Quantifying meaningful adoption of a SARS-CoV-2 exposure notification app on the campus of the University of Arizona

Joanna Masel[1], Alexandra Shilen[2], Bruce Helming[3], Jenna Rutschman[4], Gary Windham[5], Kristen Pogreba-Brown[2], Kacey Ernst[2]

1. Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

2. Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

3. Campus Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

4. College of Science, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

5. Information Technology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Word Count: 2,458

Abstract

Objective. To measure meaningful, local exposure notification adoption without in-app analytics.

Methods. We surveyed app usage via case investigation interviews at the University of Arizona, with a focus on the period from September 9 to November 28, 2020, after automating the issuance of secure codes to verify positive diagnoses within the test result delivery system. As independent validation, we compared the number of secure codes issued to the number of local cases.

Results. Of cases interviewed by university case investigators, 46% (286/628) reported having the app, and 55% (157/286) of these app users shared their positive SARS-CoV-2 test result in the app prior to the case investigation interview, comprising 25% (157/628) of all interviewed cases. This is corroborated by a 33% (565/1,713) ratio of code issuance (inflated by some unclaimed codes) to cases. Combining the 25% probability that a primary case rapidly shares their diagnosis with a 46% probability that the secondary case can receive exposure notifications, an estimated 11.4% of transmission pairs exhibit meaningful app usage. High adoption was achieved without the use of “push” notifications, in the context of a marketing campaign that leveraged social influencers.

Conclusions. Usage can be assessed, without in-app analytics, within a defined local community such as a college campus rather than an entire jurisdiction. With marketing, high uptake in dense social networks like universities make exposure notification a useful complement to traditional contact tracing. Integrating verification code delivery into patient results portals was successful in making the exposure notification process rapid.

3 question summary box

1) **What is the current understanding of this subject?**

The extent to which exposure notification technology reduces SARS-CoV-2 transmission depends on usage among cases.

2) **What does this report add to the literature?**

A novel metric estimates meaningful use, and demonstrates potential transmission reduction on a college campus. Clear benefit was seen from simplifying verification of diagnosis with automation during lab result delivery.

3) **What are the implications for public health practice?**

Defined communities can benefit from local deployment and marketing even in the absence of statewide deployment. Lifting current restrictions on deployment would allow more entities such as campuses to copy the model shown here to be successful.

Introduction

Smartphone applications (apps) for exposure notification have the potential, given sufficient uptake, to significantly reduce the spread of SARS-CoV-2 (1). They do so not by replacing contact tracing, but by making contact notification faster, more scalable, potentially more acceptable due to greater privacy, and more comprehensive by notifying contacts the case does not know personally (1). The University of Arizona community piloted the Covid Watch app, which through the Google/Apple Exposure Notification API (GAEN), uses Bluetooth to measure date, distance, and duration of contact, and assess infection risk (2). This technology is currently restricted to one app per State or country. The University of Arizona pilot was made

possible when the Arizona Department of Health Services agreed to act as the publisher of the app. App users who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 can anonymously trigger notifications, including testing and quarantine recommendations, for other Covid Watch users whom they had been in close contact with while infectious.

The focus of this study is to assess meaningful app uptake within a local community. App download numbers are readily accessible, but overstate active app usage (3). Effective uptake requires not just app installation in both a primary and a secondary case, but also reporting by the primary case of a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result by obtaining and entering a secure verification code (either from their results portal or medical provider). The potential for exposure notification to prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission depends not on overall usage in a community, but on usage specifically among individuals who go on to become infected. One concern is that individuals who are more likely to download an exposure notification app are generally more compliant with public health guidelines, and so may be less likely to be infected by SARS-CoV-2, making population statistics overestimates of effective usage. With the help of a third party, the University of Arizona used social marketing tools to promote app usage, with a focus on reaching students via identified influencers (4, 5); here we assess the outcome using a new metric of app usage.

Methods

Evaluating GAEN apps is challenging because of their strict privacy protections (6) all exposure information is present only on the phone of the notified individual, and cannot be linked to the source of exposure. To perform the evaluation outside the app itself, we therefore incorporated two questions into case investigation interviews: (i) Have you downloaded the

Covid Watch app?; (ii) If yes, did you already enter the verification code following your positive test? A portion of the faculty, staff, and students who tested positive through the on-campus testing program were assigned to a university contact tracing team, Student Aid for Field Epidemiology Response (SAFER), by the county health department (7). Assignment of cases to the University of Arizona SAFER team varied over the time period covered in this report due to changing patterns of incidence. Cases who lived on-campus (dorms and Greek housing) were consistently assigned to SAFER throughout this time period. For off-campus cases tested through the University of Arizona testing program, a surge in cases associated with campus necessitated additional support from county investigators, so from September 10 to October 30, 2020, county health department staff investigated all off-campus cases. Beginning October 31, SAFER investigated all cases tested through the University of Arizona testing program and anyone who provided an 'on-campus' address, even if they were tested off-site. The team filtered the case data through code developed in R by known on-campus addresses each day to create these investigation assignments.

Upon first launch on August 23, 2020, verification codes were given over the phone by Campus Health to persons who had previously received a positive SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. Beginning September 9, end users, when viewing their positive test result in the "Test All Test Smart" portal that supports the university's high-volume diagnostic testing, were prompted to retrieve a code automatically if they had the Covid Watch app. Some individuals tested positive twice, e.g. once by antigen test and once by PCR. Positive test results, combined across both Campus Health and the Test All Test Smart program, were de-duplicated to calculate number of cases, by discounting subsequent positive test results for the same individual if they occurred within a 90 day window from the first positive test.

Interviewed cases may be more compliant with public health measures, such as app use, than non-interviewed cases, possibly biasing this first metric towards higher app use. Therefore, we calculated a second metric, the ratio of codes issued / cases. This entailed calculating the fraction of positive tests that led to a request for a verification code by dividing number of codes issued by number of cases. We counted verification codes at point of issue rather than upon usage, but because obtaining a code requires action from an infected individual (either a phone call or clicking on a request link), we expect this to be only a slight overestimate.

Our data span August 23 to November 28, 2020 (Fall semester), during which there was a significant outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in the student population. Verification code issuance peaked in the same week as confirmed cases (Figure 1). To evaluate the impact of automated code delivery, we compare data before versus after September 9.

The University of Arizona's social media-focused marketing campaign surrounding the app launch occurred under the auspices of a pilot in the absence of a State-wide launch. The University website, main app information page, and FAQ page were used as the central source of information, to which all messaging was directed. Social influencers were identified as students who had an Instagram account with more than 4,000 followers. Influencers were given hashtags and example content to share but had full control over their own messages. Example messaging was designed to target individual personas, specifically those who were on the fence about downloading the app. Privacy protection was a key theme to assuage concerns. Influencers were not paid nor given additional incentives such as University apparel. From just under 1,000 identified influencers, 150 posted twice or more and an additional 100 posted once within the initial two week launch marketing blitz. Approximately a hundred identified influencers were

student athletes who were unable to post on account of NCAA rules and regulations regarding personal influence.

Results

Campus testing programs recorded 2,728 positive tests from August 23 to November 28, representing 2,360 cases. Of these cases, the University of Arizona SAFER team was assigned 1,359 cases to investigate and conduct contact tracing, while the remaining cases were investigated by the local health department and are not included in our sample. The university contact tracing team succeeded in reaching and interviewing 64% (876/1359) of their assigned cases, in all cases including the survey questions. Among these interviewed cases, 35% (302/876) reported no contacts to case investigators. Results are summarized in Table 1.

The proportion of interviewed cases who had downloaded the app improved during the initial weeks of the launch, rising from 38% (95/248) before September 9 to 46% (286/628) over the remainder of our reporting period. More strikingly, the proportion of app-using cases that had entered a positive diagnosis code into their app prior to the case interview, enabling rapid contact notification, rose from 32/95 (34%) before September 9 to 157/286 (55%) after. This latter comparison shows how the introduction of automated code distribution improved the frequency with which cases received and entered verification codes, and hence the impact of the technology.

From September 9 onward, 25% (157/628) of the interviewed cases both had the app and had entered a positive diagnosis code. Our alternative metric, namely codes issued / cases, rose from 48/647 (7%) prior to September 9 when codes were issued only by phone, to 33% (565/1,713) from September 9 onward.

Discussion

We propose and estimate a metric of meaningful usage among cases. Because the app's epidemiological impact depends on changing the behavior of infected persons prior to diagnosis, what matters is usage among cases, not usage among the general population. We consider the scenario where a primary case infects a secondary case within a tightly interconnected college campus and estimate the probability that both cases have used the app to the minimum necessary level to potentially impact transmission. From September 9 onward, the estimated probability of sufficient usage by the primary case is 25% (where verification code entry is required) and 46% for the secondary case (requiring only app activation). Combining these by assuming a well-mixed population and neglecting transmission from outside campus given low community prevalence at the time of this pilot study, app usage is estimated to affect 11.5% of transmission pairs (Table 1). In a structured population where individuals in the same transmission pair have more similar app usage rates, this value will be higher than 11.5%.

Our app usage metric can be used to estimate the expected reduction in the expected number of onward transmissions per case, R(t), due to the direct impact of exposure notification influencing the quarantine, testing and ultimately isolation behavior of secondary cases. This reduction could be ~11.5% if 1) all cases carried their phones with them at the time transmission occurred, 2) primary cases are tested rapidly, 3) the app detects exposures that led to transmission, and 4) notifications following infection eliminated forward disease transmission by sufficiently influencing the behavior of secondary cases. The direct reduction in R(t) will be smaller, because of violations in these assumptions, especially the fourth given reports of low quarantine compliance (8, 9). However, R(t) is also indirectly reduced when the far larger number of exposure events that do not lead to transmission also lead to behavior change, which

either prevents infection in the notification recipient, or elicits first quarantine and then isolation after they have been infected by a different exposure within the same social network (10). Indeed, empirical estimates of the epidemiological impact of app usage are higher than expected from models of their direct effects (1).

Unlike other recent evaluations (1, 11), we have not integrated over the timecourse of case counts (Figure 1) to estimate how many cases were averted through this reduction in R(t). Doing so would require the assumption that both imposed and voluntary mitigation measures would have been the same with vs. without the app, an assumption not supported by data (12). The new usage metric we propose in the current work, with its R(t) interpretation, is less dependent on the particulars of a situation, and thus more appropriate for comparing evaluations of apps deployed under various levels of disease prevalence. Indeed, holding usage constant according to our metric, the value of this technology is higher with low case prevalence than with high (13).

Because cases were asked whether they had entered verification codes prior to case investigation interviews, our results demonstrate that notification via the Covid Watch app was more rapid than both traditional contact tracing at the University of Arizona and possible digital exposure notification workflows where case investigators provide verification codes over the phone. Our automated code delivery via an end-user test results portal is now adopted by commercial test providers in Arizona.

Our installation rate of 46% among cases can be compared to the 28% installation rate among the general U.K. population, to which a 25% reduction in the size of the second wave has been attributed (1). While a 55% rate of code usage might seem low, we note that a similar 55%

rate has been seen in Germany (14). A higher rate of 72% was achieved in the U.K. (1). Even when the workflow of code receipt and entry is intuitive and requires only minimal action by app users, many cases who have previously downloaded the app have done so in order to receive rather than to trigger notifications, or did not anticipate how they would feel upon testing positive. Using the app to notify others is strictly voluntary. Usage rates can be much lower with inferior code delivery workflows, as seen in our own study before September 9.

Other jurisdictions may not have suitable analytics for measuring code usage rate among app-using cases. Comparisons could still be made for the total number of codes claimed divided by the total number of cases (corresponding to ~25% in our study) – this metric combines both app installation and code usage. One complication in making this comparison is that many US States issue codes to all cases, including non-app users, via automated SMS (15, 16). In this workflow, the receipt of a code may prompt app download and code entry without generating any exposure notifications, and so to avoid inflating the usage statistic, the number of codes that led to uploading Temporary Exposure Keys for zero days would need to be subtracted from the total. In the US state of Washington, this metric thus has an upper bound of 5.1% (averaged across 1.8% before the SMS system was implemented and 9.6% after), given that these codes were not subtracted from the total (11). A press report for California (17) suggests ~27,000 code entries, however the exact timeframe of study was not provided in the press report making even a rough estimate of cases impossible. California has had >3.6 million reported cases as of the time of writing, with the main wave of cases, roughly half the total, occurring during the period that exposure notifications were active (18).

To promote app installation by end-users, most U.S. States have relied on “push” notifications sent out by Apple and Google directly to smartphone users’ phones. These were not

available at the time of this study, and are currently available only for Apple's own Exposure Notification Express system and not for custom iOS apps (19). Another strategy to promote adoption is to use the same app to check in to venues as a privacy-preserving alternative to giving personal details (1); this is unavailable in jurisdictions that do not collect venue attendance for possible contact tracing purposes. Here we have shown that it is possible to achieve high adoption within a tightly interconnected community using a social influencer marketing strategy, without the advantage of push notifications or a multi-purpose app.

Conclusions

Here we have proposed a new metric for assessing app usage within a tightly interconnected community that does its own testing and tracing. Usage on the University of Arizona campus is high enough to make it a useful tool that complements and augments traditional contact tracing. Highly interconnected communities such as college campuses, large workplaces, tribal nations, and congregate living settings could benefit from targeted adoption campaigns even in the absence of statewide adoption and promotion. Further evaluation is needed to assess the extent of compliance with quarantine among contacts receiving notification via such apps, which is a key determinant of the overall impact of EN on reducing SARS COV-2 transmission.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Theresa Cullen for access to Pima County Health Department case investigation de-identified data, and Janet McIllece for compiling the disparate data sources in a central location.

Funding: University of Arizona.

Declaration of conflicting interests: Joanna Masel consults for WeHealth Solutions PBC, distributors of the Covid Watch Arizona app.

Research ethics: Data were collected under public health surveillance guidelines as part of an evaluation of the system. A request for aggregate data was made by the evaluation team to the Pima County Health Department and University of Arizona privacy officers in consultation with the University of Arizona IRB and was deemed not human subjects research. Data on positive tests were publicly available on the University of Arizona dashboard.

References

1. Wymant C, Ferretti L, Tsallis D, Charalambides M, Abeler-Dörner L, Bonsall D, et al. The epidemiological impact of the NHS COVID-19 App. Nature. 2021;594:408–12.
2. Wilson AM, Aviles N, Petrie JI, Beamer PI, Szabo Z, Xie M, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 infection risk within the Google/Apple exposure notification framework to inform quarantine recommendations. Risk Analysis. 2021;in press.
3. Federal Statistics Office. SwissCovid App Monitoring. 2021 [cited 2021 January 17. 2021]; Available from: https://www.experimental.bfs.admin.ch/expstat/en/home/innovative-methods/swisscovid-app-monitoring.html
4. Baer J. Just How Powerful Is Influencer Marketing? 2016 [cited 2021 Feb 22]; Available from: https://www.convinceandconvert.com/convince-and-convert-podcast/how-powerful-is-influencer-marketing/
5. Schaffer N. The age of influence: the power of influencers to elevate your brand: Harper Collins Leadership; 2020.
6. Benzler J, Bogdanov D, Kirchner G, Lueks W, Lucas R, Oliveira R, et al. Towards a common performance and effectiveness terminology for digital proximity tracing applications. arXiv preprint. 2020:arXiv:2012.12927.
7. Pogreba Brown K, Austhof E, Rosa Hernández AM, McFadden C, Boyd K, Sharma J, et al. Training and Incorporating Students in SARS-CoV-2 Case Investigations and Contact Tracing. Public Health Reports. 2020;136(2):154-60.
8. Smith LE, Potts HWW, Amlôt R, Fear NT, Michie S, Rubin GJ. Adherence to the test, trace, and isolate system in the UK: results from 37 nationally representative surveys. BMJ. 2021;372:n608.
9. Steens A, Freiesleben de Blasio B, Veneti L, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Van Zandvoort K, et al. Poor self-reported adherence to COVID-19-related quarantine/isolation requests, Norway, April to July 2020. Eurosurveillance. 2020;25(37):2001607.
10. Guttal V, Krishna S, Siddharthan R. Risk assessment via layered mobile contact tracing for epidemiological intervention. medRxiv. 2020:2020.04.26.20080648.

11. Segal C, Zhang Z, Karras BT, Revere D, Zane G, Baseman JG. Early Epidemiological Evidence of Public Health Value of WA Notify, a Smartphone-based Exposure Notification Tool: Modeling COVID-19 Cases Averted in Washington State. medRxiv. 2021:2021.06.04.21257951.
12. Weitz JS, Park SW, Eksin C, Dushoff J. Awareness-driven behavior changes can shift the shape of epidemics away from peaks and toward plateaus, shoulders, and oscillations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(51):32764-71.
13. Petrie J, Masel J. The economic value of quarantine is higher at lower case prevalence, with quarantine justified at lower risk of infection. medRxiv. 2021:2020.11.24.20238204.
14. Robert Koch Institut. Kennzahlen zur Corona-Warn-App. 2020 December 17, 2020 [cited; Available from: https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/WarnApp/Archiv_Kennzahlen/Kennzahlen_04122020.pdf?__blob=publicationFile
15. Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment. CO Exposure Notifications enabled by 1 million Coloradans. https://covid19.colorado.gov/press-release/co-exposure-notifications-enabled-by-1-million-coloradans; 2020.
16. Washington State Department of Health. News Release. https://www.doh.wa.gov/Newsroom/Articles/ID/2561/Get-a-text-click-the-link-New-texts-from-DOH-will-speed-exposure-notification-across-the-state; 2021.
17. Aarons J. In-Depth: CA Notify system deemed 'successful'. 2021 Apr. 22 2021 [cited; Available from: https://www.10news.com/news/in-depth/in-depth-ca-notify-system-deemed-successful
18. Tracking COVID-19 in California. 2021 [cited 2021 June 1]; Available from: https://covid19.ca.gov/state-dashboard/
19. National Institutes of Health Fogarty International Center. Video recording from COVID-19 Exposure Notification Digital Tools Webinar. 2021 [cited; Available from: http://www.eebweb.arizona.edu/faculty/masel/Covid19_Research/index.html



Figure 1. Total codes issued (bars) and cases (line) by week. The total number of codes issued represented only 7% of the number of cases prior to the automation of code delivery on September 9, and rose to 33% for the remainder of the study period. A reduction in cases was seen shortly after code automation began on September 9, but there is insufficient evidence to causally attribute this to the app, given other control measures put in place around the same time.

Metric	Aug 23 - Sep 8	Sep 9 - Nov 28	Total
Positive Codes issued by phone	48	166	214
Positive Codes issued via test results portal	0	399	399
Total Positive Codes issued	48	565	613
Positive tests	676	2052	2728
Cases	647	1,713	2,360
Cases investigated by university contact tracing team			1,359
Number of cases reached by university contact tracing team	248	628	876
Downloaded the app	95	286	381
Entered a code to share their positive test	32	157	189
Downloads/Cases Reached	38.3%	**45.5%**	43.5%
Code Entries/Cases Reached	12.9%	**25.0%**	21.6%
Codes Issued/Cases	7.4%	**33.0%**	26.0%
R(t) Adoption metric (primary case and secondary case, product of Downloads/Cases and Code Entries/Cases)	4.9%	**11.4%**	9.4%

Table 1. Key numbers pertaining to app usage by cases, before and after the automation of code delivery. The frequency with which cases used the Covid Watch app increased far more following the automation of verification code delivery than did the frequency with which cases had the app downloaded at the time of case interview. Key numbers following code delivery automation are shown in bold.