

1 Isolation and contact tracing can tip the scale  
2 to containment of COVID-19 in populations with social  
3 distancing

4

5 Mirjam E. Kretzschmar<sup>1#</sup>, Ganna Rozhnova<sup>1</sup>, Michiel van Boven<sup>1</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup> Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht,  
7 Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

8

9 # corresponding author:

10 Mirjam E. Kretzschmar

11 Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care

12 University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht

13 Email: [m.e.e.kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl](mailto:m.e.e.kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl)

14 Phone: +31 88 75 687 61

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 15 Abstract

16

17 **Background:** Novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has extended its range of transmission in all  
18 parts of the world, with substantial variation in rates of transmission and severity of  
19 associated disease. Many countries have implemented social distancing as a measure to  
20 control further spread.

21 **Methods:** We evaluate whether and under which conditions containment or slowing down  
22 COVID-19 epidemics are possible by isolation and contact tracing in settings with various  
23 levels of social distancing. We use a stochastic transmission model in which every person  
24 generates novel infections according to a probability distribution that is affected by the  
25 incubation period distribution (time from infection to symptoms), distribution of the latent  
26 period (time from infection to onset of infectiousness), and overall transmissibility. The  
27 model distinguishes between close contacts (e.g., within a household) and other contacts in  
28 the population. Social distancing affects the number of contacts outside but not within the  
29 household.

30 **Findings:** The proportion of asymptomatic or unascertained cases has a strong impact on the  
31 controllability of the disease. If the proportion of asymptomatic infections is larger than  
32 30%, contact tracing and isolation cannot achieve containment for an  $R_0$  of 2.5. Achieving  
33 containment by social distancing requires a reduction of numbers of non-household  
34 contacts by around 90%. Depending on the realized level of contact reduction, tracing and  
35 isolation of only household contacts, or of household and non-household contacts are  
36 necessary to reduce the effective reproduction number to below 1. A combination of social

37 distancing with isolation and contact tracing leads to synergistic effects that increase the  
38 prospect of containment.

39 **Interpretation:** Isolation and contact tracing can be an effective means to slow down  
40 epidemics, but only if the majority of cases are ascertained. In a situation with social  
41 distancing, contact tracing can act synergistically and tip the scale towards containment, and  
42 can therefore be a tool for controlling COVID-19 epidemics as part of an exit strategy from  
43 current lockdown measures.

44

45 **Funding:** This research was partly funded by ZonMw project number 91216062.

46

## 47 Author summary

48 As of 2 April 2020, the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has spread to more than 170  
49 countries and has caused over 850,000 confirmed cases of COVID-19. In the absence of  
50 effective medicines and vaccines, the preventive measures are limited to social distancing,  
51 isolation of confirmed and suspected cases and identification of their contacts. Using a  
52 transmission model, we evaluated the impact of social distancing, isolation and contact  
53 tracing on slowing down or even containing COVID-19 epidemics. We investigated how  
54 various combinations of social distancing, isolation, and contact tracing reduce the effective  
55 reproduction number, and what is needed to achieve the critical threshold of a reproduction  
56 number below 1. We estimated the impact of combinations of measures on epidemic  
57 growth rate and doubling time for the number of infections. We find that under realistic  
58 assumptions on the level of social distancing, additional isolation and contact tracing are  
59 needed for stopping the epidemic. Whether quarantining only household contacts is  
60 sufficient, depends on levels of social distancing and timeliness of tracing and isolation. Our  
61 analyses, based on best understanding of the epidemiology of COVID-19, highlight that even  
62 if social distancing is in place, isolation and contact tracing at least of household contacts are  
63 needed to stop the epidemic, and these additional measures help to delay and lower the  
64 epidemic peak. Therefore, isolation and contact tracing will be important tools for enabling  
65 exiting of currently implemented social distancing measures.

66

## 67 Introduction

68 As of early April 2020, the number of infections of the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) is still  
69 increasing at an exponential rate in many countries, while the virus is expanding its range to  
70 all parts of the world. There are no registered effective medicines, treatment options are  
71 mainly supportive, and there are no vaccines available, limiting preventive measures mainly  
72 to social distancing combined with isolation of infected persons and those that have high  
73 likelihood of being infected, for instance because they have been traced as contacts of  
74 infected persons [1, 2]. However, recently it was questioned by high-ranked officials of the  
75 World Health Organization (WHO) whether social distancing or lockdowns are sufficient to  
76 stop the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak (<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-who-ryan/lockdowns-not-enough-to-defeat-coronavirus-whos-ryan-idUSKBN2190FM>).  
77  
78 Possibly, additional measures are needed, for example active tracing of contacts in  
79 combination with isolation of infected contacts. Also, such measures will be important in the  
80 context of exit strategies, i.e. once social distancing measures are reduced or lifted, as has  
81 been suggested recently [3]. It is unclear, how effective such combinations of interventions  
82 can be in populations with social distancing in place.

83

84 To what extent local containment or local slowing down of an epidemic by isolation and  
85 contact tracing is successful depends on the fraction of infections that remain asymptomatic  
86 or have mild disease, and on the infectiousness before the onset of symptoms [4, 5]. It is  
87 known that a high probability of asymptomatic infection, a high proportion of transmission  
88 occurring before the onset of symptoms, a long delay between case finding and isolation,  
89 and high overall transmissibility all factor in negatively in the likelihood that an outbreak can

90 be contained [6-9]. For SARS-CoV-2, evidence indicates that a high fraction of infected  
91 persons is infectious before they show symptoms (up to 50%), that a substantial fraction of  
92 infections may be asymptomatic or show only mild symptoms (up to 80%), and that the  
93 epidemic doubling time in the absence of interventions is approximately one week or  
94 perhaps even less [5, 10-16]. On the other hand, it is also reported that with intensive  
95 contact tracing it may be possible to trace the majority (>80%) of secondary infections [17].

96

97 Here we provide model-based analyses of the impact of isolation and contact tracing in a  
98 setting with various levels of social distancing measures, using varying levels of the  
99 effectiveness and timeliness of contact tracing. It is important to consider the impact of each  
100 of these interventions in isolation but also in combination, as it is well known that each  
101 intervention that reduces transmission in the population (i.e. reduces the reproduction  
102 number) is expected to increase the effectiveness of additional interventions in a synergistic  
103 manner [18]. We show how those measures impact on the cumulative numbers of infecteds  
104 during an outbreak and compare with recent outbreak data from various countries [19].

105

106 We focus on conditions that make containment of an early epidemic possible, but also on  
107 the impact of isolation and contact tracing when containment is not possible, or in an exit  
108 phase from social distancing. In a population with social distancing in place, we investigate  
109 what the additional impact of isolation and contact tracing can be for reaching containment  
110 or slowing down the spread. We report effective reproduction number, the (exponential)  
111 rate of increase, and the doubling time of the epidemic for scenarios with various  
112 combinations of interventions. Considering that the capacity of healthcare systems is

113 limited, it is important to assess which interventions are most effective in slowing down the  
114 rate of increase of healthcare demand during an ongoing outbreak. As it is likely that, on the  
115 one hand, isolation and contact tracing will be more effective in close contact settings with  
116 well-defined contacts (household, workplace) than in the community (commuting, public  
117 spaces), while, on the other hand, the potential impact of household interventions on the  
118 epidemic could be smaller, we stratify the analyses by transmission setting (henceforth  
119 called household and non-household) [8]. As many of the relevant epidemiological and  
120 intervention parameters are still quite uncertain, or may be variable in different settings, we  
121 focus throughout on a systematic analysis of the relation between key parameters for  
122 timeliness and completeness of contact tracing and main outcomes such as the effective  
123 reproduction number and the epidemic growth rate.

124

## 125 Methods

126 We modify a model that was developed earlier for similar aims in another context [8]. The  
127 stochastic model describes an epidemic in its early phase as a branching process. Starting  
128 from a small set of initially infected individuals, the model calculates the numbers of latently  
129 infected persons, infectious persons, and persons that are diagnosed and isolated in time  
130 steps of one day. Latent infection, infectivity during the infectious period, and daily contact  
131 rates are quantified using distributions taken from the literature (Table 1). We distinguish  
132 between household contacts and non-household contacts, which differ in the risk of  
133 infection and the delay and effectiveness of tracing and isolation. Intervention effectiveness  
134 is determined by the daily probability of being diagnosed during the infectious period (Table  
135 2). Furthermore, intervention effectiveness depends on the delays in tracing household and  
136 non-household contacts, respectively, and the proportions of contacts can be found and  
137 isolated. We assume that isolation is perfect, i.e. that isolated persons cannot transmit any  
138 longer. The model is described by a set of difference equations, and allows for explicit  
139 computation of the basic reproduction number  $R_0$  and the effective reproduction number  
140 under interventions  $R_e$ . The model was coded in Mathematica 12.1.

141

### 142 **Natural history**

143 We assume that the latent period lasts between 4 and 6 days. Individuals then become  
144 infectious for at most 10 days. Infectivity is high at the beginning of the infectious period  
145 and decays to low levels during these 10 days (Figure S1a). The probability of symptoms  
146 onset increases during the first 4 days of the infectious period, thereby influencing the daily  
147 probability of diagnosis during the infectious period (see below).



148 An infectious individual makes contacts with household members and persons outside the  
149 household. We model the daily number of household contacts with a Poisson distribution,  
150 and the numbers of non-household contacts with a negative binomial distribution (Table 1),  
151 with parameters based on the average household size in the Netherlands, and numbers of  
152 contacts observed in a contact study in the Netherlands (FigureS1b) [20]. With the chosen  
153 parameters, the mean number of contacts per day is 13.2 (SD 8.5).

154 On each day of the infectious period, an individual makes a number of contacts according to  
155 the contact distribution. This number is reduced by a factor describing the probability that  
156 the contact person has already been infected during earlier contacts with the index person.  
157 More precisely, the number of contacts is reduced by a factor  $f_k$  per day  $k$  of the infectious  
158 period, describing the probability that a contact has already been infected on previous days  
159 of the infectious period of the index case. The probability of transmission upon contact with  
160 a susceptible household contact is given by the distribution in Figure S1a. As contacts with  
161 persons outside the household are often less close, we assume that the transmission  
162 probability for these contacts is lower by factor 0.25. Figure S1c shows the percentage of  
163 onward transmissions per day of the infectious period, e.g. more than half of all onward  
164 transmissions occur during the first 3 days of the infectious period.

165

## 166 **Social distancing**

167 Social distancing can be self-imposed, if people decide to reduce their social contacts during  
168 the outbreak, and it can be government-imposed by closing schools, workplaces, and other  
169 venues of social gatherings. Here we assume that when social distancing is applied,  
170 household contacts remain unchanged, but the mean number of non-household contacts is

171 reduced. This is implemented by a reduction factor in the mean of the negative binomial  
172 distribution describing non-household contact numbers. The reduction factor for social  
173 distancing was varied between 0% and 95%. In scenarios with social distancing we assumed  
174 that only 60% of cases are symptomatic or can be ascertained.

175

## 176 **Diagnosis, contact tracing, and isolation**

177 An infectious person becomes symptomatic with a given probability per day of the infectious  
178 period. For SARS-CoV-2 the probability of developing symptoms is high in the first few days  
179 of the infectious period. We assume that if an infected and infectious person has not  
180 developed symptoms by day 6, the probability that he/she will still do so is very small. The  
181 probability of developing symptoms determines whether he/she will be diagnosed and  
182 isolated. The total probability of developing symptoms determines the fraction that remains  
183 asymptomatic or otherwise undiagnosed, i.e. if the total probability of developing symptoms  
184 is smaller than 1, a proportion of the infected persons will remain undiagnosed and can  
185 transmit throughout their infectious period. With the assumed distributions, on average  
186 about half of all potential onward transmissions will have occurred before an infected  
187 person is diagnosed and isolated. The diagnosis can be delayed, which in the model is  
188 implemented by setting the diagnosis probability to zero for the number of days of delay.  
189 This delay describes the time between symptom onset until a symptomatic person visits a  
190 GP or hospital and gets diagnosed.

191 If an individual is diagnosed, contacts will be traced, and in case they are infected will be  
192 diagnosed and isolated. Tracing goes back in time to trace all contacts during the infectious  
193 period of the index case. There may be a delay before contacts are found and diagnosed,

194 and only a fraction of all contacts may be found. These parameters, tracing delay and tracing  
195 coverage, may be different for household and non-household contacts. We assume that all  
196 traced infected persons are immediately isolated and cannot transmit any further.

197 Therefore, the only individuals who will continue transmitting are those who are not found  
198 by tracing and are not yet diagnosed.

199

## 200 **Baseline scenario**

201 For assessing the effectiveness of contact tracing and isolation, we use a best case scenario,  
202 where all parameters are set to optimistic values. We assume that when a case is diagnosed,  
203 he/she will immediately be isolated and this will stop onward transmission completely.

204 Furthermore, we assume that all contacts will be traced, and if found infected will be  
205 isolated immediately. We assume that it takes 1 day to find and isolate both household and  
206 non-household contacts. The rationale for using these overly optimistic assumptions as a  
207 baseline is that we want to investigate the maximum contribution contact tracing can  
208 provide for achieving containment. In sensitivity analyses we investigated for various control  
209 parameters at which point of diverging from the baseline parameters control of the  
210 outbreak will be lost (Supplementary Information).

211

## 212 **Output variables**

213 We compute cumulative numbers of cases for a time period of 50 days after the epidemic  
214 has reached more than 100 cases. We compare doubling time of the epidemic with only  
215 isolation of diagnosed cases to situations with various levels of social distancing, isolation  
216 and contact tracing. We assume that all diagnosed cases are isolated upon diagnosis and

217 cannot transmit further. We plot the epidemic from the time the cumulative number of  
218 infected persons is above 100. We compare these trajectories to similar trajectories for  
219 China, Germany, Italy, Japan, Turkey, and the US using data downloaded from  
220 ourworldindata.org [19]. We show what the additional contribution of isolation and contact  
221 tracing can be in the attempt to bend the curve towards longer doubling times.

222 The model allows an explicit calculation of the basic reproduction number  $R_0$  and the  
223 effective reproduction number  $R_e$  [8].  $R_0$  is defined as the number of secondary cases an  
224 index case generates on average in a susceptible population, and  $R_e$  is the number of  
225 secondary infections per case when an intervention is in place.  $R_0$  is determined by daily  
226 transmission probabilities and numbers of contacts. The effective reproduction number is in  
227 addition determined by the level of social distancing, diagnosis probabilities, tracing delays,  
228 and tracing coverages per day of the infectious period. We can therefore investigate how  $R_e$   
229 depends on  $R_0$  and on the intervention parameters.

230 We are interested in the critical tracing coverage, i.e. what proportion of non-household  
231 contacts needs to be found and isolated to control the outbreak, for populations with  
232 various levels of social distancing. Furthermore, we study the epidemic growth rate (or  
233 epidemic doubling time) without and with contact tracing and isolation and various levels of  
234 social distancing. In sensitivity analyses, we study how these quantities depend on the delay  
235 to diagnosis of cases and on the delay in contact tracing. For example, we assume that  
236 household contacts can be traced with a high coverage and without delay, but that tracing  
237 of non-household contact may take longer and be less complete.

238 Based on the distribution of the latent and infectious periods and infectivity, we calculate  
239 the exponential growth rate and doubling time under various assumptions on the  
240 intervention parameters. This gives additional information for situations where the outbreak

241 is not controllable, because intervention measures will lower the growth rate and increase  
242 the epidemic doubling time.

243 We investigate how controllability of the outbreak depends on the fraction of infections that  
244 develop symptoms and therefore vary this percentage between 0% and 100%. We then  
245 considered combinations of interventions and their impact on effective reproduction  
246 number, growth rate, and doubling time of the epidemic. We varied levels of social  
247 distancing, and coverage of tracing of household and non-household contacts. In our  
248 analysis for different levels of social distancing we assumed that 60% of infected persons  
249 develop symptoms.

250

## 251 **Role of the funding source**

252 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data  
253 interpretation, writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit for publication. All  
254 authors had full access to all the data in the study and were responsible for the decision to  
255 submit the manuscript for publication.

256

257

## 258 **Results**

### 259 **Basic and effective reproduction numbers**

260 In the baseline scenario without interventions we calibrate the transmission probability such  
261 that the basic reproduction number equals  $R_0 = 2.5$ . In that case, 39% of transmissions take

262 place among household contacts. The basic reproduction number of household contacts is  
263 0.97, and that of non-household contacts 1.53. Hence, if all non-household transmissions  
264 could be prevented, the outbreak would be just under the control limit. In the baseline  
265 scenario without interventions the exponential growth rate is 0.19 per day and the doubling  
266 time is 3.6 days, which agrees with published estimates [13]. For sensitivity analysis of the  
267 relation between  $R_0$  and  $R_e$  for various combinations of parameters, see the Supplementary  
268 Information.

### 269 **Outbreak doubling times**

270 Isolation of diagnosed cases alone reduces the doubling time to almost 4 days. If social  
271 distancing is implemented 28 days after the first case was diagnosed, and the number of  
272 non-household contacts is reduced by 70% [21], the doubling time will increase to around 14  
273 days (Figure 1a). The figure also shows that it takes a week before the impact on the  
274 epidemic growth starts to be visible. If higher levels of social distancing can be achieved, the  
275 doubling times can be increased more (Figure 1b), but even for 90% reduction of contacts  
276 the curve has not been flattened. In Figure 1c the impact of the timing of social distancing  
277 measures on the further course of the outbreak is shown. The figure demonstrates how  
278 every week delay in implementing these measures leads to an order of magnitude higher  
279 numbers of cases, thus emphasizing the importance of fast implementation of social  
280 distancing measures. Finally, in Figure 4d we show a scenario where social distancing is  
281 implemented at day 28 after diagnosing the first case and reduces non-household contacts  
282 by 70%. Then at day 49, also contact tracing is implemented. It is assumed that all infected  
283 household contacts and 50% of the non-household contacts of a newly diagnosed case are  
284 traced and isolated. This additional measure increases the doubling time to ... days. We

285 contrast this scenario with data from epidemics in a number of countries that have  
286 implemented social distancing at various levels and time points.

287

### 288 **Fraction of non-household contacts needed to trace and isolate**

289 If there is a diagnosis delay, the question arises how successful contact tracing has to be to  
290 keep the outbreak under control. We therefore compute the minimum fraction of non-  
291 household contacts that need to be traced and isolated (henceforth termed “critical tracing  
292 coverage”) to bring  $R_e$  to below 1 (for examples with various assumptions on timeliness of  
293 contact tracing see Supplementary Information).

294

### 295 **Impact of asymptomatic cases**

296 Not being diagnosed can be a consequence of not developing symptoms, having only mild  
297 symptoms, or any other reason why infected persons might not be identified by health care.  
298 We subsume these possible reasons for cases not being ascertained under the term  
299 “asymptomatic”. With increasing proportion of asymptomatic cases, the possibility of  
300 controlling the outbreak with contact tracing and isolation quickly fades. This is shown in  
301 Figure 2, where we plotted the critical tracing coverage for non-household contacts for  
302 several values of  $R_0$  as a function of the fraction of symptomatic cases (i.e. the fraction of  
303 those who will eventually develop symptoms during their entire infectious period).  
304 Household contacts are assumed to be always traced and isolated. The figure shows that for  
305  $R_0 = 2.5$  control is not possible with isolation and contact tracing, if less than 60% of all  
306 infected persons develop symptoms or are otherwise not detected by the health care

307 system, even if all other parameters are at the most optimistic values. Other interventions  
308 measures such as social distancing are then needed for containment of the outbreak.

309

310

### 311 **Social distancing and contact tracing**

312 Social distancing in theory can reduce the effective reproduction number to below 1, but  
313 only if non-household contacts are almost reduced to zero. In reality this is not possible,  
314 because there are many non-household contacts which cannot be avoided to keep essential  
315 processes in society going. Therefore social distancing will not be complete and may not be  
316 sufficient for containment. Additional tracing and isolation of household contacts may then  
317 be the additional effort needed to achieve containment. In figure 3a we show for various  
318 levels of social distancing, expressed as proportion reduction of non-household contacts,  
319 what fraction of household- or additionally non-household contacts need to be traced and  
320 isolated to reduce the effective reproduction number. Similarly, figure 3b shows the  
321 increase of the doubling time that can be achieved with these contact tracing measures  
322 depending on level of social distancing. Figure 4a shows for various values of  $R_0$ , what are  
323 the critical tracing coverages of household contacts only in order to reach an effective  
324 reproduction number of 1, which is the threshold to containment. If tracing household  
325 contacts is not sufficient, also non-household contacts have to be traced and isolated, for  
326 which the critical coverages are shown in figure 4b. For example, if social distancing leads to  
327 a reduction of 50% of non-household contacts, additional tracing and isolating household  
328 contacts can further reduce the effective reproduction number, but cannot achieve



329 containment. If then also 20% of non-household contacts can be traced and isolated, the  
330 transition to containment can be made.

331

## 332 Discussion

333 Our analyses show that rapid diagnosis and isolation of infections based on COVID-19  
334 disease alone cannot control outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2, but that the addition of tracing and  
335 isolation of traced cases could in theory be successful depending on the value of  $R_0$   
336 (Figure 2). In practice, however, the potential for containment will be seriously jeopardized  
337 by various delays and imperfections in the tracing process. Especially delays in diagnosis and  
338 isolation, and the existence of asymptomatic and mild infections that contribute to onward  
339 transmission will make an outbreak uncontrollable. As evidence is mounting that the  
340 proportion of asymptomatic and mild cases is large and leads to substantial numbers of  
341 unascertained cases [22], most countries have now switched to strategies of social  
342 distancing or complete lockdowns. Such measures have proven effective earlier during the  
343 2009 influenza pandemic [23, 24]. However, social distancing can never be complete, as  
344 healthcare workers and doctors have to continue their work, but also personnel of  
345 supermarkets, public transport employees, and others need to have contact outside their  
346 households. Therefore, transmission chains may remain. We find that in a situation where  
347 60% of cases are ascertained, social distancing of non-household contacts fails to contain  
348 the epidemic even if contacts outside the household are reduced by 80%. In that case,  
349 combining the social distancing with tracing and isolation of household contacts may suffice  
350 to bring the balance towards containment. If social distancing is less severe, more intensive  
351 contact tracing and also tracing of non-household contacts is needed (Figures 3 and 4). If

352 social distancing reduces non-household contacts only by 50%, tracing and isolation also of  
353 non-household contacts is needed for containment. If this is not possible, for example due  
354 to constraints of the public health system, tracing and isolation of household contacts can at  
355 least substantially increase the doubling time of the epidemic (Figure 3b).

356

357 In the recent report by Ferguson and colleagues ([https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/news--wuhan-coronavirus/)  
358 [infectious-disease-analysis/news--wuhan-coronavirus/](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/news--wuhan-coronavirus/)) it is assumed that non-household  
359 contacts would be reduced by 75% by social distancing [25], and a contact study in the UK  
360 shows that numbers of contacts are reduced by around 73% [21]. Using these estimates, our  
361 model predicts that additional tracing and isolation of infected household contacts would  
362 suffice as an additional measure to achieve containment. Possibly, this could be achieved by  
363 using digital tracing applications as implemented in South Korea, where it has apparently  
364 helped to bring the epidemic under control [3].

365

366 Even though the pandemic situation shows that COVID-19 epidemics cannot be contained by  
367 contact tracing and rapid isolation alone, this does not render contact tracing useless. On  
368 the contrary, contact tracing and isolation when used in addition to social distancing, may be  
369 the tool needed to make this mix of strategies successful. Our analyses show that isolation  
370 and contact tracing when combined with social distancing can contribute to reducing the  
371 growth rate and increasing the doubling time of epidemics, thereby buying time, spreading  
372 the number of severe cases out over a longer period of time, and potentially also reducing  
373 the total number of infections (the “final size”) [26]. This will lower peak healthcare demand,  
374 alleviate the stress on healthcare systems, and contribute to reducing the burden of disease.

375

376 Our analyses of contact tracing add to an earlier study by a more systematic analysis of the  
377 relation between key parameters (transmissibility, fraction asymptomatic, fraction of  
378 contacts traced, diagnosis delays), and by incorporating household versus non-household  
379 contacts [27]. Household contacts are at a higher risk of becoming infected than non-  
380 household contacts as persons in a household will usually have repeated contacts. On the  
381 other hand, our analyses show that household infections contribute less to onward  
382 transmission than non-household infections simply because the numbers of household  
383 contacts are much lower than numbers of other contacts. As a consequence, the  
384 effectiveness in isolating non-household contacts is key for a successful contact tracing  
385 strategy.

386

387 A strength of the model is that quantitative information about distributions of the latent and  
388 infectious periods, and the infectivity per day of the infectious period can be incorporated  
389 easily and detailed, such that if new and better data on those quantities emerge, the  
390 analysis can be updated quickly. In particular, the model can incorporate non-standard  
391 distributions based on empirical data (e.g. viral load measurements to quantify  
392 infectiousness per day), should they become available.

393

394 A limitation of the analyses presented here is that they apply to a situation in which the  
395 epidemic is described by a branching process and is growing exponentially. This also applies  
396 to another modelling using a (one-type) branching process.[27] Ultimately, as the number of  
397 persons who are or have been infected increases, the number of persons that are still

398 susceptible will start to dwindle, and epidemic growth will ultimately come to a halt. Hence,  
399 strictly speaking our results apply to the early stages of an epidemic. In fact, even when the  
400 number of infected persons is still relatively small in the early stage of an epidemic it is  
401 possible that exponential growth is not observed, for instance due to local depletion of  
402 susceptible persons in combination with clustering in contact patterns, spatial effects, and  
403 inhomogeneous mixing [28]. However, estimates of the effective reproduction number are  
404 independent of the dynamics and give information about the ability of an intervention to  
405 stop or slow down epidemic spread. Also, at present the epidemics in many countries are  
406 still growing exponentially [19].

407

408 In conclusion, our results show that in populations where social distancing is implemented,  
409 isolation and contact tracing can play an essential role in gaining control of the COVID-19  
410 epidemic. On their own, none of these strategies are able to contain COVID-19 for realistic  
411 parameter settings, but in a combined strategy they can just tip the balance towards  
412 containment. These insights provide guidance for policy makers, who will have to decide  
413 when and how to release severe lockdown or social distancing measures, and whether  
414 additional contact tracing and isolation is then a feasible alternative to keep a resurging  
415 epidemic at bay.

416

#### 417 **Contributors**

418 MEK, MvB, and GR conceived the study. MK designed and programmed the model, and  
419 produced output. All authors interpreted the results, contributed to writing the manuscript,  
420 and approved the final version for submission.

421

422 **Declaration of interests**

423 We declare no competing interests.

424

425

426 **Tables**

427 **Table 1: Disease and transmission related parameters.**

Parameter	Distribution/values	Reference
<b>Latent period</b>	1-3 days	[29]
<b>Infectious period</b>	10 days	[29]
<b>Incubation period</b>	Weibull(3.0, 7.2) mean: 6.4 (day) sd: 2.3 (day)	[10]
<b>Number of household contacts</b>	Poisson(2.15) mean: 2.15 (day <sup>-1</sup> )	<a href="https://www.statista.com/statistics/521777/netherlands-average-household-size-by-number-of-residents/">https://www.statista.com/statistics/521777/netherlands-average-household-size-by-number-of-residents/</a>
<b>Number of non-household contacts</b>	NB(2, 0.15)* mean: 11.3 (day <sup>-1</sup> ) sd: 8.7 (day <sup>-1</sup> )	[20]
<b>Reduction factor of transmissibility for non-household contacts</b>	0.25	[30]
<b>Transmission probability per contact</b>		calibrated such that $R_0=2.5$

428

429

430

431

432 Table 2: Parameters related to diagnosis and contact tracing.

Parameter	Value/range	Reference
Delay until diagnosis of index case	Baseline: 1 day; varied from 1 to 10 days	[13] [31]
Time needed to find household contacts	Baseline: 1 day	
Time needed to find other contacts	Baseline: 1 day; varied from 1 to 7 days	[32] [33]
Percentage of household contacts isolated	Baseline: 100%; not varied in this analysis	
Proportion of other contacts isolated	Varied from 0% to 100%	
Percentage symptomatic (also interpretable as ascertainment rate)	Baseline: 100%; varied from 1.5% to 100%	
Percentage reduction contact rate outside the household	Baseline: 0%; varied from 0% to 95%	

433

434

## 435 References

- 436 1. Bernard Stoecklin S, Rolland P, Silue Y, Mailles A, Campese C, Simondon A, et al. First cases of  
437 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in France: surveillance, investigations and control measures,  
438 January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(6). Epub 2020/02/20. doi: 10.2807/1560-  
439 7917.ES.2020.25.6.2000094. PubMed PMID: 32070465.
- 440 2. Anderson RM, Heesterbeek H, Klinkenberg D, Hollingsworth TD. How will country-based  
441 mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *The Lancet.*  
442 2020;395(10228):931-4. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30567-5.
- 443 3. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2  
444 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science.* 2020:eabb6936. doi:  
445 10.1126/science.abb6936.
- 446 4. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation Period of  
447 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and  
448 Application. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020. Epub 2020/03/10. doi: 10.7326/M20-0504. PubMed PMID:  
449 32150748.
- 450 5. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, Ng T-C, Huang W-T, Lin H-H. High transmissibility of COVID-19 near  
451 symptom onset. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.03.18.20034561. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.18.20034561.
- 452 6. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, Ferguson NM. Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak  
453 controllable. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2004;101(16):6146-51. Epub 2004/04/09. doi:  
454 10.1073/pnas.0307506101. PubMed PMID: 15071187; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC395937.
- 455 7. Klinkenberg D, Fraser C, Heesterbeek H. The effectiveness of contact tracing in emerging  
456 epidemics. *PLoS One.* 2006;1:e12. Epub 2006/12/22. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0000012.  
457 PubMed PMID: 17183638; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1762362.
- 458 8. Kretzschmar M, van den Hof S, Wallinga J, van Wijngaarden J. Ring vaccination and smallpox  
459 control. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2004;10(5):832-41. Epub 2004/06/18. doi: 10.3201/eid1005.030419.  
460 PubMed PMID: 15200816; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3323203.
- 461 9. Muller J, Kretzschmar M, Dietz K. Contact tracing in stochastic and deterministic epidemic models.  
462 *Math Biosci.* 2000;164(1):39-64. Epub 2000/03/08. doi: 10.1016/S0025-5564(99)00061-9.  
463 PubMed PMID: 10704637.
- 464 10. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)  
465 infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(5).  
466 Epub 2020/02/13. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062. PubMed PMID: 32046819.
- 467 11. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of  
468 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet.*  
469 2020;395(10223):507-13. Epub 2020/02/03. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7. PubMed  
470 PMID: 32007143.
- 471 12. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019  
472 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet.* 2020;395(10223):497-506. Epub 2020/01/28. doi:  
473 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5. PubMed PMID: 31986264.
- 474 13. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China,  
475 of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med.* 2020. Epub 2020/01/30. doi:  
476 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316. PubMed PMID: 31995857.
- 477 14. Riou J, Althaus CL. Pattern of early human-to-human transmission of Wuhan 2019 novel  
478 coronavirus (2019-nCoV), December 2019 to January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(4). Epub  
479 2020/02/06. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.4.2000058. PubMed PMID: 32019669; PubMed  
480 Central PMCID: PMCPMC7001239.
- 481 15. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, et al. Transmission of 2019-  
482 nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. *N Engl J Med.* 2020. Epub  
483 2020/02/01. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2001468. PubMed PMID: 32003551.



- 484 16. Tang B, Wang X, Li Q, Bragazzi NL, Tang S, Xiao Y, et al. Estimation of the Transmission Risk of the  
485 2019-nCoV and Its Implication for Public Health Interventions. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(2). Epub  
486 2020/02/13. doi: 10.3390/jcm9020462. PubMed PMID: 32046137.
- 487 17. Keeling MJ, Hollingsworth TD, Read JM. The Efficacy of Contact Tracing for the Containment of  
488 the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19). *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.02.14.20023036. doi:  
489 10.1101/2020.02.14.20023036.
- 490 18. Dodd PJ, White PJ, Garnett GP. Notions of synergy for combinations of interventions against  
491 infectious diseases in heterogeneously mixing populations. *Mathematical biosciences*.  
492 2010;227(2):94-104. Epub 2010/07/01. doi: 10.1016/j.mbs.2010.06.004. PubMed PMID:  
493 20600157.
- 494 19. Our world in data. 2020 [1 April 2020]. Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus>
- 495 20. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts and mixing  
496 patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5(3):e74. Epub  
497 2008/03/28. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074. PubMed PMID: 18366252; PubMed Central  
498 PMCID: PMCPMC2270306.
- 499 21. Jarvis CI, van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Prem K, Klepac P, Rubin GJ, et al. Quantifying the impact of  
500 physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *CMMID Repository* 2020.
- 501 22. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates  
502 the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2). *Science*. 2020:eabb3221. doi:  
503 10.1126/science.abb3221.
- 504 23. Cauchemez S, Ferguson NM, Wachtel C, Tegnell A, Saour G, Duncan B, et al. Closure of schools  
505 during an influenza pandemic. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2009;9(8):473-81. Epub 2009/07/25. doi:  
506 10.1016/S1473-3099(09)70176-8. PubMed PMID: 19628172.
- 507 24. Te Beest DE, Birrell PJ, Wallinga J, De Angelis D, van Boven M. Joint modelling of serological and  
508 hospitalization data reveals that high levels of pre-existing immunity and school holidays shaped  
509 the influenza A pandemic of 2009 in the Netherlands. *J R Soc Interface*. 2015;12(103). Epub  
510 2014/12/30. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2014.1244. PubMed PMID: 25540241; PubMed Central PMCID:  
511 PMCPMC4305427.
- 512 25. Mahase E. Covid-19: UK starts social distancing after new model points to 260 000 potential  
513 deaths. *BMJ*. 2020;368:m1089. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1089.
- 514 26. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek H, Britton T. *Mathematical Tools for Understanding Infectious Disease  
515 Dynamics*: Princeton University Press; 2013.
- 516 27. Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, Bosse NI, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, et al. Feasibility of controlling  
517 COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2020. Epub  
518 2020/03/03. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30074-7. PubMed PMID: 32119825.
- 519 28. Chowell G, Viboud C, Simonsen L, Moghadas SM. Characterizing the reproduction number of  
520 epidemics with early subexponential growth dynamics. *J R Soc Interface*. 2016;13(123). Epub  
521 2016/10/07. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2016.0659. PubMed PMID: 27707909; PubMed Central PMCID:  
522 PMCPMC5095223.
- 523 29. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and Transmission of COVID-19 in  
524 Shenzhen China: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. *medRxiv*.  
525 2020:2020.03.03.20028423. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.03.20028423.
- 526 30. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KK, Chu H, Yang J, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated  
527 with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family  
528 cluster. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):514-23. Epub 2020/01/28. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30154-  
529 9. PubMed PMID: 31986261.
- 530 31. Donnelly CA, Ghani AC, Leung GM, Hedley AJ, Fraser C, Riley S, et al. Epidemiological  
531 determinants of spread of causal agent of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong.  
532 *Lancet*. 2003;361(9371):1761-6. Epub 2003/06/05. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(03)13410-1.  
533 PubMed PMID: 12781533.
- 534 32. Baker MG, Thornley CN, Mills C, Roberts S, Perera S, Peters J, et al. Transmission of pandemic  
535 A/H1N1 2009 influenza on passenger aircraft: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c2424.

536 Epub 2010/05/25. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c2424. PubMed PMID: 20495017; PubMed Central PMCID:  
537 PMCPMC2874661.  
538 33.Swaan CM, Appels R, Kretzschmar ME, van Steenberg JE. Timeliness of contact tracing among  
539 flight passengers for influenza A/H1N1 2009. BMC Infect Dis. 2011;11:355. Epub 2011/12/30. doi:  
540 10.1186/1471-2334-11-355. PubMed PMID: 22204494; PubMed Central PMCID:  
541 PMCPMC3265549.  
542

## 543 Figure legends

544 Figure 1: The cumulative number of cases in an outbreak shown from the time when the  
545 number of cases exceeds 100. In (A) the mean and standard deviation of 20 simulation runs  
546 is shown for a situation where up to day 28 after the first case was diagnosed, only diagnosis  
547 and case isolation is implemented. At day 28 after diagnosis of the first case (arrow) social  
548 distancing was implemented, which reduced the number of non-household contacts by 70%.  
549 In (B) simulations are shown with varying levels of social distancing (contact reductions of  
550 0%, 30%, 50%, 70%, 80%, 90%; colors from brown to red). In (C) social distancing is  
551 implemented at the level of 70% reduction at different times after the diagnosis of the first  
552 case (2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 weeks, see arrows). In (D) a scenario is shown (red dotted line) with  
553 implementation of social distancing at a contact reduction of 70% (red arrow) at day 28;  
554 additional contact tracing and isolation and quarantine of contacts starts at day 49 (orange  
555 arrow) after diagnosis of the first case. We contrast this scenario with data from outbreaks  
556 in several countries that have implemented social distancing at various levels and times  
557 during the outbreak.

558

559 Figure 2: The critical tracing coverage needed for control of the outbreak for varying  
560 percentages of asymptomatic infections and values of  $R_0$  between 1.5 and 3.5. If more than  
561 40% of cases escape diagnosis because they are asymptomatic or have only mild infections,  
562 for  $R_0 = 2.5$  the outbreak is not controllable even with our optimistic baseline values for the  
563 intervention parameters.

564

565 Figure 3: The additional impact of isolation and contact tracing in a population where social  
566 distancing is practiced on (A) the exponential growth rate and (B) the doubling time of the  
567 epidemic. The additional impact of tracing and isolating household contacts only is shown in  
568 the curves from green to yellow (tracing coverage varying from 0% to 100%). If 100% of  
569 household contacts are traced and isolated, additional benefit is gained with tracing also  
570 non-household contact with increasing tracing coverage shown colored blue to pink (varying  
571 from 0% to 100%). In these computations we assumed that 60% of cases are ascertained  
572 and  $R_0=2.5$ .


573

574 Figure 4: The critical tracing coverages required for containment in a population with social  
575 distancing. In (A) the critical tracing coverage is shown if only household contacts are traced  
576 and isolated. In (B) the tracing of household contacts is assumed to be 100% and the curves  
577 show the additional tracing of non-household contacts needed to achieve containment.  
578 Again 60% of cases are assumed to be ascertained and tracing coverages are shown for  
579 various values of  $R_0$ .

580


581 Figure 1

582



583

584




585

586


587

588



589

590




591

592

593

594

595 Figure 2




596

597

598

599

600 Figure 3




601

602

603



604 Figure 4



605

606

607