

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## **Time is of the essence: impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing for COVID-19**

Mirjam Kretzschmar<sup>1\*</sup>, Ganna Rozhnova<sup>1,2</sup>, Martin Bootsma<sup>1,3</sup>, Michiel van Boven<sup>1</sup>, Janneke van de Wiggert<sup>1,4</sup>, Marc Bonten<sup>1,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

<sup>2</sup> BioISI – Biosystems & Integrative Sciences Institute, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

<sup>3</sup> Mathematical Institute, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>4</sup> Institute of Infection and Global Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

<sup>5</sup> Department of Medical Microbiology, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, the Netherlands

\*corresponding author

Mirjam E. Kretzschmar

Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care

University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht

Email: [m.e.e.kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl](mailto:m.e.e.kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl)

Phone: +31 88 75 687 61

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

29  
30

## 31 Summary

### 32 Background

33 With confirmed cases of COVID-19 declining in many countries, lockdown measures are  
34 gradually being lifted. However, even if most social distancing measures are continued,  
35 other public health measures will be needed to control the epidemic. Contact tracing either  
36 via conventional methods or via mobile app technology is central to control strategies  
37 during de-escalation of social distancing. It is therefore essential to identify key factors for a  
38 contact tracing strategy (CTS) to be successful.

39

### 40 Methods

41 We evaluated the impact of timeliness and completeness in various steps of a CTS using a  
42 stochastic mathematical model with explicit time delays between time of infection,  
43 symptom onset, diagnosis by testing, and isolation. The model also includes tracing of close  
44 contacts (e.g. household members) and casual contacts with different delays and coverages.  
45 We computed effective reproduction numbers of a CTS ( $R_{cts}$ ) for a population with social  
46 distancing measures and various scenarios for isolation of index cases and tracing and  
47 quarantine of its contacts.

48

### 49 Findings

50 In the best-case scenario (testing and tracing delays of 0 days and tracing coverage of 100%)  
51 the effective reproduction number will be reduced with 50% from 1.2 (with social distancing  
52 only) to 0.6 ( $R_{cts}$ ) by contact tracing. A testing delay of 3 days requires tracing delay or

53 coverage to be at most 1 day or at least 80% to keep  $R_{cts}$  below 1, with the  $R_{cts}$  reduction  
54 being 15% and 17%, respectively. With a testing delay of 4 days, even the most efficient CTS  
55 cannot reach  $R_{cts}$  values below 1. The effect of minimizing tracing delay (e.g., with app-  
56 based technology) declines with declining coverage of app use, but app-based tracing  
57 remains more effective than conventional contact tracing even with 20% coverage. The  
58 proportion of transmissions per index case that can be prevented depending on testing and  
59 tracing delay and isolation of index cases ranges from above 80% in the best-case scenario  
60 (testing and tracing delays of 0 days) to 40% and 17% with testing delays of 3 and 5 days,  
61 respectively.

62

### 63 **Interpretation**

64 Minimizing testing delay is of key importance for the effectiveness of CTS. Optimizing testing  
65 and tracing coverage and minimizing tracing delays, for instance with app-based technology  
66 further enhances effectiveness of CTS, with a potential to prevent up to 80% of all  
67 transmissions. The process of conventional contact tracing should be reviewed and  
68 streamlined, while mobile app technology may offer a tool for gaining speed in the process.

69

70

71

72

73 **Funding:** ZonMw project number 91216062

74

75

## 76 Research in context

### 77 Evidence before this study

78 As of 8 May 2020, the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has spread globally and has caused  
79 more than 263,000 confirmed deaths of COVID-19 worldwide. In the absence of effective  
80 medicines and vaccines, many countries have implemented strict measures of social  
81 distancing, thereby reducing transmission and bringing the epidemic under control. For  
82 lifting these measures, adequate tools are needed to deal with possible newly arising  
83 transmission clusters. Strategies including isolation of confirmed and suspected cases, and  
84 identification and quarantining of their contacts are considered a key part of the response  
85 during de-escalation of social distancing. As a substantial portion of transmission may occur  
86 before the onset of symptoms and before cases can be isolated, it is unclear how successful  
87 contact tracing strategies (CTS) can be in reducing onward transmission.

88

### 89 Added value of this study

90 We performed a systematic analysis of the various steps required in the process of testing  
91 and diagnosing an index case as well as tracing and isolation possible secondary cases of the  
92 index case. We then used a stochastic transmission model which makes a distinction  
93 between close contacts (e.g. household members) and casual contacts to assess which steps  
94 and (possible) delays are crucial in determining the effectiveness of CTS. We  
95 evaluated how delays and the level of contact tracing coverage influence the effective  
96 reproduction number, and how fast CTS needs to be to keep the reproduction number  
97 below 1. We also analyzed what proportion of onward transmission can be prevented for  
98 short delays and high contact tracing coverage. Assuming that around 40% of transmission

99 occurs before symptom onset, we found that keeping the time between symptom onset and  
100 isolation of an index case short (<3 days) is imperative for a successful CTS. This implies that  
101 the process leading from symptom onset to receiving a positive test should be minimized by  
102 providing sufficient and easily accessible testing facilities. In addition, reducing contact-  
103 tracing delays also helps to keep the reproduction number below 1.

104

#### 105 **Implications of all the available evidence**

106 Our analyses highlight that CTS will only contribute to containment of COVID-19 if it can be  
107 organised in a way that time delays in the process from symptom onset to isolation of the  
108 index case and his/her contacts are very short. The process of conventional contact tracing  
109 should be reviewed and streamlined, while mobile app technology may offer a tool for  
110 gaining speed in the process.

111

## 112 Introduction

113 As the first wave of the SARS-CoV-2 has reached its peak of cases in many countries,  
114 societies are preparing so-called exit-strategies from the COVID-19 lockdown, while still  
115 successfully controlling transmission. Contact tracing, in combination with testing and  
116 quarantine or isolation of the contacts, is considered a key component in a phase when  
117 lockdown measures are gradually lifted<sup>1-8</sup> This requires upscaling of conventional contact  
118 tracing capacity. The potential of mobile apps to support contact tracing is widely discussed  
119 and such technology has been used in several Asian countries that have successfully  
120 reduced case numbers<sup>9-14</sup>. Yet, many uncertainties remain on the optimal process of contact  
121 tracing with conventional methods and/or mobile applications, on the timing of testing for  
122 current or past infection, and on the required coverage of contact tracing needed. As a  
123 result, predicting the effects of contact tracing, and predicting whether and at which level of  
124 virus circulation contact tracing can sufficiently control remaining transmission is difficult.

125  
126 Modelling studies have demonstrated how mobile applications can increase effectiveness of  
127 contact tracing, compared to conventional approaches for contact tracing, but effectiveness  
128 depends on what proportion of the population will use the app consistently and for a  
129 sufficiently long period of time<sup>9</sup>.

130  
131 In previous work, we have investigated the impact of timeliness and completeness of case  
132 reporting for the effectiveness of surveillance and interventions<sup>15-17</sup>, and we quantified the  
133 timeliness of contact tracing of infected passengers during an airline flight for the 2009  
134 pandemic influenza<sup>18</sup>. In all of these studies, the timing of various steps in the monitoring

135 and intervention chain emerged as one of the key factors for effectiveness of a public health  
136 response. Usually, there are identifiable delays in the response chain that may be critical to  
137 the overall effectiveness of a strategy.

138

139 Here we analyze in detail the process chain of identifying index cases by symptom-reporting  
140 followed by testing, and subsequent contact tracing, with the aim to inform policy makers  
141 on the relative importance of key steps in the process. We use a mathematical model that  
142 reflects the various steps and delays in the test and contact tracing process to quantify the  
143 impact of delays on the effective reproduction number and the fraction of onward  
144 transmission prevented per diagnosed index case<sup>5,19</sup>.

145

146

## 147 Time delays in contact tracing

148 Our starting point is an assumed effective reproduction number ( $R_e$ ) for COVID-19 of around  
149 1, describing a situation with “social distancing but measures lifted to some extent”. We  
150 then quantify the relative contribution of the individual components of a contact trace  
151 strategy (CTS) required to bring and maintain the effective reproduction number with CTS  
152 ( $R_{CTS}$ ) to a value below 1. For simplicity we do not include transmission in healthcare  
153 settings.

154 We break down the process of contact tracing in two different steps (Table 1 and Figure 1).

- 155 • An index case acquires infection (at time  $T_0$ ), then after a short latent period becomes  
156 infectious (at time  $T_1$ ), and finally symptomatic (at time  $T_2$ ), which is here defined as


157 “being eligible for testing”. Subsequently a proportion of all symptomatic subjects gets  
158 tested and diagnosed (at time  $T_3$ ). The time between  $T_2$  and  $T_3$  is called the “testing  
159 delay” ( $D_1 = T_3 - T_2$ ), and may vary between 0 and 5 days, and in this period individuals  
160 might self-quarantine. We refer to the proportion of all symptomatically infected  
161 subjects that is tested as testing coverage and vary it from 20% to 100%. After being  
162 diagnosed, we assume index cases are quarantined with no further transmission.

- 163 • The second step is tracing contacts of the index, which occurs at time  $T_4$ . A fraction of  
164 those contacts will be quarantined, with effectiveness ranging from 0%-100%. For  
165 simplicity we assume that contacts in quarantine do not spread. The time between  $T_3$   
166 and  $T_4$  is the “tracing delay” ( $D_2 = T_4 - T_3$ ), which may range from 0 (for instance with app  
167 technology) to 4 days (with conventional approaches). In this step, tracing coverage is  
168 defined as the proportion of contacts detected, which either depends on the capacity of  
169 conventional approaches (ranging from 40% to 80%) or on the fraction of the population  
170 using suitable app technology for screening (ranging from 40% to 80%).

171



172 **Figure 1: Schematic of the contact tracing process and its time delays.**  
 173  
 174



T0 time of infection of index case  
 T1 onset of infectiousness  
 T2 symptom onset  
 T3 time of positive diagnosis  
 T4 time of tracing and quarantining contacts  
 $D1 = T3 - T2$  delay to diagnosis  
 $D2 = T4 - T3$  delay in tracing contacts  
 Coverage of contact tracing: percentage of contacts found and isolated

175  
 176  
 177  
 178

**Table 1: Time delays in the test and contact tracing process (see also Figure 1).**

Time	Event	Comments	Model implementation
<b>T<sub>0</sub></b>	the time of infection of the index case	Not observed	Start of the latent period, which lasts 1-3 days.
<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	Time the index case becomes infectious	Proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission may range from 0% to 40% of all transmissions	After 1-3 days after infection, the infectious stage starts, which lasts 10 days with variable infectiousness. About 40% of transmission takes place in the first 2 days of infectiousness <sup>25</sup> .
<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>	Time that the index (case) becomes	T <sub>0</sub> until T <sub>2</sub> reflects the time window in which	The incubation period in the model is taken in agreement with published literature <sup>21</sup> .

	symptomatic, and eligible for testing	prevention is not possible with CTS	
<b>T<sub>3</sub></b>	Time that index (case) is tested positive	<p>T<sub>2</sub> until T<sub>3</sub> is the testing delay, which may range from 0-5 days</p> <p>The proportion being tested varies from 0-100%</p> <p>During this period we expect subjects to self-quarantine, with effectiveness ranging from 0%-100%</p>	After a testing delay D <sub>1</sub> after symptom onset, an individual receives a positive test result and gets isolated. If an individual self isolates immediately, D <sub>1</sub> =0. After isolation, no transmission takes place.
<b>T<sub>4</sub></b>	Time that contacts of index case are traced and quarantined.	<p>T<sub>3</sub> until T<sub>4</sub> is the tracing delay, which may range from 0 (for instance with app technology) to 4 days (with current GGD approach).</p> <p>Here we can also vary the proportion with short post-test-delay (those with apps) and not.</p>	<p>After a tracing delay D<sub>2</sub>, contacts of the index case are traced and isolated. D<sub>2</sub> and the tracing coverage (proportion of contacts found and isolated) may differ between close and casual contacts. If household contact self-isolate immediately with the index case, it means that D<sub>2</sub>=0 and coverage 100% for close contacts.</p> <p>For simplicity we assume that contacts in quarantine do not spread.</p>

180  
181 The best-case scenario is that all eligible for testing are immediately tested (coverage 100%)  
182 with a very fast test result (test-delay 1 day), followed by immediate tracing (trace delay 0  
183 days) of all contacts (coverage 100%), that immediately adhere to quarantine measures.  
184 More realistic scenarios include testing and tracing delays, with suboptimal testing and  
185 tracing coverages and suboptimal adherence to quarantining and testing.

186

### 187 **Impact on effectiveness on population level**

188 To analyse the impact of these time delays on the effectiveness of contact tracing we use a  
189 model first described in Kretzschmar et al<sup>19</sup>, which was recently adapted for SARS-CoV-2<sup>5</sup>.  
190 The stochastic model describes an epidemic in its early phase as a branching process.  
191 Starting from a small set of initially infected individuals, the model calculates the numbers  
192 of latently infected persons, infectious persons, and persons that are diagnosed and isolated  
193 in time steps of one day. Latent infection, infectivity during the infectious period, and daily  
194 contact rates are quantified using distributions taken from published data.<sup>20-24</sup> We  
195 distinguish between close contacts (e.g. household contacts, but also other high-risk  
196 contacts) and casual contacts, which differ in the risk of acquiring infection from the index  
197 case. Also, the time required for tracing and quarantining contacts and the coverage of  
198 tracing may differ between these types of contacts and between different CTS (i.e.,  
199 conventional contact tracing versus mobile app supported contact tracing). Intervention  
200 effectiveness is determined by the daily probability of an index case being diagnosed by  
201 testing during the infectious period, and depends on various delays in the process of tracing  
202 household and non-household contacts, respectively, and on the proportions of contacts  
203 that can be traced and isolated (see Figure 1). We assume that isolation is perfect, i.e. that

204 isolated persons do not transmit any longer. The model is described by a set of difference  
205 equations, and allows for explicit computation of the basic reproduction number  $R_0$ , the  
206 effective reproduction number under social-distancing interventions  $R_e$  and the effective  
207 reproduction number with CTS ( $R_{cts}$ ). The model was coded in Mathematica 12.1.

208

### 209 **Parameter settings**

210 We assumed that without social distancing individuals have on average 4 close contacts per  
211 day and around 9 casual contacts per day, with certain stochastic variability. The  
212 distributions were fitted to data from the Polymod study<sup>23</sup>. Transmission probability per  
213 contact for close contacts was taken to be 4 times higher than for casual contacts.

214 Symptomatic and asymptomatic cases were assumed to be equally infectious. Overall, the  
215 transmission probability was calibrated to a basic reproduction number of  $R_0 = 2.5$ . For the  
216 social distancing, we assumed that close contacts were reduced by 40% and casual contacts  
217 by 70%. The resulting effective reproduction number was  $R_e = 1.2$ . Without further  
218 interventions, the doubling time of the epidemic would be around 19 days.

219

### 220 **Scenarios modelled**

221 We analyzed the impact of various testing and tracing delays and tracing coverage on the  
222 effective reproduction number  $R_{cts}$  while keeping the testing coverage at 100%. For  
223 comparison, we also considered the strategy where symptomatic individuals get tested and  
224 isolated, without subsequent tracing ( $R_{iso}$ ). We varied the testing delay  $D_1$  between 0 and 7  
225 days, the tracing delay  $D_2$  between 0 and 3 days, and tracing coverages between 0% and  
226 100%. Tracing delays and coverages were allowed to differ between close contacts and  
227 casual contacts.

228

229 We then compared the effectiveness of conventional CTS with a scenario that reflects  
230 mobile app technology for alerting subjects to be tested and for tracing contacts.  
231 Differences between these strategies were taken as follows. The testing delay ( $D_1$ ) is  
232 reduced with app technology. With conventional CTS symptomatic individuals need to  
233 decide to seek health care to get tested, and we assume that with app technology  
234 symptomatic subjects get alerted and can be tested without health care interference, for  
235 instance in specific test facilities for app users. For conventional CTS we assume suboptimal  
236 coverage in identifying contacts from the week before diagnosis by testing due to recall  
237 bias, especially for casual contacts. For CTS with mobile app technology we assume 100%  
238 tracing coverage of the proportion of subjects using app technology. For simplicity we  
239 assume 100% compliance with quarantining. We assume that tracing goes back for 7 days  
240 before the positive test result. The exact parameter values for this comparison are shown in  
241 Table 2.

242

243 Next, we quantified the impact of coverage of testing and app use on the effectiveness of  
244 CTS. We varied the percentage of app users in the population between 20% and 80%. We  
245 first considered the situation that testing is provided for 100% of persons with symptoms  
246 independent of app use, and app use only influences the fraction of contacts that are  
247 traced. Alternatively, we considered the situation that only app users with symptoms are  
248 tested (i.e. testing coverage varies between 20% and 80%) and coverage of tracing also  
249 depends on fraction of app use, i.e. varies as the testing coverage.

250

251 Finally, we quantified the fraction of transmissions of an index person that can be  
 252 prevented, and the contribution to the fraction prevented from isolation and from tracing  
 253 contacts with decreasing delays. The number of onward transmissions of an index case is by  
 254 definition described by the effective reproduction number of the realized scenario.  
 255 Therefore, the difference of reproduction numbers between two intervention scenarios  
 256 under the condition that an index case is diagnosed, will describe the fraction of onward  
 257 transmissions prevented. For contact persons, this is the fraction of the total infectivity that  
 258 lies after the time of isolation, i.e. the part of infectiousness that is prevented by contact  
 259 tracing. In other words, a contact person who is detected and isolated before the start of his  
 260 infectious period is a fully prevented transmission, while a contact person who is only traced  
 261 and identified after 70% of his infectivity has passed, is counted as 0.3 of a prevented  
 262 onward transmission.

263

264 **Table 2: Comparison Conventional CT and Mobile app CT**

265

	<b>Conventional CT</b>	<b>Mobile app CT</b>
<b>Testing coverage</b>	100%	100%
<b>Time to (self)-isolation (<math>D_1</math>)</b>	4 days	0 day
<b>Time to trace close contacts (<math>D_2</math>)</b>	3 days	0 day
<b>Time to trace other contacts</b>	3 days	0 day
<b>Tracing coverage close contacts</b>	80%	100%
<b>Tracing coverage casual contacts</b>	50%	100%
<b>Time traced back</b>	7 days	7 days

266


267 **Results**

268 In the best-case scenario, if all infectious persons that develop symptoms are tested and  
269 isolated within 1 day after symptom onset the effective reproduction number  $R_e$  will decline  
270 from 1.2 to  $R_{iso} = 0.97$ , without contact tracing (Figure 2). Contact tracing will further  
271 decrease the reproduction number to  $R_{cts}=0.6$  in the best case. In the optimal scenario – a  
272 testing delay of 0 days and a tracing delay of 0 days and a tracing coverage of 100%, the  
273 additional reduction of  $R_{cts}$  is 50%. Yet, with a diagnosis delay of 3 days, tracing delay or  
274 tracing coverage should be at most 1 day or at least 80% to keep  $R_{cts}$  below 1. In these  
275 scenarios the reduction of  $R_{cts}$  compared to the best-case scenario is 15% and 17%. With a  
276 testing delay of 4 days, even the most efficient contact tracing cannot reach  $R_{cts}$  values  
277 below 1.

278  
279  
280

281 **Figure 2: Impact of contact tracing on the effective reproduction number depending on various**  
282 **delays and tracing coverages.** In these analyses, 100% of those who develop symptoms get tested.  
283 For comparison the reproduction number  $R_{iso}$  with only isolation of index cases without contact  
284 tracing is plotted (green). (A) Influence of varying tracing delay  $D_1$  on the x-axis. The curves plotted in  
285 blue show varying tracing delays  $D_2$ ; (B) Here the tracing coverage is varied in the curves plotted in  
286 blue, while there is assumed to be no delay in tracing the contacts.

287



288  
289  
290  
291

292 We assumed that conventional CTS has longer tracing delay and lower tracing coverage than  
 293 CTS based on app technology which results in marked differences in  $R_{cts}$  for the whole range  
 294 of testing delay (Figure 3). With conventional CTS,  $R_{cts}$  would remain above 1, if the testing  
 295 delay exceeds 2 days, whereas contact tracing based on app technology could still keep  $R_{cts}$   
 296 below 1, as long as testing and tracing coverage would be at least 80%. If the testing delay  
 297 reaches 5 days or more, app technology adds little effectiveness to conventional CTS or just  
 298 isolating symptomatic cases.

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306


307

308

309

310

**Figure 3: Comparison of a conventional and mobile app CTS.** For parameter values, see table 2. We assumed that ascertainment is 100% for the conventional CTS and 100% and 80% for the mobile app CTS.



311

312

313

314

315

316



317 The reductions of  $R_e$  (based on social distancing) achieved by isolation only, conventional  
318 CTS, and mobile app-based CTS is shown in figure 4. For isolation only and for conventional  
319 CTS we assumed a delay of 4 days between symptom onset and isolation of the index case.  
320 The relative reductions are independent of the level of  $R_e$ , as there is a linear relationship  
321 between the various reproduction numbers. Conventional CTS, even if applied for all  
322 infected subjects with symptoms is 45% less effective than mobile app-based CTS, due to  
323 longer tracing delays and lower tracing coverage.

324

325 The effectiveness of app-based technology declines with lower fractions of persons using it  
326 (Figure 5). Yet, it remains more effective than conventional contact tracing even with 20%  
327 coverage, due to its inherent speed. In Figure 5a we assume that all symptomatic persons  
328 get tested, and then vary coverage of app use. In Figure 5b, we assume that only app users  
329 who develop symptoms get diagnosed, and that only app users get traced and isolated.  
330 Even with low coverage there is a reduction of  $R_e$ , due to fast tracing of a small part of the  
331 population. Depending on  $R_e$ , such an approach might be sufficient to reduce  $R_{cts}$  to levels  
332 below 1.

333


334 In Figure 6, we quantified proportions of transmissions per index case that can be prevented  
335 depending on testing delay, as well as the contributions of isolation of index cases and  
336 tracing of contacts. In the best-case scenario (testing and tracing delay being 0 days) more  
337 than 80% of transmissions can be prevented if coverage of infected persons being tested is  
338 100%.

339

340


341

342 **Figure 4: The reduction of the effective reproduction number for various CTS.** The reproduction  
 343 number with CTS,  $R_{cts}$ , is shown as a percentage of the reproduction number where only social  
 344 distancing is implemented ( $R_e$ ). For the isolation scenario and conventional tracing scenario we  
 345 assumed that there is a delay of 4 days between symptom onset and isolation of the index case.  
 346  
 347



348  
 349  
 350  
 351 **Figure 5: The impact of mobile app use on  $R_{cts}$  for varying levels of app use.** In (A), we assume that  
 352 there is also testing of those who do not use the mobile app, so app use only is used for tracing  
 353 contacts. In (B), only app users, who develop symptoms, are tested.  
 354  
 355


356  
 357 (A)  
 358



359  
 360  
 361  
 362


363  
364  
365

(B)



366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380

**Figure 6: The fraction of onward transmissions prevented by isolation of the index case and his/her infected contacts. The fraction prevented by contact tracing increases with decreasing tracing delay.**



381  
382

## 383 Discussion and conclusions

384 Using a mathematical model that describes the different steps of the CTS for COVID-19 we  
385 have quantified the relevance of delays and coverage proportions for controlling  
386 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Based on these analyses we conclude that reducing the testing  
387 delay, i.e. shortening the time between symptom onset and test positivity, is the most  
388 crucial step. Reducing the tracing delay, i.e. shortening the time of contact tracing, may  
389 further enhance the effectiveness of CTS. Yet this additional effect rapidly declines with  
390 increasing testing delay. Naturally, the effectiveness of CTS increases when proportions of  
391 index subjects detected and contacts traced increase as well. CTS has huge potential to  
392 control virus transmission, and thus to alleviate other control measures, but only if all delays  
393 are maximally reduced.

394

395 There are several obvious factors that can reduce the effectiveness of CTS, such as a large  
396 proportion of infectious subjects that remain asymptomatic or are otherwise not  
397 ascertained and a large proportion of contacts that cannot be traced. The latter implies that  
398 the potential benefits of using app-based technology for contact tracing requires  
399 participation of a substantial proportion of the population. Also, app use needs to continue  
400 over a long time period, so required continued adherence of app users. Low proportions of  
401 participation do not render CTS useless, however, because it could help to locally extinguish  
402 clusters before they grow larger. Also, for this purpose, the timeliness and completeness of  
403 CTS in local populations should be high to make it successful.

404

405 The strength of the approach is that it explicitly takes many details of the contact tracing  
406 process into account, such that the key factors can be identified. A limitation of our  
407 approach is that it does not take population age-structure into account, which may  
408 influence the proportion of asymptomatic cases and the mobile app use coverage. Also, the  
409 willingness of an index case or contact person to self-isolate may be different in different  
410 age groups. We have also assumed homogeneous mixing of the population, and  
411 homogeneous distributed use of app technology for the different coverage levels. Yet,  
412 clustering of non-users may have consequences for overall effectiveness of CTS, similar to  
413 clustering of non-vaccinated subjects. This is an important aspect to be addressed in  
414 subsequent work. The model also ignores that some contacts of the index case may have  
415 symptoms before they are traced by CTS. As these contacts may already self-isolate, this  
416 lowers the benefits of contact tracing.

417

418 Our finding of the crucial importance of the first step of CTS, establishing a diagnosis in  
419 subjects with symptoms, has important consequences. It requires an infrastructure for  
420 testing, that allows subjects with symptoms to be tested, preferably, within one day of  
421 symptom onset. Studies have demonstrated that viral shedding in the respiratory tract is  
422 highest at the start of symptoms<sup>25</sup>, so early testing will also increase the sensitivity of this  
423 approach. To further enhance effectiveness, as many infectious subjects need to be tested,  
424 which requires a low threshold for testing. As the clinical symptoms of COVID-19 are mostly  
425 mild and heterogeneous, many subjects should be eligible for testing, resulting in a large  
426 proportion of subjects with negative test results. Future work should determine the optimal  
427 balance between the proportion of test-negatives and the effectiveness of CTS. In our  
428 country, testing of ambulatory subjects is coordinated by the public health services and

429 general practitioners. That infrastructure may introduce a considerable delay in testing. To  
430 optimize the effectiveness of CTS a different infrastructure with direct access of  
431 symptomatic subjects to testing facilities should be considered. Finally, laboratories should  
432 be prepared to deliver high-throughput rapid testing.

433

434 Our findings also provide strong support to optimize contact tracing. In our country this is  
435 now based on establishing a contact between public health officers and index patients,  
436 followed by an interview after which contacts are traced. This procedure is labor intensive,  
437 time consuming, prone to recall bias and usually takes several days. Optimizing this process  
438 with app technology, or any other method achieving the same goal of minimizing tracing  
439 delay, will be needed to establish optimal control of transmission. An important advantage  
440 of app-based technology is the possibility of performing multiple step tracing, as not only  
441 the first-line contacts can be traced, but also their (second-line) contacts and so on.

442 Naturally, the number of contacts than rapidly increases, which increases the number of  
443 both correctly and unnecessarily quarantined subjects. Further work will focus on finding an  
444 optimal balance for this aspect. In fact, our findings suggest that optimized CTS, with short  
445 delays and high coverage for testing and tracing could reduce the reproduction number by  
446 50%, which would allow alleviation of most of the currently implemented control measures.

447

448

449

## 450 **Acknowledgements**

451 We thank Patricia Bruijning-Verhagen and Hans Heesterbeek for useful discussions.

452

## 453 **References**

- 454 1. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, Ferguson NM. Factors that make an infectious  
455 disease outbreak controllable. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004; **101**(16): 6146-51.
- 456 2. Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, et al. Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks  
457 by isolation of cases and contacts. *Lancet Glob Health* 2020.
- 458 3. Keeling MJ, Hollingsworth TD, Read JM. The Efficacy of Contact Tracing for the  
459 Containment of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19). *medRxiv* 2020:  
460 2020.02.14.20023036.
- 461 4. Klinkenberg D, Fraser C, Heesterbeek H. The effectiveness of contact tracing in  
462 emerging epidemics. *PLoS One* 2006; **1**: e12.
- 463 5. Kretzschmar ME, Rozhnova G, van Boven M. Isolation and contact tracing can tip the  
464 scale to containment of COVID-19 in populations with social distancing. *medRxiv* 2020:  
465 2020.03.10.20033738.
- 466 6. Muller J, Kretzschmar M, Dietz K. Contact tracing in stochastic and deterministic  
467 epidemic models. *Math Biosci* 2000; **164**(1): 39-64.
- 468 7. Tang B, Wang X, Li Q, et al. Estimation of the Transmission Risk of the 2019-nCoV and  
469 Its Implication for Public Health Interventions. *J Clin Med* 2020; **9**(2).
- 470 8. Salathe M, Althaus CL, Neher R, et al. COVID-19 epidemic in Switzerland: on the  
471 importance of testing, contact tracing and isolation. *Swiss Med Wkly* 2020; **150**: w20225.
- 472 9. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests  
473 epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science* 2020.
- 474 10. Kamel Boulos MN, Geraghty EM. Geographical tracking and mapping of coronavirus  
475 disease COVID-19/severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) epidemic

476 and associated events around the world: how 21st century GIS technologies are supporting  
477 the global fight against outbreaks and epidemics. *Int J Health Geogr* 2020; **19**(1): 8.

478 11. Parker MJ, Fraser C, Abeler-Dorner L, Bonsall D. Ethics of instantaneous contact  
479 tracing using mobile phone apps in the control of the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Med Ethics*  
480 2020.

481 12. Nguyen THD, Vu DC. Summary of the COVID-19 outbreak in Vietnam - Lessons and  
482 suggestions. *Travel Med Infect Dis* 2020: 101651.

483 13. Ruan L, Wen M, Zeng Q, et al. New measures for COVID-19 response: a lesson from  
484 the Wenzhou experience. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.

485 14. Show evidence that apps for COVID-19 contact-tracing are secure and effective.  
486 *Nature* 2020; **580**(7805): 563.

487 15. Bonacic Marinovic A, Swaan C, van Steenbergen J, Kretzschmar M. Quantifying  
488 reporting timeliness to improve outbreak control. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2015; **21**(2): 209-16.

489 16. Bonacic Marinovic AA, Koopmans M, Dittrich S, et al. Speed versus coverage trade  
490 off in targeted interventions during an outbreak. *Epidemics* 2014; **8**: 28-40.

491 17. Reijn E, Swaan CM, Kretzschmar ME, van Steenbergen JE. Analysis of timeliness of  
492 infectious disease reporting in the Netherlands. *BMC Public Health* 2011; **11**: 409.

493 18. Swaan CM, Appels R, Kretzschmar ME, van Steenbergen JE. Timeliness of contact  
494 tracing among flight passengers for influenza A/H1N1 2009. *BMC Infect Dis* 2011; **11**: 355.

495 19. Kretzschmar M, van den Hof S, Wallinga J, van Wijngaarden J. Ring vaccination and  
496 smallpox control. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004; **10**(5): 832-41.

497 20. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and Transmission of COVID-19 in Shenzhen  
498 China: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. *medRxiv* 2020:  
499 2020.03.03.20028423.



- 500 21. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the  
501 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster.  
502 *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10223): 514-23.
- 503 22. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99  
504 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet*  
505 2020; **395**(10223): 507-13.
- 506 23. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the  
507 spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* 2008; **5**(3): e74.
- 508 24. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus  
509 (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro*  
510 *Surveill* 2020; **25**(5).
- 511 25. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X, Mo X,  
512 Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Wu Y, Zhao L, Zhang F, Cowling BJ, Li F,  
513 Leung GM. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*.  
514 2020 Apr 15. [Epub ahead of print]