

469 **Supplementary Information**

470 **Maximizing and evaluating the impact of test-trace-isolate programs**

471 Kyra H. Grantz*, Elizabeth C. Lee*, Lucy D’Agostino McGowan, Kyu Han Lee, C. Jessica E.

472 Metcalf, Emily S. Gurley, Justin Lessler

473 *denotes equal contribution

474 **Supplementary Methods**

475 **Mathematical Model**

476 **Infection Compartments**

477 In this model, we assume that disease transmission occurs in discrete generations and that
 478 all infections may be classified into compartments, which are defined as elements of a 1×9
 479 surveillance-quarantine-community (DQC) matrix:

$$DQC =$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccccccccc} D(., s, .) & D(., a, .) & Q(Ds, c, .) & Q(Ds, h, .) & Q(Da, c, .) & Q(Da, h, .) & Q(Q, ., .) & C(., s, .) & C(., a, .) \end{array} \right] \quad (7)$$

480 where the broad D , Q , and C classes describe infections identified through surveillance,
 481 infections that were quarantined due to contact tracing efforts, and infections that remained
 482 undetected in the community. The DQC classes are further differentiated by characteristics
 483 of their infector (x), ego characteristics (y), and characteristics of their infectees (z) in a three
 484 element tuple (x, y, z) . We use this standard tuple notation across infection compartments and
 485 parameters for ease of understanding. Any element of the tuple filled with $.$ means that that
 486 type of characteristic is not applicable. The DQC compartments are defined in Table S1.

Table S1: **Detected and Isolated - Quarantined - Community (DQC) infection compartments**

Compartment	Description
$D(., s, .)$	symptomatic infections detected through surveillance
$D(., a, .)$	asymptomatic infections detected through surveillance
$Q(Ds, c, .)$	infected community contacts of a surveillance-detected symptomatic infection that are in quarantine
$Q(Ds, h, .)$	infected household contacts of a surveillance-detected symptomatic infection that are in quarantine
$Q(Da, c, .)$	infected community contacts of a surveillance-detected asymptomatic infection that are in quarantine
$Q(Da, h, .)$	infected household contacts of a surveillance-detected asymptomatic infection that are in quarantine
$Q(Q, ., .)$	infected (household or community) contacts of a quarantined infection that are in quarantine
$C(., s, .)$	symptomatic infections that remain undetected in the community
$C(., a, .)$	asymptomatic infections that remain undetected in the community

487 The elements of the DQC matrix refer to the proportion of total infections in each com-

488 partment for a given disease generation t , and the sum of any individual DQC matrix is 1.

489 **Recursive propagation of infections**

490 We can propagate infections across disease generations recursively:

$$DQC_{t+1} = (DQC_t)(INFECT)(DETECT), \tag{8}$$

491 where $INFECT$ is a 9×6 matrix describing the rates of transition from one disease gener-
 492 ation to the next, and $DETECT$ is a 6×9 matrix describing the probability that infections in
 493 the next generation are identified by surveillance, quarantined, or undetected in the community
 494 in the DQC matrix for generation $t + 1$.

495 $INFECT$ is a sparse matrix of transition rates from DQC compartments to infections
 496 caused by specific DQC compartments. While not strictly necessary, for ease of accounting, we
 497 notate the number of next-generation infections that are derived from each DQC compartment
 498 in Table S2. We specify only six next-generation infection states because we group all infections
 499 caused by quarantined individuals into a single $I(Q, ., .)$ class; this means that all infections
 500 derived from quarantined individuals have the same probability of assignment to the appropriate
 501 compartments in the DQC_{t+1} matrix, regardless of who infected them and whether they were
 502 community or household contacts of those index infections.

Table S2: **Infections in the next generation, by infector**

Infection Type	Description
$I(Ds, c, .)$	community contacts infected by surveillance-detected symptomatic individuals
$I(Ds, h, .)$	household contacts infected by surveillance-detected symptomatic individuals
$I(Da, c, .)$	community contacts infected by surveillance-detected asymptomatic individuals
$I(Da, h, .)$	household contacts infected by surveillance-detected asymptomatic individuals
$I(Q, ., .)$	(community or household) contacts infected by quarantined individuals
$I(C, ., .)$	infected (household or community) contacts of a quarantined infection that are in quarantine

503 The elements of the *INFECT* matrix represent the transmission rates between *DQC* compartments and the infections in the next generation
 504 ($I(x, y, z)$), described by the notation *compartment* \rightarrow *infection state*:

INFECT =

$$\begin{bmatrix}
 D(., s, .) \rightarrow I(Ds, c, .) & D(., s, .) \rightarrow I(Ds, h, .) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & D(., a, .) \rightarrow I(Da, c, .) & D(., a, .) \rightarrow I(Da, h, .) & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Q(Ds, c, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Q(Ds, h, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Q(Da, c, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Q(Da, h, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Q_Q \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & C(., s, .) \rightarrow I(C, ., .) \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & C(., a, .) \rightarrow I(C, ., .)
 \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

20

505 *DETECT* is a matrix of transition probabilities from infection states to *DQC* compartments in the next generation.
DETECT =

$$\begin{bmatrix}
 I(Ds, c, .) \rightarrow D(., s, .) & I(Ds, c, .) \rightarrow D(., a, .) & I(Ds, c, .) \rightarrow Q(Ds, c, .) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I(Ds, c, .) \rightarrow C(., s, .) & I(Ds, c, .) \rightarrow C(., a, .) \\
 I(Ds, h, .) \rightarrow D(., s, .) & I(Ds, h, .) \rightarrow D(., a, .) & 0 & I(Ds, h, .) \rightarrow Q(Ds, h, .) & 0 & 0 & 0 & I(Ds, h, .) \rightarrow C(., s, .) & I(Ds, h, .) \rightarrow C(., a, .) \\
 I(Da, c, .) \rightarrow D(., s, .) & I(Da, c, .) \rightarrow D(., a, .) & 0 & 0 & I(Da, c, .) \rightarrow Q(Da, c, .) & 0 & 0 & I(Da, c, .) \rightarrow C(., s, .) & I(Da, c, .) \rightarrow C(., a, .) \\
 I(Da, h, .) \rightarrow D(., s, .) & I(Da, h, .) \rightarrow D(., a, .) & 0 & 0 & 0 & I(Da, h, .) \rightarrow Q(Da, h, .) & 0 & I(Da, h, .) \rightarrow C(., s, .) & I(Da, h, .) \rightarrow C(., a, .) \\
 I(Q, ., .) \rightarrow D(., s, .) & I(Q, ., .) \rightarrow D(., a, .) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I(Q, ., .) \rightarrow Q(Q, ., .) & I(Q, ., .) \rightarrow C(., s, .) & I(Q, ., .) \rightarrow C(., a, .) \\
 I(C, ., .) \rightarrow D(., s, .) & I(C, ., .) \rightarrow D(., a, .) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I(C, ., .) \rightarrow C(., s, .) & I(C, ., .) \rightarrow C(., a, .)
 \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

506

Transmission may differ based on the characteristics of the infecting individual (symptomatic individuals may shed more than asymptomatic ones) and the type of infectee contact (household contacts may have greater relative risk of infection than community contacts). Consequently, the transition probabilities described by the *INFECT* matrix may include different variations of the reproductive number R . Using the same tuple notation described above, we describe $R(x, y, z)$, where R represents the population-wide baseline reproductive number. Note that $R(., ., c)$ and $R(., ., h)$ are shown here only for demonstrative purposes and they are not used by themselves. Parameters are defined in Table S3.

$$R(., s, .) = R/(\alpha\kappa - \alpha + 1) \quad (11)$$

$$R(., a, .) = \kappa R/(\alpha\kappa - \alpha + 1) \quad (12)$$

$$R(., ., c) = R/(\eta\nu - \eta + 1) \quad (13)$$

$$R(., ., h) = \nu R/(\eta\nu - \eta + 1) \quad (14)$$

$$R(., a, h) = \kappa\nu R/(\alpha\kappa - \alpha + 1)(\eta\nu - \eta + 1) \quad (15)$$

$$R(., a, c) = \kappa R/(\alpha\kappa - \alpha + 1)(\eta\nu - \eta + 1) \quad (16)$$

$$R(., s, h) = \nu R/(\alpha\kappa - \alpha + 1)(\eta\nu - \eta + 1) \quad (17)$$

$$R(., s, c) = R/(\alpha\kappa - \alpha + 1)(\eta\nu - \eta + 1) \quad (18)$$

We define the reduction in infectiousness due to isolation of an index case (γ_y), and therefore truncation of the infection period as:

$$\gamma_y = \int_0^{\tau_y} f(x)dx \quad (19)$$

507 where $f(x)$ is the distribution of infectiousness, which is a function of x days since symp-
508 tom onset. The integral from 0 to τ_y represents the proportion total infectiousness where a
509 transmission event may occur for before the effective isolation of an infection of type y .

The equations governing the *INFECT* matrix are then as follows:

$$D(., s, .) \rightarrow I(Ds, c, .) = (1 - \eta)\gamma_{D(., s, .)}R(., s, c) \quad (20)$$

$$D(., s, .) \rightarrow I(Ds, h, .) = \eta\gamma_{D(., s, .)}R(., s, h) \quad (21)$$

$$D(., a, .) \rightarrow I(Da, c, .) = (1 - \eta)\gamma_{D(., a, .)}R(., a, c) \quad (22)$$

$$D(., a, .) \rightarrow I(Da, h, .) = \eta\gamma_{D(., a, .)}R(., a, h) \quad (23)$$

$$Q(Ds, c, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) = \gamma_{Q(Ds, c, .)}R \quad (24)$$

$$Q(Ds, h, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) = \gamma_{Q(Ds, h, .)}R \quad (25)$$

$$Q(Da, c, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) = \gamma_{Q(Da, c, .)}R \quad (26)$$

$$Q(Da, h, .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) = \gamma_{Q(Da, h, .)}R \quad (27)$$

$$Q(Q, ., .) \rightarrow I(Q, ., .) = \gamma_{Q(Q, ., .)}R \quad (28)$$

$$C(., s, .) \rightarrow I(C, ., .) = R(., s, .) \quad (29)$$

$$C(., a, .) \rightarrow I(C, ., .) = R(., a, .) \quad (30)$$

The *DETECT* matrix assigns infections to *DQC* compartments in the next generation. The equations governing the *DETECT* matrix are as follows:

$$I(Ds, c, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))\rho_s \quad (31)$$

$$I(Ds, c, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))\rho_a \quad (32)$$

$$I(Ds, c, \cdot) \rightarrow Q(Ds, c, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot) \quad (33)$$

$$I(Ds, c, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))(1 - \rho_s) \quad (34)$$

$$I(Ds, c, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))(1 - \rho_a) \quad (35)$$

$$I(Ds, h, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))\rho_s \quad (36)$$

$$I(Ds, h, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))\rho_a \quad (37)$$

$$I(Ds, h, \cdot) \rightarrow Q(Ds, h, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot) \quad (38)$$

$$I(Ds, h, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))(1 - \rho_s) \quad (39)$$

$$I(Ds, h, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))(1 - \rho_a) \quad (40)$$

$$I(Da, c, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))\rho_s \quad (41)$$

$$I(Da, c, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))\rho_a \quad (42)$$

$$I(Da, c, \cdot) \rightarrow Q(Da, c, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot) \quad (43)$$

$$I(Da, c, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))(1 - \rho_s) \quad (44)$$

$$I(Da, c, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, c, \cdot))(1 - \rho_a) \quad (45)$$

$$I(Da, h, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))\rho_s \quad (46)$$

$$I(Da, h, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))\rho_a \quad (47)$$

$$I(Da, h, \cdot) \rightarrow Q(Da, h, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot) \quad (48)$$

$$I(Da, h, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))(1 - \rho_s) \quad (49)$$

$$I(Da, h, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(\cdot, h, \cdot))(1 - \rho_a) \quad (50)$$

$$I(Q, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(Q, \cdot, \cdot))\rho_s \quad (51)$$

$$I(Q, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(Q, \cdot, \cdot))\rho_a \quad (52)$$

$$I(Q, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow Q(Q, \cdot, \cdot) = \omega(Q, \cdot, \cdot) \quad (53)$$

$$I(Q, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \omega(Q, \cdot, \cdot))(1 - \rho_s) \quad (54)$$

$$I(Q, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \omega(Q, \cdot, \cdot))(1 - \rho_a) \quad (55)$$

$$I(C, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)\rho_s \quad (56)$$

$$I(C, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow D(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha\rho_a \quad (57)$$

$$I(C, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, s, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \rho_s) \quad (58)$$

$$I(C, \cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow C(\cdot, a, \cdot) = \alpha(1 - \rho_a) \quad (59)$$

Table S3: **Model parameters and default values** of fixed disease transmission and natural history values.

Parameter	Description	Default
Natural history		
α	proportion of infections that are asymptomatic	0
-	Mean generation time (time between infection of index case and secondary infection)	6.5 days
-	Mean incubation period (time between infection and symptom onset of index case)	5.5 days
Disease transmission		
N	number of infections (<i>stochastic model only</i>)	-
R	baseline reproductive number for the population	2.5
$R(., y, z)$	reproductive number for y -type index cases transmitting to z -type infectees	-
η	proportion of contacts that are household contacts	1
ν	relative risk of infection among household contacts compared to community contacts	4
κ	relative transmissibility for asymptomatic relative to symptomatic infected individuals	0
γ_y	infectiousness multiplier, accounting for the reduction in y type individual's infectious period due to isolation or quarantine	-
τ_y	time delay from y type individual's symptom onset to isolation or quarantine	-
θ	Overdispersion parameter (<i>stochastic model only</i>)	0.1
Disease detection		
ρ_a	proportion of asymptomatic infections that are detected by surveillance	-
ρ_s	proportion of symptomatic infections that are detected by surveillance	-
$\omega(x, y, .)$	proportion of x -caused infections or y type individual's contacts that are identified and quarantined	-

510 **Supplementary Figures**




Figure S1: Additional benefits from isolation of asymptomatic, infected individuals, for a scenario with high case isolation completeness among symptomatic infections (50%) and high contact quarantine completeness (70%) on average 4 days after case symptom onset. Improving asymptomatic case isolation completeness will have a larger impact when the the relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infections, compared to symptomatic infections, approaches 1 (x -axis) and when the fraction of asymptomatic infections in the population is higher (*asymptomatic fraction*). Numbers by each line show the percent of all infections (symptomatic and asymptomatic) that are isolated.




Figure S2: Additional benefits from quarantine of community (non-household) contacts, for a scenario with high case isolation completeness (50%) and high household contact quarantine completeness (70%) on average 4 days after case symptom onset. Improving community contact quarantine completeness will have limited impact when the the relative risk of infection among household infections, compared to community infections, is high (x -axis) and when the percent of contacts occurring outside of the household is lower. Numbers by each line show the percent of all contacts (household and community) that are quarantined.




Figure S3: Impacts of overdispersion and stochasticity on model estimates of the reproductive number. Solid lines show the mean reproductive number across 1000 simulations (darker shaded regions, interquartile range; lighter shaded regions, 95% confidence interval) for two scenarios with highly-effective contact tracing (70% quarantine completeness on average 4 days after case symptom onset), with either 20, 100, or 10000 total infections, and with overdispersion parameter $\theta = 0.1$. Dashed lines show equivalent results without overdispersion.




Figure S4: Improvements to case isolation and contact quarantine where the generation time is 5 days: A) Impact of case isolation timing (x-axis) and completeness (line colors) on the effective reproductive number (y-axis) for a highly effective contact tracing program (left) and a less effective contact tracing program (center). Heat map (right) of the effective reproductive number across a range of case isolation timing (y-axis) and completeness (x-axis) scenarios, assuming that contact tracing is highly effective. B) Impact of contact tracing timing (x-axis) and completeness (line colors) on the effective reproductive number (y-axis) for a widespread and rapid case isolation scenario (left) and a less effective and slower case isolation scenario (center). Heat map (right) of the effective reproductive number across a range of contact tracing timing (y-axis) and completeness (x-axis) scenarios, assuming that detection and isolation of index cases is widespread and rapid.




Figure S5: Improvements to case isolation and contact quarantine where the generation time is 8 days: A) Impact of case isolation timing (x-axis) and completeness (line colors) on the effective reproductive number (y-axis) for a highly effective contact tracing program (left) and a less effective contact tracing program (center). Heat map (right) of the effective reproductive number across a range of case isolation timing (y-axis) and completeness (x-axis) scenarios, assuming that contact tracing is highly effective. B) Impact of contact tracing timing (x-axis) and completeness (line colors) on the effective reproductive number (y-axis) for a widespread and rapid case isolation scenario (left) and a less effective and slower case isolation scenario (center). Heat map (right) of the effective reproductive number across a range of contact tracing timing (y-axis) and completeness (x-axis) scenarios, assuming that detection and isolation of index cases is widespread and rapid.




Figure S6: Isolation strategies (timing and completeness) capable of achieving $R < 1$ when a given proportion of contacts (50 - 100%) are quarantined on the same day as case isolation. These strategies are shown for two assumptions of the generation time (5 days or 8 days) and for four possible baseline values of R , assuming that other non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) are in effect to reduce transmission from the uncontrolled scenario, $R = 2.5$.




Figure S7: Relationship between R and the proportion of detected infections among identified contacts, under two assumptions of the generation time (5 days and 8 days). Each position along a line shows a single test-trace-isolate strategy, with a fixed delay from case symptom onset to isolation (shown in the numbers at the top). Points are colored by the proportion of all infections that are isolated through surveillance or testing.




Figure S8: Impact of generation time assumption on reproductive number, for a scenario with high case isolation completeness (50%) and high contact quarantine completeness (70%) on the same day as case isolation. A shorter generation time implies that a greater proportion of transmission occurs before or immediately after symptom onset and, hence, that the delay from case symptom onset to case isolation must be shorter to achieve equivalent reductions to the reproductive number.