medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Assessing the risk of COVID-19 importation and the effect of quarantine

Julien Arino Nicolas Bajeux Stéphanie Portet
James Watmough

August 12, 2020

Julien Arino:
Department of Mathematics
& Data Science NEXUS
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2
Julien.Arino@umanitoba.ca

Nicolas Bajeux:
Department of Mathematics
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2

Stéphanie Portet:
Department of Mathematics
& Data Science NEXUS
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2

James Watmough:
Department of Mathematics & Statistics
University of New Brunswick
Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada E3B 5A3

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives

During the early stage of COVID-19 spread, many governments and regional jurisdictions put in place travel restrictions and imposed quarantine after arrivals in an effort to slow down or stop the importation of cases. At the same time, they implemented non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) to curtail local spread. We assess the risk of importation of COVID-19 in locations that are at that point without infection or where local chains of transmission have extinguished, and evaluate the role of quarantine in this risk.

Methods

A stochastic $SLIAR$ epidemic model is used. The effect of the rate, size, and nature of importations is studied and compared to that of NPI on the risk of importation-induced local transmission chains. The effect of quarantine on the rate of importations is assessed, as well as its efficacy as a function of its duration.

Results

The rate of importations plays a critical role in determining the risk that case importations lead to local transmission chains, more so than local transmission characteristics, i.e., strength of NPI. The latter influences the severity of the outbreaks. Quarantine after arrival in a location is an efficacious way to reduce the rate of importations.

Conclusions

Locations that see no or low level local transmission should ensure that the rate of importations remains low. A high level of compliance with post-arrival quarantine followed by testing achieves this objective with less of an impact than travel restrictions or bans.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

1 Introduction

The spatio-temporal spread of COVID-19 is documented by a sequence of importation times reported at different administrative levels. See, for instance, the works[1–4] for accounts of early post-importation spread in several countries. Canada is used here as an example; the first confirmed case was reported in Ontario on 25 January 2020. British Columbia reported a case on 28 January 2020, but other provinces and territories (P/T) did not report cases until March or later, with Nunavut still having not reported confirmed cases at the time of writing. Figure 1 shows the evolution of the percentage of jurisdictions having reported at least one new case in the past three weeks, for P/T and 112 Canadian health regions.[5,6] The initial increase in



Figure 1: Percentage of provinces, territories and health regions in Canada having declared new confirmed cases of COVID-19 in 2020 in a three weeks period.

the number of jurisdictions affected was entirely driven by case importations to these jurisdictions. Later increases are indicative of importation of a case from another jurisdiction or existence of silent transmission chains lasting more than three weeks.

In the first phase of the pandemic, most countries (or lower level bodies in federal countries with devolved health care) took global, one-size-fits-all measures. After this initial lockdown period during which travel was also severely hampered, a second phase has now started, with local transmission down in some jurisdictions. However, with no therapeutic tools or vaccines

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

yet available, preparations must be made for a potential increase of transmission in some jurisdictions. Were this to happen, many locations would be re-importing cases. It seems important, in this context, to apply a more measured approach than the total top jurisdiction-level lockdowns that were used; the enormous economic cost of the first wave of lockdowns, combined with the potential diminishing compliance of individuals with public health measures, impose that public health authorities find ways to mitigate spread that are finer grained.

As part of the arsenal of measures available to public health authorities in the fight against the spread of COVID-19, there are some that are specifically geared towards the reduction of the risk of case importations: travel restrictions or bans, self-isolation upon arrival, etc. See the Electronic Supplement A.1 for details These measures have different effects and varying efficacy. In order to evaluate their relative effectiveness, it is important to better understand the importation process.

Some works[7–16] have considered the link between transportation and importation of COVID-19. We complement these works here by finely decomposing the process through which cases are imported into different types of events and focusing on the role of the rate at which a location is "challenged" by importations. We also consider the efficacy of the main method for reducing this rate while maintaining mobility: quarantine.



Figure 2: Spatialisation process: transport of cases from other locations; importation into the location of interest; local amplification; exportation to other locations. Red indicates control methods. See A.1 for details.

Importations are a critical component in the spatialisation of COVID-19 and other emerging or re-emerging infectious diseases, the overall spread

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

phenomenon being driven by the repetition of *transport*, *importation*, *amplification* and *exportation* events. We further classify importations as *unsuccessful* if they do not lead to any local transmission chains or *successful* if they do. Successful importations then depend on the type of transmission chains they generate: they are *noncritical* or *critical* if they lead, respectively, to minor or major outbreaks. See Figure 2 and A.1 for details.

Here, we consider importations of COVID-19 to locations that are not in the amplification stage and where importations could tip the balance in the direction of entering amplification. These include locations that have not had local cases yet, saw local transmission chains that have since extinguished or are seeing limited local transmission. The main issue tackled in this paper is the assessment of the risk that a successful importation occurs depending on the rate of case importations and local conditions, as well as the effect of post-arrival quarantine on these rates. To consider the problem, we use an SLIAR model "stimulated" by individuals flowing in from other locations.

2 Methods

To track individual events and gain access to quantities such as the proportion of successful importations, we formulate the model as a continuous time Markov chain (CTMC).[17] The setting under consideration is a single location in which the population is assumed to be homogeneously mixing. Initially, there are no active cases in the community; the model tracks the fate of the cohort of individuals who are susceptible to the disease. We consider the short term response of the model to stimulations taking the form of inflow of infected individuals, as schematised in Figure 3.

2.1 Epidemiological model and parameters

The structure of the model is detailed in A.2 and A.3, with the epidemiological model detailed in Figure ES.8: *susceptible* individuals, upon infection, move to the *latent* compartment. (Incubation and latent periods are assumed to overlap.) When their latent period is over, they can either progress to a *symptomatic infection* or to an *asymptomatic* one. At the end of the infectious period, individuals are *removed* (they *recover* or *die*); they no longer spread the disease. Post-recovery immunity is assumed to last at least as long as the (short) period of time under consideration.

We adopt a case detection-based approach. Symptomatically infectious individuals are those who have been detected through testing, reporting

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

or hospitalisation, i.e., individuals who appear as *confirmed* cases in the data. Asymptomatically infectious individuals include those who are asymptomatic in the usual sense, but also symptomatic cases that avoid detection because of lack of testing. In the perspective of response to a crisis, using such a case detection-based definition for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals allows to tailor model outputs to the situation in the location under consideration. This is further enhanced by using compartments R_I and D directly connected to published data (Figures 3 and ES.8). One drawback from using a case detection-based distinction between symptomatic and asymptomatic cases is that the parameters involved (π, δ and η) incorporate not only disease characteristics but also some information about health policies specific to the location under consideration. For instance, locations performing a lot of testing have a lower proportion of individuals following the asymptomatic route, i.e., a lower value of π, than those doing less testing.

Parameter	Definition	Value
β	transmission coefficient	obtained via (ES.1)
η	modulation of transmission for incubating individuals	0.054
ξ	modulation of transmission for asymptomatic individuals	0.23
π	fraction of asymptomatic individuals	0.2
δ	case fatality ratio	0.022
$2/\varepsilon$	mean duration of incubation	5.71 days
$2/\gamma$	mean duration of infectious period	10 days
$\mathcal{R}_t$	effective reproduction number	$[0.5, 2.5]$
$1/\lambda$	average number of days between importations	$[1, 50]$
p_X	probability of importation of type X individual	$p_X \in [0, 1]$

Table 1: Model parameters.

Simulations are tailored to locations, i.e., health regions or cities. The initial susceptible population, $S(0)$, is the total population of the location under consideration, adjusted for pre-existing immunity if transmission occurred in the past. Epidemiological parameters are the means of those in[18] as well as values commonly found in the literature. Epidemiological and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

importation parameters are listed in Table 1. Simulations are run using the exact method in the `R` package *GillespieSSA2* with a time horizon of three months (92 days). Unless otherwise indicated, 1,000 simulations are run for each combination of parameter values and, when applicable, initial conditions.

2.2 Response of the system to case importations



Figure 3: Input-output setting: imports arrive through transport, are potentially funnelled through quarantine, then enter one of the infected compartments. The three types of outcomes considered are shown on the right.

Inputs to the system with transition probabilities (ES.3) are the *importation events*, i.e., stimulations taking the form of inflow of infected individuals as described by (ES.5); outputs are the responses of the system to these importation events. The nature of importation events and resulting outputs considered are summarised in Table 2.

Of particular interest here is the consideration of these responses in terms of the severity of importations as defined in A.1 and briefly summarised here.

- An *unsuccessful importation* has the import case not resulting in the transmission of the disease to anyone in the local population; in other words, there are no susceptible to latent ($S \to L_1$) transitions.

- A *successful importation* sees the import case resulting in at least one local case. Successful importations are further classified as follows.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

- A *noncritical successful importation* is one that is followed by a *minor outbreak*.
- A *critical successful importation* is one followed by a *major outbreak*.

Minor and major outbreaks are defined as in a seminal paper of Whittle;[19] see details in A.6. Finally, we say that the disease is *locally extinct* if there are no more cases of any type in the population under consideration.

3 Results

Table 2 summarises the questions investigated with the model and the outputs presented in the results.

3.1 Single stimulation simulations

3.1.1 Role of the type of importation

The nature of the import case is important, as evidenced in Table ES.3. As can be expected, the earlier in the disease cycle an infected individual is when they are introduced in a population, the longer they spend interacting with others and thus the higher the risk that they transmit the disease. For instance, from Table ES.3, importing a single L_1 latent case is followed by a major outbreak in 11.5% ($\mathcal{R}_t = 1.2$) to 70.1% ($\mathcal{R}_t = 2.5$) of simulations, while importation of an A_1 asymptomatic case leads to a major outbreak in 3.5% ($\mathcal{R}_t = 1.2$) to 30.2% ($\mathcal{R}_t = 2.5$) of simulations. For comparison, a recent study by Kucharski et al[15] found that a single importation leads to a large outbreak 17% to 25% of the time.

The nature of import cases is, to a large extent, a random hand that is dealt to importing jurisdictions. Unfortunately, most control measures they can implement "upstream" from an importation only have the capacity to remove symptomatically infectious individuals from the incoming flow, so that, in particular, latently infected individuals still can arrive.

3.1.2 Role of the size of the importation

The size of the importation is naturally a key factor in the risk of importation, as was already established by Kucharski et al.[15] To illustrate this and using outbreak severity criteria defined in A.6, let us focus on importations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

Question	Input	Output
	SINGLE STIMULATION	
Nature of importation	At $t = 0$, importation of 1 individual of type $\mathcal{I}$ Model: (ES.3)	Probability of no outbreak, minor and major outbreak First occurrence of I_1, Time to local extinction, serial interval
Size of importation	At $t = 0$, importation of N individuals of type $\mathcal{U}$ Model: (ES.3)	Probability of no outbreak, minor and major outbreak
	CHAIN OF STIMULATIONS	
Rate of importation vs effective reproductive number	Importation of 1 individual of a type $\mathcal{U}$ with $p_{\mathcal{U}} = 1$ at rate λ Model: (ES.3)+(ES.5)	Probability of no outbreak, minor and major outbreak Attack rate
	MODULATION OF CHAIN OF STIMULATIONS	
Quarantine	N individuals of type $\mathcal{U}$ arriving at rate λ are quarantined for t_q days Model: (ES.3)+(ES.5) for t_q days with $\beta = 0$	Quarantine efficacy Quarantine-regulated importation rate

Table 2: Simulation strategies. Questions addressed with the model and specification of inputs and outputs used. Individuals of type $\mathcal{I}$ are those infected with the disease, i.e., $\mathcal{I} \in \{L_1, L_2, I_1, I_2, A_1, A_2\}$. Individuals of type $\mathcal{U}$ are unobservable infected, i.e., $\mathcal{U} \in \{L_1, L_2, A_1, A_2\}$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 4: Proportions of critical (dotted red) and noncritical successful (solid blue) importations as a function of the initial number of imported L_1 cases. Circles: $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.8$, squares: 1.2 and triangles: 2.5.

of individuals in the L_1 compartment. Qualitatively similar results are obtained by considering importations of other types of infected individuals but are not shown here.

Figure 4 shows the proportion of simulations with successful importations followed by major and minor outbreaks as a function of the importation size, i.e., the initial number of L_1 individuals, for different values of the effective reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_t$. The proportion of simulations with critical successful importations, i.e., those followed by a major outbreak, is sensitive to the value of $\mathcal{R}_t$. Therefore, the value of $\mathcal{R}_t$ may significantly change the outcome if several infected individuals arrive simultaneously. The proportion of simulations with noncritical successful importations shows a maximum at a given initial number of L_1. Indeed, when the initial number of L_1 increases, it is more likely to trigger a critical successful importation than a noncritical one.

Here, there are obvious implications in terms of disease control, since one of the mechanisms leading to multiple simultaneous importations is infection during transport. Take for instance a location maintaining good but not perfect local conditions ($\mathcal{R}_t = 1.2$). If it receives four L_1 individuals, then there is roughly a 50/50 chance that this leads to a major outbreak. If, on the other hand, these four individuals each infect another person during transport because of inadequate protocols aboard the incoming conveyance,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

then the odds of a major outbreak jump up to 3/4.

3.2 Effect of importation rates and NPI efficacy

We now consider the effect of repeated importations. We suppose that individuals arrive in the location through the importation process defined in (ES.5) by the Poisson distribution with parameter λ. The rate of importation λ from a given location can be approximated from epidemiological and travel characteristics of the origin location of the import case using (ES.6); the rate of importation from all sources is given in (ES.7). We vary $1/\lambda$, the mean number of days between importation events. Here, $p_{L_1} = p_{L_2} = p_{A_1} = p_{A_2} = 0.25$ and $p_{I_1} = p_{I_2} = 0$ (we suppose I individuals are not able or allowed to travel).



Figure 5: Proportion of successful importations (SI, grey scale) and attack rates (blue scale) in a 3 month period for different values of the average number of days $1/\lambda$ between two importations and $\mathcal{R}_t$, an indicator of NPI efficacy.

Both the rate of case importations and the local effective reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_t$ have an effect on the capacity of the disease to become established in the population. The larger $\mathcal{R}_t$, the less efficacious the NPI. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

raster in Figure 5 shows the proportion of simulations with a successful importation over a three month period.

When importations occur infrequently, local conditions are key. For instance, if importations occur on average every 40 days, local conditions change the risk of post-importation outbreaks over a three months period from roughly 40% to 70% of simulations. As the rate of case importations increases, post-importation outbreaks are increasingly likely for all local conditions, to the point that when cases are introduced every three days or less, 99% of simulations see outbreaks, regardless of the effort of local control. Thus, reducing the importation rate is key to preventing outbreaks.

On the other hand, the severity of the outbreaks is also sensitive to the value of $\mathcal{R}_t$. The dots in Figure 5 show the attack rate of the disease in the population over the three months period considered, computed as the ratio (expressed as a percentage) $(S(0)-S(t_f))/S(0))$, where $S(0)$ and $S(t_f)$ are the number of susceptible individuals at the beginning and end of one simulation, respectively. Even though the probability of an outbreak is high when the rate of importations is high, regardless of local NPI effort, the intensity of local NPI effort greatly changes the outcome. Indeed, consider the attack rates where the average number of days between importations is one day (left-most column in Figure 5). Attack rates there range from 13.1% when $\mathcal{R}_t = 2.5$ to 0.02% when $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.5$. So, although the probability of importing the disease is roughly equal for this high importation rate, the severity of outcomes is very different. For $\mathcal{R}_t > 1$, we distinguish between minor and major outbreaks using the threshold τ defined in A.6. This is shown in Figure ES.10.

3.3 Effect of post-arrival quarantine

The rate of importations plays a critical role in the risk that importations will trigger local transmission chains (Figure 5). The status of individuals when they arrive is also very important (Table ES.3). In order to evaluate the benefit of post-arrival quarantine, we proceed to the following simple numerical experiment. We consider Poisson generated chains of importation events, where each importation event is one of L_1, L_2, A_1 or A_2, i.e., one of the undetected infected states. These chains are run through (ES.3) with no transmission ($\beta = 0$) and for t_q days, where t_q is the duration of quarantine. Running the chains with no transmission means we consider the evolution of each individual case through disease stages during the quarantine period. Figure 6 shows, for quarantine periods of 7 and 14 days, the transitions between stages at the beginning and end of quarantine. We highlight in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .



(a) $t_q = 7$ days (b) $t_q = 14$ days

Figure 6: Evolution of the status of import cases during a (left) one or (right) two week quarantine period imposed upon arrival. Dark grey flows are individuals who are still a risk to the jurisdiction at the end of the quarantine period. Here, simulations were run for 2,500 individuals of each type of undetected cases L_1, L_2, A_1, and A_2 entering quarantine.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

dark grey individuals who are still a risk to the community at the end of their quarantine period since they are still in unobservable stages $\mathcal{U}$ (see B.6 for details).

In order to investigate the effect of the duration t_q of quarantine, as observed in Figure 6, we now quantify the efficacy of quarantine as the probability that a case that is initially unobservable becomes observable or recovers. Figure 7 shows the probability of success of quarantine (its efficacy c) as a function of its duration, for different values of the proportion π of asymptomatic and undetected cases. The curves here are obtained by using the method in B.6.



Figure 7: Probability c that the quarantine is successful as a function of its duration t_q. From dark to light grey: fraction π of asymptomatic or undetected cases varying from 0.1 to 0.9 by steps of 0.1.

We observe that the probability c of success of the quarantine increases with the duration of quarantine, as could be expected. Furthermore, from Figure 7, testing helps the success of quarantine. Indeed, consider for instance the most widely used duration of quarantine: two weeks. If 90% of cases are asymptomatic or undetected, as could happen in a location making no effort to follow people during their isolation, the efficacy of quarantine would be about 70%. Efficacy would reach 90%, on the other hand, if only 10% of cases went undetected.

Note that the effect of quarantine on the rate of importation is derived directly from the efficacy c of quarantine. If λ is the rate of importation prior to quarantine and λ_q is the quarantine-regulated rate of importation,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

then $\lambda_q = (1-c)\lambda$. Consider Figure 5, whose abscissa is expressed in units of $1/\lambda$. The effect of a quarantine with efficacy c is to scale the days between importations right by a factor of $1/(1-c)$. Consider a jurisdiction receiving a case on average every five days. A 50% efficacious quarantine leads to receiving one case every 10 days on average, while a 90% efficacious quarantine leads to receiving one case every 50 days on average.

4 Discussion

The main results of this study are summarised by Figure 5, where the proportion of successful importations is given as a function of the effective reproduction number $\mathcal{R}_t$ and the average number $1/\lambda$ of days between importations, and Figure 7, which shows the probability that quarantine is successful as a function of its duration t_q. We use $\mathcal{R}_t$ as a measure of the effort of local public health authorities.

For an initially susceptible population, the probability of an outbreak increases with the rate of importations, even when $\mathcal{R}_t < 1$, so that with importations every few days or less, outbreaks are almost certain, regardless of local efforts. However, the resulting attack rates increase with $\mathcal{R}_t$. With the parameters chosen for simulations, if case importations occur more than once every 10 days on average, then using measures to reduce $\mathcal{R}_t$ to 0.5 still gives a 90% chance of outbreak, but with an attack rate of less than one percent at the end of three months. Thus, at the beginning of the spread, it is crucial to first hinder the importation of new cases in the location to reduce drastically the chance of an outbreak.

The sensitivity of the efficacy of the quarantine to its duration and to monitoring effort seen in Figure 7 and the resulting scaling of importation rates have important policy implications. A location receiving few cases because it is connected only to places with zero or low prevalence could reasonably adopt a shorter (seven to ten day) quarantine period and still achieve a large right scaling on the importation risk (Figure 5), provided it also implements a high level of follow up of quarantining individuals. Locations receiving cases at a high rate will need to ensure that quarantine is longer and with high compliance with the imposed duration, since non-compliance is equivalent to imposing shorter quarantines.

Our results apply to populations that see very few or no cases at all. They can however be applied to places seeing more cases if appropriate contact tracing allows to distinguish between cases stemming from imported cases and community generated cases. They can also be applied in general,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

but it will then be difficult or impossible to distinguish, as we do here, between cases generated by importations and community transmitted cases. Note that our results are also robust to the values used for parameters. We chose to use parameters mostly stemming from other work we have carried out on COVID-19, but we could also have used values from the now abundant literature on the subject. This would modify some of the graphs in a limited manner but would not alter our conclusions. We will make some of our code available on Github so it will be easy for readers to tailor our results to their specific situation. The approach used here allows to focus on the rate at which cases are imported and is in this sense quite different from other published work on the topic, which amalgamates several distinct components. It is useful, though, to provide some sense of the type of rates one can expect to observe. A formula and some examples are provided in Section A.5.

Declarations of interest

None.

Funding sources

JA, SP and JW are supported in part by NSERC Discovery Grants. JA and JW are supported in part by CIHR. JA was supported in part by the Public Health Agency of Canada. JW is supported in part by the New Brunswick Health Research Fund. The sponsors played no role in the design of the study nor in the decision to submit this work.

References

[1] Adegboye O. A, Adekunle A. I, and Gayawan E. Early transmission dynamics of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) in Nigeria. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17, 4 2020.

[2] Jesus J. G. d, Sacchi C, Candido D. d. S, et al. Importation and early local transmission of COVID-19 in Brazil, 2020. *Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de Sao Paulo*, 62:e30, 2020.

[3] Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention . Early trend of imported COVID-19 cases in South Korea. *Osong public health and research perspectives*, 11:140–145, June 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

[4] Lin C.-Y, Wang W.-H, Urbina A. N, et al. Importation of SARS-CoV-2 infection leads to major COVID-19 epidemic in Taiwan. *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*, 97:240–244, June 2020.

[5] Berry I, Soucy J.-P. R, Tuite A, and Fisman D. Open access epidemiologic data and an interactive dashboard to monitor the COVID-19 outbreak in Canada. *CMAJ*, 192(15):E420–E420, 2020.

[6] Statistics Canada . Health regions and peer groups. `https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-402-x/2015001/regions/hrpg-eng.htm`. Accessed: 2020-07-24.

[7] Adiga A, Venkatramanan S, Peddireddy A, et al. Evaluating the impact of international airline suspensions on COVID-19 direct importation risk. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[8] Craig A. T, Heywood A. E, and Hall J. Risk of COVID-19 importation to the Pacific islands through global air travel. *Epidemiology and infection*, 148:e71, March 2020.

[9] Gilbert M, Pullano G, Pinotti F, et al. Preparedness and vulnerability of African countries against importations of COVID-19: a modelling study. *Lancet*, 395:871–877, March 2020.

[10] Godin A, Xia Y, Buckeridge D. L, et al. Importation of SARS-CoV-2 following the "semaine de relâche" and Québec's (Canada) COVID-19 burden-a mathematical modeling study. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[11] Haider N, Yavlinsky A, Simons D, et al. Passengers' destinations from china: low risk of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) transmission into Africa and South America. *Epidemiology & Infection*, 148:1–7, 2020.

[12] Lopez L. F, Amaku M, Coutinho F. A. B, et al. Modeling importations and exportations of infectious diseases via travelers. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 78(2):185–209, 2016.

[13] Massad E, Amaku M, Wilder-Smith A, Costa dos Santos P. C, Struchiner C. J, and Coutinho F. A. B. Two complementary model-based methods for calculating the risk of international spreading of a novel virus from the outbreak epicentre. the case of COVID-19. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 148:1–19, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

[14] Pullano G, Pinotti F, Valdano E, Boëlle P.-Y, Poletto C, and Colizza V. Novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) early-stage importation risk to Europe, January 2020. *European Communicable Disease Bulletin*, 25, January 2020.

[15] Kucharski A. J, Russell T. W, Diamond C, et al. Early dynamics of transmission and control of covid-19: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(5):553 – 558, 2020.

[16] Tang S, Tang B, Bragazzi N. L, et al. Stochastic discrete epidemic modeling of covid-19 transmission in the province of shaanxi incorporating public health intervention and case importation. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[17] Allen L. J. A primer on stochastic epidemic models: Formulation, numerical simulation, and analysis. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 2(2):128–142, 2017.

[18] Arino J, Portet S, Bajeux N, and Ciupeanu A.-S. Investigation of global and local COVID-19 importation risks. Technical report, Public Health Risk Science division of the Public Health Agency of Canada, 2020.

[19] Whittle P. The outcome of a stochastic epidemic – A note on Bailey's paper. *Biometrika*, 42(1-2):116–122, 06 1955.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

Assessing the risk of COVID-19 importation and the effect of quarantine

Electronic supplementary material

Julien Arino, Nicolas Bajeux, Stéphanie Portet, James Watmough

A Methods

A.1 Mechanisms of spatialisation of epidemics and the nature of importations

We give here more details about the notions summarised in Figure 2 concerning the spatialisation of epidemics. Also, we make explicit the definitions regarding importations used in all the work.

Transportation is the actual movement of an infected individual to a new location. *Importation* occurs when an infected individual having acquired their infection in one location arrives in a different location while still infected with the disease. There can be two outcomes to an importation event; our terminology uses the point of view of SARS-CoV-2, the ætiological agent of COVID-19.

- An *unsuccessful* importation is one that does not lead to any further local transmission. Note that unsuccessful importations usually are not detected. It is possible that a location will see many unsuccessful importation events before it actually detects one.

- A *successful* importation is one that leads to at least one local transmission event, i.e., where the import case becomes the origin of one or more local transmission chains.

Amplification is then a critical phase of propagation that typically follows a successful importation. During amplification, cases multiply within a community, usually exponentially. In view of this, we define the *severity* of a successful importation as follows.

- A *noncritical successful importation* results in local chains of transmission that are not sustained, i.e., a *minor outbreak*. Case counts

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

remain low before eventually dying out. As for unsuccessful importations, some of these local chains of transmission might go completely unnoticed.

- A *critical successful importation* sees sustained local chains of transmission. This is a *major outbreak*.

Finally, *exportation* is the process through which a community that is seeing some local transmission becomes the source of transportation events. Note that exportation does not require amplification to be taking place, although amplification does increase the probability that an individual leaving the community is harbouring the pathogen.

In our classification, exportation and transportation are very closely related. They are, however, considered as separate processes because they provide different entry points into the control of the spatial spread of COVID-19. Here, some methods of control of the spatial spread of an epidemic are listed.

- Acting on transportation involves limiting the number of individuals hailing from known exporting locations that are allowed to enter one's jurisdiction. In the case of COVID-19, this has taken the form of partial or complete travel bans.

- To minimize the chance that, were an importation to occur, it be a successful one, most jurisdictions imposed a quarantine for travellers inbound from other locations. Some jurisdictions also implemented entry screening.

- Once successful importations occur, jurisdictions used a variety of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) to limit spread, i.e., curtail the amplification phase.

A.2 Structure of the epidemiological model

The structure of the epidemiological model is a slight modification of the SLIAR model in,[1] itself a modified version of the SLIAR model in.[2] The flow diagram is as shown in Figure ES.8: *susceptible* individuals, upon infection, move to the *latent* compartment. (Incubation and latent periods are assumed to overlap.) When their latent period is over, they can either progress to a *symptomatic infection* or to an *asymptomatic* one. At the end of the infectious period, individuals are *removed*; they no longer spread the disease.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .



Figure ES.8: Flow diagram of the $SL_1L_2I_1I_2A_1A_2R_IR_AD$ model. $\Phi = \beta(I_1 + I_2 + \xi(A_1 + A_2) + \eta L_2)$ is the force of infection. Blue compartments are observable, with I_1 and I_2 usually indistinguishable and observed as $I_1 + I_2$.

As in Arino & Portet,[1] there are two each of the latent, symptomatically infectious and asymptomatically infectious compartments. This is so that the time of sojourn in these disease states is Erlang distributed; see B.3. Also, the force of infection Φ includes contributions not only from symptomatic infectious I and asymptomatically infectious A individuals but also from individuals in L_2. This is to accommodate observations of pre-symptomatic COVID-19 infections.[3] Finally, contrary to,[1] the removed compartment is further subdivided into compartments for individuals having recovered from symptomatic and asymptomatic infections, R_I and R_A, respectively, and those having died from the disease, D.

Symptomatically infectious individuals are those who present symptoms and should normally be detected through testing, i.e., individuals who appear as *confirmed* cases in the data. Asymptomatically infectious individuals include those who are asymptomatic in the usual sense, but also symptomatic cases that avoid detection because of lack of testing. In the perspective of response to a crisis, using a case detection-based definition for symptomatic and asymptomatic cases allows to tailor model outputs to the situation in the location under consideration. This is further enhanced by using compartments R_I and D directly connected to published data.

One drawback from using a case detection-based distinction between symptomatic and asymptomatic cases is that the parameters involved (π, δ and η) must be understood as incorporating not only disease characteris-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

tics but also some information about the location under consideration. For instance, locations performing a lot of testing will typically have a lower proportion of individuals following the asymptomatic route, i.e., a lower value of π, than those doing less testing.

Some notation is introduced to make discussions simpler. Individuals of type $\mathcal{I}$ are those *infected* with the disease, i.e., $\mathcal{I} \in \{L_1, L_2, I_1, I_2, A_1, A_2\}$. The prevalence of infection at time t is then $\mathcal{I}(t) = L_1(t) + L_2(t) + I_1(t) + I_2(t) + A_1(t) + A_2(t)$. Individuals of type $\mathcal{U}$ are *unobservable* infected, i.e., $\mathcal{U} \in \{L_1, L_2, A_1, A_2\}$. *Observable* infected are $\mathcal{O} \in \{I_1, I_2\}$. The prevalence of unobservable and observable infections are obtained like that of infected cases, by summing the corresponding state variables. We can also define sets $\mathcal{U}_T$ and $\mathcal{O}_T$ for, respectively, total unobserved and observed cases, by adding R_A to $\mathcal{U}$ and R_I and D to $\mathcal{O}$; these will not be used here.

We refer to[1] for some basic properties of the corresponding ordinary differential equations (ODE) model and just mention here that the effective reproduction number of the ODE version is

$$\mathcal{R}_t = \beta \left(2\frac{\pi\xi}{\gamma} + 2\frac{1-\pi}{\gamma} + \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon} \right) S(0), \tag{ES.1}$$

where $S(0)$ is the initial susceptible population.[1] This formula is applicable to the stochastic model and is therefore useful to set some parameter values. It is used for instance when considering the intensity of NPI measures in the local community.

A.3 Base model with a single importation event

Let $t \in [0, \infty)$ be a continuous variable (*time*). The random vector $\mathbf{V}(t)$ defined as

$$(S(t), L_1(t), L_2(t), I_1(t), I_2(t), A_1(t), A_2(t), R_I(t), R_A(t), D(t))$$

is the *state* of the system at time t. Denote $\Delta\mathbf{V}(t) = \mathbf{V}(t + \Delta t) - \mathbf{V}(t)$ the change in system state in the time interval $[t, t+\Delta t]$, with $\Delta t > 0$ sufficiently small to have at most one change during this interval. The probability of a transition is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Delta\mathbf{V}(t) | \mathbf{V}(t)\right), \tag{ES.2}$$

where $\Delta\mathbf{V}(t) = (\Delta S, \Delta L_1, \Delta L_2, \Delta I_1, \Delta I_2, \Delta A_1, \Delta A_2, \Delta R_I, \Delta R_A, \Delta D)$. The components $\Delta S, \Delta L_1, \ldots, \Delta D$ take only the values ± 1 and 0 because of the hypothesis on Δt being small enough. Transition probabilities are defined

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

as follows (only nonzero values are shown):

Rate	ΔS	ΔL_1	ΔL_2	ΔI_1	ΔI_2	ΔA_1	ΔA_2	ΔR_I	ΔR_A	ΔD
ΦS	-1	1								
εL_1		-1	1							
$(1-\pi)\varepsilon L_2$			-1	1						
γI_1				-1	1					
$\delta\gamma I_2$					-1					1
$(1-\delta)\gamma I_2$					-1			1		
$\pi\varepsilon L_2$			-1			1				
γA_1						-1	1			
γA_2						-1			1	

(ES.3)

Parameters are β, the transmission coefficient, η and ξ the modifications of infectiousness for individuals who are, respectively, pre-symptomatically and asymptomatically infectious. A fraction π of individuals moves into an asymptomatic phase following incubation (and correspondingly, $1-\pi$ develop symptoms or are detected). Because of the interpretation that we make of the symptomatic cases being those that are effectively detected, π is in essence a combination of the proportion of cases that are asymptomatic and those that are symptomatic yet avoid detection.

Finally, ε and γ describe the rates at which incubation and infectiousness end, respectively. The fraction δ is the case fatality ratio; it is assumed that asymptomatic cases are mild and never lead to death.

Model (ES.3), when it is used to consider single introduction events, is combined with initial conditions at time $t = 0$ of the form $S(0) = S_0$ (the initial susceptible population), $R_I(0) = R_A(0) = D(0) = 0$ and one or several of $L_1(0), L_2(0), I_1(0), I_2(0), A_1(0)$ or $A_2(0)$ containing an integer number of individuals. In most cases, we consider the importation of a single individual, although in Section 3.1.2 we consider the effect of introductions of more than one infected individual.

When considering importations of a single infected individual at time $t = 0$, explicit formula can be derived concerning probabilities of events affecting individuals. For instance, suppose that importation is of a single infected individual in the L_2 compartment, i.e., $L_2(0) = 1$ with all other infected compartments empty. The probability that this individual recovers or dies from the disease without ever transmitting the virus is

$$\left(\frac{(1-\pi)\varepsilon}{\varepsilon+\beta\eta S(0)}\right)\left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta S(0)}\right)^2+\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{\varepsilon+\beta\eta S(0)}\right)\left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta\xi S(0)}\right)^2. \quad \text{(ES.4)}$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

The first term is the probability of progression from L_2 to I_1 without local transmission. The second one is the probability of progression from I_1 to D or R_I without local transmission. The third term is the probability of progression from L_2 to A_1 without local transmission and the last term is the progression from A_1 to R_A without local transmission.

A.4 Adding repeated importations to the model

A case importation event is described by three components: the *time* at which the event occurs, the *size* of the importation (the number of cases imported simultaneously), and the *type* (epidemiological status) of cases that are imported. In order to better understand the role of the rate of importation and lower the number of parameters affecting the output of the model, we suppose here that all importations are of size 1 and focus on the rate (timing) and nature (type) of importations.

The timing of importations is described using a Poisson process with a parameter λ; the mean time between importation events is $1/\lambda$. An imported infected individual can belong to one of the six compartments L_1, L_2, I_1, I_2, A_1 or A_2; the infectious status of the imported individual is the type of the importation event. The probability of each type is given by p_{L_1}, p_{L_2}, p_{I_1}, p_{I_2}, p_{A_1} and p_{A_2} where $p_{L_1} + p_{L_2} + p_{I_1} + p_{I_2} + p_{A_1} + p_{A_2} = 1$.

So the model with repeated importations is the CTMC with transition rates given by (ES.3), with initial condition $S(0) = S_0$ and all other compartments zero, to which the following transitions are added.

Rate	ΔL_1	ΔL_2	ΔI_1	ΔI_2	ΔA_1	ΔA_2
λp_{L_1}	1					
λp_{L_2}		1				
λp_{I_1}			1			
λp_{I_2}				1		
λp_{A_1}					1	
λp_{A_2}						1

(ES.5)

A.5 Estimation of importation rates

The number per day of case arrivals in *destination* from *origin* i can be approximated by:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i \simeq\ & \text{fraction active cases among population at } \textit{origin } i \\ \times\ & \text{fraction undetected among active cases at } \textit{origin } i \\ \times\ & \text{number of PAX per day from } \textit{origin } i \text{ to } \textit{destination}. \end{aligned} \tag{ES.6}$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

In general, a given location is connected to many other locations, say, N of them. Using (ES.6), we obtain a value λ_i for each of the $i = 1, \ldots, N$ locations that are potential sources of importation for the location under consideration. As arrival times are Poisson distributed, from the perspective of the receiving location, arrival times of events are independent exponentially distributed random variables. As a consequence, the parameter of the Poisson distribution for a location is obtained by considering competing risks and

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i. \tag{ES.7}$$

A.6 Characterising outbreak severity

To define the severity of the outcome, a threshold τ is chosen by adapting the results developed by Whittle[19] for a simpler stochastic SIR model. Whittle establishes that the probability of a *major* outbreak for an SIR model is $1 - (1/\mathcal{R}_t)^{I(0)}$ if $\mathcal{R}_t > 1$, while no major outbreak is possible when $\mathcal{R}_t < 1$, where $I(0)$ is the initial number of infected individuals in the population. He also establishes the probability of a minor outbreak when $\mathcal{R}_t < 1$, but this is not used here as we employ a different method for detecting minor outbreaks. Rather than computing the probability of a major outbreak, we decide on a probability p (in practice, $p = 0.95$) of observing a major outbreak and set the threshold $\tau = -\ln(1-p)/\ln(\mathcal{R}_t)$. This threshold is then interpreted as follows: suppose that during a simulation, we observe a successful importation; if at some point following the importation, the prevalence of the disease increases to or past τ, then with probability p, a major outbreak occurs.

As a consequence, we classify the type of importation events as follows.

- A successful importation sees an $S \to L_1$ transition for a local susceptible individual.
- An unsuccessful importation event does not lead to such a transition.
- A critical successful importation is detected by checking, when $\mathcal{R}_t > 1$, whether for some $t \in [0, t_f]$, the prevalence of infection $\mathcal{I}(t) > \tau$. There is no major outbreak (and thus no critical successful importations) for $\mathcal{R}_t < 1$.
- A noncritical successful importation is a successful importation that is not critical.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

Severity can be further evaluated using observable infected cases $\mathcal{O}(t)$, unobservable infected cases $\mathcal{U}(t)$, and total prevalence of infection $\mathcal{I}(t)$.

B Results

The examples that follow use the data for Prince Edward Island (PEI). Although not completely homogeneous, PEI is small in surface area (5,660 square kilometres) and quite densely populated (25 inhabitants per square kilometre). PEI can be reached by plane, ferry and through a bridge linking it to the continent (the Confederation Bridge). PEI has, to this point, had very few cases of COVID-19, most of them being imported.

B.1 Role of the nature of the import case

		Compartment with initial case					
	$\mathcal{R}_t$	L_1	L_2	I_1	I_2	A_1	A_2
UI	0.8	0.511	0.500	0.509	0.669	0.805	0.888
–	1.2	0.401	0.434	0.347	0.597	0.757	0.848
–	2.5	0.210	0.268	0.164	0.407	0.607	0.756
NSI	0.8	0.489	0.500	0.491	0.331	0.195	0.112
–	1.2	0.484	0.458	0.518	0.309	0.208	0.132
–	2.5	0.089	0.065	0.073	0.088	0.091	0.054
CSI	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
–	1.2	0.115	0.108	0.135	0.094	0.035	0.020
–	2.5	0.701	0.667	0.763	0.505	0.302	0.190

Table ES.3: Proportion of simulations with unsuccessful (UI), noncritical (NSI) and critical (CSI) successful importations, as a function of the type of initial case.

Since L_1 individuals are not yet infectious to others, their effect on the proportion of simulations going to local extinction is not different from introducing an L_2 individual. Importation of an asymptomatic case is more likely to be unsuccessful; this is even more noticeable late stage asymptomatic A_2 cases. Indeed, in the simulations, asymptomatically infected individuals are less infectious and those in A_2 spend, together with those in I_2, the least amount of time in the population (parameter values used in simulations are given in Table 1). The effect of the length of time spent in the population is also visible for symptomatically infectious individuals, as evidenced by the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

difference between proportions of simulations with local disease extinction for I_1 and I_2 imports. Note that the proportion of simulations with *unsuccessful importation* (UI) can be computed theoretically from equations such as (ES.4). For instance, taking an initial case L_2, the probability that the individual dies or recovers from the disease without transmitting the virus is 0.5288 (resp. 0.4176 and 0.2351) for $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.8$ (resp. 1.2 and 2.5) from (ES.4); compare these values with the values of unsuccessful importations for L_2 in Table ES.3. In further simulations, we assume that I individuals cannot travel.

B.2 Time to detection of local cases after importation

We continue with single stimulation simulations and present here results not discussed in the main text. We take the example of importation at time $t = 0$ of an L_1 individual; results are qualitatively similar for importations of other types, with only the time distributions varying.



Figure ES.9: Time to extinction of the disease, first detected locally infected individual, first detected imported case, and serial interval. Base case simulation with $S(0) = 142,906$ (population of Prince Edward Island), $L_1(0) = 1$ and all other states equal to 0. Horizontal lines indicate the median value. Black rectangles are the inter-quartile range. Here, $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.8$.

In Figure ES.9, the first violin plot describes the distribution of local extinction times, the second shows the time distribution of the first *local* detected case, the third represents the time distribution of the first *import* detected case, i.e. when the import case L_1 becomes I_1. The distribution of serial intervals generated by the index case is shown on the right. Here,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

we define the serial interval as the length of time between the start of the simulation (i.e., the importation of an L_1 individual) and the time at which the first local infection occurs ($S \to L_1$ transition).

The median time to the detection of the first symptomatic infection (I_1 individual) following an importation event is 4.7 days (95% confidence interval $1.01 - 13.6$) for the import case and 15.3 days (95% confidence interval $6.04-30.6$) for a local case. In contrast, the first local infection event ($S \to L_1$ transition) occurs, on average, 9.4 days following an importation event (95% confidence interval $2.7 - 21.8$), and more than 81% of these first infections occur after 5 days (roughly the median time of the first $L_2 \to I_1$ transition).

Thus, if the import case is detected, this happens generally slightly before the first local transmission event takes place. In such a situation, the immediate isolation of the infected import case can prevent over half the local transmissions this individual would make. Note that this highlights the importance of quarantine: those transmissions that happen before isolation would not have taken place had this individual been quarantine. So quarantine is an efficacious way to compensate for delays in detection and isolation.

Most first detections of local I_1 take place within 20 days following the importation of an L_1 individual; however, in some situations, the first infected and detected I_1 individual appears more than 30 days after the importation event. This characterises silent local transmission chains, i.e., ones involving only asymptomatically infected individuals.

B.3 Effect of the distribution of incubation periods

As mentioned in Section 2.1, compartments for L, I and A are subdivided in order to have Erlang distributed times of sojourn in these compartments rather than exponentially distributed ones. For instance, an individual traversing the two compartments L_1 and L_2 at the rate ε spends an average time $2/\varepsilon$ between entry into L_1 and exit from L_2, with their time of sojourn Erlang distributed.

Between the incubation and infectious periods, the average COVID-19 patient spends an average of 15 days infected. The time horizon for the present work and for other work on COVID-19, on the other hand, is short. With such commensurate time scales, the variance of distributions becomes important. Several papers have considered distributions of incubation periods.[4,5] Early work on 181 patients outside Hubei province before 24 February 2020[4] found the best fit for the distribution of incubation times for these

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

patients to be an Erlang distribution with shape parameter (the number of compartments needed in our approach) equal to six. In order to judge the effect of using more compartments to obtain a better shaped distribution of incubation times, we ran the same simulations as in Table ES.3, with six L compartments instead of two as in the rest of this work. Results are shown in Table ES.4; the model is robust to the number of latent compartments used.

		Compartment with initial case					
	n	L_1	L_2	I_1	I_2	A_1	A_2
UI	2	0.401	0.434	0.347	0.597	0.757	0.848
–	6	0.436	0.392	0.379	0.586	0.746	0.836
NSI	2	0.484	0.458	0.518	0.309	0.208	0.132
–	6	0.464	0.513	0.497	0.350	0.225	0.151

Table ES.4: Proportions of simulations with unsuccessful (UI) and non-critical successful (NSI) importations, as a function of the type of initial case, when $R_t = 1.2$. n is the number of latent compartments used in the simulations.

B.4 Estimation of importation rates

As some of our numerics is inspired by the example of Prince Edward Island (PEI), let us continue with this. The first day of the "Atlantic bubble", where residents of all Maritime provinces of Canada were allowed to travel freely between these provinces, 8,500 people used the Confederation Bridge, which links PEI to the continent (in New Brunswick), going towards PEI. Suppose that cases in this flow happen with the same rate as in the general population and that prevalence in the general population can be deduced from confirmed case counts.

Assume that all travellers to PEI that day came from New Brunswick and that this relaxation of travel restrictions happened when New Brunswick experienced its highest number of active cases, on 2 April 2020, when there were 72 active cases.[6] The estimate of the population of New Brunswick for the second quarter of 2020 was 780,890,[7] i.e., a fraction of active cases of 0.000092202. Estimates for the prevalence of asymptomaticity vary; however, let us use the figure we have used throughout: 20%. Based on (ES.6), this gives 0.156744228 expected cases that day or, in other words, a mean time between importations of about 6.4 days, implying a rather high risk of importation (see Figure 5).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

In practice, the Atlantic Bubble was put in place on 3 July 2020, at which time there was 1 active case in New Brunswick. Reasoning the same way, the mean time between importations in this instance would be of about 460 days, giving a very low risk of importation.

B.5 Effect of importation rates on outbreak severity

Using the threshold τ derived from Whittle,[19] we investigate in Figure ES.10 the proportion of simulations with critical successful importations when $\mathcal{R}_t > 1$.



Figure ES.10: Proportion of critical successful importations (CSI) in a 3 month period for different values of the average number of days between two importations and $\mathcal{R}_t$, an indicator of NPI efficacy.

B.6 Effect of post-arrival quarantine

The efficacy of quarantine can be expressed as the complement of the probability that an imported case is still in one of the unobservable infected states L_1, L_2, A_1, or A_2 at the end of the quarantine time t_q, i.e., the probability they emerge from quarantine infected and undetected. Consider the matrix

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

of transition rates constructed from the entries of the first column of (ES.3), represented here as the table of transition rates between stages of infection:

	L_1	L_2	I_1	I_2	A_1	A_2	R_I	R_A	D
L_1	$-\varepsilon$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L_2	ε	$-\varepsilon$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I_1	0	$(1-\pi)\varepsilon$	$-\gamma$	0	0	0	0	0	0
I_2	0	0	γ	$-\gamma$	0	0	0	0	0
A_1	0	$\pi\varepsilon$	0	0	$-\gamma$	0	0	0	0
A_2	0	0	0	0	γ	$-\gamma$	0	0	0
R_I	0	0	0	$(1-\delta)\gamma$	0	0	0	0	0
R_A	0	0	0	0	0	γ	0	0	0
D	0	0	0	$\delta\gamma$	0	0	0	0	0

Let $\mathbf{T}$ be the matrix whose entries are given in this table, and let t_{ij} denote the ith row j^{th} column entry of $\mathbf{T}$. The diagonal entries of $\mathbf{T}$ are the rates of exit from each stage, and t_{ij} with $i \neq j$ is the rate of transition from stage j to stage i. If we let $p_i(t)$ denote the probability a given individual is in stage i at time t then $p(t)$ satisfies the differential equations $\frac{dp}{dt} = \mathbf{T}p$, whose solutions are the matrix exponential $e^{\mathbf{T}t}$. Specifically, entries of $e^{\mathbf{T}t}$ are the probabilities an individual is in the corresponding row-stage at time t conditional on having started in the corresponding column-stage at time 0. Figure 6 gives a graphical representation of $e^{\mathbf{T}t}$ with parameters specified in Table 1 and t set to 7 days and 14 days respectively. Specifically, the entries of $e^{7\,\mathbf{T}}$ are as follows:

	L_1	L_2	I_1	I_2	A_1	A_2	R_I	R_A	D
L_1	0.086	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0	0	0
L_2	0.211	0.086	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0	0	0
I_1	0.304	0.299	0.247	0.000	0.000	0.000	0	0	0
I_2	0.168	0.246	0.345	0.247	0.000	0.000	0	0	0
A_1	0.076	0.075	0.000	0.000	0.247	0.000	0	0	0
A_2	0.042	0.061	0.000	0.000	0.345	0.247	0	0	0
R_I	0.088	0.182	0.399	0.736	0.000	0.000	0.978	0	0
R_A	0.023	0.047	0.000	0.000	0.408	0.753	0	1	0
D	0.002	0.004	0.009	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.022	0	1

An individual in stage L_2 at time 0 is distributed at time $t = 7$ according to column 2 of the table.

If an infected individual with state distributed according to p_X arrives in a community at time 0 and is placed in quarantine for a time t_q, then that individual's state at time t_q has distribution $e^{\mathbf{T}t_q}p_X$. Further, the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

probability the individual is in one of the states in $\{L_1, L_2, A_1, A_2\}$ at time t is given by $ue^{\mathbf{T}t}p_X$ where u is the characteristic vector for undetected infections, $u = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$ and a range of times t_q. If, after t_q days, the individual is still in an unobservable state $\mathcal{U}$, then quarantine has failed. Otherwise, quarantine is considered a success. Recall that, in the model, I individuals have been detected by the authority, explaining why I_1 and I_2 individuals are considered as a success of the quarantine. We define the efficacy of quarantine, c, as the probability,

$$c = 1 - ue^{\mathbf{T}t_q}p_X, \tag{ES.8}$$

that the imported case is in either an observable state, I_1, I_2, R_I, or D, or recovered in state R_A. Figure 7 represents c for different values of t_q, where $ue^{\mathbf{T}t_q}p_X$ is computed for $p_X = (0.25, 0.25, 0, 0, 0.25, 0.25, 0, 0, 0)^T$.

Furthermore, the quarantine-regulated importation rate λ_q is expressed by

$$\lambda_q = (1 - c)\lambda. \tag{ES.9}$$

References

[1] Arino J and Portet S. A simple model for COVID-19. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 5:309–315, 2020.

[2] Arino J, Brauer F, van den Driessche P, Watmough J, and Wu J. Simple models for containment of a pandemic. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 3(8):453–457, 2006.

[3] He X, Lau E. H, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*, 26(5):672–675, 2020.

[4] Lauer S. A, Grantz K. H, Bi Q, et al. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: Estimation and application. *Annals of internal medicine*, 172:577–582, May 2020.

[5] Yang L, Dai J, Zhao J, Wang Y, Deng P, and Wang J. Estimation of incubation period and serial interval of COVID-19: analysis of 178 cases and 131 transmission chains in Hubei province, China. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 148:1–6, 2020.

[6] Government of New Brunswick . New Brunswick COVID-19 Dashboard. `https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/8eeb9a2052d641c996dba5de8f25a8aa`. Accessed: 2020-07-27.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173658; this version posted August 14, 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 4.0 International license .

[7] Statistics Canada . Population and demography statistics. https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/subjects-start/population_and_demography. Accessed: 2020-07-27.