

Engagement and adherence trade-offs for SARS-CoV-2 contact tracing.

Tim C. D. Lucas^{a,1,*}, Emma L. Davis^{a,1}, Diepreye Ayabina^a, Anna Borlase^a, Thomas Crellen^a, Li Pi^a, Graham F. Medley^d, Lucy Yardley^{f,g}, Petra Klepac^{c,e}, Julia Gog^e, T. Déirdre Hollingsworth^a

^a*Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, University of Oxford, UK*

^b*MathSys CDT, University of Warwick, UK*

^c*Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK*

^d*Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Disease and Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK*

^e*Department for Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge, UK*

^f*School of Psychology, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK*

^g*School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, UK*

Abstract

Contact tracing is an important tool for allowing countries to ease lock-down policies introduced to combat SARS-CoV-2. For contact tracing to be effective, those with symptoms must self-report themselves while their contacts must self-isolate when asked. However, policies such as legal enforcement of self-isolation can create trade-offs by dissuading individuals from self-reporting. We use an existing branching process model to examine which aspects of contact tracing adherence should be prioritised. We consider an inverse relationship between self-isolation adherence and self-reporting engagement, assuming that increasingly strict self-isolation policies will result in fewer individuals self-reporting to the programme. We find that policies that increase the average duration of self-isolation, or that increase the probability that people self-isolate at all, at the expense of reduced self-reporting

*Corresponding author

Email address: timcdlucas@gmail.com (Tim C. D. Lucas^a)

¹Authors contributed equally

Preprint submitted to Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B. SPI-M special issue

August 20, 2020

rate, will not decrease the risk of a large outbreak and may increase the risk, depending on the strength of the trade-off. These results suggest that policies to increase self-isolation adherence should be implemented carefully. Policies that increase self-isolation adherence at the cost of self-reporting rates should be avoided.

Keywords: COVID-19, contact tracing, branching processes, SARS-CoV-2, adherence, engagement, case isolation, quarantine

1. Background

Since the first cases of SARS-CoV-2 in China in late 2019¹ the virus has spread globally, resulting in over 600,000 confirmed deaths by August 2020². Lockdown in the UK began in March 2020³ and reduced R_0 below 1 while also triggering unprecedented reductions in economic activity⁴. As lockdown restrictions are relaxed, both in the UK and in other countries, other methods for keeping R_0 below one are needed. Large-scale contact tracing is one of the potential methods for keeping virus spread under control^{5,6,7}.

During the current SARS-CoV-2 outbreak, contact tracing has been used to great effect in a number of countries including Vietnam and South Korea^{8,9}. Two broad classes of contact tracing include manual tracing and digital tracing using a smartphone app¹⁰. Manual contract tracing is the only system currently running in the UK though it is expected that a contact tracing app will be launched soon. In manual contact tracing, trained public health staff ask a case for the names and contact details of people they have recently been in close proximity with, as well as asking for information on which public areas the infected person has visited. The tracers will then identify as many contacts as possible and ask them to self-isolate for a period. Adherence to the contact tracing system is an important determinant of its efficacy^{11,6,10}.

Adherence applies to a number of different aspects of contact tracing¹². Untraced individuals with symptoms must report themselves to the contact tracing system. They then must give identifying information about the people they have been in close proximity with. Then, both the index case, and the traced contacts, must self-isolate for a period^{13,14}. If the contact tracing system uses home swab tests, the swabs must be taken carefully^{15,16}. Adherence to each of these steps will be imperfect.

Although there are many unobserved variables involved, we can start to

29 examine some of these adherence rates using public statistics from the UK
30 tracing system¹⁷. For example, of the 6,923 people who were referred to
31 the contact tracing system between the 11th and 17th of June, 70% were
32 reached. However, these 6,923 cases certainly do not represent 100% of the
33 new cases in the country that week. Of the 6,923, 74% gave details of at
34 least one contact though it is not possible to tell how many of the remaining
35 26% actually had no contacts. 82% of close contacts were reached and asked
36 to self-isolate.

37 However, these adherence rates are not fixed parameters and can be influ-
38 enced by policy. For example, economic support for those missing work^{14,18},
39 daily phonecalls to monitor adherence¹⁹ or legal ramifications for break-
40 ing self-isolation, such as those implemented in Singapore and Taiwan¹⁹,
41 might be expected to increase self-isolation rates¹⁸. In particular, this work
42 was originally undertaken in response to a question from policy makers ask-
43 ing whether legally mandating self-isolation for close-contacts would reduce
44 transmission rates. Furthermore there are likely to be trade-offs and de-
45 pendencies between parameters. In particular, contact tracing relies on self
46 reporting of symptoms in order to initially identify a chain of transmission
47 but introducing penalties for non-compliance to self-isolation might be ex-
48 pected to decrease the proportion of people that report themselves to the
49 system in the first instance. In general there are few direct, individual bene-
50 fits to self reporting oneself to a contact tracing system; instead the benefits
51 are communal and the drivers for self reporting are likely to be altruism or
52 social norms^{20,21}. However, there are direct costs both to the individual that
53 self reports and to their close contacts. Self-isolation is mentally difficult²²
54 and will come with economic costs for many^{20,23,24,14,25}. Legally enforcing
55 self-isolation exacerbates these costs.

56 The exact form that these trade-offs would take are difficult to know.
57 Adherence to self-isolation requirements might largely be binary with people
58 complying for the full 14 days (as requested in the UK) or not adhering
59 at all. In this case, legal enforcement would be expected to increase the
60 proportion of people that self-isolate. Alternatively, it is possible that self-
61 isolation adherence is more continuous with people adhering for a few days
62 instead of the full 14 days. Similarly, legal enforcement might be expected
63 to increase the duration of isolation. Finally, if swab tests are being self-
64 administered, people might be less careful or less willing to endure discomfort
65 if the consequences of a positive test are more severe (though this might
66 change as saliva tests are produced^{26,27}). While it is difficult to know the

67 functional effects of different levels of compliance, it is even more difficult to
68 quantify the strengths of the trade-offs. Legal enforcement might have a weak
69 effect on improving self-isolation adherence²² but a strong deterrent effect
70 on self-reporting. Alternatively, perhaps legal mandation has a strong effect
71 on self-isolation adherence without being a strong deterrent to self-reporting
72 rates. Furthermore, the shapes of these trade-offs are likely to differ in different
73 countries and social groups based on culture, trust in the government and
74 other factors. Careful quantitative and qualitative studies will need to be
75 conducted to quantify these effects.

76 Here we use a previously published branching process model^{11,6} to exam-
77 ine the effects of these trade-offs on the risk of a large outbreak of SARS-CoV-
78 2. We examine trade-offs between self-isolation duration and self-isolation
79 probability with self-reporting rates, contact information reporting probabili-
80 ties and sensitivity of home swab tests. It is important to note however that
81 we do not consider the societal costs²⁸ of legal enforcement of self-isolation;
82 we aim to quantify the benefits of these policies without considering the costs
83 noting that the costs are not easy to directly compare to the benefits.

84 2. Methods

85 In this paper we extend a previous model of SARS-CoV-2 transmission¹¹.
86 An overview of the model is given in Figure S1 while parameter values and
87 references are given in Table 1. At the individual-level, the number of po-
88 tential secondary contacts are modelled by a negative binomial distribution
89 while the exposure times of these new infections are modelled as a gamma
90 distribution. Self-isolating individuals are assumed to be unable to transmit
91 the disease (assuming isolation within households) and therefore potential
92 secondary cases are avoided if the gamma-distributed exposure time occurs
93 during self-isolation of the primary case. The timing of self-isolation depends
94 on whether the case was traced as a potential contact or not and a number
95 of factors affecting adherence as described in detail below. The model pro-
96 ceeds as a branching process with each simulation being seeded with twenty
97 untraced, infected individuals.

98 2.1. Secondary case distribution

99 The heterogeneity in the number of potential secondary cases caused by
100 an individual is modelled as a negative binomial distribution. For symp-
101 tomatic cases we use a mean value of 1.3 secondary cases while asymptomatic

Parameter	Values	Refs
Self-isolation probability	30%–90%	32
Self-reporting probability	30%–90%	
Test sensitivity	35%–65%	33,34,35
Minimum isolation duration	1–14 days	
Maximum isolation duration	7, 14 days	
Contact tracing coverage (%)	40%–80%	
Number of initial cases	20	
Symptomatic R_S under physical distancing	1.3	
Asymptomatic R_S under physical distancing	0.65	
Dispersion of R_S , k	0.16	31,11
Proportion asymptomatic	50%	36,37
Delay: onset to isolation	1 day	
Incubation period (Lognormal)	mean log: 1.43, sd log: 0.66	38
Infection time (Gamma)	shape: 2.12, rate: 0.69 day ⁻¹	38
Infection time shift	-3 days	38
Time to trace contacts (days)	1 day	
Delay: isolate to test result	1 days	

Table 1: Model parameters values/ranges. Parameters taken from the literature are fixed and for other parameters a range of values are explored.

102 cases are given a 50% lower infection rate. This relates to a scenario where
103 strong social distancing and good hygiene is still being observed. Earlier
104 work^{6,7} and preliminary analyses indicated that contact tracing is unable
105 keep the risk of an outbreak low without being paired with social distancing
106 so this is the scenario we focus on. Estimates for the dispersion parameter,
107 k , for SARS-COV-2 range from $k = 0.1$ (0.05–0.2) for pre-lockdown UK²⁹ to
108 $k = 0.25$ (0.13–0.88) for Tianjin, China during lockdown measures³⁰. Given
109 this range we have kept the parameter as used in^{11,31} setting $k = 0.16$. This
110 value of k yield a strongly skewed distribution with most individuals causing
111 zero potential secondary cases.

112 2.2. Infection profile

113 Individuals are labelled as symptomatic or asymptomatic with a proba-
114 bility of 50%^{36,37}. The onset time of symptoms is modelled as a lognormal




Figure 1: Overview of adherence in test and trace. An untraced individual must self-report and give the name and details of close contacts. The contact tracing team must then manage to contact the close contacts. The close contacts must self-isolate when asked and remain in self-isolation for the full isolation period (14 days in the UK). In some systems, the isolated individual is given a self-administered swab test which must be administered correctly. There is imperfect adherence or performance at each of these stages. In this paper we focus on trade-offs between self-report rate (stage 1) and self-isolation adherence (stages 4 and 5). We combine stages 2 and 3 into one parameter, which we call control effectiveness.

115 distribution with mean 1.43 days and sd of 0.66³⁹. All individuals, whether
116 symptomatic or asymptomatic are given a symptom onset time as the expo-
117 sure time of secondary cases is calculated relative to this time. The exposure
118 time for each new potential case is drawn from a gamma distribution with
119 shape parameter of 17.77 and a rate of 1.39 day⁻¹. This distribution is centred
120 three days before the onset of transmission³⁸. The sampled exposure
121 time is compared to the infector's exposure time and resampled if it occurs
122 before the infector was infected. If the exposure time of a potential secondary
123 case occurs during the primary case's self-isolation, the infection event does
124 not occur and the Ppotential secondary case does not become a case. These

125 distributions are shown in Figure S2.

126 *2.3. Contact tracing*

127 The first stage in the contact tracing system is an untraced, symptomatic
128 individual self-reporting themselves. The control effectiveness, i.e. the pro-
129 portion of an individual’s epidemiological contacts that are recalled, divulged
130 and successfully contacted by the contact tracing team, is varied between
131 40%–80%. If contact tracing is successful, the traced individual is asked to
132 self-isolate. We assume it takes one day to contact a contact. If a traced con-
133 tact subsequently shows symptoms or returns a positive test the next round
134 of contact tracing is initiated. That is, the contacts of the traced contact are
135 then traced.

136 *2.4. Testing*

137 As a baseline we assume that tests have a sensitivity of 65% and that
138 it takes one day for results to be returned. This reflects the sensitivity of
139 tests observed in the community^{34,33}. Given a positive test result contact
140 tracing for the tested individual is initiated. A negative test allows the tested
141 individual to be immediately released from quarantine. Any contacts of a
142 negative-testing case that were successfully identified prior to receiving the
143 test result are still isolated and tested. In a branching process model only
144 infected individuals are modelled. Therefore we do not track the number of
145 uninfected people that are unnecessarily asked to quarantine. Test specificity
146 affects the number of uninfected people asked to quarantine but does not
147 directly affect the spread of the disease and therefore we do not define a test
148 specificity. In this study we are concerned with quantifying the benefits of
149 contact tracing and do not attempt to weigh the epidemiological benefits
150 against the sociological costs.

151 *2.5. Adherence trade-offs*

152 We consider three main trade-offs. As we do not have good data to
153 define the shapes of these trade-offs we run simulations for all combinations
154 of parameters.

155 First, we assume that without policies to encourage self-isolation most
156 people attempt some self-isolation but the lack of adherence is with respect
157 to the duration of self-isolation that decreases. We keep the probability
158 of self-isolation constant at 70%. We assume that each person that does
159 self-isolate isolates for an amount of time taken from a uniform distribution

160 between a minimum and maximum value. For the maximum values we use
161 either the full 14 days currently recommended in the UK or a shorter seven
162 day maximum isolation. We vary the minimum duration of self-isolation
163 from 1 day to being equal to the maximum duration.

164 Second, we examine the trade-off between self-report probability and self-
165 isolation probability. We expect that policies that increase self-isolation prob-
166 ability will reduce self-report probability. We use values of self-isolation from
167 10% – 70% in increments of 20% and examine all combinations with self-
168 report probabilities from 10% – 70% also in increments of 20%. The upper
169 bound for self-isolation here is certainly above the rate of self-isolation cur-
170 rently being achieved in the UK. However, it is below the target rate for
171 other national contact tracing programmes³². Furthermore, the very strict
172 restrictions applied to travellers entering countries such as Singapore could
173 also be considered an upper bound on feasible policies. Many of the policies
174 used in these areas, such as enforced isolation in government run hotels, GPS
175 ankle bracelets, and daily video calls, would be considered draconian if ap-
176 plied to the population at large but could be reasonably expected to produce
177 self-isolation rates of 90%. In contrast to the first trade-off, we assume that
178 everyone that does self-isolate does so for the full maximum value of either
179 7 or 14 days.

180 Finally, we assume that policies that increase self-isolation probability will
181 decrease test sensitivity. This scenario applies to the case of home adminis-
182 tered tests. With strong incentives to test negative, people will be less likely
183 to perform swabs correctly. We therefore examine a range of test sensitivities
184 from a baseline of 65% down to 35% in increments of 10%.

185 *2.6. Simulation process*

186 Results presented are the combined output of 15,000 simulations for each
187 parameter combination, or scenario, considered. We define a simulation as
188 leading to a large outbreak if it has more than 2,000 cumulative cases or if
189 there are still infected cases after 300 days. The threshold of 2,000 cases was
190 chosen by running simulations with a maximum of 5,000 cases and noting
191 that of the simulated epidemics that went extinct, 99% of extinction events
192 occurred before reaching 2,000 cases. Nearly all simulations either went ex-
193 tinct or reached 2,000 cases with very few simulations lasting longer than
194 300 days. These simulations were then used to calculate the probability of
195 a large outbreak given a certain set of conditions. 95% Clopper-Pearson ex-
196 act confidence intervals were also calculated. The model was written in R

197 and the code and testing suite⁴⁰ is publicly available on GitHub ([https:](https://github.com/timcdlucas/ringbp/tree/adherence_tradeoff_runs)
198 [//github.com/timcdlucas/ringbp/tree/adherence_tradeoff_runs](https://github.com/timcdlucas/ringbp/tree/adherence_tradeoff_runs)).

199 3. Results

200 3.1. Trade-off between self-isolation duration against self-report probability




Figure 2: Trade-off between self isolation time (columns) and self report rate (rows) with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals. Individuals self isolate for a randomly selected duration between min isolation and 14 days. Untraced, symptomatic individuals self-report with a probability that varies across the rows. The proportion of close contacts that are divulged and asked to self-isolate varies across the x-axis of each subplot. The y-axis shows the risk of a large outbreak (greater than 2,000 cases) over 15,000 simulations. The probability that an individual self-isolates at all is fixed at 70%. If we assume we are currently near the top left we expect that introducing legal ramifications for breaking self isolation to move us down and right. This generally increases risk.

201 We find that increasing the duration of self-isolation increases the risk of
202 a large outbreak in the presence of reductions in self-reporting rates. The
203 probability of a large outbreak for all combinations of self-isolation duration
204 and self-report rates are shown in Figure 2. If we assume that we are currently
205 in the top left panel (high self report rates but isolation taken uniformly

206 between 1 and 14 days), policies that move us down and right generally
207 increase the risk of a large outbreak. For example, if we consider a control
208 effectiveness of 60%, with a self-isolation duration of between 1 and 14 days
209 and a self-report rate of 70% the risk of a large outbreak is 1%. If we increase
210 the self-isolation duration to always be 14 days but reduce the self-report rate
211 to 10%, the probability of a large outbreak increases from 1% to 6%. If the
212 trade-off is very weak, such that increasing self-isolation duration to always
213 be 14 days only decreases self-report rates to 50%, we see no change in the
214 probability of an outbreak.

215 If we assume a more pessimistic starting scenario of a self-isolation du-
216 ration of between 1 and 14 days and self-reporting rates of 10% and given a
217 control effectiveness of 60% we have a 6% risk of a large outbreak. We find
218 that increasing self-report rates gives a larger reduction in risk. Increasing
219 self-report rates from 10% to 70% reduces risk from 6% to 1%. In contrast,
220 increasing the duration of isolation to always being 14 days does not change
221 the risk of a large outbreak. We find that reducing the maximum isolation
222 duration from 14 days to 7 days consistently increases the risk of a large
223 outbreak (Figure S3–S5).

224 *3.2. Trade-off between self-isolation probability against self-report probability*

225 We find that increasing self-isolation probability while decreasing self re-
226 port probability does not strongly alter the probability of a large outbreak.
227 The probability of a large outbreak for all combinations of self-isolation rates
228 and self-report rates are shown in Figure 3. If we assume that we are cur-
229 rently in the top left panel (high self report rates but low self-isolation rates),
230 policies that increase self-isolation rates but decrease self-report rates would
231 move us down and right. However, whether this decreases the risk of an
232 outbreak depends on the strength of the trade-off. For example, if we con-
233 sider a control effectiveness of 60%, with a self-isolation rate of 10% and a
234 self-report rate of 70% the risk of a large outbreak is 6%. If we increase the
235 self-isolation rate to 70% and equivalently reduce the self-report rate to 10%,
236 the probability of a large outbreak is still 6%. If the trade-off is weak, such
237 that increasing self-isolation from 10% to 70% only incurs a reduction in self-
238 report rate to 50%, the reduction in risk of a large outbreak is substantial,
239 reducing from 6% to 1.5%. However, if the trade-off is strong, such that
240 increasing self-isolation from 10% to 30% causes a reduction in self reporting
241 rate from 70% to 10%, the risk of an outbreak instead marginally increases
242 from 6% to 7%.




Figure 3: Trade-off between self-isolation probability (columns) and self-report probability (rows) with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals. The y-axis shows the risk of a large outbreak (greater than 2,000 cases) over 15,000 simulations. If we assume we are currently near the top left we expect that introducing legal ramifications for breaking self isolation to move us down and right. Whether this decreases risk depends on the strength of the trade-off. If the trade-off is weak, such that as we move from the top left to isolation probability of 70% and self report probability of 50%, risk is reduced. In contrast, if increasing isolation probability from 10% to 30% incurs a drop in self reporting from 70% to 10%, risk does not change.

243 We could instead assume a more pessimistic starting scenario of self-
 244 isolation rates of 10% and self-reporting rates of 10%. Given a control ef-
 245 fectiveness of 60% we have a 7% risk of a large outbreak. However, from
 246 this scenario we can consider whether it is better to increase self-isolation
 247 or to increase self-reporting. Increasing self isolation probability to 70% re-
 248 duces risk to 6% and increasing self-report probability to 70% also reduces
 249 risk to 6%. Increasing both to 30% reduces risk to 5%. Overall, these two
 250 parameters are relatively evenly balanced.




Figure 4: Trade-off between self isolation probability (columns) and test sensitivity (rows) with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals. Untraced, symptomatic individuals self-report with a probability that varies across the rows. The proportion of close contacts that are divulged and asked to self-isolate varies across the x-axis of each subplot. If we assume we are currently near the top left, introducing legal ramifications for breaking self isolation might move us down and right. This generally decreases risk unless the trade off is very strong such that a small increase in isolation probability incurs a large decrease in test sensitivity.

251 3.3. Trade-off between self-isolation duration against test sensitivity

252 To model a decrease in careful administration of home swab tests, we
 253 vary the test sensitivity and isolation adherence. We find that increasing
 254 self-isolation rates decreases the risk of a large outbreak even if this occurs
 255 in combination with reductions in test sensitivity. The probability of a large
 256 outbreak for all combinations of self-isolation rate and test sensitivity are
 257 shown in Figure 4. If we assume that we are currently in the top left panel
 258 (relatively high test sensitivity but low self-isolation rates), policies that in-
 259 crease self-isolation rates but decrease test sensitivity would move us down
 260 and right and this in general yields reduced risks of a large outbreak. For
 261 example, if we consider a control effectiveness of 60%, with a self-isolation
 262 rate of 10% and a test sensitivity of 65% the risk of a large outbreak is 6%. If

263 we increase the self-isolation rate to 70% while reducing the test sensitivity
264 to 35%, the probability of a large outbreak reduces from 6% to 3%.

265 4. Discussion

266 Overall we have found that policies that increase self-isolation rates at
267 the expense of self-report rates are unlikely to improve the effectiveness of
268 contact tracing systems. If the primary trade-off is between the duration
269 of self-isolation and the probability of self-reporting, we find that policies
270 that increase self-isolation and reduce self-report rates will cause either an
271 increase or no change in the probability of a large outbreak depending on the
272 strength of the trade-off. When the primary trade-off was instead between the
273 probability of self-isolation and the rate of self report policies that increase
274 self-isolation rates and reduce self-report rates can increase or marginally
275 decrease the probability of a large outbreak depending on the strength of
276 the trade-off. Overall this implies that policies such as fines, and police
277 enforcement of self-isolation will have either little benefit or a negative effect.
278 Broadly, policies that improve self-report rates, even at the expense of self-
279 isolation rates should be used. This might include publicity that encourages
280 people to self-report by reminding them that there are no legal consequences
281 to them or their contacts for doing so.

282 Policies that improve self-report rates or self-isolation rates without an
283 associated trade-off will also improve contact tracing efficacy. For example,
284 economic support and employment protection for individuals that self-isolate
285 would be expected to improve self-isolation rates^{14,18,25} without decreasing
286 self-report rates. Similarly, efforts to communicate the reasons why people
287 should self-report and self-isolate may improve both of these rates simulta-
288 neously^{18,25}.

289 One of the core assumptions to this work is that legal consequences for
290 breaking self-isolation would improve self-isolation rates. However, the evi-
291 dence for this is not strong and there is evidence that feelings of shame do not
292 promote adherence^{21,25}. In contrast there is good evidence that other factors
293 such as income and boredom⁴¹ do affect self-isolation rates. How effectively
294 legal consequences for breaking self-isolation can increase self-isolation rates
295 is a complex question that will depend on cultural norms, perceived enfor-
296 cability, and the strength of economic and psychological consequences for
297 self-isolation. An important consequence of this is that self-isolation rates
298 and the effectiveness of policies aimed to improve these rates will be strongly
299 correlated such that individuals that are most likely to infect each other are
300 also likely to have similar self-isolation rates. This is not included in our
301 model but has the potential to strongly reduce contact tracing efficacy in

302 certain groups and locations.

303 With regards to test sensitivity, our results are relevant only to self-
304 administered swab-tests. Swab-tests may be replaced with reliable paper-
305 based tests. Given that we found that optimising self-isolation rates over
306 test-sensitivity minimises risk, other considerations such as test timing and
307 access are probably more important. Furthermore, currently in the UK,
308 traced contacts are not allowed out of quarantine after a negative test so the
309 system is more robust to low test sensitivity than in our simulations.

310 Here we have focused solely on the probability of a large outbreak as a
311 consequence of policy change. However, there are other costs and benefits to
312 changing values of self-report rates and self-isolation rates. High self-report
313 rates not only improves contact tracing efficacy directly, it also creates a more
314 effective system for measuring the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 in the commu-
315 nity. This gives better early warning for when an outbreak is beginning in
316 an area or group and allows for health care resources to be deployed more
317 efficiently. In contrast, self-isolation comes with many economic and social
318 costs both for the individual and the community. Avoiding strict penalties
319 for breaking self-isolation allows those most affected by these costs to self-
320 isolate less and may increase buy-in to the system as a whole. Furthermore,
321 enforcement of self-isolation policies are an infringement on a basic liberty.
322 While we have not tried to compare these costs to the epidemiological bene-
323 fits, they must always be taken into account when implementing policy.

324 **5. CRediT contribution statement**

325 Conceptualisation: All authors

326 Formal Analysis: ELD, TCDL

327 Funding acquisition: TDH

328 Investigation: ELD, TCDL, AB, LP, DA, TC, LY

329 Methodology: ELD, TCDL

330 Software: ELD, TCDL

331 Visualization: ELD, TCDL, LY

332 Writing – original draft: ELD, TCDL

333 Writing – review & editing: All authors

334 **6. Declaration of competing interest**

335 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial inter-
336 ests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work
337 reported in this paper.

338 **7. Acknowledgments & funding sources**

339 ELD, TCDL, AB, DA, LP, GFM & TDH gratefully acknowledge funding
340 of the NTD Modelling Consortium by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
341 (BMGF) (grant number OPP1184344). The following funding sources are
342 acknowledged as providing funding for the named authors. This research
343 was partly funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (NTD Modelling
344 Consortium OPP1184344: GFM). This project has received funding from the
345 European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme - project
346 EpiPose (101003688: PK). Royal Society (RP/EA/180004: PK). Wellcome
347 Trust (210758/Z/18/Z: JH, SA). Views, opinions, assumptions or any other
348 information set out in this article should not be attributed to BMGF or any
349 person connected with them. TC is funded by a Sir Henry Wellcome Fellow-
350 ship from the Wellcome Trust (reference 215919/Z/19/Z). Lucy Yardley is an
351 NIHR Senior Investigator and her research programme is partly supported
352 by NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC)-West, NIHR Health Pro-
353 tection Research Unit (HPRU) for Behavioural Science and Evaluation, and
354 the NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) All funders had
355 no role in the study design, collection, analysis, interpretation of data, writ-
356 ing of the report, or decision to submit the manuscript for publication. This

357 work was undertaken as a contribution to the Rapid Assistance in Modelling
358 the Pandemic (RAMP) initiative, coordinated by the Royal Society.

359 References

- 360 [1] South China Morning Post, Coronavirus: China's first confirmed
361 Covid-19 case traced back to November 17 [Accessed 2nd June; URL:
362 [https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3074991/coronavirus-](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3074991/coronavirus-chinas-first-confirmed-covid-19-case-traced-back)
363 [chinas-first-confirmed-covid-19-case-traced-back](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3074991/coronavirus-chinas-first-confirmed-covid-19-case-traced-back)], 2020.
- 364 [2] M. Roser, H. Ritchie, E. Ortiz-Ospina, J. Hasell, Coronavirus Pandemic
365 (COVID-19), <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-deaths>, 2020. Ac-
366 cessed: 2020-08-10.
- 367 [3] Coronavirus: Strict new curbs on life in UK announced by PM , [https:](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-52012432)
368 [//www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-52012432](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-52012432), 2020. Accessed: 2020-06-27.
- 369 [4] GDP monthly estimate, UK: April 2020, [https://www.](https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/grossdomesticproductgdp/bulletins/gdpmonthlyestimateuk/april2020)
370 [ons.gov.uk/economy/grossdomesticproductgdp/bulletins/](https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/grossdomesticproductgdp/bulletins/gdpmonthlyestimateuk/april2020)
371 [gdpmonthlyestimateuk/april2020](https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/grossdomesticproductgdp/bulletins/gdpmonthlyestimateuk/april2020), 2020. Accessed: 2020-06-27.
- 372 [5] A. Aleta, D. Martín-Corral, A. P. y Piontti, M. Ajelli, M. Litvinova,
373 M. Chinazzi, N. E. Dean, M. E. Halloran, I. M. Longini Jr, S. Mer-
374 ller, et al., Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and house-
375 hold quarantine on second waves of covid-19, *Nature Human Behaviour*
376 (2020) 1–8.
- 377 [6] E. L. Davis, T. C. Lucas, A. Borlase, T. M. Pollington, S. Abbott,
378 D. Ayabina, T. Crellen, J. Hellewell, L. Pi, G. F. Medley, et al., An im-
379 perfect tool: Covid-19'test & trace'success relies on minimising the im-
380 pact of false negatives and continuation of physical distancing., *medRxiv*
381 (2020).
- 382 [7] M. E. Kretzschmar, G. Rozhnova, M. C. Bootsma, M. van Boven, J. H.
383 van de Wijkstra, M. J. Bonten, Impact of delays on effectiveness of
384 contact tracing strategies for covid-19: a modelling study, *The Lancet*
385 *Public Health* (2020).
- 386 [8] S. M. Le, Containing the coronavirus (COVID-19): Lessons
387 from Vietnam, <https://blogs.worldbank.org/health/>

- 388 containing-coronavirus-covid-19-lessons-vietnam, 2020. Ac-
389 cessed: 2020-06-03.
- 390 [9] S. Park, G. J. Choi, H. Ko, Information technology-based tracing strat-
391 egy in response to covid-19 in south korea—privacy controversies, *Jama*
392 (2020).
- 393 [10] L. Ferretti, C. Wymant, M. Kendall, L. Zhao, A. Nurtay, L. Abeler-
394 Dörner, M. Parker, D. Bonsall, C. Fraser, Quantifying SARS-CoV-
395 2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing,
396 *Science* 368 (2020).
- 397 [11] J. Hellewell, S. Abbott, A. Gimma, N. I. Bosse, C. I. Jarvis, T. W.
398 Russell, J. D. Munday, A. J. Kucharski, W. J. Edmunds, F. Sun, et al.,
399 Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and
400 contacts, *The Lancet Global Health* (2020).
- 401 [12] S. BeidasRinad, M. BottenheimAlison, S. KilaruAustin, A. AschDavid,
402 G. VolppKevin, G. LawmanHannah, C. CannuscioCarolyn, et al., Opti-
403 mizing and implementing contact tracing through behavioral economics,
404 *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery* (2020).
- 405 [13] L. E. Smith, R. Amlôt, H. Lambert, I. Oliver, C. Robin, L. Yardley,
406 G. J. Rubin, Factors associated with adherence to self-isolation and
407 lockdown measures in the uk; a cross-sectional survey, *medRxiv* (2020).
- 408 [14] M. Bodas, K. Peleg, Self-isolation compliance in the covid-19 era influ-
409 enced by compensation: Findings from a recent survey in israel: Public
410 attitudes toward the covid-19 outbreak and self-isolation: a cross sec-
411 tional study of the adult population of israel, *Health Affairs* 39 (2020)
412 936–941.
- 413 [15] C. P. Seaman, L. T. T. Tran, B. J. Cowling, S. G. Sullivan, Self-collected
414 compared with professional-collected swabbing in the diagnosis of in-
415 fluenza in symptomatic individuals: A meta-analysis and assessment of
416 validity, *Journal Of clinical virology* 118 (2019) 28–35.
- 417 [16] N. Dhiman, R. M. Miller, J. L. Finley, M. D. Sztajnkrzyer, D. M. Nestler,
418 A. J. Boggust, S. M. Jenkins, T. F. Smith, J. W. Wilson, F. R. Cock-
419 erill III, et al., Effectiveness of patient-collected swabs for influenza
420 testing, in: *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, volume 87, Elsevier, pp. 548–554.

- 421 [17] Weekly NHS Test and Trace bulletin, England: 11 to 17
422 June 2020, [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/
423 nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-11-june-to-17-june-2020/
424 weekly-nhs-test-and-trace-bulletin-england-11-to-17-june-2020#
425 fn:1](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-11-june-to-17-june-2020/weekly-nhs-test-and-trace-bulletin-england-11-to-17-june-2020#fn:1), 2020. Accessed: 2020-06-27.
- 426 [18] S. Michie, R. West, M. B. Rogers, C. Bonell, G. J. Rubin, R. Amlôt,
427 Reducing sars-cov-2 transmission in the uk: A behavioural science ap-
428 proach to identifying options for increasing adherence to social distanc-
429 ing and shielding vulnerable people, *British Journal of Health Psychol-
430 ogy* (2020).
- 431 [19] S.-C. Chung, S. Marlow, N. Tobias, I. Alogna, A. Alogna, S.-L. You, A
432 rapid systematic review and case study on test, contact tracing, testing,
433 and isolation policies for covid-19 prevention and control, *medRxiv*
434 (2020).
- 435 [20] N. M. Baum, P. D. Jacobson, S. D. Goold, “listen to the people”:
436 public deliberation about social distancing measures in a pandemic, *The
437 American Journal of Bioethics* 9 (2009) 4–14.
- 438 [21] G. A. Travaglino, C. Moon, Explaining compliance with social distanc-
439 ing norms during the covid-19 pandemic: The roles of cultural orienta-
440 tions, trust and self-conscious emotions in the us, italy, and south korea
441 (2020).
- 442 [22] C. DiGiovanni, J. Conley, D. Chiu, J. Zaborski, Factors influencing
443 compliance with quarantine in toronto during the 2003 sars outbreak,
444 *Biosecurity and bioterrorism: biodefense strategy, practice, and science*
445 2 (2004) 265–272.
- 446 [23] K. D. Blake, R. J. Blendon, K. Viswanath, Employment and compli-
447 ance with pandemic influenza mitigation recommendations, *Emerging
448 infectious diseases* 16 (2010) 212.
- 449 [24] J. A. Horney, Z. Moore, M. Davis, P. D. MacDonald, Intent to receive
450 pandemic influenza a (h1n1) vaccine, compliance with social distancing
451 and sources of information in nc, 2009, *PLoS One* 5 (2010) e11226.
- 452 [25] R. F. Baggaley, A. Ben, L. Chappell, E. Davis, C. Dye, R. Eggo,
453 L. Fearon, M. Fyles, K. Hampson, A. Menon-Johansson, J. Meyrick,

- 454 D. Mollison, J. Nicholls, M. Pareek, L. Pellis, G. S. Tomba, C. Trotter,
455 K. Turner, C. Webb, L. Yardley, T. D. Hollingsworth, J. Gog, Recom-
456 mendations for augmenting contact tracing in the UK: Learning from
457 other diseases, Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences (2020).
458 Accessed: 2020-08-18.
- 459 [26] A. L. Wyllie, J. Fournier, A. Casanovas-Massana, M. Campbell,
460 M. Tokuyama, P. Vijayakumar, B. Geng, M. C. Muenker, A. J. Moore,
461 C. B. Vogels, et al., Saliva is more sensitive for sars-cov-2 detection in
462 covid-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs, Medrxiv (2020).
- 463 [27] C. B. Vogels, D. Brackney, J. Wang, C. C. Kalinich, I. Ott, E. Kudo,
464 P. Lu, A. Venkataraman, M. Tokuyama, A. J. Moore, et al., Salivadirect:
465 Simple and sensitive molecular diagnostic test for sars-cov-2 surveillance,
466 medRxiv (2020).
- 467 [28] U. Schuklenk, K. M. Gartland, Confronting an influenza pandemic: eth-
468 ical and scientific issues, 2006.
- 469 [29] A. Endo, S. Abbott, A. J. Kucharski, S. Funk, et al., Estimating the
470 overdispersion in COVID-19 transmission using outbreak sizes outside
471 China, Wellcome Open Research 5 (2020) 67.
- 472 [30] Y. Zhang, Y. Li, L. Wang, M. Li, X. Zhou, Evaluating transmission
473 heterogeneity and super-spreading event of COVID-19 in a metropolis
474 of China, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
475 Health (2020) 3705.
- 476 [31] J. O. Lloyd-Smith, S. J. Schreiber, P. E. Kopp, W. M. Getz, Super-
477 spreading and the effect of individual variation on disease emergence,
478 Nature 438 (2005) 355–359.
- 479 [32] A. Verrall, Rapid audit of contact tracing for covid-19 in new zealand,
480 Ministry of Health 310 (2020).
- 481 [33] L. M. Kucirka, S. A. Lauer, O. Laeyendecker, D. Boon, J. Lessler, Vari-
482 ation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain
483 reaction–based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure, Annals of
484 Internal Medicine (2020).

- 485 [34] C. Menni, A. M. Valdes, M. B. Freidin, C. H. Sudre, L. H. Nguyen, D. A.
486 Drew, S. Ganesh, T. Varsavsky, M. J. Cardoso, J. S. E.-S. Moustafa,
487 et al., Real-time tracking of self-reported symptoms to predict potential
488 COVID-19, *Nature Medicine* (2020) 1–4.
- 489 [35] P. van Kasteren, B. van der Veer, S. van den Brink, L. Wijsman,
490 J. de Jonge, A. van den Brandt, R. Molenkamp, C. Reusken, A. Meijer,
491 Comparison of seven commercial RT-PCR diagnostic kits for COVID-
492 19, *Journal of Clinical Virology* 128 (2020).
- 493 [36] K. Mizumoto, K. Kagaya, A. Zarebski, G. Chowell, Estimating the
494 asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases
495 on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020,
496 *Eurosurveillance* 25 (2020) 2000180.
- 497 [37] E. Lavezzo, E. Franchin, C. Ciavarella, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, L. Bar-
498 zon, C. Del Vecchio, L. Rossi, R. Manganeli, A. Loregian, N. Navarin,
499 et al., Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo,
500 Italy, *medRxiv* (2020).
- 501 [38] X. He, E. H. Lau, P. Wu, X. Deng, J. Wang, X. Hao, Y. C. Lau, J. Y.
502 Wong, Y. Guan, X. Tan, et al., Temporal dynamics in viral shedding
503 and transmissibility of COVID-19, *Nature Medicine* (2020) 1–4.
- 504 [39] Q. Li, X. Guan, P. Wu, X. Wang, L. Zhou, Y. Tong, R. Ren, K. S.
505 Leung, E. H. Lau, J. Y. Wong, et al., Early transmission dynamics in
506 Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia, *New England*
507 *Journal of Medicine* (2020).
- 508 [40] T. C. D. Lucas, T. M. Polling, E. L. Davis, T. D. Hollingsworth, Re-
509 sponsible modelling: Unit testing for infectious disease epidemiology,
510 *medRxiv* (2020).
- 511 [41] W. Wolff, C. S. Martarelli, J. Schüler, M. Bieleke, High boredom prone-
512 ness and low trait self-control impair adherence to social distancing
513 guidelines during the covid-19 pandemic, *International Journal of En-
514 vironmental Research and Public Health* 17 (2020) 5420.

515 **8. Supplementary material**




Figure S1: Overview of the contact tracing process implemented in our model. **Person A** isolates and self-reports to the contact tracing programme with some delay after symptom onset, by which time they have infected Persons B and C. When Person A self-reports contact tracing is initiated. They are then tested with positive result and remain isolated for their infectious period. **Person B** was infected by A prior to their symptom onset and is detected by tracing after some delay, after infecting Person D. After isolating they are tested, with a false negative result. This leads to B either a) stopping isolation immediately or b) finishing a minimum 7 day isolation period. Both may allow new onward transmission. **Person C** was infected by A but not traced as a contact. Person C does not develop symptoms but is infectious, leading to missed transmission. **Person D** was traced and tested before the false negative test was returned for Person B. The test for D returns positive, meaning that D remains isolated, halting this chain of transmission.




Figure S2: Distributions for a) incubation period (exposure time to symptom onset) from Li et al.³⁹; b) transmission profile relative to symptom onset, fitted to data and compared to He et al.³⁸; c) serial interval, fitted and compared to He et al.³⁸; and d) generation interval, combined distribution from a) and b) with re-sampling to prevent negative serial intervals, as described in the main text.




Figure S3: Trade-off between self isolation time (columns) and self report rate (rows) with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals. Individuals self isolate for a randomly selected duration between min isolation 4 and 14 days. Untraced, symptomatic individuals self-report with a probability that varies across the rows. The proportion of close contacts that are divulged and asked to self-isolate varies across the x-axis of each subplot. Self isolation probability is fixed at 70%. If we assume we are currently near the top left we expect that introducing legal ramifications for breaking self isolation to move us down and right. This generally increases risk.




Figure S4: Trade-off between self isolation probability (columns) and self report (rows) with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals. If we assume we are currently near the top left we expect that introducing legal ramifications for breaking self isolation to move us down and right. Whether this decreases risk depends on the strength of the trade-off.




Figure S5: Trade-off between self isolation time (columns) and self report rate (rows) with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals. Individuals self isolate for a randomly selected duration between min isolation4 and 14 days. Untraced, symptomatic individuals self-report with a probability that varies across the rows. The proportion of close contacts that are divulged and asked to self-isolate varies across the x-axis of each subplot. Self isolation probability is fixed at 70%. If we assume we are currently near the top left we expect that introducing legal ramifications for breaking self isolation to move us down and right. This generally increases risk.