

# 1 **Modelling the impact of rapid tests, tracing and distancing in lower-** 2 **income countries suggest that optimal policies vary with rural-** 3 **urban settings**

4  
5 Xilin Jiang<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Wenfeng Gong<sup>4\*</sup>, Zlatina Dobрева<sup>5</sup>, Ya Gao<sup>6</sup>, Matthew Quaife<sup>5</sup>, Christophe  
6 Fraser<sup>1</sup>, Chris Holmes<sup>1,2,7\*</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup> Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, University of  
9 Oxford

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Statistics, University of Oxford

11 <sup>3</sup> Wellcome Centre for Human Genetics, University of Oxford

12 <sup>4</sup> Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle WA, USA

13 <sup>5</sup> Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,  
14 London, UK

15 <sup>6</sup> Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins University

16 <sup>7</sup> The Alan Turing Institute, London, UK

17  
18 \*Corresponding authors:

19 [Wenfeng.Gong@gatesfoundation.org](mailto:Wenfeng.Gong@gatesfoundation.org)

20 Address: Unit 1901, Tower B, Ping An International Financial Center, No.1-3 Xinyuan  
21 South Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100027, PRC

22  
23 [cholmes@stats.ox.ac.uk](mailto:cholmes@stats.ox.ac.uk)

24 Address: Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, 24–29 St Giles', Oxford OX1  
25 3LB, UK

26  
27  
28  
29 **Disclaimer:** The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not  
30 necessarily represent the official position of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF).

## 31 32 **Financial & competing interests disclosure:**

33 Wenfeng Gong is an employee at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Xilin Jiang and Ya  
34 Gao served as consultants to the BMGF. The authors have no other relevant affiliations or  
35 financial involvement with any organization or entity with a financial interest in or financial  
36 conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript apart from those  
37 disclosed.

38

## 39 **Abstract**

40

41 Low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) remain of high potential for hotspots for COVID-19  
42 deaths and emerging variants given the inequality of vaccine distribution and their vulnerable  
43 healthcare systems. We aim to evaluate containment strategies that are sustainable and effective  
44 for LMICs. We constructed synthetic populations with varying contact and household structures  
45 to capture LMIC demographic characteristics that vary across communities. Using an agent-  
46 based model, we explored the optimal containment strategies for rural and urban communities by  
47 designing and simulating setting-specific strategies that deploy rapid diagnostic tests, symptom  
48 screening, contact tracing and physical distancing. In low-density rural communities, we found  
49 implementing either high quality (sensitivity > 50%) antigen rapid diagnostic tests or moderate  
50 physical distancing could contain the transmission. In urban communities, we demonstrated that  
51 both physical distancing and case finding are essential for containing COVID-19 (average  
52 infection rate < 10%). In high density communities that resemble slums and squatter settlements,  
53 physical distancing is less effective compared to rural and urban communities. Lastly, we  
54 demonstrated contact tracing is essential for effective containment. Our findings suggested that  
55 rapid diagnostic tests could be prioritised for control and monitor COVID-19 transmission and  
56 highlighted that contact survey data could guide strategy design to save resources for LMICs. An  
57 accompanying open source R package is available for simulating COVID-19 transmission based  
58 on contact network models.

59

## 60 **Introduction**

61 The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes the COVID-  
62 19, has rapidly spread worldwide since the end of 2019. <sup>1</sup> Inadequate vaccine distribution and  
63 insufficient healthcare resources have contributed to many low- and middle- income countries  
64 (LMICs) suffering more from the pandemic than affluent countries. <sup>2</sup> Many LMICs rely on  
65 testing, tracing and physical distancing to control and monitor COVID-19, <sup>3,4</sup> such as test, travel  
66 restriction, and testing and tracing programs, given the inequitable distribution of vaccines and  
67 medication. While contributing to COVID-19 control and surveillance, these non-pharmaceutical  
68 interventions (NPIs) may cause considerable damage to the economies as people put their life  
69 and work on hold. <sup>5</sup> Therefore, identifying effective NPIs for LMICs could prepare the  
70 government for new variants and peaks while easing the burden on the economy and society. <sup>4</sup>

71  
72 Emerging immunity-escaping variants from LMICs alert us to the importance of consistent  
73 surveillance and containment of COVID-19. <sup>6,7</sup> Affordable and effective testing methods are  
74 crucial to reduce the economic burden of LMICs. Many COVID-19 containment policies rely on  
75 the real-time reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), which can be  
76 challenging to implement in LMIC because of the limited clinical resources <sup>8,9</sup> and laboratory  
77 capacities. <sup>10,11</sup> The financial and lab personnel cost of maintaining large scale PCR testing would  
78 put a heavy burden on the vulnerable healthcare systems of LMICs. Therefore, it is essential to  
79 leverage alternative testing methods, such as rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) based on antigen  
80 detection, <sup>12-14</sup> which is cheaper and less resource-demanding. Additionally, community  
81 healthcare workers could perform contact tracing and quarantine to further mitigate the SARS-  
82 CoV-2 transmission, which has been implemented successfully during HIV and Tuberculosis  
83 outbreaks. <sup>15</sup> Combining RDT, contact tracing and quarantine, we can increase the testing  
84 capacity, ensure early and accurate detection of infected cases, contain disease transmission, and  
85 reduce the speed of viral mutation accumulation.

86  
87 In this study, we evaluated the dynamics of COVID-19 transmission in younger populations that  
88 are typical of LMICs and the effectiveness of testing, tracing and distancing. We constructed  
89 synthetic contact networks using contact numbers and demographic structures in lower-income

90 communities. To capture the different infection rates across geographical locations,<sup>16,17</sup> we  
91 simulated SARS-CoV-2 transmission in various contact structures and captured the uncertainty  
92 of the epidemic sizes using bootstrap samples of contact networks. We evaluated the realistic  
93 combined strategy involving test and tracing using PCR and RDT, advising patients to self  
94 isolate, and physical distancing. Our simulation results suggest the level of containment required  
95 to contain COVID-19 depends on contact frequency in the communities. We also showed that  
96 antigen RDT and symptom-based diagnosis could be deployed in several settings for better  
97 containment outcomes. To help researchers replicate results with demographics that are not  
98 included in our analysis and to update the results using properties of new variants, we released an  
99 open-source R package for contact network based transmission simulation which accommodates  
100 customised parameter settings.

101

## 102 **Material and methods**

### 103 **Processing demographic data**

104 We cited the age distribution and household sizes from the United nation.<sup>18,19</sup> (Supplementary  
105 Table 1) We considered three age groups (0-14, 15-25 and 25+ years old) for simplicity and to  
106 capture the susceptibility of the younger population and contact structure differences between  
107 younger and older groups. We cited the contact survey data from a study in Uganda to compute  
108 age-specific contact matrices and contact distribution within households.<sup>20</sup> To compare  
109 geographies that have different contact numbers, we simulated contact networks that correspond  
110 to LMICs using PERC survey data from Africa CDC.<sup>21</sup> When using the contact matrices in  
111 simulation, we scaled the contact matrix to match the average daily contact number under each  
112 setting. (Table 1)

113

### 114 **Agent-based modelling**

115 We used an agent-based model and configured the communities based on the age distributions  
116 and household sizes cited from a Uganda study.<sup>20</sup> We simulated populations using contact  
117 numbers that span a range of African countries. Additionally, we abstracted three representative  
118 community settings that have distinct demographics: (1) a rural community which represent  
119 geographies with low contact rates and medium household sizes; (2) an urban community which

120 represent geographies with high contact rates and medium household sizes; (3) a high density  
121 community which represent high contact number and large household sizes, which aim to  
122 capture communities such as slums and squatter settlements. (Table 1) For each setting, we  
123 simulated 20 synthetic populations, where each household was composed of at least one adult  
124 above age 25, and each household was assigned to a location on a two-dimensional plane. The  
125 contact networks for the synthetic population were configured for the corresponding household  
126 structure, age-specific contact matrices, and geographical clustering, using an Exponential  
127 Random Graph Model (ERGM).<sup>22</sup> See Supplemental Methods for details on the ERGM.

128  
129 After constructing the synthetic populations with contact and household structure, we randomly  
130 choose one of the 20 synthetic populations and simulated COVID-19 transmission initiated by  
131 importing 2 cases. At each time step of a simulated outbreak, one realised contact network of  
132 ERGM was sampled to represent the daily dynamic of contacts. (Figure 1) Infection events were  
133 sampled among the contacts proportional to the transmissibility multiplied by generation time,  
134 which is a Weibull distribution that has a mode on the day of onset.<sup>23</sup> The day of onset for each  
135 infected individual was sampled from the cited incubation time distribution<sup>24</sup>. The susceptibility  
136 of the younger group (0-14 years old) was set to 50% of that of the older group (15+ years old).  
137<sup>25,26</sup> The death rate is set as 1% for the older group (25+ years old) and 0.2% for the younger  
138 group (0-25 years old).<sup>27</sup> Using the age-dependent susceptibility and basic reproduction number,  
139 we computed the next generation matrix and the transmissibility. (Supplementary Methods) At  
140 each infection event, we sampled whether an infected individual is asymptomatic using a  
141 Bernoulli distribution of probability equal to 30%. (Table 1) For detailed parameterization of  
142 transmission dynamics, see Supplementary Methods.

143  
144 We tested if our model reflects the cited contact data and transmission dynamics by comparing  
145 the simulated contact distribution and generation time with the empirical data. (Figure 2) The age  
146 mixing contact matrix generated from ERGM is also compared to the survey data.  
147 (Supplementary Figure 1) We performed simulations that covered the range of contact numbers  
148 collected from Africa CDC. (Figure 3) We cautioned these contact numbers are sampled from a  
149 small proportion of the populations and should not be considered as representing the contact  
150 number for each entire nation.

151

## 152 **NPI simulation**

153 We evaluated the impact of testing alone and in combination with other NPIs, which include  
154 contact tracing, quarantine, and physical distancing, for LMICs. (Figure 1B) The testing methods  
155 considered were PCR and antigen RDT. We simulated that only individuals with symptoms and  
156 agree to be tested will receive testing. In our simulation, an infected individual with symptoms  
157 will be discovered at a rate which is the product of four parameters: healthcare seeking rate, test  
158 consent rate, sampling success rate and lab sensitivity of the test. Values and sources of testing  
159 parameters were summarised in Table 2.

160

161 Our simulation assumes a test is always performed with close contact tracing and quarantine,  
162 unless specified otherwise. We assumed only close contacts of confirmed cases who consent to  
163 be isolated will be traced. Therefore, the overall quarantine rate is determined by the product of  
164 three parameters: isolation consent rate of the infector, tracing success rate (we assumed a  
165 tracing success rate equal to 100% for members within the same household of the infector), and  
166 quarantine consent rate of the contacts. Physical distancing was modelled by reducing the  
167 number of contacts outside the households. We simulated the effect of physical distancing by  
168 reducing the non-household contact number by 20% to 80% with 20% increments. We  
169 approximate the effective reproduction number  $R_e$  under physical distancing by scaling  $R_e$   
170 proportionally to the average daily contact numbers.

171

172 In addition to individual containment measures, we also evaluated combined strategies based on  
173 current practice of COVID-19 testing. The combined strategies evaluated included 1) symptom-  
174 based isolation + PCR testing, 2) symptom-based isolation + antigen RDT, 3) and symptom-  
175 based isolation + PCR testing + antigen RDT. (Supplementary Table 3) In practice, it does not  
176 introduce extra cost to suggest individuals who show up at the test centre with symptoms to self  
177 isolate. Therefore we assumed all three containment strategies are accompanied by symptom  
178 based isolation, which has a low compliance rate (20%). All three strategies were replicated with  
179 and without physical distancing for 200 outbreak trajectories to estimate the average daily  
180 incidence number. We simulated each trajectory for 100 days to guarantee that the transmission  
181 extincts within the synthetic population.

182

### 183 **Sensitivity analysis**

184 We performed sensitivity analyses for a list of parameters that could vary (Supplementary Table  
185 4) and used regression to evaluate the impact of changing these parameters on the epidemic  
186 sizes. For the baseline conditions, we simulated outbreaks over grids of values for transmission  
187 and demographic variables that are assumed or could not be determined from literature. We  
188 computed  $R^2$  using the total infected number as the dependent variable to capture the proportion  
189 of variance explained by each variable. (Table 1). For the intervening conditions, we performed  
190 the same simulations over grids of values for testing and NPI variables. We computed the  $R^2$   
191 using infected numbers under three different intervention strategies as the dependent variables  
192 and testing/NPI variables in Table 2 as independent variables. In total we have 2,028 simulation  
193 settings (3 community settings, 4 containing strategies and 169 values for the variables) which  
194 are listed in Supplementary table 5. For each simulation setting, we simulated 200 simulated  
195 trajectories of 100 days to obtain the bootstrap confidence interval (BCI) of the estimated  
196 infection numbers.

197

198 The code generated during this study is bundled up, with an R-package available at:  
199 <https://github.com/Xilin-Jiang/NetworkCOVID19>. Please refer to the GitHub page for installing  
200 the package and setting parameters for replicating our results or performing other contact  
201 network based analysis.

202

### 203 **Role of the funding source**

204 The funders had no role in the study design, generating the data, data interpretation, generating  
205 the conclusion, writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit the manuscript for  
206 publication. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and the final  
207 responsibility for the decision to submit the paper for publication.

## 208 **Results**

### 209 **Effectiveness of testing and physical distancing**

210 To investigate the effectiveness of testing and physical distancing under different contact  
211 numbers based on survey data from African CDC.<sup>21</sup> We found moderate physical distancing  
212 (permitting 60% of non-household contacts) could contain the outbreaks for geographies when  
213 the contact number is below 11, with infection rate equal to 15.4% [95% BCI 13.5% - 17.2%].  
214 (Figure 3B) Notably, for majority of LMIC countries considered, which have more than 20 close  
215 contacts per day, even strong physical distancing alone (permitting only 40% of non-household  
216 contacts) could not protect more than half of the population (infection rate = 53.5% [95% BCI  
217 50.9% - 56.0%]). Only strict lockdown that reduces non-household contact number to 20% of  
218 that of normal could contain the outbreaks. (contact number = 20: infection rate = 5.1% [95%  
219 BCI 4.4% - 5.9%])

220  
221 RDT or PCR alone could only mitigate the transmission in communities with less than 20  
222 contacts, while combined with physical distancing, the mitigation effect increases, with 34.8%  
223 [95% BCI 33.3% - 36.3%] infection rate under moderate physical distancing. (contact number =  
224 20, non-household contact rate= 60%) The mitigating effect increases as physical distancing gets  
225 stronger, with RDT slightly outperforming PCR tests. When simulating with a contact rate of 13,  
226 we found that using PCR or antigen RDT alone will isolate or quarantine more than 25% of the  
227 population and reduce the proportion of population infected as the isolation compliance rate  
228 increases. (Supplementary Figure 2A) When isolation compliance rates are at optimistic levels  
229 (90%), antigen RDT testing outperformed PCR and reduced the infection rate to 47.4% [95%  
230 BCI 45.8% - 49.1%].

231

### 232 **Combined strategies have varying performance in rural and urban communities**

233

234 Motivated by the improved containment effect of combining tests with social distancing, we  
235 further evaluated combined strategies based on practice. Firstly, we assume patients who show  
236 up at the test centre with symptoms will be advised to isolate and told their contact to isolate  
237 (symptome-based isolation), which is modelled at a low compliance rate (Table 2); Secondly, we  
238 assumed a patient could provide sample for both a RDT and a PCR test. To contrast the contact  
239 structure between populations, we focused on three representative communities abstracted from  
240 contact data. We found that the symptom+PCR has approximately similar performance as



241 symptom+RDT, while symptom+PCR+RDT has better performance in all three community  
242 settings. (Figure 4A, Supplementary Figure 3) In rural settings, either symptom+PCR or  
243 symptom+RDT could contain the outbreaks (symptom+PCR: 4.3% infected [95% BCI: 3.6% -  
244 4.9%], Supplementary Table 3). In urban settings, symptom+PCR+RDT could suppress infection  
245 rate to 32.6% [95% BCI: 31.4% - 33.7%], while with physical distancing reduces non-household  
246 contact number by 40%, either symptom+PCR or RDT could contain the outbreaks. Notably,  
247 physical distancing could effectively flatten the curve in urban communities, (Supplementary  
248 Figure 3D) while the effect is less prominent in high density communities. Combined, these  
249 results show that affordable options such as RDT could be sufficient for low-density geographies  
250 similar to the rural settings, whereas testing and tracing programmes need to be combined with  
251 physical distancing to achieve containment in more densely populated areas similar to the urban  
252 settings.

253  
254 The distributions of infection rates show substantial uncertainty for rural communities and for  
255 urban communities when physical distancing is in place. (Figure 4A, Supplementary Table 3)  
256 These uncertainties suggest the outbreaks might have substantial variation in the epidemic sizes  
257 even for communities with similar demographics. To quantify the probability that imported cases  
258 do not start an outbreak, we defined the stochastic extinction events as the trajectories that  
259 infected less than 5% of the population. Under the three settings considered, the probability of  
260 stochastic extinction increases when testing, isolation and quarantine are implemented. In rural  
261 settings, symptom+RDT would increase the probability of stochastic extinction from 29% to  
262 70%. In urban settings, the stochastic extinction events happened in 62% of the trajectories  
263 when physical distancing and symptom+RDT+PCR are implemented, which is a much larger  
264 proportion compared to 0.5% when no NPI is implemented. In the high density settings, the  
265 stochastic extinction probability remains low even when physical distancing and  
266 symptom+RDT+PCR are all implemented (13.5%). We verified that the probability of stochastic  
267 extinction does not depend on simulated population size. (Supplementary figure 4) The  
268 possibility of achieving high stochastic extinction rates in rural and urban settings suggest  
269 consistent testing, tracing, and physical distancing could reduce the probability of full scale  
270 outbreaks resulting from imported cases.

271

## 272 **The impact of RDT sensitivity, tracing and assumed parameters**

273 Sampling success rate, antigen loading, and kit technology could all impact on the sensitivity of  
274 antigen RDT.<sup>28,29</sup> When simulating combined strategies with varying antigen RDT sensitivity,  
275 our simulations show that the containment effect increases as the RDT sensitivity increases.  
276 (Figure 4B) To reach a similar containment effect as in Figure 4A, which assumes an antigen  
277 RDT sensitivity of 56% (70% sampling success rate and 80% kit sensitivity), the kits deployed  
278 should have a sensitivity above 40%.

279  
280 For the role of contact tracing, we found when the quarantine compliance rate increased from  
281 30% to 100% under the symptom+RDT+PCR strategy, the average infection rate reduced from  
282 15.7% to 9.5% in rural settings, from 53.2% to 36.5% in urban settings, and from 66.5% to  
283 49.5% in high density settings. (Figure 4C) Note only contacts that are of isolated infectors that  
284 are successfully traced are subject to the quarantine. Without close contact quarantine measures,  
285 the combination strategies show no significant effect on reducing infection numbers  
286 (Supplementary Figure 5). Moreover, we found that the number of infected individuals  
287 discovered by testing is less than those discovered by contact tracing when the contact quarantine  
288 compliance rate is above 25%. (Supplementary Figure 6A)

289  
290 The impact of other testing parameters on the containment outcomes are summarised in  
291 Supplementary table 3 using  $R^2$  and P-values (Supplementary Methods Section 4). Among these  
292 parameters, strong correlation between isolation consent rates and containing effectiveness are  
293 observed for all strategies and settings. Days from symptom onset to isolation, quarantine  
294 consent rate of contacts and tracing success rate are correlated with containing effectiveness in  
295 urban and high density settings, while less impactful in the rural settings. Additionally, we found  
296 that starting testing and quarantine after 10% of the population are infected could protect 31% of  
297 the healthy population under urban settings and 21% of the healthy population under the high  
298 density settings (Supplementary Figure 4B).

299

## 300 **Discussion**

301 After two years since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, special attention needs to be  
302 paid to LMICs as they suffer the most from global health inequality. Low vaccination rates and  
303 vulnerable health care systems in these countries could lead to overwhelming outbreaks and  
304 harbour new variants.<sup>6,7,30</sup> Our primary goal is to prioritise tools for LMICs to protect themselves  
305 against COVID-19, where we highlighted four interconnected elements: community knowledge,  
306 RDT, physical distancing, and contact tracing. These elements could be utilised to address two  
307 pressing challenges in LMICs. Firstly, how to design a cost-effective strategy for LMICs to  
308 reduce the financial burden of controlling the transmission of COVID-19? Secondly, how to  
309 design setting-specific surveillance or containment programmes that account for geographical  
310 variability in LMICs<sup>17,31,32</sup>? We argue that community knowledge about demographics and  
311 contact structure is a valuable resource that could facilitate government decision making. For  
312 example, if a community is known to be densely populated and have crowded households, our  
313 results suggest that physical distancing is expected to be less effective there. As another example,  
314 if survey data suggested some communities have less indoor contacts than average, we would  
315 expect a light containment strategy such as mild physical distancing alone could work  
316 effectively, thus saving resources from an over-stringent strategy. In practice, policy makers  
317 could perform contact surveys in representative communities and use them to construct a  
318 classification system. Our analyses present the trends of transmission dynamics and containment  
319 effectiveness across different contact numbers and demographics. When used in combination  
320 with community knowledge, our results could guide policy design that achieves the best  
321 outcomes while saving resources.

322  
323 Antigen RDT has several desirable properties for application in LMICs. It is cheap, easy to  
324 distribute, has quick turnarounds, and doesn't require lab facilities. LMICs require consistent  
325 containment to protect their health systems from being overwhelmed, which makes RDT an ideal  
326 choice to avoid huge financial costs. Specifically, RDT might be prioritised in resource-limited  
327 regions where contact number is low and performing PCR tests is prohibitive. Though containing  
328 power subjects to the test sensitivity and community scenario, our results suggested high quality  
329 kits that have a sensitivity above 50% will provide similar containment power shown in the  
330 simulation. However, the detrimental effect of false negative and false positive results might

331 negate the containment effects.<sup>33</sup> We suggest real world RDT application should be  
332 accompanied by careful sensitivity and false positivity evaluation.

333

334 We also want to emphasise that policy design should serve its goals. If aiming at a zero-COVID  
335 policy, such as those deployed by China (as of March 5th, 2022), our results show that contact  
336 tracing is an essential element to implement, which relies on abundant personnel and quarantine  
337 capacities. However, if the goal is to flatten the curve to avoid overwhelmed health systems,  
338 mild-physical distancing is an effective measure which saves resources and might serve the  
339 young population of LMICs better. If the goal is to monitor the transmission for early alarm of  
340 new variants and prepare for outbreaks, mass RDT tests could detect abnormal outbreaks that  
341 link to new variants and auxiliary PCR tests could monitor prevalence of each variant.  
342 Successful containment strategy should apply community knowledge to serve the goal, whether  
343 it is suppressing, delaying, or monitoring the transmission of COVID-19.

344

345 There are some limitations in our study. Firstly, our simulated population is an approximation to  
346 the communities in LMICs and is limited by the available empirical evidence from LMICs.  
347 Therefore, to apply our results to specific geography requires knowledge of the target population,  
348 including demographic and contact information. Secondly, like many simulation studies, we had  
349 to choose our parameters from empirical studies that are not consistent with each other.<sup>34</sup> This  
350 difficulty is most pronounced when we are setting the parameters for age-dependent  
351 susceptibility and asymptomatic rate of the infected. Lastly, Compared to simulations on larger  
352 networks that involve more sophisticated configuration such as schools and shopping malls,<sup>35</sup>  
353 our strategy might not capture superspreading events that were reported. Future development of  
354 approximation methods might provide comparable accuracy while scaling to large populations.

## 355 **Contributors**

356 All authors contributed to study design. XJ designed the model, XJ and WG implemented the  
357 model, and XJ, WG, CF and CH analysed and verified data. All authors interpreted results, XJ,  
358 CF and CH drafted the manuscript, XJ made the figures, and all authors critically revised and  
359 approved the manuscript.

## 360 **Code availability**

361 The code generated during this study is available at:

362 <https://github.com/Xilin-Jiang/NetworkCOVID19>

363

## 364 **Acknowledgement**

365 Computation used the Oxford Biomedical Research Computing (BMRC) facility, a joint  
366 development between the Wellcome Centre for Human Genetics and the Big Data Institute  
367 supported by Health Data Research UK and the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre. The  
368 views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the  
369 Department of Health. We thank Microsoft China Co. Ltd. for computation power during the  
370 exploration stage of the study. We thank Yang Liu, Jiayao Lei and Mark Jit for discussion and  
371 comments on the manuscript.

372

## 373 Tables and Figures

374

| Parameter   | Sensitivity analysis range |            |              | Coefficient of determination |                   |                   | References |
|---|----------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
|   | Rural                      | Urban      | High density | Rural                        | Urban             | High density      |            |
| Population size   | 1000                       |            |              | 0.005 (P = 0.222)            | 0.001 (P = 0.604) | 0.009 (P = 0.109) | 36         |
| Number of initial infected patients                         | 2                          |            |              | 0.24 (P = 0)                 | 0.064 (P = 0)     | 0.022 (P = 0)     | Assumed    |
| Daily close contact number                                  | 7                          | 13         | 14           | 0.879 (P = 0)                | 0.806 (P = 0)     | 0.855 (P = 0)     | 20,37      |
| Average household size and distribution                     | 5 (Uganda)                 | 5 (Uganda) | 15 (India)   | NA                           |                   |                   | 18,38      |
| Percentage of contact between members of the same household | 50%                        | 23%        | 50%          | 0.001 (P = 0.381)            | 0.173 (P = 0)     | 0.199 (P = 0)     | 20,37      |
| Asymptomatic proportion                                     | 30% (10%-90%)              |            |              | 0.001 (P = 0.22)             | 0 (P = 0.634)     | 0 (P = 0.887)     | 39,40      |
| Asymptomatic infection rate                                 | 20% (10%-90%)              |            |              | 0 (P = 0.4)                  | 0.001 (P = 0.119) | 0.002 (P = 0.066) | Assumed    |
| Healthcare seeking rate                                     | 70%                        |            | 60%          | 0.001 (P = 0.403)            | 0 (P = 0.649)     | 0.002 (P = 0.176) | Assumed    |
| Basic reproduction number (R0)                              | 1.45                       | 2.7        | 2.9          | NA                           |                   |                   | 41         |
| Susceptibility for younger population (< 15 years old)      | 50%                        |            |              | NA                           |                   |                   | 26         |

|                               |  |    |    |
|-------------------------------|--|----|----|
| Death rate for each age group | 0.2% (0-14 years old);<br>0.2% (15-24 years old);<br>1% (25+ years old); | NA | 27 |
|-------------------------------|--|----|----|

375


376 **Table 1:** Summary of population characteristics and transmission parameters and their impact on  
377 transmission. For parameters where the source is not available for at least one of the three  
378 community settings, we simulated models with different choices of values and used regression to  
379 evaluate their impact on model outputs. (Supplementary Table 4, Supplementary Methods  
380 Section 4) The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) shows the proportion of variance in the infected  
381 number that is captured by the parameter; The P-values in the parentheses show the rate of type  
382 one error of rejecting the null hypothesis that the parameter is not correlated with infection  
383 number. Last column shows the sources for cited parameters.

384

| Parameter                                      | Symptom                                   | PCR  | Antigen RDT   | Data source |
|--|---|------|---------------|-------------|
| Test consent rate                              | 100%                                      | 80%  |               | Assumption  |
| Isolation consent rate                         | 20%                                       | 90%  |               | Assumption  |
| Days from symptom onset to isolation (days)    | 1   | 5    | 1             | Assumption  |
| Duration that close contacts are traced (days) | 3   | 5    | 3             | Assumption  |
| Tracing success rate (non-household contacts)  | 85%                                       | 80%  | 85%           | Assumption  |
| Quarantine consent rate of contacts            | 50%                                       | 70%  |               | Assumption  |
| Sampling success rate                          | NA  | 70%  |               | 29,42,43    |
| Lab sensitivity                                | NA  | 100% | 80% (10%-90%) | 28,29,44    |
| Transmission rate after quarantine             | Rural: 10%; Urban: 10%; High density: 20% |      |               | Assumption  |


385

386 **Table 2:** Summary of testing and NPI parameters. Last column shows the sources for cited  
387 parameters; values of assumed parameters are used in the containment simulations in Figure 3  
388 and Figure 4, while separate sensitivity analyses are performed for each assumed parameter  
389 (Supplementary Table 3 and Supplementary Table 4). For rationales behind the chosen value for  
390 assumed parameters, see Supplementary Methods.




391  
392 **Figure 1:** Schematic representation of methodology. A) For each parameter setting we simulated  
393 20 synthetic populations and inferred the contact network with ERGM, using age- and  
394 household-structured contact data. At each simulation step, a contact network is sampled from  
395 the ERGM, where we simulate the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. B) We evaluated the effect of  
396 physical distancing by reducing the sampling probability of non-household contacts. Testing,  
397 isolation, contact tracing, and quarantine are also simulated using the contact networks.  
398






399  
400 **Figure 2:** Properties of simulated outbreaks from the agent-based model. A) Example outbreak  
401 in a network composed of 1000 individuals, simulated under the urban setting without NPI. The  
402 left, middle and right panel show the distributions of infected individuals (red dots) on day 20,  
403 day 30 and day 40 from the day that initial cases are imported. For visualisation purposes we fix  
404 the network structure across days here, while in our analysis a different contact network is  
405 sampled each day. B) Comparison of the simulated contact number distribution with those  
406 computed from the cited Uganda survey data.<sup>24</sup> The simulated contact number distribution is  
407 computed by sampling 100 daily contact realisations from each of the 20 synthetic populations.  
408 C) Comparison of generation time from simulation (red histogram) and that from cited Uganda  
409 survey data <sup>24</sup> (blue dotted curve).



410  
 411 **Figure 3:** Evaluation of containing strategies. A) Example of case finding and quarantine in one  
 412 simulated outbreak trajectory with NPIs, where a moderate physical distancing reduces 40% of  
 413 the contact outside the household and symptom+PCR testing is performed. The network  
 414 structure is fixed for visualisation, while in simulation a contact network is different each day. B)  
 415 Social distancing and tests have different containing effects over different geographies. Synthetic  
 416 populations were constructed using a grid of contact numbers that covers several reference  
 417 LMICs. Left panel shows simulation with different levels of physical distance, indicated by the  
 418 percentage of non-household contacts that are still permitted (no physical distancing: 100%;  
 419 strongest physical distancing: 20%). The middle and right panel shows physical distancing  
 420 combined with PCR or RDT tests respectively. The size and colour of the circle shows the mean

421 of infection rate of 200 simulated outbreaks. Numbers and quantiles of the distribution are in  
 422 Supplementary Table 2.

423



424

425 **Figure 4:** The impacts of testing strategies, sensitivity, and compliance rate on epidemic size  
 426 vary with community settings. A) Infection rates under different combined strategies and in three  
 427 abstracted community settings. Each dot represents one 100-day simulated outbreak and each  
 428 box presents 200 simulated outbreaks, throughout all panels. Green boxes represent simulation  
 429 with physical distancing (60% non-household contact permitted) and orange boxes show those  
 430 without physical distancing. The quintiles of infection rate and mortality rate are summarised in  
 431 Supplementary Table 3. B) Infection rates for each community setting when applying antigen  
 432 RDT of various sensitivity. The blue boxes show the infection rate when applying the most

433 effective testing strategy identified in the upper panel, with different antigen RDT sensitivity. C)  
434 Infection rates for each community setting when different quarantine compliances rates of traced  
435 contacts are simulated. The blue boxes show the infection rates when simulating containment  
436 using the most effective testing strategy identified in the first panel. In all three panels, one dot  
437 represents the epidemic size of one bootstrap trajectory. The red dashed line shows an infection  
438 rate at 5%, dots below which are defined as stochastic extinction events.  
439  
440

441 **Supplementary Tables and Figures**

| Age group (in years)     | Uganda |                        |
|--------------------------|--------|------------------------|
| 0-14                     | 48.10% |                        |
| 15-24                    | 20.30% |                        |
| 25+                      | 31.60% |                        |
| Household Size (members) | Uganda | High density community |
| 1                        | 11.00% | 0.00%                  |
| 2-3                      | 22.00% | 6.00%                  |
| 4-5                      | 27.00% | 17.00%                 |
| 6+                       | 40.00% | 77.00%                 |

442  
443 **Supplementary Table 1:** Summary of the demographic information used in the study. We used  
444 the age and household size distributions from Uganda, except for the household size distribution  
445 in high density communities, where we used data from Afghanistan, which has the largest  
446 average household size recorded by the United Nations. <sup>18,19</sup>

447

| Contact number | Physical distancing   |                       |                       |                       |                      | Physical distancing + PCR |                       |                       |                       |                     | Physical distancing + RDT |                       |                       |                       |                     |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                | 100%                  | 80%                   | 60%                   | 40%                   | 20%                  | 100%                      | 80%                   | 60%                   | 40%                   | 20%                 | 100%                      | 80%                   | 60%                   | 40%                   | 20%                 |
| 8              | 31.8% (0.5% - 51.1%)  | 9.0% (0.3% - 25.9%)   | 2.0% (0.3% - 5.1%)    | 0.8% (0.2% - 1.6%)    | 0.4% (0.2% - 0.8%)   | 8.1% (0.5% - 17.4%)       | 2.9% (0.3% - 7.6%)    | 1.4% (0.3% - 3.0%)    | 0.6% (0.2% - 1.3%)    | 0.5% (0.2% - 0.9%)  | 5.9% (0.4% - 15.2%)       | 2.8% (0.4% - 7.3%)    | 1.2% (0.3% - 2.6%)    | 0.7% (0.2% - 1.4%)    | 0.4% (0.2% - 0.7%)  |
| 11             | 66.7% (66.6% - 75.0%) | 48.1% (1.3% - 62.2%)  | 15.4% (0.5% - 34.2%)  | 2.5% (0.3% - 7.2%)    | 0.7% (0.2% - 1.4%)   | 29.9% (13.3% - 39.0%)     | 14.0% (1.0% - 26.6%)  | 4.4% (0.6% - 10.2%)   | 1.4% (0.3% - 3.1%)    | 0.6% (0.2% - 1.1%)  | 26.2% (7.7% - 37.7%)      | 10.7% (0.6% - 23.1%)  | 3.5% (0.4% - 8.0%)    | 1.1% (0.3% - 2.6%)    | 0.6% (0.2% - 1.1%)  |
| 14             | 82.5% (80.2% - 85.7%) | 72.4% (70.1% - 78.3%) | 45.5% (0.5% - 62.2%)  | 9.1% (0.4% - 21.4%)   | 1.2% (0.3% - 2.8%)   | 46.5% (41.7% - 51.6%)     | 32.5% (20.1% - 43.4%) | 12.0% (0.8% - 25.2%)  | 2.7% (0.3% - 5.9%)    | 0.9% (0.2% - 2.0%)  | 43.4% (37.9% - 50.4%)     | 29.4% (5.1% - 41.3%)  | 10.4% (1.0% - 24.0%)  | 2.7% (0.4% - 6.1%)    | 0.8% (0.2% - 1.6%)  |
| 17             | 88.5% (87.3% - 90.9%) | 83.5% (81.1% - 85.8%) | 69.4% (66.4% - 75.8%) | 26.5% (1.0% - 47.9%)  | 2.3% (0.3% - 5.8%)   | 52.2% (47.3% - 56.9%)     | 44.6% (39.0% - 51.0%) | 25.7% (6.1% - 38.5%)  | 6.1% (0.7% - 14.0%)   | 1.3% (0.3% - 2.8%)  | 51.2% (46.0% - 55.7%)     | 40.6% (34.1% - 47.7%) | 19.4% (1.9% - 34.1%)  | 3.9% (0.4% - 8.4%)    | 1.1% (0.3% - 2.3%)  |
| 20             | 92.8% (91.3% - 94.2%) | 88.8% (86.8% - 90.6%) | 79.6% (78.0% - 83.8%) | 53.5% (27.4% - 67.4%) | 5.1% (0.3% - 13.2%)  | 58.7% (54.3% - 63.2%)     | 52.2% (47.6% - 56.6%) | 39.3% (29.5% - 47.1%) | 13.0% (1.5% - 25.7%)  | 1.9% (0.3% - 4.5%)  | 57.0% (52.0% - 61.8%)     | 49.9% (45.5% - 55.0%) | 34.8% (22.0% - 44.7%) | 10.1% (1.0% - 20.5%)  | 1.9% (0.4% - 4.2%)  |
| 23             | 95.1% (94.1% - 96.2%) | 92.1% (90.7% - 93.5%) | 86.2% (83.8% - 88.5%) | 69.4% (65.3% - 76.8%) | 10.5% (0.4% - 25.8%) | 63.5% (60.1% - 67.3%)     | 57.8% (53.1% - 61.6%) | 48.8% (43.6% - 53.4%) | 24.1% (6.4% - 38.6%)  | 3.4% (0.5% - 7.9%)  | 61.6% (56.7% - 65.7%)     | 55.1% (50.8% - 60.0%) | 44.6% (37.1% - 51.7%) | 17.7% (1.3% - 31.0%)  | 2.7% (0.5% - 6.8%)  |
| 26             | 96.6% (95.6% - 97.5%) | 94.2% (93.1% - 95.3%) | 89.0% (88.0% - 91.7%) | 78.1% (76.1% - 82.7%) | 22.7% (0.7% - 44.3%) | 68.1% (64.8% - 71.7%)     | 62.3% (58.9% - 65.9%) | 54.3% (50.4% - 59.1%) | 34.5% (15.8% - 46.2%) | 5.0% (0.5% - 11.3%) | 65.2% (61.1% - 68.8%)     | 60.0% (56.3% - 63.6%) | 51.6% (46.4% - 56.9%) | 27.2% (7.5% - 41.2%)  | 4.3% (0.5% - 9.9%)  |
| 29             | 97.6% (96.9% - 98.3%) | 95.8% (94.9% - 96.9%) | 92.3% (91.0% - 93.8%) | 85.0% (82.6% - 87.1%) | 33.1% (1.1% - 57.9%) | 72.0% (69.0% - 74.9%)     | 66.2% (62.3% - 69.8%) | 59.5% (55.4% - 63.5%) | 44.4% (36.3% - 52.4%) | 8.0% (1.0% - 17.3%) | 68.6% (64.8% - 72.2%)     | 63.5% (59.3% - 67.9%) | 56.8% (51.5% - 61.2%) | 38.9% (22.1% - 48.8%) | 6.8% (0.8% - 13.7%) |

448  
449 **Supplementary Table 2:** Summary of the distributions of infection rates for that of Figure 3B.  
450 The mean of infection rates is computed from 200 simulated trajectories of 100 days for each  
451 setting. The range in the bracket shows the 10% and 90% quantiles of the infection rates from the  
452 200 bootstrap sample trajectories.

| Strategies  | Infection rate       |                       |                       | Mortality rate     |                    |                    |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|   | Rural                | Urban                 | High density          | Rural              | Urban              | High density       |
| No intervention   | 18.0% (0.5% - 38.2%) | 79.5% (77.3% - 82.4%) | 87.0% (85.2% - 89.4%) | 0.1% (0.0% - 0.2%) | 0.4% (0.2% - 0.6%) | 0.4% (0.1% - 0.7%) |
| Symptom + PCR   | 4.3% (0.4% - 11.5%)  | 41.0% (36.0% - 47.5%) | 51.8% (47.1% - 56.9%) | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.1%) | 0.2% (0.0% - 0.4%) | 0.3% (0.1% - 0.5%) |
| Symptom + RDT   | 4.0% (0.4% - 10.3%)  | 39.7% (34.1% - 46.9%) | 51.6% (47.5% - 56.8%) | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.1%) | 0.2% (0.0% - 0.4%) | 0.3% (0.1% - 0.5%) |
| Symptom + PCR + RDT   | 3.0% (0.4% - 7.6%)   | 32.6% (25.4% - 39.8%) | 45.3% (40.9% - 50.3%) | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.1%) | 0.2% (0.0% - 0.4%) | 0.2% (0.0% - 0.4%) |
| Reducing 40% of non-household contact                       | 2.5% (0.3% - 6.9%)   | 33.7% (0.8% - 55.5%)  | 74.1% (71.6% - 78.9%) | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.1%) | 0.2% (0.0% - 0.4%) | 0.4% (0.2% - 0.6%) |
| Symptom + PCR + reducing 40% of non-household contact       | 1.3% (0.3% - 3.2%)   | 8.4% (0.7% - 19.7%)   | 31.1% (7.0% - 43.0%)  | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.0%) | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.1%) | 0.1% (0.0% - 0.3%) |
| Symptom + RDT + reducing 40% of non-household contact       | 1.2% (0.3% - 2.7%)   | 6.5% (0.6% - 14.4%)   | 29.8% (6.1% - 42.4%)  | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.0%) | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.1%) | 0.1% (0.0% - 0.3%) |
| Symptom + PCR + RDT + reducing 40% of non-household contact | 1.1% (0.3% - 2.2%)   | 5.0% (0.6% - 11.8%)   | 21.6% (3.2% - 34.4%)  | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.0%) | 0.0% (0.0% - 0.1%) | 0.1% (0.0% - 0.2%) |

453  
454 **Supplementary Table 3:** Summary of the distributions of infection and mortality rate for three  
455 community settings. The mean of infection rate and mortality rates is computed from 200  
456 simulated trajectories of 100 days for each strategy. The range in the bracket shows the 10% and  
457 90% quantiles of the infection rates from 200 bootstrap samples.

458  
459  
460  
461  
462 A)

| Parameter   | Symptom | PCR  | Antigen RDT   | Antibody RDT | Coefficient of determination |                        |                        |
|---|---------|--|---------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|   |         |  |               |              | Strategy 1                   | Strategy 2             | Strategy 3             |
| Test consent rate   | 100%    | 80%  |               | 70%          | 0.001 (P = 0.289)            | 0.007 (P = 0.022)      | 0.065 (P = 0)          |
| Isolation consent rate  | 20%     |  | 90%           |              | 0.218 (P = 0); symptom       | 0.245 (P = 0); symptom | 0.107 (P = 0); antigen |
| Antibody testing day (days from onset)  |         | NA   |               | 8            | 0 (P = 0.63)                 | 0.005 (P = 0.012)      | 0 (P = 0.97)           |
| Days from symptom onset to isolation (days)                                   | 1       | 5  | 1             | 8            | 0.031 (P = 0)                | 0.036 (P = 0)          | 0.079 (P = 0)          |
| Duration that close contacts are traced (days)                                | 3       | 5  | 3             | 8            | 0.001 (P = 0.361)            | 0.149 (P = 0)          | 0.004 (P = 0.065)      |
| Tracing success rate (non-household contacts)                                 | 85%     | 80%  | 85%           | 75%          | 0.021 (P = 0)                | 0.04 (P = 0)           | 0.078 (P = 0)          |
| Quarantine consent rate of contacts   | 50%     |  | 70%           |              | 0.05 (P = 0)                 | 0.072 (P = 0)          | 0.093 (P = 0)          |
| Sampling success rate   | NA      |  | 70%           | 100%         | NA                           |                        |                        |
| Lab sensitivity   | NA      | 100%   | 80% (10%-90%) | 90%          | NA                           |                        |                        |
| Half of patient develop detectable serological response (Days from infection) |         | NA   |               | 12           | NA                           |                        |                        |
| Transmission rate after quarantine  |         | Rural: 10%; Non-slum urban: 10%; Slum: 20%                                   |               |              | 0.004 (P = 0.042)            | 0.004 (P = 0.04)       | 0.002 (P = 0.115)      |
| Test kit availability   | NA      | Rural: none<br>Non-slum urban: unlimited<br>Slum: 2 per week per 1000 people | Unlimited     |              | NA                           |                        |                        |

Setting: Rural    Strategy 1: Symptom;    Strategy 2: Symptom + Antibody RDT;    Strategy 3: Antigen RDT ;

463

464 B)

| Parameter   | Symptom | PCR  | Antigen RDT | Antibody RDT | Coefficient of determination |                        |                       |
|---|---------|--|-------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
|   |         |  |             |              | Strategy 1                   | Strategy 2             | Strategy 3            |
| Test consent rate   | 100%    | 80%  |             | 70%          | 0.028 (P = 0)                | 0.056 (P = 0)          | 0.187 (P = 0)         |
| Isolation consent rate  | 20%     |  | 90%         |              | 0.438 (P = 0); symptom       | 0.388 (P = 0); symptom | 0.19 (P = 0); antigen |
| Antibody testing day (days from onset)  |         | NA   |             | 8            | 0 (P = 0.868)                | 0 (P = 0.946)          | 0 (P = 0.839)         |
| Days from symptom onset to isolation (days)                                   | 1       | 5  | 1           | 8            | 0.16 (P = 0)                 | 0.173 (P = 0)          | 0.287 (P = 0)         |
| Duration that close contacts are traced (days)                                | 3       | 5  | 3           | 8            | 0.002 (P = 0.166)            | 0.317 (P = 0)          | 0 (P = 0.787)         |
| Tracing success rate (non-household contacts)                                 | 85%     | 80%  | 85%         | 75%          | 0.181 (P = 0)                | 0.235 (P = 0)          | 0.246 (P = 0)         |
| Quarantine consent rate of contacts   | 50%     |  | 70%         |              | 0.214 (P = 0)                | 0.248 (P = 0)          | 0.221 (P = 0)         |
| Sampling success rate   | NA      |  | 30%         | 0            | NA                           |                        |                       |
| Lab sensitivity   | NA      | 100%   | 80%         | 90%          | NA                           |                        |                       |
| Half of patient develop detectable serological response (Days from infection) |         | NA   |             | 7            | NA                           |                        |                       |
| Transmission rate after quarantine  |         | Rural: 10%; Non-slum urban: 10%; Slum: 20%                                   |             |              | 0.033 (P = 0)                | 0.03 (P = 0)           | 0.096 (P = 0)         |
| Test kit availability   | NA      | Rural: none<br>Non-slum urban: unlimited<br>Slum: 2 per week per 1000 people | Unlimited   |              | NA                           |                        |                       |

Setting: Non-slum urban    Strategy 1: Symptom + PCR;    Strategy 2: Symptom + PCR + Antibody RDT;    Strategy 3: Antigen RDT + PCR;

465

466 C)

| Parameter   | Symptom                                    | PCR  | Antigen RDT   | Antibody RDT | Coefficient of determination |                        |                       |
|---|--|--|---------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
|   |  |  |               |              | Strategy 1                   | Strategy 2             | Strategy 3            |
| Test consent rate   | 100%                                       | 80%  |               | 70%          | 0.037 (P = 0)                | 0.055 (P = 0)          | 0.341 (P = 0)         |
| Isolation consent rate  | 20%  | 90%  |               |              | 0.448 (P = 0); symptom       | 0.445 (P = 0); symptom | 0.32 (P = 0); antigen |
| Antibody testing day (days from onset)  | NA   |  |               | 8            | 0 (P = 0.886)                | 0.016 (P = 0)          | 0 (P = 0.847)         |
| Days from symptom onset to isolation (days)                                   | 1  | 5  | 1             | 8            | 0.226 (P = 0)                | 0.282 (P = 0)          | 0.257 (P = 0)         |
| Duration that close contacts are traced (days)                                | 3  | 5  | 3             | 8            | 0.064 (P = 0)                | 0.408 (P = 0)          | 0.05 (P = 0)          |
| Tracing success rate (non-household contacts)                                 | 85%  | 80%  | 85%           | 75%          | 0.289 (P = 0)                | 0.365 (P = 0)          | 0.367 (P = 0)         |
| Quarantine consent rate of contacts   | 50%  | 70%  |               |              | 0.354 (P = 0)                | 0.471 (P = 0)          | 0.267 (P = 0)         |
| Sampling success rate   | NA   | 70%  |               | 100%         | NA                           |                        |                       |
| Lab sensitivity   | NA   | 100%   | 80% (10%-90%) | 90%          | NA                           |                        |                       |
| Half of patient develop detectable serological response (Days from infection) | NA   |  |               | 12           | NA                           |                        |                       |
| Transmission rate after quarantine  | Rural: 10%; Non-slum urban: 10%; Slum: 20% |  |               |              | 0.101 (P = 0)                | 0.095 (P = 0)          | 0.074 (P = 0)         |
| Test kit availability   | NA   | Rural: none<br>Non-slum urban: unlimited<br>Slum: 2 per week per 1000 people | Unlimited     |              | NA                           |                        |                       |

Setting: Slum    Strategy 1: Symptom + limited PCR;    Strategy 2: Symptom + limited PCR + Antibody RDT;    Strategy 3: Antigen RDT + limited PCR;

467  
468 **Supplementary Table 4:** The impact of NPI parameter setting on the effectiveness of  
469 containment. Panel A-C shows sensitivity analysis under rural, urban and high density settings.  
470 The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) shows the proportion of variance in the final infected  
471 number (under each containing strategy) that is captured by the testing parameters; The P-values  
472 in the bracket show the rate of type one error of rejecting the null hypothesis that the parameter is  
473 not correlated with outcome.

474  
475



| ID | Description  | Values  |  |   |   |   |     |      |     |     |
|----|--|---|--|---|---|---|-----|------|-----|-----|
|    |  | 1.5   | 2  | 2.5   | 3   | 3.5   |     |      |     |     |
| 1  | Basic reproduction number  | 1.5   | 2  | 2.5   | 3   | 3.5   |     |      |     |     |
| 2  | Number of daily contact  | 2   | 4  | 7   | 10  | 14  |     |      |     |     |
| 3  | Number of initial inporting cases  | 1   | 2  | 5   | 8   | 15  |     |      |     |     |
| 4  | Healthcare seeking rate  | 30%   | 50%  | 70%   | 90%   | 100%  |     |      |     |     |
| 5  | Asymptomatic rate  | 10%   | 20%  | 30%   | 40%   | 50%   | 60% | 70%  | 80% | 90% |
| 6  | Transmission ratio for isolated patients   | 5%  | 10%  | 15%   | 20%   | 25%   |     |      |     |     |
| 7  | Daily PCR tests per 1000 population for slum   | Not available   | 1  | 2   | 10  | 20  | 50  | 1000 |     |     |
| 8  | Community size   | 100   | 1000   | 2000  |   |   |     |      |     |     |
| 9  | Infection number in 1000 to trigger containment  | No delay  | 5  | 20  | 50  | 100   | 250 | 500  |     |     |
| 10 | Percentage of contacts that are with a member of household, fixing the number of total contacts  | 20%   | 40%  | 60% (did not converge for slum settings)                                    | 80% (did not converge for three settings)                     |   |     |      |     |     |
| 11 | Social distancing, which is computed as the proportion of non-household contact that is stopped.   | 0%  | 20%  | 40%   | 60% (did not converged for rural setting)                     | 80% (did not converged for rural and slum settings) |     |      |     |     |
| 12 | Non-household contact trace successful rate  | 0%  | 15%  | 35%   | 55%   | 75%   | 85% | 95%  |     |     |
| 13 | Delay after tested positive to isolation (days)  | 0   | 1  | 3   | 5   |   |     |      |     |     |
| 14 | Duration of contact tracing, counted from the day of isolation (days)  | Symptom screening/Antigen RDT = 1; Antibody RDT = 6; PCR = 3              | Symptom screening/Antigen RDT = 3; Antibody RDT = 8; PCR = 5                   | Symptom screening/Antigen RDT = 5; Antibody RDT = 10; PCR = 7               | Symptom screening/Antigen RDT = 7; Antibody RDT = 12; PCR = 9 |   |     |      |     |     |
| 15 | Delay after onset for PCR testing results (days); contact tracing duration is set to be same as the delay, as we assume healthcare workers will start contact tracing once they identify an individual with onset. | 0   | 1  | 3   | 5   | 7   | 10  | 14   |     |     |
| 16 | Delay after onset for antibody sampling (days); contact tracing duration is set to be same as the delay, as we assume healthcare workers will start contact tracing once they identify an individual with onset.   | 5   | 6  | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11   |     |     |
| 17 | Seroconversion rate  | optimistic: half of individual has detectable antibody 7 days after onset | optimistic: half of individual has detectable antibody 12 days after infection | conservative: half of individual has detectable antibody 9 days after onset |   |   |     |      |     |     |
| 18 | Test acceptance rate (conditional on an individual seek healthcare)  | Antibody (blood sample) = 30%; PCR/Antigen (swab sample) = 40%            | Antibody (blood sample) = 50%; PCR/Antigen (swab sample) = 60%                 | Antibody (blood sample) = 70%; PCR/Antigen (swab sample) = 80%              | 90%   |   |     |      |     |     |
| 19 | Symptom-based isolation consent rate, simulated with other testing measures  | 10%   | 20%  | 30%   | 40%   | 50%   | 60% | 70%  | 80% | 90% |
| 20 | Symptom-based isolation consent rate (simulation with only symptom detection, no other detecting measures)   | 10%   | 20%  | 30%   | 40%   | 50%   | 60% | 70%  | 80% | 90% |
| 21 | PCR isolation consent rate (simulation with only PCR testing, no other detecting measure)  | 10%   | 20%  | 30%   | 40%   | 50%   | 60% | 70%  | 80% | 90% |
| 22 | Antibody RDT isolation consent rate (simulation with only antibody RDT, no other detecting measure)  | 10%   | 20%  | 30%   | 40%   | 50%   | 60% | 70%  | 80% | 90% |
| 23 | Antigen RDT isolation consent rate (simulation with only antigen RDT, no other detecting measure)  | 10%   | 20%  | 30%   | 40%   | 50%   | 60% | 70%  | 80% | 90% |
| 24 | close contact quarantine compliance rate (conditional on the infector consent to be isolated)  | Symptom screen = 10%; Testing = 30%                                       | Symptom screen = 30%; Testing = 50%  | Symptom screen = 50%; Testing = 70%   | Symptom screen = 70%; Testing = 90%                           | Symptom screen = 90%; Testing = 100%                |     |      |     |     |

476

477

**Supplementary Table 5:** Parameter settings for sensitivity analysis. The Description explains

478

what variables are changed and rows contain the values of each variable used for simulation. For

479

each value we performed the simulation for baseline and three types of containing strategies

480

under the rural, urban and high density settings.

481

482

483

| ID | Description   | Values  |             |   |  |            |
|----|---|---|-------------|---|--|------------|
|    |   | 2   | 4           | 7   | 10   | 14         |
| 2  | <b>Number of daily contact</b>  |   |             |   |  |            |
|    | Rural   | 0.99  | 1.00        | 1.00  | 1.00   | 0.14       |
|    | Non-slum urban  | 1.00  | 1.00        | 0.99  | 1.00   | 1.00       |
|    | Slum  | 1.00  | 0.94        | 0.99  | 1.00   | 1.00       |
| 9  | <b>Community size</b>   | <b>100 (did not converge for rural setting)</b> | <b>1000</b> | <b>2000</b>                                     |  |            |
|    | Rural   | 0.000002 *                                      | 1.00        | 1.00  |  |            |
|    | Non-slum urban  | 1.00  | 1.00        | 1.00  |  |            |
|    | Slum  | 1.00  | 1.00        | 1.00  |  |            |
| 11 | <b>Percentage of contacts that are with a member of household, fixing the number of total contacts</b>  | <b>20%</b>                                      | <b>40%</b>  | <b>60% (did not converge for rural setting)</b> | <b>80% (did not converge for three settings)</b> |            |
|    | Rural   | 1.00  | 1.00        | 1.00  | 0 *  |            |
|    | Non-slum urban  | 1.00  | 1.00        | 0.006*  | 0 *  |            |
|    | Slum  | 0.99  | 1.00        | 1.00  | 0 *  |            |
| 12 | <b>Social distancing, which is computed as the proportion of non-household contact that is stopped.</b> | <b>0%</b>                                       | <b>20%</b>  | <b>40%</b>                                      | <b>60%</b>                                       | <b>80%</b> |
|    | Rural   | 1.00  | 1.00        | 0.99  | 1.00   | 1.00       |
|    | Non-slum urban  | 1.00  | 1.00        | 1.00  | 1.00   | 1.00       |
|    | Slum  | 1.00  | 1.00        | 1.00  | 1.00   | 1.00       |


484

485 **Supplementary Table 6:** Lack-of-fit test for the ERGM inference. We performed lack-of-fit  
 486 tests of the target statistics for the four variables that alter the ERGMs. IDs correspond to  
 487 Supplementary Table 3. For each value (bold), we compute the P-value by comparing the 20  
 488 fitted networks with the input to the ERGMs. \* shows the cases when the networks are rejected  
 489 as good fits.

490

491

492




493

494 **Supplementary Figure 1:** Comparison of fitted age-mixing contact matrix with those cited from  
 495 survey data. The color scale shows the total number of contacts for each mixing within the  
 496 populations.


497

498



499  
 500 **Supplementary Figure 2 A)** Proportion of populations that are infected (at the end of the  
 501 trajectories) and under quarantine (max value throughout the trajectories) using PCR and antigen  
 502 RDT as detection methods. The dots with bars show the mean value with 95% confidence  
 503 interval from 200 simulated trajectories for each isolation compliance rate. B) Proportion of the

504 population infected when physical distancing blocks different proportions of non-household  
505 contacts. The box shows the corresponding effective reproductive number for the level of  
506 physical distancing. The combined effect of physical distancing with each testing method shown  
507 in B is plotted with different colours.  
508




509


510 **Supplementary Figure 3:** Summary of averaged outbreak trajectories in rural, urban and  
511 density settings. A-B) Averaged trajectories of outbreaks under rural setting and those with three

512 NPI containing strategies. Left panel shows the simulation without physical distancing and the  
513 right panel shows simulation with a physical distancing that blocks 40% of non-household  
514 contacts. C-D) Same averaged trajectories under urban setting; Left panel shows simulation  
515 without physical distancing and right panel shows simulation with a physical distancing that  
516 blocks 40% of non-household contacts. E-F) Same averaged trajectories under high density  
517 community setting; Left panel shows simulation without physical distancing and right panel  
518 shows simulation with a physical distancing that blocks 40% of non-household contacts. The  
519 curves are the mean value of daily infected numbers for a synthetic population of 1000; The  
520 shaded area indicated the 95% confidence interval of the estimation; Both mean and confidence  
521 intervals are computed from 200 simulated outbreaks.  
522

## Stochastic extinction threshold: 50




523  
524 **Supplementary Figure 4:** Probability of stochastic extinction against simulated population size  
525 under the rural setting. 200 bootstrap outbreaks were simulated for each population size, with  
526 stochastic extinction probability computed as the proportion of outbreaks that have less than 50  
527 cases at the end of the 100th day.  
528



529  
530 **Supplementary Figure 5:** Averaged trajectories when no close contact tracing is performed  
531 under rural, urban and high density settings. The curves are the mean value of daily infected  
532 numbers for a synthetic population of 1000; The shaded area indicated the 95% confidence

533 interval of the estimation; Both mean and confidence interval are computed from 200 simulated  
 534 outbreaks.

535



536

537 **Supplementary Figure 6:** Evaluation of close contact tracing and delayed responses. A)

538 Proportion of total infected individuals who are either isolated by testing (red dots) or  
 539 quarantined by tracing (green dots) varies as the compliance rate of quarantine a close contact of  
 540 a confirmed case changes. B) Implementation of containing measures after a certain proportion  
 541 of the population was infected could still protect a proportion of the population, compared to the  
 542 circumstances with no intervention. All simulations are performed for rural, urban and high  
 543 density settings.

544

545

546

547

## 548 References

549 1. Zhu, N. *et al.* A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N. Engl. J. Med.*



- 550           **382**, 727–733 (2020).
- 551    2.    Tatar, M., Shoorekchali, J. M., Faraji, M. R. & Wilson, F. A. International COVID-19 vaccine  
552           inequality amid the pandemic: Perpetuating a global crisis? *J. Glob. Health* **11**, 03086 (2021).
- 553    3.    Nkengasong, J. N., Ndembi, N., Tshangela, A. & Raji, T. COVID-19 vaccines: how to ensure Africa  
554           has access. (2020).
- 555    4.    Brauner, J. M. *et al.* Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19.  
556           *Science* **371**, (2021).
- 557    5.    Hodgins, S. & Saad, A. Will the Higher-Income Country Blueprint for COVID-19 Work in Low-  
558           and Lower Middle-Income Countries? *Glob Health Sci Pract* **8**, 136–143 (2020).
- 559    6.    Collie, S., Champion, J., Moultrie, H., Bekker, L.-G. & Gray, G. Effectiveness of BNT162b2  
560           Vaccine against Omicron Variant in South Africa. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **386**, 494–496 (2022).
- 561    7.    Pulliam, J. R. C. *et al.* Increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection associated with emergence of the  
562           Omicron variant in South Africa. *MedRxiv* (2021).
- 563    8.    Bong, C.-L. *et al.* The COVID-19 Pandemic: Effects on Low- and Middle-Income Countries.  
564           *Anesth. Analg.* **131**, 86–92 (2020).
- 565    9.    Murthy, S., Leligdowicz, A. & Adhikari, N. K. J. Intensive care unit capacity in low-income  
566           countries: a systematic review. *PLoS One* **10**, e0116949 (2015).
- 567    10.   Hasell, J. *et al.* A cross-country database of COVID-19 testing. *Sci Data* **7**, 345 (2020).
- 568    11.   Nkengasong, J. Let Africa into the market for COVID-19 diagnostics. *Nature* **580**, 565 (2020).
- 569    12.   Porte, L., Legarraga, P., Vollrath, V. & Aguilera, X. Evaluation of novel antigen-based rapid  
570           detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *International Journal of*  
571           (2020).
- 572    13.   Krueger, L. J., Gaeddert, M., Koepfel, L. & Bruemmer, L. Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of use  
573           and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2.  
574           *medRxiv* (2020).

- 575 14. Jacobs, J. *et al.* Implementing COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) Rapid Diagnostic Tests in Sub-Saharan  
576 Africa: A Review. *Front. Med.* **7**, 557797 (2020).
- 577 15. Shapiro, A. E. *et al.* Community-based targeted case finding for tuberculosis and HIV in household  
578 contacts of patients with tuberculosis in South Africa. *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* **185**, 1110–  
579 1116 (2012).
- 580 16. Baqui, P., Bica, I., Marra, V. & Ercole, A. Ethnic and regional variations in hospital mortality from  
581 COVID-19 in Brazil: a cross-sectional observational study. *The Lancet Global* (2020).
- 582 17. Mohanan, M., Malani, A., Krishnan, K. & Acharya, A. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Karnataka,  
583 India. *JAMA* **325**, 1001–1003 (2021).
- 584 18. United Nation. Household Size and Composition Around the World 2017. (2017).
- 585 19. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *World Population Prospects 2019 - Volume II:*  
586 *Demographic Profiles*. (United Nations, 2020).
- 587 20. le Polain de Waroux, O. *et al.* Characteristics of human encounters and social mixing patterns  
588 relevant to infectious diseases spread by close contact: a survey in Southwest Uganda. *BMC Infect.*  
589 *Dis.* **18**, 172 (2018).
- 590 21. Dobreva, Z, Gimma, A, Rohan, H, Djoudalbaye, B, Tshangela, A, Quaife, M. Characterising social  
591 contacts under COVID-19 control measures in 18 African countries. in *1st International Conference*  
592 *on Public Health in Africa (CPHIA2021)*.
- 593 22. Robins, G., Pattison, P., Kalish, Y. & Lusher, D. An introduction to exponential random graph (p\*)  
594 models for social networks. *Soc. Networks* **29**, 173–191 (2007).
- 595 23. Sun, K. *et al.* Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*  
596 (2020) doi:10.1126/science.abe2424.
- 597 24. Ferretti, L. *et al.* Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital  
598 contact tracing. *Science* **368**, (2020).
- 599 25. Zhang, J. *et al.* Age profile of susceptibility, mixing, and social distancing shape the dynamics of the

- 600 novel coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak in China. *medRxiv* (2020)
- 601 doi:10.1101/2020.03.19.20039107.
- 602 26. Davies, N. G. *et al.* Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics.
- 603 *MedRxiv* (2020).
- 604 27. Verity, R. *et al.* Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis.
- 605 *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **20**, 669–677 (2020).
- 606 28. Scohy, A. *et al.* Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as frontline testing for COVID-19
- 607 diagnosis. *J. Clin. Virol.* **129**, 104455 (2020).
- 608 29. Pilarowski, G. *et al.* Performance characteristics of a rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay at a
- 609 public plaza testing site in San Francisco. *medRxiv* (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.02.20223891.
- 610 30. Daria, S., Asaduzzaman, M., Shahriar, M. & Islam, M. R. The massive attack of COVID-19 in India
- 611 is a big concern for Bangladesh: The key focus should be given on the interconnection between the
- 612 countries. *Int. J. Health Plann. Manage.* **36**, 1947–1949 (2021).
- 613 31. Nordling, L. The pandemic appears to have spared Africa so far. Scientists are struggling to explain
- 614 why. *Science* (2020) doi:10.1126/science.abe2825.
- 615 32. Makoni, M. COVID-19 in Africa: half a year later. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **20**, 1127 (2020).
- 616 33. Bock, P. *et al.* Understanding low sensitivity of community-based HIV rapid testing: experiences
- 617 from the HPTN 071 (PopART) trial in Zambia and South Africa. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **20**, 21780 (2017).
- 618 34. Omori, R., Matsuyama, R. & Nakata, Y. The age distribution of mortality from novel coronavirus
- 619 disease (COVID-19) suggests no large difference of susceptibility by age. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 16642
- 620 (2020).
- 621 35. Hinch, R., Probert, W. J. M., Nurtay, A., Kendall, M. & Wymatt, C. OpenABM-Covid19-an agent-
- 622 based model for non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19 including contact tracing.
- 623 *medRxiv* (2020).
- 624 36. Food and Agriculture Organization. *Guidelines on defining rural areas and compiling indicators for*

- 625            *development policy*. (2018).
- 626    37. Mossong, J., Hens, N., Jit, M., Beutels, P. & Auranen, K. POLYMOD social contact data. (2017).
- 627    38. Kumar, S. *et al.* Who interacts with whom? Social mixing insights from a rural population in India.
- 628            *PLoS One* **13**, e0209039 (2018).
- 629    39. Nishiura, H. *et al.* Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-
- 630            19). *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **94**, 154–155 (2020).
- 631    40. Nogrady, B. What the data say about asymptomatic COVID infections. *Nature* **587**, 534–535 (2020).
- 632    41. Anderson, R. M., Heesterbeek, H., Klinkenberg, D. & Hollingsworth, T. D. How will country-based
- 633            mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *Lancet* **395**, 931–934 (2020).
- 634    42. Wölfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* **581**,
- 635            465–469 (2020).
- 636    43. Wu, F. *et al.* Neutralizing Antibody Responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-19 Recovered Patient
- 637            Cohort and Their Implications. (2020) doi:10.2139/ssrn.3566211.
- 638    44. Li, Z. *et al.* Development and clinical application of a rapid IgM-IgG combined antibody test for
- 639            SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis. *J. Med. Virol.* **92**, 1518–1524 (2020).

640