

1 **Analysis of the risk and pre-emptive control of**
2 **viral outbreaks accounting for within-host**
3 **dynamics: SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing as a**
4 **case study**

5

6 William S Hart^{1,2,*}, Hyeongki Park², Yong Dam Jeong^{2,3}, Kwang Su Kim^{2,3,4}, Raiki

7 Yoshimura², Robin N Thompson^{5,6,‡}, Shingo Iwami^{2,7,8,9,10,‡}

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹Wolfson Centre for Mathematical Biology, Mathematical Institute, University of

11 Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK

12 ²interdisciplinary Biology Laboratory (iBLab), Division of Natural Science, Graduate

13 School of Science, Nagoya University, Japan

14 ³Department of Mathematics, Pusan National University, Busan, South Korea

15 ⁴Department of Science System Simulation, Pukyong National University, Busan,

16 South Korea.

17 ⁵Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

18 ⁶Zeeman Institute for Systems Biology and Infectious Disease Epidemiology

19 Research (SBIDER), University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

20 ⁷Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan.

21 ⁸Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Biology (ASHBi), Kyoto University, Kyoto,

22 Japan.

23 ⁹Interdisciplinary Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences Program (iTHEMS), RIKEN,

24 Saitama, Japan.

25 ¹⁰NEXT-Ganken Program, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research (JFCR),

26 Tokyo, Japan. 13Science Groove Inc., Fukuoka, Japan.

27

28 *Correspondence to: william.hart@maths.ox.ac.uk

29 ‡These authors contributed equally to this work.

30 **Abstract**

31 In the era of living with COVID-19, the risk of localised SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks
32 remains. Here, we develop a multi-scale modelling framework for estimating the local
33 outbreak risk for a viral disease (the probability that a major outbreak results from a
34 single case introduced into the population), accounting for within-host viral dynamics.
35 Compared to population-level models previously used to estimate outbreak risks, our
36 approach enables more detailed analysis of how the risk can be mitigated through
37 pre-emptive interventions such as antigen testing. Considering SARS-CoV-2 as a
38 case study, we quantify the within-host dynamics using data from individuals with
39 omicron variant infections. We demonstrate that regular antigen testing reduces, but
40 may not eliminate, the outbreak risk, depending on characteristics of local
41 transmission. In our baseline analysis, daily antigen testing reduces the outbreak risk
42 by 45% compared to a scenario without antigen testing. Additionally, we show that
43 accounting for heterogeneity in within-host dynamics between individuals affects
44 outbreak risk estimates and assessments of the impact of antigen testing. Our results
45 therefore highlight important factors to consider when using multi-scale models to
46 design pre-emptive interventions against SARS-CoV-2 and other viruses.

47 **Introduction**

48 Following the widespread rollout of COVID-19 vaccines, countries worldwide
49 have adopted policies of “living with COVID-19” (for example, the UK removed its final
50 domestic restrictions in February 2022 (1)). Waves of COVID-19 cases continue to
51 occur (2), generated by factors including waning immunity (3,4) and the continued
52 evolution of the SARS-CoV-2 virus (5–7), although vaccines provide high levels of
53 ongoing protection against severe disease. Nonetheless, localised outbreaks, either in
54 geographical areas or in specific populations such as schools, universities and
55 workplaces, continue to cause disruption (for example, through student or staff
56 absence).

57 Mathematical modelling can be used to estimate the (local) *outbreak risk*, which
58 is defined as the probability that a major infectious disease outbreak results from a
59 single infection occurring within the population (8–12). While the outbreak risk can be
60 estimated by simulating a stochastic epidemic model a large number of times (and
61 calculating the proportion of simulations in which a large outbreak occurs), branching
62 process theory can also be used to derive outbreak risk estimates analytically (12). A
63 commonly used formula in the applied epidemic modelling literature (13–19) is
64 $(\text{Outbreak risk}) = 1 - 1/R_0$ (whenever the basic reproduction number, $R_0 > 1$; when
65 $R_0 \leq 1$, the outbreak risk is zero). However, this formula relies on simplistic
66 assumptions, including each infected individual having constant infectiousness
67 throughout an exponentially distributed infectious period. Several studies have
68 therefore relaxed these assumptions, for example by considering a gamma-distributed
69 infectious period (14,17,20) and/or accounting for heterogeneity between age groups
70 (9,21,22).


71 In multi-scale epidemic modelling frameworks, within-host viral dynamics
72 models, which describe how the viral load of an infected host evolves over the course
73 of infection and can be calibrated to longitudinal individual data, are used to inform
74 population-level epidemiological models (23–25). One advantage of such approaches
75 is that they facilitate a detailed description of the impact of interventions, such as
76 antigen testing (26–28) or the use of antiviral drugs (29), which depend upon and/or
77 affect the within-host dynamics in a manner that cannot be fully captured in simple
78 population-level models. Multi-scale approaches have been applied to SARS-CoV-2
79 (26–33) and other pathogens including influenza (23,34) to generate outbreak
80 projections and test control interventions. However, multi-scale methods have not
81 previously been used to estimate the outbreak risk, or to analyse how the risk can be
82 mitigated through pre-emptive interventions.

83 In this study, we develop a multi-scale approach for calculating the outbreak
84 risk, accounting for within-host viral dynamics and heterogeneity in these dynamics
85 between individuals. We derive an equation satisfied by the outbreak risk under a
86 multi-scale model, and verify our analytically derived outbreak risk estimates using
87 simulations of an individual-based stochastic outbreak simulation model. Focussing
88 on the case study of SARS-CoV-2, we characterise the viral dynamics by fitting a
89 within-host model (35–42) to data from 521 individuals with infections due to the
90 omicron variant (43). We first consider the outbreak risk in the absence of
91 interventions, before exploring the extent to which the outbreak risk can be mitigated
92 through regular rapid antigen testing of the entire local population. Additionally, we
93 analyse the impact of the reproduction number for local transmissions, the level of
94 transmission following detection, heterogeneity in within-host dynamics, and
95 asymptomatic infection, on the outbreak risk and the effectiveness of antigen testing.

96 Our results highlight that the impact of regular antigen testing on the local
97 SARS-CoV-2 outbreak risk is dependent on the regularity of testing, as well as the
98 exact population under consideration (including the level of vaccine- or
99 infection-acquired immunity) and the characteristics of the viral variant responsible for
100 infections. Based on our analysis, we expect antigen testing to reduce the outbreak
101 risk but not eliminate it completely. We stress that while SARS-CoV-2 is our focus
102 here, our general approach can be applied to other viruses in preparedness for future
103 outbreaks, epidemics and pandemics beyond COVID-19.

104 **Results**

105 Our multi-scale modelling framework for estimating outbreak risks and
106 analysing the impact of pre-emptive control is outlined in the context of SARS-CoV-2
107 and regular antigen testing in **Figure 1**. In our approach, a within-host model is first
108 fitted to individual infection data to estimate the viral load of infected hosts at each time
109 since infection, potentially accounting for heterogeneity in within-host dynamics
110 between different individuals (**Figure 1A**). Accounting for a reduced transmission risk
111 following detection, which may occur prior to symptom onset if regular antigen testing
112 is carried out (**Figure 1B**), the viral load profile(s) can be used to estimate the
113 infectiousness profile(s) (**Figure 1C**). The outbreak risk, following a single newly
114 infected individual arriving in an otherwise uninfected population, is then estimated
115 under a branching process transmission model incorporating the estimated
116 infectiousness profile(s) (**Figure 1D**). Specifically, we have analytically derived
117 equations satisfied by the outbreak risk assuming either homogeneous (Eq. (1) in
118 **Methods**) or heterogeneous (Eq. (2)) within-host dynamics (the derivations are
119 described in **Supplementary Note 1**). The effect on the outbreak risk of factors such
120 as the frequency of antigen testing can then be analysed.



121

122

Figure 1. Schematic illustrating our multi-scale approach for calculating the local SARS-CoV-2 outbreak risk, accounting for regular antigen testing. A (top right). By fitting a within-host model to individual infection data, the temporal viral load profile(s) of infected individuals can be estimated, potentially accounting for heterogeneity in within-host dynamics between individuals. **B** (bottom left). In the absence of antigen testing, we assumed that infected individuals are detected upon symptom onset (scenario 1). Regular antigen testing of the whole local population may facilitate detection before symptoms (scenario 2), where the viral load profile can be used to estimate the probability of a positive test result. Accounting for the frequency of testing, the probability of detection by each time since infection can be calculated. **C** (middle right). The viral load profile(s) can then be used to estimate the infectiousness profile(s) of infected individuals, accounting for a lower transmission risk following detection, so earlier detection (e.g., when regular antigen testing takes place) leads to a suppressed infectiousness profile. **D** (top left). Assuming a branching process transmission model incorporating the estimated infectiousness profile(s) (the transmission trees next to **C** represent possible model realisations either without or with regular antigen testing), we have analytically derived an equation satisfied by the outbreak risk. The impact of the frequency of antigen testing on the outbreak risk can then be assessed.

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138 **The SARS-CoV-2 local outbreak risk and the impact of regular antigen testing**

139 Using nonlinear mixed effects modelling, we fitted a within-host viral dynamics
140 model (35–42) to data from 521 individuals with infections due to the omicron
141 SARS-CoV-2 variant (43). The temporal viral load profile of infected individuals, using
142 population estimates of within-host model parameters (**Supplementary Table 1**), is
143 shown in **Figure 2A**. Model fits to data from individual hosts are shown in
144 **Supplementary Figure 1**.


145 For simplicity, we initially demonstrated our multi-scale approach for estimating
146 the outbreak risk under the assumption of homogeneous within-host dynamics
147 (heterogeneous within-host dynamics are considered in **Figure 4**). First, we used the
148 viral load profile in **Figure 2A** to estimate the probability of detection by each time
149 since infection (**Figure 2B**). We considered scenarios both without regular population
150 antigen testing (so that infected individuals are only detected upon symptom onset),
151 and with regular antigen testing (with the detection probability accounting for
152 randomness in test timing and outcome). We then estimated the (expected)
153 infectiousness profile in each scenario, accounting for a reduction in the transmission
154 risk following detection, and averaging over different possible detection times in the
155 scenario with regular antigen testing (**Figure 2C**).

156 Outbreak risk estimates in the absence of regular antigen testing, obtained
157 using either our multi-scale approach (using Eq. (1)) or the commonly used
158 population-level estimate (which neglects within-host dynamics), $1 - 1/R_0$, are shown
159 for a range of values of R_0 in **Figure 2D** (throughout this article, we always use R_0 to
160 denote the basic reproduction number without regular antigen testing; we denote the
161 reproduction number at the start of the outbreak but accounting for testing (if carried
162 out) by $R_{0,eff}$). As would be expected, the outbreak risk increases with R_0 , while our

163 multi-scale method generally gives an outbreak risk higher than the standard
164 population-level estimate (when $R_0 \geq 1$).

165 We then used our multi-scale approach to explore the impact of regular
166 antigen testing on the outbreak risk. First, we estimated the proportion of
167 transmissions prevented from each infected individual, compared to a scenario in
168 which infected individuals are only detected upon symptom onset, under different
169 frequencies of testing (**Figure 2E**). We then calculated the outbreak risk in each case
170 (**Figure 2F**), assuming $R_0 = 1.5$ in the absence of testing (different R_0 values are
171 considered in **Figure 3**). Daily testing was here found to prevent 20% of transmissions
172 (**Figure 2E**), leading to an outbreak risk of 0.32 (**Figure 2F**), which is 45% lower than
173 the corresponding outbreak risk without testing (0.58). In comparison, testing every
174 two days was found to prevent only 13% of transmissions, giving an outbreak risk of
175 0.43.

176 To verify our results, we also used a discrete-time, individual-based,
177 stochastic outbreak simulation model to estimate the outbreak risk (**Supplementary**
178 **Figure 2**). There was relatively close agreement between estimates of the outbreak
179 risk between our analytic approach (blue line in **Figure 2F**) and the stochastic
180 simulations (red crosses). In **Supplementary Figure 3**, we considered the sensitivity
181 of our results to details of how we implemented antigen testing in our multi-scale
182 framework. We found a lower outbreak risk under frequent antigen testing (i.e.,
183 antigen testing had a greater impact on the outbreak risk) when we assumed a
184 constant interval between antigen tests, compared to our baseline assumption of a
185 constant rate of testing (i.e., an exponentially distributed interval between tests, which
186 was more straightforward to implement in our analytic approach; **Supplementary**
187 **Figure 3B**).




188

189 **Figure 2. Multi-scale estimation of the SARS-CoV-2 local outbreak risk and analysis of the**
 190 **impact of regular antigen testing. A.** Viral load profile using population estimates of within-host model
 191 parameters (**Supplementary Table 1**). The symptom onset time is shown as a vertical grey dashed line
 192 (note that the incubation period was estimated as part of the model fitting procedure), and the assumed
 193 viral load threshold for infectiousness and antigen detection is shown as a horizontal black dashed line.
 194 Note that we assumed a measurement error affecting antigen test outcomes, leading to the possibility of
 195 a positive antigen test with true viral load below this threshold, and vice versa. **B.** Probability of detection
 196 by each time since infection, both without regular antigen testing (blue) and with testing every two days
 197 (orange dotted). **C.** Infectiousness profiles in the two scenarios, averaging over exact detection times of
 198 different individuals in the scenario with antigen testing. **D.** The probability of a major outbreak without
 199 antigen testing for different values of the basic reproduction number for local transmissions, R_0 ,
 200 comparing our multi-scale approach (blue) with the commonly used formula, $1 - 1/R_0$ (whenever
 201 $R_0 > 1$; black dashed). **E.** The proportion of transmissions prevented from each infected individual by
 202 regular antigen testing (compared to a scenario where infected individuals are only detected upon
 203 symptom onset), $1 - R_{0,eff}/R_0$ (where $R_{0,eff}$ is the basic reproduction number accounting for testing),
 204 for different values of the (mean) interval between tests. **F.** The outbreak risk for different values of the
 205 (mean) interval between tests when $R_0 = 1.5$ in the absence of testing (results for other values of R_0
 206 are shown in **Figure 3C**), comparing our analytic multi-scale approach (blue) with estimates obtained
 207 using a discrete-time stochastic outbreak simulation model (see **Supplementary Figure 2**; red
 208 crosses).

209 **Effect of the local reproduction number and the extent of transmission**
210 **following detection**

211 In **Figure 2F**, we considered the outbreak risk under antigen testing for a
212 single value of the basic reproduction number for local transmissions (in the absence
213 of testing), $R_0 = 1.5$. However, even for SARS-CoV-2, the R_0 value for local
214 outbreaks is likely to vary between time periods and local populations because of
215 factors including contact rates, viral evolution and existing immunity levels. Equivalent
216 results to those in **Figure 2F** for different R_0 values are therefore shown in **Figure 3C**.
217 At R_0 values of 1.25 or below, we found daily antigen testing to be sufficient to reduce
218 the outbreak risk to zero (by reducing the reproduction number accounting for testing,
219 $R_{0,eff}$, to below one), whereas the estimated outbreak risk remains high even with
220 frequent antigen testing for large R_0 values.

221 We also explored the effect on our results of the relative transmission risk of
222 detected individuals, α_d (**Figure 3DEF**), with a lower α_d value corresponding to a
223 higher proportion of presymptomatic transmissions. Whereas in most of our analyses
224 we assumed a small, but positive, α_d value (reflecting that, for example, some
225 household transmission may occur following detection) (44), the blue curves in **Figure**
226 **3DEF** represent a scenario in which $\alpha_d = 0$. This may be relevant to specific
227 populations, such as workplaces, in which it may be possible to completely isolate
228 detected cases from the remainder of the population. In the scenario of no
229 transmission from detected individuals, antigen testing at arbitrarily high frequency
230 can theoretically prevent all transmissions that would otherwise occur (whereas in the
231 remainder of our analyses, only some proportion of presymptomatic transmissions
232 can be prevented), with testing every three days here being sufficient to reduce the
233 outbreak risk to zero (when $R_0 = 1.5$).



234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

Figure 3. Effect of the local reproduction number and the extent of transmission following detection on the outbreak risk under regular antigen testing. **A.** Infectiousness profiles without regular antigen testing, assuming a basic reproduction number for local transmissions (in the absence of testing) of $R_0 = 1.1$ (blue), 1.25 (red), 1.5 (orange), 2 (purple), or 2.5 (green). **B.** The proportion of transmissions prevented from each infected individual by regular antigen testing (which is independent of R_0). **C.** The outbreak risk for different values of the (mean) interval between antigen tests, plotted for each R_0 value. **D.** Infectiousness profiles without regular antigen testing, assuming the relative infectiousness of a detected host (compared to an undetected individual with the same viral load) is $\alpha_d = 0$ (blue), 0.26 (red; the value used elsewhere in our analyses (44)), or 0.5 (yellow), with $R_0 = 1.5$ in all cases. Under these α_d values, the proportions of presymptomatic transmissions (without regular antigen testing) are 100%, 39% and 25%, respectively. **E.** The proportion of transmissions prevented from each infected individual by regular antigen testing, for different values of the (mean) interval between tests, plotted for each α_d value. **F.** The outbreak risk for different values of the (mean) interval between tests, plotted for each α_d value.


249 **Effect of heterogeneous within-host dynamics and asymptomatic infections**

250 In order to present our multi-scale approach for calculating the outbreak risk in
251 a straightforward setting we have, up to this point, considered a scenario of identical
252 within-host viral dynamics for all infected individuals. However, in reality, within-host
253 dynamics differ between individuals. Our mixed effects within-host model fitting
254 approach has the advantage of facilitating estimation of the extent of heterogeneity in
255 within-host model parameters. We therefore conducted an analysis in which we
256 accounted for such heterogeneity when calculating the localised SARS-CoV-2
257 outbreak risk (**Figure 4**), using the generalised outbreak risk formulation in Eq. (2).

258 We found that accounting for heterogeneity in within-host dynamics leads to a
259 slightly smaller outbreak risk in the absence of regular antigen testing than in **Figure 2**
260 (**Figure 4B**). The model with heterogeneous within-host dynamics also gives a higher
261 proportion of transmissions prevented by regular antigen testing compared to the
262 homogeneous model (for each testing frequency considered; **Figure 4C**), contributing
263 to a greater difference in outbreak risk between the two models with regular antigen
264 testing than without (**Figure 4D**). For example, the outbreak risk when $R_0 = 1.5$ is
265 0.48 for the heterogeneous model without testing (0.58 for the homogeneous model),
266 and 0.17 with daily testing (0.32).

267 We also used the same outbreak risk formulation (Eq. (2)) to account for the
268 possibility of entirely asymptomatic infections (i.e., some individuals remaining without
269 symptoms throughout infection; **Figure 5**). In scenarios with a higher proportion of
270 total transmissions generated by entirely asymptomatic infected hosts, the proportion
271 of transmissions prevented by regular antigen testing was found to be higher (**Figure**
272 **5B**). This is because we assumed that asymptomatic hosts remain undetected
273 throughout infection when antigen testing is not carried out, leading to a greater impact

274 of antigen testing on asymptomatic transmissions than on those from individuals who
275 develop symptoms. This effect is likely responsible for a lower outbreak risk at higher
276 proportions of asymptomatic transmissions when antigen testing takes place
277 frequently (**Figure 5C**). We note that an assumption that 0% of transmissions are
278 generated by the asymptomatic infected individuals in the population (blue curve in
279 **Figure 5C**) is different to assuming that there are no asymptomatic infected
280 individuals at all (black dashed curve). For example, in the former case, the outbreak
281 risk will be zero whenever the primary infected individual is asymptomatic, whereas in
282 the latter case the primary infected individual will not remain asymptomatic throughout
283 infection.



284

285

Figure 4. Effect of heterogeneity in within-host dynamics on the outbreak risk under regular

286

antigen testing. A. Example simulated infectiousness profiles for five infected individuals in the

287

absence of regular antigen testing, obtained by sampling within-host model parameters using the

288

estimates of fixed and random effects in **Supplementary Table 1** and **Supplementary Table 2**,

289

respectively. The expected infectiousness profile (obtained by averaging the individual infectiousness

290

profiles of a large number of infected individuals) is shown as a black dotted curve. **B.** The probability of

291

a major outbreak without antigen testing for different values of the basic reproduction number, R_0 ,

292

comparing our multi-scale approach, either assuming homogeneous within-host dynamics (blue) or

293

accounting for heterogeneity (red), and the commonly used formula, $1 - 1/R_0$ (black dashed). **C.** The

294

proportion of transmissions per infected individual prevented by regular antigen testing, for different

295


values of the (mean) interval between tests, plotted for the models with homogeneous (blue) and

296

heterogeneous (red) within-host dynamics. **D.** The outbreak risk for different values of the (mean)

297

interval between tests, for the same scenarios as in panel **C**.



298

299

Figure 5. Effect of asymptomatic infections on the outbreak risk under regular antigen testing.

300

A. Infectiousness profiles for infected individuals who develop symptoms (blue) and those who remain asymptomatic throughout infection (red), in the absence of regular antigen testing, assuming an overall basic reproduction number, $R_0 = 1.5$, and that entirely asymptomatic hosts represent 20% of infected

302

hosts and generate 8% of transmissions (45).

303

B. The proportion of transmissions per infected individual prevented by regular antigen testing, for different values of the (mean) interval between tests, assuming entirely asymptomatic infected hosts represent 20% of all infected hosts and generate 0% (blue), 8%

305

(red) or 20% (orange) of transmissions in the absence of antigen testing, and assuming no

307

asymptomatic infected hosts (black dotted).

308

C. The outbreak risk for different values of the (mean) interval between tests, for the same scenarios as in panel B.

309 **Delayed and/or time-limited antigen testing**

310 In most of our analyses of the effect of regular antigen testing on the local
311 SARS-CoV-2 outbreak risk, we focussed on a scenario in which testing is in place at
312 the time of virus introduction and continues indefinitely. However, we also generalised
313 our analytic outbreak risk derivation to scenarios where the infectiousness profile is
314 calendar time-dependent (**Supplementary Note 4**). This enabled us to explore how
315 the effectiveness of antigen testing is reduced if testing is introduced reactively
316 following the first infection occurring (**Supplementary Figure 4A**), and/or continues
317 for only a limited time (**Supplementary Figure 4B**). We also conducted an analysis in
318 which we assumed a specified total number of tests to be available to each individual
319 (on average), and explored the optimal spacing of these tests to minimise the outbreak
320 risk (for example, 10 tests could be taken daily over 10 days, or once every two days
321 over 20 days; **Supplementary Figure 4C**), assuming reactive testing is introduced
322 when the first infected individual develops symptoms. These analyses therefore
323 demonstrate how antigen testing strategies can be optimised in settings with limited
324 testing resources.

325

326 **Discussion**

327 A key challenge for public health policy advisors is estimating the risk that
328 infectious disease cases introduced into a population will lead to a major local
329 outbreak. If the local outbreak risk can be calculated in populations with different
330 characteristics, this will enable limited surveillance and control resources to be
331 targeted effectively. In this article, we have presented a novel modelling framework for
332 estimating the local outbreak risk accounting for within-host viral dynamics.

333 To demonstrate our multi-scale approach in a concrete setting, we focussed
334 on the risk of local SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks. We used nonlinear mixed effects
335 modelling to fit a within-host model that has been used extensively to model
336 SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics (35–42) to data from 521 individuals with omicron variant
337 infections (43). The nonlinear mixed effects approach enabled us to quantify the
338 variability in within-host dynamics between individuals which, in turn, could be used to
339 characterise heterogeneity in individual infectiousness profiles (describing how the
340 transmission risk varies during each infection). We then calculated the local outbreak
341 risk based on these data, assuming either homogeneous or heterogeneous
342 within-host dynamics, before testing the effect of regular antigen testing. We found
343 that regular antigen testing can mitigate, but not necessarily eliminate, the outbreak
344 risk, depending on the frequency of testing (for example, in **Figure 2** we estimated an
345 outbreak risk of 0.58 without testing, 0.43 with testing every two days, and 0.32 with
346 daily testing) and local transmission characteristics.

347 Regular antigen testing is an example of an intervention that can be modelled
348 in greater detail using a multi-scale approach than is possible using a simpler
349 population-level model. This is because both the probability of a positive test result,
350 and the impact of detection on transmission, are likely to depend on the viral load

351 profile, with the timing of testing important for determining the exact outcome.
352 Previous studies have used multi-scale models to analyse the effectiveness of antigen
353 testing for controlling an ongoing outbreak (26–28), but none of those studies
354 considered the impact of antigen testing on the outbreak risk.

355 Antigen testing was carried out at large scale in countries including the UK
356 (46) earlier in the COVID-19 pandemic, but (similarly to other non-pharmaceutical
357 interventions) has become less commonplace following the roll-out of vaccinations.
358 However, local outbreak prevention remains important in some specific populations in
359 the era of living with COVID-19, for example in care homes due to a high proportion of
360 vulnerable individuals, and our analyses of antigen testing have ongoing relevance to
361 such populations (the UK government continues to provide free tests to care homes
362 (47)). Furthermore, while we used within-host data for the omicron SARS-CoV-2
363 variant, our methodology and qualitative findings will be applicable if a future
364 SARS-CoV-2 variant, or other viral pathogen, necessitates wider use of
365 non-pharmaceutical interventions.

366 In the absence of antigen testing, accounting for heterogeneity in within-host
367 dynamics between different hosts generally gave rise to a lower outbreak risk estimate
368 compared to that obtained under the assumption of homogeneous within-host
369 dynamics, while the estimates using both versions of our multi-scale approach were
370 higher than a commonly used outbreak risk estimate that does not account for
371 within-host dynamics (13–19) (**Figure 4B**). These results are consistent with previous
372 comparisons of the outbreak risk between models with different infectious period
373 distributions (20) or offspring distributions (48), although previous studies did not
374 consider variations in infectiousness during infection. More variability in the total
375 number of transmissions generated by different individuals typically leads to a lower

376 outbreak risk since, for example, the probability of the primary infected individual
377 generating no transmissions will then be higher. We also found a greater impact of
378 antigen testing on transmission with heterogeneous than homogeneous within-host
379 dynamics (**Figure 4C**), which contributed to a bigger difference in outbreak risk
380 estimates between the heterogeneous and homogeneous models when antigen
381 testing is carried out (**Figure 4D**) than without testing.

382 Our results highlight that transmission characteristics depending on both the
383 virus and local population under consideration are important in determining the
384 outbreak risk and impact of antigen testing. In settings where the reproduction number
385 for local transmissions is high (e.g., in high-contact environments, or due to a new viral
386 variant or waning immunity), the outbreak risk may remain high even with a high
387 testing frequency, so that mitigations in addition to antigen testing would be required to
388 substantially reduce the risk. Conversely, we found antigen testing to be more
389 effective when a high proportion of transmissions are presymptomatic, such as in
390 schools and workplaces (provided symptomatic individuals are instructed to stay at
391 home). This is because population-wide testing enables infected individuals to be
392 detected before symptoms, thus preventing presymptomatic transmissions that would
393 otherwise have occurred. Similarly, when we accounted for entirely asymptomatic
394 infections (**Figure 5**), we found a lower outbreak risk under daily testing when a higher
395 proportion of transmissions are generated by asymptomatic infectors.

396 Like any modelling study, our analyses involved assumptions and
397 simplifications. We assumed that infectiousness scales with the logarithm of the viral
398 load (26,30), with a reduction in transmission risk upon detection (due to detected
399 individuals staying at home and/or isolating) (44,49,50). However, more complex
400 within-host models or relationships between viral load and infectiousness, or a delay

401 between detection and isolation, would be straightforward to implement in our
402 multi-scale modelling framework. We also assumed equal viral load thresholds for
403 infectiousness and for antigen test positivity, but this assumption could be relaxed to
404 explore how the outbreak risk under regular antigen testing depends on test
405 sensitivity, which may vary between tests developed by different manufacturers (51).
406 While our focus here was rapid antigen testing, future work may compare the
407 effectiveness of antigen and PCR testing for reducing the outbreak risk, particularly
408 considering a trade-off between test sensitivity and turn-around time that has
409 previously been explored in the context of controlling an ongoing outbreak (28,30).

410 Our multi-scale approach for estimating the outbreak risk, accounting for
411 heterogeneous within-host viral dynamics, could be extended in numerous directions.
412 We considered a scenario involving a single infected individual arriving in a host
413 population early in their course of infection. However, it would be straightforward to
414 consider possibilities such as the primary infected individual entering the population
415 later in infection, and/or multiple infectious importations occurring. A future study may
416 also relate heterogeneity in within-host dynamics to specific characteristics such as
417 age, enabling the outbreak risk to be compared between local populations with
418 different structures. Other forms of heterogeneity, such as in susceptibility and/or
419 contact rates, could also be considered. Finally, going forwards, we plan to use the
420 mathematical results (**Supplementary Note 4**) underlying our analysis of reactively
421 introduced antigen testing (**Supplementary Figure 4**) to explore temporal changes in
422 the SARS-CoV-2 local outbreak risk, combining our multi-scale approach here with
423 previous work incorporating time-dependent susceptibility into outbreak risk estimates
424 (11) (for example, a booster vaccination campaign followed by waning immunity could
425 be considered).

426 In summary, we have developed a multi-scale modelling framework in which
427 within-host viral dynamics models can be used to inform estimates of the risk of
428 infectious disease outbreaks and to analyse the impact of pre-emptive control.
429 Applying our approach to estimate the risk of local SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks, we found
430 that regular antigen testing of the local population can reduce, but not eliminate, the
431 outbreak risk, depending on the frequency of testing as well as transmission
432 characteristics that are likely to vary temporally and between different populations.
433 Additionally, we found that it may be important to account for details such as
434 asymptomatic infection and heterogeneity in within-host dynamics to assess the
435 effectiveness of antigen testing accurately. We hope that this research will help to
436 guide pre-emptive control and mitigate the risk of outbreaks due to a range of viruses.
437

438 **Methods**

439 **Study data**

440 We analysed published viral load data from 521 individuals with symptomatic
441 infections due to the omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant (43). For each individual in the
442 dataset, the results and timing (relative to a recorded symptom onset date, including
443 some tests carried out prior to symptom onset) of at least three RT-qPCR tests were
444 available. The median number of tests per individual was 15. Viral load values
445 (converted from Ct values) were recorded for positive tests.

446

447 **Within-host model and parameter estimation**

448 We used a simple within-host model of SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics (35–42),
449 given by

$$\frac{df}{d\tau} = -bfV,$$
$$\frac{dV}{d\tau} = \gamma fV - \delta V,$$

450 where $f(\tau)$ and $V(\tau)$ denote, respectively, the proportion of uninfected target cells
451 (so that $f(0) = 1$) and viral load at time since infection τ . The parameters b , γ and δ
452 are the rate constant for virus infection, the maximum rate constant for viral replication,
453 and the death rate of infected cells, respectively.

454 We estimated the parameters b , γ and δ , in addition to the incubation period,
455 τ_{inc} , by fitting the model to the viral load data using a nonlinear mixed effects modelling
456 approach (amounting to a partial pooling of the data from each individual). Specifically,
457 the value of the parameter vector, $\theta_j = (b_j, \gamma_j, \delta_j, \tau_{\text{inc},j})$, for a given individual, j , was
458 assumed to be of the form $\theta_j = \theta_{pop} \times e^{\xi_j}$ (where the operations are applied
459 element-wise). Here, θ_{pop} is a fixed effect (referred to as the population parameter

460 value), and ξ_j is a random effect, assumed to be normally distributed with mean zero
461 and covariance matrix Ω . For simplicity, we assumed the random effects for different
462 parameters to be independent, with standard deviations ω_b , ω_γ , ω_δ and $\omega_{\tau_{\text{inc}}}$ (i.e.,
463 $\Omega = \text{diag}(\omega_b^2, \omega_\gamma^2, \omega_\delta^2, \omega_{\tau_{\text{inc}}}^2)$).

464 In the parameter fitting procedure, we estimated both the fixed effects
465 (**Supplementary Table 1**; note that the subscript *pop* is suppressed) and the standard
466 deviations of the random effects (**Supplementary Table 2**). In other words, we
467 characterised both the population (median) values of model parameters, as well as
468 variability in those parameters between individuals. The measurement error, σ , in
469 recorded values of the log viral load, was also estimated. These parameters were
470 estimated by using the Stochastic Approximation of the Expectation-Maximization
471 (SAEM) algorithm (52,53) to obtain the parameter values that maximise the likelihood
472 of the recorded viral load data. We accounted for left censoring of viral load data (i.e.,
473 a negative test result occurring at viral loads below the detection limit of $10^{2.66}$
474 copies/ml) in the likelihood. Initial values of estimated parameters were changed
475 multiple times to confirm the robustness of parameter estimation and ensure a global
476 maximum of the likelihood was obtained. Additionally, we calculated best-fit estimates
477 (Empirical Bayes Estimates (53)) of within-host model parameters for each individual
478 host (**Supplementary Figure 1**). Fitting was implemented in MONOLIX version
479 2019R2 (53).

480

481 **Detection model**

482 We assumed that infected individuals could be detected in two possible ways:

- 483 1. By returning a positive antigen test.
- 484 2. By developing symptoms (we assumed previously undetected hosts to be

485 detected immediately upon symptom onset).

486 Supposing that an infected individual conducts an antigen test when their
487 instantaneous viral load is V , we assumed (similarly to previous work (40,42)) that a
488 positive test result occurs with probability $p_+(V) = \text{Prob}(\hat{V} \geq V^*)$. Here, \hat{V} represents
489 a measured viral load, assumed to be normally distributed on the log scale
490 (independently of previous viral load measurements) such that $\log_{10}(\hat{V}) \sim$
491 $N(\log_{10}(V), \sigma^2)$; V^* is the detection limit (the choice of V^* is described in
492 **Supplementary Table 1**); and the value of the measurement error level, σ , was
493 assumed to be equal to the corresponding quantity that we estimated for PCR testing
494 (**Supplementary Table 1**). In other words, a positive test result was assumed to occur
495 whenever the measured viral load exceeds the detection limit.

496 In most of our analyses of regular antigen testing, we assumed an
497 exponentially distributed interval between successive tests, with mean T (i.e., a
498 constant rate of testing; the alternative scenario of a constant interval between tests is
499 considered in **Supplementary Figure 3B**). Under this assumption, the probability of
500 an infected individual being detected by time since infection τ is given by

$$p_d(\tau) = \begin{cases} 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{T} \int_0^\tau p_+(V(x)) dx\right), & \tau < \tau_{\text{inc}}; \\ 1, & \tau \geq \tau_{\text{inc}}; \end{cases}$$

501 where $V(x)$ represents the viral load of the specified individual at time since infection
502 x , and τ_{inc} their incubation period (τ_{inc} can be taken to be infinite to represent an
503 entirely asymptomatic infection). This expression is derived in **Supplementary Note**
504 **1**.

505

506 Infectiousness model

507 The infectiousness profile of an undetected host, $\beta_u(\tau)$, at each time since

508 infection, τ , was assumed to depend on their viral load, $V(\tau)$, according to a
509 prescribed functional relationship. Specifically, we assumed (26,30)

$$\beta_u(\tau) = K \times \max\{\log_{10}(V(\tau)) - \log_{10}(V^*), 0\},$$

510 so that only individuals with a viral load exceeding V^* are infectious. We assumed this
511 infectiousness limit to be equal to the detection limit for antigen testing (i.e., in the
512 absence of measurement errors, infected individuals will return a positive antigen test
513 if and only if they are infectious at the time of testing). The choice of the scaling factor,
514 K , is described below.

515 We assumed the effective infectiousness (accounting for behavioural factors)
516 of a detected individual at time since infection τ (where τ exceeds the time of
517 detection) to be a factor α_d times $\beta_u(\tau)$ (the choice of α_d , which lies between zero
518 and one, is described in **Supplementary Table 1**). In the absence of regular antigen
519 testing, the overall individual infectiousness profile is then

$$\beta(\tau) = \begin{cases} \beta_u(\tau), & \tau < \tau_{\text{inc}}; \\ \alpha_d \beta_u(\tau), & \tau \geq \tau_{\text{inc}}. \end{cases}$$

520 When regular antigen testing takes place, supposing the individual under
521 consideration has been detected by time since infection τ with probability $p_d(\tau)$, then
522 their expected infectiousness at time since infection τ (accounting for different
523 possible detection times) is

$$\beta(\tau) = [\alpha_d p_d(\tau) + (1 - p_d(\tau))] \times \beta_u(\tau).$$

524 The scaling factor, K , in the expression for $\beta_u(\tau)$, was chosen to obtain a
525 specified value of the basic reproduction number, R_0 , in the absence of regular
526 antigen testing (except where otherwise specified, we took the default value $R_0 =$
527 1.5). Specifically, if the expected infectiousness profile (averaging over individual

528 infectiousness profiles if the population is heterogeneous) is $\bar{\beta}(\tau)$, then we have (see
529 **Supplementary Note 2** in detail)

$$R_0 = \int_0^{\infty} \bar{\beta}(\tau) d\tau.$$

530

531 **Outbreak risk**

532 Here, we describe our approach for calculating the (local) outbreak risk (the
533 probability that a major outbreak results from a single newly infected individual being
534 introduced into an otherwise uninfected population) under the within-host, detection
535 and infectiousness models described above. A benefit of our approach is that we have
536 derived equations satisfied by the (local) outbreak risk analytically under a branching
537 process transmission model, assuming either homogeneous or heterogeneous
538 within-host dynamics between different infected individuals. These equations are
539 described below; derivations are given in **Supplementary Note 2**. The equations
540 were solved numerically, avoiding the need to run large numbers of stochastic model
541 simulations to estimate the local outbreak risk. However, we also verified our
542 analytically derived outbreak risk estimates against simulations of a discrete-time,
543 individual-based, stochastic epidemic model in **Figure 2F** (see **Supplementary**
544 **Figure 2** and **Supplementary Note 5** for details).

545

546 ***Homogeneous population model***

547 First, we considered a simplified scenario in which each member of the
548 population is assumed to follow the same infectiousness profile, $\beta(\tau)$. In this case, an
549 analytic argument gives the following implicit equation for the outbreak risk:

$$p_{\text{outbreak}} = 1 - \exp(-R_{0,\text{eff}} \times p_{\text{outbreak}}), \#(1)$$

550 where the largest solution between 0 and 1 should be taken. Here, $R_{0,\text{eff}}$ is the
551 reproduction number at the start of the outbreak, accounting for regular antigen testing
552 (assumed to be in place at the time of pathogen introduction) if carried out, while we
553 use R_0 to refer specifically to the basic reproduction number in the absence of regular
554 antigen testing. This equation has previously been derived in the special case of
555 constant infectiousness during a fixed infectious period (18), but we show in
556 **Supplementary Note 2** that this equation is valid for any $\beta(\tau)$ (provided there is no
557 heterogeneity in infectiousness). We also emphasise that while this equation only
558 depends on $R_{0,\text{eff}}$, even in this simplified scenario our multi-scale approach enables
559 detailed analysis of how interventions such as antigen testing affect $R_{0,\text{eff}}$ and
560 therefore the outbreak risk, which cannot otherwise be captured easily.

561 We solved Eq. (1) numerically under the parameter values in **Supplementary**
562 **Table 1** (in particular, using population estimates of the within-host parameters b , γ ,
563 δ and τ_{inc}) in order to estimate p_{outbreak} in the absence of regular antigen testing.
564 Then, we explored the effect of antigen testing on p_{outbreak} , for simplicity averaging
565 over the exact detection times of different individuals in most of our analyses. Of note,
566 in **Supplementary Figure 3A**, we found that explicitly accounting for heterogeneity in
567 detection times had a very small effect on the p_{outbreak} estimates.

568

569 ***Heterogeneous population model***

570 We also conducted an analysis in which we accounted for heterogeneity in
571 within-host dynamics between different individuals. In **Supplementary Note 2**, we
572 show that if there are n population subgroups, with each infected individual in group
573 j assumed to follow infectiousness profile $\beta_j(\tau)$, then the outbreak risk is the largest
574 solution between 0 and 1 of

$$p_{\text{outbreak}} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j \times \exp(-R_j \times p_{\text{outbreak}}). \#(2)$$

575 Here, a_j represents the proportion of new infections that are in group j (at the start of
576 the epidemic and neglecting heterogeneity in contact rates between groups), which
577 simply corresponds to the proportion of the population in group j if there is no
578 difference in susceptibility between groups, while R_j gives the expected number of
579 transmissions generated by an infected host in group j over the course of infection (at
580 the start of the outbreak). We note that Eq. (2) includes as special cases most previous
581 outbreak risk estimates based on branching process approximations of
582 compartmental epidemic models (see **Supplementary Note 3**).

583 To account for heterogeneous within-host dynamics, we used the estimated
584 fixed (**Supplementary Table 1**) and random (**Supplementary Table 2**) effects to
585 generate synthetic viral load profiles and incubation periods for $n = 10,000$ infected
586 individuals. The infectiousness profile of each individual was obtained (averaging over
587 possible detection times when analysing regular antigen testing), and then Eq. (2) was
588 used to estimate the outbreak risk (taking $a_j = 1/n$ for each j).

589 We also used Eq. (2) when we accounted for entirely asymptomatic infections
590 (**Figure 5**). In **Figure 5**, we assumed that a proportion, $a_1 = 0.8$, of infected
591 individuals develop symptoms, with the remaining proportion, $a_2 = 0.2$, remaining
592 asymptomatic throughout infection (45) (i.e., we took $n = 2$ in Eq. (2)). For simplicity,
593 we assumed no difference in within-host model parameters between entirely
594 asymptomatic hosts and those who develop symptoms, but instead considered
595 different possible values of the proportion of all transmissions arising from entirely
596 asymptomatic infectors (in the absence of regular antigen testing), given by

$$r_A = \frac{a_2 R_2}{a_1 R_1 + a_2 R_2} = \frac{a_2 x_A}{a_1 + a_2 x_A},$$

597 where $x_A = R_2/R_1$ represents the relative overall transmissibility of asymptomatic
598 infected hosts (where R_1 and R_2 represent the expected total number of
599 transmissions generated by each infected host who develops symptoms and by each
600 entirely asymptomatic infected host, respectively). Specifically, we considered r_A
601 values of 0, 0.08 and 0.2, which were obtained by scaling the infectiousness profiles of
602 entirely asymptomatic hosts to obtain corresponding x_A values of 0, 0.35 (the value
603 obtained by (45)) and 1, respectively.

604 Finally, we also used Eq. (2) when we accounted for variability in the exact
605 detection times of different infected individuals under regular antigen testing,
606 assuming either an exponentially distributed interval between tests (**Supplementary**
607 **Figure 3A**) or a fixed interval (**Supplementary Figure 3B**; in this case assuming each
608 infection time to be uniformly distributed between two testing times). In both cases, we
609 sampled the detection times of $n = 10,000$ hosts.

610

611 **Delayed and/or time-limited regular antigen testing**

612 In most of our analyses, we focussed on a scenario in which regular antigen
613 testing is already in place at the time of pathogen introduction and continues
614 indefinitely. However, we also considered scenarios in which testing is introduced
615 reactively after an infection occurs within the local population, and/or testing is only
616 carried out for a limited time period (**Supplementary Figure 4**). An equation for the
617 outbreak risk in this scenario is derived in **Supplementary Note 4**.

618 References

- 619 1. UK Government. COVID-19 Response: Living with COVID-19. (2022). at
620 <[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19/
621 covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19#living-with-covid-19](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19#living-with-covid-19)>
- 622 2. World Health Organization. *COVID-19 weekly epidemiological update (edition 123)*.
623 (2022). at
624 <[https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-weekly-epidemiological-update---2
625 1-december-2022](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-weekly-epidemiological-update---21-december-2022)>
- 626 3. Lavine, J. S., Bjornstad, O. N. & Antia, R. Immunological characteristics govern the
627 transition of COVID-19 to endemicity. *Science (1979)* **371**, 741–745 (2021).
- 628 4. Barnard, R. C. *et al.* Modelling the medium-term dynamics of SARS-CoV-2
629 transmission in England in the Omicron era. *Nat Commun* **13**, 4879 (2022).
- 630 5. Dyson, L. *et al.* Possible future waves of SARS-CoV-2 infection generated by variants
631 of concern with a range of characteristics. *Nat Commun* **12**, 5730 (2021).
- 632 6. Thompson, R. N., Hill, E. M. & Gog, J. R. SARS-CoV-2 incidence and vaccine escape.
633 *Lancet Infect Dis* **21**, 913–914 (2021).
- 634 7. Gog, J. R., Hill, E. M., Danon, L. & Thompson, R. N. Vaccine escape in a
635 heterogeneous population: insights for SARS-CoV-2 from a simple model. *R Soc Open
636 Sci* **8**, 210530 (2021).
- 637 8. Thompson, R. N., Gilligan, C. A. & Cunniffe, N. J. Will an outbreak exceed available
638 resources for control? Estimating the risk from invading pathogens using practical
639 definitions of a severe epidemic. *J R Soc Interface* **17**, 20200690 (2020).
- 640 9. Lovell-Read, F. A., Shen, S. & Thompson, R. N. Estimating local outbreak risks and the
641 effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions in age-structured populations:
642 SARS-CoV-2 as a case study. *J Theor Biol* **535**, 110983 (2022).
- 643 10. Kaye, A. R., Hart, W. S., Bromiley, J., Iwami, S. & Thompson, R. N. A direct comparison
644 of methods for assessing the threat from emerging infectious diseases in seasonally
645 varying environments. *J Theor Biol* **548**, 111195 (2022).
- 646 11. Sachak-Patwa, R., Byrne, H. M., Dyson, L. & Thompson, R. N. The risk of SARS-CoV-2
647 outbreaks in low prevalence settings following the removal of travel restrictions.
648 *Communications Medicine* **1**, 39 (2021).
- 649 12. Southall, E. *et al.* A practical guide to mathematical methods for estimating infectious
650 disease outbreak risks. *J Theor Biol* **562**, 111417 (2023).

- 651 13. Thompson, R. N., Gilligan, C. A. & Cunniffe, N. J. Detecting presymptomatic infection is
652 necessary to forecast major epidemics in the earliest stages of infectious disease
653 outbreaks. *PLoS Comput Biol* **12**, e1004836 (2016).
- 654 14. Thompson, R. N., Jalava, K. & Obolski, U. Sustained transmission of Ebola in new
655 locations: more likely than previously thought. *Lancet Infectious Diseases* **19**,
656 1058–1059 (2019).
- 657 15. Thompson, R. N., Thompson, C. P., Pelerman, O., Gupta, S. & Obolski, U. Increased
658 frequency of travel in the presence of cross-immunity may act to decrease the chance
659 of a global pandemic. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological
660 Sciences* **374**, (2019).
- 661 16. Althaus, C. L., Low, N., Musa, E. O., Shuaib, F. & Gsteiger, S. Ebola virus disease
662 outbreak in Nigeria: Transmission dynamics and rapid control. *Epidemics* **11**, 80–84
663 (2015).
- 664 17. Craft, M. E., Beyer, H. L. & Haydon, D. T. Estimating the probability of a major outbreak
665 from the timing of early cases: an indeterminate problem? *PLoS One* **8**, e57878 (2013).
- 666 18. Keeling, M. J. & Rohani, P. *Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals*.
667 (Princeton University Press, 2008). doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(08)70147-6
- 668 19. Thompson, R. N. *et al.* The impact of cross-reactive immunity on the emergence of
669 SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Front Immunol* **13**, 1049458 (2023).
- 670 20. Anderson, D. & Watson, R. On the spread of a disease with gamma distributed latent
671 and infectious periods. *Biometrika* **67**, 191–198 (1980).
- 672 21. Nishiura, H., Cook, A. R. & Cowling, B. J. Assortativity and the probability of epidemic
673 extinction: A case study of pandemic influenza A (H1N1-2009). *Interdiscip Perspect
674 Infect Dis* **2011**, (2011).
- 675 22. Yates, A., Antia, R. & Regoes, R. R. How do pathogen evolution and host heterogeneity
676 interact in disease emergence? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
677 Sciences* **273**, 3075–3083 (2006).
- 678 23. Hart, W. S., Maini, P. K., Yates, C. A. & Thompson, R. N. A theoretical framework for
679 transitioning from patient-level to population-scale epidemiological dynamics: influenza
680 A as a case study. *J R Soc Interface* **17**, 20200230 (2020).
- 681 24. Childs, L. M. *et al.* Linked within-host and between-host models and data for infectious
682 diseases: a systematic review. *PeerJ* **7**, e7057 (2019).

- 683 25. Garira, W. A complete categorization of multiscale models of infectious disease
684 systems. *J Biol Dyn* **11**, 378–435 (2017).
- 685 26. Larremore, D. B. *et al.* Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time
686 for COVID-19 screening. *Sci Adv* **7**, eabd5393 (2021).
- 687 27. Whitfield, C. A. & Hall, I. Modelling the impact of repeat asymptomatic testing policies
688 for staff on SARS-CoV-2 transmission potential. *J Theor Biol* **557**, 111335 (2023).
- 689 28. Forde, J. E. & Ciupe, S. M. Quantification of the tradeoff between test sensitivity and
690 test frequency in a COVID-19 epidemic—a multi-scale modeling approach. *Viruses* **13**,
691 457 (2021).
- 692 29. Torneri, A. *et al.* A prospect on the use of antiviral drugs to control local outbreaks of
693 COVID-19. *BMC Med* **18**, 191 (2020).
- 694 30. Larremore, D. B., Toomre, D. & Parker, R. Modeling the effectiveness of olfactory
695 testing to limit SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Nat Commun* **12**, 3664 (2021).
- 696 31. Goyal, A., Reeves, D. B., Fabian Cardozo-Ojeda, E., Schiffer, J. T. & Mayer, B. T. Viral
697 load and contact heterogeneity predict SARS-CoV-2 transmission and super-spreading
698 events. *Elife* **10**, e63537 (2021).
- 699 32. Goyal, A. *et al.* Slight reduction in SARS-CoV-2 exposure viral load due to masking
700 results in a significant reduction in transmission with widespread implementation. *Sci*
701 *Rep* **11**, 11838 (2021).
- 702 33. Goyal, A., Reeves, D. B. & Schiffer, J. T. Multi-scale modelling reveals that early
703 super-spreader events are a likely contributor to novel variant predominance. *J R Soc*
704 *Interface* **19**, (2022).
- 705 34. Murillo, L. N., Murillo, M. S. & Perelson, A. S. Towards multiscale modeling of influenza
706 infection. *J Theor Biol* **332**, 267–290 (2013).
- 707 35. Ikeda, H. *et al.* Improving the estimation of the death rate of infected cells from time
708 course data during the acute phase of virus infections: application to acute HIV-1
709 infection in a humanized mouse model. *Theor Biol Med Model* **11**, 22 (2014).
- 710 36. Kim, K. S. *et al.* A quantitative model used to compare within-host SARS-CoV-2,
711 MERS-CoV, and SARS-CoV dynamics provides insights into the pathogenesis and
712 treatment of SARS-CoV-2. *PLoS Biol* **19**, e3001128 (2021).
- 713 37. Ejima, K. *et al.* Estimation of the incubation period of COVID-19 using viral load data.
714 *Epidemics* **35**, 100454 (2021).

- 715 38. Iwanami, S. *et al.* Detection of significant antiviral drug effects on COVID-19 with
716 reasonable sample sizes in randomized controlled trials: A modeling study. *PLoS Med*
717 **18**, e1003660 (2021).
- 718 39. Jeong, Y. D. *et al.* Revisiting the guidelines for ending isolation for COVID-19 patients.
719 *Elife* **10**, e69340 (2021).
- 720 40. Jeong, Y. D. *et al.* Safely return to schools and offices: early and frequent screening
721 with high sensitivity antigen tests effectively identifies COVID-19 patients. *medRxiv*
722 2021.10.08.21264782 (2021). doi:10.1101/2021.10.08.21264782
- 723 41. Ejima, K. *et al.* Estimation of timing of infection from longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 viral load
724 data: mathematical modelling study. *BMC Infect Dis* **22**, 656 (2022).
- 725 42. Jeong, Y. D. *et al.* Designing isolation guidelines for COVID-19 patients with rapid
726 antigen tests. *Nature Communications* 2022 13:1 **13**, 4910 (2022).
- 727 43. Hay, J. A. *et al.* Quantifying the impact of immune history and variant on SARS-CoV-2
728 viral kinetics and infection rebound: a retrospective cohort study. *Elife* **11**, e81849
729 (2022).
- 730 44. Hart, W. S. *et al.* Generation time of the alpha and delta SARS-CoV-2 variants: an
731 epidemiological analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* **22**, 603–610 (2022).
- 732 45. Buitrago-Garcia, D. *et al.* Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and
733 presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis.
734 *PLoS Med* **17**, e1003346 (2020).
- 735 46. Torjesen, I. Covid-19: How the UK is using lateral flow tests in the pandemic. *BMJ* **372**,
736 n287 (2021).
- 737 47. UK Government. COVID-19 testing in adult social care. (2022). at
738 <[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-testing-for-adult-s](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-testing-for-adult-social-care-settings/covid-19-testing-in-adult-social-care)
739 [ocial-care-settings/covid-19-testing-in-adult-social-care](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-testing-for-adult-social-care-settings/covid-19-testing-in-adult-social-care)>
- 740 48. Lloyd-Smith, J. O., Schreiber, S. J., Kopp, P. E. & Getz, W. M. Superspreading and the
741 effect of individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature* **438**, 355–359 (2005).
- 742 49. Hart, W. S., Maini, P. K. & Thompson, R. N. High infectiousness immediately before
743 COVID-19 symptom onset highlights the importance of continued contact tracing. *Elife*
744 **10**, e65534 (2021).
- 745 50. Hart, W. S. *et al.* Inference of the SARS-CoV-2 generation time using UK household
746 data. *Elife* **11**, e70767 (2022).

- 747 51. Bekliz, M. *et al.* Analytical Sensitivity of Eight Different SARS-CoV-2 Antigen-Detecting
748 Rapid Tests for Omicron-BA.1 Variant. *Microbiol Spectr* **10**, e00853-22 (2022).
749 52. Kuhn, E. & Lavielle, M. Maximum likelihood estimation in nonlinear mixed effects
750 models. *Comput Stat Data Anal* **49**, 1020–1038 (2005).
751 53. Lixoft. Monolix documentation. at <<https://monolix.lixoft.com/>>
752

753 **Acknowledgements**

754 We would like to thank Philip Maini for helpful comments on the manuscript. W.S.H.
755 acknowledges funding by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council
756 via a Doctoral Prize (grant number EP/W524311/1) and by the Japan Society for the
757 Promotion of Science via an International Research Fellowship (short-term
758 Predoctoral Fellowship). This study was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for
759 Transformative Research Areas A 22H05215 (to S.I.), JSPS Scientific Research
760 (KAKENHI) B 18H01139 (to S.I.), 16H04845 (to S.I.), Scientific Research in Innovative
761 Areas 20H05042 (to S.I.); AMED CREST 19gm1310002 (to S.I.); AMED Development
762 of Vaccines for the Novel Coronavirus Disease, 21nf0101638s0201 (to S.I.); AMED
763 Japan Program for Infectious Diseases Research and Infrastructure,
764 20wm0325007h0001 (to S.I.), 20wm0325004s0201 (to S.I.), 20wm0325012s0301 (to
765 S.I.), 20wm0325015s0301 (to S.I.); AMED Research Program on HIV/AIDS
766 22fk0410052s0401 (to S.I.); AMED Research Program on Emerging and
767 Re-emerging Infectious Diseases 20fk0108140s0801 (to S.I.), 21fk0108428s0301 (to
768 S.I.); AMED Program for Basic and Clinical Research on Hepatitis 21fk0210094 (to
769 S.I.); AMED Program on the Innovative Development and the Application of New
770 Drugs for Hepatitis B 22fk0310504h0501 (to S.I.); AMED Strategic Research Program
771 for Brain Sciences 22wm0425011s0302; JST MIRAI JPMJMI22G1 (to S.I.); Moonshot
772 R&D JPMJMS2021 (to S.I.) and JPMJMS2025 (to S.I.); Shin-Nihon of Advanced
773 Medical Research (to S.I.); SECOM Science and Technology Foundation (to S.I.).

774

775 **Author contributions**

776 W.S.H. and S.I. conceptualised the study. All authors developed the methodology.

777 W.S.H. and H.P. wrote the model code and conducted the computational analyses.

778 S.I. and R.N.T. supervised the research. W.S.H. wrote the initial manuscript draft. All

779 authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

780

781 **Competing interests**

782 The authors declare no competing interests.