_t$.
- Number of health workers working, hired and fired in clinic $i$ at time $t$ respectively: $n^i_t$, $h^i_t$, $f^i_t$.

**Objective Function**

The goal of our model is to minimize the total cost associated with vaccine distribution across the cold chain network. The following objective function shows the different sub-costs associated with the decisions to be taken at each point in the cold chain.

\[
\text{Min } J_{HCO} = \sum_i \sum_m \sum_g K^{mg} n^m_g t^g + \sum_i \sum_g \sum_s K^{gs} n^g_s t^g + \sum_i \sum_s \sum_r K^{sr} n^s_r t^r + \sum_i \sum_r \sum_d K^{rd} n^r_d t^d + \sum_i \sum_d \sum_i K^{di} n^d_i + \]

**Transportation cost \times number of vehicles from one CCP to next lower-tier CCP**

\[
\sum_i \sum_g h^{g}_t I^g_t + \sum_i \sum_s h^{s}_t I^s_t + \sum_i \sum_r h^{r}_t I^r_t + \sum_i \sum_d h^{d}_t I^d_t + \sum_i \sum h^{i}_t I^i_t +
\]

**Holding cost per dose \times inventory at cold chain points**

\[
\sum_i \sum_j P_i^j s^{ij}_t + \sum_i \sum_j (1 - \eta) P_i^j w^{ij}_t
\]

**Shortage cost per person \times number of persons not vaccinated at clinic**

\[
\sum_i \sum_j P_i^j s^{ij}_t + \sum_i \sum_j (1 - \eta) P_i^j w^{ij}_t
\]
\[ \sum_{t} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} V^j w^i_t + \]

**Clinical services cost per dose \times consumption of vaccine units at clinic**

\[ \sum_{t} \sum_{m} \sum_{g} s^m_{t} x^m_{t} + \sum_{t} \sum_{g} \sum_{s} s^g_{t} x^g_{t} + \sum_{t} \sum_{s} \sum_{r} s^r_{t} x^r_{t} + \sum_{t} \sum_{r} \sum_{d} s^d_{t} x^d_{t} + \sum_{t} \sum_{d} \sum_{i} s^i_{t} x^i_{t} + \]

**Ordering cost (cost incurred if even one vaccine unit is ordered)**

\[ \sum_{t} \sum_{i} Ln^i_t + \sum_{t} \sum_{i} Eh^i_t + \sum_{t} \sum_{i} F f^i_t \]

**Labour costs (wages, hiring and firing costs)**

Subject to:

- Production capacity constraints associated with the manufacturers. The number of units transported from the manufacturer to the GMSDs cannot exceed the production capacity of the manufacturer at time \( t \).
  \[ \sum_{g=1}^{G} q^m_{t} \leq B^m_{t} \ \forall \ m, t \]  

- Facility selection constraints. These constraints restrict the CCP at a given level (\( b \)) to order only from one CCP at the next higher-tier CCP (\( a \)).
  \[ \sum_{a} x^a_{t} \leq 1 \ \forall \ b, t \text{ if } a \in \{g, s, r, d\} \text{ then } b := \text{next lower-tier value from} \{s, r, d, i\} \]  

  For example,
  \[ \sum_{g} x^g_{t} \leq 1 \ \forall \ s, t \]

- To ensure consistency of \( x \) and \( q \). These constraints ensure that \( x \) and \( q \) are zero/non-zero simultaneously.
  \[ q^a_{t} \leq (N^{ab} C^{ab}) x^a_{t} \ \forall \ a, b, t \text{ if } a \in \{m, g, s, r, d\} \text{ then } b := \text{next lower-tier value from} \{g, s, r, d, i\} \]  

  For example,
  \[ q^m_{t} \leq (N^{mg} C^{mg}) x^m_{t} \ \forall \ m, g, t \]

- Transportation vehicle capacity constraints. The number of trucks needed to transport the requisite number of doses from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP will depend on the capacity of the trucks and the number of doses being transported.
  \[ \frac{q^a_{t}}{C^{ab}_{t}} \leq n^a_{t} \ \forall \ a, b, t \text{ if } a \in \{m, g, s, r, d\} \text{ then } b := \text{next lower-tier value from} \{g, s, r, d, i\} \]  

\[ 13 \]
For example,
\[
\frac{q_{mg}^t}{c_{mg}} \leq n_{mg}^t \quad \forall \ m, g, t
\]

- Inventory balance constraints. This constraint balances the inflow and outflow of vaccine doses to and from a CCP, taking lead times for vaccine delivery into account.

\[
I_{t-1}^b + \sum_{a=1}^{A} q_{ab-Lab}^t = I_t^b + \sum_{c=1}^{C} q_{bc}^t \quad \forall \ b, t
\]

(5)

Here, if \( b \in \{g, s, r, d\} \), then \( a := \) next higher-tier value from \( \{m, g, s, r\} \) and \( c := \) next lower-tier value from \( \{s, r, d, i\} \). For example,

\[
I_{t-1}^g + \sum_{m=1}^{M} q_{mg-Lmg}^t = I_t^g + \sum_{s=1}^{S} q_{gs}^t \quad \forall g, t
\]

We write the inventory balance constraint for the clinic separately given that vaccine doses are consumed at this CCP.

\[
I_{t-1}^i + \sum_{d=1}^{D} q_{di-Ldi}^t = I_t^i + \sum_{j=1}^{J} w_{ij}^t \quad \forall i, t
\]

(7)

- Inventory Capacity Constraints. The amount of inventory held at a CCP cannot exceed the available capacity of the cold chain equipment (CCE) at that CCP.

\[
I_t^a \leq B_t^a \quad \forall \ a, t \quad a \in \{g, s, r, d, i\}
\]

(6)

For example,

\[
I_t^g \leq B_t^g \quad \forall \ g, t
\]

- Consumption balance constraints. The sum of administered doses and the intended doses not administered should be equal to the demand at time \( t \).

\[
w_{ij}^t + s_{ij}^t = D_{ij}^t \quad \forall \ i, j, t
\]

(7)

- Constraints on consumption incorporating lead time of administration. This constraint implies that the number of vaccine doses administered at a clinic \( i \) at time \( t \) cannot be greater than the inventory level present \( L_i \) periods ago. This constraint implies that a consignment of vaccine doses is likely to be consumed over a certain period of time, and not as soon as soon as the consignment is delivered to the clinic. Note that this constraint is absent if \( L_{ij} = 0 \).

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{J} w_{ij}^t \leq I_{t-Li}^i \quad \forall i, t
\]

(8)

- Medical personnel availability constraints. This constraint restricts the number of vaccine units that can be administered over a time period \( t \) based on the availability of vaccination personnel during worker hours and the time it takes to administer a single vaccine dose.

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{J} T_o w_{ij}^t \leq N_t^i n_t^i \quad \forall i, t
\]

(9)
• Health Workers Balance Constraints. A vaccination workforce size balance constraint to model potential movement of vaccination personnel across clinics depending upon the demand at various clinics.

\[ n_i^t = n_{i-1}^t + h_i^t - f_i^t \quad \forall \; i, t \]  

(10)

3.3. Multiple Vaccine Model

In our multiple vaccine formulation, the cold chain points are indicated by the same indices as for the single vaccine formulation. However, we have an additional index for the vaccine type.

• Vaccine index, \( k \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, K\} \) \((K \leq M)\)

Parameters

• Inventory holding cost parameters for vaccine \( k \) at each cold chain point: \( h_{kg}^t, h_{ks}^t, h_{kr}^t, h_{kd}^t, h_{ki}^t \). Units: INR/dose/week.

• Transportation cost (fixed + variable) per vehicle transporting vaccines from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., manufacturer \( m \) to GMSD \( g \), or DVS \( d \) to clinic \( i \)): \( K_{mg}^t, K_{gs}^t, K_{sr}^t, K_{rd}^t, K_{di}^t \). Units: INR/vehicle.

• Vaccine inventory holding capacity at each CCP: \( B_{kg}^t, B_{ks}^t, B_{kr}^t, B_{kd}^t, B_{ki}^t \). Units: cm\(^3\).

• Capacity of each vehicle transporting vaccines from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., manufacturer \( m \) to GMSD \( g \), or DVS \( d \) to clinic \( i \)): \( C_{mg}^t, C_{gs}^t, C_{sr}^t, C_{rd}^t, C_{di}^t \). Units: cm\(^3\).

• Fixed cost (ordering) of ordering vaccine by a CCP from the next higher-tier CCP (e.g., GMSD \( g \) from manufacturer \( m \), or clinic \( i \) from DVS \( d \)): \( S_{mg}^t, S_{gs}^t, S_{sr}^t, S_{rd}^t, S_{di}^t \). Units: INR/delivery.

• Maximum number of vehicles available for transportation from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., manufacturer ‘m’ to GMSD ‘g’, or DVS ‘d’ to clinic ‘i’): \( N_{mg}^t, N_{gs}^t, N_{sr}^t, N_{rd}^t, N_{di}^t \). Units: vehicles.

• Lead times of delivery of vaccines from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., manufacturer \( m \) to GMSD \( g \), or DVS \( d \) to clinic \( i \)): \( L_{mg}^t, L_{gs}^t, L_{sr}^t, L_{rd}^t, L_{di}^t \). Units: weeks.

• Lead times of administration of vaccines at the clinics: \( L_{ij}^t \). Units: weeks.

• Initial inventory of vaccine \( k \) held at the CCPs: \( I_{kg}^0, I_{ks}^0, I_{kr}^0, I_{kd}^0, I_{ki}^0 \) Units: doses.

• Miscellaneous parameters:
  
  – Demand by sub-group \( j \) in the clinic \( i \) at time \( t \) (in doses/week): \( D_{ij}^t \)
  
  – Shortage cost (INR) of not vaccinating a customer in subgroup \( j \) at time \( t \): \( P_{ij}^t \)
– Clinical services cost per customer in subgroup $j$ (e.g., INR/dose) for vaccine $k$: $V^{kj}$
– Average time (e.g., minutes/dose) required for administration of one vaccine dose: $T_o$
– Availability of a health worker in hours at clinic $i$ for time period $t$ (e.g., 40 hours/week): $N^i_t$
– The production capacity of manufacturer $m$ for vaccine $k$ at time $t$ (in doses): $B^{mk}_t$
– Wastage factor (proportion of each dose wasted; that is, effective volume required per dose is $\frac{1}{w}$):
– Wages of health workers per time period (e.g., INR/week): $L$
– Fixed cost (INR) of hiring one health worker: $E$
– Fixed cost (INR) of firing one health worker: $F$
– Packed vaccine volume per dose (cm$^3$/dose) of vaccine $k$: $P_k$
– Probability of getting exposed to SARS-CoV2 $\eta_k$

**Total demand**

The following is the total demand by all the subgroups at all the clinics across the entire planning horizon.
This is the same as that for single vaccine formulation.

\[
Q = \sum_t^{T} \sum_i^{I} \sum_j^{J} \frac{D^{ij}_t}{w}
\]

**Decision Variables**

- Number of doses of vaccine $k$ held at each CCP at the end of time $t$: $I^{kg}_t, I^{ks}_t, I^{kr}_t, I^{kd}_t, I^{ki}_t$
- Number of doses of vaccine $k$ delivered from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP at the beginning of time $t$ (e.g., from manufacturer $m$ to GMSD $g$, or from DVS $d$ to clinic $i$): $q^{kmg}_t, q^{kgs}_t, q^{ksr}_t, q^{krd}_t, q^{kdi}_t$
- Number of vehicles required for transporting vaccines from one CCP to the next lower-tier CCP at time $t$ (e.g., manufacturer $m$ to GMSD $g$, or DVS $d$ to clinic $i$): $n^{mg}_t, n^{gs}_t, n^{sr}_t, n^{rd}_t, n^{di}_t$
- Binary assignment variable indicating whether an order has been placed from a CCP by the next lower-tier CCP (e.g., order placed by GMSD $g$ from manufacturer $m$): $x^{kmg}_t, x^{kgs}_t, x^{ksr}_t, x^{krd}_t, x^{kdi}_t$
- Number of persons not vaccinated (i.e., number of shortages) and number of doses of vaccine $k$ administered in subgroup $j$ in clinic $i$ at time $t$, respectively: $s^{ij}_t, w^{ijk}_t$
- Number of health workers working, hired and fired in clinic $i$ at time $t$ respectively: $n^i_t, h^i_t, f^i_t$

**Objective Function**
Min $J =$

$$
\sum_i \sum_m \sum_g K_iq^{mg}_{nt} + \sum_i \sum_g \sum_s K^s_iq^{gs}_{nt} + \sum_i \sum_s \sum_r K^r_iq^{sr}_{nt} + \sum_i \sum_r \sum_d K^d_iq^{rd}_{nt} + \sum_i \sum_d \sum_i K^{di}_i +
$$

Transportation cost * no of trucks from one cold chain point to other

$$
\sum_i \sum_k \sum_g h^{kg}_i T^{kg}_t + \sum_i \sum_k \sum_s h^{ks}_i T^{ks}_t + \sum_i \sum_k \sum_r h^{kr}_i T^{kr}_t + \sum_i \sum_k \sum_d h^{kd}_i T^{kd}_t + \sum_i \sum_k \sum_i h^{ki}_i T^{ki}_t
$$

Holding cost * Inventory at cold chain points

$$
\sum_i \sum_j \sum_k p P^{ij}_t s^{ij}_t + \sum_i \sum_k \sum_j \sum_i (1 - \eta_k) p P^{ij}_t w^{ij}_t
$$

Shortage cost associated with getting disease without and with vaccination

$$
\sum_i \sum_k \sum_i \sum_j V^{ij}_t w^{ij}_t
$$

Clinical cost * Consumption of vaccine units at clinic

$$
\sum_i \sum_k \sum_m \sum_g S^{mg}_i x^{mg}_t + \sum_i \sum_g \sum_s S^{gs}_i x^{gs}_t + \sum_i \sum_s \sum_r S^{sr}_i x^{sr}_t + \sum_i \sum_r \sum_d S^{rd}_i x^{rd}_t + \sum_i \sum_d \sum_i S^{di}_i x^{di}_t
$$

Ordering cost (cost incurred if even one vaccine unit is ordered)

$$
\sum_i \sum_l Ln^i_t + \sum_i \sum_i Eh^i_t + \sum_i \sum_i Fr^i_t
$$

Labour costs (Wages, hiring and firing costs)

Subject to constraints:

- Production capacity constraints associated with the manufacturers.

$$
\sum_{g=1}^{G} q^{mg}_t \leq B^{mk}_t \quad \forall k, m, t
$$

- Facility selection constraints.

$$
\sum_a x^{ab}_t \leq 1 \quad \forall b, t \quad \text{if } a \in \{g, s, r, d\} \text{ then } b := \text{ the next lower-tier value from } \{s, r, d, i\}
$$

For example,

$$
\sum_g x^{gs}_t \leq 1 \quad \forall s, t
$$
• To ensure consistency of $x$ and $q$.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} q_{k}^{ab} P_{k} \leq (N_{ab}^{\text{C}_{t}}^{ab}) x_{t}^{ab} \quad \forall \ a, b, t \quad (3)$$

Here, if $a \in \{m, g, s, r, d\}$, then $b :=$ the next lower-tier value from $\{g, s, r, d, i\}$. For example,

$$q_{t}^{kmg} \leq (N_{mg}^{\text{C}_{t}}^{mg}) x_{t}^{kmg} \quad \forall \ k, m, g, t$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} q_{t}^{kgs} P_{k} \leq (N_{gs}^{\text{C}_{t}}^{gs}) x_{t}^{kgs} \quad \forall \ g, s, t$$

• Number of vehicles.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} q_{t}^{kab} P_{k} \leq n_{t}^{ab} \quad \forall \ a, b, t \quad (4)$$

Here, if $a \in \{m, g, s, r, d\}$ then $b :=$ the next lower-tier value from $\{g, s, r, d, i\}$. For example,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} q_{t}^{kmg} P_{k} \leq n_{t}^{mg} \quad \forall \ m, g, t$$

• Inventory balance constraints.

$$I_{t-1}^{kb} + \sum_{a=1}^{A} q_{t}^{kab} = I_{t}^{kb} + \sum_{c=1}^{C} q_{t}^{kbc} \quad \forall \ k, b, t \quad (5)$$

Here, if $b \in \{g, s, r, d\}$, then $a :=$ next higher-tier value from $\{m, g, s, r\}$ and $c :=$ next lower-tier value from $\{s, r, d, i\}$. For example,

$$I_{t-1}^{kg} + \sum_{m=1}^{M} q_{t}^{kmg} = I_{t}^{kg} + \sum_{a=1}^{S} q_{t}^{kgs} \quad \forall \ k, g, t$$

$$I_{t-1}^{ki} + \sum_{d=1}^{D} q_{t}^{ldi} = I_{t}^{ki} + \sum_{j=1}^{J} w_{ijk} \quad \forall \ k, i, t$$

• Inventory Capacity Constraints.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} I_{t}^{ka} P_{k} \leq B_{t}^{a} \quad \forall \ a, t \quad a \in \{g, s, r, d, i\} \quad (6)$$

For example,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} I_{t}^{kg} P_{k} \leq B_{t}^{g} \quad \forall \ g, t$$

• Consumption balance constraints.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_{ijk}^{ij} + s_{t}^{ij} = D_{t}^{ij} \quad \forall \ i, j, t \quad (7)$$
• Constraints on consumption incorporating lead time of administration.

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{J} w_{ijk}^{t} \leq t_{ki}^{t-L_{ij}} \forall \ i, k, t \]  

(8)

• Medical Personnel Availability Constraints.

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{k=1}^{K} T_{i} w_{ijk}^{t} \leq N_{i}^{t} n_{i}^{t} \forall \ i, t \]  

(9)

• Health Workers Balance Constraints.

\[ n_{i}^{t} = n_{i}^{t-1} + h_{i}^{t} - f_{i}^{t} \forall \ i, t \]  

(10)

3.4. Model Parameter Estimation

We have collected data for the vaccine cold chain network and the associated equipment numbers in each district of Bihar. The vaccine delivery network in Bihar operates through 1 SVS, 9 RVSs, 38 DVSs, and 606 clinics (MOHFW (2017)). The map of the immunization network indicating the different cold chain points at various tiers in Bihar is shown in figure 2.

Estimation of Cold Chain and Transportation Vehicle Capacity

Thus, there are 654 cold chain points within the vaccine distribution network in the state of Bihar. We determined that a total of 1,946 cold chain equipments have been found to be working across this cold chain network in the state (MOHFW (2017)). The numbers of each equipment type, the dimensions of the refrigerated and insulated vans (NCCVMRC (2014)) and the cold boxes (MOHFW (2016)) and estimates of other associated parameters such as the utilization factor are given in Table 1. We have assumed that the cold chain equipment for a given district are uniformly distributed across all its health centers where the vaccines are administered. For calculating the capacity of these cold chain equipment, the packed vaccine volumes per dose for the two types of COVID-19 vaccines were taken from the official data released by the Indian government (MOHFW (2021)).

Vaccines are transported in refrigerated vans from the manufacturer to the GMSD and from the GMSD to the SVS (for long distances), and in insulated vans from the SVS to all other downstream cold chain points (NCCVMRC (2014)). The capacities of these vans were calculated by assuming standard dimensions of the vehicles with a certain utilization factor. Utilization factor is a number less than 1 which is multiplied with the storage shelf volume to arrive at the actual fraction of space available for storing vaccines. It is based on the fact that the entire storage space available for storing vaccines cannot be used due to loss of vaccine doses caused by vaccine handling practices, packaging dimensions, etc. The most commonly used estimate for this parameter is 0.67 (WHO (2017)). The distances between each CCP were estimated via the Bing Maps application, and used to populate a distance matrix. The distance is then multiplied by fuel (diesel) cost to get the variable transportation cost. Fixed transportation costs have been reasonably assumed to account for the one-time ordering cost of a vehicle.
Estimation of demand

In order to demonstrate how the optimization framework can be used to prioritize certain subpopulations over others, we assumed that the population of the state can be divided into three subgroups categorized on the basis of age: children (less than 18 years), adults (between 18 to 60 years) and elderly (60 years and above). Assuming one dose of vaccine administered per person, the weekly demand for each subgroup at each clinic is calculated from the population distribution by age among all the districts in the state. The population distribution by age was obtained from the most recent Census data published by the Indian government (MHA, 2011a). This is multiplied with the growth rates by age group (MHA, 2011b) to arrive at the estimates of the population size of each subgroup.

Estimation of other parameters

The production capacity of the manufacturer has been assumed to be around 2 billion doses for the entire country (European Pharmaceuticals, 2020). However, as we demonstrate in the subsequent sections, we have performed extensive analysis regarding how the manufacturer’s production capacity affects vaccine distribution among the population - i.e., affects the extent to which demand is satisfied across the planning
Table 1: Initial data required for estimation of capacities. The dimensions are estimated based on the commercially available trucks and cold boxes in India taken from [https://www.indiamart.com/](https://www.indiamart.com/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of CCE units in Bihar MOHFW (2017)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIF (Walk in Freezer)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC (Walk in Cooler)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR (In-line Refrigerator)</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF (Deep Freezer)</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous WHO 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization factor</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard dimensions of trucks 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard dimensions of cold boxes 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inventory holding cost has been assumed to be Rs 0.3 per unit vaccine per week for all CCPs at all the tiers. The ordering costs at each tier have been reasonably assumed with costs per order increasing with the level of the CCP tier. We note here that the vaccine ordering costs at each cold chain tier can be considered to be proxy measures of the efficiency of the ordering process at a given tier. Thus these costs can be adjusted depending upon the perception of the decision-maker or analyst using this proposed decision support tool regarding the efficiency of the ordering process at a given cold chain tier. Note that ordering costs can be varied across specific facilities within a cold chain tier. Hence it is the relative values of the ordering costs both within and across cold chain tiers that are of more importance than the actual estimates themselves. A similar argument can be made for the fixed costs associated with transportation as well.

The wages, hiring, and firing cost of vaccination staff have been reasonably assumed by collecting data on standard wages. The wages are taken as the median salary of nurses (monthly) in Bihar which are adjusted appropriately to obtain the weekly wages. The hiring and firing costs have been accordingly assumed.

We explain the estimation of the shortage costs within the context for the multi-vaccine model, which can be considered to be a generalization of the single-vaccine model. We develop our modelling of the costs of not vaccinating eligible recipients based on the notion of shortage costs introduced in Hovav & Tsadikovich (2015); however, we extend their conceptualization in the following ways: (a) we modify their shortage cost model to incorporate the multiple vaccine case, which involves including a measure of vaccine effectiveness in the shortage cost model; and (b) we include the costs of the loss of life due to the disease in question, as well as the costs of illness (but not mortality), among both vaccinated and unvaccinated persons. The shortage
costs are included in the objective function of the multi-vaccine formulation in the following manner:

\[
\sum_t \sum_i \sum_j p P_{ij} s_{ij} + \sum_t \sum_k \sum_i \sum_j p (1 - \eta_k) P_{ij} w_{ijk}
\]

Here \( p \) is the probability of exposure to the SARS-CoV2 virus (we assume exposure to the virus leads to developing COVID-19 with 100% probability), and \( \eta_k \) is the effectiveness of the vaccine. Thus \( 1 - \eta_k \) represents the probability of developing COVID-19 upon exposure to the virus after getting vaccinated. The probability of exposure to the disease \( p \) can be estimated using serosurvey data (for example, 56% of the population residing in certain areas of New Delhi were found in a serosurvey to have COVID-19 antibodies [Hindu 2021] or can even be set to 1.0 for endemic diseases. We multiply both terms by \( P_{ij} \) (the shortage cost associated with a person in the \( j^{th} \) subgroup contracting the disease under question) to get the costs incurred in each case. \( P_{ij} \) is given by the following formula:

\[
P_{ij} = [mI (L - \bar{A}) + (1 - m) * R]
\]

Here \( m \) is the case fatality rate for the disease, \( I \) is the per-capita income, \( \bar{A} \) is the average age in the \( j^{th} \) subgroup, \( L \) is the population average life expectancy and \( R \) is the cost of treatment incurred by the payer (e.g., the government, or the societal cost as a whole) per case of the disease. Vaccine effectiveness (\( \eta_k \)) values have been taken from the official data given for each vaccine. A sero-survey (which tested people for COVID-19 antibodies via serological tests) was conducted in Delhi in the month of January 2021, and estimated that about 56% of the Delhi residents were exposed to the SARS-CoV2 virus [Hindu 2021]. This gives us an estimate of \( p \), the probability that a person is exposed to the virus. Note that we assume that everybody who is exposed to the virus develops the COVID-19 disease. We considered the most recent estimate of the case fatality rate of COVID-19, found out the difference between the average age of the age group and life expectancy (\( \sim 69 \) years) [Bank 2018] and multiplied with per-capita income (Rs 1,25,408) [Express 2019] to estimate the shortage cost (which is the loss in GDP) in case the person dies from COVID-19. If the person does not die (the probability of survival is \( 1 - m \)), then the additional treatment fees is incurred which is given by \( R \). These estimates were rounded to obtain the shortage costs actually used in the model. We would like to emphasize here that we provide these details to illustrate how shortage costs for a particular vaccine can be calculated and that this may be modified based on the disease under consideration as well as the data available for the vaccine(s) and the disease.

The fraction of available capacity for COVID-19 vaccine has been estimated as a ratio of the total demand for COVID-19 to the total demand for all the other vaccines, taking into account their respective packed vaccine volumes per dose. We note here that a single average packed vaccine volume per dose is taken for all the other vaccines for ease of calculation.

The values for each of the estimated/assumed parameters are given in Table 2.
Table 2: Estimated parameters and their values. "Assumed. *Estimated. The values indicated here are the demand values of each subgroup averaged over all the districts of Bihar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inventory holding costs (INR/dose/week)*</td>
<td>For all CCPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m (\rightarrow) g</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g (\rightarrow) s</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s (\rightarrow) r</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r (\rightarrow) d</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d (\rightarrow) i</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Transportation cost (INR)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m (\rightarrow) g</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g (\rightarrow) s</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s (\rightarrow) r</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r (\rightarrow) d</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d (\rightarrow) i</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel cost (INR/km) *</td>
<td>Across the cold chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packed vaccine volume (cm3/dose) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covishield</td>
<td>0.2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covaxin</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measles</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering cost (INR/delivery)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m (\rightarrow) g</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g (\rightarrow) s</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s (\rightarrow) r</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r (\rightarrow) d</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d (\rightarrow) i</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand (D_{ij}^{st}) (doses/week)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (&lt;18)</td>
<td>~ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 - 60)</td>
<td>~ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly (&gt;60)</td>
<td>~ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage cost (P_{ij}^{st}) (INR) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (&lt;18)</td>
<td>216,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 - 60)</td>
<td>285,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly (&gt;60)</td>
<td>322,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation capacities (cm3/truck) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulated van</td>
<td>960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerated van</td>
<td>9,675,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of vaccine (INR/dose) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covishield</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covaxin</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of vaccine (\eta_{k}) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covishield</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covaxin</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of getting exposed to SARS-CoV2 (p) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required for administering a dose of vaccine (min/dose) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of medical personnel administering vaccines (min/week) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of hiring of medical personnel administering vaccines (INR) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of firing of medical personnel administering vaccines (INR) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly wages of medical personnel administering vaccines (INR) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine production capacity of the manufacturers (doses/week) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of capacity reserved for storing COVID-19 vaccines *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Numerical results

We organize our presentation of the numerical experiments that we perform with the single vaccine and multiple vaccine as follows. First, we demonstrate how solving the single and multiple vaccine formulations yield results that can inform decisions associated with the distribution of vaccines across the CCP that we consider. As part of this, we consider the impact of certain parameters on the optimal ordering and inventory patterns generated by these formulations. Next, we consider the computational cost of the single vaccine formulation, and discuss preprocessing techniques that can be used to speed up solution generation as well as improve the quality of the solutions.

4.1. Single Vaccine Model

We begin by demonstrating the output of the single vaccine model within the decision support framework that we develop. In order to illustrate how the output of the decision support framework can be organized and analyzed, we consider a relatively small component of the cold chain in the state of Bihar, especially at the district level: we include only two districts (which we refer to henceforth as districts 1 and 2, respectively). This implies that in addition to the manufacturer, the GMSD, the SVS, and 9 RVSs, we consider 2 DVSs and 16 clinics, with 10 located in district 1 and 6 in district 2. Further, for ease of representation of the model output, we consider a 6 week planning horizon.

We present the output of the single vaccine model for the above cold chain for two cases: in the first case, all model parameters are estimated from Table 2 (which we refer to as the base case), and in the second case, we consider a vaccine with a higher packed volume per dose of 3.3 $cm^3$/dose (for the measles vaccine). We present the model output in this manner because the COVID-19 vaccine packed volumes per dose (e.g., 0.211 $cm^3$/dose) appear to be significantly lower than those of other commonly used vaccines, implying that the capacity required to transport and store vaccines other than the COVID-19 vaccines is likely to be significantly lower. This also provides us with an opportunity to demonstrate how storage and transportation capacity affects the optimal ordering, inventory storage, shortages, and staffing decisions associated with vaccine distribution across the cold chain. The output for the base case is provided in Table 3 and the output for the higher packed volume per dose case is provided in Table 4. Tables 3 and 4 do not list the decisions for every facility in the cold chain network; for brevity, they only contain the facilities between which vaccines are transported in a given time period. For example, for the base case, we see that all of the ordering and transportation occurs in week 1, and that the vaccines are transported to the clinics along the following path: manufacturer → the GMSD → the SVS → RVS 5 → DVS → the clinics.

We first note from Tables 3 and 4 that the number of shortages incurred (Tables 3b, 4b), the inventory held at different time periods across the planning horizon at different CCPs, which we refer to henceforth as the inventory pattern (Tables 3c, 4c) and the vaccination staff’s recruitment schedule (tables 3d, 4d) remain the same for both the cases. However, we see that the ordering and vaccine transportation patterns as seen in tables 3a and 4a are different when the storage and transportation capacity are significantly different.
We observe that for the base case, a single DVS (DVS 1) supplies the vaccine units to all the 16 clinics. It receives the entire supply from a single RVS (RVS 5), which happens to be the nearest RVS to the SVS. The reason for a single cold chain point handling the entire supply in the RVS and DVS tiers is the higher capacity available for transportation due to lower packed volumes (more than 2.5 million doses per vehicle from both the district and the regional level). All the 16 clinics order from only district 1 because the shortest route, in terms of the sum of the distances of the clinics and RVSs from DVS 1 and DVS 2, is the lowest for RVS 5 and DVS 1 among all possible routes.

However, this does not hold for the case with the higher packed volume per dose. A single district cannot cater to the demand of all 16 clinics because of the reduced transportation capacity available for vaccines with higher packed volume per dose. A vehicle from a DVS can only transport 171,736 doses at a time, which is less than the combined demand of all the clinics (333,616 doses). Therefore, the supply gets split among the two districts, with both districts ordering their respective vaccine quantities from RVSs 5 and 6, which are the nearest RVSs to the SVS. Also, we notice that ‘cross-ordering’ from the DVSs occurs at the clinic level, which means that certain clinics receive vaccines from DVSs in districts other than the district in which they are located. This happens primarily because of the restriction on transportation capacity. If the clinics were to order from the DVSs in their district only, then additional orders would need to be placed, which in turn result in additional ordering and transportation costs. This does occur given the overall cost minimization objective across the cold chain. This analysis thus illustrates the interplay of the ordering costs, transportation distances, and vaccine transport vehicle capacity. Therefore, the optimal ordering and vaccine transport pattern that our proposed framework yields does not necessarily conform to the ‘shortest’ paths (based on inter-facility distances) across the cold chain. Other factors, an example being the vaccine transport vehicle capacities, also play an important role in guiding the logistics of distribution and administration of vaccines.

We also notice from tables 3b and 4b that there are shortages in weeks 1 and 2 in both the cases, which result in shortage costs being incurred. This is seen because we have assumed a vaccine delivery lead time of 1 week from DVSs to clinics, and we also assume that one week is required to prepare a newly arrived batch of vaccines at the clinic level so that it is ready for administration to the set of eligible recipients served at that clinic. Therefore, there is a delay of two weeks before the first set of doses get administered. In order to avoid this delay and the subsequent shortage costs incurred, an analyst using this model can simply set the planning horizon to begin the required number of time periods (depending upon the lead times associated with vaccine delivery from one tier to the next lower tier) before the actual demand is incurred, and can set the demand during this ‘lead time’ period to be zero. We also note that our current assumption of lead times at only the DVS and clinic level is only to illustrate the impact of lead times on the shortage patterns across the planning horizon; depending upon the vaccine ordering, transportation and vaccine administration patterns, lead times may need to be incorporated at other tiers also.

In continuation with the above analyses, we study the impact of cold chain capacity in more detail -
Table 3: Ordering, shortage, inventory, and clinic-level vaccination staffing patterns for the lower packed vaccine volume per dose case across the planning horizon.

(a) Vaccine ordering pattern and associated costs incurred across the planning horizon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Ordering Pattern</th>
<th>Transportation Costs (INR)</th>
<th>Ordering Costs (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M → GMSD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,616</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMSD → SVS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,616</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVS → RVS 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,616</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVS 5 → DVS 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,616</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Shortage pattern and associated costs incurred across the planning horizon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Number of shortages</th>
<th>Total Shortage Cost (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Inventory holding patterns and the associated costs incurred across the planning horizon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCP</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Number of Inventory units held</th>
<th>Total Inventory cost (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMSD, SVS, RVS, DVS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics 1-10</td>
<td>2; 3; 4; 5</td>
<td>26,704; 20,028; 13,352; 6,676</td>
<td>20,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics 11-16</td>
<td>2; 3; 4; 5</td>
<td>11,096; 8,322; 5,548; 2,774</td>
<td>8,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Vaccination staffing pattern across the planning horizon: number of health workers hired, fired, and total staff numbers at the clinics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Number hired</th>
<th>Number fired</th>
<th>Staff numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
<td>10,0,0,0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,10,10,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
<td>5,0,0,0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,5,5,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

storage and transportation vehicle capacity - on the optimal shortage and inventory patterns generated by our model. For this, using the high packed volume per dose case (as packed volumes per dose higher than that of the COVID-19 vaccines appear to be more prevalent), we vary the fraction of the storage and transportation capacity available for the vaccine under consideration and report the total shortages incurred at the end of the planning horizon and the inventory pattern at each cold chain tier. We find that for a given parameterization of the model, there exists a threshold or critical value of this fraction (0.15 in our case) above which the number of shortages incurred becomes constant. Below this fraction, the number of shortages increases and consequently result in increasing shortage costs as well. In addition to the decreased storage capacity, the cap on the number of vehicles that are available at a cold chain point for transportation to the next lower-tier cold chain point also leads to this increase in the number of shortages incurred. Further, the critical fraction of cold chain capacity below which the shortages start increasing remains the same regardless of the lead times assumed across the cold chain, as this increase in the shortages is only due to the limits on storage and transportation capacity and is not related to the lead time.

We also note that even at low capacities, the proportion of eligible recipients in each subgroup not receiving the vaccines is the lowest in the highest priority subgroup (close to 0% in elderly) and the highest in the lowest priority subgroup (close to 100%) at lower fractions of available capacity. In other words, the subgroup with a higher shortage cost (a proxy for higher priority) is always catered to first, after which other subgroups are considered. Note that an optimization formulation is not necessarily required to determine which subgroups should be vaccinated first once the shortage costs are determined, at least in the case of a COVID-19. However, in situations where there are multiple vaccines for a single disease (i.e., the multiple vaccine model presented in this paper), the shortage costs become relevant, as we discuss in the following section, to determine which vaccine is to be administered, especially if there are trade-offs between vaccine efficacy and various associated costs - the cost per dose of the vaccine itself, its holding cost, ordering cost, transportation costs, etc. The interplay between the shortage costs, efficacy, and all the associated costs
Table 4: Ordering, shortage, inventory, and clinic-level vaccination staffing patterns for the higher packed vaccine volume per dose case across the planning horizon.

(a) Ordering pattern and associated costs incurred across the planning horizon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Ordering Pattern</th>
<th>Transportation Costs (INR)</th>
<th>Ordering Costs (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M → GMSD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,616</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMSD → SVS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,616</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVS → RVS 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>171,320</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVS → RVS 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162,296</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVS 5 → DVS 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>171,320</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVS 6 → DVS 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162,296</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 1 → Clinic 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,704</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS 2 → Clinic 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Shortage pattern and associated costs incurred across the planning horizon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Number of shortages</th>
<th>Total Shortage Cost (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children Adults Elderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3,004  3,204  468</td>
<td>515,671,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,248  1,331  195</td>
<td>214,264,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Inventory holding pattern and associated costs incurred across the planning horizon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCP</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Number of Inventory units held</th>
<th>Total Inventory cost (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMSD, SVS, RVS, DVS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics 1-10</td>
<td>2; 3; 4; 5</td>
<td>26,704; 20,028; 13,352; 6,676</td>
<td>20,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics 11-16</td>
<td>2; 3; 4; 5</td>
<td>11,096; 8,322; 5,548; 2,774</td>
<td>8,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Vaccination staffing pattern across the planning horizon: number of health workers hired, fired, and total staff numbers at the clinics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Number hired</th>
<th>Number fired</th>
<th>Staff numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
<td>10,0,0,0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,10,10,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
<td>5,0,0,0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,5,5,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

listed above may prove difficult to unravel without a formulation such as that we present here. Further, we included it as a placeholder for the case where the single vaccine formulation is extended to consider multiple vaccines for multiple diseases. In this case, similar or overlapping subgroups on the basis of demographic characteristics might be present, implying that using shortage costs in conjunction with vaccine efficacies and their costs might become necessary to determine the optimal set of vaccines and the associated subgroups to vaccinate.

We also briefly discuss the impact of this parameter on the inventory pattern across the cold chain. At lower values of this parameter, since the shortages are very high, the number of vaccines ordered at each tier is very less, which subsequently results in lower inventory levels. At higher values, since the capacity of vehicles is now higher, given the fact that more numbers of vaccines can be transported in fewer orders due to the high capacities, the algorithm tries to transport all the vaccines further to the next level as soon as it receives the order leading to zero inventory levels at all tiers. As we decrease the value of this parameter from the higher end, due to the reduced vaccine transportation capacities across tiers, it gets stored in the inventory and hence inventory level increases. Higher levels of inventory are seen for the GMSD and the SVS compared to the other CCPs due to the higher ordering costs at these cold chain tiers.

We conclude this section with a discussion of the manufacturer’s capacity on the optimal vaccine distribution patterns across the cold chain. We note before proceeding with the discussion that an 8 week planning horizon was used for these sets of numerical experiments. It has been evident from the COVID-19 vaccination program that the capacity of the manufacturer to meet the demand has been a significant factor in the success of the vaccination program, and hence we examine its impact on logistical considerations across the vaccine cold chain as well. From Figure 3, we observe that when the manufacturing capacity is very low, the optimal solution satisfies the demand of a limited number of clinics, selected because they represent the shortest routes across the cold chain network, to minimize the ordering and the transportation costs. Further, only the demand of the subgroup with the highest priority (elderly recipients) is met due to
limited manufacturing capacity. Given the limited manufacturer capacity (especially when the total capacity is less than that required for a subgroup in a single period), instead of transporting vaccines as they become available, vaccine doses are accumulated at the GMSD in each period until the inventory becomes sufficiently high to meet the demand of that subgroup in the limited number of clinics. These are then transported across the cold chain to the clinics without inventory accumulation at the CCPs in the intermediate tiers (i.e., inventory held is zero at all tiers where lead times are zero). Note that the clinics are selected in this situation on the basis of whether they are part of the shortest routes across the cold chain network; however, if clinics are to be prioritized due to some other criteria that become relevant at the time of decision-making (e.g., disease outbreak is high in the catchment area of a particular set of clinics), then any of the associated costs with those clinics (fixed or variable transportation or ordering costs) can be altered to ensure higher priority for the clinics in the catchment area of interest.

We notice that when the manufacturing capacity is sufficient, the optimal solution yielded by the model holds inventory at lower and intermediate tiers as the ordering and transportation costs from these are significantly lesser than those at higher tiers. Contrary to the case with very low manufacturing capacity, we see from Figures 3e and 3c that as the manufacturing capacity increases, the inventory levels at the clinics increase from zero while the same decrease to zero at GMSD. The intermediate tiers (SVS, RVS, DVS) hold inventory at initial time periods when the capacity is sufficient to do so, which is depicted in yellow in Figures 3b, 3c and 3d.

4.2. Multiple Vaccine Model

As done for the single commodity model, we begin our analysis for the multiple vaccine model with two cases: first with lower packed volumes per dose for each vaccine considered in the model, and a second case with higher packed volumes per dose for each vaccine. We consider two vaccines, which differ in their packed vaccine volume per dose, efficacy and cost of administration. Assuming sufficient manufacturing capacity, lead times of 1 week for delivery to the clinics from the DVS and preparation/administration at the clinics, we run the model for two sets of packed volumes:

- Lower packed volume per dose.
  
  Vaccine 1: a packed volume per dose of 0.211 cm$^3$/dose, efficacy 93.7%, and a cost per dose of INR 780.

  Vaccine 2: a packed volume per dose of 0.086 cm$^3$/dose, efficacy 77.8%, and a cost per dose of INR 1,410.

- Higher packed volume per dose.

  Vaccine 1: a packed volume per dose of 3.3 cm$^3$ per dose, efficacy 93.7%, and cost per dose of INR 780.
Figure 3: Inventory holding patterns across the planning horizon at each cold chain tier: impact of manufacturer capacity.
Vaccine 2: a packed volume per dose of 1.719 cm$^3$ per dose, efficacy 77.8%, and cost per dose of INR 1410.

We observe that, as expected, with sufficient manufacturer capacity for both vaccines, the optimal solution from the multiple vaccine model reduces to that obtained from the single vaccine model. This is because all other parameter values - such as ordering, inventory holding, and fixed and variable transportation costs - are assumed to be the same for both vaccines, and the difference in the costs per dose of the vaccines is not high enough compared to the shortage cost (as is likely to be the case) to prevent the higher efficacy vaccine to be administered. Thus we see that the higher efficacy - to be precise, the vaccine with the higher shortage cost - is selected for administration to the recipients.

In the current multiple vaccine formulation, we have used only a single efficacy parameter for the vaccines. However, vaccine efficacy may be measured with respect to multiple clinical endpoints: for example, efficacy in preventing symptomatic disease, in reducing transmission, in preventing severe disease and/or hospitalization, or in preventing death. Costs can be associated with each of these endpoints to arrive at a more comprehensive measure of vaccine efficacy. Further, some vaccines can be significantly more expensive to store or transport, and even ordering costs can be significantly higher, especially if both domestically manufactured vaccines and imported vaccines are considered for the same group of recipients. While we reserve the consideration of these complexities for future research, our work provides a proof-of-concept for how these considerations can be integrated within a decision support framework for optimizing vaccine distribution across the cold chain network.

We now illustrate how the multiple vaccine model can be used to determine the conditions under which the higher efficacy vaccine is not administered. We begin by analyzing the impact of manufacturer capacity. It can be seen from Figure 4 that even at low manufacturing capacities, the higher efficacy vaccine is delivered to its full capacity - that is, if the manufacturer is able to deliver 100 doses at the beginning of week $t$, all 100 doses are delivered. The remainder of the demand is fulfilled by the lower efficacy vaccine. We see that it is only at extremely low values of the manufacturer’s capacity (above 10 units per week) that minimizing the costs of ordering two vaccines are prioritized lower than minimizing the shortage costs, and hence the lower efficacy vaccine units are also ordered to meet the demand requirement. It is unlikely that the situation depicted in this graph is likely to realistically occur at the figures observed; however, depending upon the differences in ordering, transportation and storage costs, such a situation may come to pass at significantly higher manufacturer capacities. This analysis provides an illustration of how our model can be used to determine the threshold capacity of the manufacturer of the higher dose vaccine below which the lower efficacy vaccines are also selected for administration.

We now investigate the impact of costs per dose of the vaccines considered in this model. While the vaccine with higher efficacy yields a lower shortage cost, its cost per dose could be greater than that of the vaccine with lower efficacy. The multiple vaccine model can be used to determine the difference in the costs of the two vaccines at which the vaccine with the lower efficacy administered, given the sufficient manufacturer
capacity for both the vaccines. We illustrate this now. In this analysis, we keep all the costs for the two vaccines same except for their shortage costs and costs per dose. We see from Figure 5a that when the difference between the cost of vaccine is less than INR 19,300, it is always the higher efficacy vaccine that is administered but beyond this, some doses of the lower efficacy vaccine are also administered.

We see that once this threshold difference in costs per dose between the vaccines is breached, the cost of the higher efficacy vaccine dominates the shortage cost for the subgroup comprising children, but does not do so for the adult and elderly subgroups due to their higher shortage costs. Hence, the demand for the subgroup comprising children is met by the lower efficacy vaccine while the other subgroups receive the higher efficacy vaccine. When the cost per dose difference exceeds INR 25,200, adults also receive the lower efficacy vaccine, and when it exceeds INR 28,600, all recipients receive the lower efficacy vaccine.
Once again, we note that while it is very unlikely that vaccines will differ in their costs per dose by as much as INR 19,300, the lower efficacy vaccine may be preferred if differences in other associated costs are also significantly higher for the higher efficacy vaccine, and the vaccine efficacies are not substantially different. This is illustrated in Figure 5. In this analysis, we increased all fixed and variable costs that could conceivably be greater for the higher efficacy vaccine (e.g., the cost per dose, the fixed and variable transportation costs, inventory holding, and fixed ordering costs), and we find that when these costs are 9 times that of the lower efficacy vaccine, the lower efficacy vaccine starts receiving orders. As the vaccines become closer in efficacy, the value of this multiplier will also accordingly decrease.

We now consider the computational expense of the single vaccine model within our framework, and describe methods to reduce runtimes for various types of analyses.

4.3. Single Vaccine Model: Runtime Analysis and Preprocessing

The formulations that we propose in this paper support making a multitude of decisions optimally, ranging from optimal routing and scheduling decisions for the cold chain network to vaccine recipient group selection and vaccination staffing decisions. The results discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 are generated for relatively small instances of the cold chain network, and are meant primarily to illustrate (a) how the output of various models within our framework can be organized, and (b) the types of analyses that can be performed using our decision support framework. However, realistic instances of the cold chain network are likely to be significantly larger. Thus, it is important to analyze the computational expense of the optimization formulations within our framework for more realistic instances of the cold chain network given the multitude of decisions that we attempt to inform through our models.

We begin by considering the computational cost of solving the single vaccine model for the two cases presented in Section 4.1 for the entire state of Bihar: the base case (with the lower packed volume per dose) and the case with the higher packed volume per dose vaccine. This yields a problem with 1 SVS, 9 RVSs, 38 DVSs and a total of 606 clinics. We use the Gurobi commercial solver with its Python programming application process interface to solve the problem. All computational analyses were run on a workstation with an Intel R Core i5-7200 processor with a clock speed of 2.50 gigaHertz and 8 gigabytes of memory. As part of these analyses, we define the following measure, referred to as the MIP gap, of how close the solution generated by the solver is to the dual objective bound for the optimization problem (i.e., a lower bound for minimization integer programs).

\[
\text{MIP gap} = \frac{|Z_P - Z_D|}{|Z_P|}
\]

Here \(Z_P\) is the primal objective bound (i.e., the incumbent objective function value), and \(Z_D\) is the dual objective bound obtained after 42000s. The MIP gap can be used to specify a termination criterion for the algorithm; for example, if set to 1%, it implies that the algorithm will terminate if the primal objective function value is within 1% of the dual objective bound. Thus in the subsequent discussion, we compare
the computational expense of the formulation in terms of the computational runtime required to achieve an MIP gap less than some prespecified threshold (e.g., 1%).

Solving the single vaccine model for the entire state of Bihar for the base case required 95 seconds to yield an MIP gap of 0.0032%; however, when the larger packed volume per dose was used, the solver did not reach an MIP gap below 1.12% even after 10,000 seconds. This is not unexpected because, as discussed in Section 4.1, when the transportation and storage capacities are sufficiently high (the base case analysis), the solver just selects the shortest route to the clinics each time it ships vaccines during the planning horizon. However, when these capacities are lower (as in the higher packed volume per dose case), the algorithm has to consider ordering from DVSs other than those in the district where a given clinic is located in order to satisfy the demand associated with a given clinic. It is in these situations that employing preprocessing techniques to reduce computational runtimes becomes relevant.

We remind readers here that the vaccine cold chain in India consists of the following tiers, in order of flow: vaccine manufacturers, GMSDs (national level tier), SVSs (state level tier), RVSs (regional level tier) to DVSs (district level tier), clinics or vaccination centers (where vaccine administration actually occurs). In order to gain a preliminary understanding of the basis on which routes are selected through this network, we consider a simpler problem by removing the RVS tier entirely and analyse the optimal solution generated for such a network. Note that the removal of a tier in this manner is not an unrealistic operation; in situations such as the COVID-19 pandemic where the vaccination rate is crucial, public health authorities may elect to speed up the vaccine ordering and delivery process by skipping intermediate tiers. We anticipate developing a decision support tool utilizing this framework which allows removal or inclusion of as many tiers as required for the actual vaccine distribution process. The optimization problem formulation will also be automatically selected based on the tiers included in the model.

As discussed above, clinics do not necessarily order from the DVS in the district where they are located when transportation and storage capacities are limited. ‘Cross-ordering’ can happen between districts due to the interplay of storage and transportation capacities, ordering and transportation costs. For example, a DVS in a district with lower demand may, in addition to satisfying the demand of its own district, also satisfy the demand of another district with a higher demand. This often occurs because of the limit on the capacity of the vehicles used to transport vaccines from the SVS to the DVSs, which implies that the DVS in the district with higher demand may need an additional order from the SVS, perhaps even in a previous time period, to fully satisfy the demand of the clinics in its district in a given time period. This would imply that additional fixed ordering and fixed transportation costs are incurred (associated with vaccine delivery from the SVS to the DVS), and in situations where these are higher than the sum of the corresponding costs and also the transportation costs from a DVS in another district to the clinic under consideration, cross-ordering occurs.

The benefit of preventing cross-ordering from the perspective of computational expense is clear from the above analysis. Thus, we constructed a relationship between the fixed transportation cost and the ordering
cost from the SVS to the DVS by decreasing these costs from their current estimates and determining whether cross-ordering occurs at each combination of estimates of these costs. In Figure 6, we depict this relationship. On the Y-axis, we have the multipliers of the fixed transportation cost from the SVS to the DVS (for example, a value of 0.5 implies the fixed transportation cost is half the current estimate), and on the X-axis, we have the multipliers of the corresponding fixed ordering cost. A point on the graph implies that at combinations of these fixed costs below this point, cross-ordering does not occur. For example, the point (0.15, 0.8) on the graph indicates that at fixed ordering and transportation costs that are simultaneously less than 15% and 80% of the current estimates, respectively, cross-ordering does not occur. As discussed earlier, if these fixed costs are taken to be proxies of the efficiency of the vaccine ordering process, then the above result implies increasing the efficiencies of the ordering process to points below the graph would yield intuitive vaccine distribution patterns across the cold chain network.

The above analysis is used to illustrate how our computational framework can be used to determine relationships such as that depicted in Figure 6 for the specific instance of the cold chain of interest to the analyst. Deriving such a relationship would help reduce computational expense of the framework, and also yield more intuitive vaccine distribution patterns that may in turn help motivate efforts to make ordering processes more efficient.

We now consider other types of preprocessing that do not require changes to model parameter estimates. To illustrate the use of one of these techniques, we continue with the higher packed volume per dose case.
for the subsequent analyses, but without lead times at any of the tiers. We begin by observing the ordering pattern in the solution generated by running the solver for 42,000 seconds for this instance of the problem. We see that all 606 clinics order from the four nearest districts to them. This suggests that adding constraints to this effect - that clinics order from the four nearest districts to them - could reduce the number of cuts in the branch and cut algorithm employed by the solver and yield significantly faster computational runtimes such that the MIP gap threshold is breached.

Therefore, we add preprocessing constraints that restrict the clinics to order only from their four nearest DVSs. Then, we specify the solution obtained by running this preprocessed model for 10,000 seconds as the initial solution to the original instance of the problem without preprocessing constraints and run the solver for 32,000 seconds. The trajectories of the objective function values against the runtime observed in each of the following three cases is depicted in Figure 7:

1. No preprocessing
2. With preprocessing constraints
3. With initial solution obtained via the preprocessed model

We see from Figure 7 that the objective function value for the preprocessed version of the model is lower than that from the version without preprocessing, and that it is reached significantly faster (in around 1,000 seconds) than the version without preprocessing. The same observation holds for the version with the initial solution obtained from the preprocessed version also. The MIP gap for the model with the preprocessing constraints is also significantly lower than those for the other models: 0.012% versus 0.0197% and 0.0181% for the model with no preprocessing and the model with the initial solution from preprocessing, respectively.
We now use these insights for the realistic problem instance discussed in the beginning of this section - the higher packed volume per dose case for the entire state of Bihar, with lead times - which had not breached the MIP gap threshold of 1% even after 10,000 seconds. First, we apply preprocessing constraints that restrict each clinic from ordering from its nearest $n$ districts. We then varied $n$ to determine how it impacts the time taken to breach the MIP gap threshold. We find that when $n = 6$, the MIP gap reaches 0.69% in 4,279 seconds. When $n = 8$ or $n = 10$, the MIP gap is not breached even after 10,000 seconds; however, when $n = 12$, the MIP gap reaches 0.47% in 1,008 seconds.

Finally, we specify the solution obtained from adding preprocessing constraints restricting each clinic to order from its nearest 12 DVSs as the initial solution to the problem without preprocessing constraints. We find that the MIP gap reaches 0.04% in 1,481 seconds.

The above analyses indicate how the computational expense associated with the models in our framework can be reduced by applying one or more of the preprocessing techniques discussed above.

5. Discussion & Conclusions

We present in this paper a decision support framework for optimal vaccine distribution across the vaccine cold chain network. We propose two integer linear programming models within the model: a model considering a single vaccine for a single disease, and a model considering multiple vaccines for a single disease. The model can be extended to incorporate multiple vaccines for multiple diseases as well. As discussed in Section 2, a key advantage of our optimal vaccine distribution framework is that it only contains linear integer programming models in comparison with previous work, facilitating easier generation of exact solutions.

Each model within the framework supports a multitude of decisions, ranging from routing and scheduling of vaccine deliveries across the cold chain network within the planning horizon to hiring and firing decisions for vaccination staff at each clinic. We also consider every single tier within the vaccine cold chain network delineated by the Government of India [NCCVMRC 2014]. However, we understand that not all these decisions may be relevant for a public health planning authority when planning vaccine distribution across the cold chain. Therefore thus, we intend to incorporate this framework within a computational decision support tool in a modular form. This implies that the tool will allow an analyst to choose, for instance, whether to use the single vaccine or the multiple vaccine model; or to use the robust versions of these formulations. Further, the analyst will have the option of deciding whether to include or exclude a particular cold chain tier from their analysis. For example, as discussed in Section 4.3, the analyst can choose to exclude the regional vaccine store from their analysis, and the appropriate formulation will then be selected in the back-end of the decision support tool. The analyst will also be able to choose whether to include or exclude certain sets of decisions in their analysis: for example, they may choose to exclude vaccination staffing decisions, in which the appropriate terms will automatically be omitted from the formulation in the back-end. Preprocessing will also be included automatically to a certain extent; for example, if generating the solution to the analyst’s
instance of the model requires more than some prespecified threshold runtime, then preprocessing techniques such as those discussed in Section 4.3 will automatically be deployed.

A key limitation of the framework that we propose involves the multitude of parameters that need to be estimated for each model within the framework. For example, an analyst may not have access to primary data required to estimate inventory holding costs for a vaccine at every cold chain point within the network. However, we note that such data may be available to public health authorities overseeing vaccine distribution; hence for analysts working in these organizations, estimating these parameters may be a one-time effort. Further, as discussed in the preceding sections, it is the relative value of these parameters that are more relevant than actual estimates themselves. For example, if it is known that the ordering process at a particular cold chain tier, or a particular group of facilities within a cold chain tier (e.g., clinics in a particular district), is significantly more efficient than at comparable tiers or facilities, then the ordering costs for these facilities can be adjusted (starting from a reasonable initial estimate) to reflect the disparity in efficiency in their respective ordering processes.

Overall, given the ubiquity of multi-tier vaccine cold chain networks within public health systems across the world (as discussed in Section 1), we believe that the decision support framework that we propose in this study can be useful for stakeholders within public health planning authorities in these health systems.
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