medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Managing the risk of a COVID-19 outbreak from border arrivals

20 August 2020

Nicholas Steyn[1,3,4], Michael J. Plank[1,4], Alex James[1,4*], Rachelle N. Binny[2,4], Shaun C. Hendy[3,4], Audrey Lustig[2,4]

1. School of Mathematics and Statistics University of Canterbury, New Zealand.
2. Manaaki Whenua, Lincoln, New Zealand.
3. Department of Physics, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
4. Te Pūnaha Matatini: the Centre for Complex Systems and Networks, New Zealand.

*Corresponding author: alex.james@canterbury.ac.nz

Keywords: stochastic model, infectious disease outbreak, managed isolation and quarantine

Abstract

In an attempt to maintain elimination of COVID-19 in New Zealand, all international arrivals are required to spend 14 days in government-managed quarantine and to return a negative test result before being released. We model the testing, isolation and transmission of COVID-19 within quarantine facilities to estimate the risk of community outbreaks being seeded at the border. We use a simple branching process model for COVID-19 transmission that includes a time-dependent probability of a false negative test result. We show that the combination of 14-day quarantine with two tests reduces the risk of releasing an infectious case to around 0.1% per infected arrival. Shorter quarantine periods, or reliance on testing only with no quarantine, substantially increases this risk. We calculate the fraction of cases detected in the second week of their two week stay and show that this may be a useful indicator of the likelihood of transmission occurring within quarantine facilities. Frontline staff working at the border risk exposure to infected individuals and this has the potential to lead to a community outbreak. We use the model to test surveillance strategies and evaluate the likely size of the outbreak at the time it is first detected. We conclude with some recommendations for managing the risk of potential future outbreaks originating from the border.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

The COVID-19 outbreak originated in Wuhan China in late 2019 before spreading globally to become a pandemic in March 2020 (World Health Organisation, 2020). Many countries experienced widespread community transmission after undetected introductions of the disease. This led to rapid growth of new infections in many countries. New Zealand experienced an outbreak of COVID-19 between March and May 2020, but successfully controlled the epidemic and ultimately eliminated community transmission of the virus for over 100 days (Baker, Wilson, & Anglemyer, 2020; Cousins, 2020). During this time, the country's border remained closed everyone except citizens and residents, with a mandatory 14-day period of government-managed quarantine for all international arrivals. Countries such as Iceland, Taiwan, Vietnam and some states of Australia have reduced cases to very low numbers and are managing the virus with a combination of border controls and domestic restrictions. Other countries managing ongoing epidemics, including several European countries, also use border controls including quarantine to reduce the number of imported cases.

The goal of quarantining international arrivals differs depending on a country's strategy for managing COVID-19. For countries with ongoing epidemics, such as the UK, intercepting 95% of imported cases and preventing them from infecting others in the community would be considered a good outcome (Clifford et al., 2020). However, for countries with an elimination or extreme suppression strategy, such as New Zealand and Australia, interception rates need to be as high as possible to minimise the risk of seeding new community outbreaks. This strategy also requires a robust re-emergence plan for dealing with new community cases and acting rapidly to ring-fence the virus to avoid a major outbreak. This includes rapid testing, case isolation and contact tracing, as well as the option of local or regional lockdowns should significant new clusters occur.

Government-managed quarantine facilities pose a risk of seeding community outbreaks. For example, the Australian state of Victoria experienced a major outbreak in July 2020 (Golding et al., 2020), thought to have originated from close contacts between people staying in government-managed quarantine and people working there. This outbreak demonstrates the importance of minimising the risk to frontline border-facing workers and at all points of contact between international travellers and the community. The people working in these roles include securely-employed highly-trained health professionals, who administer regular COVID-19 swab tests, full-time defence staff who manage emergency fire evacuations, through to less-secure contract staff who clean or provide transport to quarantine facilities. These facilities and the individuals staying and working in them are part of the front line of defence against a reintroduction of COVID-19. It is essential to understand and minimise the risks associated with them to prevent future community outbreaks.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Mathematical models of the spread and control of COVID-19 have been used successfully in informing the New Zealand government response to the pandemic (Binny et al., 2020; Plank et al., 2020; Wilson, Parry, et al., 2020). (Wilson, Baker, & Eichner, 2020) modelled the effects of different policies, including compulsory mask use and scheduled RT-PCR tests for travellers, to mitigate the risk of quarantine-free travel between two countries with very low prevalence of COVID-19, such as New Zealand and Australia. Wilson, Schwehm, et al. (2020) considered the levels of community surveillance at healthcare facilities that would be required to detect new outbreaks early enough to stop a large outbreak. However, models have not previously been applied to managing the risk of border reintroductions via government-managed quarantine facilities.

In designing border measures to prevent reintroduction of COVID-19, there are two main sources of risk that need to be considered. Firstly, there is a risk that a recent international arrival could enter the community while infectious. Secondly, there is a risk that a border-facing worker, for example someone working in a quarantine facility, airport or port, could become infected and seed a community outbreak. These are low-risk, high-consequence events: they happen rarely but when they do happen they pose a major threat to countries, such as New Zealand, where restrictions on community activities and gatherings have been largely relaxed. Mathematical modelling is an effective tool in this situation because, in the absence of direct data on the risk of rare events, models can synthesise data on underlying aspects of the process (e.g. transmission dynamics, virus incubation period, surveillance programs, and false negative testing rates) to quantify this risk. We use a simple mathematical model of COVID-19 transmission and testing to investigate the effect of different border policy settings on the risk of a community outbreak seeded at the border via each of these routes. Our model takes account of realistic false negative rates for RT-PCR tests (Kucirka, Lauer, Laeyendecker, Boon, & Lessler, 2020).

For the risk posed by international arrivals, we compare a testing-only policy with varying combinations of mandatory quarantine and testing schedules. We also propose a novel metric that can be used to estimate the level of transmission between individuals in managed quarantine facilities. For risk posed by frontline border workers, we investigate the effect different testing schedules have on the likely size of an outbreak at the time of first detection. We consider two situations: one where the outbreak is first detected in the frontline worker, and one where it is first detected in a secondary case (i.e. a contact of a frontline worker) or later. We consider three transmission routes (household contacts, work/casual contacts, and environmental transmission) and quantify the number of expected cases when the outbreak is first detected in a case infected via these different routes. This serves to quantify the risk of a serious outbreak depending on how the outbreak is first detected and the transmission route involved. We also

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

estimate the risk that an infected individual has travelled from the region in which the outbreak was detected to another region before the outbreak was detected.

We conclude that 14-day quarantine with two scheduled tests for all international arrivals is a robust system for preventing imported cases entering the community. Steps should be taken to minimise opportunities for transmission between individuals in quarantine facilities, which can substantially elevate the risk. All frontline border-facing workers should be tested weekly to increase the likelihood that an outbreak seeded by a frontline worker is detected before it grows very large. Our analysis also provides a framework for supporting decisions on the nature and scale of the response needed to control a newly detected a community outbreak.

Methods

Transmission and testing model

We use a continuous-time branching process to model the spread of COVID-19 (Plank et al., 2020), see Table 1 for parameter values. 33% of infections are assumed to be subclinical and these are 50% as infectious as clinical cases(Byambasuren et al., 2020; Davies, Klepac, et al., 2020; Davies, Kucharski, et al., 2020). Each infected individual i causes a randomly generated number $N_i \sim NegBin(R_i, k)$ of new infections, where $R_i = 2.5$ for clinical community cases and k is the overdisperson parameter (Lloyd-Smith, Schreiber, Kopp, & Getz, 2005). Times of secondary infections relative to infection of the index case are independent random variables drawn from a Weibull distributed with mean and median equal to 5.0 days and standard deviation of 1.9 days (Ferretti et al., 2020). The model does not explicitly include a latent period. However, the shape of the Weibull generation time distribution captures this effect, giving a low probability of onward transmission occurring in the first few days after infection. The time taken to develop symptoms is gamma distributed with mean 5.5 days and standard deviation 2.3 days (Lauer et al., 2020).

With no other surveillance in place, clinical cases are tested with probability p_{test} some time after onset of symptoms. Provided the test does not give a false negative (see below), the case will be detected at that point. Subclincial infections remain asymptomatic or pauci-symptomatic throughout their infection and do not get tested. The mean time between symptom onset and a positive test result for New Zealand cases in the March to May 2020 outbreak was approximately 6 days (James et al., 2020). We assume individuals in quarantine, frontline workers and their families have a higher awareness of symptoms and get tested more quickly (on average 2 days from symptom onset to test result) than casual contacts of frontline workers (on average 6 days). Secondary cases infected via environmental transmission are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

assumed to have very low awareness and take longer to get tested (average 10 days). Testing is fast and results are received on the same day. Due to variation between individuals, the high chance of a false negative test result, asymptomatic individuals and, in some scenarios, a low testing rate, the first detected case may not be the seed case. The model does not consider case isolation measures as we are interested only the initial time period before the first case is detected and contact tracing and isolation measures are initiated.

RT-PCR tests have a probability of returning a false negative that depends on the time since infection (Kucirka et al., 2020). This false negative probability close to 100% in the first 3 days after infection, and is at its lowest (20%) 8 days after infection. Tests with symptom checks, which are only performed on people in quarantine and frontline workers in certain scenarios, are assumed to be less likely to return a false negative more than 8 days after exposure than a RT-PCR test alone, with a zero false negative rate more than 10 days after infection. This assumption reflects diagnosis of "probable" cases based on clinical assessment in the absence of a positive test result.

Quarantine facility model

We initialise simulations with a single seed case, representing an infected international arrival entering a quarantine facility. The infection time of seed cases is chosen uniformly at random in the 14 days prior to arrival. However, if the individual develops symptoms subsequently tests positive prior to arrival, they are assumed to not to travel and are excluded from the sample. For scenarios with transmission between individuals in quarantine, we use a relatively small value of the effective reproduction number (0.1 or 0.5) to model the limited opportunities for contacts among individuals in a quarantine facility. We assume there is no superspreading within quarantine facilities, i.e. $N_i \sim Poiss(R_i)$. Individuals that are infected during their stay in quarantine could be at any point in their stay, i.e. we assume there is no attempt to group returning travellers by arrival date.

In addition to symptom-triggered testing described above, all international arrivals undergo a scheduled test with symptom checks on day 3 and day 12 of their 14-day stay in quarantine. We assume that all cases that are detected in quarantine (whether via a positive test result or being diagnosed as a probable case) are completely isolated and not released until fully recovered. Cases that are detected and cases that are undetected but are more than 14 days after infection are assumed to pose no further risk of onward transmission. The key model output is therefore the probability of an undetected case reaching the end of their stay in quarantine while still infectious (within 14 days of infection) or highly infectious (within 5 days of infection). Assuming multiple international arrivals are independent, our results can be interpreted as the risk per case arriving at the border.

Community outbreak model

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Simulations of community spread are seeded with a single infectious case representing a frontline border work. We set the negative binomial overdispersion parameter k to be 0.5, which allows for heterogeneity in number of secondary cases and some superspreading (James et al., 2020). Infected individuals are randomly assigned an infection route depending on the type of contact: household (the index and secondary case reside in the same household); casual (the index and secondary case have had direct contact outside the home); or environmental (there has been no direct contact between the index and secondary case and transmission is via a contaminated surface). These are weighted by the relative attack rates for each contact route, w_{route}. The model has no fixed household size as we are only interested in the very early stages before the outbreak is detected, where only one or two household members are typically infected. Two community awareness scenarios are investigated: low community awareness where $p_{test} = 50\%$ of infected individuals (including frontline workers) ever present for testing; high community awareness, where $p_{test} = 100\%$ of infected individuals are eventually tested. For each simulation, we calculate the total number of infected individuals N_c at the time the first case is detected.

Inter-regional travel model

We use the results on expected outbreak size to estimate the probability that an individual infected has travelled outside a given region at the time the outbreak is first detected. The key model variables are the number of cases N_c infected before the first case was detected and the number of days D_i ($i = 1, \ldots, N_c$) since each of these cases was infected. Together, these give the total number of opportunities for daily travel by any infected individual. The daily individual probability of travel is r/M where M is the population size of the region in which the outbreak was detected (region A) and r is the average number of individuals that travel to another specified region (region B) each day. The probability P_{travel} that an infected individual has travelled from region A to region B before the first case was detected is:

$$P_{travel} = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{r}{M}\right)^{\sum_{i=1}^{N_c} D_i} \quad (1)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Parameter	Value		Source
Distribution of generation times	$Weibull\,(scale = 5.67, shape = 2.83)$		(Ferretti et al., 2020)
Distribution of exposure to onset (days)	$\Gamma(scale = 0.95, shape = 5.8)$		(Lauer et al., 2020)
Relative infectiousness of subclinical cases	$R_{sub}/R_{clin} = 50\%$		(Davies, Kucharski, et al., 2020), (Davies, Klepac, et al., 2020)
Reproduction number for clinical infections	$R_{clin} = 2.5$		Assumed
Reproduction number for clinical infections inside quarantine	$R_{MIQ} = [0.1, 0.5]$		See scenarios
Superspreading dispersion parameter (outside quarantine only)	$k = 0.5$		(James et al., 2020)
Proportion of subclinical infections	$p_{sub} = 0.33$		(Davies, Kucharski, et al., 2020)
Relative positive test probability for subclinical infections	$p_{testsubclin} = 0.65$		(Clifford et al., 2020)
Proportion of clinical cases tested	$p_{test} = [1, 0.5]$		See scenarios
Relative secondary attack rates outside quarantine	$w_{household} = 0.11$ $w_{casual} = 0.05$ $w_{environmental} = 0.01$		(Ferretti et al., 2020)
Distribution of time from symptom onset to test result (days)	Quarantined individuals, frontline workers and their household contacts	$\Gamma(\mu = 2, \sigma = 0.8\mu)$	Casual taken from NZ data
	Casual contacts	$\Gamma(\mu = 6.75, \sigma = 0.8\mu)$	
	Environmental contacts	$\Gamma(\mu = 10, \sigma = 0.8\mu)$	

Table 1. The parameters used in the model and their source.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: The probability per infected arrival of an individual being released into the community whilst A) infectious (within 14 days of exposure) or B) very infectious (within 5 days of exposure) under four different quarantine and testing policies, and for different rates of transmission within quarantine facilities.

Results

We run the model in two separate scenarios: (1) within managed quarantine facilities to estimate the probability an individual will leave the facility while still infectious; and (2) in the community external to quarantine facilities to estimate the size of an outbreak initiated by an infected frontline worker.

Quantifying the risk of an international arrival leaving quarantine while infectious

Various countries have mandated 14-day quarantine periods for some or all international arrivals (Clifford et al., 2020). For example, all international arrivals to New Zealand are required to spend 14 days in a government-managed isolation and quarantine facility during which they are tested twice (around day 3 and day 12 after arrival) (New Zealand Government, 2020a). No individual is allowed to leave quarantine without returning at least one negative test result. We investigate the risk of an infectious individual being released into the community under this regime and under alternative quarantine and testing regimes: testing of travellers only on departure and arrival; 5-day quarantine with testing on day 3; 14-day quarantine with no scheduled testing. We also investigate the potential effect of transmission of the virus among individuals within the quarantine facility.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Departure and arrival testing only. Tests on departure from the home country and on arrival in the destination country with no mandatory quarantine period mean that approximately 50% of infected arrivals will be isolated on arrival (Figure 1A). This assumes that the time between pre-departure testing and arrival testing is 1 day. This very low detection rate reflects the high probability of a false negative test during the first five days after infection. These individuals are also likely to be highly infectious (i.e. within 5 days of exposure) when they enter the community (Fig 1B). Under this scenario, there is only a very limited time window (assumed to be 1 day) for transmission while travelling. Therefore, the level of internal transmission makes little difference. This shows that a testing-only policy without quarantine would pose a very high risk to the community.

5-day quarantine with one test. A stay of 5 days in quarantine facilities with a test on day 3 reduces the probability of a highly infectious individual entering the community relative to the testing-only policy. With no transmission or moderate transmission within quarantine, around 25% of infected arrivals will leave quarantine while infectious. This still poses a very high risk to the community: around one in four infected arrivals will still be infectious on leaving quarantine and up to 1 in 35 will be very infectious. If there is high transmission within the quarantine facility this probability increases to around 38% infectious when leaving quarantine and over 15% highly infectious.

14-day quarantine with no scheduled testing. With a 14 day quarantine period, the probability of an infectious person leaving quarantine is 4% or 28% under moderate or high transmission respectively. Under the moderate transmission scenario this is comparable to 14 days with two tests. However, if internal transmission rates are high the additional testing gives a large decrease in risk. The risk of a very infectious person leaving is not significantly changed by removing the two tests from the 14 day quarantine period.

14-day quarantine with two tests. Assuming moderate transmission within quarantine facilities, the risk of an infectious individual being released into the community is around 2% (Figure 1A). The risk of a highly infectious individual (within 5 days of exposure) leaving quarantine is 1% (Figure 1B). This is the probability per infected arrival, i.e. it is expected that one highly infectious individual will be released for every 100 infected arrivals on average. Assuming high transmission due to mixing within quarantine, the risk of a highly infectious person entering the community increases to 7% per infected arrival. If there is no transmission within quarantine facilities, all individuals are no longer considered infectious (i.e. they were exposed more than 14 days ago) when leaving.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Measuring the risk of transmission within quarantine facilities. The fraction of cases that are detected in the second week of the two-week stay in quarantine is a measurable indicator of potential transmission within quarantine facilities. If this fraction increases substantially, then procedures for infection prevention in quarantine should be reviewed. Under the regime of 14-day quarantine with scheduled day 3 and day 12 testing, 15% of cases test positive during week 2 with no transmission within quarantine and 20% and 31% under moderate and high transmission respectively.

Community outbreak seeded by a frontline worker

We consider four testing programs of increasing stringency: (i) no regular testing of frontline workers; (ii) fortnightly testing; (iii) weekly testing; and (iv) weekly testing with symptom checks. In all cases, frontline workers are assumed to have increased awareness of COVID-19 symptoms relative to the rest of population. This is reflected in a shorter average time (2 days) between symptom onset and testing for those that get tested. The addition of symptom checks at the time of testing decrease the chance of a false negative for clinical cases in frontline workers more than 8 days after exposure, guarantee a positive result for any test on a clinical case in a frontline worker more than 10 days after exposure. This models diagnosis as a probable case based on clinical symptoms in the absence of a positive RT-PCR test result. For each of these four testing programs, we consider two different levels of community awareness: high, where 100% of clinical cases are eventually present testing some time after symptom onset, and low, where only 50% of clinical cases eventually present for testing The latter might be the result of reduced public awareness or lack of community testing.

Figure 2 show the expected size of the outbreak when the first case is detected for each of the four test regimes with high and low community awareness. With high community awareness and weekly testing, it is likely that less than 3 individuals in total have been infected when the first case is detected. If community awareness is low and there is no regular testing of frontline workers, this increases to 10 expected additional cases.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: The expected number of infected individuals when the first case is detected. This decreases significantly with increased testing of frontline workers and improved community awareness. Expected value (x) and interquartile range from 10,000 simulations (error bars) are shown.

For each scenario, we also record the type of case first detected (i.e. whether it was detected in the initial frontline worker, or if not, whether the transmission route was via the worker's household, a work/casual contact, or environmental). Figure 3 shows the probability of the first case being detected at different stages within the outbreak, i.e. whether the first detected case is the original frontline worker (seed case) or is a secondary case or later. As the frequency of frontline testing increases, it becomes more likely that an outbreak will be detected in the seed case (>80% with the weekly testing). Decreasing community awareness, which in this case applies equally to frontline workers and the general population, makes little difference to the setting of the first detection, provided there is a regular frontline worker testing regime. If there is no regular testing of frontline workers, the probability of the outbreak being first detected in a secondary case increases to 29% - 35% under high and low community awareness, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: The probability of a secondary case being detected at different stages of the outbreak. When there is a regular testing regime for frontline workers, the probability of an outbreak being detected in the seed case is high.



Figure 4: Expected number of cases depending on whether the outbreak is first detected in the seed case or in a secondary or later case. Outbreaks detected in a secondary rather than seed case will be significantly larger. Expected value (x) and interquartile range from 10,000 simulations (error bars) are shown.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Knowing whether the outbreak was first detected in a frontline worker or not (i.e. detected in the seed cases or in a secondary case) gives a valuable indicator as to the expected size of the outbreak when it is first detected (Figure 4). Regardless of community awareness level and testing regime, if the first detected case is in a frontline worker (i.e. the seed case), the size of the outbreak is likely to be small, (usually no more than 3 people infected). If the first detected case is a secondary case, including household contacts, then the expected outbreak size is much larger. If the community awareness is high, the expected outbreak size is likely to be between 11 and 14 depending on the testing regime. If community awareness is low, the expected outbreak size is likely to be between 19 and 26.

Small variations in the parameters chosen make very little change to the qualitative results. For example, increasing or decreasing the probability of being subclinical (25%-40%), and using a similar published infection kernel (Du et al., 2020) gave minor numerical changes but made no difference to the overall message that weekly testing with symptom checks is a substantial improvement on no testing or even fortnightly testing. In all parameter explorations there was a substantial increase in the expected number of exposures if the first detected case was not in the frontline worker.

Finally, we used Eq. (1) to calculate the probability that an infectious case has travelled outside a given region can be calculated as a function of the travel rate between regions. Figure 5 shows the risk of an infected individual having travelled outside a defined area in which the outbreak was first detected as a function of the per capita travel rate from that defined area. The risk increases with the per capita travel rate and is higher if the outbreak is not first detected in a frontline worker or if community awareness is low. To demonstrate the use of this model, Figure 5 shows illustrative travel rates for three regional scenarios for New Zealand: travel from the South Island to the North Island; travel from the North Island to the South Island; and travel from the Auckland region to the rest of New Zealand. We chose these scenarios because of the possibility of applying different controls at a regional level and restricting travel between regions. Travel between the North and South Islands is almost exclusively by commercial airline and ferry. Travel in and out of the Auckland region would be more difficult to restrict, but this has recently been done in response to a community outbreak detected in the Auckland region. Exact travel volume data is not available, so the travel rates shown in Figure 5 are for illustrative purpose only.

The probability of an infected individual having travelled to the South Island at the time an outbreak is first detected in the North Island is approximately 3% if the outbreak is first detected in a frontline worker regardless of the level of community awareness. If the outbreak is not first detected in a frontline worker, the probability of travel is 11% on average if community awareness is high, and up to 15% for a large outbreak. If community awareness is low, the probability of travel is 13-16% on average (depending on stringency of frontline worker testing) and up to 22% for a large outbreak. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

probability of an infected individual having travelled to the North Island at the time an outbreak is first detected in the South Island are higher than the corresponding probability of a case having travelled from the North to the South Island because of the asymmetry in population sizes. The probability of an infected individual having travelled outside the Auckland region when an outbreak is first detected there is very high, because of large travel volumes and a smaller source population (see Table 2).



Figure 5. Risk of an infected individual having travelled from region A to region B before the outbreak is first detected as a function of the travel rate (daily probability of an individual in region A travelling to region B). The different curves show different levels of community awareness (red = high awareness, blue = low awareness) and different detection settings (first detected in frontline worker = solid, first detected elsewhere = dashed). Horizontal black bars indicate an illustrative range of travel rates for three New Zealand regional scenarios: outbreak detected in the North Island, risk of an infected individual having travelled to the South Island (NI -> SI); outbreak detected in the South Island, risk of an infected individual having travelled to the North Island (SI -> NI); outbreak detected in the Auckland region, risk of an infected individual having travelled outside the Auckland region (AKL -> other). Assumed travel volumes per day: between the North and South Islands 7000 – 8500; between Auckland and the rest of New Zealand 35,000 – 45,000. Population sizes: North Island 3.75 million; South Island 1.25 million; Auckland region 1.6 million.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

For international arrivals at the border, the safest regime analysed was by far the 14 day stay in government-managed quarantine with two scheduled tests. Provided confirmed cases are completely isolated, and there is minimal transmission between individual in quarantine facilities, this regime reduces the risk of an infectious case being released into the community to less than 1% per arriving case. Significantly reducing the length of stay in quarantine would increase the risk of a highly infectious individual entering the community. Relying on testing alone with no quarantine would be much higher risk, largely because of the high false negative rate of RT-PCR tests, particularly prior to symptom onset (Kucirka et al., 2020).

The greatest reduction in risk associated with quarantined international arrivals can be obtained by minimising mixing among guests in the facilities. This can be achieved by eliminating or carefully managing shared spaces such as smoking, exercise areas, and elevators. Evidence suggests that speaking, especially while exercising, can substantially increase the chances of transmission (Buonanno, Morawska, & Stabile, 2020). Removing the possibility of contacts between guests in quarantine facilities reduces the probability that someone acquires the disease during their stay and is still infectious when they complete their 14-day quarantine period. It also allows results in lower overall infection rates in the facility, so the risk to frontline workers is reduced.

The fraction of imported cases that are detected in the second week of quarantine is an effective indicator of the level of transmission among individuals staying in quarantine facilities. Although the exact value of this indicator is sensitive to modelling assumptions, a value of 20% or more is indicative of significant within-facility transmission. Tracking the value of this indicator over time gives a measure of the effectiveness of infection prevention in the quarantine facility, and an upward trend would point to the need to review processes.

The risk of a frontline worker inadvertently seeding a major outbreak can be significantly reduced by scheduled weekly testing combined with symptom checks by a trained professionals. Clearly this should be undertaken alongside measures that minimise the risk of a frontline worker becoming infected, including training of frontline workers in infection control, supply and correct use of effective protective personal equipment at all times, cleaning potentially infected surfaces and eliminating all close contacts and shared spaces between frontline workers and quarantine guests.

The test for SARS-CoV-2 is invasive and unpleasant. Repeated compulsory testing on individuals, particularly those at relatively low risk, may be unpopular. There is also a danger of workers being reluctant to get tested or to reveal symptoms through fear of being stood down from work with no pay. This underscores the need for comprehensive paid sick leave. A recent study (Menni et al., 2020) of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

over 2.6 million individuals tested a smart phone app to assess symptoms. The best fit model had a 69% positive prediction rate, implying that this method would likely miss 30% of symptomatic cases and all asymptomatic cases. This is a slightly lower rate of false negatives than PCR testing of symptomatic individuals, but nonetheless comparable. However, the symptom checker results did not state at what point in the course of the illness the model was applied, i.e. late onset symptoms may be needed to achieve this level of accuracy. So as yet, this is not likely to be a viable substitute. However, given the rapid development of antigen, particularly saliva based, tests more frequent testing of frontline workers could soon be a very real possibility.

If a community outbreak seeded at the border is first detected outside the frontline workforce, it is likely that a large number of other infections will have occurred by the time of first detection. This applies even if the even if the first detected case is a household contact of a frontline worker, because at this stage in the outbreak it is likely that will be other infections beyond the worker's household. In these circumstances, the total number of case is likely to be large enough that an immediate local lockdown may be necessary to bring the outbreak under control. This situation occurred in Auckland, New Zealand on 11 August 2020 and an immediate local lockdown was announced (New Zealand Government, 2020b).

We used a simple model to estimate the probability that an infected individual has travelled outside the region in which the outbreak is detected. This model assumes that every individual in the region, including those infected, has an equal probability of travelling between regions each day, which ignores heterogeneity in travel patterns. Another caveat is that this method estimates the probability that an infected individual has travelled to a given region, not the probability they have passed the virus on to someone else there. The latter will depend on the time since the traveller was infected, and the length of stay and contact rates in the destination region, and potential correlations among these variables. We do not attempt to quantify this, but we note the probability of onward transmission in the destination region will necessarily be less than the probability of travel, so our results provide a conservative upper bound for the risk of inter-regional spread. This method may be useful in determining the geographical scale of any response measures in response to the outbreak detection.

These findings apply to all workers who have contact with international arrivals, whether direct or indirect. Workers who experience only indirect or environmental contact with quarantined individuals have a lower overall risk of being infected, but if they are infected the consequences are the same. Maintaining elimination of COVID-19 depends on the ability to contain all cases at the border. While the controls investigated here may seem onerous, in the long run they are likely to be a preferable alternative to regional or national lockdowns.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We did not model superspreaders or superspreading events inside quarantine facilities, as these are unlikely to occur in this environment. It is possible that communal spaces and surfaces (such as buses, elevators, reception areas, door handles) could provide an avenue for environmental transmission. This would effectively correspond to an increase in the mean number of contacts parameter in the model, but is unlikely to cause superspreading events given the restrictions on individual movements. Nevertheless, communal spaces and surfaces should be regularly cleaned and good hand hygiene encouraged to minimise the possibility of environmental transmission. Supershedders (individual heterogeneity in infectiousness) can increase the risk of release an infectious case, but this effect is small providing existing procedures are followed. We did not explicitly model families or other groups travelling together. It is possible that these will increase the number of cases detected in the second week because of transmission between people staying in the same room, but for the purposes of measuring widespread transmission in quarantine should not be considered in the fraction calculation.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support of StatsNZ, ESR, and the Ministry of Health in supplying data in support of this work. The authors would also like to thank Samik Datta, Nigel French, Markus Luczak-Roesch, Anja Mizdrak and Matt Parry for informal peer review comments on an earlier version of part of this manuscript. This work was funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and Te Pūnaha Matatini, Centre of Research Excellence in Complex Systems.

References

Baker, M. G., Wilson, N., & Anglemyer, A. (2020). Successful Elimination of Covid-19 Transmission in New Zealand. *New England Journal of Medicine*. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2025203

Binny, R. N., Hendy, S. C., James, A., Lustig, A., Plank, M. J., & Steyn, N. (2020). Probability of elimination for COVID-19 in Aotearoa New Zealand. *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.08.10.20172361

Buonanno, G., Morawska, L., & Stabile, L. (2020). Quantitative assessment of the risk of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection: prospective and retrospective applications. *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.01.20118984

Byambasuren, O., Cardona, M., Bell, K., Clark, J., McLaws, M.-L., & Glasziou, P. (2020). Estimating the extent of true asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*.

Clifford, S., Quilty, B. J., Russell, T. W., Liu, Y., Chan, Y.-W. D., Pearson, C. A., . . . Edmunds, W. J. (2020). Strategies to reduce the risk of SARS-CoV-2 re-introduction from international travellers. *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.07.24.20161281

Cousins, S. (2020). New Zealand eliminates COVID-19. *The Lancet, 395*(10235), 1474.

Davies, N. G., Klepac, P., Liu, Y., Prem, K., Jit, M., group, C. C.-w., & Eggo, R. M. (2020). Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nature Medicine, 26*, 1205-1211. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154955; this version posted September 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Davies, N. G., Kucharski, A. J., Eggo, R. M., Gimma, A., Edmunds, W. J., Jombart, T., . . . Nightingale, E. S. (2020). Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health, 5*, E375-E385. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30133-X

Du, Z., Xu, X., Wu, Y., Wang, L., Cowling, B. J., & Meyers, L. A. (2020). Serial interval of COVID-19 among publicly reported confirmed cases. *Emerging infectious diseases, 26*(6), 1341.

Ferretti, L., Wymant, C., Kendall, M., Zhao, L., Nurtay, A., Abeler-Dörner, L., . . . Fraser, C. (2020). Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science, 368*(6491).

Golding, N., Shearer, F. M., Moss, R., Dawson, P., Liu, D., Ross, J. V., . . . McCaw, J. M. (2020). *Estimating temporal variation in transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and physical distancing behaviour in Australia* Retrieved from https://www.doherty.edu.au/uploads/content_doc/Technical_report_4_update_29July2020.pdf

James, A., Plank, M. J., Hendy, S., Binny, R. N., Lustig, A., & Steyn, N. (2020). Model-free estimation of COVID-19 transmission dynamics from a complete outbreak. *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.07.21.20159335

Kucirka, L. M., Lauer, S. A., Laeyendecker, O., Boon, D., & Lessler, J. (2020). Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction–based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 173*, 262-267. doi: 10.7326/M20-1495

Lauer, S. A., Grantz, K. H., Bi, Q., Jones, F. K., Zheng, Q., Meredith, H. R., . . . Lessler, J. (2020). The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. *Annals of internal medicine, 172*(9), 577-582.

Lloyd-Smith, J. O., Schreiber, S. J., Kopp, P. E., & Getz, W. M. (2005). Superspreading and the effect of individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature, 438*(7066), 355-359.

Menni, C., Valdes, A. M., Freidin, M. B., Sudre, C. H., Nguyen, L. H., Drew, D. A., . . . Moustafa, J. S. E.-S. (2020). Real-time tracking of self-reported symptoms to predict potential COVID-19. *Nature Medicine, 26*, 1037-1040.

New Zealand Government. (2020a). *COVID-19 Public Health Response (Air Border) Order 2020* Retrieved from http://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/2020/0120/latest/LMS360123.html#LMS360150

New Zealand Government. (2020b). *COVID-19 Public Health Response (Alert Levels 3 and 2) Order 2020* Retrieved from http://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/2020/0187/latest/LMS389738.html

Plank, M. J., Binny, R. N., Hendy, S. C., Lustig, A., James, A., & Steyn, N. (2020). A stochastic model for COVID-19 spread and the effects of Alert Level 4 in Aotearoa New Zealand. *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.08.20058743

Wilson, N., Baker, M. G., & Eichner, M. (2020). Estimating the Impact of Control Measures to Prevent Outbreaks of COVID-19 Associated with Air Travel into a COVID-19-free country: A Simulation Modelling Study. *medRxiv*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20127977

Wilson, N., Parry, M., Verrall, A. J., Baker, M. G., Schwehm, M., & Eichner, M. (2020). When Can Elimination of SARS-CoV-2 Infection be Assumed? Simulation Modelling in a Case Study Island Nation. *medRxiv*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.16.20104240

Wilson, N., Schwehm, M., Verrall, A. J., Parry, M., Baker, M. G., & Eichner, M. (2020). Detecting the Emergent or Re-Emergent COVID-19 Pandemic in a Country: Modelling Study of Combined Primary Care and Hospital Surveillance. *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.13.20100743

World Health Organisation. (2020). *Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): situation report, 51* Retrieved from https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200311-sitrep-51-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=1ba62e57_10