

# An imperfect tool: COVID-19 ‘test & trace’ success relies on minimising the impact of false negatives and continuation of physical distancing.

Emma L. Davis<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a,1,\*</sup></sup>, Tim C. D. Lucas<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a,1</sup></sup>, Anna Borlase<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a</sup></sup>, Timothy M Pollington<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a,b</sup></sup>, Sam Abbot<sup>[ID](#)<sup>c</sup></sup>, Diepreye Ayabina<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a</sup></sup>, Thomas Crellan<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a</sup></sup>, Joel Hellewell<sup>[ID](#)<sup>c</sup></sup>, Li Pi<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a</sup></sup>, CMMID COVID-19 working group<sup>c,3</sup>, Graham F. Medley<sup>[ID](#)<sup>d</sup></sup>, T. Déirdre Hollingsworth<sup>[ID](#)<sup>a,2</sup></sup>, Petra Klepac<sup>[ID](#)<sup>c,e,2</sup></sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, University of Oxford, UK*

<sup>b</sup>*MathSys CDT, University of Warwick, UK*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK*

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

<sup>e</sup>*Department for Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge, UK*

---

## Abstract

**Background:** Following a consistent decline in COVID-19-related deaths in the UK throughout May 2020, it is recognised that contact tracing will be vital to relaxing physical distancing measures. The increasingly evident role of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic transmission means testing is central to control, but test sensitivity estimates are as low as 65%.

**Methods:** We extend an existing UK-focused branching process model for contact tracing, adding diagnostic testing and refining parameter estimates to demonstrate the impact of poor test sensitivity and suggest mitigation methods. We also investigate the role of super-spreading events, providing estimates of the relationship between infections, cases detected and hospital-

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email address:* [emma.davis@bdi.ox.ac.uk](mailto:emma.davis@bdi.ox.ac.uk) (Emma L. Davis<sup>[ID](#)</sup>)

<sup>1</sup>Authors contributed equally

<sup>2</sup>Authors contributed equally

<sup>3</sup>Full list of members in supplementary

isations, and consider how tracing coverage and speed affects outbreak risk. **Findings:** Incorporating poor sensitivity testing into tracing protocols could reduce efficacy, due to false negative results impacting isolation duration. However, a 7-day isolation period for all negative-testing individuals could mitigate this effect. Similarly, reducing delays to testing following exposure has a negligible impact on the risk of future outbreaks, but could undermine control if negative-testing individuals immediately cease isolating. Even 100% tracing of contacts will miss cases, which could prompt large localised outbreaks if physical distancing measures are relaxed prematurely.

**Interpretation:** It is imperative that test results are interpreted with caution due to high false-negative rates and that contact tracing is used in combination with physical distancing measures. If the risks associated with imperfect test sensitivity are mitigated, we find that contact tracing can facilitate control when the reproduction number with physical distancing,  $R_S$ , is less than 1.5.

*Keywords:* COVID-19, contact tracing, branching processes, SARS-CoV-2, testing strategy, case isolation, quarantine

---

## 1. Background

In December 2019, SARS-CoV-2, a novel coronavirus strain, was detected in Hubei Province, China.<sup>1</sup> By 31st January 2020 the first UK cases of COVID-19, the disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2, were confirmed.<sup>2</sup> Initial modelling studies indicated that fast and effective contact tracing could contain the UK outbreak in most settings.<sup>3,4</sup> However, by 20th March there were almost 4,000 confirmed cases nationwide,<sup>5</sup> at which point the UK Government halted national contact tracing and scaled up physical distancing measures, including the closure of schools and social venues, extending to heightened restrictions on non-essential travel, outdoor activities and between-household social mixing.<sup>6</sup>

By early May 2020 these measures were estimated to have reduced the effective reproduction number,  $R$ , from 2.6 to 0.62<sup>7,8</sup> and so from 12th-13th May in England some limitations on outdoor exercise were lifted and workers encouraged to return to work if they could maintain physical distancing.<sup>9</sup>

Capacity for diagnostic testing in the UK has been escalated over recent months, with capacity reaching over 100,000 tests a day by the end of April, with further plans in place to reach 200,000 tests a day by the end of

19 May.<sup>10</sup> Currently, testing of asymptomatic individuals is limited to workers  
20 and patients in NHS and social care facilities,<sup>11</sup> but from the 28th of May  
21 the UK Government rolled out the initial stages of their ‘test & trace’ con-  
22 tact tracing programme to the general population. This new approach was  
23 initiated with contact tracing of just over 2,000 confirmed cases. Crucially,  
24 the current strategy only tests symptomatic contacts and notifies individuals  
25 that they no longer need to isolate following a negative test. However, there  
26 are critical limitations to the diagnostic test, with poor sensitivity (current  
27 estimates imply close to 65%<sup>12,13</sup>), especially in community-based settings,  
28 leading to high false negative rates which are exacerbated by high variability  
29 in symptom severity.<sup>13</sup> Infectious individuals who test falsely negative may  
30 prematurely resume their normal activities, contributing to ongoing chains  
31 of transmission.

32 Imperfect adherence and the innate difficulties in identifying contacts will  
33 pose challenges for ‘test & trace’, particularly in crowded urban settings.<sup>14</sup>  
34 Therefore, evaluating both the limitations of contact tracing and how to  
35 maximise its effectiveness could be crucial in preventing a second peak in  
36 cases – which may overwhelm the NHS.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, if cases begin to  
37 rise exponentially, contact tracing capacity would be rapidly exceeded and  
38 stricter physical distancing measures required.

39 As our knowledge of the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 grows,  
40 extending Hellewell et al.’s<sup>3</sup> UK-focused contact tracing study with new in-  
41 sights could inform this ‘test & trace’ strategy. The key conclusion of the  
42 initial study was that highly effective contact tracing would be sufficient to  
43 control an initial outbreak of COVID-19 in the UK, however substantial new  
44 evidence supports much higher pre- and asymptomatic transmission rates  
45 than had initially been considered.<sup>16,17,18</sup> The focus on rapid testing in the  
46 UK contact tracing programme also requires a detailed assessment of the  
47 associated trade-offs through mechanistic modelling of the testing process.  
48 Up-to-date modelling studies are needed to investigate the feasibility of con-  
49 tact tracing and the conditions under which it is effective.

50 We use improved incubation period and serial interval estimates,<sup>19,20</sup> im-  
51 perfect self-reporting and tracing rates, as well as simulating the use of diag-  
52 nostic tests both for detection and tracing of asymptomatic infection chains.  
53 We also simulate decision-making regarding quarantine procedures for traced  
54 individuals, and then explore the trade-offs introduced by poor test sensitiv-  
55 ity, particularly when negative test results are used to advise individuals to  
56 cease self-isolation.

## 57 **2. Methods**

58 In this extension of a previous COVID-19 branching process model,<sup>3</sup> the  
59 number of potential secondary cases generated by an index case and the  
60 exposure time for each case are drawn from Negative Binomial and Gamma  
61 distributions respectively. Secondary cases are averted if the primary case is  
62 in isolation at the time of infection, assuming within household segregation  
63 is possible. The probability of isolation depends on whether the primary case  
64 was traced, their test result, and adherence to self-isolation recommendations  
65 (Figure 1). Each simulation was seeded with five infected individuals that  
66 are undetected by the contact tracing system.




Figure 1: Overview of the contact tracing process implemented in our model. **Person A** isolates and self-reports to the contact tracing programme with some delay after symptom onset, by which time they have infected Persons B and C. When Person A self-reports contact tracing is initiated. They are then tested with positive result and remain isolated for their infectious period. **Person B** was infected by A prior to their symptom onset and is detected by tracing after some delay, after infecting Person D. After isolating they are tested, with a false negative result. This leads to B either a) stopping isolation immediately or b) finishing a minimum 7 day isolation period. Both may allow new onward transmission. **Person C** was infected by A but not traced as a contact. Person C does not develop symptoms but is infectious, leading to missed transmission. **Person D** was traced and tested before the false negative test was returned for Person B. The test for D returns positive, meaning that D remains isolated, halting this chain of transmission.

67 *2.1. Secondary case distribution*

68 A Negative Binomial distribution was chosen to represent heterogeneity  
 69 in individual contact patterns or infectiousness, with the mean relating to  
 70 the *effective reproduction number under physical distancing*  $R_S$  which takes  
 71 a value of 1.1, 1.3 or 1.5 with a constant dispersion parameter  $k = 0.16$ .<sup>21</sup>  
 72 Here smaller  $k$  represents greater heterogeneity in transmission (as observed  
 73 for SARS-CoV-2 in the absence of interventions). This results in the majority  
 74 of index cases leading to no secondary infections, while a small proportion  
 75 of individuals infect a large number of secondary cases. Parameter estimates  
 76 and references can be found in Table 1.

Parameter	Values	Refs
Number of initial cases	5, 100	varied
Effective reproduction number under physical distancing, $R_S$	1.1, 1.3, 1.5	varied
Dispersion of $R_S$ , $k$	0.16	21,3
Proportion asymptomatic	0.4	16,17
Delay: onset to isolation	1 day	fixed
Incubation period (Lognormal)	mean log: 1.43, sd log: 0.66	19
Infection time (Gamma)	shape: 2.12, rate: 0.69 day <sup>-1</sup>	19
Infection time shift	-3 days	19
Untraced self-isolation prob.	90%	fixed
Self-reporting probability	0.1, 0.5, 1.0	varied
Contact tracing coverage (%)	40%, 60%, 80%, 100%	varied
Min time to trace contacts (days)	1 day	fixed
Max time to trace contacts (days)	1, 4 days	varied
Test sensitivity	0.65, 0.95	13,12,22
Delay: isolate to test result	0, 2 days	varied
Isolation duration if -ve test	0, 7 days	varied

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

77 *2.2. Infection profile*

78 Each new case is infected at an exposure time drawn from a Gamma-  
 79 distributed infectivity profile (shape = 2.12, rate = 0.69 day<sup>-1</sup>) relative to  
 80 three days before their infector's symptom onset, allowing for pre-symptomatic

81 transmission.<sup>19</sup> This exposure time is compared to the isolation times of the  
 82 infector and cases are averted if the infector is in isolation when the infection  
 83 event would have happened. For non-averted cases, symptom onset times  
 84 are drawn from a Lognormal distribution (mean = 1.43, sd = 0.66)<sup>19</sup> and  
 85 the probability of a case remaining asymptomatic throughout their infected  
 86 period is fixed at 40%.<sup>16,17</sup> The full infection profile is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Parameter distributions for A: incubation period (infection time to symptom onset), B: transmission profile relative to symptom onset and C: generation interval. Distributions for A and B are taken from He et al.<sup>19</sup> and plot C shows the combined distribution this gives for the generation interval in green (the combined distribution is truncated below at 1 day) compared with Gamma-distributed intervals estimated by Ganyani et al. (blue and orange).<sup>20</sup>

87 *2.3. Self-isolation*

88 Untraced, symptomatic cases self-isolate one day after symptom onset  
 89 with probability 90%, or otherwise continue with their normal behaviour.  
 90 This adherence reflects the best case scenario, assuming high levels of public  
 91 awareness. Our results could therefore be considered optimistic, however  
 92 comparisons between scenarios still hold.

93 *2.4. Contact tracing*

94 Contact tracing is initiated by a symptomatic individual self-reporting,  
 95 where an individual self-reports with a probability of 10% or 50%. The con-

96 tacts of that individual are then traced with 40%–100% coverage. If a contact  
97 is successfully traced they will always isolate. The time taken to trace and  
98 isolate a contact is either one day or drawn from a Uniform distribution of 1–  
99 4 days. In the absence of testing, traced contacts are assumed to isolate until  
100 non-infectious—approximately 14 days.<sup>19</sup> Any contacts that show symptoms  
101 or test positive will have their contacts traced; this continues until no further  
102 cases result in transmission chain extinction.

### 103 *2.5. Testing*

104 In simulations that include testing, we assume test sensitivities of 0.65 or  
105 0.95 with the lower value representing true sensitivity observed in healthcare  
106 settings<sup>12,13</sup> and the higher value being closer to measurements in controlled  
107 conditions<sup>22</sup> and also to demonstrate utility of an alternative testing protocol  
108 with higher sensitivity. Due to the nature of the branching process model,  
109 only infected individuals are modelled so the test specificity is not relevant to  
110 transmission, although current specificity estimates are thought to be near  
111 100%.<sup>23</sup>

112 When testing is included in the model, all individuals that either self-  
113 report to the contact tracing system (individual A in Figure 1), or are traced  
114 contacts (B & D in Figure 1), are tested. From the moment a contact self-  
115 reports or is traced, either a zero- or two-day delay is simulated before the test  
116 result is returned, chosen to be representative of UK programme targets. If  
117 a positive test is returned, the individual’s contacts are traced. If a negative  
118 test is returned, two different scenarios are explored; either a) immediate  
119 release from quarantine, or b) individual is asked to complete a seven-day  
120 precautionary isolation period. Any contacts of a negative-testing case that  
121 were successfully identified prior to receiving the test result are still isolated  
122 and tested.

### 123 *2.6. No active case detection*

124 A scenario in which there is no active case detection in the community is  
125 considered whereby the only detected cases are those who are hospitalised.  
126 This is simulated by reducing the case reporting proportion to 0.06, reflecting  
127 the hospitalisation rate in the UK.<sup>24</sup> Time from symptom onset to hospitali-  
128 sation is drawn from an Exponential distribution with mean 5.954 days (fitted  
129 to published data.<sup>24</sup>) We then defined the undetected outbreak size as the  
130 number of cases that were exposed prior to the first hospitalisation, given an



131 initial seeding of 5 index cases at  $t = 0$ . We also consider a special case of  
132 100 index cases to represent a large super-spreading event.

### 133 2.7. Simulation process

134 Results presented are the combined output of 3,000 simulations for each  
135 parameter combination, or scenario, considered. These results are used to  
136 derive the probability of a large outbreak given a range of conditions. A  
137 *large outbreak* is considered to be 2,000 cases and each simulation is run for  
138 a maximum of 300 days. The threshold of 2,000 cases was chosen by running  
139 simulations with a maximum of 5,000 cases and noting that of the simulated  
140 epidemics that went extinct, 99% of extinction events occurred before reach-  
141 ing 2,000 cases. The model was written in R and the code is publicly available  
142 in an online GitHub repository (<https://github.com/timcdlucas/ringbp>).

## 143 3. Results

144 We found that where a test sensitivity of 65% was assumed, the impact  
145 of releasing individuals with false negative results from quarantine substan-  
146 tially undermined the positive impact of contact tracing. This is shown in  
147 Figure 3B, upper left panel, ( $R_S = 1.3$ ), where the probability of a large  
148 outbreak occurring is greater with an assumed test sensitivity of 65% com-  
149 pared to scenarios where no testing was carried out at all. This result was  
150 observed across all contact tracing coverage rates. The deleterious effect of  
151 releasing false negative cases is mitigated by using a precautionary seven-day  
152 quarantine period, which reduced the risk of a large outbreak from 27.2% to  
153 15.3% for  $R_S = 1.5$ , and from 12.6% to 2.7% for  $R_S = 1.3$ , all with 80%  
154 contact tracing (Figure 3A).

155 The negative consequences of early quarantine cessation for false negative  
156 cases are further demonstrated by the fact that a two day delay in carrying  
157 out the tests also led to a decrease in the probability of a large outbreak, from  
158 27.2% to 20.4% for  $R_S$  of 1.5 and 12.6% to 5.4% for  $R_S$  of 1.3. Combining the  
159 two-day delay in testing and the seven-day precautionary quarantine reduced  
160 the risk of a large outbreak further. The risk of a large outbreak was reduced  
161 from 27.2% to 13.1% for  $R_S = 1.5$  and from 12.6% to 1.9% for  $R_S = 1.3$ ,  
162 both with 80% contact tracing coverage.

163 In the case of instant testing and an immediate end to quarantine if the  
164 test is negative, there was a comparatively small benefit from scaling up  
165 of contact tracing coverage from 40% to 100%, implying that much of the




Figure 3: A: Comparing effectiveness of test-and-release of negative symptomatics (left-hand panels) with maintaining isolation of symptomatics for a minimum seven-day period (right-hand panels) given differing assumed values for  $R_S$  and accounting for delay to testing. Assuming 65% sensitivity of diagnostic 50% self-reporting. B: Comparing utility of test-and-release of negative symptomatics (left-hand panels) with maintaining isolation of symptomatics for a minimum of 7 days (right-hand panels) given assumed test sensitivities of 65% or 95%, and compared to no-testing.  $R_S$  is assumed to be 1.3.

166 potential positive impact of contact tracing could be lost if such an approach  
 167 were taken.

168 Whilst a test with 65% sensitivity with no minimum quarantine period  
 169 can undermine the benefits of contact tracing altogether, if a test were to  
 170 be 95% sensitive, this would improve the outcome compared to no testing,  
 171 reducing the probability of an outbreak from 4.9% to 2.5% (Figure 3). If  
 172 there is a two-day delay before returning test results, a 65% test provides  
 173 no clear benefit in terms of probability of a large outbreak. With a two-day  
 174 test delay and seven-day precautionary quarantine a 65% sensitive test is  
 175 almost as effective in reducing transmission as a 95% sensitive test because  
 176 some asymptomatic chains of transmission are still identified while individ-  
 177 uals with false negative tests generally remain in quarantine for the peak of  
 178 their infectious period.

179 *3.1. Limitations of contact tracing*

180 To assess at what point during an epidemic contact tracing would be un-  
181 able to control transmission, we looked at the probability of a large outbreak  
182 (greater than 2,000 cases within 300 days) given the current outbreak size  
183 (Figure 4A). Both the time taken to trace contacts and the proportion of  
184 contacts traced had effects on the risk of a large outbreak. With  $R_S = 1.3$   
185 and a contact tracing coverage of 80% with a one day delay, the risk of a  
186 large outbreak increases almost linearly with total outbreak size (Figure 4A,  
187 top left). Once the number of cases reaches 250 the risk of a large outbreak  
188 is 24.1% and by 500 cases this increases to 36.8%. This is compared to the  
189 initial probability of 2.3% for these parameter values given 5 initial cases.  
190 With  $R_S = 1.5$  the risk of a large outbreak increased faster. At 250 cases  
191 the risk of a large outbreak is already 78.2% and by 500 cases it is 88.5%,  
192 compared to an initial risk of 15.5% when starting with 5 initial cases.

193 The time taken to trace cases had a stronger effect on the probability of  
194 a large outbreak when contact tracing coverage was higher (Supplementary  
195 Figure S1). With 80% contact tracing coverage, a four-day contact tracing  
196 delay increased the probability of a large outbreak, relative to a one day delay,  
197 from 13.1% to 17.3% for  $R_S = 1.5$  and from 1.9% to 4.0% for  $R_S = 1.3$ .

198 Even with perfect contact tracing and exercising caution regarding test  
199 results (100% of contacts traced in 24 hours and a minimum quarantine  
200 period of 7 days) a large proportion of cases are likely to go unobserved (Fig-  
201 ure 4B). High levels of symptomatic self-reporting to the tracing programme  
202 and improved test sensitivity can increase case detection: 95% sensitivity  
203 and 100% self-reporting gives an increase from 30.5% to 73.9% compared to  
204 65% sensitivity and 50% self-reporting (both for  $R_S = 1.3$ ). However, this  
205 still results in 26.1% of cases being missed, hence detecting every case is  
206 essentially infeasible.

207 Every missed case is a potential new chain of transmission and, given the  
208 low value of  $k$ , there is a risk of super-spreading events. To demonstrate  
209 this we consider a scenario where one missed case leads to a cluster of either  
210 5 or 100 new cases in a population with poor adherence to self-reporting  
211 guidelines (Figure 4C and D respectively). We assume no self-reporting, so  
212 the first observation of the outbreak occurs when the first case is hospitalised,  
213 after which contact tracing may be initiated.

214 For a cluster of 5 new cases the median total outbreak size before the first  
215 case is hospitalised is 13 cases for  $R_S = 1.3$  and 18 cases for  $R_S = 1.5$ , which  
216 translates to 4.1% and 30.1% probability of a large outbreak respectively if




Figure 4: A) Comparing probability of outbreak by total number of cases so far. Sensitivity = 65%, self-reporting proportion = 0.5, individuals testing negative are isolated for a minimum of 7 days, time to test from isolation = 2 days. B) The proportion of cases detected with 100% contact trace and 50% or 100% self-reporting for 65% and 95% sensitivity tests. C) Total cases occurring before first hospitalisation in a population with no active tracing or case detection from one super-spreading event (5 new cases). D) Total cases occurring before first hospitalisation in a population with no active tracing or case detection from one super-spreading event (100 new cases).

217 80% contact tracing can be implemented (Figure 4A). For a cluster of 100 new  
 218 cases the median total unobserved outbreak size is 226 for  $R_S = 1.3$  and 249  
 219 for  $R_S = 1.5$ , translating to 22.6% and 78.0% probability of a large outbreak  
 220 with 80% contact tracing. This emphasises the importance of maintaining  
 221 physical distancing measures that restrict the size of indoor social gatherings

222 to avoid extreme super-spreading events which could rapidly escalate.

223 For  $R_S = 1.1$  there is a 5.37% chance of seeing at least 200 cases in all  
224 scenarios, even with slower tracing (up to four days' delay) and only 40%  
225 of contacts traced. Comparatively, for  $R_S = 1.3$  there is a greater than  
226 5% chance of seeing 800 or more cases unless 100% contact tracing, or 80%  
227 contact tracing with a 1-day trace delay is achieved. For  $R_S = 1.5$  even 100%  
228 tracing with a one-day delay won't bring the probability of a large outbreak  
229 under 5%, but increasing tracing from 40% to 100% brings this probability  
230 down from 22.5% to 6.8%.




Figure 5: Outbreak size, with risk of exceeding that number of cases i.e. seeing an outbreak of at least that size for contact tracing coverages of 40% to 100% (left to right) and one or four days maximum trace delay (top to bottom). Grey dashed lines represent 5% risk of seeing an outbreak of at least that size.

### 231 3.2. Resource usage

232 We also found that higher contact tracing coverage results in a lower  
233 overall number of individuals which are traced, tested and quarantined, due

234 to the lower outbreak size (see Supplementary Figure S2). This means that  
235 achieving greater efficacy in tracing will ultimately require fewer resources.  
236 However, these resources are likely to be needed in a more condensed period  
237 of time.

## 238 4. Discussion

239 Our results show that with a test sensitivity of 65%, rapid testing which  
240 recommends infected but false-negative individuals to cease quarantine will  
241 be counter-productive, undermining contact tracing efforts, and sometimes  
242 being worse than not testing. However the impact of low test sensitivity could  
243 be mitigated by applying a minimum quarantine period to all traced contacts  
244 and using positive tests to prompt further contact tracing. This would allow  
245 negative individuals to leave quarantine comparatively early, but not im-  
246 mediately upon receipt of test result. Simply slowing down the decision-making  
247 process, so any false negative tests occur later in the infectious period, will  
248 also reduce the amount of transmission caused by premature cessation of  
249 quarantine and potentially increase likelihood of a more accurate test re-  
250 sult.<sup>13</sup> Control policies in some countries are being designed to account for  
251 the high proportion of false negative individuals: for instance Greece requires  
252 negative testing international arrivals to self-quarantine for seven days;<sup>25</sup> in  
253 Singapore two negative tests 24 hours apart are required.<sup>26</sup>

254 We show that even a test with low (65%) sensitivity can improve contact  
255 tracing outcomes if the impact of false negative cases can be limited by  
256 employing appropriate precautionary measures. This effect is seen because  
257 testing can bridge asymptomatic links in transmission chains that would  
258 otherwise have been missed, although there is some uncertainty surrounding  
259 the infectiousness of asymptomatic individuals<sup>19</sup>. Nonetheless, this benefit  
260 is only possible if testing is applied to all contacts, not just those displaying  
261 symptoms as is the initial UK policy.

262 Testing asymptomatic contacts would require more testing and resources,  
263 as well as potentially testing individuals earlier in their infectious period,  
264 before symptom onset. Earlier testing increases the impact of immediate  
265 quarantine cessation for false negative cases, so this would require a minimum  
266 quarantine period. Despite these considerations, if very good contact tracing  
267 can be implemented from the beginning of the outbreak then fewer total  
268 resources will be required because of a smaller final outbreak size, meaning  
269 the key factor for feasibility will be time-limited resource access.

270 We demonstrated that small increases in the reproduction number under  
271 physical distancing measures,  $R_S$ , has a large impact on the feasibility of  
272 contact tracing. We only consider values of  $R_S$  up to 1.5, which is still  
273 substantially lower than estimates of  $R_0$  in the absence of interventions ( $R_0 \approx$   
274  $2.7^{27}$ ) therefore, our estimates of  $R_S$  reflect a decrease in social contacts of  
275 almost 50% but even 80% coverage and a one day trace time still gives at  
276 least a 15% probability of a large outbreak. This reiterates that physical  
277 distancing is still vital, even with highly effective contact tracing, and that  
278 contact tracing will likely be insufficient to allow a complete return to normal  
279 life without additional measures, such as an effective vaccine.

280 In addition to general physical distancing, the risk posed by a single large  
281 super-spreading event means that relaxing restrictions on large gatherings,  
282 particularly indoors, could lead to a rise in case numbers. Even with very  
283 low  $R_S = 1.1$ , a local cluster of 100 unobserved cases could approximately  
284 double in size before being detected, particularly if case detection is poor.

285 We found that large outbreak risk was minimal for  $R_S = 1.1$  no matter  
286 what the contact tracing and testing strategy. What is of note to national  
287 governments who are exiting lockdown is that a dramatic change in the dy-  
288 namics occurs in the small absolute increase of  $R_S$  to 1.3. At  $R_S = 1.1$  with  
289 a poorly resourced or ineffective contact tracing system the probability of a  
290 large outbreak is roughly 1%. However only when  $R_S \geq 1.3$  does an ineffec-  
291 tive contact tracing system become noticeable, at which stage it is too late  
292 to act.

293 A number of our assumptions, particularly in comparison to the recently  
294 announced UK tracing strategy, may cause our results to appear unduly  
295 optimistic. For example, we model a scenario with very low initial case  
296 numbers and assume that tracing can occur before test results are received,  
297 and that contacts of up to 3 days pre-onset are traced. We also consider  
298 the test to have a blanket 65% sensitivity in all scenarios, whereas previous  
299 studies show that testing too early or late after exposure can dramatically  
300 increase false negative rates.<sup>13</sup> This means there is potentially an increased  
301 requirement for maintaining physical distancing measures, even if contact  
302 tracing is deployed at high coverage nationwide.

303 Furthermore there have been worrying developments in adherence to lock-  
304 down restrictions while we have developed this model. An unpublished study  
305 of 90,000 adults across the UK in the two weeks up to 25th May has found  
306 that adherence has dropped to 50%.<sup>28</sup> This may suggest that our assumption  
307 of 90% untraced symptomatic individuals self-isolating is at the upper end of

308 realistic, although symptomatic individuals will perhaps be more cautious.  
309 However, this could also have repercussions on assuming that contact-traced  
310 individuals will self-isolate when asked to do so, particularly asymptomatic  
311 individuals. Modelling studies in other countries have proposed combina-  
312 tions of contact tracing and population-level mitigation strategies<sup>29</sup> and a  
313 recent UK study puts  $R_S$  in the range of 1–1.6 for a combination of school  
314 closures, 50% reduction in social contacts and elderly shielding.<sup>8</sup> This covers  
315 the range of values considered in this study and demonstrates the potential  
316 level of physical distancing together with high-coverage contact tracing to  
317 keep the effective reproduction number below one.

318 Contact tracing improvements include *secondary contact tracing* seen in  
319 Vietnam, i.e. tracing the contacts of contacts of known cases, to get ahead  
320 of the chain of transmission.<sup>30</sup> An upcoming roll-out of a tracing app across  
321 the UK if combined with manual tracing could boost tracing coverage<sup>31</sup> and  
322 interactive dashboards are being rolled out across a number of countries to  
323 inform modelling efforts and raise public awareness.<sup>32</sup> Backwards contact  
324 tracing, whilst highly labour intensive, could also fill vital gaps where trans-  
325 mission links have been missed. As experience in contact tracing develops,  
326 it will also likely be possible to give contacts a prior probability of infection  
327 (based on the duration and setting of contact for example) and combine this  
328 with the test results to give a more accurate measure by which to determine  
329 isolation requirements.

330 Overall, we conclude that contact tracing could bring substantial benefits  
331 to controlling and preventing outbreaks, with tracing coverage and speed  
332 playing an important role, as well as testing. However, any ‘test & trace’  
333 strategy must carefully consider the limitation of poor test sensitivity, as well  
334 as the additional tracing information obtained from testing asymptomatic  
335 individuals. Poorly sensitive tests are inappropriate for ruling out a diagnosis,  
336 and infectious individuals immediately halting quarantine following a false  
337 negative result could have dangerous implications. In line with previous  
338 studies, we have demonstrated that contact tracing alone is highly unlikely  
339 to prevent large outbreaks unless used in combination with evidence-based  
340 physical distancing measures, including restrictions on large gatherings.

## 341 **5. CRediT contribution statement**

342 Conceptualisation: ELD, TCDL, PK, GFM, TDH

343 Formal Analysis: ELD, TCDL



344 Funding acquisition: TDH  
345 Investigation: ELD, TCDL, AB, TMP, LP, DA, TC  
346 Methodology: ELD, TCDL  
347 Software: ELD, TCDL, SA, JH  
348 Visualization: ELD, AB  
349 Writing – original draft: ELD, TCDL  
350 Writing – review & editing: All authors

## 351 **6. Declaration of competing interest**

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

## 355 **7. Acknowledgments & funding sources**

356 ELD, TCDL, AB, DA, LP, TMP, GM & TDH gratefully acknowledge  
357 funding of the NTD Modelling Consortium by the Bill & Melinda Gates  
358 Foundation (BMGF) (grant number OPP1184344). The following funding  
359 sources are acknowledged as providing funding for the named authors. This  
360 research was partly funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (NTD  
361 Modelling Consortium OPP1184344: GM). This project has received funding  
362 from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme  
363 - project EpiPose (101003688: PK). Royal Society (RP/EA/180004: PK).  
364 Wellcome Trust (210758/Z/18/Z: JH, SA). Views, opinions, assumptions or  
365 any other information set out in this article should not be attributed to  
366 BMGF or any person connected with them. TC is funded by a Sir Henry  
367 Wellcome Fellowship from the Wellcome Trust (reference 215919/Z/19/Z).  
368 TMP’s PhD is supported by the Engineering & Physical Sciences Research  
369 Council, Medical Research Council and University of Warwick (grant number  
370 EP/L015374/1). TMP thanks Big Data Institute for hosting him during this  
371 work. All funders had no role in the study design, collection, analysis, inter-  
372 pretation of data, writing of the report, or decision to submit the manuscript  
373 for publication.

374 **Research in Context**

375 *Evidence before this study*

376 Contact tracing, incorporating diagnostic testing, is a well-established  
377 method for controlling novel infectious disease outbreaks but has had vari-  
378 able success in restricting the spread of COVID-19. Modelling studies using  
379 early estimates of disease parameters, including Hellewell et al. and Keel-  
380 ing et al., suggested that these methods could be effective in controlling a  
381 UK outbreak of COVID-19, but rapidly increasing case numbers in March  
382 2020 resulted in a focus on physical distancing measures. However, follow-  
383 ing declining cases throughout May 2020, the UK Government began easing  
384 physical distancing and rolled out a new ‘test & trace’ contact tracing pro-  
385 gramme. Initial methods appear to have disregarded the danger of false  
386 negative test results and miss the opportunity of using testing to identify  
387 asymptomatic chains of transmission.

388 *Added value of this study*

389 We incorporate testing and updated parameter estimates into an existing  
390 branching process model to assess how ‘test & trace’ programmes could be  
391 used to help control outbreaks of COVID-19. We find that if recent test  
392 sensitivity estimates (approx. 65%) are representative then using testing to  
393 rule-out cases and immediately revoke isolation advice could substantially re-  
394 duce contact tracing efficacy. Additionally, even if these risks are mitigated,  
395 e.g. by introducing a minimum isolation period for all traced contacts, con-  
396 tact tracing must be used in combination with physical distancing measures  
397 to minimise risk of large outbreaks.

398 *Implications of all the available evidence*

399 Greater clarity in understanding of SARS-CoV-2 biology has allowed  
400 more targeted analysis of contact tracing feasibility for COVID-19 control.  
401 We find that success is highly dependent on targeting testing towards finding  
402 cases whilst minimising the impact of false negatives. Such methods should  
403 be used in combination with population-based measures, such as physical dis-  
404 tancing. Future research considering the benefit of secondary contact tracing,  
405 and other methods for maximising tracing coverage or speed, could assess the  
406 value of enhancing current contact tracing methods.

407 **References**

- 408 [1] South China Morning Post, Coronavirus: China’s first confirmed  
409 Covid-19 case traced back to November 17 [Accessed 2nd June; URL:  
410 [https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3074991/coronavirus-](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3074991/coronavirus-chinas-first-confirmed-covid-19-case-traced-back)  
411 [chinas-first-confirmed-covid-19-case-traced-back](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3074991/coronavirus-chinas-first-confirmed-covid-19-case-traced-back)], 2020.
- 412 [2] The Guardian, Could Covid-19 have reached the UK  
413 earlier than thought? [Accessed 2nd June; URL:  
414 [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jun/01/spate-of-possible-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jun/01/spate-of-possible-uk-coronavirus-cases-from-2019-come-to-light)  
415 [uk-coronavirus-cases-from-2019-come-to-light](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jun/01/spate-of-possible-uk-coronavirus-cases-from-2019-come-to-light)], 2020.
- 416 [3] J. Hellewell, S. Abbott, A. Gimma, N. I. Bosse, C. I. Jarvis, T. W.  
417 Russell, J. D. Munday, A. J. Kucharski, W. J. Edmunds, F. Sun, et al.,  
418 Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and  
419 contacts, *The Lancet Global Health* (2020).
- 420 [4] M. J. Keeling, T. D. Hollingsworth, J. M. Read, The efficacy of contact  
421 tracing for the containment of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19).,  
422 *medRxiv* (2020).
- 423 [5] Worldometer, Coronavirus UK summary. [Accessed: 12th May; URL:  
424 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/uk>], 2020.
- 425 [6] GOV.UK, Coronavirus (COVID-19) [Accessed 12th May; URL:  
426 <https://www.gov.uk/coronavirus>], 2020.
- 427 [7] C. I. Jarvis, K. Van Zandvoort, A. Gimma, K. Prem, P. Klepac, G. J.  
428 Rubin, W. J. Edmunds, Quantifying the impact of physical distance  
429 measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the uk, *BMC Medicine*  
430 18 (2020) 1–10.
- 431 [8] N. G. Davies, A. J. Kucharski, R. M. Eggo, A. Gimma, W. J. Ed-  
432munds, C. C.-. W. Group, Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions  
433 on COVID-19 cases, deaths and demand for hospital services in the UK:  
434 a modelling study, *The Lancet Public Health* (2020).
- 435 [9] BBC, Coronavirus: Some return to work as lockdown eases slightly in  
436 England [Accessed 2nd June; URL: [https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-52642222)  
437 [52642222](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-52642222)], 2020.

- 438 [10] BBC, Coronavirus: Why did the UK need 100,000 tests a day? [Accessed  
439 12th May; URL: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-51943612>], 2020.
- 440 [11] UK Department of Health and Social Care, Coronavirus  
441 (COVID-19): getting tested [Accessed 12th May; URL:  
442 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-getting-tested>],  
443 2020.
- 444 [12] C. Menni, A. M. Valdes, M. B. Freidin, C. H. Sudre, L. H. Nguyen, D. A.  
445 Drew, S. Ganesh, T. Varsavsky, M. J. Cardoso, J. S. E.-S. Moustafa,  
446 et al., Real-time tracking of self-reported symptoms to predict potential  
447 COVID-19, *Nature Medicine* (2020) 1–4.
- 448 [13] L. M. Kucirka, S. A. Lauer, O. Laeyendecker, D. Boon, J. Lessler, Vari-  
449 ation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain  
450 reaction-based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure, *Annals of*  
451 *Internal Medicine* (2020).
- 452 [14] L. Ferretti, C. Wymant, M. Kendall, L. Zhao, A. Nurtay, L. Abeler-  
453 Dörner, M. Parker, D. Bonsall, C. Fraser, Quantifying SARS-CoV-  
454 2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing,  
455 *Science* 368 (2020).
- 456 [15] R. M. Anderson, H. Heesterbeek, D. Klinkenberg, T. D. Hollingsworth,  
457 How will country-based mitigation measures influence the course of the  
458 COVID-19 epidemic?, *The Lancet* 395 (2020) 931–934.
- 459 [16] K. Mizumoto, K. Kagaya, A. Zarebski, G. Chowell, Estimating the  
460 asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases  
461 on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020,  
462 *Eurosurveillance* 25 (2020) 2000180.
- 463 [17] E. Lavezzo, E. Franchin, C. Ciavarella, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, L. Bar-  
464 zon, C. Del Vecchio, L. Rossi, R. Manganeli, A. Loregian, N. Navarin,  
465 et al., Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo,  
466 Italy, *medRxiv* (2020).
- 467 [18] J. C. Emery, T. W. Russel, Y. Liu, J. Hellewell, C. A. Pearson, G. M.  
468 Knight, R. M. Eggo, A. J. Kucharski, S. Funk, S. Flasche, et al., The

- 469 contribution of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections to transmission-  
470 a model-based analysis of the Diamond Princess outbreak, medRxiv  
471 (2020).
- 472 [19] X. He, E. H. Lau, P. Wu, X. Deng, J. Wang, X. Hao, Y. C. Lau, J. Y.  
473 Wong, Y. Guan, X. Tan, et al., Temporal dynamics in viral shedding  
474 and transmissibility of COVID-19, *Nature Medicine* (2020) 1–4.
- 475 [20] T. Ganyani, C. Kremer, D. Chen, A. Torneri, C. Faes, J. Wallinga,  
476 N. Hens, Estimating the generation interval for coronavirus disease  
477 (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data, March 2020, *Eurosurveil-*  
478 *lance* 25 (2020) 2000257.
- 479 [21] J. O. Lloyd-Smith, S. J. Schreiber, P. E. Kopp, W. M. Getz, Super-  
480 spreading and the effect of individual variation on disease emergence,  
481 *Nature* 438 (2005) 355–359.
- 482 [22] P. van Kasteren, B. van der Veer, S. van den Brink, L. Wijsman,  
483 J. de Jonge, A. van den Brandt, R. Molenkamp, C. Reusken, A. Meijer,  
484 Comparison of seven commercial RT-PCR diagnostic kits for COVID-  
485 19, *Journal of Clinical Virology* 128 (2020).
- 486 [23] N. Grassly, M. Pons Salort, E. Parker, P. White, K. Ainslie, M. Baguelin,  
487 S. Bhatt, A. Boonyasiri, O. Boyd, N. Brazeau, et al., Report 16: Role  
488 of testing in COVID-19 control, Imperial College London (2020).
- 489 [24] R. Verity, L. C. Okell, I. Dorigatti, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, N. Imai,  
490 G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, H. Thompson, P. G. Walker, H. Fu, A. Dighe,  
491 J. T. Griffin, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, A. Cori, Z. Cu-  
492 cunubá, R. FitzJohn, K. Gaythorpe, W. Green, A. Hamlet, W. Hinsley,  
493 D. Laydon, G. Nedjati-Gilani, S. Riley, S. van Elsland, E. Volz, H. Wang,  
494 Y. Wang, X. Xi, C. A. Donnelly, A. C. Ghani, N. M. Ferguson, Estimates  
495 of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis, *The*  
496 *Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020) 669–677.
- 497 [25] The Guardian, Greece to resume flights from UK on  
498 15 June with strict rules [Accessed 1st June; URL:  
499 [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/31/greece-to-resume-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/31/greece-to-resume-flights-from-uk-on-15-june-with-strict-rules)  
500 [flights-from-uk-on-15-june-with-strict-rules](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/31/greece-to-resume-flights-from-uk-on-15-june-with-strict-rules)], 2020.

- 501 [26] Coronavirus: Why a double negative test is needed before dis-  
502 charge, [https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/health/  
503 coronavirus-why-a-double-negative-test-is-needed-before-discharge](https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/health/coronavirus-why-a-double-negative-test-is-needed-before-discharge),  
504 2020. Accessed: 2020-06-03.
- 505 [27] N. Imai, A. Cori, I. Dorigatti, M. Baguelin, C. Donnelly,  
506 S. Riley, N. M. Ferguson, Report 3: Transmissibility of 2019-  
507 nCoV, Technical Report, Imperial college London, UK, 2020.  
508 Also available from [https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/  
509 imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/  
510 Imperial-College-COVID19-transmissibility-25-01-2020.pdf](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-transmissibility-25-01-2020.pdf).
- 511 [28] UCL, Just over half of adults strictly sticking to lockdown guide-  
512 lines as confidence in government falls [Accessed 31st May; URL:  
513 [https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2020/may/just-over-half-adults-strictly-  
514 sticking-lockdown-guidelines-confidence-government-falls](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2020/may/just-over-half-adults-strictly-sticking-lockdown-guidelines-confidence-government-falls)], 2020.
- 515 [29] J. R. Koo, A. R. Cook, M. Park, Y. Sun, H. Sun, J. T. Lim, C. Tam,  
516 B. L. Dickens, Interventions to mitigate early spread of sars-cov-2 in  
517 singapore: a modelling study, *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 518 [30] S. M. Le, Containing the coronavirus (COVID-19): Lessons  
519 from Vietnam, [https://blogs.worldbank.org/health/  
520 containing-coronavirus-covid-19-lessons-vietnam](https://blogs.worldbank.org/health/containing-coronavirus-covid-19-lessons-vietnam), 2020. Ac-  
521 cessed: 2020-06-03.
- 522 [31] Coronavirus: NHS virus-tracing app downloaded 55,000 times, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-hampshire-52617236>, 2020. Ac-  
523 cessed: 2020-06-03.  
524
- 525 [32] E. Dong, H. Du, L. Gardner, An interactive web-based dashboard to  
526 track covid-19 in real time, *The Lancet infectious diseases* 20 (2020)  
527 533–534.