

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

3 **Authors:** Joanna Masel, Alexandra Shilen, Bruce Helming, Jenna Rutschman, Gary Windham,
4 Michael Judd, Kristen Pogreba-Brown, Kacey Ernst.

5 **Affiliations:**

6 University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA (J. Masel, A. Shilen, B. Helming, J. Rutschman, G.
7 Windham, K. Pogreba-Brown, K. Ernst)

8 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA (M. Judd)

9

10 **Abstract**

11 Digital exposure notification requires both the primary and secondary cases to have
12 previously installed a smartphone application, and the primary case to rapidly report their
13 positive diagnosis. These conditions were met for an estimated 12% of transmission pairs during
14 a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak on the campus of the University of Arizona.

15

16 **Text**

17 Smartphone applications (apps) for exposure notification have the potential, given
18 sufficient uptake, to significantly reduce the spread of SARS-CoV-2, by making contact tracing
19 faster, more scalable, and potentially more acceptable due to greater privacy and ease of use (1).
20 The University of Arizona community piloted the Covid Watch app, which through the
21 Google/Apple Exposure Notification API (GAEN), uses Bluetooth to measure date, distance, and
22 duration of contact, and assess infection risk (2). App users who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2
23 were able to anonymously trigger notifications, including testing and quarantine
24 recommendations, for other Covid Watch users with whom they had been in contact.

25 Here we quantify meaningful uptake. App download numbers are readily accessible, but
26 overstate active app usage (3). Effective uptake requires not just app installation in both a
27 primary and a secondary case, but also that the primary case report a positive diagnosis by
28 obtaining and entering a secure verification code.

29 The effectiveness of exposure notification depends not on total population usage, but on
30 usage among individuals who go on to be infected by SARS-CoV-2. One concern is that
31 individuals who tend to comply with public health guidelines might be both more likely to
32 download an exposure notification app and less likely to contract SARS-CoV-2, leading to the
33 overestimation of effective usage. With the help of a third party, the University of Arizona used
34 social marketing tools to promote app usage. Identified influencers proved successful with quick
35 download rates among students.

36 Evaluation of GAEN apps is challenging because of their strict privacy protections. We
37 therefore partnered with case investigation of primarily university students to ask three

38 questions, with consent of the local health department. The questions were (i) ‘Have you
39 downloaded the Covid Watch app?’; (ii) ‘If yes, did you already enter the verification code
40 following your positive test?’; and (iii) ‘If yes, have you received an exposure notification
41 yourself?’ Interviews were conducted by a university team (SAFER) contracted to conduct case
42 investigations and contact tracing (4) of faculty, staff and students who tested positive through
43 the on-campus testing program. We also compared the numbers of positive tests to the numbers
44 of requests for a verification code, tabulated through our on-campus testing program. We do not
45 report here on question (iii) because early in the pilot, smartphone operating systems (not the
46 app) issued exposure notifications even for insignificant exposures, creating user confusion, and
47 rendering notification data unreliable. This issue affected all GAEN version 1 apps that
48 implemented their own risk scoring calculations, but has been resolved in later versions.

49 Our data span August 23 to November 28, during which there was a significant outbreak
50 of SARS-CoV-2 in the student population. Verification code issuance peaked in the same week
51 as confirmed cases (Figure 1).

52 Among the 1,113 faculty, staff, and students with a COVID-19 diagnosis interviewed,
53 524 (47%) told campus contact tracers that they had previously downloaded the app. Among
54 these 524, 289 (55%) had already entered a positive diagnosis code into their app, enabling
55 contact notification to occur even before the case interview. This rate of code entry is similar to
56 that of Germany (5), where there has been extensive investment in integrating verification code
57 delivery with the delivery of SARS-CoV-2 test results.

58 Combining these numbers, 26% of all infected individuals interviewed by manual contact
59 tracers reported having previously entered a verification code into their app to anonymously

60 notify their contacts. One caveat is that the cases that contact tracers succeed in interviewing
61 (response rate is ~70% of assigned cases) may have higher app use than the general campus
62 population. However, we get the same estimate of 26% by dividing the total number of
63 verification codes issued by the total number of positive tests from our campus testing facilities.
64 We count verification codes (613 in total) at point of issue rather than upon usage, but because
65 obtaining a code requires some action from an infected individual (either a phone call or clicking
66 on a request link), we expect this to be only a slight overestimate. There are also factors that
67 might cause this number to be an underestimate; specifically, we count positive tests not cases,
68 and some individuals tested positive on multiple test platforms (PCR and antigen) for the same
69 illness. These two independent approaches both yield the same estimate that 26% of cases
70 notified their contacts using the Covid Watch app.

71 Because the three questions regarding app usage were asked during the case investigation
72 interview, our results demonstrate that notification via the Covid Watch app was more rapid not
73 only than traditional contact tracing at the University of Arizona, but also more rapid than other
74 digital exposure notification workflows where traditional contact tracers provide verification
75 codes over the phone. Our automated code delivery via an end-user test results portal is now
76 adopted by commercial test providers in Arizona.

77 We propose and estimate a metric of meaningful usage among cases. Because the app's
78 purpose is to isolate the infected, focusing on cases is more epidemiologically meaningful than
79 usage among the general population. We consider the scenario where a primary case infects a
80 secondary case within a tightly interconnected community such as a college campus, and
81 estimate the probability that both cases have used the app to the minimum necessary level to
82 potentially impact transmission. The estimated probability for the primary case is 26% (where

83 verification code entry is required) and 47% for the secondary case (where only app activation is
84 required). Combining these by assuming a well-mixed population, and neglecting transmission
85 from outside campus given low community prevalence at the time this pilot study was
86 conducted, app usage is estimated to affect 12% of transmission pairs. In a structured population
87 where individuals in the same transmission pair have more similar app usage rates, this value
88 will be higher than 12%.

89 Our app usage metric can be used to estimate the expected reduction in $R(t)$ due to the
90 direct impact on the behavior of secondary cases. This reduction could be $\sim 12\%$ if 1) all cases
91 carried their phones with them at the time transmission occurred, 2) primary cases are tested
92 sufficiently rapidly, 3) the app detects exposures that led to transmission, and 4) notifications
93 following infection eliminated forward disease transmission by sufficiently changing the
94 behavior of secondary cases. The direct reduction in $R(t)$ will be smaller, because of violations in
95 these assumptions, especially the fourth given reports of low quarantine compliance (6, 7).
96 However, $R(t)$ is also indirectly reduced when the far larger number of exposure events that do
97 not lead to transmission also lead to behavior change, which either prevents infection in the
98 notification recipient, or elicits first quarantine and then isolation after they have been infected
99 by a different exposure within the same social network (8).

100 Here we have proposed a new metric for assessing app usage within a tightly
101 interconnected community that does its own testing and tracing. We show that usage on the
102 University of Arizona campus is high enough to make it a useful tool that complements and
103 augments traditional contact tracing.

104

105 **Ethical considerations**

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

111

112 **Acknowledgments**

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

116

117 **Author Bio**

118 Joanna Masel is a Professor of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology at the University of
119 Arizona and a consultant at WeHealth PBC (distributors of the Covid Watch Arizona app). She
120 is a mathematical biologist and data scientist who has published in diverse fields including
121 infectious disease, biochemistry, evolutionary biology, economics, and education.

122 **References**

123 1. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-
124 2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science*.
125 2020;368(6491):eabb6936.

- 126 2. Wilson AM, Aviles N, Petrie JI, Beamer PI, Szabo Z, Xie M, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 infection
127 risk within the Google/Apple exposure notification framework to inform quarantine recommendations.
128 Risk Analysis. 2021;manuscript accepted.
- 129 3. Federal Statistics Office. SwissCovid App Monitoring. 2021 [cited 2021 January 17. 2021];
130 Available from: [https://www.experimental.bfs.admin.ch/expstat/en/home/innovative-](https://www.experimental.bfs.admin.ch/expstat/en/home/innovative-methods/swisscovid-app-monitoring.html)
131 [methods/swisscovid-app-monitoring.html](https://www.experimental.bfs.admin.ch/expstat/en/home/innovative-methods/swisscovid-app-monitoring.html)
- 132 4. Pogreba Brown K, Austhof E, Rosa Hernández AM, McFadden C, Boyd K, Sharma J, et al. Training
133 and Incorporating Students in SARS-CoV-2 Case Investigations and Contact Tracing. Public Health
134 Reports.0(0):1-7.
- 135 5. Robert Koch Institut. Kennzahlen zur Corona-Warn-App. 2020 December 17, 2020 [cited;
136 Available from:
137 [https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/WarnApp/Archiv_Kennzahlen/Kennza-](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/WarnApp/Archiv_Kennzahlen/Kennzahlen_04122020.pdf?blob=publicationFile)
138 [hlen_04122020.pdf? blob=publicationFile](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/WarnApp/Archiv_Kennzahlen/Kennzahlen_04122020.pdf?blob=publicationFile)
- 139 6. Smith LE, Potts HWW, Amlot R, Fear NT, Michie S, Rubin J. Adherence to the test, trace and
140 isolate system: results from a time series of 21 nationally representative surveys in the UK (the COVID-
141 19 Rapid Survey of Adherence to Interventions and Responses [CORSAIR] study). medRxiv.
142 2020:2020.09.15.20191957.
- 143 7. Steens A, Freiesleben de Blasio B, Veneti L, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Van Zandvoort K, et al. Poor
144 self-reported adherence to COVID-19-related quarantine/isolation requests, Norway, April to July 2020.
145 Eurosurveillance. 2020;25(37):2001607.
- 146 8. Guttal V, Krishna S, Siddharthan R. Risk assessment via layered mobile contact tracing for
147 epidemiological intervention. medRxiv. 2020:2020.04.26.20080648.


148

149

150 Address for correspondence: Joanna Masel, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of
151 Arizona, 1041 E Lowell St. Tucson AZ 85721, USA; email: masel@email.arizona.edu. Or
152 Kacey Ernst, Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health, 1295 N Martin Ave, Drachman
153 A246, University of Arizona, Tucson AZ 85724, USA kernst@email.arizona.edu

154

155



156

157 **Figure 1.** The number of verification codes issued tracks the number of positive tests during an
158 outbreak among students on the campus of the University of Arizona. The total number of codes
159 issued represents 26% of the number of positive tests.