Optimal COVID-19 quarantine and testing strategies

Chad R. Wells [1]*, Jeffrey P. Townsend [2,3,4,5]*†, Abhishek Pandey [1], Gary Krieger [6], Burton Singer [7], Robert H. McDonald [8], Seyed M. Moghadas [9], Alison P. Galvani [1,3]

[1] *Center for Infectious Disease Modeling and Analysis (CIDMA), Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT 06520, USA*
[2]*Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut 06510, USA*
[3]*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06525, USA*
[4]*Program in Computational Biology and Bioinformatics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA*
[5]*Program in Microbiology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA*
[6] *NewFields LLC Boulder, CO USA 30301 and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Science, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus*
[7] *Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida, P.O. Box 100009, Gainesville, FL 32610, USA*
[8] *Group Health, Safety and Environment; BHP; Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, 3000*
[9] *Agent-Based Modelling Laboratory, York University, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3 Canada*

Keywords: Coronavirus; quarantine; viral shedding; disease control; testing; contact tracing

*contributed equally to this research

†corresponding author: Jeffrey.Townsend@Yale.edu

Abstract

As economic woes of the COVID-19 pandemic deepen, strategies are being formulated to avoid the need for prolonged stay-at-home orders, while implementing risk-based quarantine, testing, contact tracing and surveillance protocols. Given limited resources and the significant economic, public health and operational challenges of the current 14-day quarantine recommendation, it is vital to understand if more efficient but equally effective quarantine and testing strategies can be deployed. To this end, we developed a mathematical model to quantify the probability of post-quarantine transmission that varied across a range of possible quarantine durations, timings of molecular testing, and entry uniformly across infection time course or entry as a traced contact. Assuming cases entering quarantine uniformly across infection time course and a one-day delay for testing and, we found that a 13-day quarantine with testing on entry, a seven-day quarantine with testing on exit, and a seven-day quarantine with testing on both entry and exit each provide equivalent or lower probability of post-quarantine transmission compared to a 14-day quarantine with no testing. We found that testing on exit from quarantine is more effective in reducing probability of post-quarantine transmission than testing upon entry. When conducting a single test, testing on exit was most effective for quarantines lasting up to six days. For longer quarantines, the optimal test day was day five or day six. These results differed by no more than one day for cases entering quarantine as traced contacts. Optimal timing of testing during quarantine will reduce the probability of post-quarantine transmission, as false-positive results become less likely, enabling case isolation. Based on 4,040 SARS CoV-2 RT-PCR tests, an exit test 96 hours after the start of quarantine for an offshore oil rig population was demonstrated to identify all known asymptomatic cases that previously tested negative at entry, and—moreover—successfully prevented an expected nine offshore transmission events, each a

serious concern for initiating rapid spread and a disabling outbreak in the close quarters of an offshore rig. This successful outcome highlights the importance of context-specific guidelines for the duration of quarantine and timing of testing that can minimize economic impacts, disruptions to operational integrity, and COVID-related public health risks.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has engendered unprecedented efforts to quell ongoing outbreaks and manage healthcare capacity, including strict travel restrictions and stay-at-home orders. However, these efforts have disrupted workplaces, leading to significant and pervasive socioeconomic costs [1,2]. Economic pressures have led many governments and corporations to proceed with plans to reopen their economy and workforce [3]. Safely reopening in the absence of a vaccine relies on reducing the likelihood of an infectious individual entering a workplace or school [4]. Current strategies include the use of a 14-day quarantine and often with some combination of entry and/or exit testing, coupled with contact tracing should a case arise. These strategies aim to reduce the effective reproduction number R—the average number of secondary infections caused by a primary case—below one.

Quarantining individuals imposes myriad challenges for government workers, military, businesses, universities, and other entities. In many settings, the recommended 14-day quarantine poses a significant strain on the mental and physical health of employees and their families [5,6], coupled with the associated economic toll and potential impacts on operational integrity. For example, during the time of the epidemic with quarantine measures in place, offshore oil and gas employees may be needed to work extended cycles significantly beyond their traditional 14-day on-and-off cycle. This built-in quarantine time into the overall work schedule results in prolonged time periods that crew members are away from their home. Given the impact of long quarantines on mental and physical health [5,6], a priority of our research was to identify a minimal, effective quarantine strategy for close-quarter environments where there is potentially a high risk for the rapid spread of COVID-19 with associated severe outcomes and even mortality.

Previous work has focused on the impact of quarantine and testing on population-level COVID-19 incidence and deaths [7–9], and testing measures that are most appropriate for disease surveillance within a population by examining various testing frequencies [10]. Currently, there is no consensus regarding the optimal duration of quarantine or timing of testing that minimizes the risk of outbreaks in workplaces, university campuses, military facilities [11]. Many institutions are relying on testing at entry into quarantine, and other measures such as symptom screenings, hand sanitizers, and face masks to reduce the risk of an outbreak. Given that over 50% of COVID-19 transmission is attributed to pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic cases [12], screening for symptoms alone is inadequate to prevent or interrupt a COVID-19 outbreak [12]. In addition, testing early post-infection could produce a false-negative result [13]. Thus, symptom-based screening and one-time testing could still entail a significant probability of post-quarantine transmission (PQT). Consequently, some jurisdictions have suggested and implemented testing upon exit from a 14-day quarantine [14] . Understanding the complementarity of quarantine and testing in reducing PQT would provide vital insight into effective strategies to ensure the safety of civilian and military workers, students returning to classrooms, and international travelers, thereby mitigating disease spread in the wider community.

Here, we evaluate whether an alternative epidemiologically sound, quarantine and testing strategy exists that would be equivalent to the standard 14-day quarantine protocol in reducing PQT. To do so, we developed a mathematical model to calculate the benefits of diverse quarantine and molecular testing strategies in reducing the probability of PQT, accounting for the infectivity profile of an infected individual and the temporal diagnostic sensitivity of RT-PCR

testing. We estimated the probability of PQT for an infected individual that has not manifested symptoms but has completed quarantine with undetected infection. In our analysis, we considered different combinations of timing and frequency of testing with quarantine of up to 14 days, with and without contact tracing. In addition, we performed a sensitivity analysis on our results based on the impact of differences in the latent period. We compared the probability of PQT under three scenarios of testing: (i) on entry to quarantine only, (ii) on exit from quarantine only, and (iii) on both entry to and exit from quarantine for an infected individual. Lastly, we analyze the results of the application of guidance from our model regarding the operational processes of quarantine and testing within the oil and gas industry that prevented offshore transmission (**Supplementary Information: Narrative**).

Results

Using the infectivity profile derived from transmission pairs of COVID-19 infected individuals [15], temporal diagnostic sensitivity of RT-PCR tests [16], and an incubation period of 8.29 days [17], we calculated the probability of PQT for a basic reproduction number of $R_0 = 2.5$, assuming that secondary infections are distributed through a negative binomial distribution with a dispersion parameter of 0.25 [18] (**Table S1**). From the infectivity profile, assuming that 30.8% of infections are asymptomatic across the disease time course [12], we estimated that the reproduction number reduces to 1.6 under perfect isolation of cases upon symptom onset, with 1.2 secondary cases occurring during the incubation period (**Fig. S1A**). The expected number of secondary infections still remains above one with a lower asymptomatic proportion of 22.6% or with a reduced R_0 of 2 (**Fig. S1B–D**). Therefore, perfect isolation of all symptomatic individuals would not be sufficient to interrupt the chain of disease transmission.

Impact of quarantine without testing

To evaluate the effectiveness of quarantine alone, we computed the expected PQT (**Fig. S2A**) and the probability of PQT after a range of quarantine durations (**Fig. 1, Fig. S3**). Assuming individuals self-isolate immediately upon symptom onset, we calculated that the probability of PQT declines as the duration of quarantine increases (**Fig. 1**). This probability is less than 0.25 with a quarantine duration of at least three days, and falls below 0.05 for quarantines of eight days or longer.

Testing during quarantine

The effectiveness of quarantine in reducing the probability of PQT can be augmented through testing. We assumed a 24-hour delay between the sample collection and test results, indicating testing on exit occurs a day before the end of quarantine. Under each scenario of testing, individuals who are tested positive or developed symptoms are isolated. We found that any testing during quarantine contributed to a reduction in the probability of PQT across a full range of quarantine durations (**Fig. 1** and **Fig. S3)**. However, the magnitude of this reduction was dependent on the duration of quarantine and timing of the test. The largest reduction in the probability of PQT from conducting a single test occurs when it is performed on the last day of quarantine for durations less than seven days; on the day six for a seven-day quarantine; on day five for quarantines lasting between eight and 13 days; and on day six for quarantines that are 14 days or longer (**Fig. S4A**).

Comparing the three testing strategies, we found that testing on both entry and exit from

quarantine provides the greatest return in decreasing the probability of PQT, whereas the benefit of testing in reducing this probability is lowest when conducted only at entry into quarantine (**Fig. 1**, **Fig. S3**). Testing on exit consistently outperformed testing on entry across all quarantine durations considered (**Fig. 1**). For example, a quarantine duration as short as three days with a test on both entry and exit yields a 64.5% reduction in probability of PQT relative to no testing, compared to a 22.8% decrease when the individual is tested on entry only and a 61.4% decline for testing on exit only (**Fig. S3**).

We compared strategies of quarantine and testing with the widely implemented, World Health Organization-recommended 14-day quarantine without testing [19]. We found that a 13-day quarantine with testing on entry, a seven-day quarantine with testing on exit, and a seven-day quarantine with testing on both entry and exit each provide equivalent or lower probability of PQT compared to a 14-day quarantine with no testing (**Fig. 1**, **Fig. S2–S3**).



Figure 1: The probability of post-quarantine transmission for no testing and three testing strategies and durations of quarantine from 1–14 days, with an incubation period of 8.29 days, 30.8% asymptomatic infections and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections. Curves for the probability of post-quarantine transmission show the probability of one or more post-quarantine infections when an infected individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation or asymptomatic period without testing (red), and with testing upon entry to quarantine (orange), on exit from quarantine (blue), and on both entry to and exit from quarantine (purple). With a delay in sample collection to results, we assumed that testing on exit occurred the day before the end of quarantine.

Assessment of quarantine and testing strategies implemented for offshore facilities

We performed an assessment of the practical implications of our analyses based on quarantine and testing protocols in the setting of offshore oil-and-gas platforms (**Supplementary Information: Narrative**). We stratified the tests into regions A and B based on the location of the lab where the test results were obtained. Among the 4040 RT PCR tests conducted prior to travel offshore, there were 69 positive results (1.7%). Initially, a three-day quarantine with testing only upon entry was implemented. Of the 1792 RT-PCR tests conducted with this strategy, there were 22 positive results (1.2%). Region A deployed a seven-day home quarantine, where testing was performed on both entry and exit (96 h after the first test) starting from August

13, with 50.0% (1/2) of the positive tests occurring on exit (**Fig. 2A**). Region B expanded to a five-day hotel quarantine with testing on both entry and 96 h after the first test, starting on June 25, 2020. For the period in which the entry and exit testing strategy was implemented in region B, 33.3% (15/45) of the positive tests were obtained upon the exit test, following a negative entry test (**Fig. 2B**). Further validation of the entry and exit testing protocol was provided through an additional 155 RT-PCR tests performed post-quarantine (11 days after the initial test), all of which were negative.



Figure 2: Weekly SARS-CoV-2 testing between April 11 to August 26, 2020 among two regions where crew members were quarantined. The positivity rate of test conducted between April 11 and August 26 for (**A**) region A (with a seven-day quarantine) where testing on entry and exit was started on August 13 and (**B**) region B (with a five-day quarantine) where testing on entry and exit was started on June 25. Initially, a three-day quarantine with testing only on entry was conducted in both regions. The vertical dashed line separates the strategy of testing on only entry (left), the strategy of testing on both entry and exit (right), with follow-up post-quarantine tests conducted 11 days after the initial test (i.e., on day 12). Negative and positive sequential symbols − and + indicate the test histories. In these results, negative symbols are always conveying results to tests that were previous to the results quantified by the bar above. The number of positive tests and the number of tests conducted is denoted above the bar in parentheses.

No offshore worker registering negative tests-on-entry-and-exit from quarantine was later diagnosed with COVID-19 during their offshore work. We quantified the probability of PQT for the cases detected by an exit test, as well as the extent to which adding testing on exit to testing on entry reduced this probability, assuming an incubation period of 8.29 days. Individuals who eventually developed symptoms entered quarantine uniformly during their incubation period

(prior to symptom onset), whereas asymptomatic individuals entered quarantine over the course of their infection. Compared with a three-day quarantine and testing only on entry, extending the quarantine duration and adding testing on exit (96 h after the first test) reduced the probability of PQT by 98% for the seven-day quarantine and 93% for a five-day quarantine. If the single case identified on the exit test from region A remained undetected within the seven-day quarantine, we estimate an off-shore probability of PQT of 0.13. If the 15 cases that had been ascertained on exit from region B had remained undetected after the five-day quarantine without testing on exit, we estimate that the probability of PQT would have been 0.99, and would have resulted in an expected 9 offshore transmission events—each one a serious concern for initiating rapid spread and a disabling outbreak in the close quarters of an offshore rig. We found that the estimated probability of PQT using the strategy of testing upon entry and exit moderately increased with the proportion of infections being asymptomatic (**Fig. S5**).

Accounting for prevalence of disease in the community.

We evaluated the impact of disease prevalence in the community on the probability of PQT (**Fig. S6**). For a cohort of size 40 and a five-day quarantine with prevalence of 1%, we estimated the probability of PQT to be 0.06 for testing only on entry, and 0.005 for testing on both entry and exit (**Fig. S6B**). For a seven-day quarantine and the same prevalence, the probability of PQT drops from 0.02 for testing only on entry to 0.001 when augmented with testing on exit (**Fig. S6C**).

Contrasting contact tracing and uniform entry into quarantine

We evaluated the effectiveness of quarantine through contact tracing in reducing the probability of PQT with no delay (**Fig. 3, Fig. S7–S8**) and with one-day delay in the identification of exposed contacts (**Fig. S9–S10**). Consistent with practices at remote mining sites, tracing of contacts was assumed to be initiated by the presentation of a worker to the onsite health unit with relevant COVID-19 symptoms. For offshore oil platforms, contact tracing is initiated if there is identification of a positive case either by symptom presentation or by surveillance screening through testing. Rapid contact tracing leads to contacts being quarantined early in the disease time course (if infected), influencing the decline in the probability of PQT as the duration of quarantine increases compared to uniform entry into quarantine over the duration of the incubation period or disease course (**Fig. 3** vs **Fig. 1)**.

Under contact tracing with no testing, the probability of PQT decreases gradually from 0.35 for a quarantine lasting one day to 0.32 for a quarantine of three days, then reduces more rapidly to 0.13 for an eight-day quarantine, and again decreases gradually for longer durations of quarantine (**Fig. 3)**. In contrast, entry into quarantine uniformly over the course of the incubation period or disease period leads to a continuous decline in the probability of PQT from 0.30 for a one-day quarantine to 0.04 for an eight-day quarantine, with the rate of decrease slowing for quarantine durations longer than eight days (**Fig. 1**).

When testing on entry, the reduction in the probability of PQT as a result of increased duration of quarantine is smaller with contact tracing than with uniform entry into quarantine. For example, the reductions in the probability of PQT from a one-day quarantine to a three-day

quarantine with testing on entry are 3.8% and 7.6% for entry into quarantine based on contact tracing and uniformly, respectively.

We found that a seven-day quarantine with testing on exit, and a six-day quarantine with testing on entry and exit result in an equivalent or lower probability of PQT compared to a 14-day quarantine with no testing; testing on entry having only trivial overall benefit (**Fig. 3A**, **Fig. S7–S8**). We found that the optimal timing of a single test within quarantine of traced contacts was to test upon the last day of quarantine for durations as long as six days, with testing on day six for quarantines extending beyond six days (**Fig. S4B**).

Sensitivity analyses

We performed a comparative analysis specifying a latent period that is one day greater or lesser than the reported 2.9 days [20]. The expected transmission occurring before symptom onset was similar among the different latent periods (1.21 infection for a latent period 2.9 days; 1.24 infections for a latent period of 1.9 days; and 1.27 infections for a latent period of 3.9 days). The infectivity profiles differed among the three latent periods, with a peak infectivity that is higher for both the 1.9-day and 3.9-day latent periods when compared to our baseline (**Fig. S11**).

When individuals entered quarantine uniformly across the time course of infection (**Fig. S12–S15**), the probability of PQT was lower for shorter latent periods. For traced contacts entering quarantines of eight days or longer as (**Fig. S16–S19**), shorter latent periods entailed lower probability of PQT. For traced contacts entering quarantines of fewer than eight days, the relationship of latent period to probability of PQT is more complex. However, one-day changes

in the latent period affect the optimal day to conduct a single test by at most one day (**Fig. S4)**. Specifically, we found that a 3.9-day latent period decreased the optimal day of testing estimated for a 2.9-day latent period, whereas a 1.9-day latent period increased the best day to conduct a single test.



Figure 3: The probability of post-quarantine transmission for no testing and three testing strategies and durations of quarantine of 1–14 days, with an incubation period of 8.29 days, 30.8% asymptomatic infections and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections. Curves for the probability of post-quarantine transmission show the probability of one or more post-quarantine infections when an infected individual enters quarantine through contact tracing within the incubation period without testing (red), and with testing upon entry to quarantine (orange), on exit from quarantine (blue), and on both entry to and exit from quarantine (purple). With a delay in sample collection to results, we assumed that testing on exit occurred the day before the end of quarantine

Discussion

Here, we developed a modelling framework to calculate the probability of post-quarantine transmission of COVID-19 for a wide range of durations of quarantine, supplemented by testing on entry to quarantine, on exit from quarantine, or both. Evidence suggests that isolation of cases

upon symptom onset is insufficient to contain an outbreak of COVID-19 [12]. However, the likelihood of transmission can be reduced substantially through quarantine and testing [4]. We found that testing on both entry to and exit from quarantine was the most effective strategy in reducing the probability of PQT. Furthermore, the optimal timing of a single test was upon exit for quarantines with durations as short as six days. For a quarantine duration longer than six days, the optimal testing time is on day five or six.

An outbreak can be triggered or sustained within an environment that is monitored only for symptoms of COVID-19. Quarantining individuals before returning to work or school has been a common strategy among many businesses, the military and universities to prevent potential outbreaks. An offshore or military setting is one of numerous close-quarters environments in modern society where an outbreak can seriously impact operational integrity, leading to compromised safety and adverse economic consequences. Hence, minimizing outbreak risk while maintaining staffing is critical. Testing may allow for the quarantine duration to be reduced without increasing the risk of PQT. For example, many universities have implemented plans for quarantining and frequent testing of students and employees, where resources allow [24,25]. For businesses and close-quarters environments, the impact of false negatives are a substantially greater issue for operational integrity than false positives. Our results show that testing upon entry to quarantine carries such a risk of false negatives, as infected individuals who enter quarantine very early in the incubation period of disease may not be detected due to low viral loads.

There are benefits to conducting additional tests as prevalence in the general community increases (**Fig. S6**, blue and purple), because as substantial numbers of infected individuals enter quarantine, larger numbers of individuals may proceed through testing with rare false-negative test results, increasing PQT. Additional tests would further decrease the likelihood of the occurrence of a series of false-negatives and their impact can be quantified with our model framework. We have not quantified more extensive testing strategies here due to the limited availability of testing and the moderate decline in return of additional testing from lower detection rates during the early stages of disease post-infection (**Fig. S28**) and likely correlations in false-negative test results over time.

Optimal timing of limited testing during quarantine improves the ability to control PQT. Testing several days into quarantine increases the likelihood of an infected case testing positive (**Fig. S4**). The increasing diagnostic sensitivity of the RT-PCR test is attributable to the rapidly increasing viral load following the less detectable latent stage of infection. If the infected individual remains asymptomatic, testing near the end of a standard 14-day quarantine can also lead to low diagnostic sensitivity due to a declining viral load as they overcome the infection [26]. Specifying an average incubation period of 8.29 days, our analysis indicates that the lowest probability of PQT is achieved by testing on day six of the standard 14-day quarantine (**Fig. S4A, Fig S4B**).

Testing was found to result in a smaller reduction of the expected PQT when entering quarantine through contact tracing compared to not. Contact tracing will be more effective in identifying infected individuals than when selecting individuals at random for quarantine, due to the

differences in exposure risk, increasing the importance of reducing PQT via testing. For example, if prevalence is 1% and 10 individuals are selected at random for quarantine, then on average 0.1 people would be infected. Alternatively, if an index case is isolated upon symptom onset, there would be on average 1.21 individuals infected (for an $R_0 = 2.5$) prior to symptom onset and potentially identified through contact tracing. However, individuals entering quarantine because they are identified by contact tracing are likely to do so earlier post-infection (**Fig. S31**). Therefore, an earlier entry requires a longer quarantine (generally), and makes it more likely that testing occurs during the incubation period, when diagnostic sensitivity of the RT-PCR test is highly limited.

Our results are based on the temporal diagnostic sensitivity of RT-PCR tests, which are currently considered the gold standard test. However, this testing approach is moderately invasive, may be inconsistent during serial testing, and is dependent on the availability of some raw materials that have been scarce [27–30]. The use of saliva tests as an alternative could allow for frequent testing of individuals at a decreased cost, while being less invasive and self-administered [31,32]. There is also evidence that saliva tests are more sensitive than RT-PCR tests from nasal swabs in COVID-19 patients [27]but less sensitive for detection in a community setting [33]. Thus, the recent innovations to improve access to testing, such as widespread use of saliva tests, could shift optimal decision-making for prevention of COVID-19 transmission via quarantine and testing.

Our study is informative for businesses, military operations and universities, providing quantitative estimation of the residual risk of PQT. The calculated infection risks were used to inform the quarantine and RT-PCR testing strategy deployed by an oil and gas company prior to

workers travelling offshore. Of the positive tests obtained under this strategy, 34% were on the exit test, which prevented 16 infected crew members that otherwise would have exited quarantine and entered confined quarters offshore while infectious. The results of the time of testing for a given quarantine duration could be also useful for population-level disease control when quarantine is required for international or even interstate travel.

In summary, prolonged quarantine to reduce PQT leads to increased economic costs and negatively affects mental health and other social aspects of life. However, shortening the duration of quarantine too much can increase the risk of post-quarantine transmission due to false negatives. Furthermore, relying only on symptom onset during quarantine to identify infected cases may not be an effective strategy to prevent post-quarantine transmission, as a sizable proportion of individuals experience asymptomatic infection [22,23]. Combining timely testing with a shorter quarantine mitigates both the costs of long quarantine and post-quarantine transmission by asymptomatic casesIt is critical to consider the interplay between diagnostic sensitivity, timing of testing, and quarantine duration when augmenting quarantine with testing.

Our examination of the effects of durations of quarantine and timings of testing is critical to future efforts to balance the risk of PQT with the undue costs associated with prolonged quarantines. As efforts continue for returning to a level of normality, any control strategy will need to account for public safety, commercial and military operational integrity, school reopening and family emotional well-being. Our study indicates that the approach of testing upon entry into quarantine—currently implemented by most administrative bodies—is the least effective strategy. Testing can provide substantially higher dividends in reducing PQT if

performed later during quarantine—at exit, or in longer quarantines, at an optimal timing. Defining and comprehending the risk of PQT within each context is essential to effective and transparent balancing of lives and livelihoods in times of a global pandemic.

Conclusion

Our analysis shows a reduced probability of post-quarantine transmission when testing on exit compared to testing on entry. By augmenting quarantine with molecular testing, the quarantine duration can be substantially shortened from the recommended 14-day period, while attaining a similar level of risk. The results from this analysis are supported by data of quarantined crew members of an offshore oil facility.

Methods

Data of SARS CoV-2 tests during quarantine

Between April 11, 2020 and August 26, 2020, there were 4,040 SARS CoV-2 RT-PCR tests conducted among employees of an oil and gas company coming from two regions (stratified by lab location). A third region that was monitored is not included in our data set, as there was low population prevalence entering quarantine and there were no positive tests. During the early stages of the epidemic, both regions used a three-day quarantine with testing on entry. On August 13, employees from region A quarantined at home for seven days, with testing occurring on both entry and exit. While employees were at home, they were asked to practice social distancing in public. Starting on June 25, employees from region B were quarantined in a hotel for five days prior to their departure off-shore and tested on both entry and exit. The requirements of an employee to go off-shore were (1) passing the components of a screening

form used to filter out symptomatic cases and those potentially exposed, (2) temperature screenings, and (3) completion of the quarantine with no positive RT-PCR test. Upon a positive test, the employee initiated a 14-day isolation period and followed through the company's case management process. After the isolation period, individuals were able to return back to work contingent upon two negative RT-PCR tests.

Epidemiological parameters

The average incubation period is 8.29 days [17]. The latent period (i.e. infected but low probability of infecting contacts) is 2.9 days [20]. We consider latent periods of 1.9 days and 3.9 days in a scenario analysis [20] (**Fig. S11–S19**).

For our baseline analysis, we considered a delay of one day between sample collection and result of RT-PCT test. Thus, the sample is taken one day before the end of quarantine when testing on exit. We also conducted the analysis when there was no delay in testing results to examine the impact on the probability of PQT (**Fig. S20–S23**).

In the baseline analysis, we assumed $R_0 = 2.5$ and 30.8% of infections are asymptomatic [12,22]. We further analyzed the scenario in which 22.6% of infections are asymptomatic (**Fig S24–S27**) [23]. Asymptomatic infections were assumed to be equally as infectious as symptomatic infections. This assumption is based on measurements of viral loads in asymptomatic infections being comparable to those observed in symptomatic cases [34,35].

Infectivity profile

We determined the infectivity profile following the specified latent period using the R code provided by He et al [15]. The infectivity during the latent period was expressed as exponentially lower (**Supplementary Information: Methods, Infectivity function)**. Imposing the strict threshold where 20 days after symptom onset infectivity is zero [36,37] made no significant difference to our results.

Temporal diagnostic sensitivity of a SARS CoV-2 RT-PCR assay

We utilized the post-symptom onset temporal diagnostic sensitivity for RT-PCR tests of infected individuals [16], fitting a logistic regression function to the diagnostic sensitivity data from zero to 25 days post-symptom onset through minimization of least squares. To infer the diagnostic sensitivity prior to symptom onset, we first used this function to perform a slight extrapolation of the diagnostic sensitivity back to the peak, which occurred slightly prior to symptom onset. Second, to determine the diagnostic sensitivity for the remaining portion of the incubation period, we specified the interpolation function determined by the infectivity and the diagnostic sensitivity from post-symptom onset, and used that interpolation function on the pre-symptom onset infectivity to determine pre-symptom onset diagnostic sensitivity (**Supplementary Information: Methods, Diagnostic sensitivity function)**. This process provides the diagnostic sensitivity over the entire course of infection (**Fig. S28**)[10]. We assumed that the specificity of the RT-PCR assay was 100% [39].

Probability of post-quarantine transmission

To calculate the probability of PQT—defined to be the probability of at least one post-quarantine infection—we assumed that the expected post-quarantine transmission is described by a negative

binomial distribution with a dispersion parameter of 0.25 [18]. This value for the dispersion parameter is consistent with numerous published estimates [40–42]. For sensitivity analyses, we also computed the probability of PQT given Poisson-distributed post-quarantine transmission (**Fig. S29–S30**). In our additional analysis accounting for the underlying prevalence within the community, the probability of PQT was defined as the likelihood that at least one infected individual in a cohort became a source of PQT. Similarly, to calculate the probability of PQT given a negative test on entry for *N* infected individuals, we estimated the probability that at least one of the cases contributed to PQT.

Data availability

The number of positive tests and tests conducted at the two regions quarantining the crew members heading offshore are presented in **Fig. 2,** with other data used in the analysis referenced in **Table S1** and in the Methods**.**

Code availability

The computational code for the analysis was implemented in MATLAB, and it is available at github.com/WellsRC/Optimizing-COVID19-Quarantine-and-Testing-Strategies.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Justin Abshire for expert data collection. J.P.T. gratefully acknowledges funding from the National Science Foundation grant CCF 1918656, the Elihu endowment, Notsew Orm Sands Foundation, and BHP. G.K., B.S., and R.H.M acknowledge funding from BHP. S.M.M. acknowledges support from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (grant OV4-170643;

Canadian 2019 Novel Coronavirus Rapid Research), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and BHP. A.P.G. gratefully acknowledges funding from NIH UO1-GM087719, the Burnett and Stender families' endowment, the Notsew Orm Sands Foundation, and BHP.

References

1. Nicola, M. *et al.* The socio-economic implications of the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19): A review. *Int. J. Surg.* **78**, 185–193 (2020).
2. Martin, A., Markhvida, M., Hallegatte, S. & Walsh, B. Socio-Economic Impacts of COVID-19 on Household Consumption and Poverty. *Econ Disaster Clim Chang* 1–27 (2020).
3. Lee, J. C., Mervosh, S., Avila, Y., Harvey, B. & Matthews, A. L. See How All 50 States Are Reopening (and Closing Again). *The New York Times* (2020).
4. Aleta, A. *et al.* Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves of COVID-19. *Nature Human Behaviour* **4**, 964–971 (2020).
5. Brooks, S. K. *et al.* The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet* **395**, 912–920 (2020).
6. Mattioli, A. V., Puviani, M. B., Nasi, M. & Farinetti, A. COVID-19 pandemic: the effects of quarantine on cardiovascular risk. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* **74**, 852–855 (2020).
7. Gondim, J. A. M. & Machado, L. Optimal quarantine strategies for the COVID-19 pandemic in a population with a discrete age structure. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* vol. 140 110166 (2020).
8. Cui, Q. *et al.* Dynamic variations of the COVID-19 disease at different quarantine strategies in Wuhan and mainland China. *J. Infect. Public Health* **13**, 849–855 (2020).

9. Hou, C. *et al.* The effectiveness of quarantine of Wuhan city against the Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A well-mixed SEIR model analysis. *J. Med. Virol.* **92**, 841–848 (2020).

10. Grassly, N. C. *et al.* Comparison of molecular testing strategies for COVID-19 control: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* (2020) doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30630-7.

11. Mina, M. J., Parker, R. & Larremore, D. B. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for Containment. *New England Journal of Medicine* (2020) doi:10.1056/nejmp2025631.

12. Moghadas, S. M. *et al.* The implications of silent transmission for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* (2020) doi:10.1073/pnas.2008373117.

13. Kucirka, L. M., Lauer, S. A., Laeyendecker, O., Boon, D. & Lessler, J. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine* vol. 173 262–267 (2020).

14. Jung, J. *et al.* The Importance of Mandatory COVID-19 Diagnostic Testing Prior to Release from Quarantine. *J. Korean Med. Sci.* **35**, (2020).

15. He, X. *et al.* Author Correction: Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* (2020) doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1016-z.

16. Miller, T. E. *et al.* Clinical sensitivity and interpretation of PCR and serological COVID-19 diagnostics for patients presenting to the hospital. *FASEB J.* (2020) doi:10.1096/fj.202001700RR.

17. Qin, J. *et al.* Estimation of incubation period distribution of COVID-19 using disease onset

forward time: A novel cross-sectional and forward follow-up study. *Sci Adv* **6**, eabc1202 (2020).

18. Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Wang, L., Li, M. & Zhou, X. Evaluating Transmission Heterogeneity and Super-Spreading Event of COVID-19 in a Metropolis of China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **17**, (2020).
19. CDC. When to Quarantine. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/quarantine.html (2020).
20. Wang, X. *et al.* Impact of Social Distancing Measures on Coronavirus Disease Healthcare Demand, Central Texas, USA. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26**, 2361–2369 (2020).
21. Li, Q. *et al.* Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 1199–1207 (2020).
22. Nishiura, H. *et al.* Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **94**, 154–155 (2020).
23. Wang, Y. *et al.* Characterization of an Asymptomatic Cohort of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infected Individuals Outside of Wuhan, China. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2020) doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa629.
24. Matson, Z. College restart nears as students are asked to quarantine. *The Daily Gazette* (2020).
25. COVID-19 testing strategies vary widely across institutions. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/21/covid-19-testing-strategies-vary-widely-across-institutions.
26. Sethuraman, N., Jeremiah, S. S. & Ryo, A. Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2. *JAMA* **323**, 2249–2251 (2020).

27. Wyllie, A. L. *et al.* Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. *medRxiv* 2020.04.16.20067835 (2020).

28. Wölfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* vol. 581 465–469 (2020).

29. Zou, L. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *New England Journal of Medicine* vol. 382 1177–1179 (2020).

30. Wang, W. *et al.* Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA* (2020) doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3786.

31. Saliva sample as a non-invasive specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019: a cross-sectional study. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* (2020) doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.001.

32. Nagura-Ikeda, M. *et al.* Clinical Evaluation of Self-Collected Saliva by Quantitative Reverse Transcription-PCR (RT-qPCR), Direct RT-qPCR, Reverse Transcription–Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification, and a Rapid Antigen Test To Diagnose COVID-19. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **58**, (2020).

33. Becker, D. *et al.* Saliva is less sensitive than nasopharyngeal swabs for COVID-19 detection in the community setting. *medRxiv* 2020.05.11.20092338 (2020).

34. Li, Y. *et al.* Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Patients With Non-severe Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Have Similar Clinical Features and Virological Courses: A Retrospective Single Center Study. *Front. Microbiol.* **11**, 1570 (2020).

35. Lee, S. *et al.* Clinical Course and Molecular Viral Shedding Among Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in a Community Treatment Center in the Republic of Korea. *JAMA Intern. Med.* (2020) doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3862.

36. CDC. Duration of Isolation and Precautions for Adults with COVID-19.

https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-isolation.html (2020).

37. Xiao, A. T. *et al.* Dynamic profile of RT-PCR findings from 301 COVID-19 patients in Wuhan, China: A descriptive study. *J. Clin. Virol.* **127**, 104346 (2020).
38. Wikramaratna, P., Paton, R. S., Ghafari, M. & Lourenco, J. Estimating false-negative detection rate of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR. *medRxiv* 2020.04.05.20053355 (2020).
39. Dinnes, J. *et al.* Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **8**, CD013705 (2020).
40. Endo, A., Abbott, S., Kucharski, A. J., Funk, S. & Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working Group. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. *Wellcome Open Research* vol. 5 67 (2020).
41. Website. . https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-29548/v1_stamped.pdf.
42. Bi, Q. *et al.* Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* vol. 20 911–919 (2020).

Supplementary Information:
Optimal COVID-19 quarantine and testing strategies

Chad R. Wells [1]*, Jeffrey P. Townsend [2,3,4,5]*†, Abhishek Pandey [1], Gary Krieger [6], Burton Singer [7], Robert H. McDonald [8], Seyed M. Moghadas [9], Alison P. Galvani [1,3]

[1] *Center for Infectious Disease Modeling and Analysis (CIDMA), Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT 06520, USA*
[2]*Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut 06510, USA*
[3]*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06525, USA*
[4]*Program in Computational Biology and Bioinformatics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA*
[5]*Program in Microbiology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA*
[6]*NewFields LLC Boulder, CO USA 30301 and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Science, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus*
[7] *Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida, P.O. Box 100009, Gainesville, FL 32610, USA*
[8] *Group Health, Safety and Environment; BHP; Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, 3000*
[9] *Agent-Based Modelling Laboratory, York University, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3 Canada*

Narrative

The recommended 14-day quarantine poses a significant strain on the mental health of employees, in addition to bringing economic distress. During the time of the epidemic with quarantine measures in place, employees of an off-shore oil company are working a cycle of 26 days on and 16 days off. The goal of the company has been to reach a risk reduction of a 14-day quarantine through alternative strategies, while considering all factors in play. For the company, the marginal gains in efficacy from a five-day to a seven-day quarantine with testing on entry and exit did noy justify its implementation due to the logistical challenges and substantial costs involved. However, quarantine has been chosen to be extended in high-risk areas in order to decrease the risk of an outbreak offshore.

During the early stages of the epidemic, when prevalence was low, a three-day quarantine was implemented by the company in a secured facility with testing occurring on entry. The introduction of the risk reduction models of testing on entry and exit caused a dramatic shift in the decision for quarantining workers. A five-day quarantine was immediately implemented, with testing on entry and the second (exit) test 96 h after the first test. Positive tests were obtained within the first week of testing on exit.

Theory

Transmission over Time

Transmission of a pathogen from an infected individual is typically time-dependent, based on pathogen shedding and behavioral changes, and can be represented over time by a function $r(t)$, for which time $t = 0$ represents initial infection. To represent infectiousness, a function $r(t)$ can be scaled such that

$$\int_{t=0}^{\infty} r(t)\,t = R_0\,, \tag{1}$$

where R_0 is the basic reproduction number: the expected number of infections consequent to a single infected individual under a scenario of no intervention. Specifying a discrete end to the infection at time t_e such that $r(t) = 0$ for $t > t_e$,

$$\int_{t=0}^{t_e} r(t)\,t = R_0\,.$$

Infectiousness during discrete timespans $t_2 - t_1$ (e.g. days) can be calculated as

$$R_{t_2 - t_1} = \int_{t=t_1}^{t_2} r(t)\,t\,.$$

Self-isolation at Symptom Onset

A significant means of intervention to prevent infection is self-isolation of infected individuals upon symptom onset. The expected effect on onward transmission of an intervention such as self-isolation of a case that becomes symptomatic at time t_s can be calculated as

$$R_i = \int_{t=0}^{t_s} r(t)\,t\,, \tag{2}$$

provided that all individuals self-isolate upon presentation with symptoms. If $\int_{t=0}^{t_s} r(t)\,t > 1$, then even perfect self-isolation upon symptom onset will be insufficient to extinguish disease transmission.

If the outcome of infections leads to a proportion of infected individuals p_a that can infect others but that never manifest symptoms (i.e. that are asymptomatic carriers), then transmission may be partitioned into the contributions of symptomatic and asymptomatic cases as $R_0 = R_{0,s}\, p_s + R_{0,a}\, p_a$, in which the probability of a symptomatic case $p_s = \left(1 - p_a\right)$. $R_{0,s}$ and $R_{0,a}$ can be equated to distinct infectiousness functions $r_s(t)$ and $r_a(t)$. For simplicity of presentation in ensuing theory, it will be assumed that $R_{0,s} = R_{0,a}$ and $r_s(t) = r_a(t) = r(t)$ [1,2]. Alternate overall transmission and alternate forms of infectivity over time for asymptomatic cases may easily be partitioned and tracked in the theory that follows should there be evidence to substantiate their difference.

With $R_{0,s} = R_{0,a} = R_0$ and $r_s(t) = r_a(t) = r(t)$, the presence of asymptomatic carriers increases the degree of transmission consequent to a self-isolation intervention from that shown by **Eq. 2** to

$$R = p_s \int_{t=0}^{t_s} r(t)\, t + R_0\, p_a .$$

Quarantine

Quarantine with a Known Time of Infection. A longstanding approach to limit disease spread is the quarantine of individuals *who have no prior indication of potential for disease* but intend to migrate from a population in which there is current transmission to a population with lower or zero disease prevalence. Because quarantined individuals experience a significant restriction of personal freedom, it is important to minimize the duration of quarantine q, but also maximize its effectiveness in limiting post-quarantine transmission. Quarantine of q days from

time t_q to time $t_q + q$ limits total expected post-quarantine transmission to

$$R_q = R_0 - \int_{t_q}^{t_q + q} r(t)\, t\,.$$

For policy decision-making regarding quarantine duration, the expected post-quarantine transmission is typically most important, and can be calculated as

$$R_{q\mapsto} = \int_{t = t_q + q}^{\infty} r(t)\, t\,.$$

If individuals self-isolate, there is a trivial case in which $t_s \leq t_q + q$ and $R_{q\mapsto} = 0$; otherwise, $t_s > t_q + q$ and

$$R_{q\mapsto} = \int_{t = t_q + q}^{t_s} r(t)\, t\,.$$

Including asymptomatic carriers,

$$R_{q\mapsto} = p_s \int_{t = t_q + q}^{t_s} r(t)\, t + p_a \int_{t = t_q + q}^{\infty} r(t)\, t\,.$$

Unfortunately, these expressions are unlikely to be useful in this form for quantifying the benefits of quarantine in reducing transmission. In the case of quarantine of migrants from one population to another, the time of infection—and correspondingly the time of quarantine t_q—are rarely known.

Quarantine with an Unknown Time of Infection. In a rapidly spreading epidemic, individuals who might be entering quarantine will tend to be early in disease time course. In a rapidly declining epidemic, individuals who might be entering quarantine will tend to be later in disease time course. In a steady-state epidemic with case counts $c(t)$, $\frac{dc}{dt} \approx 0$ over the period from t_0 to t_s such that individuals entering quarantine are evenly distributed across the disease

time course. Provided all individuals experience symptoms at time t_s that qualify them for isolation instead of quarantine, then the expected post-quarantine infectivity is

$$r_q(t) = \frac{1}{t_s} \int_{u=0}^{t_s} r(t+u)\, u\,,$$

and expected post-quarantine transmission from an infected individual is

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_s} \int_{u=0}^{t_s} \int_{t=u+q}^{\infty} r(t)\, t\, u\,,$$

a function of days of quarantine q. For asymptomatic carriers entering within disease time course t_e,

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_r} \int_{u=0}^{t_e} \int_{t=u+q}^{\infty} r(t)\, t\, u\,.$$

Incorporating both symptomatic and asymptomatic infections,

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{p_s}{t_s} \int_{u=0}^{t_s} \int_{t=u+q}^{\infty} r(t)\, t\, u + \frac{p_a}{t_e} \int_{u=0}^{t_e} \int_{t=u+q}^{\infty} r(t)\, t\, u\,.$$

A similar approach that incorporates symptomatic and asymptomatic cases by their proportions within the population may be performed throughout the rest of the scenarios below, and will not be specifically pointed out for each scenario.

Testing

Testing with a Known Time of Infection. Diagnostic test sensitivity $s(t)$ is also time-dependent. Assaying for components of the pathogen (e.g. DNA, RNA, or protein), diagnostic sensitivity typically is zero to low very early in disease before the pathogen load burgeons, then declines in the later stages of disease when immune responses develop and infection is suppressed (**Fig. S28**). In a disease for which tests can diagnose infections during the

incubation phase, testing can enhance the efficacy of quarantine by identifying individuals to be isolated instead of quarantined, thereby preventing future transmission from cases that persist as infectious through an earlier exit from quarantine than would be called for in case isolation.

Testing with an Unknown Time of Infection. The temporal diagnostic sensitivity of a test for infected cases with an unknown time of infection can be calculated by integrating over the unknown time of infection, such that

$$s_u(t) = \frac{1}{t_e} \int_{u=0}^{t_e} s(t+u)\, u\,.$$

Quarantine and Testing

Quarantine with an Unknown Time of Infection with Testing on Entry. Assuming the duration of the quarantine, q, is longer than the delay between administering the test and acting to isolate upon a positive result, the expected post-quarantine infectivity over time of an individual whose time of infection is unknown and who is tested for disease on entry to quarantine is

$$r_{q\mapsto}(t) = \frac{1}{t_s} \int_{u=0}^{t_s} (1 - s(u)) \cdot\ r(t+u)\, u\,,$$

in terms of time from infection. In terms of q days of quarantine, the expected post-quarantine transmission is

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_s} \int_{u=0}^{t_s} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} (1 - s(u)) \cdot\ r(t+u)\, t\, u\,.$$

For asymptomatic carriers,

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_e} \int_{u=0}^{t_e} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} (1 - s(u)) \cdot\ r(t+u)\, t\, u\,.$$

Quarantine with an Unknown Time of Infection with Testing on Entry and Exit. Expected post-quarantine transmission from an individual whose time of infection is unknown and who is tested for disease upon entry and at the last opportunity prior to the end of quarantine is

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_s} \int_{u=0}^{t_s} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} (1 - s(u)) \cdot (1 - s(u + q - d_t)) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, t\, u\,,$$

where d_t is the delay between administering the test and isolation if positive. For asymptomatic carriers,

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_e} \int_{u=0}^{t_e} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} (1 - s(u)) \cdot (1 - s(u + q - d_t)) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, t\, u\,.$$

Quarantine with Testing at Any Time(s). Expected post-quarantine transmission of an infected individual whose time of infection is unknown and who is tested for disease at any time $0 \leq t_t \leq q - d_t$ is

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_s} \int_{u=0}^{t_s} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} (1 - s(t_t + u)) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, t\, u\,.$$

For asymptomatic carriers,

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \frac{1}{t_e} \int_{u=0}^{t_e} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} (1 - s(t_t + u)) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, t\, u\,.$$

Additional terms $(1 - s(u + t_k))$, where k indexes testing times, may be included as terms within the product inside the double integral to quantify the expected post-quarantine transmission of any schedule of testing to be applied during quarantine.

Quarantine with a Negative Test on Entry. The probability density for obtaining a false negative upon entry for a symptomatic individual is

$$f_S(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-s(t)}{\int_{u=0}^{t_s} 1-s(u)\mathrm{d}u}, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq t_S, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and the probability density for an asymptomatic individual is

$$f_A(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-s(t)}{\int_{u=0}^{t_e} 1-s(u)\mathrm{d}u}, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq t_e, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The expected post-quarantine infectivity over time of a symptomatic individual who tested negative for disease on entry to quarantine is

$$r_{q\mapsto}(t) = \int_{u=0}^{t_s} f_S(u) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, u\,,$$

in terms of time from infection. In terms of q days of quarantine, the expected post-quarantine transmission is

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \int_{u=0}^{t_s} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} f_S(u) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, t\, u\,.$$

For asymptomatic carriers, the expected post-quarantine infectivity is

$$r_{q\mapsto}(t) = \int_{u=0}^{t_e} f_A(u) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, u\,,$$

and the expected post-quarantine transmission is

$$R_{q\mapsto}(q) = \int_{u=0}^{t_e} \int_{t=q}^{\infty} f_A(u) \cdot \; r(t+u)\, t\, u\,.$$

Contact Tracing

Tracing of individuals who have had contact with an index case identifies persons whose quarantine would reduce the risk of disease transmission from recently exposed individuals. When an individual is identified as a contact of an index case, the expected time of infection is not the same as that of an individual selected at random from an infected population. Restricting

our attention to transmissions occurring between an index case and their contacts, there are four nominal transmission relationships to be considered, of which three are considered relevant to an attentive program of contact tracing and quarantine (**Table S2**): the asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic contact may have infected the index case, or may have been infected by the index case. Here we excluded from calculation the case in which a pre-symptomatic individual infects the index case, because that scenario is formally impossible with a fixed t_s and rigorous self-isolation and self-identification upon symptoms, and unlikely even with variable t_s and imperfect adherence to self-isolation and self-identification.

Table S2. Modelled infectivity functions for the contact during tracing.

Contact	Infected by the index case	Infected the index case
Symptomatic case	$r_{I\to S}(t)$	—
Asymptomatic carrier	$r_{I\to A}(t)$	$r_{A\to I}(t)$

A To-be-Symptomatic Contact Infected by the Index Case but not yet Symptomatic. By assumption, infection of the contact must have occurred prior to the onset of symptoms in the index case. The likelihood that an infection from the index case occurred at a time during the disease time course of the index case should proportionally follow $r(t)$ (**Eq. 1**). Thus, the probability density for infection—on the timescale t of the infection of the index case that was identified at symptom onset—is

$$\iota(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{r(t)}{\int_{s=0}^{t_s} r(s)\mathrm{d}s}, & \text{if } 0 \le t \le t_S, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The probability density for the time since infection of the to-be-symptomatic contact—on the timescale t of the contact—is

$$\eta(t) = \iota(t_s - t)\,.$$

Thus, the erstwhile expected infectivity from the contact that was infected by the index case from the time of intervention by a quarantine is

$$r_{I\to S}(t) = \int_{v=0}^{t_s} \eta(v) \cdot r(v + t + d_q)\; v\,,$$

where d_q is the delay from identifying the index case to quarantine of the contact. The expected post-quarantine transmission by the contact after a quarantine of duration q is

$$R_{I\to S_{q\mapsto}}(q) = \int_{v=0}^{t_s} \int_{w=q+d_q}^{t_s} \eta(v) \cdot r(v + w)\; v\, w\,.$$

An Asymptomatic Carrier Contact Infected by the Index Case. The expected infectivity of an asymptomatic contact infected by the index case—from time $t = 0$ at intervention by quarantine—is

$$r_{I\to A}(t) = \int_{v=0}^{t_s} \eta(v) \cdot r(v + t + d_q)\; v\,,$$

where d_q is the delay from identifying the index case to quarantine of the contact. The expected post-quarantine transmission from the asymptomatic contact infected by the index case starting from the time of intervention by a quarantine of duration q is

$$R_{I\to A_{q\mapsto}}(q) = \int_{v=0}^{t_s} \int_{w=q+d_q}^{\infty} \eta(v) \cdot r(v + w)\; v\, w.$$

An Asymptomatic Contact that Infected the Index Case. Because the index case was assumed to be identified due to symptom onset, an asymptomatic contact that infected the index

case must have already been infected for a duration of at least $t_s + d_q$. Consequently, the probability density of infection from that contact is

$$\kappa(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{r(t)}{\int_{s=t_S+d_q}^{\infty} r(s)\mathrm{d}s}, & \text{if } t \geq t_S + d_q, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Setting $\mathrm{K} = \int_{v=t_s+d_q}^{\infty} r(v)\ dv$, the expected infectivity of the asymptomatic contact that infected the symptomatic index case—from time $t = 0$ at intervention by quarantine—is

$$r_{A\to I}(t) = \frac{1}{\mathrm{K}} \int_{v=t_s+d_q}^{\infty} r(v)\ \cdot r(t+v)\, v\,,$$

and the expected post-quarantine transmission is

$$R_{A\to I_{q\mapsto}}(q) = \frac{1}{\mathrm{K}} \int_{w=q}^{\infty} \int_{v=t_s+d_q}^{\infty} r(v) \cdot r(w+v)\, v\, w\,.$$

Continuing our assumption that individuals are assiduously self-isolating upon symptom onset and recalling that $R_i = \int_{t=0}^{t_s} r(t)\, t$ (**Eq. 2**), we can tabulate the expected transmission by contacts of the index that are classified into three kinds (**Table S3**). By assumption, a contact to become symptomatic could not have infected the index case, because otherwise in an assiduously self-isolating population, that contact would have been the index case.

Table S3. Expected infections from contacts of each modeled transmission type.

Contact	Infected by the index case	Infected the index case
Symptomatic case	$p_s R_i$	—
Asymptomatic carrier	$p_a R_i$	$p_a R_o$

Combining all three transmission functions of contacts of an index case discovered due to appearance of symptoms, the expected post-quarantine infectivity

$$r_c(t) = \frac{p_s R_i}{R_i + p_a R_o} r_{I\to S}(t) + \frac{p_a R_i}{R_i + p_a R_o} r_{I\to A}(t) + \frac{p_a R_o}{R_i + p_a R_o} r_{A\to I}(t).$$

Incorporating a quarantine of duration q for contacts, the expected post-quarantine transmission

$$R_c(q) = \frac{p_s R_i}{R_i + p_a R_o} R_{I\to S}(q) + \frac{p_a R_i}{R_i + p_a R_o} R_{I\to A}(q) + \frac{p_a R_o}{R_i + p_a R_o} R_{A\to I}(q).$$

Probability of post-quarantine transmission

The probability of post-quarantine transmission is specified to be the probability that an infected individual exits quarantine, but can still infect one or more individuals. We calculated this probability under a negative-binomial model appropriate when superspreaders play a role in transmission, as well as a Poisson distribution appropriate when transmission is fairly evenly distributed among infected individuals.

Negative-binomial distribution.We specified a negative binomial distribution

$$f(x|r,p) = \frac{\Gamma(r+x)}{\Gamma(r)\Gamma(x+1)} p^k (1-p)^x,$$

with dispersion parameter $k = 0.25$ [3] and $p = \frac{r}{r + R_{q\mapsto}(q)}$, such that the average of the distribution was $R_{q\mapsto}(q)$. Thus, the corresponding probability of post-quarantine transmission with negative binomially-distributed transmissions from a case is

$$P(q) = 1 - f(0|k,p).$$

Poisson distribution. Specifying a Poisson distribution producing an expected number of secondary infections post-quarantine transmission of $R_{q\mapsto}(q)$, the probability of transmission after a quarantine of duration q days

$$P(q) = 1 - e^{-R_{q\mapsto}(q)}.$$

Population prevalence

Given a cohort size N and a prevalence of ρ, the probability of post-quarantine transmission is $1-(1-P(q))^{N\rho}$.

Methods

Infectivity function. We use a Gamma function to specify the infectivity over the disease time course (**Fig. S1 and Fig. S11**). We generated the infectivity profile during the pre-symptomatic phase for each duration of the pre-symptomatic period corresponding to each latent period, using the `R` code provided from He et al [4]. However, as a matter of accounting for the full disease time course, a level of infectivity during the latent period prior to the discrete onset of the distribution provided by He et al must also be specified. Therefore, we specified the infectivity during this early period of infection as $A(e^{m\cdot(t)}-1)$, where the constants m and A are estimated such that the infectivity function $r(t)$ is smooth and continuous over the entire disease time course. Since the infectivity profile after the latent stage is described by a Gamma function (which has an initial value of zero), we truncate the exponential function at time $t_L + \Delta t$, where t_L is the duration of the latent period; Δt was set as the difference between t_L and the upper bound of t_L (where the difference in the log-likelihood at t_L and at $t_L + \Delta t$ was 1.96 [5]).

Diagnostic sensitivity function. To characterize the diagnostic sensitivity post-symptom onset, we estimated the coefficients of a logistic regression model

$$\ln\left(\frac{s(t)}{1-s(t)}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \beta_j (t-t_S)^j,$$

by fitting the function $s(t)$ to diagnostic test-sensitivity data from day zero to 25 days post-symptom onset [6] through the minimization of least squares

$$RSS = \min_{\beta} \sum_{i=0}^{25} \left(\ln\left(\frac{s(i+t_S)}{1-s(i+t_S)} \right) - \ln\left(\frac{\tilde{s}_i}{1-\tilde{s}_i} \right) \right)^2,$$

where $\tilde{s}_i$ denotes the observed diagnostic sensitivity at day i post-symptom onset. The peak infectivity occurs prior to symptom onset from the inferred infectivity curves [4], implying that the infectivity curve is monotonically decreasing over time after symptom onset. To be consistent, the sensitivity should also be monotonically decreasing over time after symptom onset as infectivity (a proxy for the viral load) is decreasing. Therefore, a constraint that the maximum sensitivity after symptom onset occurred at time zero was included in the estimation of the coefficients of the logistic regression model.

To select the number of coefficients in the logistic regression model, we used the Akaike information criterion,

$$\mathrm{AIC} = 2(N + 1) + 26 \ln(RSS),$$

where there are $N + 1$ coefficients being estimated for the 26 data points. The logistic regression model with the lowest AIC value was used to determine the diagnostic sensitivity.

We used diagnostic test-sensitivity data from zero to 25 days post-symptom onset [5] and the infectivity profile post-symptom onset [4] to construct a mapping from infectivity to diagnostic sensitivity, then used that mapping to infer the diagnostic sensitivity during the incubation period from the infectivity pre-symptom onset. To infer the diagnostic sensitivity during the unobserved incubation period, we defined an interpolation function for the diagnostic sensitivity based on the Cartesian pairing of $r(t)$ and $s(t)$ from symptom onset. Since the peak of infectivity occurred prior to symptom onset, we performed a slight extrapolation of the function $s(t)$ determined by logistic regression. This extrapolation lies within a small range between the symptom-onset

diagnostic sensitivity of 0.96 and an upper limit of 1.0 for each latent period, so that our results are not sensitive to this extrapolation.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1: Parameter descriptions and values used to assess quarantine and testing strategies

Description	Parameter	Value	Reference
Basic reproductive number	R_0	2.5 and 2.0	[7]
Basic reproductive number for symptomatic infection	$R_{0,s}$	R_0	[2]
Basic reproductive number for asymptomatic infection	$R_{0,a}$	R_0	[2]
Incubation period	t_S	8.29 days	[8]
Duration of disease in asymptomatic individuals	t_e	t_S + 20 days	[9,10]
Proportion of infections that are asymptomatic	p_a	30.8% 22.6%	[11] [12]
Latent period	t_L	2.9 1.9 and 3.9	[13]

Supplementary Figures



Figure S1. Average infectivity profile for a known time of infection under no self-isolation upon symptom onset (black) and perfect isolation upon symptom onset (yellow line) for (**A**) R_0 = 2.5 and 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic (resulting in 1.6 secondary infections, yellow fill), (**B**) R_0 = 2 and 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic (resulting in 1.3 secondary infections, yellow fill), (**C**) R_0 = 2.5 and 22.6% of infections being asymptomatic (resulting in 1.5 secondary infections, yellow fill) and (**D**) R_0 = 2 and 22.6% of infections being asymptomatic (resulting in 1.2 secondary infections, yellow fill).



Figure S2: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S3: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S4: The optimal day of testing to obtain the minimum post-quarantine transmission with 30.8% of infections asymptomatic,perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections, and an incubation period of 8.29 days. Specifying a latent period of (**A**) 2.9 days with uniform entry into quarantine, (**B**) 2.9 days and entry into quarantine as a traced contact, (**C**) 1.9 days and uniform entry into quarantine, (**D**) 1.9 days and entry into quarantine as a traced contact, (**E**) 3.9 days and uniform entry into quarantine, and (**F**) 3.9 days and entry into quarantine as a traced contact.



Figure S5: The impact of asymptomatic infection on the probability of post-quarantine transmission, with perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections, an incubation period of 8.29 days and a latent period of 2.9 days. For proportions from 0–1 of infections being asymptomatic, the probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course with no testing (red) and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine (blue) for a (**A**) five-day quarantine and a (**B**) seven-day quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete.



Figure S6. The probability of post-quarantine transmission for a cohort and underlying prevalence. Specifying an incubation period of 8.29 days and a latent period of 2.9 days, the probability of post-quarantine transmission accounting for underlying community prevalence in a cohort (crew) of 40 employees for testing on entry (orange), testing on exit (blue), and testing on both entry and exit (purple) for a (**A**) three-day quarantine, (**B**) five-day quarantine, (**C**) seven-day quarantine, and (**D**) 14-day quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete.



Figure S7: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days,a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete.



Figure S8: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S9: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days,a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing with a one-day tracing delay. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S10: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing, with a one-day tracing delay, for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S11: Infectivity profiles of an individual for an incubation period of 8.29 days and assuming no self-isolation upon symptom onset, corresponding to the reported duration of the latent period (2.9, black), and latent periods one day longer (3.9, dashed blue), and one day shorter (1.9, dashed green), and numbers of secondary infections that occur within the incubation period for a 2.9-day latent period (1.21, black), for a 3.9-day latent period (1.27, blue), and for a 1.9-day latent period (1.24, green).



Figure S12: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 1.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S13: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 1.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S14: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 3.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S15: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 3.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S16: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 1.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S17: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 1.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S18: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 3.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S19: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 3.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S20: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course with no delay in obtaining the test result. For durations of quarantine from 0–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Testing on exit is assumed to occur on the last day of quarantine (i.e. there is negligible delay in obtaining the test result). Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S21: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 0–21 days, with no delays in obtaining the test result, when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Testing on exit is assumed to occur on the last day of quarantine (i.e. there is negligible delay in obtaining the test result). Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S22: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing with no delay in obtaining the test result. For durations of quarantine from 0–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Testing on exit is assumed to occur on the last day of quarantine (i.e. there is negligible delay in obtaining the test result). Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies



Figure S23: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 0–21 days, with no delay in obtaining the test result, when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine.Testing on exit is assumed to occur on the last day of quarantine (i.e. there is negligible delay in obtaining the test result). Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S24: Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 22.6% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course. For durations of quarantine from 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S25: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 22.6% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S26:Expected post-quarantine transmission for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 22.6% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections when individuals enter quarantine through contact tracing. For durations of quarantine of 1–21 days, (**A**) the expected infections post-quarantine with no testing, testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine; and (**B**) the durations of quarantine with testing on entry, testing on exit, and testing on entry and exit that perform just as well or better than a quarantine with no testing. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S27: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections) for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 22.6% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S28: The diagnostic sensitivity of the RT-PCR test over the time course of disease for an incubation period of 8.29 days. (**A**) The sensitivity function using a logistic regression model (black line) fit to the empirical data of SARS CoV-2 test results from Miller et al [6](red dots) through minimization of least squares and AIC model selection. (**B**) The daily diagnostic sensitivity over the course of the disease when the latent period is 2.9 days (black), 1.9 days (green), and 3.9 days (blue).

Duration of quarantine	No testing	Entry	Exit	Entry and Exit
1	0.534	0.307	0.307	0.254
2	0.471	0.297	0.213	0.189
3	0.398	0.275	0.113	0.103
4	0.316	0.236	0.045	0.039
5	0.229	0.179	0.017	0.014
6	0.148	0.114	0.009	0.006
7	0.085	0.06	0.005	0.003
8	0.048	0.03	0.003	0.001
9	0.034	0.021	0.003	0.001
10	0.024	0.016	0.002	0.001
11	0.017	0.011	0.002	0.001
12	0.012	0.008	0.001	0.001
13	0.008	0.005	0.001	0.001
14	0.005	0.004	0.001	<0.001
15	0.004	0.002	0.001	<0.001
16	0.002	0.002	0.001	<0.001
17	0.002	0.001	<0.001	<0.001
18	0.001	0.001	<0.001	<0.001
19	0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
20	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
21	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Testing strategy

Probability of post-quarantine transmission: 0.9 to 1.0; 0.8 to 0.9; 0.7 to 0.8; 0.6 to 0.7; 0.5 to 0.6; 0.4 to 0.5; 0.3 to 0.4; 0.2 to 0.3; 0.1 to 0.2; 0.01 to 0.1; 0 to 0.01

Figure S29: Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections), assuming infections are Poisson distributed, for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when a symptomatic individual enters quarantine uniformly within the incubation period and asymptomatic individuals enter uniformly across the disease time course for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S30:Probability of post-quarantine transmission (probability of one or more post-quarantine infections), assuming infections are Poisson distributed, for durations of quarantine from 1–21 days when an individual enters quarantine through contact tracing for an incubation period of 8.29 days, a latent period of 2.9 days, with 30.8% of infections being asymptomatic and perfect self-isolation of symptomatic infections with no testing, when tested upon entry to quarantine, when tested on exit from quarantine, and when tested on entry and exit from quarantine. Because of the time required to obtain test results, sampling for the test on exit is assumed to occur the day before the quarantine is complete. Cells that share a background color in common indicate equivalent durations of quarantine associated with each of the testing strategies.



Figure S31: The probability density function for when during the disease time course cases enter quarantine. (**A**) The day in which a contact infected by an index case enters quarantine (black) compared to the uniform entry into quarantine of a case to exhibit symptoms (blue) and an asymptomatic case (red). (**B**) The day in which the asymptomatic contact that infected the index case enters quarantine (black) compared to the uniform entry of an asymptomatic case (red) entering quarantine.

References

1. Li, Y. *et al.* Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Patients With Non-severe Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Have Similar Clinical Features and Virological Courses: A Retrospective Single Center Study. *Front. Microbiol.* **11**, 1570 (2020).
2. Lee, S. *et al.* Clinical Course and Molecular Viral Shedding Among Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in a Community Treatment Center in the Republic of Korea. *JAMA Intern. Med.* (2020) doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3862.
3. Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Wang, L., Li, M. & Zhou, X. Evaluating Transmission Heterogeneity and Super-Spreading Event of COVID-19 in a Metropolis of China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **17**, (2020).
4. He, X. *et al.* Author Correction: Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* (2020) doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1016-z.
5. Meeker, W. Q. & Escobar, L. A. Teaching about Approximate Confidence Regions Based on Maximum Likelihood Estimation. *The American Statistician* vol. 49 48 (1995).
6. Miller, T. E. *et al.* Clinical sensitivity and interpretation of PCR and serological COVID-19 diagnostics for patients presenting to the hospital. *FASEB J.* (2020) doi:10.1096/fj.202001700RR.
7. Moghadas, S. M. *et al.* Projecting hospital utilization during the COVID-19 outbreaks in the United States. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **117**, 9122–9126 (2020).
8. Qin, J. *et al.* Estimation of incubation period distribution of COVID-19 using disease onset forward time: A novel cross-sectional and forward follow-up study. *Sci Adv* **6**, eabc1202 (2020).
9. Xiao, A. T. *et al.* Dynamic profile of RT-PCR findings from 301 COVID-19 patients in Wuhan, China: A descriptive study. *J. Clin. Virol.* **127**, 104346 (2020).

10. CDC. Duration of Isolation and Precautions for Adults with COVID-19. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-isolation.html (2020).
11. Nishiura, H. *et al.* Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **94**, 154–155 (2020).
12. Wang, Y. *et al.* Characterization of an Asymptomatic Cohort of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infected Individuals Outside of Wuhan, China. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2020) doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa629.
13. Wang, X. *et al.* Impact of Social Distancing Measures on Coronavirus Disease Healthcare Demand, Central Texas, USA. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26**, 2361–2369 (2020).