Frequency of routine testing for COVID-19 in high-risk environments to reduce workplace outbreaks

Elizabeth T Chin BS[1†], Benjamin Q Huynh BS[1†], Matthew Murrill MD PhD[2], Sanjay Basu MD PhD[3,4,5], and Nathan C Lo MD PhD[2]

1 Department of Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
2 Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA
3 Center for Primary Care, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA
4 Research and Population Health, Collective Health, San Francisco, CA, USA
5 School of Public Health, Imperial College, London, UK

† Co-first author

Abstract:

Shelter-in-place policies have been considered effective in mitigating the transmission of the virus SARS-CoV-2. To end such policies, routine testing and self-quarantine of those testing positive for active infection have been proposed, yet it remains unclear how often routine testing would need to be performed among workers returning to workplaces, and how effective this strategy would be to meaningfully prevent continued transmission of the virus. We simulated SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain reaction testing to estimate the frequency of testing needed to avert continued epidemic propagation as shelter-in-place orders are relaxed. We find that testing strategies less frequent than daily (e.g. weekly testing or testing once prior to returning to work) are unlikely to prevent workforce outbreaks without additional interventions. Even given unlimited testing capacity, the impact of frequent testing may not be sufficient to reliably relax shelter-in-place policies without risking continued epidemic propagation, unless other measures are instituted to complement testing and self-isolation.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, infection control, epidemiology, pandemic
Main Text Word Count: 734
Submission date: 4/28/20
Revision date: 6/8/20

Correspondence:
Nathan C. Lo, MD PhD
Department of Medicine
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94110 USA
nathan.lo@ucsf.edu

Background: Shelter-in-place policies have been considered effective in mitigating the transmission of SARS-CoV-2, the causative virus of COVID-19.[1,2] As such policies end, routine testing in high-risk environments (e.g. hospitals, nursing facilities, essential workers) have been proposed to prevent workplace outbreaks. Yet it remains unclear how often routine testing would need to be performed in high-risk workplaces, and how effective such a strategy would be to prevent workplace outbreaks.

Objective: To estimate the effectiveness of routine testing with SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) to reduce workplace transmission of COVID-19.

Methods and Findings: We developed a simulation model that included health states of susceptible to infection (non-immune), exposed to SARS-CoV-2, infectious, or recovered (immune). We used the latest available data on the natural history of SARS-CoV-2, including the duration of incubation period, relative infectiousness during pre-symptomatic and early infection stages, and 40% proportion of sub-clinical cases (see Appendix). We modeled an infectious outbreak within a community with a basic reproductive number (R_0) of 2.4, corresponding to the number of secondary infections caused by an infected person in an entirely susceptible population.[2,3] Workplace transmissions occurred with infectious contacts with the community and within the workforce. We used data on the sensitivity and specificity of PCR testing, as a function of day of infection given known time-varying sensitivity of this test modality.[4] We evaluated routine PCR testing of various frequencies, from daily to once monthly testing. We estimated the projected reduction in the number of infectious working days for an infected employee, the primary outcome of this study. We assumed that persons self-isolated upon symptom onset, and persons with PCR-confirmed infection self-isolated one day after detection, while those that were not detected continued to work and potentially infect others. We estimated the effect of testing on the effective reproductive number (R_e), while the testing program was in place. Monte Carlo sampling across the uncertainty ranges of each parameter was completed to estimate the range of possible outcomes (see Appendix). The code and data are available online (see Appendix).

If workers are tested daily by PCR, we estimated a 59.8-64.5% reduction in the number of infectious days worked. By contrast, when testing each worker every three days, we observed a 37.7-41.7% reduction; when testing weekly, we observed a 19.8-23.8% reduction; and when testing monthly, we observed a 2.8-7.4% reduction (Figure 1).

In our simulations, the optimal testing frequency and effective reproduction number (R_e) were sensitive to changes in the basic reproduction number (R_0, secondary infections caused by an infectious person without any testing or intervention in place), the true value of which remains unclear (Figure 2). If the workplace $R_0 = 2$,[2,3] workers would have to be tested at least every two days to prevent an outbreak amongst the workforce (to reach $R_e < 1$), unless other measures were added to testing and self-isolation. If assuming $R_0 = 2.5$,[2,3] workers would have to be tested every day. Conversely, if other interventions bring $R_0 = 1.5$, testing every 3-4 days (twice weekly) would suffice (see Appendix).

Discussion: Our findings imply that in high-risk settings with ongoing community-based transmission, daily PCR testing followed by self-isolation would likely be required to prevent workplace outbreaks if implemented without additional interventions. Due to the imperfect sensitivity of PCR testing, even with frequent testing, a meaningful proportion of infected persons may be missed. We find that strategies with less frequent testing - such as weekly testing or testing once prior to returning to work - would have insufficient reduction in number of infectious days.

The study has limitations in the model assumptions and available data. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is documented to have high degree of heterogeneity across settings, whereas we used a transmission rate that considered an average among high-incidence settings such as nursing homes. Our model focuses on outbreaks amongst the workforce in contained high-risk environments, rather than the population at large; it thus assumes workplaces do not provide this level of routine testing to non-workers (e.g. patients, customers). Furthermore, routine PCR testing would require substantial resources, logistical support, and high participation from the population.[5]

In conclusion, these findings support that routine testing strategies can provide benefit to reduce transmission in high-risk environments with frequent testing but may require complementary strategies to reliably prevent resurgence of case counts to relax shelter-in-place policies. Further evidence should be generated on the use of strategies in combination with testing, including masking, ventilation changes, disinfection, and physical distancing.

Figures



Figure 1: Projected effectiveness of routine PCR testing frequency on reduction on transmission for high risk workers. The x-axis refers to the frequency of PCR testing simulation from daily (testing frequency of 1 day) to once a month (testing frequency of 30 days). The y-axis represents the reduction in total number of infectious days attributable to each testing strategy. We estimate 40% of cases to be sub-clinical. Error bars represent the interquartile range of projected reduction, varying sensitivity and specificity of the PCR test and assumptions on natural history of transmission.



Figure 2: Projected effective reproduction number in a susceptible workplace under different testing scenarios. We estimated the effectiveness of increasing frequency of routine PCR testing to reduce the effective reproductive number, under various assumption on the true underlying basic reproductive number. The x-axis refers to the frequency of PCR testing simulation from daily (testing frequency of 1 day) to once a month (testing frequency of 30 days). The y-axis represents the effective reproductive number (R_e), which is the average number of people infected by the average person with SARS-CoV-2. The goal is to reduce the effective reproductive number below one to prevent ongoing transmission. Bounds represent the interquartile range.

Contributions
E.T.C, N.C.L, and B.Q.H coded the simulation and analysis. S.B. and N.C.L. supervised the study. All authors contributed to study design, interpretation of results, and writing of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments
E.T.C acknowledges support by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE 1656518. NCL is supported by the University of California, San Francisco. B.Q.H acknowledges support by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE 1656518 and the National Library of Medicine under Training Grant T15 LM 007033. Funding sources had no role in the writing of this correspondence or the decision to submit for publication.

Declaration of interests
SB serves on the City of San Francisco's Department of Public Health street outreach team for homeless adults affected by COVID-19, as a provider at the HealthRight360 Integrated Care Center, and as an employee of Collective Health, all of which provide COVID-19 testing. The views expressed here reflect the opinions of the authors and not necessarily those of affiliated organizations.

References
1. Courtemanche C, Garuccio J, Le A, Pinkston J, Yelowitz A. Strong Social Distancing Measures In The United States Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2020:101377hlthaff202000608.
2. Koo JR, Cook AR, Park M, et al. Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore: a modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020.
3. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(5):672-675.
4. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020.
5. Lewnard JA, Lo NC. Scientific and ethical basis for social-distancing interventions against COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020.

Technical Appendix

Methods

We developed a microsimulation model to estimate the reduction in infectious workdays over a range of frequencies of routine PCR testing strategies. We developed a susceptible-exposed-infectious-recovered (SEIR)-like model in which workers interact with an age-structured community population (representing patients, customers, etc.) as well as among themselves. We simulated PCR-based testing for each individual in a workforce and varied the time intervals for routine PCR testing from daily to monthly. We assumed infectiousness begins in the last two days of the incubation period[2] and workers self-quarantine when receiving a positive test or when symptoms occur, so that transmission between workers occurs only from sub-clinical or early-clinical infectious workers. We also assumed workers take one day to receive results after testing. We probabilistically varied the following parameters: incubation time, early infectious period, late infectious period, test sensitivity, and test specificity.

The model tracked three features of each simulated person: (i) the person's true state of infection (susceptible, exposed, early sub-clinical infection, late sub-clinical infection, early clinical infection, late clinical infection, or recovered) (Figure A1, Table A1); (ii) the observed state of infection based on test results (uninfected, currently infected based on positive PCR, or immune based on observed PCR infection followed by completion of a 14 day self-quarantine period); and (iii) whether the person was at work. Each individual believed to be uninfected in the population is tested at varying intervals. We simulated 100 individuals across 1000 simulations for each parameter setting, with 300 days in each simulation. To calculate the reduction in transmission, we take the mean number of infectious working days, weighted by infectiousness, under a specific testing frequency and divide it by the mean number of weighted infectious working days under no testing.

To estimate R_e in a susceptible workforce, we multiplied R_0 by the reduction in transmission at that time period. The bounds in each Figure represent the interquartile range of effective reproduction over different test frequencies. The model assumes a constant worker population and that workers gain immunity in the short-term after recovery.



Figure A1. Structure of stochastic individual-level model of COVID-19 transmission. The labels of each state correspond with definitions in Table A1. The prob(a,c) refers to the probability of being a clinical or sub-clinical with force of infection lambda.

Table A1: Definition of states in the transmission model

State	Symbol	Infectious	Symptomatic	Virus detectable?	Immune
Susceptible	$\mathcal{S}(t)$	×	×	×	×
Exposed to infection	$\mathcal{E}(t)$	×	×	×	×
Early subclinical infection	$\mathcal{I}_{s,1}(t)$	✓	×	✓	×
Late subclinical infection	$\mathcal{I}_{s,2}(t)$	✓	×	✓	×
Early clinical infection	$\mathcal{I}_{c,1}(t)$	✓	×	✓	×
Late clinical infection	$\mathcal{I}_{c,2}(t)$	✓	✓	✓	×

Table A2: Model parameters and distributions in model

Parameter	Distribution/Value	References
Sensitivity of PCR	Time varying* estimates fit to a truncated normal distribution by day of infection, ~75%	1
Specificity of PCR	98-100% fit to a truncated normal distribution	2-5
Incubation period	5.2 days (95% CI, 4.1-6.4) fit to a truncated normal distribution	6
Early infectious period	2.3 days (95% CI, 0.8–3.0 days) fit to a truncated normal distribution	6
Late infectious period	7 days (IQR, 3-7 days) fit to a truncated normal distribution	6
Proportion sub-clinical	40%	7
Discount factor for late infectious period	50% as early infectious period	6
Discount factor for sub-clinical infectiousness	50% as infectious as symptomatic	8,9

* Sensitivity estimates by day of infection were obtained from Kucirka et al. [1]. Sensitivity estimates during the early infectious period were excluded because sensitivity was fit using the data of only one individual from the Danis et al study. This patient tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 when obtained using nasopharyngeal swabs during the pre-symptomatic phase. Upon symptom onset, the patient had an endotracheal aspirate (ETA) sample test positive; however, the nasopharyngeal swabs of the same day and the following days remained negative. To obtain an optimistic estimate, we took the maximum sensitivity (day 8 after exposure) and applied it to all prior infectious days. We assume that an individual is a true positive starting at the start of the early infectious period.

Table A3: Ranges of mean percent reduction of infectiousness in the workplace.

Testing frequency	Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	Ideal Case
1	62.7% (61,64.5)	61.4% (59.8,63.1)	61.5% (59.9,63.1)	100% (98.3,100)
2	48.7% (46.9,50.5)	48.1% (46.4,49.8)	48% (46.3,49.6)	82.9% (81.2,84.6)
3	39.9% (38,41.7)	39.6% (37.9,41.4)	39.4% (37.7,41.1)	67.4% (65.7,69.2)
4	33.1% (31.2,35.1)	33% (31.2,34.8)	32.9% (31.2,34.7)	56.1% (54.3,57.9)
5	28.4% (26.4,30.4)	28.5% (26.6,30.3)	28.4% (26.6,30.2)	48.4% (46.5,50.3)
7	21.9% (19.8,23.9)	22% (20.1,24)	21.9% (20,23.8)	38.3% (36.3,40.2)
10	15.9% (13.7,18)	15.9% (13.9,17.9)	15.9% (14,17.9)	28% (26,30.1)
15	10.5% (8.3,12.7)	10.6% (8.5,12.7)	10.4% (8.3,12.4)	18.5% (16.3,20.7)
20	7.9% (5.7,10.2)	8.1% (6,10.2)	8.1% (6,10.2)	14.1% (11.9,16.3)
25	6.1% (3.9,8.4)	6.4% (4.3,8.5)	6.3% (4.2,8.4)	11.3% (9.1,13.6)
30	5.1% (2.8,7.4)	5.3% (3.1,7.4)	5.2% (3.1,7.3)	9.3% (7,11.6)

Simulations were stratified for various risk groups (low: $R_0 = 1.5$, medium: $R_0 = 2$, high: $R_0 = 2.5$) under time varying sensitivities with a testing delay of 1 day. The percent reduction under the ideal case was simulated with 100% sensitivity without any testing delays in a low risk population.

Data and code available at: https://github.com/etchin/covid-testing.

Appendix References

1. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med*. Published online May 13, 2020. doi:10.7326/M20-1495
2. Arevalo-Rodriguez, Ingrid, et al. False-negative results of initial RT-PCR assays for COVID-19: A systematic review. preprint. 21 Apr. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.16.20066787.
3. Arima Y, Shimada T, Suzuki M, et al. Early Release - Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection among Returnees to Japan from Wuhan, China, 2020 - Volume 26, Number 7—July 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. doi:10.3201/eid2607.200994
4. Ai T, Yang Z, Hou H, et al. Correlation of Chest CT and RT-PCR Testing in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of 1014 Cases. *Radiology*. Published online February 26, 2020:200642. doi:10.1148/radiol.2020200642
5. Fang, Yicheng, et al. "Sensitivity of Chest CT for COVID-19: Comparison to RT-PCR." Radiology, Feb. 2020, p. 200432. doi:10.1148/radiol.2020200432
6. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(5):672-675. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5
7. Oran DP, Topol EJ. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Ann Intern Med*. Published online June 3, 2020. doi:10.7326/M20-3012
8. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science*. 2020;368(6490):489-493. doi:10.1126/science.abb3221
9. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, et al. *Age-Dependent Effects in the Transmission and Control of COVID-19 Epidemics*. Epidemiology; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.24.20043018