

1 **SARS-CoV-2 quarantine mandated by contact tracing: burden and infection rate among close**  
2 **contacts in Zurich, Switzerland, 2020-2021**

3 H el ene E. Aschmann<sup>1,2</sup>, Anja Domenghino<sup>2,3</sup>, Ruedi Jung<sup>2</sup>, Tala Ballouz<sup>2</sup>, Dominik Menges<sup>2</sup>, Jan Fehr<sup>2</sup>,  
4 Milo A. Puhan<sup>2</sup>

5 1. Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine & Department of Epidemiology and  
6 Biostatistics, University of California San Francisco (UCSF), San Francisco General Hospital, 1001  
7 Potrero Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94110, San Francisco, USA

8 2. Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich (UZH),  
9 Hirschengraben 84, CH-8001 Zurich, Switzerland

10 3. Department of Visceral and Transplantation Surgery, University Hospital Zurich, R amistrasse  
11 100, CH-8091 Zurich, Switzerland

12 Correspondence: H el ene E. Aschmann ([helene.aschmann@ucsf.edu](mailto:helene.aschmann@ucsf.edu))  
13 Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine  
14 San Francisco General Hospital  
15 1001 Potrero Avenue  
16 San Francisco, CA 94110

17 **Abstract**

18 Objectives

19 Before vaccines and effective treatments were available, quarantine of close contacts was important  
20 to limit the spread of SARS-CoV-2. To evaluate potential benefits and harms of quarantine, we aimed  
21 to estimate infection rates and describe experiences and mental health among persons in mandated  
22 quarantine during the early SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

23 Methods

24 We invited adults in mandated quarantine after an exposure to SARS-CoV-2 identified through  
25 contact tracing of the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland, between August 2020 and January 2021.  
26 Participants completed two questionnaires and received up to two SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain  
27 reaction tests, during and at the end of quarantine.

28 Results

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

29 Among 395 participants, quarantine duration ranged from 2 to 20 days. By day 11 since the last  
30 contact, 11.1% [95% CI 8.4%–14.7%] were infected with SARS-CoV-2. The proportion of participants  
31 with symptoms of depression doubled from 9.3% before quarantine to 18.9% during quarantine, and  
32 12.1% reported quarantine was very or extremely difficult.

### 33 Conclusions

34 Although quarantine was only moderately burdensome for most participants, some experienced  
35 significant difficulties and burden. Policymakers need to balance infection control with potential  
36 harms placed on individuals.

## 37 Introduction

38 Authorities mandating quarantine of close contacts of persons infected with SARS-CoV-2 need to  
39 balance quarantine’s efficacy in limiting viral spread against its impact on individuals, society, and  
40 economy. The balance of quarantine’s benefits and harms should not only be counted with mortality  
41 and morbidity, but should also consider protection from financial, social, and psychological harm on  
42 quarantined persons [1]. Quarantine was especially important at the beginning of the SARS-CoV-2  
43 pandemic when vaccines and effective medical treatment were not available. Currently, only few  
44 countries still impose quarantine and in Switzerland, quarantine mandates were lifted in April 2022.  
45 But with new variants and waning vaccine effectiveness, quarantine remains an option according to  
46 the World Health Organization [2].

47 Quarantine is associated with poor psychological outcomes, in particular after a duration of one  
48 week or longer [3,4]. Individuals in quarantine or isolation have 2-3 times increased odds for  
49 depressive, anxiety or stress-related disorders [4]. Furthermore, low adherence (42% in the UK [5],  
50 28% in Norway [6]) limited its efficacy. While at the beginning of the pandemic, some called for  
51 quarantine as long as 21 days based on incubation time [7–9], testing soon allowed to reduce  
52 quarantine duration [10–15]. Later some persons were exempted from quarantine due to prior  
53 infections or vaccination [2].

54 To evaluate or inform policy makers, a detailed evaluation of the benefits and harms of quarantine  
55 measures is warranted. Our aims were (1) to estimate infection rates among close contacts in  
56 mandated quarantine in the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland, during the early SARS-CoV-2 pandemic  
57 (i.e., the secondary attack rate), and (2) to assess mental health, difficulties and worries during  
58 quarantine as well as adherence, and motivation to adhere to quarantine.

## 59 [Methods](#)

### 60 [Study Population](#)

61 This analysis is based on the Zurich SARS-CoV-2 Cohort, a prospective, observational, population-  
62 based study of an age-stratified random sample of 1106 SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals and their  
63 close contacts based on contact tracing in the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland. All participants provided  
64 electronic consent. The study was prospectively registered (ISRCTN14990068) and approved by the  
65 ethics committee of the Canton of Zurich (BASEC 2020-01739).

66 More detailed information about the study enrolment procedures are reported elsewhere [16]. In  
67 short, close contacts were identified through contact tracing and randomly sampled in clusters based  
68 on their index case (the person with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test in the cohort with whom a potentially  
69 infectious contact occurred). We recruited close contacts from August 7, 2020, to January 15, 2021.  
70 Eligible persons included adults (aged  $\geq 18$ ), fluent in German, resident in the canton of Zurich, and  
71 consenting to participate. Persons were not eligible if they declined to be re-contacted for study  
72 purposes or if the index case was not recorded (e.g., the contact occurred in another country).

### 73 [Data collection](#)

74 Close contacts were invited to complete a baseline questionnaire upon enrolment. A second  
75 questionnaire was sent on the second to last day of quarantine. Moreover, they were invited to  
76 receive a polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test for SARS-CoV-2 at the beginning of quarantine  
77 (preferably on day 5 or 6) and at the end of quarantine. Close contacts testing positive were invited

78 to participate in a separate arm of the study instead. We reported mental health outcomes in  
79 persons who tested positive separately [17].

80 The questionnaires included the German version of short form of the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress  
81 Scale (DASS-21) [18], and a subset of questions from the COVID-19 Pandemic Mental Health  
82 Questionnaire [19]. We asked how well informed and prepared participants felt, how difficult  
83 quarantine measures were in general to follow, and how difficult the specific rules published by the  
84 Swiss Federal Office of Public Health were [20]. Potential worries, reasons for motivation and positive  
85 experiences were piloted with lay persons and we added open text comments to allow participants  
86 to add others.

87 To compare participants with non-participants, aggregated data were analysed based on data from  
88 contact tracing. These data were recorded in Microsoft Office Excel forms and in the Surveillance  
89 Outbreak Response Management and Analysis System (SORMAS) [21] a web application developed  
90 for contact tracing.

### 91 [Sample size estimation](#)

92 The sample size calculation was based on the proportion of close contacts with a positive PCR test  
93 after day 5 of quarantine. We estimated 5% would test positive until day 5, and 3% with an initial  
94 negative test would test positive by the end of quarantine. To show a difference of 1% at a  
95 significance level of 0.05, a sample size of 294 was needed. However, the sample size was increased  
96 because not all participants agreed to get tested. Recruitment was stopped when the targeted  
97 sample size was reached for SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals of our cohort study, as the study had  
98 several aims.

### 99 [Statistical analysis](#)

100 We modelled the cumulative probability over time of converting during the mandated quarantine for  
101 all invited close contacts. This cumulative probability was derived by modelling the proportion of  
102 persons who remained without a positive test using a survival analysis with the `trm` package

103 (version 0.6-4) in R [22]. For each positive test, we assumed the conversion to occur earliest on the  
104 day after the last negative test or, in the absence of a test, on the day of last contact, and latest on  
105 the day the sample for the positive test was taken (interval censoring) [23,24]. For close contacts  
106 without a positive test, the observations were censored after the last negative test. Because our  
107 recruitment in the close contact sub-study did not include contacts who converted before they  
108 consented to participate, we also included data from non-participants in the model, to account for  
109 contacts who converted early. For non-participants, we obtained the sampling day of positive tests  
110 from contact tracing data. We assumed a similar frequency of negative tests as for participants,  
111 except for the tests on day 10 and 11 of quarantine. Since testing at the end of quarantine was a  
112 study-specific procedure, and not mandated by the Department of Health, we assumed non-  
113 participants had only as many negative tests on day 10 and 11 as participants on day 9.

114 Descriptive analyses were performed for all other outcomes. For DASS-21, missing data were  
115 imputed for each subscale if two or less answers were missing using the mean of the remaining  
116 answers. We explored associations of (1) overall motivation, (2) feeling prepared, (3) difficulty of  
117 quarantine measures overall, and (4) having more time to relax during quarantine with baseline  
118 characteristics based on a priori hypotheses and hypotheses generated based on participants'  
119 comments. We included age and sex in all regressions. All outcomes were elicited as five-point Likert-  
120 type scales, and we used logistic ordinal regression to analyse associations [25].

121 Informed consent, recruitment and survey data were collected and managed using REDCap  
122 electronic data capture tools [26,27]. For participants who preferred not to complete the survey  
123 online, written consent was sought via letters and questionnaires were completed via phone. All  
124 analyses were performed using R version 4.1.1 [28].

## 125 Results

### 126 Study Population

127 Of 21 316 records of close contacts, 10 110 were considered eligible during the initial screening  
128 (Figure 1). We invited 1484 persons (and 8 duplicates). Of these, 129 were not eligible, and 526 had  
129 finished quarantine or converted to a positive case. Of the remaining 829 persons, 395 consented to  
130 participate, corresponding to a response rate of 48%.

131 We compared baseline characteristics between 395 participants and 1018 non-participants. This  
132 analysis did not consider 79 persons who should not have been invited (8 duplicates, 56 underage, 14  
133 not close contacts, 1 already converted before we invited them). Participants and non-participants  
134 were similar in sex and duration of quarantine (Table S1). Age was missing for 36% of non-  
135 participants, so a direct comparison is difficult. However, participants were likely younger than non-  
136 participants because their index cases (persons with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test) were younger (Table  
137 S1), and the age of index cases and close contacts was correlated (Table S2).

138 Almost all participants (94%) performed the mandated quarantine at home (Table 1). Some  
139 participants (22%) had children in their household. Many were household contacts, meaning they  
140 were living in the same household as an individual with a SARS-CoV-2 infection (35%). Most  
141 participants were employed (70%). Of those who worked, most could work at home (47%) or at least  
142 partially (24%). Some self-quarantined before receiving the official mandate because they knew of a  
143 contact with an infected person (38%). Among household contacts, 47% (64/135) self-quarantined,  
144 while 37% (50/135) answered that their reason to initiate quarantine was the official mandate.

### 145 PCR test results during quarantine

146 At least one PCR test was performed in 358 of 395 participants during their quarantine. Our analysis  
147 of the secondary attack rate considered a total of 1404 invited adult close contacts in whom we  
148 could have noted a conversion (Figures S1 and S2). In a survival analysis that considers when persons  
149 were tested (positive and negative), the estimated cumulative probability for a conversion by day 11

150 was 11.1% [95% CI: 8.4–14.7%] (Figure 2A). Most conversions occurred within 5 days after the last  
151 potentially infectious contact: the estimated cumulative probability reached 9.1% [95% CI: 6.6–  
152 12.7%] by day 5. The mean follow-up time up to the last test result was 7.4 days.

### 153 [Quarantine duration](#)

154 In theory, household contacts should always have had a quarantine duration of at least 10 or 11 days  
155 (quarantine duration was decreased from 11 to 10 days in November 2020). However, 24 of 135  
156 household contacts (17.8%) reported durations of 5 to 9 days (Figure 2B). A regular duration of 10 or  
157 11 days was reported by 89 (65.9%) and an extended duration by 22 (16.3%) household contacts.  
158 Non-household contacts declared shorter durations of quarantine, with a median of 8 days and  
159 ranging from 2 to 20 days. Among all contacts, quarantine was extended in 29 (7.4%) persons; this  
160 occurred when persons spent their quarantine together and one of them converted during that time.

### 161 [Motivation to adhere to quarantine measures](#)

162 Most participants reported that they were motivated to adhere to quarantine measures overall: 338  
163 (86.7%) answered that they were motivated, very motivated, or extremely motivated (Figure 3).  
164 Participants were most motivated to get tested when symptoms appeared (360, 92.3%). However,  
165 less participants were motivated not to leave their home for 10 days (275, 70.5%), not to meet family  
166 and friends (269, 69.0%), to follow hygiene rules (220, 56.4% among those not living alone), and to  
167 stay at home longer if necessary (198, 50.8%) (e.g., if they or others in their household developed  
168 symptoms).

169 The most important motivations to stay in quarantine were to protect family and friends, protect the  
170 community at large, and contribute to fighting the pandemic, followed by the official mandate from  
171 authorities (Figure 3). Less participants considered others knowing they should be in quarantine,  
172 others being afraid to contract the virus, or possible punishments as important reasons.

## 173 Worries during quarantine

174 Participants worried most that their loved ones could contract the coronavirus: 289 (74.1%) were  
175 worried, very, or extremely worried (Figure 3). Most worried about the health of the person infected  
176 with SARS-CoV-2 (i.e., their index case) (63.8%) and becoming inactive (61.8%). Many worried about  
177 contracting the virus themselves (43.1%). Some participants worried about becoming depressed  
178 (22.3%).

179 Worries were associated with the overall motivation (Table 2). Participants who worried about  
180 contracting the virus themselves had 2.08 [95% CI: 1.41–3.09] times higher odds of reporting higher  
181 levels of overall motivation. By contrast, worries about becoming depressed were associated with  
182 lower motivation (0.45 [95% CI: 0.28–0.72] times smaller odds for higher levels of motivation).

## 183 Difficulty of quarantine measures

184 Quarantine measures were perceived as difficult or very difficult by 84 participants (21.5%) during  
185 quarantine (Figure S3) and by 65 participants (17.5%) at the end of quarantine (Figure S4). In total,  
186 109 participants (27.9%) found quarantine measures difficult or very difficult at either time point.  
187 Difficulty overall was lower for older adults (odds ratio 0.84 [95% CI: 0.75–0.95] for each additional  
188 10 years), and lower for male participants (odds ratio 0.50 [95% CI: 0.34–0.72]) (Table 2). Although  
189 several participants commented on the difficulty of taking care of children and the infected person,  
190 we could not confirm with statistical significance that difficulty was higher for participants living with  
191 children (odds ratio 1.49 [95% CI: 0.96–2.31]), or for household contacts (odds ratio 1.39 [95% CI:  
192 0.95–2.04]). There was no association between the overall difficulty and work from home during  
193 quarantine (odds ratio 1.00 [95% CI: 0.67–1.47]).

## 194 Symptoms of depression, anxiety, and stress

195 370 participants answered the DASS-21 questionnaire both at baseline and at the end of quarantine.  
196 The proportion of participants with depressive symptoms (of any severity) doubled from 9.3% before  
197 quarantine to 18.9% during quarantine (Figure 4). A sensitivity analysis with all participants showed



198 similar results (Figure S5). Overall, 65 participants (17.6%) had a relevant worsening by at least one  
199 category in depression, anxiety, or stress (Figure S6). However, 27 participants (7.3%) improved by at  
200 least one category in at least one subscale. Depression and stress scores increased with statistical  
201 significance (depression: +1.70 [95% CI: 1.19–2.22], stress +1.06 [95% CI: 0.47–1.66]) (Figure S6). The  
202 change in depression scores was higher in men than in women and higher in those with higher  
203 baseline scores, i.e., more pronounced in those with pre-existing depressive symptoms (Table 2).  
204 In direct comparisons, some participants reported feeling more isolated (22.0%) and increased  
205 trouble sleeping (14.0%) during quarantine compared to two weeks prior (Figure S7). Feeling more  
206 impatient or angry, consuming more alcohol, having more nightmares, feeling more worried,  
207 nervous, or depressed was reported by 8.3% to 11.0%.

#### 208 [Positive experiences](#)

209 Most participants reported more time to relax (253, 68.0%). Some commented that quarantine was  
210 stressful because they took care of children or of the SARS-CoV-2 positive person. An ordinal logistic  
211 regression confirmed that persons living with children (odds ratio 0.59 [95% CI: 0.37–0.92]) and  
212 persons working from home (odds ratio 0.66 [95% CI: 0.44–0.98]) had lower odds of reporting more  
213 time to relax.

#### 214 [Information and preparation for quarantine](#)

215 Most participants felt well or very well prepared for quarantine (47.2%) or neutral (40.3%). Older  
216 adults felt better prepared (odds ratio 1.19 [95% CI: 1.05–1.34] per additional 10 years), as did  
217 participants who felt well or very well informed (odds ratio 5.27 [95% CI: 3.03–9.32]). Participants  
218 worried about becoming depressed felt less well prepared (odds ratio 0.37 [95% CI: 0.23–0.58]).

#### 219 [Adherence with quarantine](#)

220 By the end of quarantine, 74 participants (19.9%) had left their house or met people during  
221 quarantine. One participant decided to stop quarantine early after a negative test based on the  
222 mistaken belief that a negative test ends quarantine.

223 We also asked household contacts about their adherence to the recommendations, in particular  
224 interacting with the person infected with SARS-CoV-2 (Figure S7). The recommendation that was  
225 least followed was wearing a mask when entering this person’s room – 20% rarely or never followed  
226 this rule.

227 Several participants expressed a need for physical activity outdoors and took precautions. One  
228 person described: “I badly needed a 20-minute walk or run. I went once early in the morning and  
229 once in the evening, so I virtually met nobody [...]. I always had a mask with me. This should be  
230 allowed in my opinion.” Others answered that quarantine rules did not consider the need to walk the  
231 dog or helping people with disabilities.

### 232 [Financial hardship](#)

233 In total, 62 of 390 participants worried about financial consequences: they were worried about losing  
234 their job or getting into financial difficulties or expected income loss due to quarantine (with no or  
235 only partial compensation). Only 14% (53 of 390) expected a reduced income; among them, 20  
236 expected a partial, 25 no compensation. Twenty-two persons (6%) were worried, very, or extremely  
237 worried about getting into financial difficulties due to quarantine, and 39 persons (10%) were a little  
238 worried. 26 (7%) were a little worried about losing their job due to quarantine, and 12 persons were  
239 worried, very, or extremely worried.

### 240 [Burden of quarantine](#)

241 In total, 176 of 390 participants (45.1%) found quarantine difficult, expected negative financial  
242 consequences or had symptoms of decreased mental health. There was little overlap between the 65  
243 participants who worsened significantly in a DASS-21 dimension and the 62 participants who  
244 expected negative financial consequences; 117 of 390 participants either had worsened mental  
245 health or expected financial consequences (29.2%). Finally, 109 of 390 participants felt that  
246 quarantine measures were difficult or very difficult.

## 247 Discussion

248 This study puts infection rates in close contacts (i.e., the secondary attack rate) into context with the  
249 negative and positive experiences of persons in quarantine. We found that about 11% of contacts  
250 were infected, and the majority (9%) had already converted by day 5 after the last (potentially  
251 infectious) contact. While some persons had positive experiences (e.g., more time to relax was  
252 reported by 68%), this stands in contrast to significant difficulties and burden experienced by almost  
253 half of the close contacts, including decreased mental health and financial consequences.

254 Our results compare to published secondary attack rates in close contacts, although these varied  
255 widely, partly due to different definitions of close contacts [29–34]. Even in household contacts,  
256 estimates ranged from 5% to 48% [29–34]. Highest estimates come from disadvantaged populations  
257 [34], reflecting that our population had comparatively good resources to protect themselves from  
258 transmission within a household.

259 Our study found a comparable increase in the risk for depressive symptoms as studies from earlier  
260 epidemics, which reported a 2.0-2.8 fold increase [4]. Prior studies also reported a higher risk among  
261 those with a history of depressive symptoms or mental illness, but did not report that the increase  
262 was higher in men [4]. Although others found associations of the duration of quarantine with  
263 negative psychological effects [3,36], we did not find a similar effect. A study in Germany found  
264 higher psychological distress among infected persons in isolation than in close contacts [37]. In  
265 comparison, our cohort study found similar rates of depressive symptoms for both groups [17].  
266 However, in our study close contacts had higher rates of stress but lower rates of anxiety [17].

267 Although close contacts reported high motivation, adherence was moderate and comparable to  
268 other studies [1,5,6,38]. About 20% left their house, e.g., for groceries, or met persons from other  
269 households, and only half the household contacts reported voluntary self-quarantine before  
270 receiving the official mandate. In comparison, in the index case study arm of our cohort, 14% did not  
271 comply with measures before their positive result, and 3% after their positive result [17]. This is in

272 line with other studies where adherence was lower in persons without symptoms [38]. We found  
273 that contacts who worried less about contracting the virus were less motivated to adhere. Contact  
274 tracers should therefore carefully explain why the exposure was potentially infectious.

275 Quarantine should be limited to the shortest possible but necessary duration. A 10-11 day  
276 quarantine was sufficient in our population, in a setting with high testing resources. Our study also  
277 adds to other evidence that supported a shortened 7-day quarantine with a negative test at the end  
278 of quarantine, as introduced soon after our study concluded [12–14,39]. Public health authorities  
279 should provide better information on testing. For example, 7% of our participants experienced long  
280 quarantine durations of 12 to 20 days due to others in their household testing positive. These  
281 extensions could have been reduced if their household members had been tested earlier.

282 Future interventions should aim to reduce the burden of quarantine for parents and persons with  
283 depressive symptoms [3]. Participants in our survey expressed a strong desire for outdoor physical  
284 activity, walking their dog, and letting children go outside. Experiences among parents are in line  
285 with our findings in infected persons in isolation, where parents had higher difficulty with isolation  
286 measures than persons without children [17].

287 A limitation of our study is that we only included close contacts of adult index cases, although  
288 sometimes children in the same household were also positive. Parents likely experienced more  
289 difficult quarantines, so we may have underestimated difficulties. Furthermore, we may have  
290 overestimated motivation and adherence as more motivated persons may have been more likely to  
291 consent to participate in the study. Additionally, we did not measure long term effects on mental  
292 health, although a prior study reported sustained negative effects 6 months after quarantine [3].  
293 Finally, infection rates among close contacts alone are not sufficient to measure quarantine’s  
294 effectiveness, which also depends on epidemic severity, timeliness of contact tracing, duration and  
295 adherence with quarantine [40]. Delays in contact tracing and many undetected or not traced COVID-

296 19 cases during the Fall 2020 surge likely limited quarantine’s effectiveness, but we did not aim to  
297 estimate averted infections.

298 To inform future pandemic response and evaluate past public health interventions, it is important to  
299 compare the effectiveness with the burden placed on quarantined persons. Our analysis exemplifies  
300 that this comparison should ideally be performed in the same population, as many factors, such as  
301 mental health, motivation, and adherence, influence each other. Going forward, policy makers  
302 should critically assess the need for quarantine and strategically study and reduce negative impact on  
303 quarantined persons.

## 304 Acknowledgments

305 We thank Prof. Torsten Hothorn for his support with the survival analysis.

## 306 Potential conflicts of interest

307 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## 308 Patient consent statement

309 All participants provided electronic consent. The study was prospectively registered  
310 (ISRCTN14990068) and approved by the ethics committee of the Canton of Zurich (BASEC 2020-  
311 01739).

## 312 Funding

313 The ZSAC study was funded through the Health Directorate of the Canton of Zurich and the Pandemic  
314 Fund of the University of Zurich. ZSAC was also part of the Corona Immunitas research program,  
315 coordinated by the Swiss School of Public Health (SSPH+) and funded through SSPH+ fundraising,  
316 including funding by the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, the Cantons of Switzerland (Basel,  
317 Vaud, and Zurich), private funders (ethical guidelines for funding stated by SSPH+ were respected)  
318 and institutional funds of the participating universities. HEA was also supported by a Swiss National  
319 Science Foundation Early Postdoc.Mobility Fellowship [191414] and a Postdoc.Mobility Fellowship  
320 [214129]. TB received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation  
321 program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 801076, through the SSPH+ Global  
322 PhD Fellowship Program in Public Health Sciences (GlobalP3HS) of the Swiss School of Public Health.  
323 Study funders had no role in the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, or writing of  
324 this report.

325

## 326 References

- 327 1. Sopory P, Novak JM, Noyes JP. Quarantine acceptance and adherence: qualitative evidence  
328 synthesis and conceptual framework. *J Public Heal. Journal of Public Health*; 2021;
- 329 2. World Health Organization. Contact tracing and quarantine in the context of the Omicron SARS-  
330 CoV-2 variant. 2022;1–9. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Contact_tracing_and_quarantine-2022.1)  
331 [Contact\\_tracing\\_and\\_quarantine-2022.1](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Contact_tracing_and_quarantine-2022.1)
- 332 3. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological  
333 impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*. 2020;395:912–20.
- 334 4. Henssler J, Stock F, van Bohemen J, Walter H, Heinz A, Brandt L. Mental health effects of infection  
335 containment strategies: quarantine and isolation—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Arch*  
336 *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2021;271:223–34.
- 337 5. Smith LE, Potts HWW, Amlôt R, Fear NT, Michie S, Rubin GJ. Adherence to the test, trace, and  
338 isolate system in the UK: Results from 37 nationally representative surveys. *BMJ*. 2021;372.
- 339 6. Steens A, De Blasio BF, Veneti L, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Van Zandvoort K, et al. Poor self-reported  
340 adherence to COVID-19-related quarantine/isolation requests, Norway, April to July 2020.  
341 *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25:1–6.
- 342 7. Li ZY, Zhang Y, Peng LQ, Gao RR, Jing JR, Wang J Le, et al. Demand for longer quarantine period  
343 among common and uncommon COVID-19 infections: a scoping review. *Infect Dis Poverty*.  
344 2021;10:5–13.
- 345 8. Khadem Charvadeh Y, Yi GY, Bian Y, He W. Is 14-Days a Sensible Quarantine Length for COVID-19?  
346 Examinations of Some Associated Issues with a Case Study of COVID-19 Incubation Times. *Stat Biosci*.  
347 2022;14:175–90.
- 348 9. Wang R, Wang Q. Determination and estimation of optimal quarantine duration for infectious  
349 diseases with application to data analysis of COVID-19. *Biometrics*. 2021;1–10.
- 350 10. Wells CR, Townsend JP, Pandey A, Moghadas SM, Krieger G, Singer B, et al. Optimal COVID-19  
351 quarantine and testing strategies. *Nat Commun. Springer US*; 2021;12:1–9.
- 352 11. Reid MJA, Prado P, Brosnan H, Ernst A, Spindler H, Celentano J, et al. Assessing Testing Strategies  
353 and Duration of Quarantine in Contact Tracing for SARS-CoV-2: A Retrospective Study of San  
354 Francisco’s COVID-19 Contact Tracing Program, June-August 2020. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2021;8:2–  
355 5.
- 356 12. Quilty BJ, Clifford S, Hellewell J, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Flasche S, et al. Quarantine and testing  
357 strategies in contact tracing for SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Heal*. 2021;6:e175–83.
- 358 13. Jones A, Fialkowski V, Prinzing L, Trites J, Kelso P, Levine M. Assessment of Day-7 Postexposure  
359 Testing of Asymptomatic Contacts of COVID-19 Patients to Evaluate Early Release from Quarantine —  
360 Vermont, May–November 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70:12–3.
- 361 14. Ashcroft P, Lehtinen S, Angst DC, Low N, Bonhoeffer S. Quantifying the impact of quarantine  
362 duration on covid-19 transmission. *Elife*. 2021;10:1–33.
- 363 15. Peng B, Zhou W, Pettit RW, Yu P, Matos PG, Greninger AL, et al. Reducing COVID-19 quarantine  
364 with SARS-CoV-2 testing: A simulation study. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11:1–13.
- 365 16. Ballouz T, Menges D, Aschmann HE, Jung R, Domenghino A, Fehr JS, et al. Individual-Level  
366 Evaluation of the Exposure Notification Cascade in the SwissCovid Digital Proximity Tracing App:

- 367 Observational Study. *JMIR Public Heal Surveill.* 2022;8:1–14.
- 368 17. Domenghino A, Aschmann HE, Ballouz T, Menges D, Strebel D, Derfler S, et al. Mental health of  
369 individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 during mandated isolation and compliance with  
370 recommendations — A population-based cohort study. 2022;1–20.
- 371 18. Nilges P, Essau C. Die Depressions-Angst-Stress-Skalen: Der DASS – ein Screeningverfahren nicht  
372 nur für Schmerzpatienten. *Obere Extrem.* 2015;10:649–57.
- 373 19. Rek S V., Bühner M, Reinhard MA, Freeman D, Keeser D, Adorjan K, et al. The COVID-19 Pandemic  
374 Mental Health Questionnaire (CoPaQ): psychometric evaluation and compliance with  
375 countermeasures in psychiatric inpatients and non-clinical individuals. *BMC Psychiatry.* 2021;21:1–  
376 15.
- 377 20. Federal Office of Public Health FOPH. COVID-19: Instructions on quarantine. 2021.
- 378 21. Perscheid C, Benzler J, Hermann C, Janke M, Moyer D, Laedtke T, et al. Ebola outbreak  
379 containment: Real-time task and resource coordination with SORMAS. *Front ICT. Frontiers Media*  
380 *S.A.;* 2018;5.
- 381 22. Hothorn T. Most likely transformations: The mlt package. *J Stat Softw.* 2020;92.
- 382 23. Therneau T, Grambsch PM. *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model.* New York:  
383 Springer; 2000.
- 384 24. Therneau T. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. *R Packag. version 3.2-13.* 2021. Available from:  
385 <https://cran.r-project.org/package=survival>
- 386 25. Venables WN, Ripley BD. *Modern Applied Statistics with S.* Fourth edition. New York: Springer;  
387 2002. Available from: <https://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/pub/MASS4/>
- 388 26. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture  
389 (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research  
390 informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.* 2009;42:377–81.
- 391 27. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O’Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium:  
392 Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform.*  
393 2019;95:103208.
- 394 28. R Core Team. *R: a language and environment for statistical computing.* R Foundation for  
395 Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria; 2020. p. <https://www.R-project.org>.
- 396 29. Hu S, Wang W, Wang Y, Litvinova M, Luo K, Ren L, et al. Infectivity, susceptibility, and risk factors  
397 associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission under intensive contact tracing in Hunan, China. *Nat*  
398 *Commun.* 2021;12:1–11.
- 399 30. Proesmans K, Hancart S, Braeye T, Klamer S, Robesyn E, Djiena A, et al. COVID-19 contact tracing  
400 in Belgium: main indicators and performance, January – September 2021. *Arch Public Heal. BioMed*  
401 *Central;* 2022;80:1–10.
- 402 31. Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, Ng TC, Huang WT, Lin HH. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19  
403 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods before and after Symptom  
404 Onset. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020;180:1156–63.
- 405 32. Tsang TK, Fang LQ, Zhang A, Jiang FC, Ruan SM, Liu LZ, et al. Variability in transmission risk of  
406 SARS-CoV-2 in close contact settings: A contact tracing study in Shandong Province, China. *Epidemics.*  
407 2022;39:100553.
- 408 33. Ma X, Wu K, Li Y, Li S, Cao L, Xie H, et al. Contact tracing period and epidemiological



- 409 characteristics of an outbreak of the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in Guangzhou. *Int J Infect Dis.*  
410 2022;117:18–23.
- 411 34. Vallès X, Roure S, Valerio L, López-Muñoz I, Pérez-Quílez O, Soldevila L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 contact  
412 tracing among disadvantaged populations during epidemic intervals should be a priority strategy:  
413 results from a pilot experiment in Barcelona. *Public Health.* 2021;195:132–4.
- 414 35. Jassim G, Jameel M, Brennan E, Yusuf M, Hasan N, Alwatani Y. Psychological Impact of COVID-19,  
415 Isolation and Quarantine: A Comparative Study. *SSRN Electron J.* 2021;1413–21.
- 416 36. Kwon H-Y, Kim Y, Lee S-Y. What Matters for Depression and Anxiety During the COVID-19  
417 Quarantine?: Results of an Online Cross-Sectional Survey in Seoul, South Korea. *Front Psychiatry.*  
418 2022;13:1–9.
- 419 37. Klee L, Fabrice A, Eisenburger N, Feddern S, Gabriel C, Kossow A, et al. Coping strategies during  
420 legally enforced quarantine and their association to psychological distress level: a cross-sectional  
421 study. *Public Health.* 2022;209:52–60.
- 422 38. Eraso Y, Hills S. Self-isolation and quarantine during the UK’s first wave of covid-19. A mixed-  
423 methods study of non-adherence. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18.
- 424 39. Kolesar JM, Gayheart T, Poston L, Monday E, Forster D, Belcher E, et al. Preliminary Research on a  
425 COVID-19 Test Strategy to Guide Quarantine Interval in University Students. *Covid.* 2022;2:254–60.
- 426 40. Craig KJT, Rizvi R, Willis VC, Kassler WJ, Jackson GP. Effectiveness of contact tracing for viral  
427 disease mitigation and suppression: Evidence-based review. *JMIR Public Heal Surveill.* 2021;7.  
428  
429

430 Tables

431 **Table 1:** Baseline characteristics of participants and information relevant to their quarantine

		<b>N of 390</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Age	18-39 years	196	(50)
	40-64 years	156	(40)
	65+ years	38	(10)
Sex	Female	195	(50)
Education	No school diploma	1	(0)
	Mandatory school	12	(3)
	Vocational education	98	(25)
	Upper or post-secondary education	41	(11)
	Tertiary education other than university	110	(28)
Job situation	University bachelor or higher	126	(32)
	Employed	273	(70)
	Self-employed	24	(6)
	In education	47	(12)
	Retired	32	(8)
Knows who the index case is	Not working / unemployed / housewife	12	(3)
	Yes	364	(93)
	Strong suspicion	17	(4)
Type of contact	No	7	(2)
	Household contact	135	(35)
	Workplace contact	49	(13)
Quarantine place	Other	197	(51)
	At home	371	(94)
	At someone else's home	9	(2)
	Vacation home	9	(2)
	Hotel	1	(0)
	Hospital	1	(0)
Reason to initiate quarantine	Other	1	(0)
	Mandated through Department of Health	163	(42)
	Self-quarantined due to known contact	161	(38)
	Asked by employer	28	(7)
	Asked by health care provider	10	(2)
	Recommended by close ones	15	(4)
	SwissCovid App warning	6	(2)
	Always stayed at home	1	(0)
Household	Living alone	51	(13)
	Living with one other adult	121	(31)
	Living with several adults, no children	131	(34)
	Living with children	87	(22)
Care giving of index case (among household contacts)	N of 135		
	Yes	91	(67)
Possibility to work from home (among those working or in education)	N of 342		
	Possible	162	(47)
	Partially	82	(24)
	Not possible	76	(22)
	On sick leave	8	(2)
	Vacation or semester break	6	(2)

432

433 **Table 2:** Associations of baseline participant characteristics with motivation, feeling prepared,  
 434 difficulty with quarantine measures, time to relax (all ordinal logistic regressions where the outcome  
 435 was a five-point Likert-type scale), and change in depression score (linear regression). \*Statistically  
 436 significant at 0.05 significance level, not corrected for multiple testing.

<b>Outcome: Higher overall motivation to comply with quarantine measures</b>	<b>OR [95% CI]</b>
Age (per 10 years, reference age 18)	1.01 [0.90–1.14]
Sex (male vs female)	0.96 [0.66–1.40]
Worried about getting sick with COVID-19 (own health) (worried, very worried, or extremely worried vs little or not at all worried)	2.08 [1.41–3.09]*
Worried about becoming depressed (worried, very worried, or extremely worried vs little or not at all worried)	0.45 [0.28–0.72]*
<b>Outcome: Feeling better prepared</b>	
Age (per 10 years, reference age 18)	1.19 [1.05–1.34]*
Sex (male vs female)	0.91 [0.62–1.33]
Well or very well informed (vs neutral, poor, or very poor)	5.27 [3.03–9.32]*
Worried about becoming depressed (worried, very worried, or extremely worried vs little or not at all worried)	0.37 [0.23–0.58]*
Worried about getting sick with COVID-19 (own health) (worried, very worried, or extremely worried vs little or not at all worried)	0.96 [0.65–1.42]
<b>Outcome: Overall difficulty with quarantine measures</b>	
Age (per 10 years, reference age 18)	0.84 [0.75–0.95]*
Sex (male vs female)	0.50 [0.34–0.72]*
Working (possible or partially possible vs not possible)	1.00 [0.67–1.47]
Household contact (vs index case not in the same household)	1.39 [0.95–2.04]
Children in household (yes vs no)	1.49 [0.96–2.31]
<b>Outcome: More time to relax</b>	
Age (per 10 years, reference age 18)	0.98 [0.87–1.10]
Sex (male vs female)	0.92 [0.63–1.34]
Working (possible or partially possible vs not possible)	0.66 [0.44–0.98]*
Taking care of index case (yes vs no or not applicable)	1.08 [0.69–1.69]
Children in household (yes vs no)	0.59 [0.37–0.92]*
<b>Outcome: Change in depression score (during quarantine minus before)</b>	
Age (per 10 years, reference age 18)	1.02 [0.99–1.06]
Sex (male vs female)	4.68 [1.67–13.12]*
Quarantine duration (per additional day)	1.01 [0.81–1.27]
Living alone (vs living with others)	0.91 [0.20–4.23]
Children in household (yes vs no)	2.64 [0.75–9.31]
Working (possible or partially possible vs not possible)	1.19 [0.38–3.64]
Baseline depression score (per additional point)	1.23 [1.10–1.36]*

437

438

## 439 Figure Legends

440 **Figure 1:** Participant flow through recruitment. Recruitment was performed in two stages. Potential  
441 participants had to complete an online form to be contacted by the study team or give oral consent  
442 to have the online form completed for them.

443 **Figure 2:** Timing of conversions during quarantine and duration of quarantine


444 A) Cumulative probability of conversion from close contact to case with positive test (i.e., secondary  
445 attack rate), from the day of last contact with the index case. Most conversions occur within the first  
446 5 days since last contact. Conversion on day 0 means that the sample for the PCR test was taken on  
447 the day of last contact. The person was reported as a close contact and most likely received the  
448 positive test result one day later.

449 B) Duration of quarantine for household contacts and non-household contacts. This includes  
450 potential self-quarantine before the mandated quarantine and extensions due to other household  
451 members in quarantine converting to cases.

452 **Figure 3:** Participants' responses regarding motivation for quarantine measures, reasons for  
453 motivations, worries, and positive experiences during quarantine.


454 **Figure 4:** Change in proportion of persons with symptoms of depression, anxiety, or stress from  
455 before to during mandated quarantine. This analysis is restricted to participants who completed both  
456 questionnaires.

457 **Figures**



458


459 **Figure 1:** Participant flow through recruitment. Recruitment was performed in two stages. Potential  
 460 participants had to complete an online form to be contacted by the study team or give oral consent  
 461 to have the online form completed for them.



462

463 **Figure 2:** Timing of conversions during quarantine and duration of quarantine


464 A) Cumulative probability of conversion from close contact to case with positive test (i.e., secondary  
465 attack rate), from the day of last contact with the index case. Most conversions occur within the first  
466 5 days since last contact. Conversion on day 0 means that the sample for the PCR test was taken on  
467 the day of last contact. The person was reported as a close contact and most likely received the  
468 positive test result one day later.



469

470 **Figure 3:** Participants' responses regarding motivation for quarantine measures, reasons for


471 motivations, worries, and positive experiences during quarantine.




472

473 **Figure 4:** Change in proportion of persons with symptoms of depression, anxiety, or stress from  
 474 before to during mandated quarantine. This analysis is restricted to participants who completed both  
 475 questionnaires.






A




B




### Motivation

Extremely Very Motivated A bit Not at all




### Reasons for motivation

Extremely Very Important A bit Not at all




### Worries

Extremely Very Worried A bit Not at all




### Positive experiences

Strongly agree Agree Partially Disagree Strongly disagree




Proportion of responses


## Depressive symptoms



## Anxiety



## Stress



Severity of symptoms —○— Any severity —■— Mild —●— Moderate —▲— (Extremely) severe