

1 **Surveillance strategies for the detection of new SARS-CoV-2 vari-** 2 **ants across epidemiological contexts**

3
4 Kirstin I. Oliveira Roster¹, Stephen M. Kissler¹, Enoma Omoregie², Jade C. Wang², Helly
5 Amin², Steve Di Lonardo², Scott Hughes ^{†2}, Yonatan H. Grad ^{*†1}

6
7 ¹ Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,
8 Boston, MA

9 ² New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York City, NY

10
11 [†] Co-senior authors

12 ^{*} Correspondence: ygrad@hsph.harvard.edu

13 **Abstract**

14
15
16
17
18 Rapid identification of new SARS-CoV-2 variants is a critical component of the public health
19 response to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, we lack a quantitative framework to assess
20 the expected performance of sampling strategies in varying epidemic contexts. To address
21 this gap, we used a multi-patch stochastic model of SARS-CoV-2 spread in New York City to
22 evaluate the impact of the volume of testing and sequencing, geographic representativeness
23 of sampling, location and timing of variant emergence, and relative variant transmissibility on
24 the time to first detection of a new variant. The strategy of targeted sampling of likely emer-
25 gence locations offered the most improvement in detection speed. Increasing sequencing ca-
26 pacity reduced detection time more than increasing testing volumes. The relative transmissi-
27 bility of the new variant and the epidemic context of variant emergence also influenced detec-
28 tion times, showing that individual surveillance strategies can result in a wide range of detec-
29 tion outcomes, depending on the underlying dynamics of the circulating variants. These find-
30 ings help contextualize the design, interpretation, and trade-offs of genomic surveillance strat-
31 egies.

32 Introduction

33
34 Genomic surveillance is an important tool for public health response to infectious disease
35 (1,2). For pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2, genomic surveillance has enabled rapid identifi-
36 cation and characterization of genetic variants that differ in transmissibility, virulence, and an-
37 tigenic space, and thus informed disease control policies and the design and clinical use of
38 therapeutics and vaccines (3–7).

39
40 Many questions remain about the impact of sampling strategies on the time to first detection
41 of a variant. Guidelines suggest specific sequencing rates or fixed sequencing volumes (7)(8),
42 depending on available resources, logistical considerations, overall SARS-CoV-2 prevalence,
43 and surveillance objectives. They also emphasize the importance of sequencing cases that
44 accurately reflect all SARS-CoV-2 infections, which requires representativeness of both test-
45 ing and sequencing. In low- and middle-income countries, increasing testing volume as a way
46 of improving the representativeness of sampling is most important to reducing variant detec-
47 tion times (9). However, we lack a general quantitative assessment of sampling strategies to
48 detect new variants—where ‘new’ refers to local emergence of a novel variant or the importa-
49 tion of an emerging, known or an unknown variant—within a target detection time that consid-
50 ers the role of geographic representativeness of sampling, the optimal testing and sequencing
51 volumes, and epidemic context.

52
53 To address this gap, we simulated the impact of a set of surveillance strategies on variant
54 detection across a range of contexts. We developed a multi-patch stochastic transmission
55 model for SARS-CoV-2 in New York City (NYC) and incorporated empirical human mobility
56 data for the geographic dispersal of pathogens. We chose NYC as a case study given its
57 experience with genomic surveillance and publicly available data on testing, sequencing, and
58 mobility (10,11). We simulated the introduction of new variants with varying levels of transmis-
59 sibility in locations across the city and at multiple introduction times relative to the introduction
60 of the previously dominant variant. We then simulated testing and sequencing scenarios, vary-
61 ing both the volume and distribution of sampling, and computed the time to first detection,
62 the overall burden of disease, and the geographic variability of the disease burden under each
63 strategy. By developing this framework, we aimed to contextualize decision-making on ge-
64 nomic surveillance within the diversity of possible disease scenarios.

65 66 67 Methods

68 69 *Data.*

70
71 Baseline COVID-19 testing rates (609 tests per 100,000 residents per week) and sequencing
72 rates for NYC were obtained from the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (NYC
73 DOHMH) (11) from December 2020 until November 2021 at the geographic resolution of mod-
74 ified ZIP-code tabulation areas (MODZCTAs). Mobility data were obtained from Meta *via* the
75 Facebook Data for Good Initiative (12), which reported the physical locations of anonymized
76 app users within 600m-by-600m tiles in 8-hour intervals. These data were aggregated to both
77 MODZCTAs and boroughs and used to construct a mixing matrix estimating the rate of inter-
78 personal encounters among the residents of NYC. We used data from the United States Cen-
79 sus Bureau to define mappings between MODZCTAs, tiles, and boroughs. The main analysis
80 was conducted at the geographic scale of boroughs. We conducted a sensitivity analysis at
81 the level of MODZCTAs. Full details are provided in the **Supplementary Materials and Meth-**
82 **ods.**

83 84 *Model structure.*

85

86 To simulate the introduction and subsequent transmission of a novel SARS-CoV-2 variant, we
87 constructed a multi-patch, two-variant stochastic compartmental model that builds on the basic
88 structure of a Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered-Susceptible (SEIRS) model. A first
89 variant was seeded in the population and a single index case of a novel variant was introduced
90 at varying times and in varying locations. The new variant was simulated to be more infectious
91 than the previously circulating variant. In sensitivity analyses (see Supplemental Material), we
92 considered variants that also had greater and faster immune evasion. Individuals progressed
93 stochastically through the states defined by variant characteristics (cross-protection, transmis-
94 sion probability, duration of latent and infectious periods) and the number of individuals in each
95 compartment. The probability of transmission between geographic locations (patches repre-
96 senting a borough or MODZCTA) was governed by the contact between boroughs (as ob-
97 served through human mobility), and the relative quantities of infectious and susceptible resi-
98 dents. We accounted for imperfect test sensitivity and specificity and for infection-induced be-
99 havioral changes, such as reducing contacts in response to a positive test. We then assessed
100 the impact on detection outcomes of different characteristics of the surveillance strategy and
101 the epidemiological context, specifically the volume of testing and sequencing, the geographic
102 distribution of testing, the introduction time and location of the second variant relative to the
103 first, the probability of transmission, and the connectivity (inward and outward mobility) of in-
104 troduction and sampling locations. Full details on the model structure are provided in the **Sup-**
105 **plementary Materials and Methods**. Code is available at [github.com/gradlab/detecting-](https://github.com/gradlab/detecting-sarscov2-variants)
106 [sarscov2-variants](https://github.com/gradlab/detecting-sarscov2-variants).

107

108 ***Statistical analysis.***

109

110 The main outcomes in this study were the time to variant detection (the number of days be-
111 tween when the index case becomes infectious and laboratory confirmation of the new variant
112 among sequenced specimens), the cumulative number of infections, and the variation in cu-
113 mulative infections across locations. We ran 100 simulations per scenario and calculated the
114 arithmetic means, medians, and confidence intervals of the main outcomes across simula-
115 tions. For sampling schemes, we considered (1) the distribution of test volume in New York
116 City provided to DOHMH, which we termed ‘baseline’ testing, (2) test volumes distributed by
117 population density, and (3) test volumes distributed randomly across locations. We also con-
118 sidered “focused testing scenarios” in which 20-100% of tests were allocated in a single loca-
119 tion, with the remaining tests distributed evenly among the other locations according to their
120 population size. For total testing volumes, we considered a range between 5% and 300% of
121 the reported testing volume. For sequencing rates, we considered a range between 1% and
122 90% of all positive tests to be selected for sequencing. In a sensitivity analysis, we evaluated
123 fixed sequencing quantities instead of sequencing proportions, which distinguished the mar-
124 ginal contribution of sequencing versus testing alone.

125

126 When all introduction times produced qualitatively similar results, we reported in the main text
127 the results from the scenario in which the new variant is introduced just before the outbreak
128 peak of the previously dominating variant (at $t = 50$ days). In this scenario, detection was
129 expected to be at or near its slowest, due to high background prevalence and depletion of
130 susceptible individuals. Full results for all parameter combinations are provided in the **Sup-**
131 **plementary Data**.

132

133

Results

Geographic sampling strategy

Relative to the baseline volume and distribution of testing and sequencing in NYC (the “baseline” testing and sequencing strategy), detection times were similarly distributed when test volumes were allocated to be (a) proportional to the population density or (b) uniformly at random across locations (Fig. 1). This similarity across geographic sampling strategies was unaffected by the outcome measure used as well as the timing and location of the new variant’s introduction. However, the geographic sampling strategy affected detection outcomes if the introduction location of the new variant was oversampled. Allocating a greater proportion of tests in a single location reduced detection times and cumulative infections of variants emerging in that location but increased detection times of variants that first appeared elsewhere (Fig. 2). This effect was especially pronounced in Staten Island and Brooklyn, but weaker in Manhattan (Supplementary Fig. S5).




Figure 1. Distribution of detection times by geographic sampling strategy. Points depict the time between variant introduction and detection in days for the scenarios where tests are sampled geographically according to the baseline testing strategy, proportionally to population size, or randomly across New York City (at variant introduction 50 days after the prior variant, 30% of baseline test volume, and 10% sequencing rate). Boxes and whiskers depict the minimum, lower 25%, median, upper 75%, and maximum detection times.




Figure 2. Detection time by proportion of tests allocated in a single location. Lines depict the average detection time for scenarios where between 20% and 100% of tests are sampled from a single location, and the remaining tests are evenly distributed across the remaining locations by population size. The lines distinguish between scenarios where the variant emerged in the primary allocation location, i.e., test over-sampling and emergence occurred in the same location (blue), and scenarios where the variant emerged in one of the other locations, i.e., test over-sampling and emergence occurred in different locations (red). Ribbons depict the 95% confidence interval for the detection time.

Testing and sequencing volumes

Outcomes varied considerably across testing and sequencing rates, with higher rates leading to faster detection, fewer cases, and less variation in cumulative infections across locations (Fig. 3). In accordance with sampling guidelines for well-resourced settings (7), we assumed

170 that a fixed percentage of tests was sequenced. Thus, increasing the number of tests also
171 increased the number of sequenced samples.

172
173 To better understand the individual contributions of testing and sequencing, we fixed the quan-
174 tities of samples selected for sequencing at varying testing volumes. Fixed sequencing vol-
175 umes were implemented as a cap on the maximum number of samples that can be sequenced
176 per day. The actual number of sequenced cases depended on the test positivity rate.

177
178 The improvement in variant detection with increasing test volumes at a given sequencing pro-
179 portion was driven by the increase in sequencing volume rather than test volume. At all levels
180 of testing, increasing the number of sequenced samples reduced the detection time, while
181 increasing testing alone had little impact on new variant detection (**Fig. 4**).




Figure 3. Detection outcomes by test quantity and sequencing rate. Lines depict the mean duration between variant introduction and detection in days (A) and the cumulative infections upon detection (B) as a function of daily testing volume (given new variant introduction 50 days after the prior variant, baseline test strategy). Ribbons depict the 95% confidence interval for the detection time. Colors represent proportions of tests selected for sequencing.

182
183 We also considered an alternative interpretation of the sequencing cap, where the sequencing
184 volume depended on both the test volume and the positivity rate (**Supplement 3; Supple-**
185 **mentary Materials and Methods**). The results from this sensitivity analysis fall between the
186 fixed volume and fixed rate analyses (**Figs. 3 and 4**). Raising testing capacity improved de-
187 tection times for low levels of testing (up to 50-75 tests per 100k persons). At higher levels of
188 testing, improvements in detection time were driven primarily by increased sequencing capac-
189 ity (**Supplementary Fig. 3**).

190

191
192




Figure 4. Detection time by test volume and fixed sequencing capacity. Lines depict the mean duration between variant introduction and detection in days as a function of daily testing volume, colored by the maximum sequencing volume (A), and as a function of daily maximum sequencing volume, colored by the test volume (B) (at variant introduction 50 days after the prior variant and baseline sampling strategy).

193
194
195
196
197
198
199

Emergence context

We compared introduction times of the new variant as an approximation for varying background prevalence of the previously circulating variant and the population susceptibility to infection.

200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226

When the second, more transmissible variant was introduced into a fully susceptible population together with the first variant (at $t = 0$), the second variant was more likely to dominate due to its increased transmissibility. Under this scenario, the extinction probability of the second variant (defined as the likelihood that a variant will cause no more than 10 infections) was only 9.6% under the baseline sampling strategy. Both variants generally persisted through the duration of the simulation, though the second variant caused more infections. Consequently, at a $t=0$ introduction time, the second variant was detected in under 33 days in 95% of simulations. If the second variant was introduced after the peak of the first variant's outbreak (at $t = 80$ or $t = 100$), the second variant had a high probability of extinction (64.6 and 84.2%, respectively), and if it persisted, it was detected later (at least 56 and 37 days after introduction




Figure 5. Detection time of a novel variant across introduction times. Points depict the time between variant introduction and detection in days for different introduction times (with baseline distribution of tests, 30% of baseline test quantity, and sequencing rate 10%). Points are jittered horizontally to help visualize the distribution. Boxes and whiskers depict the minimum, lower 25%, median, upper 75%, and maximum detection times. The extinction probability for each scenario is depicted using inset squares, where the relative area of the red square is proportional to the extinction probability.

227 in 95% of simulations, respectively). The greatest range of disease dynamics and conse-
228 quently detection times was observed when the second variant was introduced just before the
229 peak of the first variant (at $t = 50$), with detection times ranging from 16 to 145 days (**Fig 5**).

230
231 The introduction location did not significantly impact the detection time or cumulative disease
232 burden across the city but did influence where infections occurred. The number of infections
233 was highest in locations with the highest mobility connectivity to the emergence location, which
234 was either the introduction location itself or other locations, depending on the mobility matrix.
235 Emergence in Staten Island, for example, produced infections primarily within Staten Island,
236 while emergence in Manhattan led to a high number of infections in Brooklyn and Queens
237 (**Supplementary Fig. S4**).

238
239

240 **Variant characteristics**

241 We compared variants with different levels of transmissibility, varying the probability of infec-
242 tion given an infectious contact from $\beta = 0.21$ to $\beta = 0.5$ (contrasting with the transmissibility
243 of the first variant of $\beta = 0.2$). This transmission parameter affected the disease dynamics,
244 with more transmissible variants spreading more quickly, leading to earlier detection. All trans-
245 mission rates yielded a wide range of cumulative infections at detection time (**Fig. 6**).

246




Figure 6. Detection time by cumulative infections for different transmission rates. Points depict the mean detection time and cumulative number of infections upon detection, averaged across 100 simulations of each introduction location, for each of the six transmission probabilities, represented by different colors (at variant introduction 50 days after the prior variant, baseline distribution of tests, 30% of baseline test quantity, and sequencing rate 10%). The baseline transmission rate of the pre-existing variant is $\beta = 0.2$.

247
248

249 **Discussion**

251 This study provides an assessment of testing and sequencing strategies for the detection of
252 new SARS-CoV-2 variants to help inform genomic surveillance policies. We considered var-
253 ying quantities and distributions of resources within a wide range of potential settings for var-
254 iant emergence and assessed how they influenced variant detection times and the unde-
255 tected disease burden.
256

257
258 Our results confirm that variant detection is governed by both the surveillance strategy and
259 the epidemic dynamics in which the new variant arises (13). The relative transmissibility of the
260 new variant as well as the context of variant emergence influenced its speed of spread and
261 extinction probability, which in turn affected detection outcomes (Figs. 5 and 6).

262
263 Surveillance guidelines stipulate the need for representative sampling strategies, which re-
264 quire not only that a random subset of positive cases be chosen for sequencing, but that posi-
265 tive cases also accurately reflect infections across the population; non-representative sam-
266 pling delays the detection of new variants (14). Nonrepresentative testing and sequencing
267 must be considered separately and jointly, along dimensions such as demography, socioeco-
268 nomic factors, disease outcome, and geography. In this study, we assessed the role of geog-
269 raphy in representative sampling. For variation in the geographic distribution of sequencing,
270 other work found that if sampling was not representative, then raising test volume improved
271 variant detection times more than raising sequencing rates (9). Our study considered the ge-
272 ographic distribution of testing, as well as the volume of both testing and sequencing, and
273 found that in the context of random sampling of tests for sequencing, improvements in detec-
274 tion time were driven primarily by increases in sequencing volume rather than testing volume
275 (**Fig. 4**). The geographic distribution of residents receiving tests impacted detection outcomes
276 only via the proximity to the emergence location of the new variant (**Fig. 2**), though careful test
277 distribution matters to many related public health and social equity objectives (14–16). Over-
278 sampling emergence locations improved detection outcomes, underscoring the importance of
279 targeted sequencing, for example at ports of entry or of patients with prolonged viral replication
280 (8). The connectivity of the introduction location did not impact detection times but did affect
281 where infections occurred before variant detection (**Supplement 3**). Variants that emerged
282 among residents of boroughs with more inward and outward mobility produced more infections
283 in other boroughs. In our simulations, a variant first appearing in a resident of Manhattan, for
284 example, caused more infections on average in Brooklyn and Queens than in Manhattan itself.
285 Failing to adequately sample locations near emergence or those highly connected to emer-
286 gence locations will lead to a disproportionate number of infections in those locations.

287
288 The number of undetected infections varied widely for a given transmission rate, even at fixed
289 detection times (**Fig 6**). This result demonstrated the challenge of understanding the epidemi-
290 ologic scenario on discovery of a new variant and the need for combining pathogen genome
291 sequencing with other forms of surveillance. More work is also needed to understand whether
292 optimal surveillance strategies differ if the primary objective is monitoring or detecting variants
293 and how to position genomic surveillance within the broader landscape of sometimes compet-
294 ing public health objectives.

295
296 The model in this study was designed to be simple, while accounting for the most important
297 factors affecting testing and sequencing, and to help attain a qualitative understanding of
298 which parameters influence detection times and undetected infections. Consequently, the sim-
299 ulation results, such as the detection times, should not be interpreted as predictions. Specific
300 simplifications include the modeling of single introductions of a novel variant, rather than ac-
301 counting for multiple introductions or several variants. We also assumed homogeneous mixing
302 within locations and did not account for age structure, social networks, or social determinants
303 of health. SARS-CoV-2 infection risk varies across socioeconomic and demographic groups,
304 due in part to variability in the average number of contacts, vaccine uptake, long- and short-
305 distance mobility, comorbidities linked to more severe disease outcomes, and other social
306 factors (17–19). While we incorporated neighborhood-level variations in movement, we did
307 not include within-neighborhood heterogeneity or between-neighborhood variation in social
308 determinants of health. A basic first analysis suggests that household income correlates neg-
309 atively with undetected infections in our simulations (**Supplement 4**). Future work may explore
310 how these heterogeneities influence emergence locations of new variants, disease dynamics,
311 and consequently detection outcomes.

312
313 The model in this study also took a simplified perspective of genomic surveillance processes.

314 We assumed random sampling of positive tests and did not account for variations in specimen
315 quality across testing sites or in access to testing, which may cloud estimates of the preva-
316 lence of circulating variants (20). In this sense, our model takes an idealized view of our ca-
317 pacity to sample randomly from the population in each borough or zip code.

318
319 Even though we incorporated human mobility data, the model did not account for human re-
320 sponses to the epidemiological situation, such as reduced contact rates during periods of high
321 or rising prevalence, or changes in public health policies like mask mandates. Contact patterns
322 vary over time, not just across places, and future studies should examine how new variant
323 detection changes when incorporating time-varying human behavior.

324
325 Detection of novel variants remains a critical component of the response to the COVID-19
326 pandemic. Emerging empirical evidence on genomic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 variants has
327 allowed public health agencies to provide guidance on sampling strategies to detect and mon-
328 itor variants, though more research is needed to anticipate the impact of these strategies under
329 as yet unseen epidemiologic settings. This modeling study aimed to contribute to these ongo-
330 ing efforts to assess variant detection strategies, by simulating detection outcomes for varying
331 testing and sequencing rates in NYC. We focused on the role of geography in representative
332 sampling as well as the context of variant emergence. The epidemiologic context, including
333 emergence timing and background prevalence, played an important role in shaping detection
334 times and undetected disease burdens. Targeted sampling of emergence locations was the
335 primary aspect of geographical representativeness examined in our model that improved de-
336 tection outcomes. Increased testing is an important tool to enable more representative sam-
337 pling (9), though in well-resourced settings with random sampling, as was assumed in this
338 case study of NYC, increasing sequencing capacity rather than testing had a larger impact on
339 improving detection speeds.

340
341
342

343 **Acknowledgments**
344 The authors thank Faten Takai for helpful feedback on the manuscript and the Public Health
345 Lab whole genome sequencing and data units.

346
347 **Funding**
348 K. Oliveira Roster gratefully acknowledges the support of the São Paulo Research Foundation
349 (FAPESP) under grant 2021/11608-6. This project has been funded by contract 200-2016-
350 91779 and 6NU50CK000517-01-07 with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Dis-
351 claimer: The findings, conclusions, and views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not
352 necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
353 (CDC).

354
355

Supplementary Materials and Methods

Data

Mobility

Through its Facebook Data for Good initiative, Meta provides aggregated and anonymized movement data from users who have enabled location sharing (12). It is available in 8-hour intervals and with a maximum geographic resolution of 600-by-600m tile sizes. We leveraged this data to compute the average share of users moving between geographic tiles on a given day, aggregated to both modified zip code areas (MODZCTA) and boroughs. This percentage was rescaled to the population size of each location, under the assumption that Facebook users who activate location sharing are representative of NYC residents, which may not be true in practice and may limit our ability to accurately capture human movement across the city. The movements were captured in the raw mobility matrix M , where an entry $M_{\{i \rightarrow j\}}$ indicates the number of movements from location i to location j . We then computed a contact matrix from the mobility matrix under the assumption of homogeneous mixing. The probability that a resident of location i has contact with a resident of location j in any location k was defined as:

$$k_{\{i,j\}} = \sum_k \frac{M_{\{i \rightarrow k\}} M_{\{j \rightarrow k\}} \mu_{contacts}}{\sum_l M_{\{l \rightarrow k\}}}$$

Where $\mu_{contacts}$ is the average number of contacts per person, $M_{\{i \rightarrow k\}}$ is the number of individuals moving from location i to location k , and $\sum_l M_{\{l \rightarrow k\}}$ is the sum of all individuals moving to location k . This contact matrix determined the coupling strength of two locations in the mathematical model, and therefore influenced the likelihood for an infection to spread between the two locations.

Testing and Sequencing Rates


Weekly COVID-19 testing rates and sequencing rates by MODZCTA are published by the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (16). The baseline test rate was calculated as the daily average from December 2020 to November 2021.

Compartmental Model Structure

We implemented a multi-patch, two-variant stochastic compartmental model which builds upon the basic structure of an SEIRS model. Exposure, testing, sequencing, isolation, recovery, waning (cross-)protection, and reinfection were treated as stochastic events. The model explicitly incorporated human mobility, testing and sequencing rates, as well as test sensitivity and specificity. It also included control measures to account for the fact that testing strategies may impact disease dynamics if infectious individuals reduce their contacts upon receiving a positive test result.

The model structure is presented in Supplemental Figure 1 and described in more detail below. The corresponding parameters are listed in Supplemental Table 1. Susceptible (S) individuals may be exposed (E) to one of two variants, represented by subscripts 1 and 2, or they may isolate if they receive a false positive test result (S_q). After a latent period, an exposed individual moves to one of five infectious compartments depending on their reporting and isolation outcome: an infection may be unreported (I_U), for example if it is asymptomatic or detected only via an at-home test. A positive case may be detected at an official test center (I_T), leading the person to isolate (I_{Tq}) or not (I_{Tnq}). Finally, the positive test may also be sequenced (I_G), again separating individuals by their isolation status (I_{Gq}, I_{Gnq}). After recovery, individuals

408 have temporary full protection against reinfection with either variant while they remain in com-
 409 partments R_U, R_T, R_G . Full protection wanes over time at variant-specific rates, making individ-
 410 uals susceptible to reinfection with one ($S_{1\{1\}}, S_{2\{1\}}, S_{1\{2\}}, S_{2\{2\}}$) or both variants ($S_{12\{1\}}, S_{12\{2\}}$).
 411 The model incorporates a variant-specific leaky immunity parameter ($a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{21}, a_{22}$), which
 412 defines the reduction in the probability of reinfection after full protection has waned.
 413
 414



Supplemental Figure S1. Model structure

415
 416
 417

$$418 \frac{dS}{dt} = \epsilon S_q - p_t(1 - p_{TP}) p_q S - b_1 k I_1 S - b_2 k I_2 S$$

$$419 \frac{dS_q}{dt} = p_t(1 - p_{TP}) p_q S - \epsilon S_q$$

420
 421

Variant 1:

422

$$423 \quad \frac{dE_1}{dt} = b_1 k I_1 S + a_{1\{1\}} b_1 k I_1 (S_{1\{1\}} + S_{12\{1\}}) + a_{1\{2\}} b_1 k I_1 (S_{1\{2\}} + S_{12\{2\}}) - \frac{1}{L_1} E_1$$

$$424 \quad \frac{dI_{U1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_1} E_1 [(1 - p_t) + p_t p_{FN}] - \frac{1}{D_1} I_{U1}$$

$$425 \quad \frac{dI_{Tq1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_1} E_1 [p_t (1 - p_g) p_{TP} p_q] - \frac{1}{D_1} I_{Tq1}$$

$$426 \quad \frac{dI_{Tnq1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_1} E_1 [p_t (1 - p_g) p_{TP} (1 - p_q)] - \frac{1}{D_1} I_{Tnq1}$$

$$427 \quad \frac{dI_{Gq1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_1} E_1 [p_t p_g p_{TP} p_q] - \frac{1}{D_1} I_{Gq1}$$

$$428 \quad \frac{dI_{Gnq1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_1} E_1 [p_t p_g p_{TP} (1 - p_q)] - \frac{1}{D_1} I_{Gnq1}$$

$$429 \quad \frac{dR_{U1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{D_1} I_{U1} - R_{U1} (w_{1\{1\}} + w_{2\{1\}} - w_{1\{1\}} w_{2\{1\}})$$

$$430 \quad \frac{dR_{T1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{D_1} (I_{Tq1} + I_{Tnq1}) - R_{T1} (w_{1\{1\}} + w_{2\{1\}} - w_{1\{1\}} w_{2\{1\}})$$

$$431 \quad \frac{dR_{G1}}{dt} = \frac{1}{D_1} (I_{Gq1} + I_{Gnq1}) - R_{G1} (w_{1\{1\}} + w_{2\{1\}} - w_{1\{1\}} w_{2\{1\}})$$

$$432 \quad \frac{dS_{1\{1\}}}{dt} = w_{1\{1\}} (1 - w_{2\{1\}}) (R_{U1} + R_{T1} + R_{G1}) - a_{1\{1\}} b_1 k I_1 S_{1\{1\}}$$

$$433 \quad \frac{dS_{12\{1\}}}{dt} = w_{1\{1\}} w_{2\{1\}} (R_{U1} + R_{T1} + R_{G1}) - a_{1\{1\}} b_1 k I_1 S_{12\{1\}} - a_{2\{1\}} b_2 k I_2 S_{12\{1\}}$$

$$434 \quad \frac{dS_{2\{1\}}}{dt} = w_{2\{1\}} (1 - w_{1\{1\}}) (R_{U1} + R_{T1} + R_{G1}) - a_{2\{1\}} b_2 k I_2 S_{2\{1\}}$$

435

436

437 **Variant 2:**

438

$$439 \quad \frac{dE_2}{dt} = b_2 k I_2 S + a_{2\{1\}} b_2 k I_2 (S_{2\{1\}} + S_{12\{1\}}) + a_{2\{2\}} b_2 k I_2 (S_{2\{2\}} + S_{12\{2\}}) - \frac{1}{L_2} E_2$$

$$440 \quad \frac{dI_{U2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_2} E_2 [(1 - p_t) + p_t p_{FN}] - \frac{1}{D_2} I_{U2}$$

$$441 \quad \frac{dI_{Tq2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_2} E_2 [p_t (1 - p_g) p_{TP} p_q] - \frac{1}{D_2} I_{Tq2}$$

$$442 \quad \frac{dI_{Tnq2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_2} E_2 [p_t (1 - p_g) p_{TP} (1 - p_q)] - \frac{1}{D_2} I_{Tnq2}$$

$$443 \quad \frac{dI_{Gq2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_2} E_2 [p_t p_g p_{TP} p_q] - \frac{1}{D_2} I_{Gq2}$$

$$444 \quad \frac{dI_{Gnq2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_2} E_2 [p_t p_g p_{TP} (1 - p_q)] - \frac{1}{D_2} I_{Gnq2}$$

$$445 \quad \frac{dR_{U2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{D_2} I_{U2} - R_{U2} (w_{1\{2\}} + w_{2\{2\}} - w_{1\{2\}} w_{2\{2\}})$$

$$446 \quad \frac{dR_{T2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{D_2} (I_{Tq2} + I_{Tnq2}) - R_{T2} (w_{1\{2\}} + w_{2\{2\}} - w_{1\{2\}} w_{2\{2\}})$$

$$447 \quad \frac{dR_{G2}}{dt} = \frac{1}{D_2} (I_{Gq2} + I_{Gnq2}) - R_{G2} (w_{1\{2\}} + w_{2\{2\}} - w_{1\{2\}} w_{2\{2\}})$$

$$448 \quad \frac{dS_{1\{2\}}}{dt} = w_{1\{2\}} (1 - w_{2\{2\}}) (R_{U2} + R_{T2} + R_{G2}) - a_{1\{2\}} b_1 k I_1 S_{1\{2\}}$$

$$449 \quad \frac{dS_{12\{2\}}}{dt} = w_{1\{2\}} w_{2\{2\}} (R_{U2} + R_{T2} + R_{G2}) - a_{1\{2\}} b_1 k I_1 S_{12\{2\}} - a_{2\{2\}} b_2 k I_2 S_{12\{2\}}$$

450
$$\frac{dS_{2\{2\}}}{dt} = w_{2\{2\}}(1 - w_{1\{2\}})(R_{U2} + R_{T2} + R_{G2}) - a_{2\{2\}}b_2kI_2S_{2\{2\}}$$

451

452 where $I_1 = I_{U1} + I_{Tq1} + I_{Tnq1} + I_{Gq1} + I_{Gnq1}$ and $I_2 = I_{U2} + I_{Tq2} + I_{Tnq2} + I_{Gq2} + I_{Gnq2}$

453

454 Where p_t is the test rate, p_g is the sequencing rate, p_q is the control measure compliance
 455 rate, p_{TP} is the true positive rate, $a_{x\{y\}}$ is the leaky immunity parameter, $w_{x\{y\}}$ is the waning
 456 full immunity parameter, b is the probability of infection given contact, L is the average dura-
 457 tion of the latent period, D is the average duration of the infectious period, k is the contact
 458 matrix, and ϵ is the rate of ending control measures if false positive.

459

460

461 Table S1. Parameters

462

Parameter	Description
p_t	<i>Test rate (share of population)</i>
p_g	<i>Sequencing rate (share of positive tests)</i>
p_q	<i>Control measure compliance rate</i>
p_{TP}	<i>True positive rate of test instrument</i>
$a_{x\{y\}}$	<i>Leaky immunity parameter: percent suscepti- bility to infection with variant x after infection with variant y</i>
$w_{x\{y\}}$	<i>Waning full immunity parameter: rate of loss of immunity against variant x after infection with variant y</i>
b	<i>Probability of infection given a contact with an infectious individual</i>
L	<i>Average duration of latent period</i>
D	<i>Average duration of infectious period</i>
k	<i>Contact matrix</i>
ϵ	<i>Rate of ending control measures with false positive test result</i>

463

464

465

466

467 **Simulations**

468

469

470 *Geographic Test Distribution*

471

472 We implement the following primary strategies for testing allocation. Supplemental Figure 2
 473 shows an example of the test rates under each scenario.


- 474 - Baseline: Tests are allocated according to the current NYC strategy, computed as the
475 average allocation and daily test quantity between December 2020 and November
476 2021.
- 477 - Population density-based allocation: The same number of tests are distributed homo-
478 geneously across the city, so that each location has the same test rate. Locations with
479 a larger population receive more tests than less densely populated boroughs or
480 MODZCTAs.
- 481 - Random allocation: The available tests are distributed randomly across locations. This
482 effectively results in higher per-capita test rates in less densely populated areas.

483 *Test Volume*


484
485
486 We varied the quantity of available tests from 5% to 400% of the NYC average of 7,184 tests
487 per day (87 tests per 100,000 persons). Changing the quantity of available tests may be un-
488 derstood as either increased capacity or reduced reporting, for example due to a shift toward
489 home testing. From February 2020 to September 2021, an estimated 75 percent of COVID-
490 19 infections went unreported (21). With the emergence of the Omicron sub-variants BA.2.12
491 and BA.2.12.1, underreporting may be as high as 95 percent (22).

492
493 To further understand the role of the geographic test distribution, we also considered “focused
494 testing scenarios”, where individual locations are over-sampled. In these scenarios, 20-100%
495 of all tests were sampled from a single location and the remaining tests were distributed across
496 the remaining locations proportional to population size. We then compared how detection out-
497 comes differed when the new variant emerged in the over-sampled location *versus* one of the
498 other locations.


A) Baseline



B) Density



C) Random



Supplemental Figure S2. Sample number of tests per capita at the borough level. Boroughs are colored by the proportion of the population that is tested each week under the baseline (A), density-based (B), and random (C) sampling strategy.

499

500

501

502

503 *Sequencing volume*

504

505 The main analysis considered sequencing probabilities of 5-90% of all positive tests. The se-
506 quencing volume for each day of the simulation was therefore determined by the test volume
507 and the number of infections. Raising test volume for a given epidemiologic scenario effec-
508 tively raises sequencing volume at fixed sequencing probabilities.

509

510 In two sensitivity analyses, we sought to isolate the effect of testing and sequencing volumes
511 by placing a cap on sequencing resources:

512

- 513 - Sensitivity analysis 1: At any time point, a fixed number of positive tests was
514 sequenced. If there were fewer positive tests than sequencing resources (due to low
prevalence), then all positive tests were sequenced. The maximum sequencing

515 volume was reached when there was a sufficient quantity of positive tests, i.e.,
516 sufficiently high prevalence and test volume. The effective sequencing volume did not
517 necessarily vary for different sequencing caps, if prevalence and/or test volume were
518 low.

519 - Sensitivity analysis 2: A fixed number of tests were assigned as potentials for
520 sequencing, akin to placing a stamp on a subset of test kits. If a test with a stamp was
521 positive, the sample was sequenced. The maximum sequencing volume was achieved
522 when all (stamped) tests were positive, which depended on the number of infections.
523 The effective sequencing volume necessarily varied between the different sequencing
524 caps.

525
526

527
528

528 *Variants*

529
530

530 The first variant was modeled to resemble the Delta SARS-CoV-2 variant with an effective
531 transmission probability of 0.2. We then introduced a second variant, which was (i) more trans-
532 missible, (ii) had greater and faster immune evasion, or (iii) both. We considered effective
533 transmission probabilities of 0.21-0.5.

534
535

536
537

536 *Context of variant emergence*

537
538

538 We simulated the emergence of the second variant at different locations and different times
539 relative to the introduction of the first variant. The first variant was introduced with a single
540 index case in each location, to simulate even spread across the city. The second variant was
541 introduced with one index case in a single location, representing the location of residence of
542 the index case. We simulated all possible introduction locations. Introduction times of the sec-
543 ond variant varied from 0 to 150 days after the introduction of the first variant. The introduction
544 times represent different contexts, because of varying prevalence of the first variant and var-
545 ying numbers of susceptible individuals. We did not distinguish between variants that emerged
546 within the city and those that were imported. The index case of the novel variant in our model
547 could thus represent the first case of a newly emerging variant introduced to NYC from outside
548 the city or a globally undetected variant that either emerged within NYC or was imported from
549 outside before detection.

550
551

551 *Outcome measures*


552
553

553 For each simulation, we computed three primary outcome measures. The *time to detection*
554 was defined as the number of days between the introduction and detection (first sequenced
555 case) of the second variant. *Cumulative undetected infections* measured the total number of
556 people who were exposed to (i.e., infected by) the second variant in NYC by the time the new
557 variant was detected, including individuals who at detection time were in the latent phase prior
558 to infectiousness, infectious, recovered, or susceptible to reinfection. Finally, we computed the
559 *standard deviation of the cumulative undetected infections* across locations as an estimate of
560 the geographic variation in disease burden.

561
562

563
564


565 **Supplement 2: Sensitivity analysis of fixed sampling volumes**



Supplementary Figure S3. Detection time by fixed volumes of test and sequencing quantities. Lines depict the mean duration between variant introduction and detection in days (A) as a function of daily testing volume, colored by the maximum sequencing volume, and (B) as a function of maximum sequencing volume, colored by the test volume.


566
567
568
569

Supplement 3: Role of introduction location




Supplementary Figure S4. Cumulative infections by borough for introduction locations Manhattan and Staten Island. Points depict the number of cumulative infections in each borough at detection time (at variant introduction 50 days after the prior variant, baseline distribution of tests, 30% of baseline test quantity, and sequencing rate 10%). Boxes and whiskers depict the minimum, lower 25%, median, upper 75%, and maximum cumulative infections.

570



571
 572 **Supplementary Figure S5. Detection time by proportion of tests allocated in a single location, by**
 573 **introduction location.** Lines depict the average detection time for scenarios where between 20% and 100% of
 574 tests are sampled from a single location, and the remaining tests are evenly distributed across the remaining loca-
 575 tions by population size. The sub-plots distinguish between scenarios where the variant emerged in the primary
 576 allocation location, i.e., test over-sampling and emergence occurred in the same location (left), and scenarios where
 577 the variant emerged in one of the other locations, i.e., test over-sampling and emergence occurred in different
 578 locations (right).

579
 580
 581




582
 583 **Supplementary Figure S6. Detection times by introduction location.** Points depict the detection time in days
 584 for each introduction location (at variant introduction 50 days after the prior variant, baseline distribution of tests,
 585 30% of baseline test quantity, and sequencing rate 10%). Boxes and whiskers depict the minimum, lower 25%,
 586 median, upper 75%, and maximum detection times.

587

588
 589 **Supplement 4: Social equity**

590
 591 We explored the relationship between socioeconomic variables and the average cumulative
 592 undetected exposures at the time of new variant detection across all NYC zip codes (**Supple-**
 593 **mentary Fig. S7**). We observed a weak negative correlation (Pearson correlation coefficient
 594 -0.39), with cumulative exposures decreasing with increasing household income, possibly due
 595 to lower population density in wealthier neighborhoods.

596



Supplementary Figure S7. Cumulative undetected exposures by average household income. Points depict the mean cumulative number of infections by household income across 625 simulations (5 simulations for each introduction location) when testing is distributed according to the baseline testing strategy. Colors depict the five boroughs.

597

598

599

600

601

602

References

603

604 1. Walensky RP, Walke HT, Fauci AS. SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern in the United
605 States—Challenges and Opportunities. *JAMA*. 2021 Mar 16;325(11):1037–8.

606 2. Inzaule SC, Tessema SK, Kebede Y, Ogwel Ouma AE, Nkengasong JN. Genomic-
607 informed pathogen surveillance in Africa: opportunities and challenges. *Lancet Infect Dis*.
608 2021 Sep 1;21(9):e281–9.

609 3. Moderna Announces Omicron-Containing Bivalent Booster Candidate mRNA-1273.214
610 Demonstrates Superior Antibody Response Against Omicron [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jun
611 9]. Available from: [https://investors.modernatx.com/news/news-details/2022/Moderna-
612 Announces-Omicron-Containing-Bivalent-Booster-Candidate-mRNA-1273.214-
613 Demonstrates-Superior-Antibody-Response-Against-Omicron/default.aspx](https://investors.modernatx.com/news/news-details/2022/Moderna-Announces-Omicron-Containing-Bivalent-Booster-Candidate-mRNA-1273.214-Demonstrates-Superior-Antibody-Response-Against-Omicron/default.aspx)

614 4. Viana R, Moyo S, Amoako DG, Tegally H, Scheepers C, Althaus CL, et al. Rapid
615 epidemic expansion of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in southern Africa. *Nature*.
616 2022;603(7902):679–86.

617 5. Robishaw JD, Alter SM, Solano JJ, Shih RD, DeMets DL, Maki DG, et al. Genomic
618 surveillance to combat COVID-19: challenges and opportunities. *Lancet Microbe*. 2021
619 Sep 1;2(9):e481–4.

620 6. Chen Z, Azman AS, Chen X, Zou J, Tian Y, Sun R, et al. Global landscape of SARS-CoV-
621 2 genomic surveillance and data sharing. *Nat Genet*. 2022 Apr;54(4):499–507.

622 7. WHO. Guidance for surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 variants: Interim guidance, 9 August
623 2021 [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2021 Aug [cited 2022 Nov 19] p. 21. Available
624 from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO_2019-
625 nCoV_surveillance_variants](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO_2019-nCoV_surveillance_variants)

626 8. ECDC. Guidance for representative and targeted genomic SARS-CoV-2 monitoring.
627 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. 2021 May 3;

- 628 9. Han AX, Toporowski A, Sacks JA, Perkins MD, Briand S, van Kerkhove M, et al. SARS-
629 CoV-2 diagnostic testing rates determine the sensitivity of genomic surveillance
630 programs. *Nat Genet.* 2023 Jan;55(1):26–33.
- 631 10. Vasylyeva TI, Fang CE, Su M, Havens JL, Parker E, Wang JC, et al. Introduction and
632 Establishment of SARS-CoV-2 Gamma Variant in New York City in Early 2021 [Internet].
633 medRxiv; 2022 [cited 2022 May 29]. p. 2022.04.15.22273909. Available from:
634 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.04.15.22273909v1>
- 635 11. NYC Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Data [Internet]. NYC Department of
636 Health and Mental Hygiene; 2022 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from:
637 <https://github.com/nychealth/coronavirus-data>
- 638 12. Maas P. Facebook Disaster Maps: Aggregate Insights for Crisis Response &
639 Recovery. In: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on*
640 *Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* [Internet]. New York, NY, USA: Association for
641 *Computing Machinery*; 2019 [cited 2022 Nov 22]. p. 3173. (KDD '19). Available from:
642 <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3340412>
- 643 13. Subissi L, von Gottberg A, Thukral L, Worp N, Oude Munnink BB, Rathore S, et al.
644 An early warning system for emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Nat Med.* 2022 May 30;
- 645 14. Pond EN, Rutkow L, Blauer B, Aliseda Alonso A, Bertran de Lis S, Nuzzo JB.
646 Disparities in SARS-CoV-2 Testing for Hispanic/Latino Populations: An Analysis of State-
647 Published Demographic Data. *J Public Health Manag Pract.* 2022 Aug;28(4):330.
- 648 15. Martin EG. Integrating Health Equity and Efficiency Principles in Distribution
649 Systems: Lessons From Mailing COVID-19 Tests. *J Public Health Manag Pract.*
650 2022;28(4):327–9.
- 651 16. McPhearson T, Grabowski Z, Herreros-Cantis P, Mustafa A, Ortiz L, Kennedy C, et
652 al. Pandemic Injustice: Spatial and Social Distributions of COVID-19 in the US Epicenter.
653 *J Extreme Events.* 2020 Dec;07(04):2150007.
- 654 17. McDonald SA, Devleesschauwer B, Wallinga J. The impact of individual-level
655 heterogeneity on estimated infectious disease burden: a simulation study. *Popul Health*
656 *Metr.* 2016 Dec 1;14:47.
- 657 18. Rodriguez-Diaz CE, Guilamo-Ramos V, Mena L, Hall E, Honermann B, Crowley JS,
658 et al. Risk for COVID-19 infection and death among Latinos in the United States:
659 examining heterogeneity in transmission dynamics. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2020 Dec;52:46-
660 53.e2.
- 661 19. Booth A, Reed AB, Ponzo S, Yassaee A, Aral M, Plans D, et al. Population risk
662 factors for severe disease and mortality in COVID-19: A global systematic review and
663 meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(3):e0247461.
- 664 20. Wohl S, Lee EC, DiPrete BL, Lessler J. Sample Size Calculations for Variant
665 Surveillance in the Presence of Biological and Systematic Biases. medRxiv. 2022 Jan
666 1;2021.12.30.21268453.
- 667 21. CDC. Cases, Data, and Surveillance [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and
668 Prevention. 2020 [cited 2022 May 26]. Available from:
669 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/burden.html>

670 22. Mandavilli A. Two new Omicron subvariants are spreading quickly in New York State.
671 The New York Times [Internet]. 2022 Apr 13 [cited 2022 May 26]; Available from:
672 <https://www.nytimes.com/live/2022/04/13/world/covid-19-mandates-cases-vaccine>

673

674