medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Prevent the resurgence of infectious disease with asymptomatic carriers

Zhechun Zhang (zhechunzhang@fas.harvard.edu)

Quantitative Biology Initiative, Harvard University, 52 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA

Abstract

As many countries reached the peak of the COVID-19 outbreak, there is debate on how to reopen the economy without causing a significant resurgence. Here we show, using a microsimulation model, that how to reopen safely depends on what percentage of COVID-19 cases can be detected by testing. The higher the detection rate, the less restrictive the reopen plan needs to be. If 70% of cases can be detected, schools and businesses can reopen if 2-layer quarantine is imposed on each confirmed case. Our results suggest that increasing the detection rate is essential to prevent the resurgence of COVID-19.

As of April 12, 2020, COVID-19 has spread to more than 170 countries on six continents. As many countries are approaching or past peak, resurgence prevention has become the next important task. The task is challenging due to asymptomatic carriers, which can transmit the disease without being detected. Approximately 25% of COVID-19 cases are asymptomatic[1]. How to prevent the resurgence of such an infectious disease is an open and urgent question.

To address this question, we developed a microsimulation model[2,3] assuming only a portion of cases is detected by testing. Disease carrier is infectious between days 5 and 14 post-infection[4,5] (Fig. S1). After day 7, some carriers are detected by testing (Fig. S1), which results in the quarantine of these carriers and their close contacts. We applied this model to a hypothetical region similar to Massachusetts. There are 6.8 million residents (0.4 million 4-and-under, 1.6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

million K-12 and college students, 3.9 million employees, and 0.9 million retirees), 2.3 million households, and 210,000 employers (Fig. S2). The model has a timeline similar to the COVID-19 outbreak in Massachusetts (Fig. S3). Patient 0 was introduced on February 26 at a company conference; K-12 schools and colleges were closed on March 14; non-essential works were shut down on March 22.

To test this model, we first compared the number of simulated cases to reported cases. Because the latter depends on testing availability and turnaround time, it sets a lower bound of actual cases approximately one week before the report date (Fig. S4). Reported death, in comparison, provides a more realistic estimate of actual cases 1-2 weeks before the report date (Fig. S5). Here we assumed the death rate is ~1% as reported in Korea, where extensive testing started early in the outbreak. Third, our model predicts a peak date of reported cases on April 24 (Fig. S6). In comparison, the University of Washington model (covid19.healthdata.org) predicts a peak date of resource use on April 28 (Fig. S7). Fourth, our model predicts a total death of 9,106 by August 5th, 11% more than the University of Washington model (Fig. S7). Fifth, our model predicts a serial interval of 5.04 +/- 0.04 days, consistent with the reported interval of 4.4-7.5 days[4]. Last, our model predicts a reproduction number of 5.96 +/- 0.18. This number is higher than SARS[6,7] and the COVID-19 estimate[4] based on the early outbreak in Wuhan, where testing was limited. Therefore, we modeled a disease that is more infectious than SARS.

According to the model, the safe reopen plan depends on the detection rate. If 70% of cases can be detected, all restrictions can be lifted (Fig. 1a) as long as 2-layer quarantine is in place (Fig. 1b). 2-layer means not only the confirmed carrier and its close contacts, but their workplace,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

schools, homes, and communities, need to be quarantined (Fig. 1c). This additional layer leads to 950 +/- 69 quarantines per confirmed case. Nevertheless, at any given time, only a small percentage of the total population is under quarantine (Fig. S8).



Figure 1. Abundant tests and 2-layer quarantine prevent the resurgence of an infectious disease with asymptomatic carriers. a, Daily cases if work, school, and community reopen (top), if work and school reopen, but not community (mid), and if businesses with less than 2000 employees reopen (bottom). Color denotes the testing capacity measured by the percentage of cases detected. Error bars denote S.E.M (n=20). **b**, Daily cases after reopening of work, school, and community. Color denotes the number of quarantine layers implemented. **c**, Schematics of quarantine layers. Red arrows indicate disease transmission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

2-layer quarantine is necessary to prevent a resurgence (Fig. 1b). In general, the number of layers required is determined by two timescales: τ_i, the time when the patient becomes infectious, and τ_q, the time when quarantine starts. It may take 4-5 days (τ_i) for a patient to become infectious[4] and another 4-5 days for the test to come back positive and for public health officials to reach close contacts. At the time quarantine starts (τ_q), the disease could have spread from the first layer of contacts to the next layer (Fig. 1c).

If 60% of cases can be detected, schools and businesses can reopen, but community contacts need to be restricted (Fig. 1a). Community activities outside schools, work, and home account for ~30% of total daily contacts[8] (Fig. S3).

If 30% of cases can be detected, in addition to restricting community activities, schools and large businesses (>2000 employees in our model) need to remain in remote mode (Fig. 1a). Due to their large size, schools and large businesses are hot spots for disease transmission. Compared to the rest of the population, students are 66% +/- 12% more likely to transmit the disease. Employees of large businesses, 94% +/- 5%. According to the model, had schools, large businesses, and community activities been shut down on March 3, the outbreak in Massachusetts would be limited to 3220 +/- 650 people and peaked by March 31 (Fig. S9).

The resurgence of infectious disease has significant impacts on public health and the economy. Our model shows for diseases with asymptomatic carriers, the reopen plan needs to be developed based on the estimated detection rate. At the initial stage of reopening, it is safer to assume only a small percentage of cases (~30% or less) are detected. In order to increase the detection rate, it

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

may be necessary to test all symptomatic patients and potential contacts of confirmed cases, and routinely screen high-risk sub-populations. 100,000 COVID-19 tests a day cost $5million[9], which is only 0.3% of daily GDP in Massachusetts[10]. Therefore, dramatically expanding COVID-19 tests is a small investment with a high return.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S1. The infectious window and the detection window of the infectious disease with asymptomatic carriers.



Figure S2. A microsimulation model applied to a region similar to Massachusetts. The percentage of close contacts in work/school, home, and community is consistent with a recent survey of daily contacts in European countries.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S3. The timeline of COVID-19 responses in Massachusetts



Figure S4. Cumulative cases as a function of time predicted by the simulation (black) and the number of COVID-19 cases reported by the Massachusetts department of public health (light grey). Dark grey dots indicate the number of reported cases but shifted by 7 days. Error bars denote S.E.M (n=20).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S5. Cumulative cases as a function of time predicted by the simulation (black) and the number of COVID-19 related deaths reported by the Massachusetts department of public health (light grey). Here the comparison is made on dates on which cumulative deaths are greater than 100. Dark grey dots indicate the number of reported deaths divided by an estimated death rate of 1% but shifted by 11 days. Error bars denote S.E.M (n=20).



Figure S6. Daily cases as a function of time predicted by the simulation. The simulation predicts that the number of reported cases will peak on April 24, after an adjustment of 7 days to account the time between initial infection and test confirmation. Error bars denote S.E.M (n=20).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S7. The University of Washington prediction of medical resources needed and total deaths. The model predicts a peak date of April 28 for medical resources and 8,219 deaths by August 4.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S8. The percentage of the Massachusetts population under quarantine after reopening. Error bars denote S.E.M (n=20).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S9. Cumulative and daily cases as a function of time in simulations in which schools, large businesses, and community activities shut down on March 14 (top) and March 3 (bottom). Error bars denote S.E.M (n=20).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067652; this version posted April 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

1. CDC. Percentage of asymptomatic cases. 2020.
2. Halloran ME, Ferguson NM, Eubank S, et al. Modeling targeted layered containment of an influenza pandemic in the United States. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2008;105:4639-44.
3. Team ICC-R. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. 2020.
4. Anderson RM, Heesterbeek H, Klinkenberg D, Hollingsworth TD. How will country-based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? Lancet 2020;395:931-4.
5. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. N Engl J Med 2020;382:1177-9.
6. Donnelly CA, Ghani AC, Leung GM, et al. Epidemiological determinants of spread of causal agent of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. Lancet 2003;361:1761-6.
7. Lipsitch M, Cohen T, Cooper B, et al. Transmission dynamics and control of severe acute respiratory syndrome. Science 2003;300:1966-70.
8. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. PLoS Med 2008;5:e74.
9. CMS.gov. Medicare Administrative Contractor (MAC) COVID-19 Test Pricing. 2020.
10. fred.stlouisfed.org. Total Gross Domestic Product for Massachusetts. 2020.