Susceptibility of zero community transmission regimes to new variants of SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study of Queensland

Paula Sanz-Leon*[a], Nathan J. Stevenson[a], Robyn M. Stuart[b], Romesh G. Abeysuriya[c], James C. Pang[a], Stephen B. Lambert[d], Cliff C. Kerr[e], James A. Roberts[a]

[a] *Brain Modelling Group, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, QLD, Australia*
[b] *Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark*
[c] *Burnet Institute, Melbourne, VIC, Australia*
[d] *Child Health Research Centre, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia*
[e] *Institute for Disease Modeling, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, WA, USA*

Abstract

Objectives: To assess the risk of sustained community transmission of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 in Queensland (Australia) in the presence of high-transmission variants of the virus.

Design: We used an agent-based model *Covasim* and the demographics, policies, and interventions implemented in the state. Using the calibrated model we simulated possible epidemic trajectories that could eventuate due to leakage of infected cases with high-transmission variants, during a period of zero community transmission.

Setting: Model calibration covered the first-wave period from early March 2020 to May 2020. Predicted epidemic trajectories were simulated from early February 2021 to late March 2021.

Main outcomes: A calibrated model of COVID-19 epidemiology in Queensland; the conditions that could lead to an outbreak; and how likely that situation is to occur.

Results: Simulations showed that one infected agent with the ancestral (A.2.2) variant has a 14% chance of crossing a threshold of sustained community transmission (i.e., > 5 infections per day, more than 3 days in a row), assuming no change in the prevailing preventative and counteracting policies. However, one agent carrying a more infectious variant (e.g., B.1.1.7) has a 43% chance of crossing the same threshold; a threefold increase. Doubling the average number of daily tests results in a decrease of this probability from 43% to 23%.

Conclusions: The introduction of even a small number of people infected with high-transmission variants dramatically increases the probability of sustained community transmission in Queensland.

Keywords: COVID-19, agent-based modelling, Queensland, Australia, high-transmissibility variants, variants of concern

Summary Box

The known

The B.1.1.7 variant that emerged in the UK spreads faster than the ancestral COVID-19 strain of early 2020, with a reported transmissibility between 40%-90% higher. However, the probabilities of developing sustained community transmission in Queensland, which is currently a zero community transmission setting, are unknown.

The new

Using an agent-based model, with the levels of testing observed in Queensland during February–March 2021, we found that as few as 3 agents infected with a highly-transmissible variant have an 80% chance of developing sustained community transmission.

*Corresponding author

The implications

Until high vaccine coverage is achieved, a swift implementation of policies and interventions, together with high adherence rates, will be required to minimise the probability of sustained community transmission from high-transmission variants.

1. Introduction

The novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has altered normal daily life for the majority of the world's population, tallying over 167 million confirmed cases and over 3.4 million deaths globally (https://covid19.who.int/ – accessed May 24th 2021). A key area of COVID-19 research has been the development of models that capture the spread of the virus under a wide variety of conditions and incorporate demographics of specific geographic locations [1–8]. These models have been used to simulate interventions such as 'stay at home' orders, school closures, social distancing, border closures, and vaccination. Analyses of simulation outputs provide insights on the efficacy of interventions, permit stress testing of a range of interventions against increasing infection rates, and help estimate the use of resources required for desired health outcomes. This information can guide policy makers to find the delicate balance between minimising the spread of COVID-19, and increasing social and economic disruption.

In Australia, following the closure of international borders in March 2020, much of the response to the pandemic has been undertaken by state and territory governments. In the Australian context, local elimination of COVID-19 transmission has occurred through the implementation of location-specific interventions. To accurately simulate this scenario, state-specific apparent transmissibility (the probability that an infected person will transmit COVID-19 to another), the age distribution of the population, and differences in lockdown policies must be considered.

The assessment of existing policy effectiveness against the transmission of mutated strains of the virus is of particular relevance, with numerous variants emerging overseas [9]. One variant of concern is the B.1.1.7 (or Alpha) lineage that emerged in the UK. It is estimated to be between $\sim$ 40%–90% more transmissible than previous COVID-19 strains, though there is no apparent change in disease severity (e.g., critical cases and deaths) [10]. More recent variants such as the B.1.617.1 (or Kappa) and B.1.617.2 (or Delta) lineages that emerged in India still require further study to determine their impact on transmissibility and disease severity [9]. In countries with ongoing community transmission, more transmissible variants rapidly dominate. However, in zero-transmission Australian settings, the effects of new variants with increased transmissibility on the spread of COVID-19 remain poorly understood [9].

In this paper, we calibrate an agent-based model of COVID-19 transmission (Covasim [11]) to epidemiological data in Queensland, Australia, taking into account the state's mix of policies and the timing of their implementation. This model complements existing Covasim models for the spread of COVID-19 in other Australian states including New South Wales [12] and Victoria [13].

We use the calibrated model to estimate the probabilities of sustained community transmission regimes. We compare the spread of COVID-19 with (a) the ancestral strain (A.2.2 using the PANGO nomenclature [14]); and, (b) the more infectious B.1.1.7 variant [14], in a Queensland setting. The role of testing rate as a mitigating intervention is also investigated.

2. Methods

The model used a population of 200,000 agents to predict the transmission of COVID-19 in Queensland, generated with the demographic data from the 2016 census by the Australian Bureau of Statistics [15]. Agents can interact deterministically (e.g., agents who meet regularly at places of worship) or randomly (e.g., entertainment venues, festivals, exhibitions). The probability that an agent is infected depends on interactions with their contact networks; here we modelled 14 different networks [11] (see Supplementary Fig. S1). Other variables were set according to current literature or modified for the Australian milieu [11, 13].

Start and end dates of policies and interventions were compiled from multiple online sources [16, 17] (Supplementary Fig. S2). The effect of policies on the spread of COVID-19 were modelled as a network-specific reduction in transmissibility. We used previous Australia-specific Covasim models [13] to estimate the effect of policy changes in each contact network (Supplementary Fig. S1).

The model parameters inferred from Queensland-specific data were: (i) overall transmissibility; (ii) initial number of infections on 1 March 2020; and (iii) testing odds ratio (i.e., how much more symptomatic agents are tested compared to asymptomatic agents). The testing odds ratio is adjusted over three critical periods in 2020: 1 March to 29 March, 30 March to 16 April, and 17 April to 15 May (date after which locally transmitted cases reached zero). The data used to calibrate the model were acquired directly from the Epidemiology Team at Queensland Health and included the number of infected cases (total, acquired locally, and acquired overseas), and tests per day, with data spanning back to Queensland's first confirmed case on 28 January 2020.

A two-stage process was undertaken to fit the model. Both steps minimised the absolute differences between the median model trajectory and the empirical trajectory of locally-acquired, cumulative diagnoses. The first step used a fixed-grid search to determine suitable ranges for the model parameters. The second step employed a hyperparameter optimisation framework [18] to adjust five parameters simultaneously (overall transmissibility, initial number of infections on 1 March 2020, and the testing odds ratio in the three periods mentioned above). The simulated period spanned 1 March to 15 May 2020. Samples of parameter combinations were drawn from a uniform distribution. For all simulations during the fitting process, we incorporated the empirical daily number of tests administered during that period and assumed a high level of self-isolation, similar to other low-transmission settings [12].

Using the calibrated model, we then explored the impact of "introduction scenarios" in which infectious agents were released into the community, assuming that recent policies are kept (February to May 2021). All simulations included contact tracing and physical distancing policies (Supplementary Table S1).

The main output measure in these introduction scenarios was the probability of crossing a threshold that would indicate sustained community transmission (SCT) leading to a potential outbreak. SCT was defined as occurring when the number of *new infections* is greater than 5 per day for at least 3 consecutive days. We also measured the probability of detecting SCT (DSCT), using *new diagnoses*, which are the observable upon which policy changes would be enacted. Specifically, DSCT occurs when the 3-day average of *new diagnoses* is greater than 5 per day for at least 3 consecutive days. Both definitions are based on a modelling study of outbreak projections for Victoria [19]. Probabilities were quantified as the percentage of model simulations that crossed the corresponding threshold (SCT or DSCT), out of 1000 simulations.

All epidemic projections span the period from 1 February 2021 to 31 March 2021. We seeded a *cluster* of infected agents into the community by infecting a subset of agents in a single day. The agents within the cluster are assumed to be unlinked (i.e., they do not belong to the same household or workplace). This approach models scenarios such as an undetected leak from hotel quarantine, non-compliance with self-isolation, or undetected clusters in the community. We simulated two main scenarios: (i) a cluster of seeded infections for the current calibrated Queensland transmissibility, and (ii) a cluster of seeded infections with the transmissibility increased by 70% to simulate a B.1.1.7-like variant.

We repeated these analyses for a stream of incoming infections (termed *Poisson* seeding), by releasing a small number of infected agents randomly (in number and time) over the simulated period. This approach incorporates the random arrival time of infected agents and could model international travel bubble scenarios, or repeated failures of hotel quarantine with a reservoir of active cases (Supplementary Figs S3–S5). For each scenario, each model run uses a different realisation of the initial cluster (or stream) of infections.

We also examined the effects of testing rate, and subsequent quarantine/isolation (Q/I), on the ability to mitigate and detect SCT. Here we define quarantine as segregation of potentially infected agents (not to be confused with hotel quarantine) and isolation as segregation of confirmed (via testing) infected agents. When infected agents are detected via testing, they are put in isolation (I). As a secondary effect the contacts of confirmed cases are traced and tested (with higher priority than the general population). The exposed contacts are then quarantined (Q) while they wait for their test result to come back. The effect of testing was simulated by varying the daily number of tests and Q/I leakage. We allocated tests randomly throughout the population. The baseline number of tests was estimated from empirical data as the mean number of daily tests between 22 January and 22 February 2021 (6260 $\pm$ 2100 tests, mean $\pm$ SD). The effects of Q/I were simulated by varying "leakage" (non-adherence) from quarantine and self-isolation. The lower these values, the fewer infected agents (potential and confirmed) re-enter the community.

3. Results

Calibration Results

The calibrated model accurately captures the initial outbreak and the decline in cases following lockdown (Figure 1). The model also predicts that for every diagnosed case there were approximately four undetected infections in the community. The inferred model parameters suggest that Queensland was in an ultra-low transmission setting at the beginning of the pandemic.



Figure 1: Fitting of the calibrated model to the main COVID-19 wave in Queensland between 1 March 2020 and 15 May 2020. **A**: Cumulative trajectories. **B**: Daily trajectories. Solid lines are the median model projections over 1000 model runs; shaded areas indicate 95% projected intervals over different initialisations of infected agents on 1 March 2020; blue dots represent empirical numbers of confirmed locally-acquired cases.

Outbreak Results

Using the calibrated model, we explored the susceptibility of the Queensland population to developing SCT given a cluster of seeded infections. Figures 2A-B illustrate the projected trajectories of new infections for a range of cluster sizes. The larger clusters generate higher daily infection rates more quickly, regardless of the variant. However, the A.2.2 variant exhibits markedly lower growth rates than the B.1.1.7 variant, with many instances of small initial clusters failing to spread widely within the modelled 8-week period. A similar result holds for streams of randomly-arriving (Poisson seeded) infections (Supplementary Fig. S3).

The probability of developing SCT is shown in Fig. 2C. For large clusters, both variants are likely to pass the threshold of SCT. However, for small clusters, the B.1.1.7 variant presents a substantially higher risk of developing SCT. This result has only weak dependence on the rates of Q/I leakage (Supplementary Fig. S4). The Queensland-specific relative risk of SCT for the B.1.1.7 variant over the A.2.2 variant is shown in Fig. 2D. This ratio shows that for small cluster sizes (<5), the probability of developing SCT in the presence of a variant that is 70% more transmissible than A.2.2, is 300% higher than the probability of developing SCT in the presence of A.2.2. The probabilities of detecting SCT are also strongly elevated (Supplementary Fig. S5).

Next, we examined the effects of increased testing on the probabilities of developing SCT. Since increased testing leads to increased Q/I, it is plausible that this intervention could mitigate the increased transmissibility of new variants. Thus, we simulated a range of increased testing rates and calculated the ensuing probabilities of developing SCT (Fig. 3). We found that doubling the current level of testing (∼6k tests to ∼12k tests) results in a 23% decrease in the probability of developing SCT due to a single seeded infection of the B.1.1.7 variant (i.e., a drop from approximately 43% to 33%). However, even with this reduction, the risk of



Figure 2: Predicted epidemic trajectories for new clusters of infections comparing the A.2.2 and B.1.1.7 variants. **A:** Projected trajectories of new infections assuming Queensland-specific A.2.2 transmissibility and a range of seeded cluster sizes. **B:** Projected trajectories for the Queensland-specific B.1.1.7 transmissibility. In A and B, thick coloured lines represent the median trajectory of new infections, estimated over 1000 runs. The colour of each line denotes the size of the initial cluster of infections. Light-grey thin lines are selected individual trajectories from scenarios with different cluster size. **C:** Summary of probabilities with sustained community transmission (SCT) for the A.2.2 variant (blue) and B.1.1.7 variant (orange). **D:** Relative risk of SCT for B.1.1.7 versus A.2.2, estimated as the SCT probability for B.1.1.7 infections divided by the SCT probability for A.2.2 infections. The green line denotes when the SCT probability for both variants is the same. Simulations used the current baseline level of testing (∼6k daily tests) and a moderate Q/I leakage (∼50%).

developing SCT due to a single infected agent leaking into the Queensland community is still approximately 2.5 times larger than the risk estimated for the A.2.2 variant. An increase in testing by an order of magnitude (10-fold) would be needed to nullify the excess risk posed by high-transmissibility variants. Increasing testing also decreases the probability of detecting SCT (Supplementary Fig. S6), again because of the ensuing increased Q/I, though even very high testing rates do not reduce the detection probability for B.1.1.7 to the level of A.2.2 because for the less transmissible strain small outbreaks are more likely to go undetected.

4. Discussion

We tailored an agent-based model of COVID-19 to Queensland, Australia. The calibrated model reproduces the 2020-wave of locally-acquired cases, and was used to predict epidemic scenarios in the face of more transmissible variants, in particular the B.1.1.7 variant. We found that for the same policy settings, a 70% increase in transmissibility translates to an up to 3-fold increase in the chance of developing SCT. These increases can be mitigated by a sustained increase in testing and subsequent Q/I, but the required increase in testing (10-fold) far exceeds the maximum number of daily tests performed in Queensland since the beginning of the pandemic (∼ 35,000 tests per day). Nevertheless, our results support a strong role for Q/I in reducing the spread of COVID-19 in ultra-low transmission environments [20]. This is further supported by the Australian experience in which, other than the 2020 Victorian second wave, outbreaks of COVID-19 have been rare, small, and effectively contained.



Figure 3: Probabilities of sustained community transmission for multiple levels of testing. The black line with filled circles represents SCT probabilities for A.2.2 and $\sim$ 6000 daily tests. Red-shaded lines are SCT probabilities for the B.1.1.7 variant and multiple levels of testing. All cases have a low Q/I leakage (<10%).

The rarity of prolonged outbreaks in Australia also justifies the threshold used to quantify the probability of regimes with SCT, that could lead to larger outbreaks. In a global context where India counted over 400,000 daily diagnoses in the middle of May 2021, Argentina over 30,000, and Taiwan recently exceeded 700 daily diagnoses [21], our thresholds are conservative. However, in an Australian context, these thresholds are a lenient estimate of a policy change trigger under the assumption of a largely susceptible population, noting that appropriate thresholds may change as vaccination coverage increases. Our choice of threshold is supported by recent 3-day lockdowns in Queensland (January and March 2021), which were triggered by the detection of a single locally-acquired case. The large risk of developing SCT due to B.1.1.7 infections suggests that our current "new normal", with approximately 1.6% of the population fully vaccinated [21], does not leave a substantial margin to sustain a zero-community transmission regime if a moderate (let alone large) number of infections with B.1.1.7 or other highly-transmissible variant of concern leaks into the community.

Our model calibration suggests Queensland had a lower transmissibility than previously found for New South Wales and Victoria [12, 13]. Several factors may contribute to this reduced transmissibility. These include: (i) fitting the model to diagnoses during a period with very limited testing; (ii) behavioural changes due to an increasing volume of news regarding outbreaks overseas; (iii) the fitting process reducing overall transmissibility to account for overall smaller spread of COVID-19 in Queensland than New South Wales and Victoria; (iv) having a lower population density and different mobility patterns around and between cities [22]; (v) a smaller manufacturing industry (17% of Australia's output, compared to 28% and 32% for Victoria and New South Wales respectively), which has been associated with regional heterogeneity in outbreaks in Italy, potentially due to the intensity and duration of interactions between workers [23]; and (vi) a different latitude/climate [24].

We modelled Queensland without considering geographical effects explicitly, as has been done successfully to model COVID-19 in New South Wales and Victoria. This approximation may lead to underestimates in transmissibility within the denser population centres, given that Queensland's population is geographically dispersed (just under 50% of Queensland's population lives in Brisbane, compared to 66% of New South Wales in Sydney and 77% of Victoria in Melbourne). We also calibrated the model to locally-acquired case numbers rather than total cases, a large proportion of which were in hotel quarantine. Although we have not explicitly modelled the hotel quarantine system, our modelling of seeded community infections after a period of no community transmission is designed, specifically, to simulate the consequences of leaks from hotel quarantine or cross-border importations (state or international). Such modelling will also be important

to inform responses should any new variant emerge, and fall outside the effective immunisation scope of currently available vaccines and to plan the longer term strategy of re-opening international borders.

References

[1] Panovska-Griffiths J, Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, Klein DJ, Viner RM, et al. Determining the optimal strategy for reopening schools, the impact of test and trace interventions, and the risk of occurrence of a second COVID-19 epidemic wave in the UK: a modelling study. Lancet Child Adolesc Health. 2020;4(11):817–827.

[2] Aleta A, Martin-Corral D, y Piontti AP, Ajelli M, Litvinova M, Chinazzi M, et al. Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves of COVID-19. Nat Hum Behav. 2020;4(9):964–971.

[3] IHME COVID-19 Forecasting Team. Modeling COVID-19 scenarios for the United States. Nat Med. 2021;27(1):94–105.

[4] Dehning J, Zierenberg J, Spitzner FP, Wibral M, Neto JP, Wilczek M, et al. Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness of interventions. Science. 2020;369(6500):eabb9789.

[5] Wu K, Darcet D, Wang Q, Sornette D. Generalized logistic growth modeling of the COVID-19 outbreak: comparing the dynamics in the 29 provinces in China and in the rest of the world. Nonlinear Dyn. 2020;101(3):1561–1581.

[6] Zhao S, Chen H. Modeling the epidemic dynamics and control of COVID-19 outbreak in China. Quant Biol. 2020;p. 1–9.

[7] Chang SL, Harding N, Zachreson C, Cliff OM, Prokopenko M. Modelling transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. Nat Commun. 2020;11(1):1–13.

[8] Rockett RJ, Arnott A, Lam C, Sadsad R, Timms V, Gray KA, et al. Revealing COVID-19 transmission in Australia by SARS-CoV-2 genome sequencing and agent-based modeling. Nat Med. 2020;26(9):1398–1404.

[9] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern as of 21 May 2021; 2021. Accessed 2021-05-24. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/variants-concern.

[10] Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Kucharski AJ, Munday JD, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B. 1.1. 7 in England. Science. 2021;372(6538).

[11] Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, Abeysuriya RG, Hart G, Rosenfeld K, et al. Covasim: an agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. medRxiv. 2020;p. 2020.05.10.20097469.

[12] Stuart RM, Abeysuriya RG, Kerr CC, Mistry D, Klein DJ, Gray RT, et al. Role of masks, testing and contact tracing in preventing COVID-19 resurgences: a case study from New South Wales, Australia. BMJ open. 2021;11(4):e045941.

[13] Scott N, Palmer A, Delport D, Abeysuriya R, Stuart R, Kerr CC, et al. Modelling the impact of reducing control measures on the COVID-19 pandemic in a low transmission setting. Med J Aust. 2020;p. In press.

[14] Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O'Toole Á, Hill V, McCrone JT, Ruis C, et al. A dynamic nomenclature proposal for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic epidemiology. Nat Microbiol. 2020;5(11):1403–1407.

[15] Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2016 Census QuickStats; 2016. Accessed 2021-05-24. Available from: https://quickstats.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/quickstat/3?opendocument.

[16] Queensland State Government. What you can and can't do; 2021. Available from: https://www.qld.gov.au/health/conditions/health-alerts/coronavirus-covid-19/current-status/public-health-directions/what-you-can-and-cant-do.

[17] ABC News. Queensland's coronavirus timeline: How COVID-19 cases spread around the state; 202. Accessed 2021-05-24. Available from: https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-03-28/coronavirus-timeline-queensland-tracking-spread/12077602?nw=0.

[18] Akiba T, Sano S, Yanase T, Ohta T, Koyama M. Optuna: A Next-Generation Hyperparameter Optimization Framework. In: Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining. KDD '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2019. p. 2623—2631.

[19] Abeysuriya RG, Delport D, Stuart RM, Sacks-Davis R, Kerr CC, Mistry D, et al. Preventing a cluster from becoming a new wave in settings with zero community COVID-19 cases. medRxiv. 2020;p. 2020.12.21.20248595.

[20] Kerr CC, Mistry D, Stuart RM, Rosenfeld K, Hart GR, Núñez RC, et al. Controlling COVID-19 via test-trace-quarantine. Nat Commun. 2021 May;12(1):2993.

[21] OurWorld In Data. Daily new confirmed COVID-19 cases per million people; 2021. Accessed 2021-05-27. Available from: https://ourworldindata.org/covid-cases.

[22] Dalziel BD, Kissler S, Gog JR, Viboud C, Bjørnstad ON, Metcalf CJE, et al. Urbanization and humidity shape the intensity of influenza epidemics in U.S. cities. Science. 2018 Oct;362(6410):75–79.

[23] Ascani A, Faggian A, Montresor S. The geography of COVID-19 and the structure of local economies: The case of Italy. J Reg Sci. 2020 Dec;.

[24] Burra P, Soto-Díaz K, Chalen I, Gonzalez-Ricon RJ, Istanto D, Caetano-Anollés G. Temperature and Latitude Correlate with SARS-CoV-2 Epidemiological Variables but not with Genomic Change Worldwide. Evol Bioinform. 2021 Jan;17:1176934321989695.

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table S1 summarizes the references for the most relevant categories of parameters.

Parameter category	**reference/value**
Covasim version	1.7.6 [11]
Age-specific susceptibility, disease progression, and mortality risks	Table 2 [13]
Population subsets included in each contact network	Covasim default values [11]
Mean number of contacts per person in settings or during activities	Table 4 [13]
Relative transmissibility of contact networks	as per NSW model [12]
Quarantine and Isolation factor	Table 7 [13]
Probability of successful contact tracing	Table 7 [13]

Supplementary Table S1: Summary of references for model parameters.

Appendix B. Supplementary Figures



Supplementary Figure S1: Policy-based government interventions are incorporated in the model as changes in the transmissibility of each layer. In each horizontal bar, grey portions indicate the reference level transmissibility (equal to 1). Blue portions indicate the current policies have the effect of reducing the layer's transmissibility. The darker the shade of blue, the lower the effective transmissibility in that layer. Red portions indicate that the transmissibility in that layer (here, only the home layer) is larger than baseline levels because people spend more time or are in close proximity with contacts within the layer.



Supplementary Figure S2: Policies incorporated in the model. The colours denote four policy categories: semi-permanent public health recommendations (orange); restriction policies that reduce the spread by restricting activities of the general population (red); policies that seek to counteract the spread, such as increased testing or checking people are respecting home-quarantine (light green); and relaxation polices (green).



Supplementary Figure S3: Projected trajectories of new diagnoses for Poisson-seeded infections. **A**: A.2.2 variant. **B:** B.1.1.7 variant. Solid thick lines represent the median trajectory of new cases over 1000 runs. Light coloured lines are single model runs. The colour of each line denotes the size of the initial cluster of infections.



Supplementary Figure S4: Probability of regimes with sustained community transmission (SCT) for a range of Q/I factors and initial cluster sizes. **A:** A.2.2 variant. **B:** B.1.1.7 variant. Numbers in each cell and colours represent percentage (%) probabilities calculated from an ensemble of 1000 runs for each parameter set. This figure highlights the stark contrast between the risk of sustained community transmission posed by the B.1.1.7 variant versus the A.2.2 variant. For very small cluster sizes (<5), the B.1.1.7 variant poses a risk of 40 percentage points more than A.2.2. In scenarios with the A.2.2 variant, for a cluster size of 3, Q/I leakage has a moderate effect on increasing probability of SCT from 42% (low leakage) to 52% (high leakage). However, this effect is masked in the case of the B.1.1.7. That is, for moderate to large cluster sizes (> 7 seeded infections), community transmission is ongoing by the time the infected agents are detected and isolated, and their contacts traced and quarantined. This does not mean that Q/I interventions are not necessary but, put simply, if testing is limited, they may not be sufficient to stop SCT triggered by a small cluster of agents infected with a high-transmissibility variant. However, low Q/I leakage will have a crucial effect on slowing down the spread that could lead to an outbreak.



Supplementary Figure S5: Probability of detecting regimes with sustained community transmission (SCT). **A,B**: Cluster-seeded infections. **C,D**: Poisson-seeded infections. **A,C**: A.2.2 variant. **B,D**: B.1.1.7 variant. Colours and numbers represent percentage (%) probabilities calculated from an ensemble of 1000 runs for each parameter set.



Supplementary Figure S6: Probability of detecting sustained community transmission (DSCT) for multiple cluster sizes of the B.1.1.7 variant. The black line with filled circles represents DSCT probabilities for A.2.2 and $\sim$ 6000 daily tests. Red-shaded lines are DSCT probabilities for the B.1.1.7 variant and multiple levels of testing. All cases have a low Q/I leakage (<10%).