

# Estimating the impact of test-trace-isolate-quarantine systems on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in Australia

Freya M. Shearer<sup>1</sup>, James M. McCaw<sup>1,2</sup>, Gerard Ryan<sup>1,3</sup>, Tianxiao Hao<sup>1,3</sup>, Nicholas J Tierney<sup>1,3</sup>, Michael Lydeamore<sup>4</sup>, Kate Ward<sup>5</sup>, Sally Ellis<sup>5</sup>, James Wood<sup>6</sup>, Jodie McVernon<sup>7,8</sup>, and Nick Golding<sup>1,3,9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Infectious Disease Dynamics Unit, Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

<sup>2</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

<sup>3</sup>Telethon Kids Institute, Perth, Australia

<sup>4</sup>Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University

<sup>5</sup>Public Health Response Branch, NSW Ministry of Health

<sup>6</sup>School of Population Health, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

<sup>7</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

<sup>8</sup>Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference Laboratory Epidemiology Unit at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

<sup>9</sup>Curtin University, Perth, Australia

## ABSTRACT

We report on an analysis of Australian COVID-19 case data to estimate the impact of TTIQ systems on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in 2020–21. We estimate that in a low prevalence period in the state of New South Wales (tens of cases per day), TTIQ contributed to a 54% reduction in transmission. In a higher prevalence period in the state of Victoria (hundreds of cases per day), TTIQ contributed to a 42% reduction in transmission. Our results also suggest that case-initiated contact tracing can support timely quarantine in times of system stress. Contact tracing systems for COVID-19 in Australia were highly effective and adaptable in supporting the national suppression strategy through 2020 and 2021.

Keywords: contact tracing, COVID-19, modelling, surveillance data

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Test-trace-isolate-quarantine (TTIQ) strategies have been widely employed to mitigate the impacts of  
3 SARS-CoV-2, particularly during the pre-vaccine era of the pandemic. The aim of TTIQ is to reduce  
4 transmission through the timely detection and isolation of cases. The potential utility of TTIQ measures  
5 is pathogen-specific, as it depends on inherent pathogen characteristics, including transmissibility, and the  
6 extent of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission [1, 2]. Early in 2020, evidence of significant  
7 pre-symptomatic [3] and asymptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [4] indicated that symptomatic case  
8 isolation alone, while important for mitigating transmission, was unlikely to be an effective containment  
9 strategy. However, estimates of around four days or longer for the generation interval of SARS-CoV-2 [5,  
10 6, 7] (the time between an individual becoming infected and then infecting another person) was considered  
11 to be sufficiently long for contact tracers to identify contacts before they became infectious, suggesting  
12 the potential for contact tracing and quarantine to have a large additional impact on transmission, provided  
13 that tracing was rapid and reasonably complete. Indeed, early modelling studies anticipated an important  
14 role for TTIQ in mitigating transmission, though unless a high proportion of cases could be isolated and  
15 contacts rapidly traced and quarantined, wider social measures would also be required to achieve outbreak

16 control [8, 9, 10].

17 A range of contact tracing strategies are possible and approaches to TTIQ for SARS-CoV-2 have  
18 varied across settings and through the course of the pandemic. The identification and notification of  
19 contacts is generally a manual process managed by public health authorities. Faster and more complete  
20 contact identification is theoretically possible with smartphone-based digital contact tracing[11, 12], and  
21 while digital approaches were employed in many countries to augment more conventional processes,  
22 implementation issues have largely prevented them from contributing meaningfully to disease control  
23 [13, 14]. During the 2020–21 (pre-Omicron) period, standard procedure in Australia was to identify  
24 contacts via telephone interviews with confirmed cases. Contacts were then directed to quarantine by a  
25 public health official. This procedure is highly effective at reducing transmission but the per case burden  
26 on public health response teams is high, and systems can rapidly become overwhelmed at high caseloads.  
27 When caseloads exceed public health workload capacity, delays from case notification to interview and  
28 from interview to contact quarantine increase, reducing TTIQ effectiveness [9, 15].

29 In countries pursuing a ‘strong suppression’ strategy, including Australia through 2020 and much of  
30 2021 [16], high performing TTIQ systems supported virus suppression and low daily case incidence was  
31 critical to the ongoing effectiveness of these systems. In 2020 and 2021, Australia’s most populous state  
32 of New South Wales (NSW) effectively managed a series of small outbreaks (tens of cases per day) of  
33 COVID-19 through a combination of intensive case and contact management and limited wider social  
34 restrictions (with strict border measures also in place). Contact tracing was both upstream for cases with  
35 no known source of infection, identifying individuals who had contact with the case during the time  
36 in which the case was likely to have acquired their infection, and downstream, identifying individuals  
37 who had contact with a confirmed case during the time in which the case was likely to be contagious.  
38 Furthermore, tracing of ‘secondary contacts’, *i.e.*, identifying contacts of contacts, was performed when  
39 capacity allowed [17, 18]. Weekly reporting on the performance of NSW contact tracing systems for the  
40 latter half of 2020 indicated that 100% of cases were interviewed within 24 hours of notification and  
41 100% of close contacts identified by cases were directed to quarantine by public health officials within 48  
42 hours of case notification [19]. Formal analysis of various case and behavioural data streams during this  
43 period also suggest that TTIQ played a key role in outbreak control [20].

44 The availability of COVID-19 vaccines in early 2021 triggered a transition from a national goal  
45 in Australia of no community transmission to one of manageable transmission (from a public health  
46 and clinical perspective) [21]. This transition recognised that under higher caseloads, new approaches  
47 to contact tracing were required — which included ‘case-initiated’ contact tracing, whereby cases are  
48 instructed to self-identify their primary close contacts and ask them to quarantine, and seek a test. In the  
49 (relatively) early stages of vaccine roll-out, an incursion of the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 in June  
50 2021 led to the largest epidemic wave in Australia (up to thousands of cases per day)[22] prior to the  
51 emergence of Omicron in late 2021. To adapt to higher caseloads than previously experienced in NSW,  
52 local health authorities adopted a policy of case-initiated contact tracing in August 2021. This included  
53 instantaneous result notification via text message to cases, simultaneously directing them to isolate and  
54 notify their close contacts.

55 Here we report on an analysis of Australian COVID-19 case data to estimate the effectiveness of  
56 TTIQ systems in 2020-21. First, we directly estimate from detailed case data the contribution of TTIQ to  
57 transmission reduction in situations of low prevalence — tens of cases per day or hundreds of cases per  
58 day. We then apply a simulation approach, validated by case data, to assess the impact of case-initiated  
59 contact tracing on TTIQ effectiveness in NSW during the Delta epidemic from July–November 2021.

## 60 **METHODS**

### 61 **Setting**

62 We focus on the public health response in two of Australia’s eight states/territories: New South Wales  
63 (NSW) and Victoria (VIC). NSW and VIC are Australia’s two most populous states, with populations of  
64 more than 8 million and 6 million, respectively, largely concentrated in major urban centres. They also  
65 have the highest volumes of international travellers and experienced considerably higher total numbers of  
66 confirmed COVID-19 cases and peak daily incidence than other jurisdictions in 2020–21. Australia’s  
67 adoption of a ‘strong suppression’ strategy in early 2020 meant that COVID-19 epidemiology through  
68 much of 2020 and 2021 was characterised by periods of zero case incidence and sporadic outbreaks, as  
69 detailed elsewhere [23]. However, a number of major waves of infection occurred, most notably a wave

**Table 1.** Location and dates of each TTIQ period and the associated epidemiological context, key response measures, and the response objective.

TTIQ period	Setting	Epidemiology	Response measures	Response objective
Optimal	NSW Jul 2020–Jan 2021	Series of small outbreaks of ancestral virus (tens of cases per day)	Society was relatively open except for three weeks of stay-of-home orders in a single locality; intensive TTIQ	No community transmission
Partial	VIC Aug 2020	Large outbreak of ancestral virus (hundreds of cases per day) with transmission concentrated in subsections of the population, including essential workers and public housing residents	Stay-at-home orders; intensive TTIQ	No community transmission
Case-initiated	NSW Aug–Sept 2021	Widespread community transmission of the Delta variant (thousands of cases per day)	Stay-at-home orders; intensive TTIQ including case-initiated contact tracing	Manageable health and clinical impacts during and post vaccine rollout

70 of ancestral virus infection in VIC from June–October 2020 and waves of the Delta variant seeded into  
71 NSW and VIC in mid-2021 (Figure 1).

## 72 Case data

73 We use line listed data on cases from NSW and VIC. These data include the dates of key events in the  
74 TTIQ pathway: date of test, date of notification (of a positive test result to the public health authority),  
75 date of symptom onset (where applicable), and date of case interview. Additionally, the NSW data contain  
76 the date of likely infection/exposure and the date of case isolation. Note that for cases detected via  
77 contact tracing, the date of isolation can be prior to the date of test (*i.e.*, it is technically the date of either  
78 *quarantine* or isolation).

## 79 Estimating impact of test-trace-isolate-quarantine systems from case data

80 We estimate the impact of TTIQ on transmission for two epidemiological and response contexts within  
81 the ‘strong suppression’ policy era: very low case loads (tens of cases per day), representing a ‘Optimal’  
82 TTIQ effect; and relatively higher case loads (hundreds of cases per day) representing a ‘Partial’ TTIQ  
83 effect (Figure 1 and Table 1). We evaluate the impact of TTIQ in each context by computing a change in  
84 expected onward transmission.

85 The impact of TTIQ systems on transmission depends on both how quickly cases are found and  
86 isolated, and what proportion of infections are detected (since undetected infections are unlikely to isolate).  
87 Our analyses assume perfect detection of infections and compliance with isolation. While data to estimate  
88 case ascertainment in Australia throughout 2020–21, such as from infection prevalence studies, do not  
89 exist, ascertainment of infections was likely very high during the ‘strong suppression’ era. This was due  
90 to the intensive contact tracing and epidemiological investigation, with the explicit aim of identifying all  
91 infections in chains of transmission. Further, Australian jurisdictions repeatedly returned to periods of  
92 zero case incidence following outbreaks, suggesting negligible undetected transmission.

### 93 ‘Optimal’ TTIQ effect

94 We estimate the effectiveness of TTIQ at reducing transmission using the empirical distribution of times  
95 from infection to isolation for all cases in NSW between July 2020 and January 2021. During this period,  
96 intensive upstream and downstream contact tracing was carried out, caseloads were low (tens per day),  
97 and the impact of TTIQ was clear in suppressing transmission [19]. While some social restrictions were  
98 in place, including the closure of nightclubs and person density rules for public venues and workplaces,  
99 society remained relatively open. In mid-December 2020, two large super-spreading events occurred  
100 in the NSW locality of Northern Beaches, leading to a rapidly spreading outbreak and imposition of

101 stay-at-home orders in the affected locality for three weeks, in addition to an intensive TTIQ response.  
102 The outbreak was largely confined to this single locality and never exceeded 70 cases per day.

103 We directly translate these intervals from infection to isolation into reductions in potential for onward  
104 transmission, as described below. We assume that infectiousness over time since infection follows a  
105 lognormal distribution (as estimated by [5]) and evaluate the overall percentage reduction in infectiousness  
106 due to TTIQ. We define this reduction as a Optimal TTIQ effect, representing the maximum reduction in  
107 transmission that we may expect due to TTIQ for that pathogen (*i.e.*, ancestral virus strain), given the  
108 policy, social, and health system context.

109 We calculate the expected reduction in transmission ( $s$ ; a multiplier on the reproduction number) due  
110 to isolation as the finite sum (up to a maximum of  $N = 20$  days) of the product of the probability mass  
111 functions of the isolation delay distribution ( $\pi_I$ , delay from infection to isolation) and generation interval  
112 distribution in the absence of isolation ( $\pi_G$ , delay from infection to onward transmission for individuals  
113 not in isolation):

$$s = \sum_{\delta=0}^{\infty} \pi_I(\delta) \pi_G(\delta) \quad (1)$$

114 Since the data are only available on a daily time step, we model both  $\pi_I$  and  $\pi_G$  as discrete probability  
115 distributions over times since infection to isolation. The generation interval distribution is modelled as a  
116 discretised log-normal, with parameters given posterior mean estimates from [5]:

$$\pi_G(\delta|\mu, \sigma) = \int_{\delta}^{\delta+1} \text{lognormal}(z|\mu, \sigma) dz \quad (2)$$

117 When cases are rapidly found and placed into isolation, the isolation delay distribution,  $\pi_I$ , has most  
118 of its mass on small delays and the isolation effect  $s$  tends toward 0. At times when cases are not found  
119 and isolated until after most of their infectious period has passed,  $\pi_I$  has most of its mass on large delays  
120 and  $s$  tends toward 1.

### 121 **'Partial' TTIQ effect**

122 Similarly detailed data on the date of isolation of cases were not available from VIC, where a major wave  
123 of infection (hundreds of cases per day) occurred from July–October 2020. As in NSW, intensive upstream  
124 and downstream contact tracing was in place, and with relatively higher caseloads, contact tracing systems  
125 were reported to be under stress [24]. Australia's Common Operating Picture reported that 10% of case  
126 interviews in VIC were outstanding 48 hours after case notification and public health workforce status,  
127 including surge capacity, was listed as “saturated” on 27 August 2020 [24]. Stringent stay-at-home orders  
128 were in place at this time, and while these measures reduced average contact rates at the population-level,  
129 transmission was concentrated in subsections of the population with higher-than-average rates of contact  
130 (*e.g.*, health care workers) [20]. Nonetheless, contacts would have been more easily identifiable than in a  
131 freely mixing population, with most contacts occurring in household and workplace settings.

132 By assuming improvements in TTIQ are proportional to improvements in times to detection (*i.e.*,  
133 times from symptom onset to test), we estimated the relative performance of TTIQ during this pe-  
134 riod/epidemiological context where TTIQ was considered to be less effective. More specifically, we  
135 estimated a distribution of times to isolation using the case data for VIC from 4 August 2020 — the  
136 peak of daily locally-acquired COVID-19 cases in Australia in 2020. We define the resulting estimated  
137 reduction in transmission as a Partial TTIQ effect.

138 We interpolated the distribution of times from infection to isolation at each date  $t$  in VIC, by first  
139 defining a time-series of weights  $w(t)$  based on improvements over time in the delay from symptom  
140 onset to notification. That is, we applied equation 1 to the distribution of times from *assumed infection*  
141 (taken to be 5 days prior to the recorded date of symptom onset [ref]) to *notification*,  $\pi_{I^*(t)}$  at each time  $t$ ,  
142 took the reciprocal of this (so that greater reductions in transmission correspond to higher weights), and  
143 normalised it to have maximum value 1:

$$s^*(t) \approx \sum_{\delta=0}^N \pi_{I^*(t)}(\delta) \pi_G(\delta) \quad (3)$$

$$w(t) = \frac{1 - s^*(t)}{\max(1 - s^*(t))} \quad (4)$$

144 These weights were used to compute an interpolated time-series of distributions of times from infection  
145 to isolation  $\pi_{\hat{I}(t)}$  between the time-varying distribution of times from assumed infection to notification  
146 ( $\pi_{I^*(t)}$ , which can be considered an upper bound on the time from infection to isolation), and the Optimal  
147 period distribution of times from infection to isolation  $\pi_{IO}$  (derived from the NSW case data) as follows:

$$\pi_{\hat{I}(t)}(\delta) = \pi_{IO}(\delta)w(t) + \pi_{I^*(t)}(\delta)(1 - w(t)) \quad (5)$$

148 This assumes that when operating at its best (the shortest delays from symptom onset to notification),  
149 the Victorian contact tracing system was operating with the same distribution of times from infection to  
150 isolation as in NSW during the Optimal reference period. It also assumes that reductions in the distribution  
151 times from infection to isolation (or assumed infection to notification) scaled according to improvements  
152 in the times from symptom onset to notification.

153 Finally, we took the infection to isolation distribution for the Partial TTIQ period  $\pi_{IP}$  to be the value  
154 of the interpolated distribution of times from infection to isolation  $\pi_{\hat{I}(t)}(\delta)$  as on 4 August 2020 in VIC.

### 155 **Assessing impact of case-initiated contact tracing via simulation**

156 We use a simulation approach to consider the impact of case-initiated contact tracing on transmission in  
157 NSW in mid-2021, during the escalating phase of the Delta epidemic wave where caseloads (thousands  
158 per day with a peak of 1,511 cases per day) were unprecedented in the Australian context. During this  
159 period, intensive upstream and downstream TTIQ were performed, including case-initiated tracing of  
160 downstream contacts, and stay-at-home restrictions were in place. We validate our simulations by relating  
161 them to available data on timeliness of case isolation from NSW over various time periods (Figure 1).

### 162 **Model overview**

163 A stochastic simulation model was used to represent the relationship between contact tracing delays,  
164 symptomatic detection, and times from infection to isolation in continuous chains of contact tracing. By  
165 sampling from distributions of contact tracing times, this model generates distributions of time from  
166 infection to isolation, which were then used to calculate expected reductions in transmission. Note that  
167 the model assumes perfect detection of infections and compliance with isolation.


168 We calculate the expected distribution of times from infection to isolation ( $T_I$ ) from two different delay  
169 distributions: the time from infection of the source case to infection of the contact ( $T_G$ , the generation  
170 interval); and a random sample from the distribution of times from isolation of the source case to isolation  
171 of the infected contact ( $T_A$ , the contact tracing delay) (Figure 2). The latter of these is comprised of several  
172 different component distributions, including the time from swab collection to case notification, the time  
173 from case notification to case interview, and the times from interview to contact notification and swab  
174 collection (Figure 3).

175 We estimate the distribution over times from infection to isolation ( $T_I$ ) by iteratively sampling infector  
176 and infectee times to isolation and times to onward transmission in long simulated chains of transmission  
177 via a recursive sampling algorithm (Markov chain Monte Carlo using a Gibbs sampler) whereby each  
178 infectee becomes the infector for the next iteration. This yields a stable distribution of times from infection  
179 to isolation for cases from which the reduction in transmission potential can be calculated.

180 The Gibbs sampling algorithm proceeds as follows, and encodes the schematic in Figure 2. We  
181 initialise the Markov chain by sampling an initial time from infection to isolation  $T_I$  for an index case.  
182 This initial value is rapidly ‘forgotten’ by the chain as it moves to its stable state, and therefore results are  
183 insensitive to the choice of distributions from which to sample initial values. We sampled the initial value  
184 from a very broad positive-truncated normal distribution as is standard practice for use of Gibbs samplers  
185 in Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling in Bayesian inference.

186 We then iterate the Gibbs sample as follows, incrementing the iteration variable  $i$  until a predetermined  
187 number of samples have been obtained:





**Figure 1.** Daily new cases of COVID-19 reported in the states of New South Wales and Victoria from 1 March 2020 to 1 November 2021. Grey shading indicates the time periods/points of case data from which Optimal (tens of cases per day), Partial (hundreds of cases per day), and NSW Delta (where a policy of case-initiated contact tracing was in place, and thousands of cases were reported per day) TTIQ effects were calculated. Details on the response context during each of these periods are provided in Table 1.

1. Sample a generation interval  $T_{G_i}$  from the infectee to the infector from the generation interval distribution  $\pi_G$ , truncated so that the infection cannot occur after the infector's date of isolation  $T_{I_{i-1}}$ :

$$T_{G_i} \sim \pi_G(\mu, \sigma)[0, T_{I_{i-1}}] \quad (6)$$

2. Sample a contact tracing delay between detections of the infector and the infectee  $T_{A_i}$  from the contact tracing delay distribution, independently of the other parameters in the Gibbs sampler. The contact tracing delay distribution is parameterised as a categorical distribution with the vector  $p_F$  of probability masses (the frequency of delays) for each possible number of days delayed:

$$T_{A_i} \sim \text{Categorical}(p_F) \quad (7)$$

3. Calculate the isolation delay for the infectee  $T_i$  from these other delays. The time from the infector being infected to the infectee being isolated is  $T_{I_{i-1}} + T_{A_i}$ , and subtracting the generation interval from this gives the isolation delay for the infectee:

$$T_i = T_{G_i} - T_{I_{i-1}} + T_{A_i} \quad (8)$$

- 188 4. Increment  $i$  so that the infectee becomes the infector for the next iteration of the Gibbs sampler.


189 This Gibbs sampler yields (non-independent) samples from  $T_i$ , from which the discrete distribution  
190  $\pi_G$  can be calculated, and used in Equation 1

191 Within this modelling framework, we can investigate the likely impacts of various proposed TTIQ  
192 strategies by adjusting parameters and distributions to represent the implementation of those strategies.

### 193 **Modelling case-initiated contact tracing**

194 We model scenarios of TTIQ with and without case-initiated contact tracing by modifying the overall  
195 contact tracing delay: the distribution of times from source case isolation to infected contact isolation.

196 We model the contact tracing delay as the sum of three other types of delay: the time from swab  
197 collection to notification, the time from notification to the infected contact being identified (via interview



**Figure 2.** Representation of infection progression for a source case and an infected contact, with the timings of key TTIQ actions indicated. TTIQ aims to reduce the time from infection to isolation ( $T_I$ ). Longer tracing delays ( $T_A$ ) result in longer times to quarantine/isolation and a greater proportion of infectiousness in the community (orange) compared to when delays are short.

198 or by the case), and the aggregate of all ‘other’ delays. These other delays might include the time from  
199 source case isolation to swab collection, and the time from source case interview to the infected contact  
200 being instructed to isolate. Empirical and modelled distributions for each scenario and contact tracing  
201 delay are shown in Figure 3.

202 For scenarios without case-initiated contact tracing, we estimate the distributions of times from swab  
203 collection to case notification and from case notification to case interview from NSW data. We use a  
204 modelled distribution for ‘other’ delays with mean and variance of one day since we are not able to  
205 estimate these directly from the data.

206 For scenarios with case-initiated contact tracing, we use the same delays for times from swab collec-  
207 tion to notification of the source case, and the ‘other’ delays, but we modify the times from source case  
208 notification to interview so that some fraction of these delays (those infected contacts that are identified  
209 by cases) are always set to zero, and the remainder are sampled from the estimated distribution of times  
210 (some of which are also zero). The zero day delay for cases performing case-initiated contact tracing,  
211 reflects an assumption that instructions to notify contacts are sent to cases immediately, and that the case  
212 is immediately able to identify close contacts. It is assumed that the time taken from this point to instruct  
213 contacts to isolate is the same as for manual contact tracing, and this is included in the same distribution  
214 of ‘other’ delays.

215  
216 We applied the above model to three different delay distributions for NSW:

- 217 • Optimal — representing the Optimal TTIQ period in NSW from July 2020–February 2021 when  
218 the formal case-initiated contact tracing was not in place and thus we assume that contacts start  
219 quarantine after being identified by a source case interview.
- 220 • ‘Delta epidemic without case-initiated’ — representing the period in NSW from mid-August 2021–  
221 mid-September 2021 when case-initiated contact tracing was in place but we assume that contacts  
222 start quarantine only after being identified by a source case interview.
- 223 • ‘Delta epidemic with case-initiated’ — as above, except with an assumption that 80% of infected  
224 contacts are immediately identified by cases and thus start quarantine on the date of source case  
225 notification.

226 The purpose of the first analysis was to assess how closely our simulation model could reproduce the  
227 observed times to isolation from the case data during the Optimal TTIQ period. Once satisfied with our  
228 model calibration/performance, the aim of our second and third analyses was to assess whether the formal  
229 policy of case-initiated contact tracing reduced delays to isolation. We assessed how closely simulation  
230 scenarios where contacts were either immediately identified by cases (scenario with case-initiated contact  
231 tracing) or by public health authorities following a case interview (counterfactual scenario without case-  
232 initiated contact tracing) match the observed times from infection to isolation from the case data during a  
233 period in NSW when a policy of case-initiated contact tracing was in place.


234 During the ‘Delta epidemic with case-initiated’ scenario, we assumed that 80% of close contacts were  
235 readily identifiable by the case (*e.g.*, household and workplace contacts). This high proportion reflects the  
236 fact that stay-at-home restrictions in place during this period minimised the number of social contacts and  
237 concentrated infected contacts in household and essential workplace settings where contacts are fewer  
238 and more easily identifiable. We would expect the fraction of cases found by case-initiated contact tracing  
239 to be smaller under less stringent restrictions.

## 240 RESULTS


241 Figure 4 displays estimates of times from infection to isolation and TTIQ impact on transmission from  
242 case data. We estimate that periods of Optimal TTIQ in reduced transmission by 54% (left panel) and  
243 Partial TTIQ resulted in a 42% reduction in transmission (middle panel). Further, in the escalating phase  
244 of the Delta epidemic in NSW (mid-August to mid-September 2021), we estimate that TTIQ systems were  
245 able to reduced transmission by 40% (right panel). The distribution of times from infection to isolation  
246 did not vary significantly over the Optimal TTIQ period, suggesting that the performance of NSW’s TTIQ  
247 system was consistent over a range of levels of social restriction.

248 Figure 5 displays times from infection to isolation and corresponding TTIQ impact on transmission as  
249 predicted by our simulation model under three different delay scenarios. The left panel shows that our






**Figure 3.** Modelled distributions of various delays in the contact tracing process as estimated from NSW data (dots = data). These distributions are used as inputs in our model of TTIQ impact on transmission. Time from swab collection to notification and notification to interview are informed by NSW data from July 2020 to February 2021 (‘NSW Optimal’, row 1) and from mid-August to mid-September 2021 (‘NSW Delta epidemic without case-initiated’, row 2). ‘Other delays’ is calibrated to match the overall distribution of delays from infection to isolation for the ‘Optimal’ period and has a mean delay of one day. This represents all other delays in the contact tracing process that we are not yet to estimate from data. For example, the time from interview to contact notification and the time from contact notification to isolation. ‘NSW Delta epidemic with case-initiated’ (row 3) assumes the same delays as for ‘NSW Delta epidemic without case-initiated’ except that 80% of notification to interview delays are set to zero. This represents a high proportion of contacts being immediately advised by the case to isolate (*e.g.*, household contacts).



**Figure 4.** Distribution of delays from infection to isolation, and the resulting percentage reduction in transmission, estimated from case data under three delay scenarios (as outlined in Figure 15). Optimal is times from infection to isolation from NSW case data between July 2020 and January 2021. The distribution of times from infection to isolation for Partial and NSW Delta are extrapolated from Optimal based on delays from symptom onset to notification measured for VIC on 4 August 2020 (Partial) and for NSW on 15 August 2021 (NSW Delta). Dashed vertical lines indicate the time of symptom onset.



**Figure 5.** Distribution of delays from infection to isolation, and the resulting percentage reduction in transmission, predicted by our model under three delay scenarios (as outlined in Figure 15). Dashed vertical lines indicate the time of symptom onset.

250 simulation model can re-produce the transmission reduction calculated from observed distributions of  
 251 times from infection to isolation (Optimal TTIQ, 55% reduction). The middle panel shows that with a  
 252 high level of case-initiated contact tracing, NSW contact tracing delays measured during the escalating  
 253 phase of the Delta epidemic (August-September 2021) would be able to achieve similar reductions in  
 254 transmission as for the Partial TTIQ period in VIC 2020 (48% reduction). The right panel shows that the  
 255 contact tracing delays in NSW during the Delta epidemic are predicted to have resulted in a much smaller  
 256 reduction in transmission (24% reduction) if case-initiated contact tracing (or other strategies to reduce  
 257 times to isolation) were not in place. Furthermore, our predicted transmission reduction with case-initiated  
 258 contact tracing (middle panel, Figure 5) broadly aligns with that estimated directly from NSW case data  
 259 (right panel, Figure 4). That is, the distribution of times from infection to isolation resulting from our  
 260 scenario assuming case-initiated contact tracing are closer to the observed distribution of times to isolation  
 261 from NSW case data, than the counterfactual scenario assuming health authority initiated contact tracing  
 262 only. This suggests that implementation of a formal case-initiated contact tracing policy was successful in  
 263 reducing delays to isolation and contributed to transmission reduction during the escalating phase of the  
 264 Delta epidemic wave in August 2021 when caseloads were thousands per day.

## 265 DISCUSSION

266 We assessed the impact of TTIQ on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in Australia during 2020 and 2021, using  
267 data from specific locations and times to represent a range of epidemiological and response contexts.  
268 We estimate that in a very low prevalence period (tens of cases per day) in the state of NSW, under  
269 social restrictions of varying stringency, TTIQ contributed to a 54% reduction in transmission. In a  
270 higher prevalence period (hundreds of cases per day) in the state of VIC, under stay-at-home orders,  
271 TTIQ contributed to a 42% reduction in transmission. Our analysis also suggests that switching to a  
272 case-initiated contact tracing policy in NSW during the 2021 Delta epidemic (thousands of cases per day  
273 with a peak of 1,511 cases) contributed to the maintenance of high levels of TTIQ effectiveness under  
274 (relatively) high case loads.

275 These findings must be interpreted in light of the COVID-19 epidemiology and response policy  
276 from 2020–21 in these jurisdictions, and our key modelling assumptions. Our analyses assume perfect  
277 detection of infections (*i.e.*, 100% case ascertainment), which we believe is reasonable for Australia’s  
278 ‘strong suppression’ era. This was due to the large-scale community testing, intensive contact tracing  
279 and epidemiological investigation (including extensive use of sequencing to link cases to clusters), with  
280 the explicit aim of identifying all infections in chains of transmission. Test positivity was consistently  
281 very low [25], very few cases had no clear source of infection [26], and jurisdictions repeatedly returned  
282 to periods of zero case incidence following outbreaks (Figure 1), all suggesting negligible undetected  
283 transmission.

284 In the absence of temporal data on the prevalence of infections in NSW and VIC, such as via random  
285 population screening as performed in the United Kingdom [27, 28], we cannot robustly estimate case  
286 ascertainment. If case ascertainment were less than 100%, then actual reductions in transmission due  
287 to TTIQ would be lower than estimated here, since undetected infections are less likely to isolate. The  
288 percentage reduction in transmission is approximately linearly proportional to the fraction of infections  
289 detected. For example, if only half of infected people are detected, only half of infections can have any  
290 onward transmission events averted due to isolation.

291 Our analyses assume perfect compliance with isolation and quarantine. That is, all individuals are  
292 assumed to stay in isolation/quarantine from the isolation start date (either reported or inferred) for the  
293 remainder of their infectious period. Data are not available to estimate levels of isolation compliance, but  
294 we expect that it was very high in Australia during the analysis period due to both support to maintain  
295 isolation, including welfare checks and counselling, and financial penalties for non-compliance of up to  
296 \$5,000 enforced through home visits by police/military [29]. Nonetheless, compliance was unlikely to  
297 be perfect (encompassing both individuals who partially isolate and those who do not isolate at all), and  
298 would have resulted in lower reductions in transmission due to TTIQ than estimated here.

299 Our estimates of the TTIQ impact on transmission were made for periods when other, synergistic,  
300 public health measures were in place, including restrictions on population movement and social gatherings.  
301 These measures reduce the pressure on TTIQ systems by both directly contributing to transmission  
302 reduction and reducing the per case burden on public health authorities (since on average cases would  
303 have fewer contacts per day to trace). Strict stay-at-home measures were in place in VIC during the Partial  
304 TTIQ period (August 2020), including: a night-time curfew; one hours’ outdoor exercise allowance;  
305 once daily shopping for essential supplies; restrictions on movement more than 5km from a person’s  
306 residence; and strict definitions of essential workers and businesses. While population-average rates of  
307 daily non-household contacts were significantly reduced during this period, epidemiological assessments  
308 suggested that the populations in which transmission was concentrated likely had higher-than-average  
309 levels of social contact [20]. Stay-at-home measures were also in place when NSW enacted case-initiated  
310 contact tracing (July 2021). When simulating case-initiated contact tracing, we assumed that a high  
311 proportion of contacts could be identified by the case, which while likely reasonable under stay-at-home  
312 conditions, was unlikely to be possible under lighter social restrictions.

313 During the Optimal TTIQ period from July 2020–December 2020, NSW effectively controlled a  
314 series of localised outbreaks while society remained relatively open (though some restrictions were in  
315 place such as social gatherings capped at 20 people). In our previous analysis of this period of the NSW  
316 epidemic (using a different modelling approach and data sources including social contact data [20]), we  
317 estimated that levels of population-mixing were sufficient to support continued epidemic growth, yet each  
318 outbreak was brought under control, which we interpreted as reflecting a strong TTIQ response. The  
319 performance of TTIQ in NSW was maintained during a rapidly growing outbreak in mid-December 2020

320 (resulting from two large super-spreading events), likely supported by stay-at-home orders imposed in the  
321 affected locality for three weeks.

322 The impact of TTIQ on SARS-CoV-2 transmission has been investigated in a number of other settings  
323 [30, 31, 9, 15, 32, 33, 34, 35]. These studies use either mathematical models, parameterised to COVID-19  
324 transmission and contact tracing processes [30, 31, 9, 15, 35], or perform empirical analyses of case data  
325 [32, 33, 34]. Others have assessed the combined impact of TTIQ and social restrictions by measuring  
326 serial intervals over time (time between the symptom onsets of an index case and a secondary case) since  
327 the more quickly infected people are identified and isolated, the fewer the opportunities for transmission  
328 late in the infectious period, the shorter the serial interval [36]. Disentangling the relative impact of  
329 TTIQ measures from other response measures is challenging, partly because interventions are often  
330 implemented in rapid succession, but also because much of the case data available to inform such analyses  
331 is incomplete or biased in ways that are difficult to measure. In an analysis of the effectiveness of 13  
332 categories of non-pharmaceutical interventions in reducing SARS-CoV-2 transmission using case data  
333 from 2020, Liu and colleagues concluded that evidence regarding the effectiveness of testing and contact  
334 tracing was inconsistent and inconclusive [32].

335 Because our study is based on pairs of exposure and isolation times for cases that likely represented  
336 a very high proportion of all infections, we are able to directly quantify the impact on transmission of  
337 truncating the infectious period of cases via TTIQ measures. However, we are not able to estimate the  
338 extent to which these systems may have been assisted by other measures, and therefore our results must  
339 be interpreted in context of the other measures in place, as discussed above.

340 Davis and colleagues performed a mathematical modelling study to estimate potential TTIQ effective-  
341 ness in the United Kingdom (UK) in 2020–21 [30]. The model incorporated information on TTIQ systems  
342 in the UK (*e.g.*, test turnaround time, percentage of symptomatic individuals presenting for testing, *etc.*)  
343 and used population survey data on isolation compliance. They concluded that well-implemented contact  
344 tracing could provide up to a 15% reduction in onward transmission (above and beyond reductions in  
345 transmission due to physical distancing behaviour).

346 It is not surprising that we estimate a much stronger effect of TTIQ in Australia compared to the  
347 UK study. The UK study assumed imperfect compliance with isolation (up to 90%), imperfect tracing  
348 coverage (up to 80% of contacts reached), and 50% of symptomatic individuals presenting for testing.  
349 Further, it does not account for the effects of strategies other than downstream contact tracing to identify  
350 contacts, such as the tracing of upstream or secondary contacts, since these were not part of UK test trace  
351 isolate procedures at the time (and likely unsustainable under the case burden). In contrast, in Australia  
352 contact tracing for COVID-19 from 2020 through to 2021 was not just focused on primary contacts  
353 identified by the case, authorities also used location-based contact identification, traced both primary  
354 and secondary contacts (when capacity allowed), and routinely performed upstream tracing for cases  
355 with no identified source of infection (supported by rapid genomic sequencing) [17]. Location-based  
356 contact identification, supported by QR code ‘sign-in’ systems, provided an additional ‘ring’ of contact  
357 identification and management. The designation of ‘contacts’ requiring management by these means  
358 was much more inclusive than many close contact definitions employed in other countries [9, 37, 38].  
359 Furthermore, the level of presentation by the Australian public for testing was high throughout the analysis  
360 period (2020–21), including during periods of low or zero prevalence. During a localised outbreak in  
361 December 2020, NSW recorded 69,809 tests in 24 hours (8.7 tests per 1,000 population), reporting seven  
362 confirmed cases in that period [25].

363 In addition to assumptions of perfect case ascertainment and perfect compliance, there are a number  
364 of other limitations to the analysis presented here. Our model assumed that in the absence of a formal  
365 case-initiated contact tracing policy, infected contacts would not isolate until after being identified by a  
366 case interview. However, cases may inform household members and other close contacts of their positive  
367 result, and these contacts may choose to self-isolate. The predominance of such self-directed isolation  
368 behaviour will likely be difficult to estimate from data, since recorded dates of isolation could represent  
369 the date when contacts are instructed to isolate, the date when they began isolating, or the last day in the  
370 community, but not all three dates. To simulate case-initiated contact tracing in the escalating phase of the  
371 Delta epidemic in NSW, we reduced the time from case notification to notification of their contacts (*i.e.*,  
372 removing the delay case notification to case interview). While our model incorporating these assumptions  
373 was able to closely match the observed times to isolation, it is possible that other strategies implemented  
374 by health authorities or changes in population behaviour during this period may have also reduced delays

375 to isolation.

376 We did not examine the effectiveness of TTIQ response in Australia's six other states and territories,  
377 largely due to very low (or zero) case incidence over the analysis period (and hence scarce data available  
378 for analysis). However, we expect that the TTIQ systems in these jurisdictions were high-performing,  
379 since similarly intensive TTIQ strategies as used in NSW and VIC were employed in response to SARS-  
380 CoV-2 incursions. For example, in response to an incursion in November 2020 (fewer than 50 cases in  
381 total), the state of South Australia imposed state-wide stay-at-home restrictions and employed intensive  
382 tracing of primary and secondary contacts, placing contacts in hotels for the duration of their quarantine  
383 period [18].

384 Our study demonstrates the high impact of TTIQ on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in Australia from  
385 2020–21, prior to the emergence of the Omicron variant in November 2021. High-performing TTIQ  
386 systems were both critical to the maintenance of Australia's strong suppression strategy and directly  
387 assisted by the low prevalence environment. Our analysis also highlights the value of surveillance data  
388 that enables the evaluation of intervention effectiveness. Direct estimates of TTIQ impact would not  
389 have been possible without systematic collection of the dates of likely exposure and isolation of cases by  
390 public health response teams in NSW. These data supported both real-time operational decision-making,  
391 including local case and contact management, and longer-term strategic response planning, with estimates  
392 of TTIQ impact incorporated in a range of modelling analyses supporting Australia's 2021 national  
393 COVID-19 're-opening' plan [21].

## 394 **CODE AVAILABILITY**

395 Code for performing the analyses and generating the figures is available at: [https://github.com/](https://github.com/njtierney/ttiq-simulation)  
396 [njtierney/ttiq-simulation](https://github.com/njtierney/ttiq-simulation).

## 397 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

398 The analyses performed in this study required access to data from the Australian National Notifiable  
399 Disease Surveillance System (NNDSS) and the New South Wales (NSW) Notifiable Conditions Informa-  
400 tion Management System (NCIMS), which are not able to be shared under the terms of our data access  
401 agreements. For access to NNDSS data, a request must be submitted via [NNDSS.datarequests@](mailto:NNDSS.datarequests@health.gov.au)  
402 [health.gov.au](mailto:NNDSS.datarequests@health.gov.au). For access to NCIMS data, contact the NSW Ministry of Health via [https:](https://data.nsw.gov.au/contact)  
403 [//data.nsw.gov.au/contact](https://data.nsw.gov.au/contact).

## 404 **ETHICS STATEMENT**

405 The study was undertaken as urgent public health action to support Australia's COVID-19 pandemic  
406 response. The study used data from the Australian National Notifiable Disease Surveillance System  
407 (NNDSS) provided to the Australian Government Department of Health under the National Health Security  
408 Agreement for the purposes of national communicable disease surveillance. Data from the NNDSS were  
409 supplied after de-identification to the investigator team for the purposes of provision of epidemiological  
410 advice to government. Contractual obligations established strict data protection protocols agreed between  
411 the University of Melbourne and sub-contractors and the Australian Government Department of Health,  
412 with oversight and approval for use in supporting Australia's pandemic response and for publication  
413 provided by the data custodians represented by the Communicable Diseases Network of Australia. The  
414 ethics of the use of these data for these purposes, including publication, was agreed by the Department of  
415 Health with the Communicable Diseases Network of Australia.

416 The study also used routinely collected patient administration data from the New South Wales (NSW)  
417 Notifiable Conditions Information Management System (NCIMS). Data was supplied by the NSW  
418 Ministry of Health, with all records de-identified and securely managed to ensure patient privacy and  
419 to ensure the study's compliance with the National Health and Medical Research Council's Ethical  
420 Considerations in Quality Assurance and Evaluation Activities. The NSW Public Health Act (2010)  
421 allows for such release of data to identify and monitor risk factors for diseases and conditions that have a  
422 substantial adverse impact on the population and to improve service delivery. Following review, the NSW  
423 Ministry of Health determined that this study met that threshold and therefore provided approval for the  
424 study to proceed. The project oversight and approval for publication was provided by the NSW Ministry  
425 of Health.



## 426 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

427 This work was directly funded by the Australian Government Department of Health Office of Health  
428 Protection. Additional support was provided by the National Health and Medical Research Council of  
429 Australia through its Centres of Research Excellence (SPECTRUM, GNT1170960) and Investigator  
430 Grant Schemes (JMcV Principal Research Fellowship, GNT1117140; FMS Emerging Leader Fellowship,  
431 2021/GNT2010051).

432 This research was supported by The University of Melbourne's Research Computing Services and the  
433 Petascale Campus Initiative.

434 This work could not have been completed without the support of the public health network in NSW. The  
435 Public Health Response Branch, NSW Health including contact tracing staff as well as operational, policy,  
436 epidemiology, surveillance, data quality and data acquisition staff contributed to the TTIQ implementation  
437 and data provision. In addition, colleagues in the public health units located within the 15 local health  
438 districts across the state all contributed to the implementation of the TTIQ strategy.

## 439 REFERENCES

- 440 [1] Christophe Fraser, Steven Riley, Roy M. Anderson, and Neil M. Ferguson. Factors that make an  
441 infectious disease outbreak controllable. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 101(16):6146–6151, 2004. doi:  
442 10.1073/pnas.0307506101.
- 443 [2] Corey M. Peak, Lauren M. Childs, Yonatan H. Grad, and Caroline O. Buckee. Comparing nonphar-  
444 maceutical interventions for containing emerging epidemics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 114(15):  
445 4023–4028, 2017. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1616438114.
- 446 [3] Xi He, Eric H. Y. Lau, Peng Wu, Xilong Deng, Jian Wang, Xinxin Hao, Yiu Chung Lau, Jessica Y.  
447 Wong, Yajuan Guan, Xinghua Tan, Xiaoneng Mo, Yanqing Chen, Baolin Liao, Weilie Chen, Fengyu  
448 Hu, Qing Zhang, Mingqiu Zhong, Yanrong Wu, Lingzhai Zhao, Fuchun Zhang, Benjamin J. Cowling,  
449 Fang Li, and Gabriel M Leung. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of  
450 COVID-19. *Nat Med*, page 672–75, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5>.
- 451 [4] Nicholas G Davies, Petra Klepac, Yang Liu, Kiesha Prem, Mark Jit, CMMID COVID-19 working  
452 group, and Rosalind M Eggo. Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19  
453 epidemics. *Nat Med*, 26(8):1205–1211, August 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9.
- 454 [5] Hiroshi Nishiura, Natalie M Linton, and Andrei R Akhmetzhanov. Serial interval of novel coronavirus  
455 (COVID-19) infections. *Int J Infect Dis*, 93:284–6, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.060.
- 456 [6] Tapiwa Ganyani, Cécile Kremer, Dongxuan Chen, Andrea Torneri, Christel Faes, Jacco Wallinga, and  
457 Niel Hens. Estimating the generation interval for coronavirus disease (covid-19) based on symptom  
458 onset data, march 2020. *Eurosurveillance*, 25(17):2000257, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.17.2000257>.
- 460 [7] Qun Li, Xuhua Guan, Peng Wu, Xiaoye Wang, Lei Zhou, Yeqing Tong, Ruiqi Ren, Kathy S.M.  
461 Leung, Eric H.Y. Lau, Jessica Y. Wong, Xuesen Xing, Nijuan Xiang, Yang Wu, Chao Li, Qi Chen,  
462 Dan Li, Tian Liu, Jing Zhao, Man Liu, Wenxiao Tu, Chuding Chen, Lianmei Jin, Rui Yang, Qi Wang,  
463 Suhua Zhou, Rui Wang, Hui Liu, Yinbo Luo, Yuan Liu, Ge Shao, Huan Li, Zhongfa Tao, Yang Yang,  
464 Zhiqiang Deng, Boxi Liu, Zhitao Ma, Yanping Zhang, Guoqing Shi, Tommy T.Y. Lam, Joseph T.  
465 Wu, George F. Gao, Benjamin J. Cowling, Bo Yang, Gabriel M. Leung, and Zijian Feng. Early  
466 transmission dynamics in wuhan, china, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*,  
467 382(13):1199–1207, 2020. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316.
- 468 [8] Joel Hellewell, Sam Abbott, Amy Gimma, Nikos I Bosse, Christopher I Jarvis, Timothy W Russell,  
469 James D Munday, Adam J Kucharski, W John Edmunds, Fiona Sun, Stefan Flasche, Billy J Quilty,  
470 Nicholas Davies, Yang Liu, Samuel Clifford, Petra Klepac, Mark Jit, Charlie Diamond, Hamish  
471 Gibbs, Kevin van Zandvoort, Sebastian Funk, and Rosalind M Eggo. Feasibility of controlling  
472 COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *Lancet Glob Health*, 8(4):e488–e496, 2020.  
473 doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30074-7.
- 474 [9] MJ Keeling, TD Hollingsworth, and Read JM. Efficacy of contact tracing for the containment of the  
475 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *J Epidemiol Community Health*, 74(10):861–866, 2020. doi:  
476 doi:10.1136/jech-2020-214051.
- 477 [10] Adam J Kucharski, Petra Klepac, Andrew J K Conlan, Stephen M Kissler, Maria L Tang, Hannah  
478 Fry, Julia R Gog, W John Edmunds, Jon C Emery, Graham Medley, James D Munday, Timothy W



- 479 Russell, Quentin J Leclerc, Charlie Diamond, Simon R Procter, Amy Gimma, Fiona Yueqian Sun,  
480 Hamish P Gibbs, Alicia Rosello, Kevin van Zandvoort, Stéphane Hué, Sophie R Meakin, Arminder K  
481 Deol, Gwen Knight, Thibaut Jombart, Anna M Foss, Nikos I Bosse, Katherine E Atkins, Billy J  
482 Quilty, Rachel Lowe, Kiesha Prem, Stefan Flasche, Carl A B Pearson, Rein M G J Houben, Emily S  
483 Nightingale, Akira Endo, Damien C Tully, Yang Liu, Julian Villabona-Arenas, Kathleen O'Reilly,  
484 Sebastian Funk, Rosalind M Eggo, Mark Jit, Eleanor M Rees, Joel Hellewell, Samuel Clifford,  
485 Christopher I Jarvis, Sam Abbott, Megan Auzenbergs, Nicholas G Davies, and David Simons.  
486 Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission  
487 of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis*, 20(10):  
488 1151–1160, 2020. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30457-6.
- [11] Luca Ferretti, Chris Wymant, Michelle Kendall, Lele Zhao, Anel Nurtay, Lucie Abeler-Dörner,  
489 Michael Parker, David Bonsall, and Christophe Fraser. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
490 suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science*, 368(6491), 2020. doi: 10.1126/  
491 science.abb6936.
- [12] Jobie Budd, Benjamin S Miller, Erin M Manning, Vasileios Lampos, Mengdie Zhuang, Michael  
493 Edelstein, Geraint Rees, Vincent C Emery, Molly M Stevens, Neil Keegan, Michael J Short, Deenan  
494 Pillay, Ed Manley, Ingemar J Cox, David Heymann, Anne M Johnson, and Rachel A McKendry.  
495 Digital technologies in the public-health response to COVID-19. *Nat Med*, 26(8):1183–1192, 2020.  
496 doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-1011-4.
- [13] Florian Vogt, Bridget Haire, Linda Selvey, Anthea L Katelaris, and John Kaldor. Effectiveness  
498 evaluation of digital contact tracing for COVID-19 in New South Wales, Australia. *Lancet Public  
499 Health*, 7(3):e250–e258, 2022. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00010-X.
- [14] Zhilian Huang, Huiling Guo, Yee-Mun Lee, Eu Chin Ho, Hou Ang, and Angela Chow. Performance  
501 of digital contact tracing tools for covid-19 response in singapore: Cross-sectional study. *JMIR  
502 Mhealth Uhealth*, 8(10):e23148, 2020. doi: 10.2196/23148.
- [15] Mirjam E Kretzschmar, Ganna Rozhnova, Martin C J Bootsma, Michiel van Boven, Janneke H  
504 H M van de Wijgert, and Marc J M Bonten. Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing  
505 strategies for COVID-19: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*, 5(8):e452–e459, 2020. doi:  
506 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30157-2.
- [16] Australian Government Department of Health. Australian Health Protection Princi-  
508 pal Committee (AHPPC) statement on strategic direction, 24 July 2020. Available  
509 from: [https://www.health.gov.au/news/australian-health-protection-  
510 principal-committee-ahppc-statement-on-strategic-direction](https://www.health.gov.au/news/australian-health-protection-principal-committee-ahppc-statement-on-strategic-direction).
- [17] Australian Government Department of Health. National Contact Tracing Review, A report for  
512 Australia's National Cabinet. Available from: [https://www.health.gov.au/resources/  
513 publications/national-contact-tracing-review](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/national-contact-tracing-review), 13 November 2020.
- [18] Sara Garcia, ABC News. What is SA's 'double-ring fencing' approach and did it save the state from  
515 a prolonged lockdown? Available from: [https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-07-27/  
516 what-is-the-sa-double-ring-fencing-approach-to-covid/100323140](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-07-27/what-is-the-sa-double-ring-fencing-approach-to-covid/100323140), 27  
517 July 2021.
- [19] New South Wales Department of Health. COVID-19 Weekly Surveillance in NSW Epidemiological  
519 Week 35, Ending 29 August 2020. Available from: [https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/  
520 Infectious/covid-19/Pages/weekly-reports-archive.aspx](https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/Pages/weekly-reports-archive.aspx), 2020.
- [20] Nick Golding, David J. Price, Gerard E. Ryan, Jodie McVernon, James M. McCaw, and Freya M.  
522 Shearer. Estimating the transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 during periods of high, low and zero case  
523 incidence. *medRxiv*, 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.11.28.21264509.
- [21] Australian Government. National Plan to transition Australia's National COVID-19 Response, 2  
525 July 2021. Available from: [https://www.pmc.gov.au/national-plan-transition-  
526 australias-national-covid-response](https://www.pmc.gov.au/national-plan-transition-australias-national-covid-response).
- [22] Australian Government Department of Health. COVID-19, Australia: Epidemiology Report 50,  
528 Reporting period ending 12 September 2021. *Commun Dis Intell*, 45, 2021.
- [23] Australian Government Department of Health. COVID-19, Australia: Epidemiology Report 42,  
530 Reporting period ending 23 May 2021. *Commun Dis Intell*, 45, 2021.
- [24] Australian Government Department of Health. Coronavirus (COVID-19) common operating  
532 picture. Available from: [https://www.health.gov.au/resources/collections/  
533](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/collections/)

- 534 coronavirus-covid-19-common-operating-picture, 2021.
- 535 [25] New South Wales Government, Department of Health. COVID-19 data and statis-  
536 tics. Available from: [https://www.nsw.gov.au/covid-19/stay-safe/data-and-](https://www.nsw.gov.au/covid-19/stay-safe/data-and-statistics#toc-new-covid-19-cases-and-tests)  
537 [statistics#toc-new-covid-19-cases-and-tests](https://www.nsw.gov.au/covid-19/stay-safe/data-and-statistics#toc-new-covid-19-cases-and-tests).
- 538 [26] New South Wales Government, Department of Health. In focus – locally-acquired COVID-  
539 19 cases: a review of the last six weeks. Available from: [https://www.health.nsw.](https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/Documents/in-focus-6-week-review.pdf)  
540 [gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/Documents/in-focus-6-week-review.pdf](https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/Documents/in-focus-6-week-review.pdf), 13  
541 August 2020.
- 542 [27] Paul Elliott, Oliver Eales, Nicholas Steyn, David Tang, Barbara Bodinier, Haowei Wang, Joshua  
543 Elliott, Matthew Whitaker, Christina Atchison, Peter J. Diggle, Andrew J. Page, Alexander J. Trotter,  
544 Deborah Ashby, Wendy Barclay, Graham Taylor, Helen Ward, Ara Darzi, Graham S. Cooke, Christl A.  
545 Donnelly, and Marc Chadeau-Hyam. Twin peaks: The Omicron SARS-CoV-2 BA.1 and BA.2  
546 epidemics in England. *Science*, 376(6600):eabq4411, 2022. doi: 10.1126/science.abq4411.
- 547 [28] Koen B Pouwels, Thomas House, Emma Pritchard, Julie V Robotham, Paul J Birrell, Andrew  
548 Gelman, Karina-Doris Vihta, Nikola Bowers, Ian Boreham, Heledd Thomas, James Lewis, Iain  
549 Bell, John I Bell, John N Newton, Jeremy Farrar, Ian Diamond, Pete Benton, Ann Sarah Walker,  
550 Koen B Pouwels, A Sarah Walker, Derrick Crook, Philippa C Matthews, Tim Peto, Emma Pritchard,  
551 Nicole Stoesser, Karina-Doris Vihta, Alison Howarth, George Doherty, James Kavanagh, Kevin K  
552 Chau, Stephanie B Hatch, Daniel Ebner, Lucas Martins Ferreira, Thomas Christott, Brian D Marsden,  
553 Wanwisa Dejnirattisai, Juthathip Mongkolsapaya, Sarah Hoosdally, Richard Cornall, David I Stuart,  
554 Gavin Sreaton, David Eyre, John Bell, Stuart Cox, Kevin Paddon, Tim James, Thomas House,  
555 John N Newton, Julie V Robotham, Paul Birrell, Helena Jordan, Tim Sheppard, Graham Athey, Dan  
556 Moody, Leigh Curry, Pamela Brereton, Jodie Hay, Harper Vansteenhout, Iain Bell, Ian Diamond,  
557 Alex Lambert, Pete Benton, Emma Rourke, Stacey Hawkes, Sarah Henry, James Scruton, Peter  
558 Stokes, Tina Thomas, John Allen, Russell Black, Heather Bovill, David Braunholtz, Dominic Brown,  
559 Sarah Collyer, Megan Crees, Colin Daglish, Byron Davies, Hannah Donnarumma, Julia Douglas-  
560 Mann, Antonio Felton, Hannah Finselbach, Eleanor Fordham, Alberta Ipser, Joe Jenkins, Joel Jones,  
561 Katherine Kent, Geeta Kerai, Lina Lloyd, Victoria Masding, Ellie Osborn, Alpi Patel, Elizabeth  
562 Pereira, Tristan Pett, Melissa Randall, Donna Reeve, Palvi Shah, Ruth Snook, Ruth Studley, Esther  
563 Sutherland, Eliza Swinn, Heledd Thomas, Anna Tudor, Joshua Weston, Shayla Leib, James Tierney,  
564 Gabor Farkas, Raf Cobb, Folkert Van Galen, Lewis Compton, James Irving, John Clarke, Rachel  
565 Mullis, Lorraine Ireland, Diana Airimitoiaie, Charlotte Nash, Danielle Cox, Sarah Fisher, Zoe Moore,  
566 James McLean, and Matt Kerby. Community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in England from April to  
567 November, 2020: results from the ONS Coronavirus Infection Survey. *Lancet Public Health*, 6(1):  
568 e30–e38, 2021. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30282-6.
- 569 [29] New South Wales Government. Media release 30 November 2021: NSW Govern-  
570 ment announces further precautionary measures to manage the Omicron variant. Avail-  
571 able from: [https://www.nsw.gov.au/media-releases/nsw-government-takes-](https://www.nsw.gov.au/media-releases/nsw-government-takes-further-omicron-precautionary-steps)  
572 [further-omicron-precautionary-steps](https://www.nsw.gov.au/media-releases/nsw-government-takes-further-omicron-precautionary-steps).
- 573 [30] Contact tracing is an imperfect tool for controlling COVID-19 transmission and relies on population  
574 adherence. *Nat Commun*, 12(1):5412, 2021. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-25531-5.
- 575 [31] Kyra H. Grantz, Elizabeth C. Lee, Lucy D’Agostino McGowan, Kyu Han Lee, C. Jessica E. Metcalf,  
576 Emily S. Gurley, and Justin Lessler. Maximizing and evaluating the impact of test-trace-isolate  
577 programs: A modeling study. *PLoS Med*, 18(4):1–16, 2021. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003585.
- 578 [32] Yang Liu, Christian Morgenstern, James Kelly, Rachel Lowe, James Munday, C Julian Villabona-  
579 Arenas, Hamish Gibbs, Carl A B Pearson, Kiesha Prem, Quentin J Leclerc, Sophie R Meakin, W John  
580 Edmunds, Christopher I Jarvis, Amy Gimma, Sebastian Funk, Matthew Quaife, Timothy W Russell,  
581 Jon C Emory, Sam Abbott, Joel Hellewell, Damien C Tully, Rein M G J Houben, Kathleen O’Reilly,  
582 Georgia R Gore-Langton, Adam J Kucharski, Megan Auzenberg, Billy J Quilty, Thibaut Jombart,  
583 Alicia Rosello, Oliver Brady, Katherine E Atkins, Kevin van Zandvoort, James W Rudge, Akira Endo,  
584 Kaja Abbas, Fiona Yueqian Sun, Simon R Procter, Samuel Clifford, Anna M Foss, Nicholas G Davies,  
585 Yung-Wai Desmond Chan, Charlie Diamond, Rosanna C Barnard, Rosalind M Eggo, Arminder K  
586 Deol, Emily S Nightingale, David Simons, Katharine Sherratt, Graham Medley, Stéphane Hué,  
587 Gwenan M Knight, Stefan Flasche, Nikos I Bosse, Petra Klepac, Mark Jit, and CMMID COVID-  
588 19 Working Group. The impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on SARS-CoV-2 transmission

- 589 across 130 countries and territories. *BMC Med*, 19(1):40, 2021. doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01872-8.
- 590 [33] Seth Flaxman, Swapnil Mishra, Axel Gandy, H Juliette T Unwin, Thomas A Mellan, Helen Coupland,  
591 Charles Whittaker, Harrison Zhu, Tresnia Berah, Jeffrey W Eaton, Mélodie Monod, Pablo N Perez-  
592 Guzman, Nora Schmit, Lucia Cilloni, Kylie E C Ainslie, Marc Baguelin, Adhiratha Boonyasiri,  
593 Olivia Boyd, Lorenzo Cattarino, Laura V Cooper, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Amy  
594 Dighe, Bimandra Djaafara, Ilaria Dorigatti, Sabine L van Elsland, Richard G FitzJohn, Katy A M  
595 Gaythorpe, Lily Geidelberg, Nicholas C Grassly, William D Green, Timothy Hallett, Arran Hamlet,  
596 Wes Hinsley, Ben Jeffrey, Edward Knock, Daniel J Laydon, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Pierre Nouvellet,  
597 Kris V Parag, Igor Siveroni, Hayley A Thompson, Robert Verity, Erik Volz, Caroline E Walters,  
598 Haowei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Oliver J Watson, Peter Winskill, Xiaoyue Xi, Patrick G T Walker,  
599 Azra C Ghani, Christl A Donnelly, Steven Riley, Michaela A C Vollmer, Neil M Ferguson, Lucy C  
600 Okell, Samir Bhatt, and Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. Estimating the effects of  
601 non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*, 584(7820):257–261, 2020. ISSN  
602 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7.
- 603 [34] Rachael Pung, Alex R Cook, Calvin J Chiew, Hannah E Clapham, Yinxiaohu Sun, Zongbin Li,  
604 Borame L Dickens, Stefan Ma, Kenneth Mak, Chorh Chuan Tan, Derrick Heng, Mark I-Cheng  
605 Chen, and Vernon J Lee. Effectiveness of Containment Measures Against COVID-19 in Singapore:  
606 Implications for Other National Containment Efforts. *Epidemiology*, 32(1), 2021.
- 607 [35] Akira Endo, Quentin Leclerc, Gwenan Knight, Graham Medley, Katherine Atkins, Sebastian Funk,  
608 and Adam Kucharski. Implication of backward contact tracing in the presence of overdispersed trans-  
609 mission in covid-19 outbreaks. *Wellcome Open Res*, 5:239, 10 2020. doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.  
610 16344.1.
- 611 [36] Sheikh Taslim Ali, Lin Wang, Eric H. Y. Lau, Xiao-Ke Xu, Zhanwei Du, Ye Wu, Gabriel M.  
612 Leung, and Benjamin J. Cowling. Serial interval of SARS-CoV-2 was shortened over time by  
613 nonpharmaceutical interventions. *Science*, 369(6507):1106–1109, 2020. doi: 10.1126/science.  
614 abc9004. URL <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.abc9004>.
- 615 [37] United Kingdom Health Security Agency. [Withdrawn] Guidance for contacts of people with con-  
616 firmed coronavirus (COVID-19) infection who do not live with the person. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-for-contacts-of-people-with-possible-or-confirmed-coronavirus-covid-19-infection-who-do-not-live-with-the-person/guidance-for-contacts-of-people-with-possible-or-confirmed-coronavirus-covid-19-infection-who-do-not-live-with-the-person#what-is-meant-by-a-contact>.
- 621  
622 [38] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim Guidance on Developing a COVID-  
623 19 Case Investigation & Contact Tracing Plan: Overview. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/appendix.html>.
- 624  
625