

1 **COVID-19 testing systems and their effectiveness in**
2 **small, semi-isolated groups for sports events**

3 **Short title:** Effectiveness of COVID-19 testing systems in small, semi-isolated groups

4 **Masashi Kamo^{1*}, Michio Murakami², Wataru Naito¹, Jun-ichi Takeshita¹, Tetsuo Yasutaka³,**
5 **Seiya Imoto⁴**

6 ¹ National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Research Institute of
7 Science for Safety and Sustainability, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

8 ² Center for Infectious Disease Education and Research, Osaka University, Japan

9 ³ National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Geological Survey of
10 Japan, Research Institute for Geo-Resources and Environment, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

11 ⁴ Division of Health Medical Intelligence, Human Genome Center, The Institute of Medical Science,
12 The University of Tokyo, Japan

13 *** Corresponding author**

14 E-mail: masashi-kamo@aist.go.jp (MK)

15

16 **Abstract**

17 In this study, we quantitatively assessed the effectiveness of systems for COVID-19 testing in small
18 groups of sport teams that are semi-isolated from the general population by countermeasures
19 against infection. Two types of group were assumed, and the dynamics of infection within each
20 group was modeled by using a compartment model of infectious disease. One group (Group A)
21 comprised domestic professional sports teams that play many games over a season while
22 remaining within a relatively small region. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) tests were routinely
23 conducted once every 2 weeks, and the number of infected individuals that could not be removed
24 after identification by testing or checking for symptoms was defined as the risk. The other group
25 (Group B) comprised teams that travel across borders for mass-gathering events like the Olympic
26 and Paralympic Games. The teams were isolated for 2 weeks at their destination; frequent testing
27 and checking for symptoms was conducted, and any infected individuals were removed. The
28 number of infected individuals participating in games after the isolation period was defined as the
29 risk. In Group A, the number of infected individuals detected by routinely conducted PCR testing
30 was lower than the number of infected individuals detected by checking for symptoms, indicating
31 that routine testing every 2 weeks was not very effective. In Group B, daily PCR testing was the
32 most effective, followed by daily antigen testing. Dual testing, in which individuals with a positive
33 antigen test were given an additional PCR test, was the least effective with an effect equal to PCR
34 testing every other day. These results indicate that repeated testing does not necessarily increase
35 the detection of infected individuals.

36

37 **1. Introduction**

38 Since the outbreak of COVID-19, about 223,022,538 cases have been confirmed worldwide as of 12
39 September 2021, including about 4,602,882 deaths (WHO 2020). Vaccination has led to a decline in
40 the prevalence of the disease, but the rise of variants has led to the spread of the disease again in
41 some countries (Ritchie et al. 2020).

42 Although social measures involving individual behavioral changes such as mask-wearing and
43 lockdowns have been implemented (Agarwal & Sunitha 2020), some professions have resumed
44 their socio-economic activities by conducting regular testing for infection, a typical example being
45 professional sports. In domestic sports such as the professional baseball and soccer leagues in
46 Japan and in international sports competitions such as the European Football Championship (UEFA
47 2020) and the Australian Open Tennis Tournament (Victoria State Government 2021), routine
48 antigen and polymerase chain reaction (PCR) tests and isolation of positive cases and their close
49 contacts are carried out. In the Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic Games that were held July to
50 September 2021, daily antigen testing of athletes and accompanying staff, and additional PCR
51 testing for those identified as positive by the antigen tests, were mandatory (Tokyo Organising
52 Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games 2020 2021).

53 The effectiveness of a test in identifying infected individuals depends on the sensitivity of the
54 test and the frequency of testing (Mina et al. 2020). Dickens et al. (2020) examined the
55 effectiveness of isolation of infected individuals identified by testing at airports. Panovska-Griffiths
56 et al. (2020) investigated the effectiveness of regular testing of the public in reducing the spread of
57 infection and Du et al. (2021) estimated the cost-effectiveness of testing and isolation for the
58 public by using well-studied compartment models for infectious disease dynamics (SEIR models;
59 Anderson and May 1992) and proposed strategies for effective testing regimens. Those studies
60 examined the effectiveness of countermeasures in relatively large populations, but no study has
61 examined their effectiveness in small, semi-isolated groups of limited personnel, such as athletes
62 and staff.

63 It is expected that the optimum testing system would be different between groups that stay in
64 the same region for a long period of time (through a season), as in the case of domestic
65 professional sports leagues, and groups that concentrate in one country for a short period of time
66 and disperse after the games, as in the case of international games such as the Olympic and
67 Paralympic Games. In relation to optimizing disease management in these groups, it is important to
68 quantitatively evaluate how often antigen and PCR testing should be performed. Quantitative
69 evaluation of the effectiveness of the testing system used in the Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic
70 Games will provide important insights for similar mass-gathering events in the future.

71 The present study evaluated the effectiveness of the current testing systems in two types of
72 small group. In the first group—a small population that plays in a national league several times
73 through a season—we quantitatively evaluated the contribution of PCR testing once every 2 weeks
74 to identifying and isolating infected individuals. In the second group—a small population gathering
75 in one place to play in an international championship—we examined the efficiency of test
76 frequency and test sensitivity (PCR or antigen) in controlling infection, as well as the effect of failed
77 specimen collection. The Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic Games adopted saliva samples for daily
78 antigen testing and additional PCR testing to speed up the process, but these samples are not
79 always accurate and appropriate because they are easily affected by gargling, eating, or drinking
80 immediately before the test; however, the role of such errors on infection control has not been
81 examined at all. In all cases, the population dynamics were analyzed by using a probabilistic
82 compartment model for infectious disease dynamics.

83 **2. The model and scenarios for risk evaluation**

84 The model used in this study is a SEIR model containing the numbers of individuals in a population
85 who are susceptible (S), exposed (E), infected (I), pre-symptomatic at day 1 (P_1), pre-symptomatic
86 at day 2 (P_2), infected and symptomatic (I_s) or infected and asymptomatic (I_a), and recovered (R).
87 Two pre-symptomatic states (P_1, P_2) are considered because test sensitivity for P differs between

88 day 1 and day 2 (it is assumed that an individual spends 2 days in state P on average; see below for
89 parameter settings).

90 An individual in state S who comes into contact with an infected individual (state P , Ia , or Is)
91 becomes state E at rate β . Individuals in state E are assumed to not be infective. E state individuals
92 become P_1 state individuals at rate σ . P_1 state individuals become P_2 state individuals at rate ρ_1 . P_2
93 state individuals become either Ia or Is state individuals at rate ρ_2 . The partition coefficient for
94 states Ia and Is is η ; the probability that a P state individual becomes Is is η and the probability
95 that a P state individual becomes Ia is $1 - \eta$. Both Ia and Is state individuals become R state
96 individuals at rate γ .

97 The dynamics of these states are mathematically described as

$$\begin{aligned} 98 \quad \frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta S(P_1 + P_2 + Ia + Is)/N, \\ 99 \quad \frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta S(P_1 + P_2 + Ia + Is)/N - \sigma E, \\ 100 \quad \frac{dP_1}{dt} &= \sigma E - \rho_1 P_1, \\ 101 \quad \frac{dP_2}{dt} &= \rho_1 P_1 - \rho_2 P_2 \\ 102 \quad \frac{dIa}{dt} &= (1 - \eta)\rho_2 P_2 - \gamma Ia, \\ 103 \quad \frac{dIs}{dt} &= \eta\rho_2 P_2 - \gamma Is \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

104 where N is the total number of individuals. Throughout this study, $N = 100$.

105 The differential equations are solved by individual based simulation. For example, an E state
106 individual becomes P state with a probability $\Delta t\sigma$ and remains in state E with a probability $1 -$
107 $\Delta t\sigma$, where Δt is a time scaling parameter set at 0.01 throughout the present study, and
108 repetition of the random choice 100 times corresponds to 1-day dynamics.

109 **2.1 Definitions of groups, testing systems, and risk**

110 Players in professional sports teams and in the Olympic and Paralympics Games are under stricter
111 behavior limitations than the general public, and groups of players are semi-isolated from general
112 society. Because perfect isolation is not possible, it can be assumed that infection in a group occurs
113 through rare contact between the players (and staff) and members of the general public. Once

114 infection occurs in a group, it is assumed that the infection spreads within the group according to
115 standard infectious disease dynamics (Eq. 1). Because contact between players (and staff) and
116 members of the general public is rare, it is assumed that diseases are brought in from outside the
117 group only once during the period we consider in our simulation (maximum 2 weeks), and the
118 number of infected individuals is only one (initial condition of simulation is $E(0)=1$, see Eq. 1). In
119 reality, there is the chance that two individuals will be infected at the same time or that infections
120 will be brought into the group twice at different times, but in this study we ignore such conditions
121 for the sake of simplicity.

122 The aim of the present study is not to investigate the long-term dynamics of COVID-19 but to
123 evaluate the efficiency of testing systems. Japanese professional soccer teams perform routine PCR
124 testing every 2 weeks. Players in groups that travel from abroad are often isolated for 2 weeks.
125 These examples show that 2 weeks is often a unit of measurement for dealing with this disease,
126 and hence in this study we simulate the infection dynamics of the disease for a maximum of 2
127 weeks.

128 As stated in the Introduction, we consider two types of group. One is a group like a
129 professional baseball team (Group A). Players in the group are semi-isolated from society. Their
130 movements are limited between home and away fields. The simulation of infection dynamics starts
131 with 1 infected individual (state E). During the simulation of up to 2 weeks, a PCR test is done once
132 sometime within the 2 weeks. (The day that the PCR test is conducted cannot be identified. This is
133 because the day the first infected individual appears is a random event, and if we take the day that
134 the first infected individual appears to be the starting point of the simulation, then the day that the
135 PCR test is conducted will be random). Checking for symptoms are conducted daily. On the day of
136 the PCR test, the PCR test is done prior to the checking for symptoms. Infected individuals
137 confirmed by PCR test (individuals in state P_1 , P_2 , I_a , or I_s can be detected) are removed from the
138 group. It is assumed that that infected individuals in I_s state can always be identified as infected
139 individuals by checking for symptoms and they are removed from the group by daily checking. The
140 number of unidentified infected individuals remaining in the group is defined as the risk. In reality,

141 if infected individuals are found, additional testing (PCR or antigen testing) may be done on all
142 players in the group. This leads to a reduction in risk but is not considered in the present study.

143 In the other group (Group B), the members are almost fully isolated in a “bubble” for 2 weeks
144 after arriving at their destination, as was the case of the Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic Games, and
145 return home after the games. During the 2 weeks of isolation, checking for symptoms and testing is
146 conducted daily. There are three types of test system: an antigen test, a PCR test, and an additional
147 PCR test for individuals who test positive for antigens. Those who are confirmed in any test system
148 to be infected are removed from the group. The number of unidentified infected individuals at day
149 14 (2 weeks) when isolation is ceased is defined as the risk. This is the number of individuals who
150 participate in the games in an infected state, resulting in contact between infected and
151 non-infected individuals across the group. Note that the number in state E is excluded from the
152 number of infected individuals because state E does not cause new infections.

153 It is assumed that specimens collected for testing can include those with failed collections or
154 subject to unintentional (or intentional) specimen mishandling. The effect that test errors resulting
155 from such specimens has on the risk is considered.

156 In this group, there is only one event of infection from outside and only one infected individual.
157 The cases to consider are individuals already infected on arrival, and individuals not infected at
158 arrival but newly infected during the isolation period. Let p_p be the probability that there is one
159 infected individual at the point of entry into the destination. Let p_{pd} be the probability that an
160 individual in the group is infected per day after entry into the destination. The probability that one
161 infected individual occurs in a group of N individuals (p_d) is given by the binomial distribution as

$$162 \quad p_d = \frac{N!}{1!(N-1)!} p_p^1 (1 - p_{pd})^{N-1} = N p_p p_{pd} (1 - p_{pd})^{N-1}. \quad (2)$$

163 It is assumed that infection is brought in from outside the group just once. The probability that one
164 individual in the group is infected at arrival is p_p . The probability that the individual is not infected
165 at arrival $(1 - p_p)$ and is newly infected the next day (p_d) is $(1 - p_p) p_d$, and the probability that the

166 first infection occurs at day 2 is $(1 - p_p)(1 - p_d)p_d$. The probabilities are generalized to the first
167 infection at day t as

$$168 \quad p(t) = \begin{cases} p_p & \text{for } t = 0 \\ (1-p_p)(1-p_d)^{t-1}p_d & \text{for } t > 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

169 The settings for each group are summarized in Table 1.
170

171 **Table 1:** Summary of information about groups

Group definition	
Group A	Playing in a domestic league. Travel is limited to domestic travel.
Group B	Playing a large international competition in which several teams gather. Travel is across the border.
Testing system	
Group A	PCR test every 2 weeks. Daily checking for symptomatic individuals.
Group B	Daily antigen test or PCR test or both. Daily checking for symptomatic individuals.
Simulation length	
Group A	Maximum 2 weeks. If positive confirmation is given, simulation is complete.
Group B	Two weeks
Risk definition	
Group A	Number of infected individuals remaining in the population after removal of those who tested positive.
Group B	Number of infected individuals remaining at the end of the 2-week isolation period (number of infected individuals participating in the games)

172

173 **2.2 Model parameters**

174 Average duration (in days) at each state (E, P_1, P_2, I_a, I_s) were from He et al. (2020b) as rounded to
175 the nearest integer, and hence infected individuals stay 3 days as E ($\sigma = 1/3$), 1 day as P_1 ($\rho_1=1$), 1
176 day as P_2 ($\rho_2=1$), 7 days as I_a or I_s ($\gamma = 1/7$). The partition coefficient (η) of I_a and I_s states was from
177 He et al. (2020a) and is 0.54 ($I_a:I_s = 0.46:0.54$). The basic reproductive number (R_0) of the
178 SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant is found to be 5.08 (Liu and Rocklov 2021), but the groups that
179 participated in the Olympic and Paralympic Games and professional sports teams are subject to
180 stricter controls than the general public; hence, R_0 is assumed to be 4 in this study, although R_0 may
181 be even smaller under the condition that most players and staffs have already been vaccinated.

182 Because the average duration in an infective state (P_1 , P_2 , I_a , or I_s) is 9 days, the transmission rate
183 β is obtained by solving $4 = 9\beta$, and is $\beta = 4/9$.

184 Here, the transmission rate was assumed to be constant because of the short period of up to
185 14 days. In reality, the transmission rate may decrease when an infected person is detected within
186 a close group, which may lead to strong infection prevention measures. Therefore, it is possible
187 that the risk estimated in this study is overestimated. Parameters for sensitivities of the PCR test
188 are $s_1 = 0.33$ (sensitivity with respect to P_1), $s_2 = 0.62$ (sensitivity with respect to P_2), and $s_3 = 0.80$
189 (sensitivity with respect to I_a and I_s) (Kucirka et. al. 2020). The sensitivities of the antigen test are
190 70% of these values of the PCR test (Brümmer et al. 2021).

191 In the test system whereby individuals who test positive for antigens have an additional PCR
192 test, two tests are conducted within a very short time. The total sensitivities are assumed to be
193 multiples of the sensitivities of the antigen and PCR tests (i.e., assumption of independent
194 sensitivities). In reality, because the test sensitivities are dependent on viral load, it is likely that
195 individuals who test positive for antigens will be positive for the second PCR test, hence the test's
196 power may be estimated to be lower than it actually is under the assumption of independent
197 sensitivities.

198 The probability that a group in Group B has one individual who is infected at arrival (p_p) is
199 1.0×10^{-4} . The probability depends on the infection prevalence and management system in the
200 country of origin, and hence the value is based on an assumption. The probability that an individual
201 in a group is infected per day (p_{pd}) is 1.0×10^{-6} , and this is also based on an assumption. Under this
202 value for p_{pd} , the probability that one individual in a group of 100 players becomes infected per day
203 (p_d) is about 1.0×10^{-4} (see Eq. 2). Under these assumptions, the values of p_p and p_d are almost
204 identical, implying that even before departure the group is under the same level of control as that
205 at the destination (at the destination, the group is isolated in a bubble, and hence it is likely that p_d
206 $< p_p$). These parameters are summarized in Table 2.

207 In both testing scenarios, we performed 10,000 simulations and examined the average of the
208 total number of infected individuals.

209

210 **Table 2:** Summary of model parameters


Parameters	Values	Notes
σ	1/3	Transition rate from state E to state P_1 per day
ρ_1	1	Transition rate from state P_1 to state P_2 per day
ρ_2	1	Transition rate from state P_2 to state Ia or Is
η	0.54	Fraction that P_2 becomes state Is
γ	1/7	Transition rate from Ia or Is to R (recovery rate)
β	4/9	Transmission rate per day per contact
s_1	0.33	PCR test sensitivity to state P_1
s_2	0.62	PCR test sensitivity to state P_2
s_3	0.80	PCR test sensitivity to state Ia and Is
p_p	1.0×10^{-4}	Probability that an individual is infected at arrival
p_{pd}	1.0×10^{-6}	Probability that an individual is infected per day
N	100	Number of individuals in a group

211

212 **3. Results**

213 **3.1 Group A: The effect of PCR testing every 2 weeks**

214 Figure 1 shows the infection dynamics for a group of 100 players without any countermeasures
 215 against infection (no checking for symptoms, no tests at all). The total number of infected
 216 individuals at day 9 is about 4 (agreeing well with the assumption of $R_0 = 4$), and the total number
 217 of infected individuals at about day 14 is about 10, implying that 10% of the individuals in a group
 218 are infected in 2 weeks, if no countermeasures are implemented.
 219



220

221 **Figure 1: Infection dynamics without any countermeasures.** The initial values

222 are $S(0) = 99$, $E(0) = 1$, and the others are 0. The average of 10,000 replicates.

223 Total number of infected individuals is the sum of E , P_1 , P_2 , Ia , and Is .

224

225 If the starting point of the simulation is taken to be the timing that an individual in the group
226 becomes infected, then the day on which PCR testing is conducted is a random event, and the tests
227 are conducted on day 0 to 13 with equal probability. Simulations were performed for each of all
228 possible days with 10,000 replicates. The results are summarized in Table 3.

229

230 **Table 3:** Summary of simulation results. Averages of 10,000 repetitions each from day 0 to day 13

231 when the test is performed (140,000 replicates total).

Average days until the first positive confirmation (day) ¹	6.131
Number of positive individuals removed from the population due to positive confirmation ¹	1.146
Number of infected individuals remaining in the group after removal of detected infected individuals (number among them with E status). ¹ This is the risk.	1.986 (1.219)
Percentage of 140,000 repetitions in which positive cases were confirmed by symptom checking (%) ²	62.41
Percentage of 140,000 repetitions in which positive cases were confirmed by PCR testing (%) ²	22.84
Percentage of 14-day simulations with no positive confirmation (%) ²	14.74

232 ¹ Averages exclude cases where infected individuals were not confirmed within 14 days
233 of simulation

234 ² Sum of these three percentages becomes 100%


235

236 Figure 2a shows whether the detection of infected individuals was made by routine testing or
237 by checking for symptomatic, for each day the test was conducted. When the first infected
238 individual appeared on the day that PCR testing was conducted (day 0 on the horizontal axis), all
239 detection of infected individuals was made by checking for symptoms (a black dot). The detection
240 rate by PCR test (gray dots) was always lower than that by the checking for symptoms. When the
241 PCR testing was conducted at day 4 after the first infection, about 45% of infected individuals were
242 detected by the test (about 55% were detected by the checking for symptoms). This result implies
243 that the infected individuals were mostly detected through the checking for symptoms rather than
244 by the PCR test.

245 Figure 2b shows the average waiting time until infected individuals were detected. If an
246 infected individual appeared in the group on the day of the PCR test (day 0), it took an average of
247 6.5 days to detect subsequently infected individuals, and all detection was made by checking for
248 symptomatic individuals. If the PCR test was conducted 4 days after the first infected individual
249 appeared in the group, the average waiting time was shorter than that of testing at day 0. This is
250 because the detection by PCR test was maximum (Fig. 2a), but the difference from testing at day 0
251 is just about 1 day.

252 The fraction of infected individuals that were detected by checking for symptoms was 73.20%
253 $[= 100 \times 62.41 / (62.41 + 22.84)]$ (Table 3). In this test system, it can be concluded that the role that
254 routine PCR testing plays in detecting infected individuals is not as significant as checking for
255 symptoms.

256



257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

Figure 2: Detection rate of infected individuals (a) and waiting time for

infection detection (b). (a) The ratio of infected individuals detected by

checking for symptoms (black dots) with respect to those detected by routine

PCR testing (gray dots). (b) The average waiting time until detection of infected

individuals after the first infection occurred in the group. The overall average is

6.1 days. This implies that the first infected individual in the group occurs about

6 days (on average) before subsequently infected individuals are found.

266

3.2 Group B: The effect of daily tests and daily checking for symptomatic individuals

267

Figure 3 shows the infection dynamics for a test system involving a daily antigen test and additional

268

PCR test for those who test positive for antigens (the number of infected individuals excluding the

269

individuals in state E are shown). Infected individuals were removed from the group, and the

270

simulation continued for 14 days. The dynamics with various test error rates are shown. When

271

there is no error, the number of infected individuals rises once but then decreases at around day 3

272

or 4. The dynamics indicates that the effective reproductive number is less than 1 in this test


273

system with no error. In contrast, when the error rates are above 10%, the number of infected

274

individuals keeps rising, indicating that the effective reproductive number is greater than 1.

275



276

277 **Figure 3:** Infection dynamics in Group B with the test system including an
 278 additional PCR test for individuals who test positive for antigens. The initial
 279 condition of the dynamics is $S(0) = 99$, $E(0) = 1$, and all others are 0. The
 280 number of infected individuals in state E is excluded in the figure (see Eq. 4 for
 281 the number of infected individuals). This is because individuals in state E are
 282 not infective and have no effect even if they participate in games.

283

284 We assume that an infectious disease is brought into the group from the outside only once.
 285 Under this assumption, if the infection is brought into the group 2 days after arrival at the
 286 destination, the infection spreads within the group for 12 days. The number of infected individuals
 287 is given by the number at day 12 in Figure 3. We define the total number of individuals infective at
 288 day t after the first infection as

$$289 \quad I(t) = P_1(t) + P_2(t) + Ia(t) + Is(t), \quad (0 \leq t \leq 14). \quad (4)$$


290 The probability that infection is brought into the group at day t is given by Eq. 3, and hence the
 291 average number of infected individuals playing in the games (I_m) is

$$292 \quad I_m = \sum_{t=0}^{14} p(t)I(14 - t). \quad (5)$$

293 The dynamics of the test system with antigen and PCR tests can be solved in the same way as
 294 in Figure 3. Using the result of the dynamics and Eq. 5, the risk of infected individuals participating
 295 in games after isolation can be obtained.

296 The results are shown in Figure 4a. Although it is almost obvious, the risk becomes higher as
297 the error rate rises in any system. The risk is the lowest in the test system with PCR testing only,
298 the second lowest in the test system with antigen testing only, and highest in the test system with
299 an additional PCR test for individuals testing positive for antigens. The combination of two tests
300 leads to increased risk, because infection is determined only when both tests are positive. This
301 order was kept for all test error rates except when the rate was 1.0 which corresponds to no tests
302 (ideally, risk by all test systems should be the same at this situation, but they were different due to
303 variability caused by stochastic simulations).

304 When the error rate is 0, the risk of the test system with an additional PCR test for individuals
305 testing positive for antigens was about 0.5×10^{-3} . In the test system with the PCR test only, the risk
306 reaches 0.5×10^{-3} when the error rate is about 0.4. Thus, the risk with the test system with an
307 additional PCR test for individuals testing positive for antigens with zero error rate is equivalent to
308 the risk with the test system that with a PCR test only with error rate of 0.4.
309



310

311

Figure 4: Risks in Group B in various measurement scenarios. (a) Risks in

312

Group B with different test systems and different test error rates. The risk with

313

the test system with daily PCR testing only (○) was the lowest, that with daily

314

antigen testing only (△) was the second lowest, and that with an additional PCR

315

test for individuals testing positive for antigens (◇) was the highest. In all

316

simulations, infected individuals showing symptoms (state *I*s) are removed

317

daily. (b) The risk with different test frequency. Only PCR testing with 0% error

318

was used for the test. Numbers on the horizontal axis indicate the number of

319

days to the next test. For example, a number 2 means that the test frequency

320

was every 2 days. In all test frequencies, the first test on arrival (day 0) at the

321

destination is conducted at day 0. At up to 7-day frequencies, more than two

322

tests were conducted within the 14 days' isolation. After 8 days, tests were

323

conducted two times, and at 15 days, testing is only once at day 0.

324

325

Figure 4b shows the risk by only PCR testing at different test frequencies, with test error rate

326

of zero. Not surprisingly, the risk increased as the test frequency was reduced. Numbers along the

327

horizontal axis represent the days to the next test, and hence a number 1, for example, means that

328

the test is conducted daily. The risk for the “1 day to next test” in Figure 4b is equal to the risk with

329

zero error rate of the daily PCR test in Figure 4a (○ on the vertical axis). The risk for the “15 days to


330

next test” in Figure 4b is equal to the risk with 100% error rate, implying no test in Figure 4a. In all

331 results in Figure 4b, PCR tests were conducted at least once on arrival (day 0) at the destination.
332 The reason why the number of tests is different but the risk is the same is that the individuals
333 already infected on arrival at the destination are in state E , which is a state that cannot be detected
334 by testing. Furthermore, by comparing Figures 4a and 4b, we can understand the risk equivalency
335 between test error and test frequency. In the test system with PCR only (o in Fig. 4a), the risk was
336 0.35×10^{-3} when the error rate was 0.2. The risk with PCR testing every 2 days was 0.346×10^{-3} .
337 These values imply that daily PCR testing with 20% error and PCR testing every 2 days with 0% error
338 are risk equivalent.

339

340 The number of infected individuals at each time t in Eq. 5 is shown in a stacked bar graph in
341 Figure 5. This figure shows the contribution of the day the infected individual appeared in the
342 group to the risk. In addition to the three test systems shown in Figure 4a, the risk with no tests but
343 with daily checking for symptoms is also shown. Figure 5a shows risks with p_p (probability that an
344 individual is infected on arrival) is 1.0×10^{-4} (the value we have investigated so far, see Table 2).
345 Figure 5b shows risks with $p_p = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ (10 times higher). In Figure 5a, the risk without testing was
346 1.634×10^{-3} . By conducting tests, the risk became 0.493×10^{-3} (antigen+PCR), 0.265×10^{-3} (antigen
347 only), and 0.149×10^{-3} (PCR only), and rates of reduction were respectively 69.8%, 83.8%, and 90.9%.
348 When p_p is 10 times higher (Fig. 5b), risk without testing was 3.69×10^{-3} , and the risk was reduced
349 by 0.799×10^{-3} (antigen+PCR), 0.374×10^{-3} (antigen only), and 0.187×10^{-3} (PCR only). The
350 contribution of p_p (the brightest gray area) on all risks with no tests in Figure 5a was just 6.9%, but
351 the contribution was 42.6% in Figure 5b. These results indicate that it is important to keep the risk
352 of infection as low as possible at the point of arrival at the destination.
353



354

355

Figure 5: The contribution of the day on which the infected individual appeared.

356

(a) Results with parameters in Table 2. (b) Results when the probability that an

357

individual was infected at arriving (p_p) was 10 times higher (other parameters

358

were the same). Test error rates were assumed to be 0%.

359

360

So far, we have defined the risk as the number of infected individuals participating in games

361

after 14 days' isolation. The number of individuals removed from the group as infected during the

362

14 days' isolation (the number of individuals who cannot participate in games) might also be

363

considered as a risk. Figure 6 shows the results of adding the number of individuals removed from

364

the group due to the infection during the 14 days' isolation to the number of infected individuals

365

participating in the games in Figure 5. In contrast to Group A, removal due to infection mainly

366

occurs by testing positive (except in the case of no tests, where of course there is no positive test

367

result). The numbers of infected persons during the 14 days (i.e., the number of infected

368

individuals playing in the games plus the number of individuals removed from the group) were

369

1.75×10^{-3} , 1.94×10^{-3} , 2.20×10^{-3} , and 2.84×10^{-3} for PCR only, antigen only, antigen + PCR, and no

370

test, respectively with $p_p = 10^{-4}$. If the probability that there is an infected individual on arrival

371

increases tenfold, the numbers of individuals removed because of infection become about double


372

in all test systems and were 3.40×10^{-3} , 3.92×10^{-3} , 4.68×10^{-3} , and 6.82×10^{-3} for PCR only, antigen

373

only, and antigen + PCR, and no test, respectively.

374



375

376

Figure 6: Number of infected and removed individuals. Number of infected

377

individuals playing in the games (in Fig. 5) plus the number of individuals

378

removed from the group owing to infection. Black shows the number removed

379

by checking for symptom, dark gray shows the number removed by routine

380

testing, and light gray is the number in Fig. 5 (number of infected individuals

381

participating in the games). In the left panel, the probability that there is an

382

infected individual at arrival (p_p) is 1.0×10^{-4} , and in the right panel the

383

probability is 1.0×10^{-3} .

384

385 4. Discussion

386

The risk of infectious diseases and the effectiveness of countermeasures in two sports groups of

387

different nature were investigated by using a stochastic compartment model. One group (Group A)

388

is a professional sports team, which spends a season playing several games within a relatively small

389

area. The other (Group B) is a group of players leaving their country to play an international match

390

in a certain destination. They cross a border and are isolated there for a while, have a limited

391

number of games, and then go home just after the games are over.

392 4.1 Risk in Group A

393

The countermeasures for the group were a regular PCR test (every 2 weeks) for all players (and

394

staff) and checking for symptomatic individuals. The individuals identified as infected (either by test

395

or by checking for symptoms) are removed from the group. After the removal of these identified

396 individuals, some unidentified infected individuals remain in the group, and the number of
397 remaining infected individuals was defined as the risk in this group.

398 In this group, most of the infected individuals were identified by checking for symptoms, and
399 the efficiency of the PCR test once per 2 weeks in identifying infected individuals was only about
400 1/3 of that of checking for symptoms (Table 3), indicating that the efficiency of the PCR tests to
401 detect the infected individuals was not high. The reason is almost obvious: testing every 2 weeks is
402 not frequent enough. In our parameterization, a susceptible individual becomes uninfected again
403 12 days after infection, and hence the dynamics of this infection has 12-day cycles. Identification of
404 infected individuals by routine PCR testing can be thought of as a kind of sample survey. In order to
405 reproduce the 12-day cyclic dynamics, samples must be taken at least every 6 days (Shannon 1949).
406 In other words, for higher efficiency, the frequency of testing should be increased.

407 In the test system in Group A, as shown in Table 3, after removal of infected individuals
408 detected by testing and symptom confirmation, an average of 1.986 infected individuals remains in
409 the group, of which 1.219 are in state *E*, which cannot be detected by tests. Additional testing may
410 be useful to detect these remaining infected individuals. However, because most of the remaining
411 infected individuals in the group are of *E* status, few infected individuals would be detected by
412 immediate additional testing. It may be more effective to wait a few days (for state *E* to become
413 state *P*) before conducting additional tests after strict isolation for preventing new infections while
414 waiting.

415 **4.2 Risk in Group B**

416 In this population, we defined the risk as the number of infected individuals remaining in the group
417 at the end of 2 weeks of isolation (the number of individuals participating in games in an infected
418 state) and calculated the risk under several test systems. As can be seen from Figure 3, when there
419 are no test errors, the effective reproduction number is below 1, and if a test system of daily
420 antigen testing plus additional PCR testing for individuals who test positive for antigens (dual test
421 system) is used, an outbreak of infection within the group can be prevented. However, if the error

422 rate is more than 10%, the effective reproduction number will be more than 1, and the infection
423 will spread within the group.

424 Among the three test systems (PCR test only, antigen test only, and dual test), the dual test
425 system had the highest risk. Although PCR testing is costly and the number of tests is often limited,
426 antigen testing is prone to false positives. The dual testing system helps reduce the number of PCR
427 tests while also reducing the number of false positives that can occur with antigen testing. At the
428 same time, however, a false-negative result on the second PCR test leads to the missing of infected
429 individuals detected by the first antigen test. The second PCR test can serve as a relief measure for
430 individuals who are identified as infected by false-positive results on the first antigen test.

431 Providing relief measures for false-positive individual is an important task, but because relief
432 measures increase the risk of infection, it is not easy to find out what the best system is. Further
433 careful discussion on this point is needed. Note that we have assumed that the sensitivity of dual
434 testing is a simple multiplication of the sensitivities of these two tests (assuming that the
435 sensitivities of the tests are independent), but this assumption may not be valid in some cases (for
436 example, where there is a possibility that a positive case by the first antigen test is likely to be
437 positive again by the second PCR test).

438 In Figure 4b, we examined how the risk changed when the frequency of testing was reduced.
439 The risk (the number of infected individuals playing games) was 0.346×10^{-3} when the test
440 frequency was every 2 days. The risk with dual testing with no error (\diamond in Fig. 4a) was about
441 0.5×10^{-3} , and the value is higher than the risk with PCR testing every 2 days (0.346×10^{-3}). This
442 implies that PCR testing every 2 days had a lower risk than daily dual testing. If PCR testing can be
443 performed on all subjects in terms of cost and availability of testing resources, then performing
444 only the PCR test thoroughly on the subjects may be the most promising option for reducing the
445 risk of infection.

446 Comparison of Figures 4a and 4b indicates that the risk with daily PCR testing only at an error
447 rate of 20% was similar to the risk with PCR testing every 2 days at an error rate of 0%. This result
448 shows the importance of collecting accurate and appropriate samples. Finding such a risk

449 equivalence relationship is important for decision making, not only for infectious disease control
450 but also for general risk assessment studies.

451 Daily testing reduced the number of infected individuals after 14 days (i.e., those who
452 participate in games while infected) by nearly 80% (Fig. 5, dual test with $p_p = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$) and reduced
453 the number of infected individuals during 14 days by nearly 30% (Fig. 6, dual test with $p_p =$
454 1.0×10^{-3}), highlighting that daily testing is effective in reducing the number of infected players who
455 go to games. Furthermore, keeping the initial number of infected individuals low is important to
456 reduce the risk. If infection control measures are taken before departure, any infected individuals
457 will arrive at the destination in state E , a state that cannot be detected by tests. Although it is very
458 important to reduce the initial number of infected individuals, testing immediately after entry into
459 the country is not very useful. At the Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic Games, the athletes were
460 generally tested twice, 96 hours before departure and once on the arrival. They were allowed to
461 participate in Games-related activities for the first 3 days after their arrival if they tested negative
462 for COVID-19 every day and operated under a higher level of supervision. Thorough testing before
463 and after the arrival may have been a useful approach to reduce the risk of infection in the athlete
464 village, but it will need to be verified separately whether only the 3-day testing and supervision
465 after arrival was sufficient.

466 **Competing interests**

467 This research project includes other members from two private companies, Kao Corporation and
468 NVIDIA Corporation, Japan. W.N. received financial support from the Kao Corporation until March
469 2020 in a context outside the submitted work. T.Y. and W.N. have received financial support from
470 the Kao Corporation for a collaborative research project in the context of measures at
471 mass-gathering events. T.Y. and W.N. have received financial support from the Yomiuri Giants, the
472 Japan Professional Football League, and the Japan Professional Basketball League. M.K., M.M., T.Y.
473 W.N, and S.I. have attended the New Coronavirus Countermeasures Liaison Council jointly
474 established by the Nippon Professional Baseball Organization and the Japan Professional Football

475 League as experts without any reward. T.Y. and W.N. are advisors to the Japan National Stadium.
476 The findings and conclusions of this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not
477 represent the official views of any institution.

478 **References**

- 479 Agarwal, V. & Sunitha, B. K. 2020 COVID-19: Current pandemic and its societal impact. International
480 Journal of Advanced Science and Technology 29, 432–439.
- 481 Anderson, R. M, May, R. (1991) Infectious Diseases of Humans: Transmission and Control. Oxford
482 University Press. Oxford.
- 483 Brümmer, L. E., Katzenschlager, S., Gaeddert, M., Erdmann, C., Schmitz, S., Bota, M., Grilli, M.,
484 Larmann, J., Weigand, M. A., Pollock, N. R., Mac' e, A., Carmona, S., Ongarello, S., Sacks, J. A. &
485 Denkinger, C. M. 2021 Accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: A living
486 systematic review and meta- analysis. PLOS MEDICINE
487 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003735>. (last access September 1, 2021)
- 488 Dickens, B. L., Koo, J. R., Lim, J. T., Sun, H., Clapham, H. E., Wilder-Smith, A. & Cook, A. R. 2020
489 Strategies at points of entry to reduce importation risk of COVID-19 cases and reopen travel.
490 JOURNAL OF TRAVEL MEDICINE 27(8).
- 491 Du, Z., Pandey, A., Bai, Y., Fitzpatrick, M. C., Chinazzi, M., Pastorey Piontti, A., Lachmann, M.,
492 Vespignani, A., Cowling, B. J., Galvani, A. P. & Meyers, L. A. 2021 Comparative
493 cost-effectiveness of SARS- CoV-2 testing strategies in the USA: a modelling study. LANCET
494 PUBLIC HEALTH 6(3), E184–E191.
- 495 He, W., Yi, G. Y. & Zhu, Y. 2020a Estimation of the basic reproduction number, average incubation
496 time, asymptomatic infection rate, and case fatality rate for covid-19: Meta-analysis and
497 sensitivity analysis. Journal of Medical Virology 92(11), 2543–2550.

498 He, X., Lau, E. H. Y., Wu, P., Deng, X., Wang, J., Hao, X., Lau, Y. C., Wong, J. Y., Guan, Y., Tan, X., Mo,
499 X., Chen, Y., Liao, B., Chen, W., Hu, F., Zhang, Q., Zhong, M., Wu, Y., Zhao, L., Zhang, F., Cowling,
500 B. J., Li, F. & Leung, G. M. 2020b Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
501 COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* 26, 672–675.

502 Kucirka, L. MM, Lauer, S. A., Laeyendecker, O., Boon, D., Lessler, J. (2020) Variation in
503 false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction–based SARS-CoV-2 tests
504 by time since exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-1495>

505 Liu, Y. & Rocklöv, J. 2021 The reproductive number of the delta variant of sars-cov-2 is far higher
506 compared to the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 virus. *Journal of Travel Medicine*
507 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taab124>. (last access September 1, 2021)

508 Mina, M. J., Parker, R. & Larremore, D. B. 2020 Rethinking COVID-19 test sensitivity - a strategy for
509 containment. *The New England Journal of Medicine* e120, 1–3.

510 Panovska-Griffiths, J., Kerr, C. C., Stuart, R. M., Mistry, D., Klein, D. J., Viner, R. M. & Bonell, C. 2020
511 Determining the optimal strategy for reopening schools, the impact of test and trace
512 interventions, and the risk of occurrence of a second COVID-19 epidemic wave in the UK: a
513 modelling study. *LANCET CHILD & ADOLESCENT HEALTH* 4(11), 817–827.

514 Ritchie, H., Mathieu, E., Rodes-Guirao, L., Appel, C., Giattino, C., Ortiz-Ospina, E., Hasell, J.,
515 Macdonald, B., Beltekian, D. & Roser, M. 2020 Coronavirus pandemic (covid-19). *Our World in*
516 *Data* <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus>. (last access September 1, 2021)

517 Shannon, C. E. 1949 Communication in the presence of noise. *Proceedings of the Institute of Radio*
518 *Engineers* 37, 10–21.

519 Tokyo Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games 2020 2021 The International
520 Olympic Committee, The International Paralympic Committee. *The Playbook athletes and*
521 *officials (Version 3)*.
522 <https://gtimg.tokyo2020.org/image/upload/production/kms17lvv7qw4c9tjuiud.pdf>. (last
523 access September 1, 2021)

- 524 UEFA (2020) UEFA Return to Play Protocol v4
525 https://editorial.uefa.com/resources/0269-124c43300d07-9e91c138333d-1000/uefa_return_t
526 [o_play_protocol.pdf](#) (last access September 1, 2021)
- 527 Victoria State Government 2021 Strict quarantine rules to serve up safe Australian Open
528 <https://www.premier.vic.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-01/210112%20-20Strict%20Quaranti>
529 [ne%20Rules%20To%20Serve%20Up%20Safe%20Australian%20Open.pdf](#) (last access
530 September 1, 2021)
- 531 WHO 2020 WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2020. <https://covid19.who.int/>. (last access
532 September 12, 2021)