

1 **Title: Using high-resolution contact networks to evaluate SARS-CoV-2 transmission and**
2 **control in large-scale multi-day events**

3 **Authors:** Rachael Pung^{1-3*}, Josh A Firth^{4,5}, Lewis G Spurgin⁶, Singapore CruiseSafe working
4 group, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Vernon J Lee^{1,7}, Adam J Kucharski^{2,3}

5 **Affiliations:**

6 ¹ Ministry of Health, Singapore

7 ² Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene and
8 Tropical Medicine, London, UK

9 ³ Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical
10 Medicine, London, UK

11 ⁴ Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

12 ⁵ Merton College, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

13 ⁶ School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

14 ⁷ Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore, Singapore

15

16 *Corresponding author. Email: rachael.pung@lshtm.ac.uk

17

18

19 **Abstract:** The emergence of the highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant has created a
20 need to reassess the risk posed by increasing social contacts as countries resume pre-
21 pandemic activities, particularly in the context of resuming large-scale events over multiple
22 days. To examine how social contacts formed in different activity settings influences
23 interventions required to control outbreaks, we combined high-resolution data on contacts
24 among passengers and crew on cruise ships with network transmission models. We found
25 passengers had a median of 20 (IQR 10–36) unique close contacts per day, and over 60% of
26 their contact episodes were made in dining or sports areas where mask wearing is typically
27 limited. In simulated outbreaks, we found that vaccination coverage and rapid antigen tests had
28 a larger effect than mask mandates alone, indicating the importance of combined interventions
29 against Delta to reduce event risk in the vaccine era.

30

31 **Main Text:**

32

33 Many countries are resuming domestic activities as vaccination coverage and population
34 immunity against SARS-CoV-2 increases (1–3). Settings with particularly high contact rates,
35 such as meetings, conferences, exhibitions, and cruises, are also revenue generating sectors
36 with high pre-pandemic visitor throughput across the world (4, 5). However, the transmission
37 dynamics on real world networks of large-scale events are yet to be fully explored in the COVID-
38 19 era (6). Understanding the risk of outbreaks in these settings and possible outbreak control
39 interventions would enable event planners to gauge the sustainability of their operations and for
40 policy makers to weigh the public health cost against the economic gains. Given breakthrough
41 infections in vaccinated individuals and the spread of the highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2
42 Delta variant (7–9), countries have employed a range of tools alongside routine vaccination to
43 suppress disease transmission, including vaccine certifications, rapid antigen tests, mask

1 mandates, and digital contact tracing devices (10, 11). Although there have been efforts to
2 estimate infection risk during large events from routine testing data and contact tracing
3 interviews (12), data from contact tracing devices can enable finer scale assessment of
4 interactions such as the distance and duration of contact depending on the strength and
5 continuity of the Bluetooth signals captured in these devices. Furthermore, these devices
6 overcome the challenges of recall bias and achieve more reliable estimates of the contacts in a
7 network (13).

8
9 In Singapore, ‘cruises to nowhere’ (i.e. cruises that depart and return to the port of origin without
10 other ports of call) began as a safe travelling option during the COVID-19 pandemic with a
11 range of activities and hence setting-specific interactions onboard. We collected contact data
12 from around 1,000 crew and 1,300 passengers per sailing between November 2020 and
13 February 2021 and analysed the resulting social interaction networks. We then use these
14 contact networks to simulate SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant outbreaks and assess how different
15 combinations of interventions and network formulations influence transmission in a range of
16 settings during a large-scale event.

17 18 **Results**

19 **Characterising social interactions on cruise ships**

20 3,963,256 contact episodes with 1,846,312 unique contact pairs were recorded during 37-hour
21 data collection periods across four separate three-day sailings (see Materials and methods).
22 During the period studied, cruise lines were operating at 50% capacity with a passenger to crew
23 ratio of approximately 1:1 and passengers from different travelling groups were strongly advised
24 to maintain a physical distance of at least one metre from other groups.

25
26 The four sailings had a mean of 1304 passengers (range 1142–1682) with a median age of 54
27 (IQR 35–63) and a mean of 1050 crew (range 1003–1083) spread across eight work
28 departments (Table 1). There was a high density of contacts among passengers, with some
29 clustering of contacts among crew, although crew members may be required to work with other
30 individuals from the same or different departments, and roles such as housekeeping and galley
31 crew had contacts dispersed across the network (Fig. 1A and fig. S1). Crew were encouraged to
32 form ‘work bubbles’ as part of COVID-19 workplace interventions (i.e. team of workers that work
33 independently from another team). As a result, on average they had 10 unique close contacts
34 per day (IQR 6–18), about 50% lower than that of passengers (median 20, IQR 10–36) (Fig.
35 1B). If the threshold for close contact (defined as a cumulative duration of interaction of 15
36 minutes in our baseline analysis) was relaxed to a shorter duration, the overall median unique
37 close contacts scaled exponentially (Fig. 1C). The strength of each contact (i.e. edge weights)
38 can be further quantified as a function of the duration of the contact (see Materials and
39 methods). Adjusted for the duration of each contact, the median weighted degree in crew was
40 8.3 (IQR 4.4–13.5), while the median in passengers was 13.9 (IQR 5.6–23.7) (Table 2).
41 Furthermore, passengers had significantly higher connectivity with other highly-connected
42 individuals, with a median eigenvector centrality of 0.3 (IQR 0.1–0.5) compared to a median of
43 0.09 (IQR 0.03–0.2) for crew (Table 2 and fig. S2).

44
45
46 **Table 1** Demographics of passengers (A) and crew (B) onboard four cruise sailings. Number of
47 passenger and crew presented as mean with range in brackets, unless specified otherwise.

1

A	Passenger = 1304 (1142–1682)	B	Crew = 1050 (1003–1083)
Demographics		Department*	
Median age across all sailing in years (IQR)	54 (35–63)	Entertainment	77 (73–81)
Passengers by age group		Food & Beverage (F&B)	179 (171–185)
<12 years	47 (36–61)	Galley	214 (208–219)
12–29 years	166 (123–285)	Gaming	175 (163–187)
30–39 years	184 (99–327)	Hotel services	84 (77–92)
40–49 years	164 (144–199)	Housekeeping	123 (114–137)
50–59 years	285 (268–317)	Marine	154 (148–160)
60–69 years	314 (274–336)	Security	44 (40–48)
≥70 years	146 (95–176)		
Gender			
Female	676 (602–832)		
Male	625 (540–850)		


2 * Details of each department are provided in supplementary table 1.

3


4

5

A



1



2

1
2 **Fig. 1** Distribution of cruise ship contacts. (A) Illustrative short-term network dynamics, showing
3 cumulative network of all contacts that began between 12.00 to 12.05pm on the second day of a
4 sail and lasted till the end of their contact episode. Edge width and colour intensity are a
5 function of the type of contact (i.e. close, casual and transient). Intra- and inter-cohort contacts
6 are represented by the connection of nodes with the same and different colour respectively. (B)
7 Number of unique close, casual, transient contacts made per day by passenger and crew. (C)
8 Number of close contacts per day for both crew and passengers using different thresholds for
9 the cumulative duration of interaction.

10
11 **Table 2** Network properties of passengers and crew onboard four cruise sailings. Results
12 presented as median with IQR in brackets.

Network Properties	Passenger	Crew	<i>P</i> -value
Weighted degree	13.9 (5.6–23.7)	8.3 (4.4–13.5)	$< 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$
Eigenvector centrality	0.3 (0.1–0.5)	0.08 (0.03–0.2)	$< 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$
Clustering coefficient	0.4 (0.3–0.4)	0.3 (0.2–0.4)	$< 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$


14

15 **Analysing the contacts formed during activities**

16
17 The total number of contacts made by passengers with passengers from other travelling groups
18 varied according to the type of location and the time spent at that location. The total close
19 contacts plateaued at approximately 3 (IQR 2–5) after spending at least 1 hour in a food and
20 beverage (F&B) location (Fig. 2A) while the total close contacts was 2 (IQR 1–3) after spending
21 30 minutes to 1 hour in a sports location and increased to 4 (IQR 2–7) after spending at least 2
22 hours (Fig. 2C).

23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2




3

4

5 **Fig. 2** Number of contacts made between passengers from different travelling groups per visit to a type of location (A-E) and
6 snapshot of contact network at respective locations for 2 hour intervals on the second day of the sailing (F-J). Type of locations are:
7 F&B (A, F), entertainment (B, G), sports (C, H), shops (D, I) and public areas (E, J). Median (shapes), 50% (dark lines) and 95%
8 intervals (light lines) are shown in (A-E). Nodes of different colour intensity represent the time spent in the location by respective
9 passengers.

1 Over the three-day sailings, a median of 71% (IQR 64–74%) of all the close contact episodes
2 occurring between passengers from different travelling groups occurred in F&B locations of
3 which 23% (IQR 19–26%) and 38% (IQR 31–40%) occurred in the buffet and inclusive
4 restaurants respectively (Fig. 3A and B). 16% (IQR 11–24%) of the close contacts occurred in
5 entertainment areas and 8% (IQR 6–10%) in sports areas (Fig. 3A). Passengers are largely
6 mask-off when dining or engaged in sports and this accounted for 79% (IQR 69–84%) of all
7 close contact episodes, 69% (IQR 57–76%) casual and 60% (IQR 51–66%) transient contact
8 episodes (Fig. 3A).



9
10 **Fig. 3** Type of contact by location of interaction and throughout the sailing, (A) proportion of all
11 close, casual and transient contact episodes between passengers of different travelling groups
12 by the location of interaction, (B) proportion of all close, casual and transient contact episodes
13 between passengers of different travelling groups by respective F&B locations.
14

15 Modelling outbreak dynamics and interventions

16
17 To examine the spread of SARS-CoV-2 on cruise ships and implications for other large-scale
18 multi-day events, we used the contact data to generate an undirected network with nodes and
19 edges representing individuals and the contact between them respectively. We defined the
20 strength of an edge as a function of the proportion of days with recorded contact over a three-
21 day sail period and the mean daily cumulative contact duration between two individuals to
22 approximate a scenario where the edge weight reached 95% saturation after 3 hours of contact
23 (see Materials and methods). This meant that the propensity for transmission increased and
24 stabilised after 3 hours of contact, to mimic contacts formed in family gatherings over extended
25 periods of time (14, 15).

26
27 We extended a community network transmission model (16, 17) to simulate SAR-CoV-2 Delta
28 variant transmission over seven days, to enable comparison between different interventions
29 during early generations of transmission. We considered interventions including: (i) one-off PCR
30 testing one day before the sailing (to allow for test turnaround time), (ii) rapid antigen testing at
31 the start and halfway through the event, (iii) mask wearing in feasible settings and (iv)

1 vaccination coverage among attendees. In both (i) and (ii) testing interventions, we assumed
2 infected individuals were isolated immediately after a positive test. The sensitivity of the PCR
3 and rapid antigen tests were assumed to vary with viral load modelled according to the Delta
4 variant (8, 18–20). For the mask wearing intervention, we assumed that passengers of different
5 travelling groups would be exposed to each other without a mask during dining, sports activities
6 (e.g. pool and waterslides, rock climbing, basketball, football) or smoking breaks; and would be
7 wearing a mask correctly otherwise. Furthermore, contacts between passengers and crew were
8 assumed to occur with mask-on at all times and crew-crew contacts were assumed to occur
9 without a mask during meals times, workouts or smoking breaks. The proportion of contacts that
10 occurred without a mask were modelled based on the proportion of contacts occurring in F&B
11 and sport settings (Fig. 3A).

12
13 Under the baseline scenario with no modelled interventions, with one initial infected individual
14 and assuming that the event lasted for 7 days, we estimated a median of 10 individuals (IQR 3–
15 23) would be infected by the end of the event (Fig. 4A and fig. S3A). Of these, 90% (IQR 84–
16 100) would only develop symptoms after the event. Because presymptomatic transmission was
17 assumed to account for 25% the transmission, more than two generations of infections could
18 sometimes occur during the event (Fig. S3B). We estimated that 64% and 17% of the simulated
19 outbreaks involved spillover from passengers to crew and inter-department crew transmission
20 respectively, and we estimated that spillover events first occurred in the 2nd (IQR 2–3) and 3rd
21 (IQR 3–4) generation respectively. Outbreaks with a final size of more than 10 cases occurred
22 in 48% of our simulations (Fig. 4B).


23
24 With the introduction of a one-off PCR test one day prior to the start of the cruise, the index
25 case was isolated in 49% of the time, while 5% of the remaining simulations resulted in no
26 transmission due to the stochastic nature of early disease transmission and the structure of the
27 social network (Fig. 4B). As a result, more than half of the simulations had zero secondary
28 cases. The risk of an outbreak of more than 10 cases was reduced to 22% with the PCR
29 intervention. However, with rapid antigen testing at the start and at halfway through the event
30 instead, only 3% of simulations resulted in a large outbreak.

31
32 We also modelled passenger-passenger interactions occurring under a mask-off setting
33 approximately 60% of the time (based on the total transient, casual and close contacts in Fig.
34 2A) and assumed that all passenger-crew interactions occurred while wearing masks and that
35 30% of crew-crew interactions occurred when eating or working out without mask. Under these
36 conditions and in the absence of other interventions, 22% of the simulations end with a large
37 outbreak size (Fig. 4B). Assuming all individuals onboard the cruise ship were vaccinated
38 (individuals under 12 years of age account for only 2% of the cruise population), 95% of
39 simulations resulted in 5 or fewer cases (Fig. 4B).




40
41 We examined the expected outbreak size under a combination of interventions under the
42 assumption that vaccination confers 50% protection against infection (9, 21, 22) and 50%
43 lowered infectiousness in a vaccinated but infected individual (23) (Fig. 4C and 4D). Regardless
44 of the testing strategies applied (i.e. no test, once-off PCR test, rapid antigen testing at the start
45 and halfway through the event), and at any level of vaccine coverage, the addition of a mask-on
46 intervention would further reduce the expected outbreak size by about 54% (IQR 50–59%).
47 Given outbreak size is the cumulative result of individual transmission events, this implies that
48 the overall intervention effectiveness of a mask mandate is substantially less than the assumed
49 mask-on efficacy at the individual level (Table 4) (24–26). The expected outbreak size in
50 simulations involving rapid antigen testing was less than 1 when vaccine coverage was
51 minimally 25% (i.e. the expected number of transmission events was less than the initial number

1 of infected individuals) (Fig. 4C). The expected outbreak size in mask-on, no testing
2 interventions differed from mask-off, once-off PCR testing intervention by less than 1 case
3 across varying vaccination coverage. The same was observed between a mask-on, once off
4 PCR testing intervention and a mask-off, rapid antigen testing intervention. Compared to the
5 expected outbreak size, the 95th percentile of the outbreak size is approximately 3 times higher,
6 with the no testing, mask-off and one-off PCR testing, mask-off interventions generating the
7 highest number of cases among all other combinations of interventions (Fig. 4D).
8
9 Sensitivity analysis under different assumptions of the edge weights – and hence per-contact
10 risk – showed an increase in the expected outbreak size as the duration required to be defined
11 as a ‘maximal contact’ (i.e. weight of one) decreases (Fig. S4). Across all scenarios of varying
12 testing strategy, vaccination coverage, network assumptions for edge weight, the average
13 reduction in the expected outbreak size between a mask-on and mask-off scenario was 60%
14 (IQR 54–71%).. Assuming edge weights vary based on the proportion of days over the entire
15 sailing when interactions were recorded (i.e. a transient contact in a day is as risky as a close
16 contact in a day), the difference in the expected outbreak size between a mask-on, no testing
17 scenario and a mask-off, once-off PCR testing widens to 32 cases (IQR 11–64) (Fig. S4C). The
18 difference in the expected outbreak size between a mask-on, once-off PCR testing scenario and
19 a mask-off, rapid antigen testing at the start and halfway through the event differed by 6 cases
20 (IQR 5–19) (Fig. S4C). We obtained similar conclusions on the relative effect of different
21 combinations of interventions when we varied assumptions about the extent of vaccine
22 effectiveness and presymptomatic transmission (see Supplementary Materials).
23

A



1



2

1 **Fig. 4** Outbreak size under respective interventions. (A) Cases and contacts in one outbreak
2 simulation with cases represented by an enlarged node and red curved arrows depicting
3 disease transmission, (B) proportion of simulations by respective outbreak size under different
4 interventions, (C) average outbreak size and (D) 95th percentile of outbreak size for different
5 interventions and varying vaccination coverage.

6 **Discussion**

7 We found that the structure and intensity of contacts over a multi-day cruise has major
8 consequences for outbreak control in different settings, particularly if there are mask-free
9 activities and leaky testing protocols mean infectious individuals are likely to go undetected.
10 Cruises represent an aggregation of different activities including F&B, entertainment, sports,
11 meeting, conference, entertainment and workplace settings. The presence of multi-group
12 passengers and crew from different departments can therefore offers insights into the potential
13 dynamics of different actors in other large-scale multi-day events (e.g. a conference where there
14 are participants, organising teams, external vendors, front-end and back-end F&B service staff,
15 audio visual support teams) and resulting implications for control of SARS-CoV-2.

16
17 Our social network analysis showed that passengers had a high number of contacts and their
18 contacts typically exhibit high levels of contact with other individuals. As such, any disease
19 transmission would likely be driven by passenger level interactions rather than crew. In early
20 2020, this was evident in the sharp rise in the number of COVID-19 passengers with symptom
21 onset before or during the early stages of quarantine onboard the Diamond Princess (27). While
22 the number of contacts made with other passengers are potentially lowered due to physical
23 distancing and awareness of the pandemic in the studied Singapore setting, the number and
24 type of activities onboard the cruise still means that each passenger forms around 20 unique
25 close contacts per day. Compared to an average of 59 unique close contacts with more than 15
26 minutes of interaction in a UK community setting over a 14-day period (28), this was 5 times
27 higher, further illustrating the intensity of contacts during such events. More than 70% of the
28 close and casual contacts on the cruises occurred in F&B locations where passengers were
29 largely mask-off and thus posing a higher risk of infection and transmission. We observed that
30 the number of close contacts plateaued in F&B settings as the time spent in the location
31 increases. As such, reducing this risk potentially requires more creative use of space to
32 increase the distance between groups of passengers, improve indoor ventilation and encourage
33 more outdoor dining.

34
35 With numerous work functions interfacing with passengers, and given the overlapping shifts and
36 closely related job scope between crew (e.g. F&B and galley, hotel services and housekeeping),
37 we found it only took around 3 generations for the infection to spread from a passenger to a
38 crew before reaching another crew in a different department. Crew and event personnel play an
39 important role in ensuring smooth operations and their wellbeing should be accounted for in the
40 plans when reopening events. Hence, besides encouraging crew cohorting, interventions that
41 minimise transmission in passengers would have an indirect effect of protecting the crew.

42
43 When applied individually, none of the interventions analysed were capable of reducing the
44 expected outbreak size to be lower than one; the number of initial infected cases in passengers,
45 equivalent to a community incidence of 1 per 1,000 individuals. However, a combination of rapid
46 antigen testing at the start and halfway through the sailing with at least 25% coverage of a
47 vaccine that confers 50% protection against infection and 50% lowered infectiousness would
48 result in the cruise event having fewer onward transmission than the number of initial infectives.
49 This is conditioned on the cases exhibiting Delta variant-like high viral loads with prolonged

1 shedding (8, 19, 20, 29) which improves the sensitivity of rapid antigen tests. While PCR tests
2 have a higher sensitivity than rapid antigen tests at low viral load levels, the tests need to be
3 conducted on land prior to the event due to the turnaround time required and for validity of lab
4 results. This implies that cases who develop symptoms several days after the sailing may not be
5 identified prior to the event, due to viral loads near the limits of detection, and large outbreaks
6 could occur.

7
8 The expected outbreak size under different combinations of interventions was sensitive to the
9 assumptions of the network edge weights. When edges are weighted by the proportion of days
10 with recorded interaction over a three-day sail period, two individuals with transient contact in a
11 day are assumed to have the same risk as two individuals with close contact in a day. This
12 assumption is applicable when the dominant mode of transmission is largely independent of the
13 duration of contact (e.g. environmental or airborne transmission). There were 5 times more
14 transient interactions than close contacts and these contacts are now equally at risk of infection.
15 Thus, mask wearing would largely help to lower the risk of transmission and acquiring infection,
16 and outperforms PCR testing or even twice antigen testing interventions especially when the
17 proportion of presymptomatic transmission is high during the early stage of viral shedding.

18
19 Both mask-off, rapid antigen testing and mask-on, once-off PCR testing would help to reduce
20 the risk of disease introduction and further transmission if the index cases successfully escape
21 initial detection. While their differences in the expected outbreak size was less than 10 cases
22 across different assumptions to the edge weights, they bring different outcomes to the
23 passenger experience and operations planning — an extra swab test at the middle of the event
24 versus wearing a mask at all times other than during dining and engaged in sports, logistics to
25 check the test outcomes versus monitoring mask wearing practices, managing false positives
26 versus passengers flouting rules.

27
28 One limitation to our study was that we did not model contact tracing around detected cases.
29 While cruise lines are trained to trace and quarantine close contacts as part of the pilot
30 reopening, as the ease of rapid testing increases with fast turnaround time, this could serve as a
31 replacement for slower and resource intensive contact tracing in such settings. With pre-
32 symptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and high levels of transmissibility of the Delta
33 variant, the effectiveness of contact tracing is approaching a point of saturation in many
34 countries (30). Furthermore, even if the threshold for close contact to be traced is lowered, the
35 corresponding exponential increase in contacts fulfilling this criteria would make it logistically
36 challenging to trace all individuals in a reasonable amount of time. Fully asymptomatic infections
37 – as opposed to presymptomatic infections – were also not considered in the analysis. Should
38 these infections exhibit lowered viral load, the testing interventions would be less likely to detect
39 asymptomatic individuals but any potential for increase in outbreak size would be counteracted
40 by their lowered infectiousness. Currently, there is no strong evidence to suggest that
41 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Delta infections are less infectious than symptomatic individuals
42 (31, 32). Lastly, the accuracy of the data collected is largely dependent on the usage behaviour.
43 Passengers are required to carry the contact tracing devices at all times except when engaged
44 in water sports. Hence, interactions at the water sports areas may not be well represented but
45 this effect to our analysis is expected to be minor as the cruise line of study required
46 passengers to book these facilities in advance to facilitate crowd control. In a cabin, each
47 passenger's device may not necessarily be placed in a 2m proximity and the frequent close
48 contact interactions in these settings would not be recorded accurately. However, given that
49 individuals in the cabin would largely continue to interact with each other outside the cabin while
50 carrying the device, this would help to record a large proportion of their close interaction. Thus,
51 this limitation is reduced when the probability of infection saturates after a certain level of

1 exposure as is in the case of SARS-CoV-2 (33). Despite such limitations, this is one of the few
2 studies with large- and fine-scale data collection from multiple events in one setting and
3 comparison with future studies of similar data collection methods in these settings may help to
4 strengthen our findings.

5
6 With the ongoing spread of the highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant alongside
7 increasing vaccination coverage, many countries have oscillated between reopening and
8 restrictions of varying extents, in turn affecting the sustainability of economic and social
9 activities. As the pressure to resume large-scale events increases, but the effectiveness of
10 vaccines against infection and transmission remains variable, combining social interaction data
11 with models such as the one presented here can enable an improved data-driven assessment
12 of the risk of transmission arising from planned activities and the potential reduction offered by
13 the continuation and implementation of non-pharmaceutical interventions.

14

15 **Materials and methods**

16 Data

17 Each cruise sailing lasts for three days — departing at 7pm on the first day and arriving at 8am
18 on the last day, and only contacts during this period were studied. Embarking and disembarking
19 begins and ends at approximately 12 noon on both days and devices are stored together prior
20 to issuance or after collection. As such, data prior to departure and after arrival were not used,
21 as the recorded data may be an artefact of devices being stored together.

22
23 All individuals onboard a cruise are issued a digital contact tracing device with a unique device
24 identification number. These devices are calibrated based on signal strength to broadcast
25 Bluetooth signals to other devices within a 2m radius every 14.9 seconds followed by a scan of
26 nearby signals lasting for 0.1 seconds. Each scan record captures the timestamp of the signal
27 exchange and the identification number of the interacted device. After every five minute interval,
28 the records of 30 unique devices with the highest signal strength in each device are then stored.
29 The stored records are then uploaded to a server on land. Further data processing is required to
30 determine the duration of contact between two individuals. If there are two or more records with
31 consecutive difference(s) of less than five minutes, the duration of contact is the difference of
32 the last and first timestamp in the series of records.

33
34 For each cruise sailing, we collected a de-identified manifest with the device identification
35 number and details of the device holder (passenger or crew; for crew: department of the crew;
36 for passengers: cabin number, keycard number, age, gender). The cruise ship can be
37 demarcated into different areas based on the activities in a location (i.e. type of location: food
38 and beverage (F&B), entertainment, shops, sports, public areas) and all passengers were
39 required to tap-in using their keycards upon entering a new area onboard the cruise ship. We
40 also collected a de-identified list of entry records with each record capturing the keycard
41 number, location and timestamp of entry.

42
43 Using the three data sources (i.e. contact data, de-identified manifest and de-identified location
44 records), we categorised the contacts between each dyad into one of four contact groups,
45 namely (i) passenger-passenger contact from within the same travelling group (i.e. passengers
46 in the same cabin or having a cumulative contact duration of more than 5 hours over three
47 days), (ii) passenger-passenger contact from different travelling groups, (iii) crew-crew contact,

1 and (vi) passenger-crew contact. 5 hours was selected as a conservative definition for travelling
2 groups, given that this is considerably longer than an average meal duration and more than
3 99% of the cumulative contact duration (i.e. sum of all contact episodes) between passengers
4 from different cabins were less than this duration.

5
6 We further classified a contact episode in a location into close, casual and transient types of
7 contact if the cumulative duration of contact was at least 15 minutes, at least 5 minutes but less
8 than 15 minutes, and less than 5 minutes respectively in a 2m radius (34–36). For each
9 individual in each type of location, we estimated the number of different types of contacts (i.e.
10 close, casual and transient contact) with passengers from different travelling groups over time
11 spent in the location. Across the sailings, for each type of contact, we estimated the proportion
12 of contacts occurring at a type of location over all types of location.

13

14 **Social Network Construction**

15 We performed a preliminary social network analysis and estimated the weighted degree
16 distribution (number of contacts made per individual with each contact weighted by the duration
17 of contact, to be elaborated), the distribution of the clustering coefficient (a measure of the
18 triadic linkage among individuals) and individuals' eigenvector centrality (a measure of direct
19 and indirect centrality within a network) of passengers and crew in respective departments in
20 each sailing. We performed a Welch's t-test to evaluate each network property for passengers
21 against that for crew and p-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant. While the
22 mean and interquartile range (IQR) of each estimate fluctuate across sailings, the 95% range of
23 the estimates exhibit substantial overlap (Fig. S1). As such, we selected contact data collected
24 over a single sailing with 1208 passengers and 1032 crew to construct the social network for
25 simulating disease transmission. Supplementary simulations were also performed on other
26 sailings to ensure consistency in the percentage reduction in outbreak size for various outbreak
27 interventions across the sailing (Supplementary fig. 7).

28

29 In the main analysis, we generated an undirected network with the strength of an edge weighted
30 as a value between 0 and 1 based on the proportion of days with recorded contact over a three-
31 day sail period and the exponent transformation of the mean daily cumulative contact duration
32 between two individuals as follows:

33

34

$$w_{ij} = c_{ij}(1 - e^{-\overline{d}_{ij}\sigma})$$

35

36 where w_{ij} is the weight of a contact between individuals i and j , c_{ij} is the proportion of days with
37 recorded contact and \overline{d}_{ij} is the mean daily cumulative contact duration expressed hours. σ is a
38 scalar of 0.5 to approximate a scenario where the edge weight reaches 95% saturation after 3
39 hours of contact ($w_{ij} \rightarrow 1$). As a sensitivity analysis, we explored other weightings for the
40 network edges; similar to the above but 95% saturation to the same level of infection risk after 1
41 hour of contact, or based on the proportion of days over the entire sailing with recorded contact
42 only. These scenarios depict how risk of infection increases based on contact duration as
43 observed in SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in settings of poor ventilation (37, 38) or transmission
44 driven by a highly transmissible pathogen onboard cruises such as norovirus (39).

45

46 **Transmission Model**

1 We simulated SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant transmission on the above generated social contact
2 network by extending the individual based models developed by Firth et al and Hellewell et al
3 (Table 3) (16, 17).

4
5 **Table 3** Parameter values and assumptions
6
7

Parameter	Assumed values	Details and references
Incubation period (days)	Mean = 4.4, sd = 1.9	(40)
Adherence to isolation when tested positive (%)	100	For scenarios involving testing only and we assume that there are available cabins for individuals to isolate given that cruises are operating at 50% capacity.
Delay from positive test to isolation (hrs)	No delay	For scenarios involving testing, individuals were isolated once tested positive.
Initial cases among passengers	1	
Scaling parameter	0.24-0.26	Each network formulation uses one scaling parameter value to calibrate the probability of Delta infection among cabin contacts to be similar to that of household contacts of 20% (29, 41, 42). The range of values used across the different network formulations are as shown.

8
9
10 For each simulation, we assume that the disease is introduced by one passenger who could be
11 infected up to 14 days prior to the event, with equal probability on any of the days but the onset
12 of the index case would only occur between the start (i.e. day 1) and the end (i.e. day 7) of the
13 event. The distribution of the symptoms onset date, S , on respective day of the event, d , is as
14 follows:
15

$$S(d) = \int_{-13}^0 I(\delta)\theta(d + |\delta|)d\delta$$

16
17 where δ is the day of infection prior to the event (i.e. $\delta = 0$ represents the day before the start of
18 event), $I(\delta)$ is the probability of being infected on any of the 14 days prior to the event and is
19 fixed at $1/14$, θ is the incubation period distribution with $d + |\delta|$ representing the time since
20 infection on the respective day of the event.
21

22 Currently, all crew are required to be tested weekly and are largely confined to the cruise except
23 during periods of shore leave, thereby reducing the risk of disease introduction by crew. Each
24 day, the model searches for susceptible individuals in contact with the infected cases who are

1 not isolated and infection from infector i to susceptible individual j occurs based on the following
 2 probability:

$$P_{i \rightarrow j}(d) = 1 - e^{-\Delta d \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}(d)}$$

4 where Δd is the modelled time step of one day, and $\lambda_{i \rightarrow j}(d)$ is the force of infection between
 5 infector i and susceptible individual j on day d expressed as:

$$\lambda_{i \rightarrow j}(d) = w_{ij} f(d | \mu_i, \alpha_i, \omega_i) r_{scale} \beta_{ij}$$

8 where $f(d | \mu_i, \alpha_i, \omega_i)$ is the probability density function that represents the infectiousness of the
 9 infector on day d . We assumed a skew normal distribution with location parameter μ_i set based
 10 on the infector's day of onset, a slant parameter α_i and a scale parameter ω_i adjusted such that
 11 25% of the infections occurred prior to symptom onset. As there is substantial uncertainty in the
 12 proportion of presymptomatic transmission for SARS-CoV-2 (43), for sensitivity analysis, we
 13 considered a scenario where about 50% of transmission occurred prior to symptom onset.

15 We multiplied the force of infection with a scaling factor, r_{scale} , so that the mean probability of
 16 infection of a susceptible individual staying in the same cabin as an infected case is
 17 approximately 20% assuming exposure in the cabin and during all shared activities throughout
 18 the entire duration of infectiousness, similar to the household attack rates for SARS-CoV-2
 19 Delta variant cases (29, 41). β_{ij} is the relative risk of infection depending on vaccination status
 20 and mask wearing behaviours, and is parameterised to reduce the probability of infection
 21 according to Table 4.

22 **Table 4** Parameter values for the relative risk of infection, β_{ij}

Relative risk	Vaccination and mask wearing status	Remarks
$\beta = 1$	Mask-off (i.e not wearing a mask) and both the infected and susceptible individuals are not vaccinated.	No change in probability of infection.
β_{vi}	Mask-off and infected individual i is vaccinated.	Mean probability of transmitting infection reduces by 50% (23).
β_{vj}	Mask-off and susceptible individual j is vaccinated.	Mean probability of acquiring infection reduces by 50% (9, 21, 22).
β_{vij}	Mask-off and both infected individual i and susceptible individual j are vaccinated.	Mean probability of infection reduces by 75%. Assumes the effect of vaccination on transmission and acquiring infection is independent.
β_m	Mask-on (i.e. wearing a mask) only.	Mean probability of infection reduces by 80% when both the infected individual and

		susceptible contact are wearing a mask (24).
$\beta_{m,vi}$	Mask-on and infected individual i is vaccinated.	Mean probability of infection reduces by 90%. Assumes the effect of vaccination and mask wearing on reducing the probability of transmitting infection is independent.
$\beta_{m,vj}$	Mask-on and susceptible individual j is vaccinated.	Mean probability of infection reduces by 90%. Assumes the effect of vaccination and mask wearing on reducing the probability of acquiring infection is independent.
$\beta_{m,vij}$	Mask-on and both infected individual i and susceptible individual j are vaccinated.	Mean probability of infection reduces by 95%. Assumes the effect of vaccination and mask wearing on reducing the probability of transmission and acquiring infection is independent.

1

2 **Interventions**

3 In the testing interventions, the sensitivity of the tests were assumed to vary with viral load. We
 4 assumed PCR is 100% sensitive for cycle threshold (Ct) values (a measure of viral load) below
 5 35 and rapid antigen tests is 94.5% sensitive for Ct values below 25 and lowered sensitivities as
 6 the Ct values increases (18). The viral load trajectory was modelled in relation to the Delta
 7 variant, rising above the limits of test detection three days before symptoms onset with
 8 prolonged shedding post symptoms onset (8, 19, 20).

9

10 For the mask wearing intervention, the expected weight of the contact between individuals i and
 11 j of contact group g are then modified based on the intervention of mask wearing and
 12 vaccination as follows:

13

$$\bar{\lambda}_{ijg}(t) = w_{ij} \int_{t-1}^t f(u; \mu_i, \alpha_i, \omega_i) du r_{scale} [(1 - m_g)\beta_v + m_g\beta_{m,v}]$$

$$\beta_v \in \{\beta, \beta_{vi}, \beta_{vj}, \beta_{vij}\}$$

$$\beta_{m,v} \in \{\beta_m, \beta_{m,vi}, \beta_{m,vj}, \beta_{m,vij}\}$$

14

15

16 where m_g is the probability that the contact between any pairs of individual of a contact group
 17 g occurs while wearing a mask. β_v and $\beta_{m,v}$ are the relative risk of infection based on the
 18 vaccination status of the infector and infectee (Table 2).

1
2 For each intervention or combination of interventions, we ran 1000 simulations. We estimated
3 the incidence by the day of infection, the number of cases in each generation, and the expected
4 final outbreak size. All analyses were done in R version 4.0.4 (44) and the model code is
5 available at (45).
6

References

1. A. Pavli, H. C. Maltezou, COVID-19 vaccine passport for safe resumption of travel. *Journal of Travel Medicine*. **28** (2021), doi:10.1093/jtm/taab079.
2. D. for D. GOV.UK Culture, Media and Sport, Events Research Programme: Phase I findings. *GOV.UK* (2021), (available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/events-research-programme-phase-i-findings/events-research-programme-phase-i-findings>).
3. The Lancet Microbe, Vaccine certificates: does the end justify the means? *The Lancet Microbe*. **2**, e130 (2021).
4. Singapore Tourism Board, Third consecutive year of growth for Singapore tourism sector in 2018 | STB (2019), (available at <https://www.stb.gov.sg/content/stb/en/media-centre/media-releases/third-consecutive-year-of-growth-for-singapore-tourism-sector-in-2018.html>).
5. A. Curley, R. Garber, V. Krishnan, J. Tellez, For corporate travel, a long recovery ahead, (available at <http://ceros.mckinsey.com/coronavirus-promo-video-desktop>).
6. Environment Modelling Group, Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, EMG and DCMS: Science framework for opening up group events, 16 March 2021. *GOV.UK* (2021), (available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/emg-and-dcms-science-framework-for-opening-up-group-events-16-march-2021>).
7. B. Li, A. Deng, K. Li, Y. Hu, Z. Li, Q. Xiong, Z. Liu, Q. Guo, L. Zou, H. Zhang, M. Zhang, F. Ouyang, J. Su, W. Su, J. Xu, H. Lin, J. Sun, J. Peng, H. Jiang, P. Zhou, T. Hu, M. Luo, Y. Zhang, H. Zheng, J. Xiao, T. Liu, R. Che, H. Zeng, Z. Zheng, Y. Huang, J. Yu, L. Yi, J. Wu, J. Chen, H. Zhong, X. Deng, M. Kang, O. G. Pybus, M. Hall, K. A. Lythgoe, Y. Li, J. Yuan, J. He, J. Lu, *Virological*, in press, doi:10.1101/2021.07.07.21260122.
8. S. W. X. Ong, C. J. Chiew, L. W. Ang, T.-M. Mak, L. Cui, M. P. H. S. Toh, Y. D. Lim, P. H. Lee, T. H. Lee, P. Y. Chia, S. Maurer-Stroh, R. T. P. Lin, Y.-S. Leo, V. J. Lee, D. C. Lye, B. E. Young, Clinical and virological features of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern: a retrospective cohort study comparing B.1.1.7 (Alpha), B.1.315 (Beta), and B.1.617.2 (Delta). *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2021), doi:10.1093/cid/ciab721.
9. P. Elliott, D. Haw, H. Wang, O. Eales, C. Walters, K. Ainslie, C. Atchison, C. Fronterre, P. Diggle, A. Page, A. Trotter, S. Prosolek, T. (cog-Uk), D. Ashby, C. Donnelly, W. Barclay, G. Cooke, H. Ward, A. Darzi, S. Riley, “REACT-1 round 13 final report: exponential growth, high prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and vaccine effectiveness associated with Delta variant in England during May to July 2021” (Working Paper, 2021), (available at <http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/90800>).
10. L. Ferretti, C. Wymant, M. Kendall, L. Zhao, A. Nurtay, L. Abeler-Dörner, M. Parker, D. Bonsall, C. Fraser, Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science*. **368**, eabb6936 (2020).
11. J. O’Connell, D. T. O’Keeffe, Contact Tracing for Covid-19 — A Digital Inoculation against Future Pandemics. *New England Journal of Medicine*. **385**, 484–487 (2021).
12. J. A. E. Smith, S. Hopkins, C. Turner, K. Dack, A. Trelfa, P. S. Monks, Public Health Impact of Mass Sporting and Cultural Events in a rising COVID-19 prevalence in England, 15 (2021).
13. K. Eames, S. Bansal, S. Frost, S. Riley, Six challenges in measuring contact networks for use in modelling. *Epidemics*. **10**, 72–77 (2015).
14. S. E. F. Yong, D. E. Anderson, W. E. Wei, J. Pang, W. N. Chia, C. W. Tan, Y. L. Teoh, P. Rajendram, M. P. H. S. Toh, C. Poh, V. T. J. Koh, J. Lum, N.-A. M. Suhaimi, P. Y. Chia, M. I.-C. Chen, S. Vasoo, B. Ong, Y. S. Leo, L. Wang, V. J. M. Lee, Connecting clusters of COVID-19: an epidemiological and serological investigation. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. **20**, 809–815 (2020).
15. Y. Liu, R. M. Eggo, A. J. Kucharski, Secondary attack rate and superspreading events

- for SARS-CoV-2. *The Lancet*. **395**, e47 (2020).
16. J. A. Firth, J. Hellewell, P. Klepac, S. Kissler, A. J. Kucharski, L. G. Spurgin, Using a real-world network to model localized COVID-19 control strategies. *Nat Med*. **26**, 1616–1622 (2020).
 17. J. Hellewell, S. Abbott, A. Gimma, N. I. Bosse, C. I. Jarvis, T. W. Russell, J. D. Munday, A. J. Kucharski, W. J. Edmunds, F. Sun, S. Flasche, B. J. Quilty, N. Davies, Y. Liu, S. Clifford, P. Klepac, M. Jit, C. Diamond, H. Gibbs, K. van Zandvoort, S. Funk, R. M. Eggo, Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *The Lancet Global Health*. **8**, e488–e496 (2020).
 18. J. Dinnes, J. J. Deeks, S. Berhane, M. Taylor, A. Adriano, C. Davenport, S. Ditttrich, D. Emperador, Y. Takwoingi, J. Cunningham, S. Beese, J. Domen, J. Dretzke, L. F. di Ruffano, I. M. Harris, M. J. Price, S. Taylor-Phillips, L. Hoof, M. M. Leeflang, M. D. McInnes, R. Spijker, A. V. den Bruel, C. C.-19 D. T. A. Group, Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2021), doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013705.pub2.
 19. P. Y. Chia, S. W. X. Ong, C. J. Chiew, L. W. Ang, J.-M. Chavatte, T.-M. Mak, L. Cui, S. Kalimuddin, W. N. Chia, C. W. Tan, L. Y. A. Chai, S. Y. Tan, S. Zheng, R. T. P. Lin, L. Wang, Y.-S. Leo, V. J. Lee, D. C. Lye, B. E. Young, “Virological and serological kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant vaccine-breakthrough infections: a multi-center cohort study” (2021), p. 2021.07.28.21261295, , doi:10.1101/2021.07.28.21261295.
 20. S. M. Kissler, J. R. Fauver, C. Mack, C. G. Tai, M. I. Breban, A. E. Watkins, R. M. Samant, D. J. Anderson, J. Metti, G. Khullar, R. Baits, M. MacKay, D. Salgado, T. Baker, J. T. Dudley, C. E. Mason, D. D. Ho, N. D. Grubaugh, Y. H. Grad, “Viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 variants in vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals” (2021), p. 2021.02.16.21251535, , doi:10.1101/2021.02.16.21251535.
 21. S. Nanduri, Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Nursing Home Residents Before and During Widespread Circulation of the SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant — National Healthcare Safety Network, March 1–August 1, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. **70**, 1163–1166 (2021).
 22. A. Fowlkes, Effectiveness of COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Frontline Workers Before and During B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant Predominance — Eight U.S. Locations, December 2020–August 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. **70**, 1167–1169 (2021).
 23. R. J. Harris, J. A. Hall, A. Zaidi, N. J. Andrews, J. K. Dunbar, G. Dabrera, Effect of Vaccination on Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in England. *New England Journal of Medicine*. **385**, 759–760 (2021).
 24. D. K. Chu, E. A. Akl, S. Duda, K. Solo, S. Yaacoub, H. J. Schünemann, D. K. Chu, E. A. Akl, A. El-harakeh, A. Bognanni, T. Lotfi, M. Loeb, A. Hajizadeh, A. Bak, A. Izcovich, C. A. Cuello-Garcia, C. Chen, D. J. Harris, E. Borowiack, F. Chamseddine, F. Schünemann, G. P. Morgano, G. E. U. M. Schünemann, G. Chen, H. Zhao, I. Neumann, J. Chan, J. Khabisa, L. Hneiny, L. Harrison, M. Smith, N. Rizk, P. G. Rossi, P. AbiHanna, R. El-khoury, R. Stalteri, T. Baldeh, T. Piggott, Y. Zhang, Z. Saad, A. Khamis, M. Reinap, S. Duda, K. Solo, S. Yaacoub, H. J. Schünemann, Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. **395**, 1973–1987 (2020).
 25. R. Yapp, Z. Willis, J. Jones, Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey technical article: analysis of populations in the UK by risk of testing positive for COVID-19, September 2021 (2021), (available at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/articles/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveytechnicalarticle/analysisofpopulationsintheukbyriskoftestingpositiveforcovid19september2021>).
 26. J. Abaluck, L. H. Kwong, A. Styczynski, A. Haque, M. A. Kabir, E. Bates-Jefferys, E. Crawford, J. Benjamin-Chung, S. Benhachmi, S. Raihan, S. Rahman, N. Zaman, L.

- Stephen, M. Mobarak, M. A. Haque, “The Impact of Community Masking on COVID-19: A Cluster-Randomized Trial in Bangladesh” (2021), (available at <https://www.poverty-action.org/publication/impact-community-masking-covid-19-cluster-randomized-trial-bangladesh>).
27. Expert Taskforce for the COVID-19 Cruise Ship Outbreak, Epidemiology of COVID-19 Outbreak on Cruise Ship Quarantined at Yokohama, Japan, February 2020 - Volume 26, Number 11—November 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. *Emerg Infect Dis.* **26**, 2591–2597 (2020).
 28. M. J. Keeling, T. D. Hollingsworth, J. M. Read, Efficacy of contact tracing for the containment of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *J Epidemiol Community Health.* **74**, 861–866 (2020).
 29. M. Kang, H. Xin, J. Yuan, S. T. Ali, Z. Liang, J. Zhang, T. Hu, E. H. Y. Lau, Y. Zhang, M. Zhang, B. J. Cowling, Y. Li, P. Wu, “Transmission dynamics and epidemiological characteristics of Delta variant infections in China” (2021), p. 2021.08.12.21261991, , doi:10.1101/2021.08.12.21261991.
 30. S. Reardon, How the Delta variant achieves its ultrafast spread. *Nature* (2021), doi:10.1038/d41586-021-01986-w.
 31. M. Stockbridge, M. Purver, T. Solel, A. Jian, D. Arikan, R. Ovens, A. Swayamprakasam, D. Chapman, R. Vipond, A. Bown, A. Sienkiewicz, S. Tunkel, T. A. Fowler, T. E. Peto, S. Hopkins, Technical Report: In vitro and clinical post-market surveillance of Biotime SARS-CoV-2 Lateral Flow Antigen Device in detecting the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant (B.1.617.2) (2021), (available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/999867/in-vitro-and-clinical-post-market-surveillance-of-Biotime-SARS-CoV-2-Lateral-Flow-Antigen-Device-in-detecting-the-SARS-CoV-2-Delta-variant-B.1.617.2.pdf).
 32. Abbott, Evaluating Delta and other COVID variants to ensure test effectiveness. *Abbott*, (available at <https://www.abbott.com/corpnnewsroom/diagnostics-testing/monitoring-covid-variants-to-ensure-test-effectiveness.html>).
 33. X. Zhang, J. Wang, Dose-response Relation Deduced for Coronaviruses From Coronavirus Disease 2019, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome: Meta-analysis Results and its Application for Infection Risk Assessment of Aerosol Transmission. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* **73**, e241–e245 (2021).
 34. Government of the United Kingdom, Guidance for contacts of people with confirmed coronavirus (COVID-19) infection who do not live with the person. *GOV.UK* (2021), (available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-for-contacts-of-people-with-possible-or-confirmed-coronavirus-covid-19-infection-who-do-not-live-with-the-person/guidance-for-contacts-of-people-with-possible-or-confirmed-coronavirus-covid-19-infection-who-do-not-live-with-the-person>).
 35. Ministry of Health, Singapore, MOH | FAQs - Confirmed Cases and Contact Tracing (2021), (available at <https://www.moh.gov.sg/covid-19/general/faqs---confirmed-cases-and-contact-tracing>).
 36. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, Public Health Guidance for Community-Related Exposure. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* (2020), (available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/public-health-recommendations.html>).
 37. J. Lu, J. Gu, K. Li, C. Xu, W. Su, Z. Lai, D. Zhou, C. Yu, B. Xu, Z. Yang, COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with Air Conditioning in Restaurant, Guangzhou, China, 2020 - Volume 26, Number 7—July 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC, doi:10.3201/eid2607.200764.
 38. Y. Shen, C. Li, H. Dong, Z. Wang, L. Martinez, Z. Sun, A. Handel, Z. Chen, E. Chen, M. H. Ebell, F. Wang, B. Yi, H. Wang, X. Wang, A. Wang, B. Chen, Y. Qi, L. Liang, Y. Li, F. Ling, J. Chen, G. Xu, Community Outbreak Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among Bus Riders in Eastern China. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* **180**, 1665–1671 (2020).

39. E. T. Isakbaeva, M.-A. Widdowson, R. S. Beard, S. N. Bulens, J. Mullins, S. S. Monroe, J. Bresee, P. Sassano, E. H. Cramer, R. I. Glass, Norovirus Transmission on Cruise Ship. *Emerg Infect Dis.* **11**, 154–157 (2005).
40. M. Zhang, J. Xiao, A. Deng, Y. Zhang, Y. Zhuang, T. Hu, J. Li, H. Tu, B. Li, Y. Zhou, J. Yuan, L. Luo, Z. Liang, Y. Huang, G. Ye, M. Cai, G. Li, B. Yang, B. Xu, X. Huang, Y. Cui, D. Ren, Y. Zhang, M. Kang, Y. Li, Transmission Dynamics of an Outbreak of the COVID-19 Delta Variant B.1.617.2 — Guangdong Province, China, May–June 2021. *CCDCW.* **3**, 584–586 (2021).
41. Public Health England, “SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in England Technical briefing 14” (2021), (available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/991343/Variants_of_Concern_VOC_Technical_Briefing_14.pdf).
42. O. T. Ng, V. Koh, C. J. Chiew, K. Marimuthu, N. M. Thevasagayam, T. M. Mak, J. K. Chua, S. S. H. Ong, Y. K. Lim, Z. Ferdous, A. K. bte Johari, M. I.-C. Chen, S. Maurer-Stroh, C. Lin, R. T. P. Lin, K. B. Tan, A. R. Cook, Y. S. Leo, V. J. Lee (in press), Impact of Delta Variant and Vaccination on SARS-CoV-2 Secondary Attack Rate Among Household Close Contacts. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*
43. D. Buitrago-Garcia, D. Egli-Gany, M. J. Counotte, S. Hossmann, H. Imeri, A. M. Ipekci, G. Salanti, N. Low, Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med.* **17**, e1003346 (2020).
44. R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2020; <https://www.R-project.org/>).
45. R. Pung, *Code for Using high-resolution contact networks to evaluate SARS-CoV-2 transmission and control in large-scale multi-day events* (2021; https://github.com/rachaelpung/cruise_networks).

Funding

RP declares funding from the Singapore Ministry of Health. AJK declares funding from Wellcome Trust ((206250/Z/17/Z) and the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR)(NIHR200908).

Author contributions: Conceptualization: RP, VJL, AJK. Methodology: RP, JAF, LGS, AJK. Investigation: RP, Singapore CruiseSafe working group. Visualization: RP, JAF, LGS, AJK. Supervision: VJL, AJK. Writing, original draft: RP, AJK. Writing, review & editing: all authors

Competing interests: Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data and materials availability: All data are available in the manuscript or the supplementary materials. The data and code used for our analyses is publicly available at (45).