

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

3

4 Mirjam E. Kretzschmar^{1#}, Ganna Rozhnova¹, Michiel van Boven¹

5 ¹Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht,
6 Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

7

8 # corresponding author:

9 Mirjam E. Kretzschmar

10 Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care

11 University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht

12 Email: m.e.e.kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl

13 Phone: +31 88 75 687 61

14 Abstract

15

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

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

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

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

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

43

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

45

46 Research in context

47 **Evidence before this study**

48 As of 8 April 2020, the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has spread to more than 170
49 countries and has caused near 90,000 deaths of COVID-19 worldwide. 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 and quarantining of their
52 contacts. Evidence suggests that a substantial portion of transmission may occur before the
53 onset of symptoms and before cases can be isolated, and that many cases remain
54 unascertained. This has potentially important implications for the prospect of containment
55 by combinations of these measures.

56 **Added value of this study**

57 Using a stochastic transmission model armed with current best estimates of epidemiological
58 parameters, we evaluated under which conditions containment could be achieved with
59 combinations of social distancing, isolation and contact tracing. We investigated the level of
60 social distancing needed for containment, and how an additional implementation of
61 isolation and contact tracing may likely help to in reducing the effective reproduction
62 number to below 1, the critical threshold. We analyzed what proportion of household and
63 non-household contacts need to be isolated effectively to achieve containment depending
64 on the level of social distancing in the population. We estimated the impact of combinations
65 of these measures on epidemic growth rate and doubling time for the number of infections.
66 We find that under realistic assumptions on the level of social distancing, additional isolation
67 and contact tracing are needed for stopping the epidemic. Whether quarantining only

68 household contacts is sufficient, depends on levels of social distancing and timeliness of
69 tracing and isolation.

70 **Implications of all the available evidence**

71 Our analyses based on best understanding of the epidemiology of COVID-19, highlight that
72 if social distancing is not complete, isolation and contact tracing at least of household
73 contacts can help to delay and lower the epidemic peak. High levels of timely contact
74 tracing of household and non-household contacts may be sufficient to control the epidemic.

75 Introduction

76 As of early April 2020, the number of infections of the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) is still
77 increasing at an exponential rate in many countries, while the virus is expanding its range to
78 all parts of the world. There are no registered effective medicines, treatment options are
79 mainly supportive, and there are no vaccines available, limiting preventive measures mainly
80 to social distancing combined with isolation of infected persons and those that have high
81 likelihood of being infected, for instance because they have been traced as contacts of
82 infected persons [1, 2]. However, recently it was questioned by high-ranked officials of the
83 World Health Organization (WHO) whether social distancing or lockdowns are sufficient to
84 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>).
85 Possibly, additional measures are needed, for example active tracing of contacts in
86 combination with isolation of infected contacts. Also, such measures will be important in the
87 context of exit strategies, i.e. once social distancing measures are reduced or lifted, as has
88 been suggested recently [3]. It is unclear, how effective such combinations of interventions
89 can be in populations with social distancing in place.
90

91

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

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

104

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

113

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

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

132

133 Methods

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

149

150 **Natural history**

151 We assume that the latent period lasts between 1 and 3 days. Individuals then become
152 infectious for at most 10 days. Infectivity is high at the beginning of the infectious period
153 and decays to low levels during these 10 days (Figure S1a). The probability of symptoms
154 onset increases during the first 4 days of the infectious period, thereby influencing the daily
155 probability of diagnosis during the infectious period (see below).

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

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

173

174 **Social distancing**

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

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

183

184 **Diagnosis, contact tracing, and isolation**

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

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

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

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

207

208 **Baseline scenario**

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

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

219

220 **Output variables**

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

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

230 The model allows an explicit calculation of the basic reproduction number R_0 and the
231 effective reproduction number R_e [8]. R_0 is defined as the number of secondary cases an
232 index case generates on average in a susceptible population, and R_e is the number of
233 secondary infections per case when an intervention is in place. R_0 is determined by daily
234 transmission probabilities and numbers of contacts. The effective reproduction number is in
235 addition determined by the level of social distancing, diagnosis probabilities, tracing delays,
236 and tracing coverages per day of the infectious period. We can therefore investigate how R_e
237 depends on R_0 and on the intervention parameters.

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

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

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

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

258

259 **Role of the funding source**

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

264

265

266 **Results**

267 **Basic and effective reproduction numbers**

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

270 place among household contacts. The basic reproduction number of household contacts is
271 0.97, and that of non-household contacts 1.53. Hence, if all non-household transmissions
272 could be prevented, the outbreak would be just under the control limit. In the baseline
273 scenario without interventions the exponential growth rate is 0.19 per day and the doubling
274 time is 3.6 days, which agrees with published estimates [13]. For sensitivity analysis of the
275 relation between R_0 and R_e for various combinations of parameters, see the Supplementary
276 Information.

277 **Outbreak doubling times**

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

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

295

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

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

302

303 **Impact of asymptomatic cases**

304 Not being diagnosed can be a consequence of not developing symptoms, having only mild
305 symptoms, or any other reason why infected persons might not be identified by health care.
306 We subsume these possible reasons for cases not being ascertained under the term
307 “asymptomatic”. With increasing proportion of asymptomatic cases, the possibility of
308 controlling the outbreak with contact tracing and isolation quickly fades. This is shown in
309 Figure 2, where we plotted the critical tracing coverage for non-household contacts for
310 several values of R_0 as a function of the fraction of symptomatic cases (i.e. the fraction of
311 those who will eventually develop symptoms during their entire infectious period).
312 Household contacts are assumed to be always traced and isolated. The figure shows that for
313 $R_0 = 2.5$ control is not possible with isolation and contact tracing, if less than 60% of all
314 infected persons develop symptoms or are otherwise not detected by the health care

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

317

318

319 **Social distancing and contact tracing**

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

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

339

340 Discussion

341 Our analyses show that rapid diagnosis and isolation of infections based on COVID-19
342 disease alone cannot control outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2, but that the addition of tracing and
343 isolation of traced cases could in theory be successful depending on the value of R_0
344 (Figure 2). In practice, however, the potential for containment will be seriously jeopardized
345 by various delays and imperfections in the tracing process. Especially delays in diagnosis and
346 isolation, and the existence of asymptomatic and mild infections that contribute to onward
347 transmission will make an outbreak uncontrollable. As evidence is mounting that the
348 proportion of asymptomatic and mild cases is large and leads to substantial numbers of
349 unascertained cases [22], most countries have now switched to strategies of social
350 distancing or complete lockdowns. Such measures have proven effective earlier during the
351 2009 influenza pandemic [23, 24]. However, social distancing can never be complete, as
352 healthcare workers and doctors have to continue their work, but also personnel of
353 supermarkets, public transport employees, and others need to have contact outside their
354 households. Therefore, transmission chains may remain. We find that in a situation where
355 60% of cases are ascertained, social distancing of non-household contacts fails to contain
356 the epidemic even if contacts outside the household are reduced by 80%. In that case,
357 combining the social distancing with tracing and isolation of household contacts may suffice
358 to bring the balance towards containment. If social distancing is less severe, more intensive
359 contact tracing and also tracing of non-household contacts is needed (Figures 3 and 4). If

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

364

365 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/)
366 [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
367 contacts would be reduced by 75% by social distancing [25], and a contact study in the UK
368 shows that numbers of contacts are reduced by around 73% [21]. Using these estimates, our
369 model predicts that additional tracing and isolation of infected household contacts would
370 suffice as an additional measure to achieve containment. Possibly, this could be achieved by
371 using digital tracing applications as implemented in South Korea, where it has apparently
372 helped to bring the epidemic under control [3].

373

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

383

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

394

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

401

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

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

415

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

424

425 **Contributors**

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

429

430 **Declaration of interests**

431 We declare no competing interests.

432

433

434 **Tables**

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

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

436

437

438

439

440 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%	

441

442

443 References

- 444 1. Bernard Stoecklin S, Rolland P, Silue Y, Mailles A, Campese C, Simondon A, et al. First cases of
445 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in France: surveillance, investigations and control measures,
446 January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(6). Epub 2020/02/20. doi: 10.2807/1560-
447 7917.ES.2020.25.6.2000094. PubMed PMID: 32070465.
- 448 2. Anderson RM, Heesterbeek H, Klinkenberg D, Hollingsworth TD. How will country-based
449 mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *The Lancet.*
450 2020;395(10228):931-4. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30567-5.
- 451 3. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2
452 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science.* 2020:eabb6936. doi:
453 10.1126/science.abb6936.
- 454 4. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation Period of
455 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and
456 Application. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020. Epub 2020/03/10. doi: 10.7326/M20-0504. PubMed PMID:
457 32150748.
- 458 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
459 symptom onset. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.03.18.20034561. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.18.20034561.
- 460 6. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, Ferguson NM. Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak
461 controllable. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2004;101(16):6146-51. Epub 2004/04/09. doi:
462 10.1073/pnas.0307506101. PubMed PMID: 15071187; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC395937.
- 463 7. Klinkenberg D, Fraser C, Heesterbeek H. The effectiveness of contact tracing in emerging
464 epidemics. *PLoS One.* 2006;1:e12. Epub 2006/12/22. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0000012.
465 PubMed PMID: 17183638; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1762362.
- 466 8. Kretzschmar M, van den Hof S, Wallinga J, van Wijngaarden J. Ring vaccination and smallpox
467 control. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2004;10(5):832-41. Epub 2004/06/18. doi: 10.3201/eid1005.030419.
468 PubMed PMID: 15200816; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3323203.
- 469 9. Muller J, Kretzschmar M, Dietz K. Contact tracing in stochastic and deterministic epidemic models.
470 *Math Biosci.* 2000;164(1):39-64. Epub 2000/03/08. doi: 10.1016/S0025-5564(99)00061-9.
471 PubMed PMID: 10704637.
- 472 10. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)
473 infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(5).
474 Epub 2020/02/13. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062. PubMed PMID: 32046819.
- 475 11. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of
476 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet.*
477 2020;395(10223):507-13. Epub 2020/02/03. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7. PubMed
478 PMID: 32007143.
- 479 12. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019
480 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet.* 2020;395(10223):497-506. Epub 2020/01/28. doi:
481 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5. PubMed PMID: 31986264.
- 482 13. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China,
483 of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med.* 2020. Epub 2020/01/30. doi:
484 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316. PubMed PMID: 31995857.
- 485 14. Riou J, Althaus CL. Pattern of early human-to-human transmission of Wuhan 2019 novel
486 coronavirus (2019-nCoV), December 2019 to January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(4). Epub
487 2020/02/06. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.4.2000058. PubMed PMID: 32019669; PubMed
488 Central PMCID: PMCPMC7001239.
- 489 15. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, et al. Transmission of 2019-
490 nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. *N Engl J Med.* 2020. Epub
491 2020/02/01. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2001468. PubMed PMID: 32003551.

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

544 Epub 2010/05/25. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c2424. PubMed PMID: 20495017; PubMed Central PMCID:
545 PMCPMC2874661.
546 33.Swaan CM, Appels R, Kretzschmar ME, van Steenberg JE. Timeliness of contact tracing among
547 flight passengers for influenza A/H1N1 2009. BMC Infect Dis. 2011;11:355. Epub 2011/12/30. doi:
548 10.1186/1471-2334-11-355. PubMed PMID: 22204494; PubMed Central PMCID:
549 PMCPMC3265549.
550

551 Figure legends

552 Figure 1: The cumulative number of cases in an outbreak shown from the time when the
553 number of cases exceeds 100. In (A) the mean and standard deviation of 20 simulation runs
554 is shown for a situation where up to day 28 after the first case was diagnosed, only diagnosis
555 and case isolation is implemented. At day 28 after diagnosis of the first case (arrow) social
556 distancing was implemented, which reduced the number of non-household contacts by 70%.
557 The green lines show the doubling times without intervention (3.6 days), with isolation of
558 diagnosed cases (3.9 days), and with social distancing (13.7 days). In (B) simulations are
559 shown with varying levels of social distancing (contact reductions of 0%, 30%, 50%, 70%,
560 80%, 90%; colors from brown to red; gray lines are doubling times). In (C) social distancing is
561 implemented at the level of 70% reduction at different times after the diagnosis of the first
562 case (2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 weeks, see arrows). In (D) a scenario is shown (red dotted line) with
563 implementation of social distancing at a contact reduction of 70% (red arrow) at day 28;
564 additional contact tracing and isolation and quarantine of contacts starts at day 49 (orange
565 arrow) after diagnosis of the first case. We contrast this scenario with data from outbreaks
566 in several countries that have implemented social distancing at various levels and times
567 during the outbreak.

568

569 Figure 2: The critical tracing coverage needed for control of the outbreak for varying
570 percentages of asymptomatic infections and values of R_0 between 1.5 and 3.5. If more than
571 40% of cases escape diagnosis because they are asymptomatic or have only mild infections,
572 for $R_0 = 2.5$ the outbreak is not controllable even with our optimistic baseline values for the
573 intervention parameters.

574

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


583

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

590


591 Figure 1

592



593

594




595

596


597

598



599

600




601

602

603

604

605 Figure 2




606

607

608

609

610 Figure 3




611

612

613

614 Figure 4



615

616

617