### Adaptive sentinel testing in workplace for COVID-19 pandemic

Yi Li<sup>1</sup>, Mandy Chen<sup>1</sup>, Joshy George<sup>1</sup>, Edison T. Liu<sup>1</sup>, R. Krishna Murthy Karuturi<sup>1,#</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Jackson Laboratory, Farmington, CT 06032, USA. <sup>#</sup>Correspondance to be addressed to: Krishna.Karuturi@Jax.Org

Abstract. Testing and isolation of infectious employees is one of the critical strategies to make the workplace safe during the pandemic for many organizations. Adaptive testing frequency reduces cost while keeping the pandemic under control at the workplace. However, most models aimed at estimating test frequencies were structured for municipalities or large organizations such as university campuses of highly mobile individuals. By contrast, the workplace exhibits distinct characteristics: employee positivity rate may be different from the local community because of rigorous protective measures at workplace, or self-selection of co-workers with common behavioral tendencies for adherence to pandemic mitigation guidelines. Moreover, dual exposure to COVID19 occurs at work and home that complicates transmission modelling, as does transmission tracing at the workplace. Hence, we developed bi-modal SEIR model and R-shiny tool that accounts for these differentiating factors to adaptively estimate the testing frequency for workplace. Our tool uses easily measurable parameters: community incidence rate, risks of acquiring infection from community and workplace, workforce size, and sensitivity of testing. Our model is best suited for moderate-sized organizations with low internal transmission rates, no-outward facing employees whose position demands frequent in-person interactions with the public, and low to medium population positivity rates. Simulations revealed that employee behavior in adherence to protective measures at work and in their community, and the onsite workforce size have large effects on testing frequency. Reducing workplace transmission rate through workplace mitigation protocols and higher sensitivity of the test deployed, though to a lesser extent. Furthermore, our simulations showed that sentinel testing leads to only marginal increase in the number of infections even for high community incidence rates, suggesting that this may be a cost-effective approach in future pandemics. We used our model to accurately guide testing regimen for three campuses of The Jackson Laboratory.

Keywords: COVID19, Pandemic, SEIR, Infection Rates, Testing Frequency

#### 1 Introduction

The Jackson Laboratory (JAX) is a free-standing not-for-profit genetics research institute of ~2,800 employees distributed in three major campuses in Maine, California, and Connecticut. JAX is unique in that it is a hybrid of a pure academic research institution,

and a production unit providing mice and services to universities and pharmaceutical

companies. In Mar'2020, the pandemic was gripping the world and lockdowns were being announced throughout the USA. Following the guidelines of the respective state governments, all three campuses of JAX were shut down. The immediate measures to reopen Jax campuses were reducing the onsite workforce size, requiring social distancing and mask-wearing as guided by CDC, and importantly, employee testing to identify and isolate infectious staff from the workplace and thereby minimizing consequential infections. When JAX initiated universal screening for COVID-19 infection to identify asymptomatic viral shedders, there was a vigorous debate as to how frequently should the workforce be tested. It was recognized that testing frequency has not only major cost implications and disruption of work processes, but also social consequences because of the reluctance of some members of the workforce to the discomfort of frequent testing. Using population modeling approaches, it had been recommended that the optimal testing frequency in a university setting should be every 3 days. Earlier in the pandemic, this was neither financially nor logistically feasible for a distributed workforce as for JAX. Moreover, the work environment in an institution that has production and service in addition to lab-based biomedical research is significantly different from a university comprising tens of thousands of young students who are highly mobile during the day and evening.

Therefore, we decided to develop an algorithmic approach to dynamically determine the optimal testing frequency that takes JAX's employee behavior characteristics into account. As an experimental probe, the testing was initiated at weekly intervals to obtain baseline information on our three geographical sites, California, Maine, and Connecticut. Upon investigation, we found that population (community) positivity rates and employee sizes at each campus contributed to the very different incidences of positives at different campuses. In addition, the positivity rates among JAX employees were significantly lower than the population positivity rate in each of the respective state of the campus. We hypothesized that the demographics of JAX staff and an effective COVID19 education program at Jax led to behaviors that lowered exposure of JAX employees and their families to COVID19 resulting in lower positivity rates among JAX staff as compared to the local community rates. Another important characteristic of workplace spread of COVID19 is that the employees of an organization are exposed to COVID19 both at the workplace and at social setting when they return home. The exposure would depend on a variety of factors including masking and social distancing regulations at work, idiosyncratic employee behavior in personal social settings, and exposure potential of the employee's family. Given that although these parameters change across campuses and over time, the trends were consistent for each worksite. Therefore, we wanted to have an adaptive testing program so that would take account of the consistent patterns we observed at each state site, and project the minimal testing frequency for optimal cost and health effects for the workforce.

Compartmental models [1-2,15], especially the variants of SEIR models [3-8,15], have been shown to be effective at estimating trends of epidemics. For dynamic populations, the floating population models or multi-group models [9-12] have been proposed in the literature. They are effective at capturing trends of an epidemic due to within-group spread as well as exposure to a few distinct homogeneous groups. The goal typically is to estimate trends in each homogeneous group and guide policies such

> as travel and closure. Though the multi-group compartmental models have been shown to be effective at estimating trends of the epidemic when multiple groups interact such as incorporating floating population, they are complex and do not control for the average rate of transmission of infection from an infectious employee nor account for specific characteristics of a workplace with limited populations (between 500-5000) and employees who are not outward-facing (i.e. whose job is direct contact with the general public). Therefore, workplace modeling is different from multi-group modeling in several ways including the goal, and the population, population flow, the parameters to be measured, and interventions to be deployed. The goal of the workplace model is to estimate the minimal testing frequency required to achieve stringent control of the number of infections at the workplace to be below a pre-chosen threshold, rather than just flattening the curve. Unlike multi-group models, there is no  $j^{th}$  cluster in the workplace model. Staff come to work from home, interact at the workplace and return to their homegroup; thus, they constitute a fixed sample of a group that acts as carriers of external infections to the workplace and carriers of workplace infections back to their homegroup. The workplace model needs to control a few well defined and controllable factors such as interaction among employees (e.g., masking, population size at work, social distancing), contact tracing, testing, and quarantining. Hence, a workplace model must account for exposure in the home group as well as at work while accounting for the workplace measures and community (aka population) parameters. Separate workplace modeling can help quantify the impact of workplace measures (e.g., testing, mask, social distancing, etc) on the transmission of infection and should be used in the modeling along with the population (home group) parameters such as community positivity rate and exposure rates. The dynamic nature of these population parameters can easily be accounted for through public sources and testing frequency estimates be adjusted. Assessing workforce COVID rates also helps adjust the impact of population positivity rates since employee exposure in outside social settings will be strongly affected by adherence to regulations governing the homegroup and to personal risk tolerances.

> To accomplish this, we developed a *bi-modal SEIR (bSEIR) model* to model COVID19 incidence & transmission at workplace and developed an R-shiny based tool to estimate the optimal testing frequency of employees to control the number of active cases at workplace. The model is based on the number of onsite employees, population positivity rate in the respective county, the quantified relative risk of infection assuming exposure of employees to COVID19 outside the workplace (using a Hazard ratio or HR), empirical internal transmission rate through contact tracing efforts in the workplace, and sensitivity of testing. Given the recent waves of vaccinations and their varying vaccine efficacy rates, our model was adjusted to account for it. The tool allows modeling testing frequency for sentinel or cohort testing. This is a stratagem where a fixed proportion of workers would be tested at a particular time interval until the entire cohort has been tested. In our bSEIR modeling, we assume that the population risk of all employees be homogeneous as most onsite employees live typically within commutable distance from the workplace. We also assume that the interaction among the workers is limited only to the workplace i.e., infectious employees may infect their colleagues only at workplace even though some workers will have social interactions outside the workplace.

Our *bi-modal SEIR* (bSEIR) model allows simple modeling of dual exposure (within the workplace and at home)-and testing frequency by accounting for easily measurable community and workplace parameters of epidemic incidence and transmission. The simulations show the importance of employee education and support to minimize their exposure outside the workplace in reducing the testing frequency required. Furthermore, sentinel testing, a logistically feasible testing paradigm, was evaluated and shown that it only marginally (2-6%) increases the total number of infections over a 3-month period. In addition, our simulations show that a moderate vaccination rate of 40-60% among employees coupled with reduced population positivity rates would have a multifold reduction in testing frequency requirements. Employee testing may not be required at very low population positivity rates if employees continued to exercise caution in social settings. We used our tool to generate weekly reports to forecast the expected numbers of infections and to recommend testing frequency for each campus of The Jackson Laboratory. Overall, our model helped our organization to minimize the cost of testing while controlling the epidemic at our workplace.

#### 2 Methods



**Figure 1**: Modeling the pandemic: (top) SEIR model for the closed community, and (bottom) bi-modal SEIR model for the workplace (open system) -  $\beta$ 1 and  $\beta$ 2 are conversion rates from S to E due to exposure work and at home group respectively.

#### 2.1 SEIR model for a closed community

SEIR (Susceptible, Exposed, Infectious and Removed) model [3-8] (Figure 1, top panel) is best suited to model pandemics in a closed community. As per an SEIR model, the community members belong to one of the four compartments: Susceptible (S) compartment where a subset of the community is not immune and not exposed to the virus in the current cycle, Exposed (E) compartment where another subset of members are infected with the virus but are not infectious yet, Infectious (I) compartment where infected members are infected and recovered from the infection (and become immune to the virus in this article) or succumbed to the infection. Assume N is the total number of people in the community, S, E, I, R are the number of people in the four compartments respectively at time t i.e., S+E+I+R = N.  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$  are the conversion rates from compartments so that and birth of the total number of the total to the total number of the total number of the total to the total number of people in the four compartments from the total number of people in the four compartments from the total number of people in the total number of people in

5

rates. The dynamics of the fraction of people in the four compartments are specified in the following system of differential equations and can be solved in a closed form under certain conditions [15].

$$egin{aligned} rac{dS}{dt} &= \Lambda N - \mu S - rac{eta IS}{N} \ rac{dE}{dt} &= rac{eta IS}{N} - (\mu + a)E \ rac{dI}{dt} &= aE - (\gamma + \mu)I \ rac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma I - \mu R. \end{aligned}$$

The conversion rates,  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , are determined by the model parameters (Tables 1 and 2 along with the Equation 1). For example,  $\beta$ , the conversion rate from S to E compartment, is determined by the average number of members an infectious member can infect during his/her infectious period within the community;  $\alpha$ , the conversion rate from E to I compartment is determined by the average length of the latent period (LP) of the virus;  $\gamma$ , the conversion rate from I to R compartment is determined by the average number of days from being infectious to symptom manifestation (Pre) or when a person is tested positive and hence is isolated.

Parameter	Description	Default value
p1	the proportion of asymptomatic cases in SARS-	
	CoV-2 cases	0.5
LP	SARS-CoV-2 virus latent period (days)	3
Pre	average no. of days being infectious before	
	symptoms onset	4
Total	average no. of days an infectious person remains	
	infectious	14
C	no of employees an infectious employee can in-	
	fect in a workforce	1

Table 1: Parameters characterizing the spread of the pandemic

 $\beta 1 = C*0.05249$  $\alpha = 1/LP$ 

 $\gamma = 1/Pre$  for symptomatic cases and

=  $1/test_freq$  for asymptomatic cases (see algorithm for the details)  $\mu$  (normal death rate) = 0

 $\Lambda$  (birth rate) = 0

Equation 1: Computing SEIR conversion parameters

#### 2.2 bi-modal SEIR (bSEIR) to model dual exposure open group

The SEIR model is applicable only to a closed community where a certain number of infected members are present at the beginning of a simulation, and SEIR models the trajectory of number of infections within this closed community. However, members

> (employees) of a typical workplace are exposed to COVID19 both within and outside the workplace on daily basis. Therefore, we extended the SEIR model to this setting (bSEIR model in Figure 1, the bottom panel) where susceptible employees are exposed both within (with the rate of  $\beta$ 1) and outside (with the rate of  $\beta$ 2) the workplace every day. The internal exposure rate,  $\beta$ 1, depends on a workplace's extant of pandemic and the protective measures adopted. The external exposure rate,  $\beta$ 2, is determined by the probability of exposure to the community infections (hazard ratio or HR) and the local community or population positivity rate (P). The HR is estimated based on the empirical test data from the workplace, described in the following subsection. The *bSEIR* model accounts for the infections of employees from their home community as daily incoming waves of infections, followed by conversions from E to I and I to R as in an open community model. The *bSEIR* model is aimed at controlling the average number of employees in I, typically to be under 1 in our case, in small to moderate-sized organizations

> We account for both symptomatic and asymptomatic types of COVID19 positive cases present in a workforce with a pre-specified proportion. We assume that asymptomatic positive cases are isolated upon being tested positive; while symptomatic cases are isolated upon symptom onset or tested positive before the symptoms manifest, whichever is earlier. The employees traced to be in close contact with COVID19 positive employees will be quarantined upon the identification of both types of cases. We also assume that the test can only detect infectious cases (with a specified sensitivity and specificity) but not all infected cases, and the infectiousness is uniformly distributed over the infectious period for both types of COVID19 positive cases. The assumptions are summarized in Table 3.

We implemented our *bSEIR* model using the deterministic implementation of the SEIR model in [2]. A user set parameter is available to control the number of infectious employees that can be tolerated throughout the staggered testing period in our online tool. The default values of the parameters of the progression of infection and occurrence of symptoms are obtained from [1]. The tool can recommend the minimal daily test proportion that satisfies the requirement of this parameter. The parameters along with their explanation and default values are given in Table 2. The assumptions of bSEIR model and their impact is explained in Table 3.

Parameter	Description	default value	comments
С	no of employees, an	1	depends on the pro-
	infectious employee		tective measures in
	can infect in a work-		the organization
	force		
Posrate	no of positive cases	daily positivity	
(Positivity	per 1000 tested in the	rate in the corre-	
rate)	local community	sponding state or	
		county	

HR (Hazard Ratio)	probability of expo- sure to the infections in the local commu- nity outside the work- place	0.2	empirically esti- mated using test data. (see methods)
Ι	no of infectious em- ployees that are toler- ated at a workforce	1	To be adjusted based on the organ- ization characteris- tics (e.g. # of em- ployees, nature of work, testing and social distancing measures) and pop- ulation parameters, and feasibility
Ν	no of employees on- site	workplace spe- cific	
unit	time unit	week	Either week or day
contact- TracingEff	proportion of close contacts of a positive case that can be traced	0	We set it to 0 for a conservative esti- mate and due to low internal transmis- sion rate
sens	test sensitivity	0.95	This should be ad- justed based on the testing kits used.
spe	test specificity	1	This should be ad- justed based on the testing kits used.

**Table 2**: Parameters in the *bSEIR* model. Choice or calculation of their values is addressed in Methods

Assumption	Impact	Range of parameters	
COVID19 tests are pos-	Results in false negatives,	Test sensitivity= 0.5 to	
itive for infectious staff	will miss those in E, but not	0.95. Our default value is	
only.	infectious.	0.95 if PCR testing is used	
Asymptomatic staff are	There is a delay between	Assuming there is no de-	
identified by positive	being tested and being	lay between a positive test	
test results and are quar-	quarantined. They could	result and quarantining.	
antined immediately	spread during this period.	- •	

	-	
symptomatic employees are identified either by symptoms or testing	no of days being infectious before symptoms onset var- ies among employees. Only the average period is ac- counted for in the model.	Mean number of days: 4 User can change this pa- rameter from 3 to 7
Fixed proportion of asymptomatic and symptomatic positive cases	Affects how people in I compartment move to R compartment	Default value: 0.5 User can change this pa- rameter from 0 to 1
Employees catch the vi- rus 1) exposure to local population, 2) by col- leagues at workplace	Resulted in bSEIR model. It doesn't account for varia- tion among employees. Only averages are ac- counted for.	Three major parameters of bSEIR model are :1) pos- rate, 2) HR, and 3) C. pos- rate is projected for a fu- ture week based on histor- ical data and HR is esti- mated using empirical data.
tests negative while be- ing healthy or while in- cubating the virus (in- fected, not infectious yet)	It provides a conservative estimate of testing fre- quency.	The incubation parameter can be adjusted by the user. The default value is 3
Infectiousness is uni- formly distributed over the infectious period, and assumed to be the same for symptomatic and asymptomatic cases	This leads to higher-than- required testing frequency as infectiousness tappers off over the course of infec- tion.	This can be handled by the user settable parameter <i>to-tal</i> . The default value is 14
Infection independence. Any two infectious em- ployees infect a non- overlapping set of em- ployees at the work- place	If this assumption is vio- lated, the model estimates a higher number of infections than actual, leading to higher-than-required test- ing frequency	The internal transmission rate can be adjusted based on the tracking data at the workplace.
Low internal transmis- sion rate. Assumes good protective measures: so- cial distancing and masking are effectively imposed.	If the internal transmission rate goes higher, the inde- pendent infection assump- tions will be violated and lead to a higher-than-re- quired testing frequency.	The parameter C can be adjusted to account for the deviations from this as- sumption.
Employees are either fully onsite or fully off- site. All partial onsite employees are	Leads to higher-than-re- quired testing frequency.	An organization can deal with it either by adjusting the effective number of employees by weighing

	٢	2
	L	
	-	
	-	,

accounted as fully on- site for the modeling purposes and the model- ing is performed only for on-site employees.		each employee propor- tional to their onsite time.
Infected employees won't be reinfected within the period moni- tored	Leads to lower-than-re- quired testing frequency.	Users can keep the number of employees at the same level as the number of on- site employees at any time thus getting a conservative estimate of testing fre- quency.
The workforce is not outward facing	The outward-facing work- force may have a higher chance of being infected e.g., sales staff in grocery stores and healthcare staff. It can lead to higher HR and violating the independence assumptions.	The user can set HR to an appropriate level as data emerges with a good con- tact tracing. Our model can estimate HR based on observed data on infec- tions and internal trans- mission rates.

Table 3: Assumptions of Bi-modal SEIR model.

#### **bSEIR** Algorithm

Let us assume the following:

*SEIR(·)*: is an R function in the R package *EpiDynamics* [13] to estimate the fraction of employees in compartments S, E, I, and R at next day given the conversion rates *prop*: proportion of employees that are tested every day

 $\gamma_l$  (conversion rate from I to R for asymptomatic cases) = prop\*sens + (l-prop\*sens)/total

 $\gamma_2$  (conversion rate from I to R for symptomatic cases) = prop\*sens + (1-prop\*sens)/PreD: number of days to estimate the fractions

bSEIR ()

let  $\beta 2 = posrate \times LP \times HR$ for *t* in 1:D, do the following let *s*<sub>*t*-1</sub>, *e*<sub>*t*-1</sub>, *t*<sub>*t*-1</sub> be the fraction of employees in compartments *S*, *E*, *I*, *R* at day *t*-1 respectively let *a*<sub>*s*-</sub> *a*<sub>*t*-</sub> *a*<sub>*t*-</sub> *a*<sub>*t*-</sub> *b*<sub>*t*-</sub> the fraction of employees in compartments *S*. *E*, *I*, *R* at day

let  $as_t$ ,  $ae_t$ ,  $ai_t$ ,  $ar_t$  be the fraction of employees in compartments *S*, *E*, *I*, *R* at day *t* respectively due to asymptomatic infections

let  $ss_t$ ,  $se_t$ ,  $si_t$ ,  $sr_t$  be the fraction of employees in compartments *S*, *E*, *I*, *R* at day *t* respectively due to symptomatic infections

 $\langle as_t, ae_t, ai_t, ar_t \rangle = SEIR(\mu, \Lambda, \beta I, \alpha, \gamma I, s_{t-1}, e_{t-1}, i_{t-1}, r_{t-1})$ 

 $\langle ss_t, se_t, si_t, sr_t \rangle = SEIR(\mu, \Lambda, \beta I, \alpha, \gamma_2, s_{t-1}, e_{t-1}, i_{t-1}, r_{t-1})$ 

 $s_{t} = p_{1} \times (as_{t} - \beta_{2}) + (1 - p_{1}) \times (ss_{t} - \beta_{2})$   $e_{t} = p_{1} \times (ae_{t} + \beta_{2}) + (1 - p_{1}) \times (se_{t} + \beta_{2})$   $i_{t} = p_{1} \times ai_{t} + (1 - p_{1}) \times si_{t}$   $r_{t} = p_{1} \times ar_{t} + (1 - p_{1}) \times sr_{t}$ end of for loop

#### Equation 2: Algorithm for bSEIR Model

#### 2.2.1 Incorporating vaccination rate and efficacy in the bSEIR model

The vaccine rate (*Vr*) is defined as a fraction of employees fully vaccinated i.e.,  $Vr = (\#of \ employees \ fully \ vaccinated)/(\#of \ employees \ in the \ organization)$ . If *Vri* is the proportion of employees received vaccine *i* (e.g., Moderna, Pfizer, J&J, etc) whose efficacy is *Vei*, then the overall efficacy of vaccination is estimated as weighted efficacy of all vaccine choices received by the workforce, as given below:

$$Ve = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Vri * Vei$$

We can incorporate vaccination information in two different ways, by

1. Estimating the effective number of employees in S compartment i.e.,  $Se = S^*(1-Ve)$ . The underlying assumption is that  $S^*Ve$  employees neither be infected nor be infectious, the assumption supported by recent studies [14]. or

2. Adjusting employee exposure to account for vaccinated employees i.e.  $HRe = HR*(1 - Ve)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . The underlying assumption is that the vaccinated employees' exposure to COVID will not lead to being infectious.

Of these two choices, we use (1) for its simplicity and ease of estimation.

#### 2.2.2 Hazard ratio (HR) estimation

*Method 1*: The hazard ratio can be estimated using empirical employee testing data. The (backward) 14-day moving average positivity rate for day t ( $L_t$ ) was calculated based on the testing data from the Jackson Laboratory. The number of new tests and the number of new positive tests each day for each state were downloaded from https://covidtracking.com/data/download, and the (backward) state-specific14-day moving average positivity rate for day t ( $P_t$ ) was calculated. The hazard ratio  $H_t$  at day t is computed as  $L_t/P_t$ . Since the number of employees at each campus is small,  $L_t$ , hence,  $H_t$ , are zero when  $P_t$  is below 5% (Figure 3). We calculated the average over non-zero  $H_t$  for a campus and used it as the probability of exposure to the local population risk. As shown in Figure 3,  $H_t$  estimates are not significantly different among campuses

Method 2: In another method, we estimated the number of infected persons in a week based on our simulation model and searched the best HR which minimized the mean

squared difference between the observed and predicted number of infected persons in a week. To increase the number of data points to estimate HR, we assumed that the three campuses had the same HR and pooled the estimation data points from the three campuses together. This method is useful when the incidence rates are low.

#### 2.2.3 Community positivity rate projection

...

. /.

To estimate the testing frequency for a future week, the average daily population or local community positivity rate for a future week is needed besides other parameters. We assumed the daily positivity rate changed smoothly with time and estimated the daily population positivity rates for the next 7 days by polynomial curve (with a degree of 2 or 3) fitting of the observed daily population positivity rates during the past few months, followed by averaging on the 7 projections.

1	I he I ool (https://rshiny.jax.org/connect/#/apps/156/access)	i

src-test-freq-sentinel			src-test-freq-sentinel	
which campus		proportion of asymptomatic cases in SARS-	which comput	amountion of asymptotecture cases in LEEL.
Silve CT .		CoV/2 cases	100 01	CoVd coses
		81 08	in the second se	81 D 88
no of persons an infectious person can		01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 08	no of persons an infectious person can	AT 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
infect during the infectious period in the			infect during the infectious period in the	
D in		test sensitivity	0 W	Not sensitivity
<u>.</u>			-0	
DI 10 DI 40 DI 18 DI 100 DI 100 10		0.7 0.74 0.76 0.027 0.00 0.8 0.84 0.80 1	ar is at at in the strate the strate	at any any and any any any any
Threshold for no of infectious persons in the		no of days passed from being infected to	Threshold for no of infectious persons in the	no of days passed from being infected to
rganization		being infectious	organization int	being intectious
			0	
		8 68 13 18 24 3 28 42 48 54 8		1 10 10 10 10 1 10 10 10 10 1
No of employees		no of days being infectious before	No of employees	no of days being infectious before
200		symptoms criset	290	symptoms crowl
		х 🛛 ж	an of easilies cause par 1998 factor in	
to of positive cases per 1000 tested in			general population	1 16 2 20 3 10 1 10 1 10 10 10
fereral population			25.3	no of days an infected person remains
25.3		infectious	and which the link on another is account in	r m a
probability that an employee is exposed to		х 🖬 ж	general population	
peneral population		O	N (20) N	
· 00 · ·				contact tracing efficiency
		contact tracing efficiency		* 00 ×
and the second first of the second second			confidence interval for no of infectious persons	
persons		8 87 82 83 54 84 88 87 18 88 1	200	
216.			10.4	clean at the start?
100		clean at the start?	weekly testing proportion	·
weekly testing proportion		1	0	no of cycles
0.25		no of cycles		4 *
			set to 0 if the testing prop will be determined by the App	
set to 0 if the testing prop will be determined by the App			New Obs: no of texts in which the most	sun)
live Obs. no of termin which the most	8487			Yes
nore protony, universitations	765			recommended weekly testing proportion
	moothemended unsets	te secting properties	set to 0 P do not need training prop-excitinate based on the new site by the App	0.3
servic ton oci nazivienti estangigana estanize tanted on tre new atte toritte Acto	e		the off of the second second between	
are out of the real, and the pressure				
			prop-0.30x ( per week) next every 25 days (PDs Cont Interval)	
half a surface and g growth Starting Co. (1) a set			14 C	
			1.	
	and the second		1	
			F	
			1	
			-	
			1 A	

A screenshot demonstrating prediction of infectious cases at the workplace with a fixed testing frequency. A screenshot demonstrating the predicted testing frequency while the number of infectious is under one at the workplace.

. . . . .

**Figure 2:** bSEIR R-Shiny tool - The R-shiny interface of the bSEIR tool. Screenshots of bSEIR tool for pandemic spread at workplace (left) and estimating testing frequency (right).

#### 12

Major predictions or	Description	Main Parameters
features of the tool		to set
Predicting testing fre-	Weekly testing proportion	C, posRate, HR, N
quency		
Estimating spread of	Plot of number of infectious em-	C, posRate, HR, N
pandemic - given test-	ployees over a period	
ing frequency.		
Change alerts monitor-	Whether the number of infectious	If yes, set New
ing.	people in recent tests exceed the up-	Obs: no of tests to a
	per bound; if yes, estimate new test-	positive number.
	ing frequency to get I under control	if no, set it to 0.

Table 3: Predictions available from the tool and the features of the tool

We developed an R-shiny based tool for interactive analysis to predict infected number of employees at a future time point, to check whether testing frequency to be increased, or to estimate testing frequency. We showed the functions of our tool in Table 4 and screenshots of the interfaces in Figure 2. The parameters associated with the workplace are placed on the left panel of the interface and the parameters associated with the spread of the pandemic are placed on the right panel of the interface for ease of operation.

#### 4 **Results**

## 4.1 COVID19 positive cases are detectable even in organizations as small as 300 employees but depends on community positivity rate

We conducted a power analysis of our model to identify the occurrence of a single infection among a workforce. Figure 3 shows the plots of a minimum size of the organization required for different population positivity rates, for different powers of detection. The same data is shown in Table 4 for the power of detection at 70% and 85%. At a population positivity rate of as low as 1%, we can detect the occurrence of one infection in an organization of size as small as 300 at a power of 80%. This is critical for the testing program to be effective at workplace.

Community Pos-	Min #of employees at	Min #of employees at
itivity rate	power=0.7	power=0.85
0.5%	540	760
1%	269	379
2%	134	188
5%	53	74
10%	26	36

Table 4: Detectability of COVID-19 positive cases



#### smallest N to detect >=1 positive case with CI

**Figure 3**: Organization size (N) required to detect at least one positive case depends on population positivity rate. Four colors stand for detection power of 0.85, 0.8, 0.75, 0.7 respectively.

## 4.2 Size of the workforce and employee behavior coupled with community positivity rate have a major impact on the frequency of testing

We conducted simulations to assess the influence of population and workplace parameters on the testing frequency required to control the number of infectious staff (I) to be <=1 at the workplace. The simulations used *contact tracing efficiency* = 0, *clean start, monitor from Day1, test sensitivity*=0.95, *without a gap between sentinel testing cycles.* The results (figure 4) show that the frequency of testing mostly depends on *hazard ratio* (*HR*), *size of the workforce* and *daily population positivity rate.* Small to moderate internal infection rates have significant effect on testing frequency for lower population positivity rates or smaller hazard ratios. Large organizations (no of employees ~5000) need to keep hazard ratio small even for small population positivity rates to keep the testing frequency lower to avoid outbreak at the organization. Frequency of testing is significantly affected by the size of the organization and hazard ratio, while internal transmission rate has a significant impact on testing frequency only when low testing frequency is possible i.e., for low HR and low community positivity rate. The

#### 14

sensitivity of testing also has marginal effect on testing frequency (data not shown here).



**Figure 4**: Frequency of testing to control the number of infectious employees to be  $\leq 1$  (test sensitivity = 0.95, clear start of the cohort, no tracking and monitor the cases from day 1, no gap in testing). The frequency of testing mostly depends on the hazard ratio and size of the organization. Small to moderate internal infection rates have a significant effect on testing frequency for lower population positivity rates (per 1000) and smaller hazard ratios. Moderate-sized organizations (EE#=5000) need to keep hazard ratio small even for small population positivity rates to control outbreaks at the organization.

# 4.3 Sentinel testing leads to marginally higher infections than cohort testing at higher HR (Contact tracing efficiency = 0, clean start, monitor from Day1)

Sentinel testing, a schedule of testing all employees over an extended period, is typically adopted due to its feasibility of logistics and resource availability for testing. For example, for a cohort of 400, the population can be tested in blocks of 100 per week until all 400 individuals have been tested at least once in the 4-week interval. However, we may expect it to lead to higher number of infections compared to testing all employees at one go i.e., cohort testing. Our simulations (figure 5) show that, over a 90-day period, sentinel testing leads to only a marginally higher (2-6% more i.e., fold change of 1.02-1.06) infections than cohort testing. The impact will be lower if the hazard ratios and population positivity rates are low. Sentinel testing can be further divided into two categories, one without gaps between testing cycles and the other allowing variable proportion of testing with fixed gaps. The former results in a lower number of infections but much higher relative cost, while the later leads to higher average proportion of



**Figure 5**: Ratio of Frequency of testing for sentinel testing vs cohort testing for a fixed average weekly proportion of testing of 0.25, 0.33 and 0.5. The analysis is based on test sensitivity = 0.95 and Organizational size=500.

#### 4.4 Impact of Vaccination Rate on Testing frequency

We conducted simulations to understand the impact of efficacy rates of vaccines against COVID19 infections on the testing frequency. We used both models discussed in Methods section to account for vaccination rates in our bSEIR model i.e., adjusting for HR vs adjusting for effective population. Though both models give rise to similar testing frequency, adjusting for HR (y-axis) leads to higher frequency of testing (sup figure *Vac*) for a subset of scenarios.

Even a modest vaccination rate has a significant effect on the testing frequency, especially for medium organizations of size below 1000 employees. The impact is extremely high for low HR and medium population positivity rates, as highlighted by the cyan-colored lines in Figure 6.



16

**Figure 6**: A modest vaccination rate of 40-60% has a huge impact on testing frequency, especially at low population positivity rates or a low hazard ratio of 0.2. Therefore, population vaccination, employee vaccination, and continued education of employees are important factors to keep the testing frequency low for the economics of organizations and the health of the employees.

#### 4.5 Adaptive Sentinel Testing at JAX - An application of our tool

To apply bSEIR model for Jax's adaptive sentinel testing policy, we projected community positivity rates and hazard ratios for all campuses of Jax.

Figure 7 shows that our projections of community positivity rate are within 20% error for most of the time, for all campuses. However, the relative error is higher for lower community positivity rates, mostly overestimating the community positivity rate which results in a higher-than-required testing frequency only for mid to higher HR at low community positivity rates.







(b) Accuracy of Population positive rate prediction

Figure 7: Projecting community positive rate using a polynomial model fitting, and its accuracy across Jax campuses.

Typical HR turned out to be 0.25 for all Jax campuses. However, the HR was expected to spike during the holiday season of Thanksgiving and Christmas in 2020. Hence, we set HR for normal weeks (=0.25) and holiday weeks (=0.35).

The scatter plot in figure 8 shows a very strong correlation (=0.68) between our prediction of the number of cases to the observed number of cases.



(a) Scheme for Jax's adap- (b) bi-Model SEIR accurately predicted cases at tive sentinel testing Jax (correlation = 0.68) Figure 8: Performance of Bi-Modal SEIR model.

#### 5 Discussion

Adaptive testing frequency is crucial to balance between economics of testing and to keep the pandemic under control at the workplace. We developed a *bi-modal SEIR* (*bSEIR*) model to account for changing parameters of the pandemic in the community and the workplace where the workforce is not outwardly facing.

Our *bi-modal SEIR* allows simple modeling of dual exposure, outbreak, and testing frequency by accounting for easily measurable community, and workplace parameters

> of epidemic incidence and transmission. The simulations show the importance of employee education and support to minimize their exposure to community infections in reducing the testing frequency required. Even a modest vaccination rate of 40-60% with vaccines of the efficacy of more than 90% would greatly reduce testing frequency by 2-4-fold. It is highly pronounced for low HR and medium to high community positivity rates. Furthermore, sentinel testing, a logistically feasible testing paradigm, was evaluated and shown that it only marginally (2-6%) increases the total number of infections over a 3-month period. Thus, sentinel testing is a viable cost-effective approach to manage testing in the workplace. We used our tool to generate weekly reports of forecast of population positivity rates, expected number of infections, and recommended testing frequency for The Jackson Laboratory. Overall, our model helped our organization to minimize the cost of testing while controlling the epidemic.

> An apparent limitation of our model is that it does not explicitly assume the possibility of break-through infections which requires a fraction of employees in the *R* compartment to be moved to the *S* compartment. However, as we repeat the simulations with S to be total onsite workforce size and adjusting the vaccine efficacy rates to account for changing efficacy of vaccines with time, the break-through infections are indirectly accounted for which will be good enough to predict the short-term course of the pandemic at the workplace. Our formulation, to compute average vaccine efficacy, can be generalized not only for different types of vaccines, but also for different efficacies due to new variants and different time periods after the most recent vaccinations. Furthermore, our model can be applied for a higher internal transmission rate by adjusting the internal transmission rate that accounts for one employee being exposed to multiple infectious employees. Overall, the apparent limitations of the model can be dealt with appropriate adjustment or estimation of its parameters.

#### References

- Fred Brauer, Compartmental Models in Epidemiology, Mathematical Epidemiology. 2008; 1945:19–79.
- 2. Julie C. Blackwooda and Lauren M. Childs. An introduction to compartmental modeling for the budding infectious disease modeler. Letters in Biomathematics, 5(1):195–221, 2018.
- Shaobo He, Yuexi Peng & Kehui Sun. SEIR modeling of the COVID-19 and its dynamics. Nonlinear Dyn, 101:1667–1680, 2020.
- Alberto Godio, Francesca Pace, and Andrea Vergnano. SEIR Modeling of the Italian Epidemic of SARS-CoV-2 Using Computational Swarm Intelligence. Int J Environ Res Public Health, 17(10): 3535, 2020.
- Z. Yang, Z. Zeng, K. Wang, S.-S. Wong, *et al.*, Modified SEIR and AI prediction of the epidemics trend of COVID-19 in China under public health interventions. Journal of Thoracic Disease 2020;12:165-174.
- Samuel Mwalili, Mark Kimathi, Viona Ojiambo, Duncan Gathungu & Rachel Mbogo. SEIR model for COVID-19 dynamics incorporating the environment and social distancing. 13:352, 2020.
- VeronikaGrimm, Friederike Mengel & Martin Schmidt. Extensions of the SEIR model for the analysis of tailored social distancing and tracing approaches to cope with COVID-19. Scientific Reports, 11:4214, 2021.

- Lan Meng and Wei Zhu. Generalized SEIR Epidemic Model for COVID-19 in a Multipatch Environment. Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society, 2021:5401253, 2021.
- Sebastián Contreras, H. Andrés Villavicencio, David Medina-Ortiz, Juan Pablo Biron-Lattes, Alvaro Olivera-Nappa. A multi-group SEIRA model for the spread of COVID-19 among heterogeneous populations, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals, 136, 2020.
- Pengyan Liu and Hong-Xu Li. Global behavior of a multi-group SEIR epidemic model with age structure and spatial diffusion. Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering, 17(6):7248– 7273, 2020.
- 11. Jean Dolbeault and Gabriel Turinici. Social Heterogeneity and the COVID-19 Lockdown in a Multi-group SEIR Model. medRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.15.20103010.
- Jinliang Wang and Hongying Shu. Global Analysis on a Class of Multi-group SEIR Model with Latency and Relapse. Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering, 13(1):209-225, 2010.
- 13. https://github.com/oswaldosantos/EpiDynamics: R implementations of programs from the book Keeling, M.J. and Rohani, P. (2007) Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals. Princeton University Press.
- 14. Rabih Ghostine, Mohamad Gharamti, Sally Hassrouny and Ibrahim Hoteit. An Extended SEIR Model with Vaccination for Forecasting the COVID-19 Pandemic in Saudi Arabia Using an Ensemble Kalman Filter. Mathematics, 9:636. 2021.
- 15. Compartmental models in epidemiology
  - , https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Compartmental\_models\_in \_epidemiology&oldid=1094997436 (last visited June 28, 2022).