

1 **Looking under the lamp-post: quantifying the performance of contact tracing in the United**
2 **States during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic**

3
4 **Authors:** Henry Bayly¹, Madison Stoddard², Debra Van Egeren³, Eleanor J Murray⁴, Julia
5 Raifman⁵,
6 Arijit Chakravarty²⁺, Laura F White^{1*+}

7
8
9
10 **Affiliations:**

11 ¹ Department of Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

12 ² Fractal Therapeutics, Cambridge, MA, USA.

13 ³ Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, USA.

14 ⁴ Department of Epidemiology, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

15 ⁵ Department of Health Law, Policy and Management, Boston University School of Public
16 Health, Boston, MA, USA

17
18
19 * Corresponding author

20 + contributed equally

21
22 **Word count:** 3498

23 **Abstract word count:** 215

24

25 **Abstract:**

26 Contact tracing forms a crucial part of the public-health toolbox in mitigating and
27 understanding emergent pathogens and nascent disease outbreaks. Contact tracing in the
28 United States was conducted during the pre-Omicron phase of the ongoing COVID-19
29 pandemic. This tracing relied on voluntary reporting and responses, often using rapid antigen
30 tests (with a high false negative rate) due to lack of accessibility to PCR tests. These limitations,
31 combined with SARS-CoV-2's propensity for asymptomatic transmission, raise the question
32 "how reliable was contact tracing for COVID-19 in the United States"? We answered this
33 question using a Markov model to examine the efficiency with which transmission could be
34 detected based on the design and response rates of contact tracing studies in the United States.
35 Our results suggest that contact tracing protocols in the U.S. are unlikely to have identified
36 more than 1.65% (95% uncertainty interval: 1.62%-1.68%) of transmission events with PCR
37 testing and 0.88% (95% uncertainty interval 0.86%-0.89%) with rapid antigen testing. When
38 considering an optimal scenario, based on compliance rates in East Asia with PCR testing, this
39 increases to 62.7% (95% uncertainty interval: 62.6%-62.8%). These findings highlight the
40 limitations in interpretability for studies of SARS-CoV-2 disease spread based on U.S. contact
41 tracing and underscore the vulnerability of the population to future disease outbreaks, for
42 SARS-CoV-2 and other pathogens.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50 **Introduction**

51 The management and control of infectious disease has been a signal modern achievement.

52 Advances in epidemiological techniques pioneered during the 19th century established public
53 health as a discipline. Overlapping with, but distinct from the medical establishment and the
54 biopharmaceutical industry, modern public health organizations have sought to control disease
55 using nonpharmaceutical interventions (NPIs).

56

57 Contact tracing is a cornerstone of the public-health response, particularly with emergent
58 pathogens and nascent disease outbreaks [1]. Effective contact tracing facilitates estimates of
59 epidemiological parameters describing disease spread. In the current COVID-19 pandemic,
60 rigorous early studies relying on contact tracing revealed key epidemiological features of SARS-
61 CoV-2 such as asymptomatic transmission [2,3], superspreading [4], and aerosol transmission
62 [5–9]. This provided a basis for projecting the future course of the outbreak and designing a
63 public health response.

64

65 Effective contact tracing is also critical for limiting onward spread through the deployment of
66 test-and-trace and isolation protocols. Many Asia-Pacific countries effectively limited SARS-CoV-
67 2 community spread for the first two years of the pandemic, relying on contact tracing with
68 isolation of contacts, including strict testing and isolation efforts at their borders. For example,
69 South Korea used methods such as tracking credit card transactions and using closed circuit
70 televisions to link contacts together [10]. In China, specifically Hubei, suspected contacts were
71 placed under monitored house arrest throughout their quarantine period [11]. This strategy
72 permitted high levels of within country contact and mobility while keeping case counts low
73 [12–18].

74

75 In the U.S., contact tracing was primarily performed in the pre-Omicron era, and largely
76 abandoned in early 2022 [19]. It has been widely recognized that contact tracing in the U.S. has

77 not slowed disease transmission [20]. Part of the challenge has been that the process varied
78 from state to state and relied on individual initiative and access to testing [19]. This meant that
79 an individual typically must be symptomatic, voluntarily seek testing, and have their positive
80 result reported to initiate contact tracing [21]. Public health officials initiated an investigation
81 by asking the index case to identify their contacts, who in turn would be interviewed. The
82 exposed contacts were monitored for symptoms and could choose to test for SARS-CoV-2 five
83 days after exposure. If positive, the contact (now a secondary case) would be asked to name
84 their contacts.

85
86 The process was largely voluntary, allowing for selection bias and many missed transmission
87 chains. There was often no system for identifying close contacts whom the index case did not
88 know personally. Many published papers noted that many named contacts were not
89 successfully traced [22–24] and not all symptomatic contacts were willing to undergo testing
90 [25]. A systematic surveillance-based cross-sectional study in the U.S. showed that 2 out of 3
91 index cases of COVID-19 were either not reached by tracers or declined to share contacts. Only
92 70% of named contacts agreed to be interviewed, and only 50% of those contacts were
93 monitored, leading to an average of less than one contact per index case being monitored [26].
94 Additionally, the CDC-recommended 15 minutes of contact within six feet over a 24-hour
95 period was somewhat arbitrary and never updated, even as evidence emerged indicating that
96 COVID-19 could be transmitted through brief interactions.

97
98 The implications of these limitations in contact tracing are significant. The relatively high
99 reproductive number for SARS-CoV-2 [27] would suggest that many transmission chains
100 generated from a single index case went undetected. Additionally, asymptomatic transmission
101 and superspreading behavior would also impact the efficacy of contact tracing for infection
102 control and the generalizability of inferences made about transmission dynamics [28,29].

103
104 In keeping with this voluntary and symptom-gated approach to contact tracing, there are many
105 examples of minimally observed onward transmission in settings where transmission would be

106 expected. This includes studies involving children with strong implications for policies related to
107 schools. The results of studies investigating children and COVID-19 transmission have
108 documented limited forward transmission, but this is often in context of significant mitigation
109 strategies being in place or incomplete contact tracing [30–32]. During the initial omicron surge,
110 when contact tracing was limited, schools struggled to remain open, reported high absenteeism
111 rates, and in some cases, relied on the national guard to teach courses and due to incomplete
112 contact tracing it was unclear what role children in schools played in transmission [33,34]. In
113 one another case, two COVID-19 positive hairdressers in Missouri saw 139 clients over a ten-
114 day period, with no reported onward transmission [24]. Notably, of the exposed clients, only
115 ~75% (n=104) responded to contact tracers' requests for interviews, and only ~50% (n=67)
116 agreed to be tested. Biases in willingness to respond to interviews or agree to testing may have
117 concealed many onward transmission events.

118
119 Another example, demonstrated the challenges in identifying both primary and secondary
120 infections, was the Sturgis motorcycle rally in August 2020. Following this 10-day event in
121 Meade County, South Dakota (attended by approximately 460,000 persons [35] without [36–
122 38] any mask-wearing requirements or other mitigating policies [39]), there was a wave of
123 COVID-19 cases in Meade County and South Dakota. The counties outside of South Dakota that
124 contributed the highest inflows of rally attendees experienced a 6.4-12.5% increase in COVID-
125 19 cases relative to counties without inflows [40]. Despite evidence of population-level changes
126 in COVID-19 case counts following the rally, the CDC and Minnesota Department of Health were
127 able to identify only 21 person-to-person transmission events [41]. Out of the 86 positive cases,
128 only 41 reported being in close contact (defined as being within 6 feet of another person for
129 ≥ 15 minutes) with other people, and they reported an average of 2.5 close contacts. Both
130 statistics are implausible for a 10-day motorcycle rally featuring indoor dining and concerts [42–
131 44]. The CDC's report does not specify how many of the 102 secondary contacts were tested,
132 consistent with other U.S. contact-tracing studies [45,46].

133

134 Examples such as these, coupled with the unique features of SARS-CoV-2 contact tracing in the
135 U.S. during the early part of the pandemic raise the question “what was the efficiency of
136 contact tracing, as it was implemented in the U.S.”? We answered this question using Markov
137 Chain modeling to synthesize data from multiple sources of information on testing and contact
138 tracing completeness to estimate the efficiency with which onward transmission could be
139 detected. Our model-based approach sought to quantify two metrics of performance for
140 contact tracing: 1) the percentage of all transmission pairs identified in a disease
141 cluster/outbreak, and 2) the percentage of onward transmission events identified from a
142 known index case. These metrics correspond broadly to the two contact-tracing scenarios
143 described above, the Sturgis motorcycle rally study (seeking all transmission pairs) and the
144 Missouri hairdressers (seeking onward transmission from a known index case). Our results
145 suggest that, as may be expected, contact tracing protocols in the United States are unlikely to
146 have identified more than a vanishingly small fraction of transmission events. We contrast this
147 with a similar model run that incorporates data from Asian countries with more comprehensive
148 contact tracing protocols in place, which yields a larger fraction of identified transmission
149 events.

150

151 **Methods**

152

153 *Model*

154 We created a Markov Model to represent the sequence of events in contact tracing depicted in
155 Figure 1. The model captures the steps in contact tracing beginning with identifying a primary
156 infectious individual through testing and then engaging that person in contact tracing by
157 accurately identifying their contacts. The final steps of the model details engaging the infected
158 contact and completing testing. We focus on estimating the probability of identifying infected
159 contacts only. We parameterize the model steps through literature review. We capture
160 uncertainty in the transition parameters by sampling over a literature-informed uncertainty
161 range of the parameters 10,000 times. When no data was available on a parameter value, we
162 sweep over the range of [0,1].

163

164 *Literature search and model parameterization*

165 We reviewed the literature to produce estimates for each of the parameters of our model
166 (Figure 1). We used the search term “(covid 19 or covid-19 or covid19) AND (case investigation
167 or contact tracing) AND (united states or US)” on PubMed to inform parameters that define the
168 likelihood of individuals naming their close contacts and of those contacts responding to a
169 contact tracing encounter and being tested. We collected data from contact tracing
170 investigations that reported the proportion of positive cases that named contacts, the
171 proportion of named contacts reached, the proportion of contacts that cooperated with
172 tracers, and/or the proportion of contacts tested.

173

174 We also parameterized our model to represent a setting where stringent contact tracing was
175 implemented. For this, we derived estimates from Taiwan and South Korea, which had rigorous
176 contact tracing protocols during the initial phase of the pandemic using the search terms ‘(covid
177 19 or covid-19 or covid19) AND (case investigation or contact tracing) AND (taiwan)’ and ‘(covid
178 19 or covid-19 or covid19) AND (case investigation or contact tracing) AND (korea or south
179 korea)’. We run the model separately for RAT and PCR tests.

180

181 The model can be divided into two distinct categories of parameters that contribute to the
182 overall effectiveness of contact tracing: 1) efficiency of testing and 2) efficiency of contact
183 tracing. Efficiency of testing includes the proportion of symptomatic people receiving testing,
184 test sensitivity (RAT or PCR) [47,48], and the proportion of contacts tested. Efficiency of contact
185 tracing aggregates the probabilities that tracers contact a positive index case, a positive index
186 case names contacts, and named contacts are traced. Both aggregate parameters take values
187 between [0,1]. We plot all possible combinations of these parameters on a heatmap and
188 identify the estimates obtained for the U.S.-based and ideal scenarios.

189

190 *Code Availability.*

191 The Markov Model was implemented in Python, and code for running the simulations and
192 plotting the results are available in a Jupyter notebook on Github_([https://github.com/Henry-](https://github.com/Henry-Bayly/ContactTracingMarkovModel)
193 [Bayly/ContactTracingMarkovModel](https://github.com/Henry-Bayly/ContactTracingMarkovModel)).

194

195 **Results**

196 *Literature search*

197 Our literature search of U.S. studies yielded 1,355 papers. Of these, the first 350 were reviewed
198 to represent a random sample of the total papers found, as our goal was to conduct a
199 representative and not comprehensive literature review. We excluded 325 papers that did not
200 contain data relevant to the parameters required for our model, leaving twenty-five papers
201 with information on contact tracing parameters. When multiple papers had values for the same
202 parameter, for instance the probability of a case naming contacts, we assumed that the true
203 value was uniformly distributed in the range of the reported values across the papers. All
204 parameter values are shown in Table 1; sources of the parameters are shown in Tables S1-S6.
205 We were unable to identify precise parameter estimates for the probability of a symptomatic
206 person receiving testing and assume a uniform distribution over [0,1].

207

208 We reviewed 225 papers from South Korea and Taiwan. However, we were unable to
209 find studies quantifying contact tracing parameters related to the completeness of tracing. This
210 appeared to be due to a much more comprehensive approach to contact tracing in these
211 countries, negating the need to report on these parameters since it was assumed that reporting
212 was nearly complete. For example, South Korea used traditional shoe-leather epidemiology
213 along with large databases (global positioning system, credit card transactions, and closed-
214 circuit television) [10] and in one study of 5,706 index cases an average of 9.9 contacts per
215 index case were reported [10]. Taiwan similarly reported an average of 27.61 contacts per index
216 case [49]. This contrasts with the US where the average number of non-household contacts
217 reported in a large study was one for every three index cases [50]. Therefore, we hypothesized
218 a realistic range of [0.9, 1.0] for all parameters not associated with testing sensitivity in our
219 ideal model setting.

220

221 *Estimates of contact tracing efficacy*

222 We examined the efficiency of contact tracing along the two dimensions described previously:

223 1) the percentage of all transmission pairs identified in a disease cluster/outbreak, and 2) the
224 percentage of onward transmission events identified from a known index case.

225

226 We estimate a 0.88% chance (95% uncertainty range: 0.86%-0.89%) of identifying any
227 transmission pair in the U.S. when RAT are the primary testing modality. More specifically, we
228 estimate a 20.2% chance of identifying a positive index case, a 20.0% chance of identifying
229 contacts given that the index case has been identified, and a 21.2% chance of identifying
230 positive secondary cases given the index cases and contacts were identified. Using more
231 sensitive, but less available, PCR tests, we estimate a 1.65% (95% uncertainty range: 1.62%-
232 1.68%) chance of identifying a transmission pair (Figure 2, Table 2). Our model estimates a
233 27.7% chance of identifying a positive index case, a 19.8% chance of identifying contacts given
234 that the index case has been identified, and a 29.2% chance of identifying positive cases given
235 that the index cases and its contacts were correctly identified. By contrast, when we use an
236 idealized scenario, based on data from East Asia, we estimate a 62.7% (95% uncertainty range:
237 62.6%-62.8%) chance of identifying a given transmission pair when using PCR testing and 33.5%
238 (95% uncertainty range: 33.4%-33.6%) when using RAT (Figure 2, Table 2).

239

240 When an index case has been identified, we remove the associated model steps. In our U.S.
241 based example, we estimate a 2.62% (95% uncertainty interval: 2.59%-2.65%) and 3.62% (95%
242 uncertainty interval: 3.58%-3.66%) chance of identifying a positive contact of a known index
243 case using RAT and PCR testing, respectively. In our idealized tracing setting, these increase to
244 53.3% (95% uncertainty interval: 53.2%-53.4%) for RAT and 73.3% (95% uncertainty interval:
245 73.2%-73.4%) for PCR testing.

246

247

248 **Discussion**

249 Since its emergence in humans more than three years ago, SARS-CoV-2 has overwhelmed public
250 health institutions globally. The virus still exerts an enormous mortality and morbidity burden
251 worldwide, with nearly 7 million reported deaths thus far [51]. Underlying this is the systematic
252 failure of contact tracing, which was abandoned by most states in the United States by early
253 2022 [19] and contraindicated in CDC guidance for communities with “sustained ongoing
254 transmission” of COVID-19 [21]. The Lancet Commission report on COVID-19 [52] and several
255 reviews [20,53,54] have highlighted this shortcoming in pandemic response.

256
257 Our work takes this a step further by quantifying the extent to which contact tracing failed to
258 identify transmission events in the U.S. and in an idealized setting base on East Asian data. Our
259 demonstrate that the voluntary steps in contact tracing, i.e. seeking testing and interacting with
260 contact tracers, reduced the efficiency dramatically, with fewer than 2% of transmission events
261 identified compared to 62.7% in a setting where testing and compliance with tracing was
262 higher.

263
264 Contact tracing formed the basis of modern epidemiological practice, dating back to the
265 investigation of the 1854 Broad Street Cholera outbreak in Britain [55] that led to both a
266 mechanistic understanding of cholera transmission [56] and successful control of the outbreak.
267 A more recent example of highly successful and proactive contact tracing by public health
268 authorities was the effective suppression of monkeypox in the Western US in 2003 [57].
269 Notably, during the current pandemic, many other countries (such as China, Japan, South
270 Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam and Singapore) were successful at implementing contact tracing in the
271 first two years of the pandemic [14–18].

272
273 The impact of poor contact tracing in the U.S. has undermined our understanding of the
274 transmission potential of SARS-CoV-2. For example, the argument that schools do not
275 contribute to SARS-CoV-2 transmission was based in part on the lack of detection of
276 transmission chains in a school setting. Numerous publications showed a lack of contact-traced
277 chains of transmission in a school setting [58–62], while in effect lacking a positive control for

278 the ability to identify onward chains of transmission [63]. It is now clear that SARS-CoV-2
279 readily transmitted in schools [64–72], particularly when robust mitigation measures are not in
280 place [73,74]. Indeed, dramatic increases in case detection rates have been observed in studies
281 that relied on surveillance testing, rather than contact tracing [70]. Additionally, this led to the
282 conclusion that the most common source of transmission was gatherings in the home, but it is
283 unclear if this is a consequence of household contacts being easiest to identify or a result of
284 many transmission studies being conducted in settings with strict shut downs, where
285 households were one of the few places where transmission could occur [75]. Also, reports from
286 the West have pointed to a lack of detected transmission chains in air travel [76–78]. These
287 reports are contradicted by careful contact tracing studies from other countries, which have
288 clearly demonstrated person-to-person transmission in flight [79–81], even when robust
289 mitigation measures were in place [82].

290
291 Our work has several limitations. We have assumed instantaneous contact tracing, ignoring the
292 impact of tracing delays on infection control which has a significant impact on contact tracing
293 effectiveness against transmission [83,84] due to short incubation period of SARS-CoV-2 [85].
294 Instead, our estimates for contact tracing effectiveness apply to the informativeness of contact
295 tracing studies, and they form an upper bound for the effectiveness of contact tracing as a
296 transmission prevention measure. We do not account for asymptomatic transmission, again
297 making our estimates an upper bound. The percent of asymptomatic COVID-19 cases is
298 estimated to be anywhere between 1.6% and 56.5% [90–96], with a these cases having a
299 relative reduced infectiousness of 0 to 62% [90-97]. This would mean our estimated 1.65% of
300 transmission pairs identified with PCR testing could be as low as 0.9%, assuming no
301 asymptomatic index cases are identified. We also have not accounted for superspreading,
302 which has been estimated to be a significant feature in COVID-19 transmission [94–96]. This
303 implies that missing a superspreading index case would have tremendous impact on
304 downstream contact tracing efforts and that there is significant stochasticity [97]. We only
305 consider the probability of identifying infected contacts, but it is ideal to also identify
306 uninfected contacts accurately. Finally, we estimate the probability of naming an infected

307 contact using data describing the probability of naming any contacts at all (rather than the
308 probability of naming any given contact). This means that our final estimated probabilities are
309 upper bounds of the true values. Despite representing an upper bound, our contact tracing
310 estimates suggest that U.S. contact tracing studies fail to identify the vast majority of
311 transmission pairs and onward transmission events. This severely limits the inferences that can
312 be drawn from such studies.

313
314 Our work points to several key lessons for future public health efforts. First, compliance is a key
315 driver of contact tracing effectiveness. Methods to improve compliance will be crucial for future
316 contact tracing efforts- whether using technological approaches (such as mobile phone or
317 surveillance-camera based tracing) or by making changes to the legal framework around public
318 health efforts (see Supplementary Information S2 for a more on this topic).

319
320 Second, there is a pressing need for innovation, to develop contact tracing methodologies that
321 are more resistant to noncompliance. One such approach may be backward contact tracing,
322 which seeks to identify who infected the detected case. Here when contact tracing is executed
323 backward to identify the source of infection (parent), the more offspring (infections) a parent
324 has produced, the more frequently the parent shows up as a contact. Model-based analysis
325 suggests that a backwards contact tracing approach does not require sampling a network at
326 such a large scale as forward tracing [98,99] to understand transmission dynamics, and
327 addresses the problem of low compliance. This approach has been proposed by others for
328 COVID-19 [100–102], and has been empirically shown to be effective, particularly in identifying
329 superspreading events [103], however this is unlikely to be as helpful in reducing transmission.

330
331 Third, public health responses to future outbreaks must include educate the public about
332 behaviors with health outcomes, including creating a normative framework around contact
333 tracing compliance. Consistent messaging about limiting transmission and contact tracing are
334 key as has been noted by the Lancet Commission [52], among others [104,105]. This could
335 include reframing messaging to reduce stigma that has often been associated with contact

336 tracing [106] and which undermines contact tracing efficacy [107]. During the HIV epidemic,
337 contact tracers emphasized the index case’s personal responsibility towards the health of their
338 sexual partners [1]. It also includes addressing misinformation, which led many to believe that
339 COVID-19 was a “hoax” [108] and public health measures were overreactions [109].

340
341 Finally, we have shown that testing availability and accuracy create a critical gap in contact
342 tracing efforts. Considering only the steps for testing accuracy and cases/contacts receiving
343 testing in our model we find that only 12.4% of possible cases *could* be identified with RAT, the
344 most available testing modality. To effectively manage future outbreaks, tests need to be
345 sensitive, provide rapid results, and be readily available.

346
347 The work presented here adds to the growing body of literature [26,110,111] highlighting the
348 poor performance of contact tracing in the West during the ongoing pandemic and suggests
349 practical fixes for this problem, as we have described. In its absence, public health is forced to
350 rely on population-wide measures for disease spread and will not be able to fine-tune its
351 responses to match the situation. If we are to improve our response to the current crisis, or to
352 others in the future, we must improve our ability to deliver this key function.

353

354 **TABLES**

355 **Table 1.** Table of parameters derived from literature that were used in the model.

Parameter (Step in the Model)	U.S. Probability Range	Ideal Contact Tracing Probability Range
Symptomatic case receives testing*	[0,1]	[0.90, 1.0]
COVID-19 test gives true positive*	[0.57, 0.73] (RAT) [48] and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR) [47]	[0.57, 0.73] (RAT) and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR)
Tracers make contact with a positive case** [22,26,45,46,50,112–116]	[0.41, 0.82]	[0.90, 1.0]
Positive case names any contacts** ^a [22,26,45,112,113,116,117]	[0.17, 0.52]	[0.90, 1.0]
Tracers make contact with infected contacts of positive case** [22,26,46,112,113,115–117]	[0.28, 0.85]	[0.90, 1.0]
Infected contacts of positive case get tested* [113,117–121]	[0.19, 0.45]	[0.90, 1.0]
Contact’s COVID-19 test gives a true positive*	[0.57, 0.73] (RAT) [48] and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR) [47]	[0.57, 0.73] (RAT) and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR)

356 ^aThese values represent the probability that a positive case names any contacts at all. We use
 357 this as a proxy for the given step. Thus, our model represents an overestimate of the true
 358 efficacy of contact tracing.

359 * parameter related to testing

360 **parameter related to tracing

361 **Table 2.** Probabilities of correctly identifying positive contacts of a given index case stratified by
 362 contact tracing style and by use of RAT/PCR tests. Values in parenthesis represent the 95%
 363 uncertainty intervals.


	United States		Ideal Contact Tracing	
	RAT	PCR Tests	RAT	PCR Tests
Percent of all transmission pairs in an outbreak	0.88% (0.86%-0.89%)	1.65% (1.62%-1.68%)	33.5% (33.4%-33.6%)	62.7% (62.6%-62.8%)
Percent of onward transmission from a known index case	2.62% (2.59%-2.65%)	3.62% (3.58%-3.66%)	53.3% (53.2%-53.4%)	73.3% (73.2%-73.4%)

364

365

366 FIGURES

367



368

369

370


371

372

373 5 coincide with phase 2 (identifying contacts of positive cases). Finally, steps 6 and 7 coincide
374 with Phase 3 (identifying positive cases among contacts).

375

376




377

378

379 **Figure 2. Impact of contact tracing and testing on the probability of identifying a positive**
380 **contact of an infected individual with COVID-19.** Quality of testing refers to parts of the
381 process relating to testing and aggregates the following probabilities: symptomatic people
382 receiving testing, symptomatic index cases receive true positive test result (i.e. test sensitivity),
383 contacts receive testing, contacts receive a true positive test result. Quality of contact tracing
384 aggregates the probability of: tracers contact a positive index case, a positive index case names
385 contacts, and tracers contact the contacts of the index case. This shows that if testing and
386 contact tracing are done perfectly, we can expect to identify all contacts of infected individuals
387 (illustrated through the colors of the heat map). The blue circles correspond to our simulations
388 using RAT while the white circles correspond to PCR testing use. The two circles in the lower left
389 hand corner correspond to our United States estimates while the two in the upper half
390 correspond to our simulations using estimates from South Korea and Taiwan, where there was
391 stricter contact tracing.

392



393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404

405 **References**

406

- 407 1. Brandt AM. The History of Contact Tracing and the Future of Public Health. *Am J Public*
408 *Health*. American Public Health Association; **2022**; 112(8):1097–1099.
- 409 2. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
410 COVID-19. *Nat Med*. **2020**; 26(5):672–675.
- 411 3. Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, et al. Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of
412 SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. American Association for the Advancement of Science; **2021**;
413 371(6526):eabe2424.
- 414 4. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working
415 Group, Abbott S, Kucharski AJ, Funk S. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19
416 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. *Wellcome Open Res*. **2020**; 5:67.
- 417 5. Lu J, Gu J, Li K, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with Air Conditioning in Restaurant,
418 Guangzhou, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. **2020**; 26(7):1628–1631.
- 419 6. Eichler N, Thornley C, Swadi T, et al. Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
420 Coronavirus 2 during Border Quarantine and Air Travel, New Zealand (Aotearoa). *Emerg*
421 *Infect Dis*. **2021**; 27(5):1274–1278.
- 422 7. Kwon K-S, Park J-I, Park YJ, Jung D-M, Ryu K-W, Lee J-H. Evidence of Long-Distance Droplet
423 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Direct Air Flow in a Restaurant in Korea. *J Korean Med Sci*.
424 **2020**; 35(46):e415.
- 425 8. Wang J, Du G. COVID-19 may transmit through aerosol. *Ir J Med Sci*. **2020**; 189(4):1143–
426 1144.
- 427 9. Shen Y, Li C, Dong H, et al. Airborne Transmission of COVID-19: Epidemiologic Evidence
428 from Two Outbreak Investigations. *SSRN Electron J*. **2020**; .
- 429 10. Park YJ, Choe YJ, Park O, et al. Contact Tracing during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak, South
430 Korea, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. **2020**; 26(10):2465–2468.
- 431 11. Maier BF, Brockmann D. Effective containment explains subexponential growth in recent
432 confirmed COVID-19 cases in China. *Science*. **2020**; 368(6492):742–746.
- 433 12. Lu N, Cheng K-W, Qamar N, Huang K-C, Johnson JA. Weathering COVID-19 storm: Successful
434 control measures of five Asian countries. *Am J Infect Control*. **2020**; 48(7):851–852.
- 435 13. Zhou Y, Jiang H, Wang Q, Yang M, Chen Y, Jiang Q. Use of contact tracing, isolation, and
436 mass testing to control transmission of covid-19 in China. *The BMJ*. **2021**; 375:n2330.

- 437 14. El Guerche-Séblain C, Chakir L, Nageshwaran G, et al. Experience from five Asia-Pacific
438 countries during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic: Mitigation strategies and
439 epidemiology outcomes. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* **2021**; 44:102171.
- 440 15. Jefferies S, French N, Gilkison C, et al. COVID-19 in New Zealand and the impact of the
441 national response: a descriptive epidemiological study. *Lancet Public Health.* **2020**;
442 5(11):e612–e623.
- 443 16. Van Nguyen H, Lan Nguyen H, Thi Minh Dao A, et al. The COVID-19 pandemic in Australia:
444 Public health responses, opportunities and challenges. *Int J Health Plann Manage.* **2022**;
445 37(1):5–13.
- 446 17. Chen S-C. Taiwan’s experience in fighting COVID-19. *Nat Immunol.* **2021**; 22(4):393–394.
- 447 18. Van Nguyen Q, Cao DA, Nghiem SH. Spread of COVID-19 and policy responses in Vietnam:
448 An overview. *Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis.* **2021**; 103:157–161.
- 449 19. Feliciano M. State Approaches to Contact Tracing during the COVID-19 Pandemic [Internet].
450 Natl. Acad. State Health Policy. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
451 <https://www.nashp.org/state-approaches-to-contact-tracing-covid-19/>
- 452 20. Clark E, Chiao EY, Amirian ES. Why Contact Tracing Efforts Have Failed to Curb Coronavirus
453 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Transmission in Much of the United States. *Clin Infect Dis Off*
454 *Publ Infect Dis Soc Am.* **2021**; 72(9):e415–e419.
- 455 21. CDC. Health Departments [Internet]. *Cent. Dis. Control Prev.* 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26].
456 Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/contact-tracing.html)
457 [tracing/contact-tracing-plan/contact-tracing.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/contact-tracing.html)
- 458 22. Lash RR, Donovan CV, Fleischauer AT, et al. COVID-19 Contact Tracing in Two Counties -
459 North Carolina, June-July 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* **2020**; 69(38):1360–1363.
- 460 23. Nadeem R. The Challenges of Contact Tracing as U.S. Battles COVID-19 [Internet]. *Pew Res.*
461 *Cent. Internet Sci. Tech.* 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
462 [https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/10/30/the-challenges-of-contact-tracing-](https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/10/30/the-challenges-of-contact-tracing-as-u-s-battles-covid-19/)
463 [as-u-s-battles-covid-19/](https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/10/30/the-challenges-of-contact-tracing-as-u-s-battles-covid-19/)
- 464 24. Hendrix MJ, Walde C, Findley K, Trotman R. Absence of Apparent Transmission of SARS-
465 CoV-2 from Two Stylists After Exposure at a Hair Salon with a Universal Face Covering
466 Policy - Springfield, Missouri, May 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* **2020**;
467 69(28):930–932.
- 468 25. Doyle T, Kendrick K, Troelstrup T, et al. COVID-19 in Primary and Secondary School Settings
469 During the First Semester of School Reopening - Florida, August-December 2020. *MMWR*
470 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* **2021**; 70(12):437–441.

- 471 26. Lash RR, Moonan PK, Byers BL, et al. COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing in the
472 US, 2020. *JAMA Netw Open*. **2021**; 4(6):e2115850.
- 473 27. Alimohamadi Y, Taghdir M, Sepandi M. Estimate of the Basic Reproduction Number for
474 COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Prev Med Pub Health*. Korean
475 Society for Preventive Medicine; **2020**; 53(3):151–157.
- 476 28. Nakajo K, Nishiura H. Exploring secondary SARS-CoV-2 transmission from asymptomatic
477 cases using contact tracing data. *Theor Biol Med Model*. **2021**; 18(1):12.
- 478 29. Kinoshita R, Anzai A, Jung S-M, et al. Containment, Contact Tracing and Asymptomatic
479 Transmission of Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19): A Modelling Study. *J Clin Med*.
480 **2020**; 9(10):3125.
- 481 30. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children
482 and Adolescents Compared With Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA*
483 *Pediatr*. **2021**; 175(2):143–156.
- 484 31. Kim J, Choe YJ, Lee J, et al. Role of children in household transmission of COVID-19. *Arch Dis*
485 *Child*. **2021**; 106(7):709–711.
- 486 32. Yung CF, Kam K, Nadua KD, et al. Novel Coronavirus 2019 Transmission Risk in Educational
487 Settings. *Clin Infect Dis*. **2021**; 72(6):1055–1058.
- 488 33. Schwartz S, Gewertz C. Omicron Is Making a Mess of Instruction, Even Where Schools Are
489 Open. *Educ Week* [Internet]. **2022** [cited 2023 Feb 20]; . Available from:
490 [https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/omicron-is-making-a-mess-of-instruction-](https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/omicron-is-making-a-mess-of-instruction-even-where-schools-are-open/2022/01)
491 [even-where-schools-are-open/2022/01](https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/omicron-is-making-a-mess-of-instruction-even-where-schools-are-open/2022/01)
- 492 34. Long C. Omicron Exacerbating School Staff Shortages | NEA [Internet]. [cited 2023 Feb 20].
493 Available from: [https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/omicron-](https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/omicron-exacerbating-school-staff-shortages)
494 [exacerbating-school-staff-shortages](https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/omicron-exacerbating-school-staff-shortages)
- 495 35. 2020 Sturgis Rally Final Vehicle Counts [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
496 <https://news.sd.gov/newsitem.aspx?id=27174>
- 497 36. Blistein J. “Freedom-Loving People”: Behind the Scenes at That Controversial Smash Mouth
498 Show in South Dakota [Internet]. *Roll. Stone*. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
499 [https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/sturgis-covid-19-biker-fest-smash-](https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/sturgis-covid-19-biker-fest-smash-mouth-1043040/)
500 [mouth-1043040/](https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/sturgis-covid-19-biker-fest-smash-mouth-1043040/)
- 501 37. Even the Official Motorcycle Brand of the Sturgis Rally Thinks the Mass Gathering Is Too
502 Risky [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: [https://news.yahoo.com/even-](https://news.yahoo.com/even-official-motorcycle-brand-sturgis-091043595.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnLw&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAE-Mbd02M7hUYmmufo9DeJ5BTNfsZOc1Z4B0b2yq9vvRmYegzua-)
503 [official-motorcycle-brand-sturgis-](https://news.yahoo.com/even-official-motorcycle-brand-sturgis-091043595.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnLw&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAE-Mbd02M7hUYmmufo9DeJ5BTNfsZOc1Z4B0b2yq9vvRmYegzua-)
504 [091043595.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnLw&guce_referr](https://news.yahoo.com/even-official-motorcycle-brand-sturgis-091043595.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnLw&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAE-Mbd02M7hUYmmufo9DeJ5BTNfsZOc1Z4B0b2yq9vvRmYegzua-)
505 [er_sig=AQAAE-Mbd02M7hUYmmufo9DeJ5BTNfsZOc1Z4B0b2yq9vvRmYegzua-](https://news.yahoo.com/even-official-motorcycle-brand-sturgis-091043595.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnLw&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAE-Mbd02M7hUYmmufo9DeJ5BTNfsZOc1Z4B0b2yq9vvRmYegzua-)

- 506 r6eYcG3WWyq8Hfffeq2WkWB6sR3jX1eeVKlMA_74t-hd-
507 vLk798wTDPvXiizPqVBjiNMviJbLOYBHfn-7EGUdE_4PeQ7N-
508 eYEch3PJ4C_8Tsi26OG7TPWAT&guccounter=2
- 509 38. “It’s literally impossible to stop”: Sturgis, South Dakota, braces as hundreds of thousands of
510 bikers arrived in the middle of a pandemic [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
511 <https://news.yahoo.com/literally-impossible-stop-sturgis-south-231030345.html>
- 512 39. Sturgis Motorcycle Rally [Internet]. Wikipedia. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
513 https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sturgis_Motorcycle_Rally&oldid=112059155
514 8
- 515 40. Dave D, McNichols D, Sabia JJ. The contagion externality of a superspreading event: The
516 Sturgis Motorcycle Rally and COVID-19. *South Econ J.* **2021**; 87(3):769–807.
- 517 41. Firestone MJ. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with a 10-Day Motorcycle Rally in a
518 Neighboring State — Minnesota, August–September 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
519 *Rep* [Internet]. **2020** [cited 2022 Nov 26]; 69. Available from:
520 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6947e1.htm>
- 521 42. Harleys everywhere, masks nowhere: Sturgis expects crowd of 250,000 [Internet]. *Chic.*
522 *Sun-Times.* 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
523 [https://chicago.suntimes.com/coronavirus/2020/8/7/21359318/sturgis-motorcycle-](https://chicago.suntimes.com/coronavirus/2020/8/7/21359318/sturgis-motorcycle-harleys-everywhere-masks-nowhere)
524 [harleys-everywhere-masks-nowhere](https://chicago.suntimes.com/coronavirus/2020/8/7/21359318/sturgis-motorcycle-harleys-everywhere-masks-nowhere)
- 525 43. Rapier G. “If I die from the virus, it was just meant to be”: 250,000 descend upon tiny South
526 Dakota town for world-famous motorcycle rally [Internet]. *Bus. Insid.* [cited 2022 Nov
527 26]. Available from: [https://www.businessinsider.com/sturgis-motorcycle-rally-kicks-off-](https://www.businessinsider.com/sturgis-motorcycle-rally-kicks-off-despite-surg-ing-coronavirus-cases-2020-8)
528 [despite-surg-ing-coronavirus-cases-2020-8](https://www.businessinsider.com/sturgis-motorcycle-rally-kicks-off-despite-surg-ing-coronavirus-cases-2020-8)
- 529 44. 2020 Sturgis Motorcycle Rally attracts thousands with no mask requirements amid
530 pandemic [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
531 [https://www.usatoday.com/picture-gallery/news/nation/2020/08/09/2020-sturgis-](https://www.usatoday.com/picture-gallery/news/nation/2020/08/09/2020-sturgis-motorcycle-rally-draws-thousands-no-mask-requirements-covid-19-coronavirus/3331908001/)
532 [motorcycle-rally-draws-thousands-no-mask-requirements-covid-19-](https://www.usatoday.com/picture-gallery/news/nation/2020/08/09/2020-sturgis-motorcycle-rally-draws-thousands-no-mask-requirements-covid-19-coronavirus/3331908001/)
533 [coronavirus/3331908001/](https://www.usatoday.com/picture-gallery/news/nation/2020/08/09/2020-sturgis-motorcycle-rally-draws-thousands-no-mask-requirements-covid-19-coronavirus/3331908001/)
- 534 45. Bonacci RA, Manahan LM, Miller JS, et al. COVID-19 Contact Tracing Outcomes in
535 Washington State, August and October 2020. *Front Public Health.* **2021**; 9:782296.
- 536 46. Shelby T, Schenck C, Weeks B, et al. Lessons Learned From COVID-19 Contact Tracing During
537 a Public Health Emergency: A Prospective Implementation Study. *Front Public Health.*
538 **2021**; 9:721952.
- 539 47. Kortela E, Kirjavainen V, Ahava MJ, et al. Real-life clinical sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR
540 test in symptomatic patients. *PLoS ONE.* **2021**; 16(5):e0251661.

- 541 48. S J, F S-R, P J, P B, M N. Diagnostic accuracy of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test in real-life
542 clinical settings. *Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis* [Internet]. *Int J Infect Dis*;
543 **2021** [cited 2022 Nov 26]; 109. Available from:
544 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34242764/>
- 545 49. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission
546 Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and After Symptom
547 Onset. *JAMA Intern Med*. **2020**; 180(9):1156–1163.
- 548 50. Hood JE, Kubiak RW, Avoundjian T, et al. A Multifaceted Evaluation of a COVID-19 Contact
549 Tracing Program in King County, Washington. *J Public Health Manag Pract JPHMP*. **2022**;
550 28(4):334–343.
- 551 51. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 15]. Available from:
552 <https://covid19.who.int>
- 553 52. The Lancet Commission on lessons for the future from the COVID-19 pandemic - The Lancet
554 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
555 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(22\)01585-9/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(22)01585-9/fulltext)
- 556 53. Lewis D. Why many countries failed at COVID contact-tracing — but some got it right.
557 *Nature*. **2020**; 588(7838):384–387.
- 558 54. Kwon O. Evidence of the importance of contact tracing in fighting COVID-19. *Epidemiol*
559 *Health*. **2022**; 44:e2022006.
- 560 55. Tulchinsky TH. John Snow, Cholera, the Broad Street Pump; Waterborne Diseases Then and
561 Now. *Case Stud Public Health*. **2018**; :77–99.
- 562 56. Competing Theories of Cholera [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 27]. Available from:
563 <https://www.ph.ucla.edu/epi/snow/choleratheories.html>
- 564 57. CDC. Monkeypox in the U.S. [Internet]. *Cent. Dis. Control Prev*. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 27].
565 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/monkeypox/outbreak/us-outbreaks.html>
- 566 58. COVID-19 in children and the role of school settings in transmission - second update
567 [Internet]. *Eur. Cent. Dis. Prev. Control*. 2021 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
568 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/children-and-school-settings-covid-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/children-and-school-settings-covid-19-transmission)
569 [19-transmission](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/children-and-school-settings-covid-19-transmission)
- 570 59. Hershov RB. Low SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in Elementary Schools — Salt Lake County,
571 Utah, December 3, 2020–January 31, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* [Internet].
572 **2021** [cited 2022 Nov 26]; 70. Available from:
573 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7012e3.htm>

- 574 60. Falk A, Benda A, Falk P, Steffen S, Wallace Z, Høeg TB. COVID-19 Cases and Transmission in
575 17 K-12 Schools - Wood County, Wisconsin, August 31-November 29, 2020. *MMWR Morb*
576 *Mortal Wkly Rep.* **2021**; 70(4):136–140.
- 577 61. Gandini S, Rainisio M, Iannuzzo ML, Bellerba F, Cecconi F, Scorrano L. No evidence of
578 association between schools and SARS-CoV-2 second wave in Italy [Internet]. medRxiv;
579 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. p. 2020.12.16.20248134. Available from:
580 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248134v1>
- 581 62. Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, et al. Incidence and Secondary Transmission of
582 SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Schools. *Pediatrics.* **2021**; 147(4):e2020048090.
- 583 63. Johnson KE, Lachmann M, Stoddard M, et al. Detecting in-school transmission of SARS-CoV-
584 2 from case ratios and documented clusters. *MedRxiv Prepr Serv Health Sci.* **2021**;
585 :2021.04.26.21256136.
- 586 64. White LF, Murray EJ, Chakravarty A. The role of schools in driving SARS-CoV-2 transmission:
587 Not just an open-and-shut case. *Cell Rep Med.* **2022**; 3(3):100556.
- 588 65. Manica M, Poletti P, Deandrea S, et al. Estimating SARS-CoV-2 transmission in educational
589 settings: A retrospective cohort study. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* [Internet]. [cited
590 2022 Nov 29]; n/a(n/a). Available from:
591 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/irv.13049>
- 592 66. Meuris C, Kremer C, Geerinck A, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 After COVID-19
593 Screening and Mitigation Measures for Primary School Children Attending School in
594 Liège, Belgium. *JAMA Netw Open.* **2021**; 4(10):e2128757.
- 595 67. Torres JP, Piñera C, De La Maza V, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
596 Antibody Prevalence in Blood in a Large School Community Subject to a Coronavirus
597 Disease 2019 Outbreak: A Cross-sectional Study. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc*
598 *Am.* **2021**; 73(2):e458–e465.
- 599 68. Gold JAW, Gettings JR, Kimball A, et al. Clusters of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Elementary
600 School Educators and Students in One School District - Georgia, December 2020-January
601 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* **2021**; 70(8):289–292.
- 602 69. Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Grant R, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection in schools in a northern French
603 city: a retrospective serological cohort study in an area of high transmission, France,
604 January to April 2020. *Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull.* **2021**;
605 26(15):2001695.
- 606 70. Crowe J, Schnaubelt AT, SchmidtBonne S, et al. Assessment of a Program for SARS-CoV-2
607 Screening and Environmental Monitoring in an Urban Public School District. *JAMA Netw*
608 *Open.* **2021**; 4(9):e2126447.

- 609 71. Buja A, Zabeo F, Cristofori V, et al. Opening Schools and Trends in SARS-CoV-2 Transmission
610 in European Countries. *Int J Public Health*. **2021**; 66:1604076.
- 611 72. Llupià A, Borràs-Santos A, Guinovart C, Utzet M, Moriña D, Puig J. SARS-CoV-2 transmission
612 in students of public schools of Catalonia (Spain) after a month of reopening. *PloS One*.
613 **2021**; 16(5):e0251593.
- 614 73. Theuring S, Thielecke M, Loon W van, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission in school
615 settings during the second COVID-19 wave: a cross-sectional study, Berlin, Germany,
616 November 2020. *Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull*. **2021**;
617 26(34):2100184.
- 618 74. Cowger TL, Murray EJ, Clarke J, et al. Lifting Universal Masking in Schools — Covid-19
619 Incidence among Students and Staff. *N Engl J Med*. Massachusetts Medical Society; **2022**;
620 387(21):1935–1946.
- 621 75. Lei H, Xu X, Xiao S, Wu X, Shu Y. Household transmission of COVID-19—a systematic review
622 and meta-analysis. *J Infect*. Elsevier; **2020**; 81(6):979–997.
- 623 76. Nir-Paz R, Grotto I, Strolov I, et al. Absence of in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 likely due
624 to use of face masks on board. *J Travel Med*. **2020**; 27(8):taaa117.
- 625 77. Saretzki C, Bergmann O, Dahmann P, et al. Are small airplanes safe with regards to COVID-
626 19 transmission? *J Travel Med*. **2021**; 28(7):taab105.
- 627 78. Pombal R, Hosegood I, Powell D. Risk of COVID-19 During Air Travel. *JAMA*. **2020**;
628 324(17):1798.
- 629 79. Guo Q, Wang J, Estill J, et al. Risk of COVID-19 Transmission Aboard Aircraft: An
630 Epidemiological Analysis Based on the National Health Information Platform. *Int J Infect*
631 *Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis*. **2022**; 118:270–276.
- 632 80. Khanh NC, Thai PQ, Quach H-L, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV 2 During Long-Haul Flight.
633 *Emerg Infect Dis*. **2020**; 26(11):2617–2624.
- 634 81. Yang N, Shen Y, Shi C, et al. In-flight transmission cluster of COVID-19: a retrospective case
635 series. *Infect Dis Lond Engl*. **2020**; 52(12):891–901.
- 636 82. Bae SH, Shin H, Koo H-Y, Lee SW, Yang JM, Yon DK. Asymptomatic Transmission of SARS-
637 CoV-2 on Evacuation Flight. *Emerg Infect Dis*. **2020**; 26(11):2705–2708.
- 638 83. Kretzschmar ME, Rozhnova G, Bootsma MCJ, Boven M van, Wiggert JHHM van de, Bonten
639 MJM. Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing strategies for COVID-19: a
640 modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. **2020**; 5(8):e452–e459.

- 641 84. Johnson KE, Stoddard M, Nolan RP, White DE, Hochberg N, Chakravarty A. This time is
642 different: model-based evaluation of the implications of SARS-CoV-2 infection kinetics for
643 disease control [Internet]. medRxiv; 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 29]. p. 2020.08.19.20177550.
644 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.19.20177550v2>
- 645 85. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing
646 | Science [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
647 <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abb6936?cookieSet=1>
- 648 86. Gao Z, Xu Y, Sun C, et al. A systematic review of asymptomatic infections with COVID-19. *J*
649 *Microbiol Immunol Infect.* **2021**; 54(1):12–16.
- 650 87. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People
651 Without COVID-19 Symptoms. *JAMA Netw Open.* **2021**; 4(1):e2035057.
- 652 88. Ma Q, Liu J, Liu Q, et al. Global Percentage of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among
653 the Tested Population and Individuals With Confirmed COVID-19 Diagnosis: A Systematic
654 Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open.* **2021**; 4(12):e2137257.
- 655 89. Mahmood M, Ilyas N-U-A, Khan MF, Hasrat MN, Richwagen N. Transmission frequency of
656 COVID-19 through pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic patients in AJK: a report of 201
657 cases. *Virol J.* **2021**; 18(1):138.
- 658 90. Tan J, Ge Y, Martinez L, et al. Transmission roles of symptomatic and asymptomatic COVID-
659 19 cases: a modelling study. *Epidemiol Infect.* **2022**; 150:e171.
- 660 91. Just how contagious is asymptomatic Covid-19? [Internet]. [cited 2023 Mar 8]. Available
661 from: <https://www.advisory.com/Daily-Briefing/2022/06/02/covid-transmission>
- 662 92. Moghadas SM, Fitzpatrick MC, Sah P, et al. The implications of silent transmission for the
663 control of COVID-19 outbreaks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* **2020**; 117(30):17513–17515.
- 664 93. Muller CP. Do asymptomatic carriers of SARS-COV-2 transmit the virus? *Lancet Reg Health –*
665 *Eur* [Internet]. Elsevier; **2021** [cited 2023 Mar 8]; 4. Available from:
666 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762\(21\)00059-4/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762(21)00059-4/fulltext)
- 667 94. Chen PZ, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. Understanding why superspreading drives the
668 COVID-19 pandemic but not the H1N1 pandemic. *Lancet Infect Dis.* Elsevier; **2021**;
669 21(9):1203–1204.
- 670 95. Lakdawala SS, Menachery VD. Catch Me if You Can: Superspreading of COVID-19. *Trends*
671 *Microbiol.* **2021**; 29(10):919–929.
- 672 96. Chopping the tail: How preventing superspreading can help to maintain COVID-19 control -
673 ScienceDirect [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 1]. Available from:
674 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1755436520300487>

- 675 97. Gupta M, Parameswaran GG, Sra MS, et al. Contact tracing of COVID-19 in Karnataka, India:
676 Superspreading and determinants of infectiousness and symptomatic infection. *PLoS*
677 *ONE*. **2022**; 17(7):e0270789.
- 678 98. Kojaku S, Hébert-Dufresne L, Mones E, Lehmann S, Ahn Y-Y. The effectiveness of backward
679 contact tracing in networks. *Nat Phys*. **2021**; 17:652–658.
- 680 99. A National Plan to Enable Comprehensive COVID-19 Case Finding and Contact Tracing in the
681 US. :16.
- 682 100. Empirical evidence on the efficiency of backward contact tracing in COVID-19 | *Nature*
683 *Communications* [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 29]. Available from:
684 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-022-32531-6>
- 685 101. Bradshaw WJ, Alley EC, Huggins JH, Lloyd AL, Esvelt KM. Bidirectional contact tracing
686 could dramatically improve COVID-19 control. *Nat Commun*. Nature Publishing Group;
687 **2021**; 12(1):232.
- 688 102. S0523_Oxford_-_Backwards_contact_tracing.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 29].
689 Available from:
690 <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme>
691 [nt_data/file/1048768/S0523_Oxford_-_Backwards_contact_tracing.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme)
- 692 103. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working
693 Group, Leclerc QJ, et al. Implication of backward contact tracing in the presence of
694 overdispersed transmission in COVID-19 outbreaks. *Wellcome Open Res*. **2020**; 5:239.
- 695 104. Amara PS, Platt JE, Raj M, Nong P. Learning about COVID-19: sources of information,
696 public trust, and contact tracing during the pandemic. *BMC Public Health*. **2022**;
697 22(1):1348.
- 698 105. Samuel G, Lucivero F, Johnson S, Diedericks H. Ecologies of Public Trust: The NHS COVID-
699 19 Contact Tracing App. *J Bioethical Inq*. **2021**; 18(4):595–608.
- 700 106. Brandt AM. *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States*
701 *Since 1880- 35th Anniversary Edition*. Oxford University Press; 2020.
- 702 107. El-Sadr WM, Platt J, Bernitz M, Reyes M. Contact Tracing: Barriers and Facilitators. *Am J*
703 *Public Health*. American Public Health Association; **2022**; 112(7):1025–1033.
- 704 108. Tanase L-M, Kerr J, Freeman ALJ, Schneider CR. COVID-19 risk perception and hoax
705 beliefs in the US immediately before and after the announcement of President Trump's
706 diagnosis. *R Soc Open Sci*. Royal Society; 9(8):212013.
- 707 109. Nadeem R. Lack of Preparedness Among Top Reactions Americans Have to Public Health
708 Officials' COVID-19 Response [Internet]. *Pew Res. Cent. Sci. Soc*. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov

- 709 26]. Available from: [https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2022/10/05/lack-of-](https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2022/10/05/lack-of-preparedness-among-top-reactions-americans-have-to-public-health-officials-covid-19-response/)
710 preparedness-among-top-reactions-americans-have-to-public-health-officials-covid-19-
711 response/
- 712 110. Using a household-structured branching process to analyse contact tracing in the SARS-
713 CoV-2 pandemic | Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences
714 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 29]. Available from:
715 <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2020.0267>
- 716 111. Davis EL, Lucas TCD, Borlase A, et al. Contact tracing is an imperfect tool for controlling
717 COVID-19 transmission and relies on population adherence. Nat Commun. Nature
718 Publishing Group; **2021**; 12(1):5412.
- 719 112. Miller JS, Bonacci RA, Lash RR, et al. COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing in
720 Central Washington State, June-July 2020. J Community Health. **2021**; 46(5):918–921.
- 721 113. Stargel A, Taylor MM, Zansky S, Spencer K, Hogben M, Shultz A. Case Investigation and
722 Contact Tracing Efforts from Health Departments in the United States, November 2020–
723 December 2021. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. **2022**; :ciac442.
- 724 114. Kalyanaraman N, Fraser MR. Containing COVID-19 Through Contact Tracing. Public Health
725 Rep. **2020**; 136(1):32–38.
- 726 115. Spencer KD, Chung CL, Stargel A, et al. COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing
727 Efforts from Health Departments - United States, June 25-July 24, 2020. MMWR Morb
728 Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(3):83–87.
- 729 116. Kanu FA, Smith EE, Offutt-Powell T, Hong R, Dinh T-H, Pevzner E. Declines in SARS-CoV-2
730 Transmission, Hospitalizations, and Mortality After Implementation of Mitigation
731 Measures— Delaware, March–June 2020. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2020**; 69(45):1691–
732 1694.
- 733 117. Sachdev DD, Brosnan HK, Reid MJA, et al. Outcomes of Contact Tracing in San Francisco,
734 California—Test and Trace During Shelter-in-Place. JAMA Intern Med. **2021**; 181(3):381–
735 383.
- 736 118. Sachdev DD, Chew Ng R, Sankaran M, et al. Contact-Tracing Outcomes Among Household
737 Contacts of Fully Vaccinated Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients: San
738 Francisco, California, 29 January-2 July 2021. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am.
739 **2022**; 75(1):e267–e275.
- 740 119. Jones A, Fialkowski V, Prinzing L, Trites J, Kelso P, Levine M. Assessment of Day-7
741 Postexposure Testing of Asymptomatic Contacts of COVID-19 Patients to Evaluate Early
742 Release from Quarantine - Vermont, May-November 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly
743 Rep. **2021**; 70(1):12–13.

- 744 120. Matthias J. Notes from the Field: COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing
745 Program — Spirit Lake Tribe, North Dakota, September–November 2020. MMWR Morb
746 Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. **2021** [cited 2022 Nov 27]; 70. Available from:
747 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7014a4.htm>
- 748 121. Atherstone C, Siegel M, Schmitt-Matzen E, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Associated
749 with High School Wrestling Tournaments - Florida, December 2020-January 2021.
750 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(4):141–143.
- 751
- 752