

1 **Threshold analyses on combinations of testing, population size, and vaccine coverage for**  
2 **COVID-19 control in a university setting**

3

4 Xinmeng Zhao<sup>□1</sup>, Hanisha Tatapudi<sup>□1</sup>, George Corey<sup>2</sup>, and \*Chaitra Gopalappa<sup>1</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Massachusetts Amherst,  
7 MA, USA

8 <sup>2</sup> University Health Services, University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA, USA

9

10 \*Corresponding author:

11 e-mail: [chaitrag@umass.edu](mailto:chaitrag@umass.edu)

12

13 <sup>□</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Abstract**

26  
27 We simulated epidemic projections of a potential COVID-19 outbreak in a residential university

28 population in the United States under varying combinations of asymptomatic tests (5% to 33%

29 per day), transmission rates (2.5% to 14%), and contact rates (1 to 25), to identify the contact

30 rate threshold that, if exceeded, would lead to exponential growth in infections. Using this, we

31 extracted contact rate thresholds among non-essential workers, population size thresholds in the

32 absence of vaccines, and vaccine coverage thresholds. We further stream-lined our analyses to

33 transmission rates of 5 to 8%, to correspond to the reported levels of face-mask-use/physical-

34 distancing during the 2020 pandemic.

35

36 Our results suggest that, in the absence of vaccines, testing alone without reducing population

37 size would not be sufficient to control an outbreak. If the population size is lowered to 34% (or

38 44%) of the actual population size to maintain contact rates at 4 (or 7) among non-essential

39 workers, mass tests at 25% (or 33%) per day would help control an outbreak. With the

40 availability of vaccines, the campus can be kept at full population provided at least 95% are

41 vaccinated. If vaccines are partially available such that the coverage is lower than 95%, keeping

42 at full population would require asymptomatic testing, either mass tests at 25% per day if vaccine

43 coverage is at 63-79%, or mass tests at 33% per day if vaccine coverage is at 53-68%. If vaccine

44 coverage is below 53%, to control an outbreak, in addition to mass tests at 33% per day, it would

45 also require lowering the population size to 90%, 75%, and 60%, if vaccine coverage is at 38-

46 53%, 23-38%, and below 23%, respectively.

47

48 Threshold estimates from this study, interpolated over the range of transmission rates, can  
49 collectively help inform campus level preparedness plans for adoption of face mask/physical-  
50 distancing, testing, remote instructions, and personnel scheduling, during non-availability or  
51 partial-availability of vaccines, in the event of SARS-Cov2-type disease outbreaks.

52

### 53 Financial Disclosure Statement

54 CG, XZ, and HT were partially funded by the National Science Foundation #1915481. The  
55 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or  
56 preparation of the manuscript.

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

## 72 **Introduction**

73 The COVID-19 pandemic caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus has caused significant disease and  
74 economic burdens since its first outbreak in December 2019. Because of the absence of an  
75 effective vaccine, as of June 2020 at the time of this study and since March 2020, the main  
76 intervention for the prevention of COVID-19 transmissions had been to reduce contacts between  
77 people through lockdowns of non-essential organizations and services [1]. However, lockdowns  
78 are a threat to the economic stability of a nation as seen by the unprecedented rise in  
79 unemployment rates [2,3]. Therefore, while lockdowns are a good short-term strategy, for a  
80 long-term strategy, or until a vaccine becomes widely available, it has become necessary to  
81 identify alternate strategies and lifestyles that control the disease burden while minimizing the  
82 economic burden. Interventions that are effective include the use of face masks, physical  
83 distancing between persons at a recommended 6ft, and contact tracing and testing or mass testing  
84 to enable early diagnosis in the asymptomatic stage of infection [4]. However, removal of  
85 lockdowns should be strictly accompanied by a reopening plan that rapidly and efficiently  
86 enables the adoption of the above interventions to avoid an epidemic rebound. In addition to  
87 public health agencies, all members of a community, in both public and private sectors, play a  
88 key role in the development and implementation of a reopening plan that is most suited for their  
89 organization [5]. Among these sectors, universities and colleges bear a special burden to develop  
90 a reopening plan that include changes to a range of activities related to teaching, research, dining,  
91 housing, and extra-curricular activities.

92  
93 We developed a compartmental differential equations model to simulate epidemic projections of  
94 a potential COVID-19 outbreak in a population of 38,000 individuals, which is representative of

95 undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff in a typical residential university in the  
96 United States. We simulated epidemic projections of potential outbreaks under varying  
97 combinations of contact tracing and testing, and mass testing, to identify combinations that  
98 would reduce the effective reproduction number  $R_e$  to a value below the epidemic threshold of 1.  
99  $R_e$  is directly proportional to the duration of infectiousness, transmission rate (the probability of  
100 transmission per contact per day, representing the infectiousness of the virus), and contact rate  
101 (the number of contacts per person per day) [6]. Asymptomatic testing through trace and test or  
102 mass tests lead to diagnosis in the asymptomatic phase of the infection, and thus, if persons  
103 diagnosed with infection are successfully quarantined, it reduces the duration of exposure [7–9]  
104 and thus reduce  $R_e$ . Physical distancing by the recommended 3 or 6ft and use of face masks can  
105 reduce transmission rate, and thus reduce  $R_e$  [10,11]. Reducing contact rate such as through  
106 transitioning to remote work to reduce population density on campus directly reduces  $R_e$ . Thus,  
107 different types of interventions help reduce each of these components of  $R_e$ . Here, we evaluated  
108 different combinations of test rates, transmission rates, and contact rates that help reduce  $R_e$  to  
109 below 1 to identify minimum levels of testing, physical distancing and face mask use, and  
110 population density necessary for effective control of an outbreak.

111  
112 While it is generally known that increasing contact tracing and testing is necessary, studies  
113 evaluating testing at an organizational level, such as university, were only recently emerging at  
114 the time of this study in June 2020. One study that analyzed contact tracing in the general  
115 populations estimated that reducing  $R_0$  of 1.5 to an  $R_e$  of 1 requires more than 20% of contacts  
116 traced, reducing  $R_0$  of 2.5 to an  $R_e$  of 1 requires more than 80% of contacts traced, and reducing  
117  $R_0$  of 3.5 to an  $R_e$  of 1 requires more than 100% of contacts traced [12]. A modeling study

118 applied to the Boston area [13] estimated that the best way-out scenario is a Lift and Enhanced  
119 Testing (LET) with 50% detection and 40% of contacts traced. According to this, the number of  
120 individuals that need to be traced per 1000 persons is below 0.1 under partial reopening and  
121 below 0.15 under total reopening. Models for a university were only recently emerging at the  
122 time of this study in June 2020, [14–17] but typically, most studies combine transmission rate  
123 and contact rate as one metric in the evaluation of testing.

124

125 In this study, instead of using a product of transmission rate and contact rate as one metric as  
126 typically done, we evaluated these separately, due to the following reasons. First, it helps  
127 systematically evaluate different interventions considering that different types of interventions  
128 help reduce each of the three components of  $R_e$ , testing reduces duration of exposed infectious  
129 stage, transitioning to remote classes reduce contact rate, vaccinations reduce the number of  
130 contacts who are potential disease carriers, and face mask use and 6ft distancing reduces  
131 transmission rate. Second, while adoption of each of these decisions are made at an  
132 organizational level, adherence and feasibility of face mask and 6ft distancing are highly  
133 influenced by individual behaviors and thus have a larger range of uncertainty. Third, while  
134 physical distancing and use of face masks can reduce transmission rate, the baseline transmission  
135 rate and expected reductions could vary based on multiple factors such as indoor vs. outdoor  
136 settings and ventilation, proper use and type of face mask [10,11,18,19], mode of transmission  
137 [20–23], and viral load in the index person [8,24]. Fourth, though we specifically focus this study  
138 on COVID-19 caused by the original SARS-CoV-2 virus, studying varying levels of  
139 transmission rates could help extrapolate findings to new variants or future outbreaks of viral  
140 respiratory infections with similar disease progressions [24], especially in the early stages when

141 specific data is lacking but when the same non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as face masks,  
142 physical distancing, remote instructions, and testing, are suitable options.

143  
144 To systematically inform these analyses, we first evaluated different combinations of trace and  
145 test rate, mass test rate, and transmission rate for a range of contact rates, to identify the  
146 threshold contact rates that maintain infection cases below certain set levels of tolerance. We  
147 then used the contact rate thresholds to identify the population size thresholds, i.e., the maximum  
148 population size on campus, which could help inform decisions related to campus activities such  
149 as the fraction of classes to transition to remote. We also used the contact rate thresholds to  
150 identify the vaccine coverage thresholds for a post-vaccine era, i.e., the vaccine coverage  
151 necessary for a campus to return to a normal population size. We also identify, under each  
152 intervention combination, the number of trace and tests and quarantines. These metrics could  
153 collectively help inform development of a preparedness plan for reopening a university during  
154 the COVID-19 pandemic or to set protocols in the event of future outbreaks.

## 155 **Methodology**

### 156 **Simulation methodology**

157 We developed a compartmental model for simulating epidemic projections over time. The  
158 epidemiological flow diagram for the compartmental model is depicted in Fig 1A. Each box is an  
159 epidemiological state, and each arrow represents a transition from one state to another. Note,  
160 each compartment is further split by age and gender, but for clarity of notations, we do not  
161 include it in the equations below.

162

163 **Fig 1. Overview of the extended SEIR compartmental model.**

164 (A) Compartmental model flow diagram. (B) Natural disease progression of SARS-COV-2 virus  
165 in infected patients.

166 S = susceptible, L = exposed and not infectious (Latent stage) (asymptomatic), E =  
167 asymptomatic and infectious, I = symptomatic and infectious,  $Q_L$  = exposed and not infectious  
168 (Latent) and Quarantined (diagnosed),  $Q_E$  = asymptomatic and infectious and Quarantined  
169 (diagnosed),  $Q_I$  = Infectious and Quarantined (diagnosed), H = Hospitalized, R = Recovered, and  
170 D = Deaths.

171  
172 Let  $\pi_t = [S, L, E, I, Q_L, Q_E, Q_I, H, R, D]$  be a vector, with each element representing the number of  
173 people in a compartment at time  $t$ , specifically,

- 174  
175  $S$  = the number of susceptible individuals at time  $t$ ,
- 176  $L$  = the number of exposed, but asymptomatic and not infectious individuals (latent stage;  
177 also, the non-infectious phase of incubation stage) at time  $t$ ,
- 178  $E$  = the number of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatically infectious individuals  
179 (infectious phase of the incubation stage) at time  $t$ ,
- 180  $I$  = the number of infectious individuals (symptomatic and infectious stage) at time  $t$ ,
- 181  $Q_L$  = the number of exposed, asymptomatic and not infectious (latent) and quarantined  
182 individuals (diagnosed) at time  $t$ ,
- 183  $Q_E$  = the number of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatically infectious and quarantined  
184 individuals (diagnosed) at time  $t$ ,
- 185  $Q_I$  = the number of infectious and quarantined individuals (diagnosed) at time  $t$ ,
- 186  $H$  = the number of hospitalized individuals at time  $t$ ,
- 187  $R$  = the number of recovered individuals at time  $t$ , and
- 188  $D$  = the number of deaths at time  $t$ .



189 Epidemic states  $L$ ,  $E$ , and  $I$  were formulated such that each state represented a distinct phase  
190 along the natural disease progression (see Fig 1B), and they collectively included all phases.  
191 Over time, persons from  $S$  can transition to  $L$ ,  $E$ , and  $I$ , and upon diagnoses, transition to  
192  $Q_L$ ,  $Q_E$ , or  $Q_I$ , and further to  $H$ ,  $R$ , or  $D$ , (transitions represented by arrows in Fig 1A) as discussed  
193 below.

194 Let,

195  $p$  = transmission rate (probability of transmission per contact per day),

196  $c$  = contact rate (number of contacts per person per day),

197  $N$  = total population who are alive,

198  $a_B$  = symptom-based testing rate,

199  $a_{C,t}$  = rate of testing through contact tracing at time  $t$ ,

200  $a_{U,t}$  = rate of testing through mass testing at time  $t$ ,

201  $\rho$  = test sensitivity for asymptomatic testing (through mass tests or trace and test),

202  $days_L$  = duration in latent period,

203  $days_{incub}$  = duration in incubation period,

204  $days_{IR}$  = time from onset of symptoms to recovery,

205  $days_{Q_I R}$  = time from diagnosis to recovery,

206  $days_{Q_I H}$  = time from diagnosis to hospitalization,

207  $days_{HR}$  = time from hospitalization to recovery,

208  $days_{HD}$  = time from hospitalization to death,

209  $prop_{hosp}$  = proportion hospitalized, and

210  $prop_{severe}$  = proportion of cases that are severe.

211 Then, we can write the equations for transition rates (arrows in Fig 1A) as follows:

212  $r_{S,L} = \frac{pc(E+I)}{N}$ , which assumes that only infected persons in  $E$  and  $I$  can transmit, persons  
213 in  $Q_E$  and  $Q_I$  self-quarantine, and persons in  $L$  and  $Q_L$  are not infectious.

$$r_{L,E} = \frac{1}{days_L}$$

214  $r_{E,Q_I} = \frac{(prop_{severe})}{days_{incub} - days_L}$ , which assumes that only a proportion of cases that are severe  
215 ( $prop_{severe}$ ) get diagnosed immediately because of exhibition of symptoms, we use the  
216 proportion hospitalized as a proxy for severe cases; the denominator is based on the  
217 assumption that the duration in state E is equal to the difference between the duration of  
218 the incubation period and the latent period.

219  $r_{E,I} = \frac{(1-prop_{severe})}{days_{incub} - days_L}$ , which follows from above.

220  $r_{I,Q_I} = a_B$ , which assumes that under symptom-based testing, only persons who show  
221 moderate to severe symptoms get diagnosed and those who show mild symptoms do not.

222  $r_{Q_I,H} = \frac{prop_{hosp}}{days_{Q_I,H}}$ , for  $prop_{hosp}$  we use the proportion of persons hospitalized among those  
223 diagnosed through symptom-based testing.

224  $r_{L,Q_L} = \rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}$ , which assumes that under the implementation of both  
225 mass testing and contact tracing and testing, persons diagnosed through mass test will not  
226 be tested again on the same day through contact tracing (as our time unit is daily).

227  $r_{E,Q_E} = \rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}$ , which is similar to above.

228  $r_{I,R} = (1 - a_B)[\rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}] + \frac{1}{days_{IR}}$ , which assumes that persons with  
229 mild cases that did not get diagnosed through symptom-based testing have a chance of  
230 getting tested through additional testing options, and self-quarantine upon diagnosis. Note  
231 that we did not separately model asymptomatic cases but incorporated that into the

232 symptom-based testing rate ( $a_B$ ) by considering that 35% of cases are mild to no  
233 symptoms and thus do not have a chance of being diagnosed through symptom-based  
234 testing.

$$235 \quad r_{Q_L, Q_E} = \frac{1}{days_L}$$

$$236 \quad r_{Q_E, Q_I} = \frac{[a_B(1 - prop_{severe}) + (prop_{severe})]}{days_{incub} - days_L}, \text{ theoretically, } r_{Q_E, Q_I} \text{ should be the same as } r_{E, I},$$

237 however, as the rate of transitioning from  $Q_I$  to  $H$  is fixed to fit to the proportion  
238 hospitalized under symptom-based tests, if extensive testing is conducted, the number of  
239 persons in  $Q_I$  would increase, thus, incorrectly inflating the number of persons who are  
240 hospitalized; To avoid this, we modified the equation to consider that the number of  
241 persons flowing into  $Q_I$  would be equal to the proportion flowing from  $I$  to  $Q_I$  under  
242 symptom-based testing.

$$243 \quad r_{Q_E, R} = \frac{(1 - [a_B(1 - prop_{severe}) + (prop_{hosp})])}{days_{incub} - days_L}, \text{ which follows from the above equation.}$$

$$244 \quad r_{Q_I, R} = \frac{1 - prop_{hosp}}{days_{Q_I R}}$$

$$245 \quad r_{H, R} = \frac{prop_{recover}}{days_{HR}}$$

$$246 \quad r_{H, D} = \frac{(1 - prop_{recover})}{days_{HD}}$$

247 Note:  $r_{s,s}$  is the testing rate (either through mass test or trace and test). We assumed that  
248 susceptible persons go back to the susceptible state after testing, i.e., we did not explicitly  
249 track false positives.

250 The values and ranges for the above epidemic parameters used in the compartmental simulation  
251 model are presented in Supplemental Appendix Table S1.

252 We simulate the epidemic over time using the following system of differential equations

$$253 \quad \pi_{t+1} = \pi_t + \pi_t Q_t \cdot dt$$

254 where,  $Q_t$  = a matrix of transition rates between states (arrows in Fig 1A), and  $dt$  = time-step.

255 We use a time-unit of per day for the transition rates in  $Q_t$  and set  $dt = \frac{1}{10}$ , and thus, the model

256 simulates every 10<sup>th</sup> of a day.

257 The expansion of the system of differential equations are as follows:

$$S_{t+1} = S_t + (-r_{S,L} S_t) dt$$

$$L_{t+1} = L_t + (r_{S,L} S_t - (r_{L,E} + r_{L,Q_L}) L_t) dt$$

$$E_{t+1} = E_t + (r_{L,E} L_t - (r_{E,I} + r_{E,Q_E} + r_{E,Q_I} + r_{E,R}) E_t) dt$$

$$I_{t+1} = I_t + (r_{E,I} E_t - (r_{I,Q_I} + r_{I,R}) I_t) dt$$

$$Q_{L,t+1} = Q_{L,t} + (r_{L,Q_L} L_t - (r_{Q_L,Q_E}) Q_{L,t}) dt$$

$$Q_{E,t+1} = Q_{E,t} + (r_{E,Q_E} E_t - (r_{Q_E,Q_I} + r_{Q_E,R}) Q_{E,t}) dt$$

$$Q_{I,t+1} = Q_{I,t} + ((r_{E,Q_I} E_t + r_{Q_E,Q_I} Q_{E,t} + r_{I,Q_I} I_t) - (r_{Q_I,H} + r_{Q_I,R}) Q_{I,t}) dt$$

$$H_{t+1} = H_t + (r_{Q_I,H} Q_{I,t} - (r_{H,R} + r_{H,D}) H_t) dt$$

$$R_{t+1} = R_t + (r_{Q_E,R} Q_{E,t} + r_{Q_I,R} Q_{I,t} + r_{I,R} I_t + r_{H,R} H_t) dt$$

$$D_{t+1} = D_t + r_{H,D} H_t dt$$

258 We can further expand by substitution of the rate terms with their equations as follows:

$$S_{t+1} = S_t + \left( -\frac{pC(E + I)}{N} \right) S_t dt$$

$$L_{t+1} = L_t + \left( \frac{pC(E + I)}{N} S_t - \left( \frac{1}{days_L} + \rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t} \right) L_t \right) dt$$

$$E_{t+1} = E_t + \left( \frac{1}{days_L} L_t - \left( \frac{(1 - prop_{severe})}{days_{incub} - days_L} + (\rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}) + \frac{(prop_{severe})}{days_{incub} - days_L} \right) E_t \right) dt$$

$$I_{t+1} = I_t + \left( \frac{(1 - prop_{severe})}{days_{incub} - days_L} E_t - \left( a_B + (\rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}) + \frac{1}{days_{IR}} \right) I_t \right) dt$$

259

$$Q_{L,t+1} = Q_{L,t} + \left( (\rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}) L_t - \left( \frac{1}{days_L} \right) Q_{L,t} \right) dt$$

$$Q_{E,t+1} = Q_{E,t} + \left( (\rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}) E_t - \left( \frac{[a_B(1 - prop_{severe}) + (prop_{severe})]}{days_{incub} - days_L} + \frac{1 - prop_{hosp}}{days_{QIR}} \right) Q_{E,t} \right) dt$$

$$Q_{I,t+1} = Q_{I,t} + \left( \frac{(prop_{severe})}{days_{incub} - days_L} E_t + \frac{[a_B(1 - prop_{severe}) + (prop_{severe})]}{days_{incub} - days_L} Q_{E,t} + a_B I_t - \left( \frac{prop_{hosp}}{days_{QIH}} + \frac{1 - prop_{hosp}}{days_{QIR}} \right) Q_{I,t} \right) dt$$

$$H_{t+1} = H_t + \left( \frac{prop_{hosp}}{days_{QIH}} Q_{I,t} - \left( \frac{prop_{recover}}{days_{HR}} + \frac{(1 - prop_{recover})}{days_{HD}} \right) H_t \right) dt$$

$$R_{t+1} = R_t + \left( \frac{(1 - [a_B(1 - prop_{severe}) + (prop_{hosp})])}{days_{incub} - days_L} Q_{E,t} + \frac{1 - prop_{hosp}}{days_{QIR}} Q_{I,t} + (\rho a_{U,t} + (1 - \rho a_{U,t}) \rho a_{C,t}) + \frac{1}{days_{IR}} I_t + \frac{prop_{recover}}{days_{HR}} H_t \right) dt$$

$$D_{t+1} = D_t + \frac{(1 - prop_{recover})}{days_{HD}} H_t dt$$

260

261 Input data assumptions and sources for simulation model

262

263 For the rates of natural disease progression, we used estimates from other studies in the  
264 literature. The description of the data, sources, and values (with ranges and medians where  
265 applicable) for all parameters are available in the Supplemental Appendix Table S1. Briefly, we  
266 assumed an incubation period duration of 5.4 days [25], the first 2.5 days in stage L (not  
267 infectious and asymptomatic) [26], and the remaining 2.9 days in stage E (infectious and  
268 asymptomatic). We assumed about 65% of cases develop medium to severe symptoms [27] and,  
269 in the absence of test and trace or mass test, can be diagnosed through symptom-based testing.  
270 We assumed the remaining 35% of cases show mild to no symptoms and can be diagnosed only  
271 through trace and test, or universal mass test. We assumed an average duration of 3.5 days from  
272 the time of onset of symptoms to hospitalization [28], with the proportion hospitalized varying as  
273 a function of age. For mild cases, we assumed an average duration of 7 days from the time of  
274 onset of symptoms to recovery [28]. We assumed case fatality rates vary as a function of age and  
275 gender.

276

277 Interventions

278 *Mass test and trace and test:* We evaluated the following scenarios: mass test only, trace and test  
279 only, delayed trace and test only, combination mass test and trace and test, and combination mass  
280 test and delayed trace and test, each at different rates of testing, as follows. We evaluated mass  
281 testing at rates of 5% 10%, 20%, 25%, and 33% of the population per day, which is equivalent to

282 testing once every 20 days (5% per day over every 20-day period), 10 days, 5 days, 4 days, and 3  
283 days (33% per day every 3-day period), respectively. We modeled the rate of trace and test as the  
284 inverse of the time from infection to effective isolation of a contact, i.e., the sum of the number  
285 of days passed since contact with an individual (as reported by the index diagnosed person) and  
286 the number of days into the future to find, test, and isolate the infected contact. We chose this  
287 definition as each component in this duration can vary significantly for every diagnosed person  
288 and for each of their contacts. In the case the contact is never found, the duration would be the  
289 full duration of infection. Thus, this definition of trace and test can be comparable to data that is  
290 typically collected. Specifically, the trace and test rate here should be compared to the average of  
291 the inverse of the time from reported contact to either effective isolation of that contact or  
292 maximum infection duration (whichever is the least value), averaged over all contacts. We  
293 evaluated trace and test rates at levels of 10%, 17%, 20%, 25%, 33%, and 50%, equivalent of 10  
294 days, 6 days, 5 days, 4 days, 3 days, and 2 days, respectively, from the time of transmission of  
295 infection to effective isolation of that contact. We evaluated combinations of mass test and trace  
296 and test, by varying mass tests between 5% and 33% per day and keeping trace and test at 50%  
297 as this higher rate of trace and test maybe more feasible with mass test than symptom-based test  
298 only. We assumed trace and test would initiate within the first 5 cases of diagnosis. Considering  
299 there may be delays in setting up a trace and test system (such as in events of new outbreaks in  
300 the future or failure to respond quickly), to tests its sensitivity, we evaluated scenarios by  
301 delaying the initiating of trace and test to after diagnosis of 20 cases. Thus, the scenarios referred  
302 to as ‘trace and test only’ and ‘combination tests’ refers to initiation of trace and test after first 5  
303 cases of diagnosis. And the scenarios referred to as ‘delayed trace and test only’ and ‘delayed  
304 combination tests’ refers to delaying initiation of trace and test to after diagnoses of 20 cases. In

305 all scenarios, we applied baseline symptom-based testing, assumed test results are available  
306 within 24 hours, and persons testing positive self-quarantine for 14-days. For diagnosis in  
307 asymptomatic stages, i.e., diagnosis through trace and test or mass test, we assumed a test  
308 sensitivity of 0.9 [29].

309  
310 *Non-pharmaceutical interventions:* We evaluated transmission rates ( $p$ ) of 14% (baseline), 8%  
311 (mid), 5.4% (lower-mid), and 2.5% (lowest). The baseline value of  $p$  corresponds to an average  
312 estimate under no interventions (no physical distancing and no face masks) [11,30]. A  
313 transmission rate of 8% corresponds to the expected rates with the use of face masks in a non-  
314 health care setting [11]. Transmission rates of 5.4% and 2.5% correspond to expected rates under  
315 3ft and 6ft physical distancing, respectively [11] (see Supplemental Appendix Table S2). We  
316 evaluated contact rates between 1 and 25 ( $c$ ), we did not differentiate between on-campus and  
317 off-campus contact rates.

318

### 319 Application to a university setting

320 Demographic data: We used the Fall 2018 student enrollment data from the University of  
321 Massachusetts - Amherst, Amherst, MA, to determine the population size of undergraduate and  
322 graduate students and their age and gender distributions [31]. For faculty and staff, we used the  
323 age distribution of persons 25 years and older from the Town of Amherst, MA, where the  
324 university is located [32]. To initiate an outbreak, we assumed 4 to 5 infected cases on Day 1,  
325 estimated as follows. We assumed that the proportion of incoming students who are infected  
326 would be equal to the prevalence of COVID-19 in Massachusetts (MA) in June 2020. We also  
327 assumed that all incoming students would be tested, and about 10% of infected cases would be



328 false negatives. Prevalence is unknown, as not all cases are diagnosed and diagnosed cases are  
329 not specifically tracked. Therefore, to estimate prevalence of COVID-19 in MA, we used the  
330 simulation model to determine the ratio of new diagnosis to persons with infection and applied  
331 that ratio to the number of new diagnoses on June 26<sup>th</sup> in MA. This resulted in about 4 infected  
332 cases on day 1 remaining undetected, thus initiating an outbreak. We also assumed that at the  
333 beginning of every week, there would be about 3 to 4 infections from outside, calculated by  
334 assuming that about 10% of the population are likely to mix with the population outside the  
335 university or travel out of Amherst during weekends and are not tested upon return. Based on the  
336 above, we initialized the model on Day 1 with 4 infected persons in the Latent stage and added 3  
337 to 4 outside cases to the Latent stage at the beginning of every week. We simulated the model for  
338 a 90-day period to represent the duration of the expected Fall 2020 semester.

339

#### 340 Tolerance on the number of infected cases for identifying contact rate thresholds

341

342 We evaluated contact rate thresholds under three levels of epidemic tolerance: relaxed tolerance,  
343 medium tolerance, and tight tolerance. Relaxed tolerance marked the point beyond which there  
344 was an exponential growth in infections, the maximum number of infections under this tolerance  
345 level was about 170. For medium tolerance, we set the number of infections to less than 77, and  
346 for tight tolerance, we set the number of infections to less than 50. The latter two cases  
347 correspond to maximum infections for a case fatality rate (CFR) of 2%, which is the reported  
348 CFR in the general population for the United States [33]. That is,  $1/0.02$  gives the 50 cases  
349 threshold and 77 is obtained by further dividing that by 65%, which is the proportion of cases  
350 with medium to severe symptoms [27], to account for the remaining 35% of cases with mild to  
351 no symptoms that were likely unreported and thus not included in the CFR calculation. As the

352 CFR for COVID-19 is much lower in university student aged populations, the use of the  
353 alternative tolerance on the number of infections helps avoid spill-over effect of a breakout into  
354 the community. Also note that, because of our assumptions for the number of initial cases and  
355 cases per week entering the population from outside, the minimum number of cases over the 90-  
356 day period would be 45. Therefore, the tolerance of 50 cases is a very tight tolerance. For  
357 context, one of the indicators CDC uses to categorize community transmission risk is the number  
358 of cases per 100,000 persons during the last 7 days, categorizing as low, moderate, and  
359 substantial to high if there were less than 10, 10-49, and greater than 49 cases, respectively [34].  
360 Converting our tolerance levels to the CDC indicator would translate to 35, 15, and 10 cases for  
361 relaxed, medium, and tight tolerances, respectively. If we exclude the 45 cases from outside, it  
362 translates to 25, 6, and 1 cases for relaxed, medium, and tight tolerances, respectively.

363

#### 364 Population behavioral data

365  
366 While there was limited data on contact rates specific to university students at the time of this  
367 original study in June 2020, studies conducted since then have generated some (though limited)  
368 data on population behaviors. These data include contact rates and behaviors related to use of  
369 non-pharmaceutical interventions such as face mask and 6 ft physical distancing, mostly either  
370 self-reported in surveys or estimations made in other modeling studies informed through  
371 university settings. We briefly summarize the data from each study in the Supplemental  
372 Appendix Table S3. Some of the surveys were specific to university students in the United States  
373 while others were either university students in other countries or general populations. Studies on  
374 surveys of university students, when partial shutdowns were enforced and universities resorted to  
375 varying levels of remote classes, reported 6 to 8 contacts per person per day [35,36]. However,

376 students who self-reported as providing essential services or caring for non-household members  
377 (~23%) reported an average contact rate of about 14 per person per day [37]. Modeling studies  
378 that estimated contacts among university students for a scenario prior to the pandemic assume  
379 contact rates of 16 to 24 per person per day [38–40]. Using data on face mask use and physical  
380 distancing, specifically originating from three surveys of student and general population in the  
381 United States [38,42,43] and the transmission rates corresponding to these interventions  
382 (summarized in Supplemental Appendix Table S3), we calculate the expected transmission rate  
383 to be between 5% and 8%. We use these estimates to further streamline our analyses.

#### 384 Interpretation of contact rate thresholds: size of social circle, population size, and 385 vaccine coverage

386  
387 We utilize the contact rate thresholds, under the different levels of testing and transmission rate  
388 (face mask use and physical distancing), to identify four additional metrics that would help  
389 inform campus decisions: first, the contact rate threshold among non-essential workers after  
390 accounting for the higher contact rate among essential workers, which would help inform the  
391 size of social circles at the individual level and schedule campus activities; second, the threshold  
392 values for population size on campus as a proportion of the actual population size, which would  
393 help decisions related to the fraction of remote vs. face-to-face classes, on-campus housing, and  
394 other campus activities for the era of pre-vaccine availability; third, for the era of post-vaccine  
395 availability, the threshold values for vaccination coverage for the university to return to normal  
396 (i.e., 100% population size); fourth, the threshold values for population sizes under varying  
397 levels of vaccine coverage, which would help decisions related to campus activities in the event  
398 that vaccines are only partially available that coverage is not at levels sufficient to fully return to  
399 normal. All four metrics would be used alongside decisions related to the level of testing.

400 The metrics were estimated as follows. Suppose  $\hat{C}$  is the contact rate threshold, we estimated the  
401 first metric as  $\hat{C}_n = (\hat{C} - C_e p_e)/(1 - p_e)$ , where  $\hat{C}_n$  is the contact rate threshold among non-  
402 essential workers (we limit  $0 \leq \hat{C}_n \leq \hat{C}$ ),  $C_e$  is the contact rate among essential workers (we  
403 assume  $C_e = 14$  [37]), and  $p_e$  is the proportion of the population who are essential workers (we  
404 assume  $p_e = 23\%$  [37]).

405 The interpretation of the second, third, and fourth metrics arise from our simplifying assumption  
406 that contact rates are directly proportional to the population density [41],  $C = c_0 \rho$ ;  $\rho = N/A$ ;  
407 where  $C$  is the actual contact rate (under regular face-to-face instructions),  $\rho$  is the density,  $N$  is  
408 the population size,  $A$  is the campus area, and  $c_0$  is a constant. Further, we assume that university  
409 campuses maintain similar levels of population density under regular work conditions, i.e.,  
410 though the population sizes may vary across universities, the campus area also changes  
411 proportionally so that the population density is similar, and thus, the contact rates under regular  
412 work conditions are also similar. Multiple studies reported similar contact rates of 16 to 24 under  
413 regular working conditions supporting this assumption [42,43]. Thus, if our estimated contact  
414 rate thresholds (say  $\hat{C}$ ) are lower than the actual contact rates of 16 to 24 ( $C$ ), given fixed area  
415 ( $A$ ), achieving  $\hat{C}$  would require reducing the population size ( $N$ ) proportional to the reduction in  
416 contact rate, i.e.,  $\hat{C}/C = \hat{N}/N (= \text{say } \hat{p})$ , implying that the population size on campus should be  
417 at a maximum of  $\hat{p}\%$  of its original population size ( $\hat{p} = \hat{C}/C$ ).

418

419 The third metric on interpretation of threshold for vaccination coverage (say  $\hat{V}$ ) follows from the  
420 above assumptions. Achieving a contact rate threshold of  $\hat{C}$  when universities are back to regular  
421 face-to-face classes, i.e.,  $\hat{N} = N$  or  $\hat{p} = 1$ , would require that  $(1 - \hat{C}/C)$  proportion of the  
422 population be effectively vaccinated. More precisely, vaccine coverage should be at least

423  $\hat{V} = (1 - (\hat{C}/C)) / v_e$ , where  $v_e$  is vaccine efficacy and corresponds to the chance that a  
424 vaccinated individual is fully protected from being infected, and thus, is not a potential disease  
425 carrying contact. Intuitively, this is saying that though the actual contact rate is  $C$ , because  $\hat{V}\%$   
426 are vaccinated and protected from infection or transmitting, the effective contact rate is  $\hat{C}$ . This  
427 implies that a threshold contact rate of  $\hat{C}$  can be achieved, while maintaining  $\hat{p} = 1$ , if  $\hat{V}\%$  are  
428 vaccinated. The vaccine coverage results presented here were estimated by assuming a vaccine  
429 efficacy of 95%, and thus, in the event that this changes, the vaccine coverage results should be  
430 adjusted by multiplying with 95% and dividing by the new value.

431  
432 Following from above, the fourth metric considers the fact that if the actual vaccine coverage  
433 (say  $V$ ) is less than  $\hat{V}$ , achieving the contact rate threshold ( $\hat{C}$ ) would also require some reduction  
434 in  $N$ . Specifically, the population size on campus should be at a maximum of  $\hat{p}\%$  of its original  
435 population size, with  $\hat{p} = 1 - ((1 - V)C - \hat{C}) / C$ , derived as follows. We can write  $(1 -$   
436  $V)C - \hat{C}$  as the number of excess contacts, i.e., the number to reduce after accounting for the  
437 proportion vaccinated  $((1 - V)C)$ , the proportion of contacts to reduce would then be  $((1 -$   
438  $V)C - \hat{C}) / C$ , and finally, applying the same assumptions as in the second metric would give the  
439 equation for  $\hat{p}$ . If the vaccination coverage is zero, i.e.,  $V = 0$ , we would get back  $\hat{p} = \hat{C}/C$ . If  
440  $V = 1$ , then  $\hat{p} = 1 + \hat{C}/C$ , which implies that even if  $\hat{C} = 0$ , the campus can fully open. We  
441 bound  $0 \leq \hat{p} \leq 1$ , such that, even if  $\hat{C} > 0$  we interpret this as fully back to normal population  
442 size (though it would mathematically imply that the campus can handle a higher density from an  
443 epidemic perspective, e.g., influx from outside).

444

445 Thus, to keep within the infection tolerance levels,  $\hat{C}$  would mark the maximum average contact  
446 rate over the full population,  $\hat{C}_n$  the maximum average contact rate for non-essential workers  
447 after accounting for the higher contact rate among essential workers,  $\hat{p}$  the maximum proportion  
448 of the population who should return back to campus (either when  $V = 0$  or  $0 < V \leq \hat{V}$ ), and  $\hat{V}$   
449 the minimum vaccine coverage to fully return back to normal ( $\hat{p} = 1$ ). As the above method of  
450 estimation of thresholds incorporate the effectiveness of vaccinations, we can interpret that the  
451 interventions, such a testing and use of facemask and social distancing, would be applied to only  
452 the unvaccinated persons.

### 453 Identifying feasible intervention combinations

454

455 We identify three sets of feasible combination results. For the event that vaccines are  
456 unavailable, we identify the feasible combinations of testing, contact rate for non-essential  
457 workers ( $\hat{C}_n$ ), and population size on campus ( $\hat{p}$ ) that can effectively control an outbreak to  
458 below the tolerance levels. We define feasible combinations as those with  $\hat{C}_n > 2$  in the  
459 transmission rate range of 5% to 8%, which would correspond to the reported use of face mask  
460 and physical distancing among the university population (see ‘Population behavioral data’  
461 above). For the event that vaccines are partially or fully available, we identify the minimum  
462 vaccine coverage threshold ( $\hat{V}$ ) for the campus to fully return back to normal ( $\hat{p} = 1$ ), and if the  
463 vaccine coverage is below this threshold, the reductions in population size ( $\hat{p}$ ) necessary to  
464 control the epidemic to within the tolerance levels. We also identify suitable testing scenarios for  
465 reported levels of face mask use and physical distancing (transmission rate of 5% to 8%), and  
466 reported levels of contact rates under regular face-to-face classes (16 to 24 per day) and remote  
467 classes (6 to 8 per day). We define suitable as those that avoid exponential growth in cases over

468 the duration of a semester. For the above three sets of combination scenarios, we also present  
469 results under the full range of transmission rates in the Appendix Tables S4, S5, and S6, which  
470 could be useful in the event of change in transmission rates such as emergence of new virus  
471 variants.

## 472 **Results**

473 When vaccines are unavailable ( $V = 0\%$ ), there is no single intervention that can effectively  
474 control an outbreak. However, there are multiple feasible combinations of testing, contact rate  
475 for non-essential workers ( $\hat{C}_n$ ), and population size on campus ( $\hat{p}$ ) that can be implemented to  
476 effectively control an outbreak to keep cases below the relaxed to medium tolerance levels,  
477 though none to keep cases below the tight tolerance level (Table 1). Examples of feasible  
478 combinations under the relaxed tolerance level include: mass tests only at 25% per day, contact  
479 rate for non-essential workers at 2 to 6 per day, and campus population size at 26% to 42%; or  
480 trace and test only at 33%, contact rate for non-essential workers at 4 to 8 per day, and campus  
481 population size at 31% to 47% (see full list in Table 1). Under the medium tolerance level, only  
482 scenarios with combination tests were feasible, examples include: 5% mass test, 50% trace and  
483 test, contact rate for non-essential workers at 2 to 5 per day, and campus population size at 26%  
484 to 36%; or 33% mass test, 50% trace and test, contact rate for non-essential workers at 8 to 14  
485 per day, and campus population size at 47% to 73% (see full list in Table 1). Note: the range in  
486 population size results correspond to mid-points of the range for contact rate ( $C$ ) of 16 and 24 in  
487 Table 1.

488 **Table 1. Feasible combinations <sup>□</sup> of testing, contact rate, and population size on campus for**  
489 **effective control of a disease outbreak in the absence of a vaccine**

Tolerance	Testing	Contact rate threshold (per day)† for non-essential workers‡	Population size† (if regular contact rate is 16)	Population size† (if regular contact rate is 24)	Peak trace and tests per day (per 10,000 persons)	Peak quarantine per day (per 10,000 persons)
Relaxed tolerance	S+25%U	2 - 6	31% - 50%	21% - 33%	0 - 0	6 - 7
	S+33%U	5 - 9	44% - 63%	29% - 42%	0 - 0	7 - 7
	S+33%T	4 - 8	38% - 56%	25% - 38%	14 - 21	18 - 18
	S+50%T	6 - 11	50% - 75%	33% - 50%	36 - 55	22 - 23
	S+5%U+50%T	10 - 16	69% - 100%	46% - 67%	33 - 48	20 - 20
	S+10%U+50%T	11 - 18	75% - 100%	50% - 75%	24 - 35	15 - 15
	S+20%U+50%T	15 - 22	94% - 100%	63% - 92%	16 - 25	13 - 13
	S+25%U+50%T	16 - 24	100% - 100%	67% - 100%	14 - 20	13 - 12
	S+33%U+50%T	18 - 25	100% - 100%	75% - 100%	12 - 15	10 - 9
	S+5%U+50%dT	4 - 9	38% - 63%	25% - 42%	36 - 55	21 - 25
	S+10%U+50%dT	6 - 13	50% - 81%	33% - 54%	32 - 63	21 - 25
	S+20%U+50%dT	11 - 18	75% - 100%	50% - 75%	36 - 54	21 - 21
	S+25%U+50%dT	13 - 19	81% - 100%	54% - 79%	28 - 41	19 - 18
	S+33%U+50%dT	15 - 23	94% - 100%	63% - 96%	21 - 33	16 - 18
Medium tolerance	S+5%U+50%T	2 - 5	31% - 44%	21% - 29%	8 - 9	6 - 6
	S+10%U+50%T	4 - 8	38% - 56%	25% - 38%	7 - 11	6 - 6
	S+20%U+50%T	5 - 10	44% - 69%	29% - 46%	4 - 7	5 - 5
	S+25%U+50%T	6 - 11	50% - 75%	33% - 50%	4 - 6	4 - 5
	S+33%U+50%T	8 - 14	56% - 88%	38% - 58%	3 - 6	5 - 5
	S+20%U+50%dT	2 - 5	31% - 44%	21% - 29%	4 - 4	6 - 6
	S+25%U+50%dT	4 - 6	38% - 50%	25% - 33%	4 - 4	6 - 5
	S+33%U+50%dT	5 - 9	44% - 63%	29% - 42%	3 - 4	6 - 5
Tight tolerance	No scenarios were feasible <input type="checkbox"/>					

Relaxed tolerance: Less than 1 death or 170 cases of infection. This point also marks the point beyond which there was an exponential growth in infections in the simulated runs.

Medium tolerance: Less than 77 cases of infections. Estimated as 1/CFR /%reported cases. We assumed a case fatality rate (CFR) of 2% in the general population in the US [33]; We assumed that 65% of infected cases are reported, which is the proportion showing medium to severe symptoms [27].

Tight tolerance: Less than 50 cases of infection. Estimated as 1/CFR. We assumed a case fatality rate (CFR) of 2% in the general population in the US [33].

S: symptomatic testing, U: Mass test, T: trace and test, dT: delayed trace and test.

We defined a testing scenario as feasible if estimated contact rate thresholds among non-essential workers were at least 2 when transmission rates were 8% and 5% (corresponding to reported use of face mask and physical distancing [11,30]). The range of values in the table thus correspond to transmission rate of 8% - 5%  
 ‡ We assume 23% are essential workers and have a contact rate of 14 per day [37].

† Contact rate threshold (per person per day): the average value for contacts per person per day to keep infections below the tolerance level. These reduced contact rates, from the original rates of 16 to 24 [42,43], can be achieved through reduction in population size at the noted thresholds.



491 The corresponding peak numbers of trace and tests per day (per 10,000 persons) in the above  
 492 feasible scenarios were at a reasonably manageable level. The relaxed tolerance level had a  
 493 higher value (14 to 55 per day) than the medium tolerance level (3 to 11 per day) considering the  
 494 population size on campus were lower in the latter case because of the tighter tolerance (Table  
 495 1). The peak number of quarantines per day (per 10,000 persons) for the above feasible scenarios  
 496 also seem manageable. As with above, the relaxed tolerance level had a higher value (6 to 25 per  
 497 day) than the medium tolerance level (5 to 6 per day). Combinations of testing, contact rate, and  
 498 population size for the full range of transmission rates evaluated are presented in Supplemental  
 499 Appendix Table S4.

500 When vaccines become partially or fully available, to keep the population size on campus at  
 501 100% ( $\hat{p} = 1$ ), the level of testing necessary to effectively control an outbreak would depend on  
 502 the vaccine coverage in the population (Table 2). To keep infection cases within the relaxed  
 503 tolerance level, implementing symptomatic-testing-only will be sufficient if at least 95% ( $\hat{V}$ ) of  
 504 the population are vaccinated (Table 2). With the addition of mass tests only, 5%, 10%, 20%,  
 505 25%, and 33% mass tests per day would be sufficient if at least 89% to 95%, 84% to 89%, 74%  
 506 to 84%, 63% to 79%, and 53% to 68% ( $\hat{V}$ ) of the population are vaccinated (Table 2),  
 507 respectively, the range corresponding to transmission rate of 5% to 8%, i.e., the unvaccinated  
 508 continue to use face masks and maintain physical distancing at current compliance levels.

509 **Table 2. Combinations of testing, vaccine coverage, and population size for effective control**  
 510 **of a disease outbreak**

Testing	Vaccination coverage	Population size (if regular contact rate is 16)	Population size (if regular contact rate is 24)
S	95% - 100%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
Mass tests only (% tested per day)			
S+5%U	89% - 95%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+10%U	84% - 89%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%

S+20%U	74% - 84%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+25%U	63% - 79%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+33%U	53% - 68%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+33%U	38% - 53%	100% - 97%	79% - 83%
S+33%U	23% - 38%	85% - 82%	64% - 68%
S+33%U	8% - 23%	70% - 67%	49% - 53%
Trace and tests only			
S+10%T	84% - 95%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+17%T	79% - 89%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+20%T	74% - 84%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+25%T	68% - 84%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+33%T	58% - 74%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+50%T	42% - 63%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+50%T	27% - 42%	100% - 92%	77% - 75%
S+50%T	12% - 27%	87% - 77%	62% - 60%
Trace and tests only (capped at 20%)			
S+10%T	84% - 95%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+17%T	79% - 89%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+20%T	74% - 84%	100% - 100%	100% - 100%
S+20%T	59% - 69%	96% - 94%	84% - 86%
S+20%T	44% - 54%	81% - 79%	69% - 71%
S+20%T	29% - 39%	66% - 64%	54% - 56%
S+20%T	14% - 24%	51% - 49%	39% - 41%

The range of value presented correspond to transmission rate range of 5% - 8%, thus fixing face mask and physical distancing at reported levels.

S: symptomatic testing, U: Mass test, T: trace and test, dT: delayed trace and test.

511

512 If vaccine coverage ( $V$ ) is below 53% (the threshold noted above), it would be necessary to also

513 reduce the population size (Table 2). If vaccine coverage ( $V$ ) is between 38% and 53%, 23% and

514 38%, or 8% and 23%, in addition to mass tests at 33% per day, it would be necessary to maintain

515 a population size threshold ( $\hat{p}$ ) of at most 90%, 75%, or 60% on average, respectively, (Table 2)

516 and the unvaccinated continue to use face masks and maintain physical distancing at current

517 compliance levels. Note: the population size threshold noted here is the average of the values

518 reported for contact rate ( $C$ ) of 16 and 24 in Table 2.

519

520 Instead of adding mass tests only, addition of trace and tests only to symptom-based testing at  
 521 the lowest rate of 10% (or highest rate of 50%) will also be sufficient to keep the population size  
 522 on campus at 100% ( $\hat{p} = 1$ ) if at least 84% to 95% are vaccinated (or 42% to 63% are  
 523 vaccinated) (Table 2). If vaccine coverage ( $V$ ) is below 42% it would be necessary to also reduce  
 524 the population size, keeping it to at most 89% on average if vaccine coverage is between 27%  
 525 and 42%, and to at most 75% on average if vaccine coverage is between 12% and 27%.  
 526 Considering that 50% trace and test, equivalent to 2 days from infection to isolation is a very  
 527 tight timeline, which may be more feasible only with digital tracing, we also evaluated at a  
 528 maximum of 20% trace and test, equivalent to 5 days from infection to isolation. This level of  
 529 20% trace and test only will be sufficient to keep the population size on campus at 100% if  
 530 vaccine coverage is at least 74% to 84%. If vaccine coverage is below that, it will also require a  
 531 reduction in population size, e.g., to 75% on average if only 44% to 54% of the population are  
 532 vaccinated (Table 2). All the above scenarios for trace and tests also correspond to the continued  
 533 use of face masks and physical distancing at least at current compliance levels (transmission rate  
 534 of 5% to 8%). The combinations of testing and vaccination coverage under the full range of  
 535 transmission rates are presented in Supplemental Appendix Table S5.

536  
 537 **Table 3. Suitable testing options for effective control of a disease outbreak keeping contact**  
 538 **rates at reported levels<sup>†‡</sup>**

Testing	Number infected (per 10,000 persons)		Peak trace and tests per day (per 10,000 persons)		Peak quarantine per day (per 10,000 persons)	
	5%	8%	5%	8%	5%	8%
Transmission rate ( $p$ ) □-->						
S+33%U	23 (20, 27)	44 (32, 67)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	4 (3, 5)	7 (5, 13)
S+33%T	30 (25, 36)	60 (42, 89)	14 (9, 17)	22 (14, 28)	12 (9, 14)	24 (18, 33)
S+50%T	23 (21, 26)	34 (29, 41)	20 (12, 24)	29 (19, 36)	10 (9, 13)	18 (14, 22)
S+5%U+50%T	19 (17, 21)	25 (22, 29)	8 (7, 13)	16 (10, 19)	6 (5, 7)	9 (8, 12)
S+10%U+50%T	17 (16, 19)	22 (20, 24)	6 (5, 9)	8 (7, 10)	5 (4, 5)	7 (6, 8)
S+20%U+50%T	16 (15, 16)	19 (18, 21)	4 (3, 4)	4 (4, 5)	4 (3, 4)	5 (4, 5)

S+25%U+50%T	15 (15, 16)	18 (17, 20)	3 (2, 4)	3 (3, 3)	3 (3, 4)	4 (4, 4)
S+33%U+50%T	15 (14, 16)	17 (16, 18)	2 (2, 2)	2 (2, 3)	3 (3, 3)	4 (3, 4)
S+5%U+50%dT	30 (26, 34)	45 (38, 55)	26 (16, 32)	46 (36, 64)	15 (12, 18)	26 (21, 34)
S+10%U+50%dT	24 (22, 27)	34 (29, 40)	11 (9, 18)	24 (15, 32)	10 (8, 12)	17 (14, 21)
S+20%U+50%dT	19 (18, 21)	25 (22, 28)	4 (3, 8)	10 (6, 10)	6 (5, 7)	9 (8, 11)
S+25%U+50%dT	18 (17, 19)	22 (20, 25)	3 (3, 3)	6 (4, 8)	5 (5, 5)	7 (6, 9)
S+33%U+50%dT	17 (16, 17)	19 (18, 22)	2 (2, 2)	3 (2, 6)	4 (4, 4)	6 (5, 7)

S: symptomatic testing, U: Mass test, T: trace and test, dT: delayed trace and test

† Reported value of contact rate is on average between 6 and 8 per person per day under remote instructions [35,36]; Using our estimations, this would correspond to population size of about 31% and 42%. Results in the table correspond to this contact rate, presented as average (minimum, maximum)

‡ Reported contact rate is on average between 16 and 24 per person per day under face-to-face instructions [42,43]. None of the scenarios for this contact rate were suitable, and thus, are not presented in the table.

□ We defined a testing scenario as suitable if there were no exponential growth in infections when transmission rates were 5% and 8% (corresponding to reported use of face mask and physical distancing [11,30]).

539

540 The total cases of infections and deaths over a 90-day semester if a fully unvaccinated population

541 is on campus (contact rates of 16 to 24 per person per day as reported for regular face-to-face

542 instructions [42,43]) suggest an exponential growth in infections in most testing scenarios, even

543 if face mask and physical distancing are used at levels reported during the pandemic

544 (transmission rates of 5% to 8%) (Supplemental Appendix Table S6). With contact rate of 6 to 8

545 per person per day (corresponding to reported numbers when several universities moved to

546 partial or full remote instructions [35,36]) and use of facemask and physical distancing at levels

547 reported during the pandemic, an exponential growth in infections was prevented with the

548 following testing scenarios: 33% per day mass test only, at least 33% trace and test only, any of

549 the combination tests, and any of the delayed combination tests (Table 3). In these suitable

550 scenarios, the peak number of trace and tests, per 10,000 persons, varied from 2 to 64 per day,

551 and the peak number of quarantines, per 10,000 persons, varied from 3 to 26 per day (Table 3).

552

## 553 **Discussions**

554 This work estimates, under varying combinations of mass test, trace and test, and transmission  
555 rate, the contact rate thresholds that would help efficiently control an infectious disease outbreak  
556 on residential university campuses in the United States. The metric typically used in the COVID-  
557 19 literature for evaluating testing strategies is the reproduction number  $R_0$ , which combines the  
558 contact rate and transmission rate. As interventions that influence transmission rates are different  
559 than those that influence contact rates, separating these parameters help systematically evaluate  
560 metrics to inform epidemic control protocols on university campuses. In this study, we extracted  
561 four main metrics. First, the contact rate threshold among non-essential workers after accounting  
562 for the higher contact rate among essential workers, which could help inform the size of social  
563 circles at the individual-level and schedule group activities such as in labs and offices. Second,  
564 population size threshold, i.e., the maximum proportion of the actual population size, which  
565 could help university-level activity decisions such as the fraction of classes that should be moved  
566 to remote instruction. Third, the threshold values for vaccination coverage for the campus to  
567 return to normal, i.e., the minimum vaccination coverage for having 100% of the population back  
568 on campus, which would help plan for the period post introduction of vaccines. Fourth, the  
569 threshold values for population size if vaccine coverage is below required thresholds, which  
570 could help decisions in the event that vaccines are not widely available that coverage (proportion  
571 vaccinated) is not at levels sufficient to fully resume normal activities. The fourth metric could  
572 especially be useful in the transitional phase to normality (until vaccines become fully  
573 available) and where the results suggest lowering the population size by just a small number,  
574 which could be achieved by moving only a few classes online, such that, the overall population  
575 density on campus on any given day is lower but most students have most (if not all) of their  
576 classes as face-to-face.

577

578 While the implementation of the decisions related to the above metrics are driven at the  
579 university-level, adherence and feasibility to use of interventions such as face mask and physical  
580 distancing could vary by individual behaviors [37,39,40]. By separately modeling contact rates  
581 and transmission rates in this study, we extracted results corresponding to transmission rates (of  
582 5% to 8%) that match reported behaviors for face mask use and physical distancing [11,30], and  
583 thus evaluated the university-level decisions under these adherence or feasibility ranges.

584

585 Our analyses suggest that implementing only testing, only face mask use and physical distancing,  
586 or only population size reductions will not be sufficient, but require combinations of these  
587 interventions to successfully control an outbreak on university campuses. Further, in the absence  
588 of vaccinations, at reported levels of face mask and physical distancing, testing alone without  
589 reducing population size would also not be sufficient to control an outbreak. This suggests that  
590 university campuses have high population densities that, for effective control of highly virulent  
591 infections such as SARS-CoV-2, it would require reducing the population size such as through  
592 remote learning.

593

594 Although individual interventions are not sufficient, there are multiple choices for combinations  
595 of interventions to choose from if vaccines are unavailable. If, along with continuing face mask  
596 and physical distancing at current levels, the population size is kept to at most 34% (or 44%) of  
597 the actual population size, mass tests only of 25% (or 33%) per day would help control an  
598 outbreak (Table 1). The choice between mass tests of 25% per day vs. 33% per day should

599 consider the costs of a greater proportion remote learning (quantitative and qualitative costs) vs.  
600 costs of both testing more often and testing a larger population.

601  
602 An alternative to mass tests only would be trace and test only, along with continuing face mask  
603 and physical distancing at current levels and reducing population size. Trace and test only would  
604 also be sufficient at rates of 33% (or 50%) if population size is kept to at most 39% (or 52%)  
605 (Table 1). These population size range are close to the 34% (or 44%) reported above for 25% (or  
606 33%) per day mass tests only. Trace and test of 33% and 50% correspond to 3 days and 2 days,  
607 respectively, from the time an infected person makes contact with an individual to effective  
608 isolation of that individual. Feasibility of this short turnaround times would determine the choice  
609 between use of mass test vs. trace and test. Turnaround times are expected to be shorter with  
610 digital contact tracing, such as smart phone apps, compared to manual tracing, and feasibility and  
611 adoption of apps could be higher among university students than general population. However,  
612 studies related to its feasibility and adoption followed by adherence to isolation, among other  
613 issues such as privacy and alternative digital technologies are only recently emerging [44–47].  
614 Our results also suggest that, if these turnaround times are not achievable and further if there are  
615 any delays in trace and test initiation, then trace and test alone is not favorable (none of the  
616 delayed trace and test were feasible (Table 2)) and should instead adopt either mass tests only or  
617 mass test with trace and test. Use of mass test with trace and test could improve trace and test  
618 due to potential early diagnosis of index persons. Our results suggest that, if mass tests can  
619 increase trace and test to 50% (within two days from contact to isolation), there is more  
620 flexibility in trade-offs between mass test rates and contact rate thresholds, and thus more  
621 flexibility in population size (Table 2).

622  
623 In the event that vaccines are available, the full population can be back on campus and resume  
624 normal activities provided at least 95% of the population is vaccinated (Table 2). If vaccine  
625 coverages are lower than 95%, resuming normal activities with the full population size on  
626 campus would require additional asymptomatic testing, with the level of testing depending on  
627 vaccine coverage. Mass tests of at least 25% per day would be sufficient if vaccine coverage is at  
628 least 70%, or mass tests of at least 33% per day would be sufficient if vaccine coverage is at least  
629 59%. If vaccine coverage is below 59%, to control an outbreak, in addition to mass tests at 33%  
630 per day, it would also require lowering the population size to 90%, 75%, and 60%, if vaccine  
631 coverage is at 46%, 31%, and 16%, respectively (Table 2).

632  
633 Corresponding to the reported compliance to face mask and physical distancing and reported  
634 contact rates of 6 to 8 per person per day (a population size of 31% to 42% as per our  
635 estimations), from surveys [35,37,39] conducted over the year 2020 when universities  
636 transitioned a large proportion of classes to remote instructions and vaccines were unavailable,  
637 our results suggest the need for at least 33% mass test only or 33% trace and test only (Table 3).  
638 Scenarios that did not meet these criteria led to exponential growths in infections. These results  
639 generally match observed cases over the Fall 2020 semester, where several campuses saw cases  
640 into the thousands within the first two weeks of opening and were able to quickly control the  
641 spread within two to three weeks by temporarily transitioning to remote instructions [48]. While  
642 the universities were able to effectively control the outbreak quickly, it was also observed by this  
643 study [48] that the infections rapidly spread into the neighboring community, which were less  
644 successful in controlling the spread. Therefore, we believe, results obtained from our study,



645 which set tight tolerance levels on infection cases, would be beneficial for developing epidemic  
646 response plans that consider the interests of the broader community. Our results also suggest that,  
647 with asymptomatic testing only, it would be necessary to have a vaccination coverage threshold  
648 of >95% for a university to fully return back to normal. This threshold is much higher than the  
649 typical 70% to 80% range used for herd-immunity in the literature for the general population  
650 [49], to a small extent because of setting a tighter tolerance but to a large extent because of the  
651 higher population density characteristic of university campuses. The latter can also be observed  
652 in  $R_0$  values estimated for universities, which in some instances went above 10 even with online  
653 instructions [48], while the herd-immunity in the general population is approximately calculated  
654 as  $1 - 1/R_0$  using a  $R_0$  of 3.5.

655  
656 Our work is subject to limitations. Our model is deterministic. We used an average contact rate  
657 for all persons in order to estimate threshold values that could help inform university-level  
658 decisions. We did not model contact rates to be representative of actual expected networks  
659 between individuals. We did not explicitly model other interventions that could reduce  
660 transmission rate such as controlled ventilation, filtering air and controlling air flow, which are  
661 likely to impact transmissions [50]. The transmission rates also have a large range of uncertainty  
662 due to varying individual behaviors, the data used for streamlining the analyses in this study are  
663 based on limited data availabilities, however, the extrapolations over the wide range of  
664 transmission rates could be utilized. We did not model false positives for any of the testing  
665 scenarios and thus susceptible persons immediately return back to susceptible compartment after  
666 testing. We did not model other flu like illnesses and thus we did not assess the additional  
667 healthcare resource needs such as testing and quarantining because of similarity in symptoms

668 with COVID-19. In estimation of vaccination thresholds, we did not consider the natural  
669 immunity developed among persons who may have been infected previously. The estimation of  
670 vaccination thresholds assume that the virus is still prevalent in the larger community and thus  
671 there is a chance of the infection entering the population, such as through local or global travel.  
672 We assume that the population density is similar across university campuses with contact rates  
673 between 16 and 24, and thus, this assumption should be considered when generalizing to  
674 campuses.

675  
676 In conclusion, the results from this study could be used to collectively inform decisions related to  
677 testing, population size reductions through remote instructions, size of social circles, personnel  
678 scheduling in labs and offices, under scenarios of both unavailability or partial availability of  
679 vaccines, and within the observed levels of compliance to face mask use and physical distancing.  
680 The analyses conducted here specifically streamlined the results to the COVID-19 disease caused  
681 by the SARS-CoV-2 virus. However, given the wide range of transmission rates evaluated here,  
682 which were based on results from a meta-analysis study that evaluated SARS-CoV-2 and other  
683 viruses of similarly high virulence [11], broader observations from this study could be  
684 extrapolated for use in early stages of new outbreaks of similar viral respiratory infections with  
685 similar incubation periods, [24] where non-pharmaceutical intervention options such as face  
686 masks, physical distancing, remote instructions, and testing are the suitable options. As was the  
687 case at the time of conducting this study, in the early stages of an outbreak, there is uncertainty in  
688 the baseline transmission rate, efficacy of face mask use and physical distancing [11]. Thus, the  
689 results over the range of transmission rates might only serve as a preliminary guide, until more  
690 information becomes available for more streamlined analyses.

691

692 **Acknowledgements**

693 We would like to acknowledge Sonza Singh, Shifali Bansal, Seyedeh Nazanin Khatami, and

694 Arman Mohseni Kabir for their assistance in data collection in initial stages of the study, and Dr.

695 Laura Balzer, Dr. Michael Ash, and Dr. Hari Balasubramanian for their comments and inputs.

696

697

698

## 699 **References**

- 700 1. Coronavirus Resource Center. Impact of opening and closing decisions by state. In: Johns  
701 Hopkins University of Medicine. [Internet]. 8 Jul 2020 [cited 8 Jul 2020]. Available:  
702 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/state-timeline>
- 703 2. Holzer J. The COVID-19 crisis: How do U.S. employment and health outcomes compare to  
704 other OECD countries? In: Brookings [Internet]. 2 Jun 2020 [cited 8 Jul 2020]. Available:  
705 [https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-covid-19-crisis-how-do-u-s-economic-and-health-](https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-covid-19-crisis-how-do-u-s-economic-and-health-outcomes-compare-to-other-oecd-countries/)  
706 [outcomes-compare-to-other-oecd-countries/](https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-covid-19-crisis-how-do-u-s-economic-and-health-outcomes-compare-to-other-oecd-countries/)
- 707 3. Blustein D, Duffy R, Ferreira J, Cohen-Scali V, Cinamon R, Allan B. Unemployment in the  
708 time of COVID-19: A research agenda. *J Vocat Behav.* 2020;119.  
709 doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103436
- 710 4. CDC. How to Protect Yourself & Others. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
711 [Internet]. 24 Apr 2020 [cited 9 Jul 2020]. Available:  
712 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>.
- 713 5. CDC. Interim Guidance for Businesses and Employers Responding to Coronavirus Disease  
714 2019 (COVID-19). In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. 6 May 2020  
715 [cited 8 Jul 2020]. Available: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-business-response.html)  
716 [ncov/community/guidance-business-response.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-business-response.html)..
- 717 6. Barratt H, Kirwan M, Shantikumar S. Epidemic theory (effective & basic reproduction  
718 numbers, epidemic thresholds) & techniques for analysis of infectious disease data  
719 (construction & use of epidemic curves, generation numbers, exceptional reporting &  
720 identification of significant clusters). In: Health Knowledge [Internet]. [cited 8 Jul 2020].  
721 Available: [https://www.healthknowledge.org.uk/public-health-textbook/research-](https://www.healthknowledge.org.uk/public-health-textbook/research-methods/1a-epidemiology/epidemic-theory)  
722 [methods/1a-epidemiology/epidemic-theory](https://www.healthknowledge.org.uk/public-health-textbook/research-methods/1a-epidemiology/epidemic-theory)
- 723 7. Kucharski A, Klepac P, Conlan A, Kissler S, Tang M, Fry H, et al. Effectiveness of isolation,  
724 testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2  
725 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20: 1151–  
726 1160. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30457-6
- 727 8. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding  
728 and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26: 672–675. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-  
729 0869-5
- 730 9. Bedford J, Enria D, Giesecke J, Heymann DL, Ihekweazu C, Kobinger G, et al. COVID-19:  
731 towards controlling of a pandemic. *The Lancet.* 2020;395: 1015–1018. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
732 6736(20)30673-5
- 733 10. MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. A rapid systematic review of the efficacy of face masks and  
734 respirators against coronaviruses and other respiratory transmissible viruses for the  
735 community, healthcare workers and sick patients. *International Journal of Nursing Studies.*  
736 2020;108: 103629. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103629

- 737 11. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing,  
738 face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2  
739 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2020;395: 1973–1987.  
740 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9
- 741 12. Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, Bosse NI, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, et al. Feasibility of  
742 controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *The Lancet Global*  
743 *Health*. 2020;8: e488–e496. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30074-7
- 744 13. Aleta A, Martín-Corral D, Pastore y Piontti A, Ajelli M, Litvinova M, Chinazzi M, et al.  
745 Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves  
746 of COVID-19. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2020;4: 964–971. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0931-9
- 747 14. Gressman PT, Peck JR. Simulating COVID-19 in a University Environment. *Mathematical*  
748 *Biosciences*. 2020;328: 108436. doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2020.108436
- 749 15. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. COVID-19 screening strategies that permit the safe re-  
750 opening of college campuses. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Jul.  
751 doi:10.1101/2020.07.06.20147702
- 752 16. Knowledge @ Wharton. COVID-19 on Campus: How Should Schools Be Redesigned? 22  
753 Jun 2020 [cited 8 Jul 2020]. Available: [https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/how-](https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/how-should-universities-be-redesigned-in-the-wake-of-covid-19/)  
754 [should-universities-be-redesigned-in-the-wake-of-covid-19/](https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/how-should-universities-be-redesigned-in-the-wake-of-covid-19/)
- 755 17. Vasquez M, Diep F. What Covid-19 Computer Models Are Telling Colleges About the Fall.  
756 In: *The Chronicle of Higher Education* [Internet]. 19 Jun 2020 [cited 8 Jul 2020]. Available:  
757 <https://www.chronicle.com/article/What-Covid-19-Computer-Models/249027>
- 758 18. Roos R. Masks plus hand hygiene reduced ILI in college dorm study. In: *CIDRAP* [Internet].  
759 22 Jan 2010 [cited 8 Jul 2020]. Available: [https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-](https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2010/01/masks-plus-hand-hygiene-reduced-ili-college-dorm-study)  
760 [perspective/2010/01/masks-plus-hand-hygiene-reduced-ili-college-dorm-study](https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2010/01/masks-plus-hand-hygiene-reduced-ili-college-dorm-study)
- 761 19. Aiello AE, Murray GF, Perez V, Coulborn RM, Davis BM, Uddin M, et al. Mask use, hand  
762 hygiene, and seasonal influenza-like illness among young adults: A randomized  
763 intervention trial. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2010;201: 491–498.  
764 doi:10.1086/650396
- 765 20. Meselson M. Droplets and Aerosols in the Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *N Engl J Med*.  
766 2020;382: 2063–2063. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2009324
- 767 21. Jayaweera M, Perera H, Gunawardana B, Manatunge J. Transmission of COVID-19 virus by  
768 droplets and aerosols: A critical review on the unresolved dichotomy. *Environmental*  
769 *Research*. 2020;188: 109819. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109819
- 770 22. Anderson EL, Turnham P, Griffin JR, Clarke CC. Consideration of the Aerosol Transmission  
771 for COVID-19 and Public Health. *Risk Analysis*. 2020;40: 902–907.  
772 doi:10.1111/risa.13500

- 773 23. Zhang Y, Jiang B, Yuan J, Tao Y. The impact of social distancing and epicenter lockdown  
774 on the COVID-19 epidemic in mainland China: A data-driven SEIQR model study.  
775 MedRxiv. 2020. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.04.20031187>
- 776 24. Lessler J, Reich NG, Brookmeyer R, Perl TM, Nelson KE, Cummings DA. Incubation  
777 periods of acute respiratory viral infections: a systematic review. *The Lancet Infectious*  
778 *Diseases*. 2009;9: 291–300. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(09)70069-6
- 779 25. Hill A, Levy M, Xie S, Sheen J, Shinnick J, Gheorghe A, et al. Modeling COVID-19 Spread  
780 vs Healthcare Capacit. 27 May 2020. Available: <https://alhill.shinyapps.io/COVID19seir/>
- 781 26. Ma S, Zhang J, Zeng M, Yun Q, Guo W, Zheng Y, et al. Epidemiological parameters of  
782 coronavirus disease 2019: a pooled analysis of publicly reported individual data of 1155  
783 cases from seven countries. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Mar.  
784 doi:10.1101/2020.03.21.20040329
- 785 27. CDC. COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. In: Centers for Disease Control and  
786 Prevention [Internet]. [cited 5 May 2021]. Available:  
787 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios-archive/planning-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios-archive/planning-scenarios-2020-05-20.pdf)  
788 [scenarios-2020-05-20.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios-archive/planning-scenarios-2020-05-20.pdf)
- 789 28. MIDAS 2019 Novel Coronavirus Repository. [cited 24 Apr 2020]. Available:  
790 <https://github.com/midas-network/COVID-19>
- 791 29. Kobokovich A, West R, Gronvall G. Serology-based tests for COVID-19. In: Johns Hopkins  
792 Bloomberg School of Public Health, Center for Healthy Security [Internet]. 7 Jul 2020  
793 [cited 8 Jul 2020]. Available: [https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/resources/COVID-](https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/resources/COVID-19/serology/Serology-based-tests-for-COVID-19.html)  
794 [19/serology/Serology-based-tests-for-COVID-19.html](https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/resources/COVID-19/serology/Serology-based-tests-for-COVID-19.html)
- 795 30. Zhao PJ. A Social Network Model of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Epidemiology*; 2020 Mar.  
796 doi:10.1101/2020.03.23.20041798
- 797 31. At a glance, 2019-2020, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. [cited 9 Jun 2020].  
798 Available: [https://www.umass.edu/oir/sites/default/files/publications/glance/FS\\_gla\\_01.pdf](https://www.umass.edu/oir/sites/default/files/publications/glance/FS_gla_01.pdf)
- 799 32. ACS DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES. In: United States Census Bureau  
800 [Internet]. [cited 5 May 2021]. Available:  
801 [https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Profile%20of%20General%20Population%20and%20](https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Profile%20of%20General%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Characteristics%20amherst%20massachusetts&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05)  
802 [0Housing%20Characteristics%20amherst%20massachusetts&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05](https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Profile%20of%20General%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Characteristics%20amherst%20massachusetts&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05)
- 803 33. Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Beltekian D, Mathieu E, Hasell J, Macdonald B, et al. Mortality  
804 Risk of COVID-19. In: Our World in Data [Internet]. [cited 5 May 2020]. Available:  
805 <https://ourworldindata.org/mortality-risk-covid#the-case-fatality-rate>
- 806 34. CDC. COVID Data Tracker. [cited 18 Jun 2021]. Available: [https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view)  
807 [data-tracker/#county-view](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view)

- 808 35. Nixon E, Trickey A, Christensen H, Finn A, Thomas A, Relton C, et al. Contacts and  
809 behaviours of university students during the COVID-19 pandemic at the start of the  
810 2020/21 academic year. *Public and Global Health*; 2020 Dec.  
811 doi:10.1101/2020.12.09.20246421
- 812 36. Cashore J, Duan N, Janmohamed A, Wan J, Zhang Y, Henderson S. COVID-19  
813 Mathematical Modeling for Cornell's Fall Semester. 2020. Available: [https://cpb-us-](https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.coecis.cornell.edu/dist/3/341/files/2020/10/COVID_19_Modeling_Jun15-VD.pdf)  
814 [w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.coecis.cornell.edu/dist/3/341/files/2020/10/COVID\\_19\\_Modeling\\_](https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.coecis.cornell.edu/dist/3/341/files/2020/10/COVID_19_Modeling_Jun15-VD.pdf)  
815 [Jun15-VD.pdf](https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.coecis.cornell.edu/dist/3/341/files/2020/10/COVID_19_Modeling_Jun15-VD.pdf)
- 816 37. Cohen AK, Hoyt LT, Dull B. A Descriptive Study of COVID-19–Related Experiences and  
817 Perspectives of a National Sample of College Students in Spring 2020. *Journal of*  
818 *Adolescent Health*. 2020;67: 369–375. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.06.009
- 819 38. Brooks-Pollock E, Christensen H, Trickey A, Hemani G, Nixon E, Thomas A, et al. High  
820 COVID-19 transmission potential associated with re-opening universities can be mitigated  
821 with layered interventions. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Sep.  
822 doi:10.1101/2020.09.10.20189696
- 823 39. COVID-19 Mitigation Behavior Survey Results. In: Kansas State University [Internet].  
824 [cited 26 Apr 2020]. Available: [https://www.k-state.edu/covid-19/communications/every-](https://www.k-state.edu/covid-19/communications/every-wildcat-a-wellcat/fall-2020-mitigation-behavior-survey-results.html)  
825 [wildcat-a-wellcat/fall-2020-mitigation-behavior-survey-results.html](https://www.k-state.edu/covid-19/communications/every-wildcat-a-wellcat/fall-2020-mitigation-behavior-survey-results.html)
- 826 40. COVID-19 Reopening Survey Data. In: Risk and Social Policy Group [Internet]. [cited 26  
827 Apr 2020]. Available:  
828 [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ec4464f22cd13186530a36f/t/5ef0e413c14aa311f584](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ec4464f22cd13186530a36f/t/5ef0e413c14aa311f58404fe/1592845331607/FINAL_onepager_wave1.pdf)  
829 [04fe/1592845331607/FINAL\\_onepager\\_wave1.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ec4464f22cd13186530a36f/t/5ef0e413c14aa311f58404fe/1592845331607/FINAL_onepager_wave1.pdf)
- 830 41. Hu H, Nigmatulina K, Eckhoff P. The scaling of contact rates with population density for the  
831 infectious disease models. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 2013;244: 125–134.  
832 doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2013.04.013
- 833 42. Danon L, House TA, Read JM, Keeling MJ. Social encounter networks: collective properties  
834 and disease transmission. *J R Soc Interface*. 2012;9: 2826–2833.  
835 doi:10.1098/rsif.2012.0357
- 836 43. Beutels P, Shkedy Z, Aerts M, Van Damme P. Social mixing patterns for transmission  
837 models of close contact infections: exploring self-evaluation and diary-based data collection  
838 through a web-based interface. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2006;134: 1158–1166.  
839 doi:10.1017/S0950268806006418
- 840 44. Menges D, Aschmann H, Moser A, Althaus CL, von Wyl V. The role of the SwissCovid  
841 digital proximity tracing app during the pandemic response: results for the Canton of  
842 Zurich. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2021 Feb.  
843 doi:10.1101/2021.02.01.21250972



- 844 45. Colizza V, Grill E, Mikolajczyk R, Cattuto C, Kucharski A, Riley S, et al. Time to evaluate  
845 COVID-19 contact-tracing apps. *Nat Med*. 2021;27: 361–362. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-  
846 01236-6
- 847 46. Lewis D. Contact-tracing apps help reduce COVID infections, data suggest. In: *Nature*  
848 [Internet]. 21 Feb 2021 [cited 1 May 2021]. Available:  
849 <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00451-y>
- 850 47. Masel J, Shilen A, Helming B, Rutschman J, Windham G, Judd M, et al. Quantifying  
851 meaningful adoption of a SARS-CoV-2 exposure notification app on the campus of the  
852 University of Arizona. *Epidemiology*; 2021 Feb. doi:10.1101/2021.02.02.21251022
- 853 48. Lu H, Weintz C, Pace J, Indana D, Linka K, Kuhl E. Are college campuses superspreaders?  
854 A data-driven modeling study. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical*  
855 *Engineering*. 2021; 1–11. doi:10.1080/10255842.2020.1869221
- 856 49. Aschwanden C. Five reasons why COVID herd immunity is probably impossible. In: *Nature*  
857 [Internet]. 18 Mar 2021 [cited 1 May 2021]. Available:  
858 <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00728-2>
- 859 50. Dai H, Zhao B. Association of the infection probability of COVID-19 with ventilation rates  
860 in confined spaces. *Build Simul*. 2020;13: 1321–1327. doi:10.1007/s12273-020-0703-5
- 861



Fig 1 (A)




Fig 1 (B)

COMPARTMENTAL  
MODEL STATESPHASE OF  
NATURAL  
DISEASE  
PROGRESSION