

# 1 **Designing isolation guidelines for COVID-19 patients utilizing rapid antigen tests: a** 2 **simulation study using viral dynamics models**

## 3 4 **Authors**

5 Yong Dam Jeong<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Keisuke Ejima<sup>3,4,†,\*</sup>, Kwang Su Kim<sup>1,†</sup>, Woo Joohyeon<sup>1</sup>, Shoya Iwanami<sup>1</sup>, Yasuhisa  
6 Fujita<sup>1</sup>, Il Hyo Jung<sup>2</sup>, Kenji Shibuya<sup>4</sup>, Shingo Iwami<sup>1,5,6,7,8\*</sup>, Ana I. Bento<sup>3,‡</sup>, and Marco Ajelli<sup>9‡</sup>

## 7 8 **Affiliations**

9 <sup>1</sup>interdisciplinary Biology Laboratory (iBLab), Division of Biological Science, Graduate School of Science,  
10 Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan.

11 <sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, Pusan National University, Busan, South Korea.

12 <sup>3</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Indiana University School of Public Health-Bloomington,  
13 IN, USA.

14 <sup>4</sup>The Tokyo Foundation for Policy Research, Tokyo, Japan.

15 <sup>5</sup>Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan.

16 <sup>6</sup>Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Biology (ASHBi), Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.

17 <sup>7</sup>NEXT-Ganken Program, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research (JFCR), Tokyo, Japan.

18 <sup>8</sup>Science Groove Inc., Fukuoka, Japan.

19 <sup>9</sup>Laboratory for Computational Epidemiology and Public Health, Department of Epidemiology and  
20 Biostatistics, Indiana University School of Public Health-Bloomington, IN, USA

21  
22 \* Corresponding authors: [kejima@iu.edu](mailto:kejima@iu.edu) (KE) [iwami.iblab@bio.nagoya-u.ac.jp](mailto:iwami.iblab@bio.nagoya-u.ac.jp) (S Iwami)

23 † These authors contributed equally to this work. ‡ These senior authors contributed equally to this work.

25 **Author contributions:** Conceived and designed the study: KE S Iwami. Analyzed the data: YDJ KE KSK S  
26 Iwami. Wrote the paper: YDJ KE KSK WJ S Iwanami YF IHJ KW TM TW KS S Iwami AIB MA. All  
27 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

28

29 **Competing Interest Statement:** M.A. has received research funding from Seqirus; the funding is not related  
30 to COVID-19. The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

31

32 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, mathematical model, personalized medicine, isolation

## Abstract

Appropriate isolation guidelines for COVID-19 patients are warranted. Currently, isolating for fixed time is adapted in most countries. However, given the variability in viral dynamics between patients, some patients may no longer be infectious by the end of isolation (thus they are redundantly isolated), whereas others may still be infectious. Utilizing viral test results to determine ending isolation would minimize both the risk of ending isolation of infectious patients and the burden due to redundant isolation of noninfectious patients. In our previous study, we proposed a computational framework using SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics models to compute the risk and the burden of different isolation guidelines with PCR tests. In this study, we extend the computational framework to design isolation guidelines for COVID-19 patients utilizing rapid antigen tests. Time interval of tests and number of consecutive negative tests to minimize the risk and the burden of isolation were explored. Furthermore, the approach was extended for asymptomatic cases. We found the guideline should be designed considering various factors: the infectiousness threshold values, the detection limit of antigen tests, symptom presence, and an acceptable level of releasing infectious patients. Especially, when detection limit is higher than the infectiousness threshold values, more consecutive negative results are needed to ascertain loss of infectiousness. To control the risk of releasing of infectious individuals under certain levels, rapid antigen tests should be designed to have lower detection limits than infectiousness threshold values to minimize the length of prolonged isolation, and the length of prolonged isolation increases when the detection limit is higher than the infectiousness threshold values, even though the guidelines are optimized for given conditions.

## 53 Introduction

54 Vaccination campaign for COVID-19 are being successfully implemented over the world (World  
55 Health Organization). However, despite the high vaccination coverages achieved in many Western countries  
56 (World Health Organization), the emergence of the Omicron variant reminded us how vaccination alone may  
57 not be sufficient to prevent new major waves of infection (World Health Organization). Nonpharmaceutical  
58 interventions (NPIs), such as wearing masks, social distancing, reactive closures, still play a central role in the  
59 pandemic response and testing, isolation, and quarantine represent its backbone (Aleta et al., 2020).

60 One of the point of discussion regarding the isolation of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals is when to  
61 end the isolation period. A longer isolation decreases the risk of transmission after the isolation; however, it  
62 may impose unnecessarily lengthy isolation, which is a burden on physical and mental health of the patients  
63 (Mian, Al-Asad, & Khan, 2021) and economy (Ash, Bento, Kaffine, Rao, & Bento, 2021). The criteria for  
64 ending isolation need to be determined considering the balance between pros and cons of the isolation.

65 There are two main approaches widely adapted by countries to determine the end of the isolation of  
66 COVID-19 patients. One is to isolate infected patients over a fixed time, whereas the other is to isolate infected  
67 patients until their viral load drops below a “safe(r)” level (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020) .  
68 In our previous study, we demonstrated that the latter approach, based on PCR testing of isolated individuals,  
69 could minimize unnecessary isolation while controlling the risk of further transmission (Jeong et al., 2021).  
70 This is because some patients are no longer infectious by the end of isolation (thus they are redundantly  
71 isolated), whereas others may still be infectious, due to substantial individual variability in viral dynamics  
72 (Iwanami et al., 2021). However, PCR tests have a few limitations when used to determine the end of isolation.  
73 First, the turnaround time is a day or two (Larremore et al., 2021), suggesting patients need to wait a day or  
74 two until they are released from isolation even though they were not infectious anymore. Second, PCR tests  
75 are pricy. The cost of single PCR test is 51 USD (Baggett et al., 2020), whereas that of rapid antigen tests is  
76 5 USD (Du et al., 2021) in the US, although the cost could differ between countries. Further, the facilities for  
77 PCR tests are not available everywhere.

78 In the US, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) created guidelines for when to  
79 discontinue precautions (thus isolation) for COVID-19 patients in health care settings (Centers for Disease

Control and Prevention, 2020). In the early phase of the pandemic, the guideline included the use of PCR tests as follows: “Results are negative from at least two consecutive respiratory specimens collected  $\geq 24$  hours apart” (a test-based guideline)(Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020). However, on August 10, 2020, possibly due to the discussed limitations of PCR testing, the guideline was updated as follows: “At least 10 days have passed since symptoms first appeared”, because “in the majority of cases, it [a test-based guideline] results in prolonged isolation of patients who continue to shed detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA but are no longer infectious.” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020).

Given these limitations of PCR tests, the use of antigen tests in determining the end of the isolation period could be considered. On one hand, antigen tests have a few advantages compared to PCR tests: i) a shorter turnaround time (less than an hour)(Butler et al., 2021; Dao Thi et al., 2020; Larremore et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021); ii) low cost, and iii) easier accessibility. On the other hand, the low sensitivity of rapid antigen tests could be an issue. The detection limit of antigen tests is about  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL (Butler et al., 2021; Dao Thi et al., 2020; Miyakawa et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021), whereas that of PCR tests is about  $10^{2.0}$  copies/mL (Fung et al., 2020; Giri et al., 2021; van Kasteren et al., 2020). However, the infectiousness threshold values assessed by epidemiological data and in-vivo experiments (i.e., culturability) was estimated to be  $10^{5.0-6.0}$  (van Kampen et al., 2021; Wölfel et al., 2020), which is close to or slightly higher than the detection limits of antigen tests. This supported the use of antigen test screening to mitigate transmission (Larremore et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022; Quilty et al., 2021).

Here, we conduct a modeling study evaluate the use of antigen tests to determine the end of the isolation period, minimizing both the risk of onward transmission following isolation and the burden of the isolation.

## Materials and Methods

### Viral load data

Longitudinal viral load data of symptomatic and asymptomatic COVID-19 patients were extracted from literatures using PubMed and Google Scholar. To estimate parameters of the viral dynamics model, we used the data satisfying the following criteria: 1) viral load was measured at three different time points at least; 2) viral load was measured from upper respiratory specimens (i.e., nose or pharynx); 3) patients were not treated with antiviral drugs or vaccinated before infection (because the model does not account for vaccine and antiviral effect). All data were collected from 2020 to early 2021, and are alpha, epsilon, and non-variants of interest/variants of concern (VOI/VOCs) as well as the original variant. As all the data used in this study were from published data and deidentified, ethics approval was not needed.

### Modeling SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics and parameter estimation

The viral load data were used to parameterize the mathematical models of viral dynamics. The detail of the models is available in our previous study (Jeong et al., 2021). Under reasonable parameter settings, the trajectory of viral load  $V(t)$  shapes a bell-shaped curve; the viral load increases exponentially first, hit the peak, and then declines because of limited uninfected target cells (those monotonically decrease as virus increases). A nonlinear mixed-effect model was used for parameter estimation as in the previous study (Jeong et al., 2021). Model parameters were estimated independently for symptomatic and asymptomatic patients.

### Simulation of viral dynamics and ending isolation following different guidelines

True viral load data,  $V(t)$ , for 1,000 patients were simulated by running the developed viral dynamics model. Parameter values of the simulation for each patient were resampled from the posterior distributions estimated in the fitting process. Accounting for measurement error (mainly due to sampling process), the measured viral load is assumed as a sum of true viral load and measurement error:  $\hat{V}(t) = V(t) + \varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma)$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is the measurement error term. The variance of the error term,  $\sigma^2$ , was estimated in the fitting process. We assumed that the isolation and the first test was performed 8 days after infection. This assumption does not influence our results as this study focuses on the late phase of the infection (i.e., when

129 the viral load reaches the detection limit of antigen tests). The test is repeated with a fixed time interval until  
130 a fixed number of consecutive negative results ( $\hat{V}(t) < \text{detection limit}$ ) are observed. To simulate different  
131 guidelines, we varied the time interval of tests and the number of consecutive negative results. The detection  
132 limits of the antigen test were varied from  $10^4$  copies/mL to  $10^6$  copies/mL. The lowest value ( $10^4$  copies/mL)  
133 corresponds to the antigen test kits developed by Fujifilm, and the highest value ( $10^6$  copies/mL) corresponds  
134 the one broadly used and developed by Abbot (Miyakawa et al., 2021). The threshold level for infectiousness  
135 is still uncertain and thus we investigated different values from  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL to  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL (Jeong et  
136 al., 2021). Simulations were separately performed for symptomatic patients and asymptomatic patients.  
137

### 138 **Designing the isolation guideline utilizing antigen tests**

139 In exploring different isolation guidelines, two metrics are considered: 1. the probability of  
140 prematurely ending isolation, and 2. the length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation, both of which are defined  
141 in the previous paper (Jeong et al., 2021). For simplicity, we define the first metric as “risk”, and second metric  
142 as “burden” of isolation.

143 Balancing those two metrics are challenging because stricter guidelines (i.e., more consecutive  
144 negative results and longer interval of tests) contributes to reducing the risk, however, yields to unnecessarily  
145 long isolation. Therefore, the best guideline is defined as the combination of time interval of tests and  
146 consecutive negative results which controls the risk of ending isolation of infectious patients under a certain  
147 level (1% or 5%) while minimizing the prolonged isolation.  
148

## 149 Results

### 150 Descriptive statistics

151 In total, 10 papers included at least one patient meeting the inclusion criteria. In those papers, 109 and  
152 101 were symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, respectively. There were 85, 117, and 8 patients from Asia,  
153 USA, and Europe, respectively (**Table 1**). In most studies, cycle thresholds were reported instead of viral load.  
154 Therefore, the cycle threshold was converted to viral load (copies/mL) using the conversion formula:  
155  $\log_{10}(\text{Viral load [copies/mL]}) = -0.32 \times \text{Ct values [cycles]} + 14.11$  (Peiris et al., 2003). All the patients  
156 in those studies were hospitalized regardless of the symptom status; however, clinical course of infection (i.e.,  
157 severity) was not consistently available.

### 158 Model fitting to the asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals

159 **Figure 1** shows the fitted curves of viral load for symptomatic and asymptomatic patients using  
160 estimated fixed effect parameters. For both cases, the peak viral load appears about 4 days after infection.  
161 However, the peak viral load was higher in symptomatic cases (about  $10^{6.5}$  copies/mL for symptomatic cases  
162 vs.  $10^{6.0}$  copies/mL for asymptomatic cases), and the viral load remained relatively high for longer time in  
163 symptomatic individuals. The viral load drops below 1 copy/mL at day 25 (95%CI: 21-29) and 21 (95%CI:  
164 17-24) for symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, respectively. The difference on peak value of the viral load  
165 between symptomatic and asymptomatic cases was observed, which is explained by difference on the rate  
166 constant for virus infection in the model (**Supplementary File 1**). The quicker clearance of the virus in  
167 asymptomatic individuals is explained by a stronger immune response, with a higher death rate of infected  
168 cells in the model (**Supplementary File 1**). This finding is in agreement with previous studies suggesting  
169 lower viral load and shorter persistence of viral RNA in mild than in severe cases (Sun et al., 2020; Zhang et  
170 al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020) and a longer persistence of viral RNA in symptomatic individuals (Stephen M.  
171 Kissler et al., 2021). Given these differences in the viral dynamics, we evaluate different isolation guideline  
172 for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals.

### 173 Antigen tests to end isolation



176 **Figures 2 and 3** show the probability of prematurely ending isolation (risk) and the length of  
177 unnecessarily prolonged isolation (burden) for symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, respectively, by varying  
178 the consecutive negative results, interval between tests, and infectiousness threshold values. The detection  
179 limit of rapid antigen tests was assumed to be  $10^4$  copies/mL and  $10^6$  copies/mL in **Figures 2 and 3**,  
180 respectively. As we observed in our previous paper (Jeong et al., 2021), regardless of detection limits,  
181 infectiousness threshold values, and symptom presence, the risk declined as the interval between tests becomes  
182 longer and more consecutive negative results are needed. Meanwhile, the burden increased at the same time.

183 Should 5% or lower risk of prematurely ending isolation be considered as acceptable, it is not possible  
184 to identify a single optimal strategy as the effectiveness of the guideline are estimated to depend on the  
185 infectiousness threshold, detection limits of the antigen test, and symptom presence. For example, when the  
186 detection limit and infectiousness threshold value were  $10^4$  copies/mL and  $10^5$  copies/mL, the optimal  
187 guideline (denoted by the square in **Figures 2 and 3**) for symptomatic individuals was to perform tests every  
188 day and to observe 2 consecutive negative results before ending the isolation (risk: 0.020 [95%CI: 0.016 to  
189 0.025] and burden: 4.0 days [95% empirical CI: 0 to 10]). The optimal guideline also depends on the  
190 acceptable risk of prematurely ending isolation. When a 1% or lower risk is considered to be acceptable, more  
191 consecutive negative results would be needed to end isolation. When the detection limit is high ( $10^6$   
192 copies/mL), an optimal guideline would require more consecutive negative results, as the infectiousness  
193 threshold values are below the detection limit and limited number of consecutive negative results cannot  
194 guarantee that the viral load is below the infectiousness threshold.

195 **Figure 4** summarized the burden of isolation when considering the identified optimal guideline under  
196 different conditions (i.e., symptom presence, acceptable level of risk, and infectiousness threshold values).  
197 Low burden was realized when higher risk could be accepted (comparison between **Figure 4A** and **4B**). The  
198 influence of symptom presence on the burden was estimated to be limited.

199 The influence of the combination of infectiousness threshold values and detection limits on the burden  
200 was intriguing. When the detection limit was higher than the infectiousness threshold value (i.e., detection  
201 limit was  $10^6$  copies/mL), the burden was minimized when the detection limit is close to the infectiousness  
202 threshold values. However, when the detection limit is lower than the infectiousness threshold values, the

203 burden was not much influenced by the infectiousness threshold values. That says, rapid antigen tests should  
204 have lower detection limits than infectiousness threshold values, and the burden becomes large when the  
205 detection limit is much higher than the infectiousness threshold values, even though the guidelines are  
206 optimized for given conditions.

207

## Discussion

We provide a quantitative assessment of alternative guidelines for the definition of duration of the isolation period based on the use of rapid antigen tests. We found that the optimal guideline was depending on the acceptable risk, detection limits, infectiousness threshold values, in agreement with what was estimated for PCR-based exit testing guidelines (Jeong et al., 2021). Among those three factors, the detection limit was positively associated with consecutive negative results necessary to end isolation. In other words, more consecutive negative results are necessary when the detection limit is above infectiousness threshold values. Our study supports the need to define different testing strategies to end the isolation for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. Comparing the burden of isolation (i.e., length of prolonged isolation) depending on different settings, we found rapid antigen tests should have lower detection limits than infectiousness threshold values, and the burden increases as the detection limit is much higher than the infectiousness threshold values, even though the guidelines are optimized for given conditions.

The burden of isolation under optimal guidelines was influenced by infectiousness threshold values, which was not observed in the previous study using PCR tests (Jeong et al., 2021). PCR tests can quantitatively measure viral load; thus, the measured viral load is directly compared against the infectiousness threshold value whatever the value is. Therefore, the impact of infectiousness threshold values was not observed on the burden of isolation under optimal guidelines when PCR tests are used (Jeong et al., 2021). Meanwhile, as results from rapid antigen tests are qualitative (i.e., positive, or negative), we only know whether the viral load is below the detection limit, but we do not necessarily know whether it is below the infectiousness threshold value depending on the values. For instance, if the detection limit is below the infectiousness threshold value (detection limit is  $10^4$  copies/mL in this study), negative antigen tests results suggest that the viral load is below the infectiousness threshold value. In such case, we did not find much influence of infectiousness threshold values on the burden of isolation. Meanwhile, if the detection limit is above the infectiousness threshold value (detection limit is  $10^6$  copies/mL in this study), negative antigen results does not necessarily suggest that the viral load is below infectiousness threshold value. Therefore, in such cases, the burden increases when the difference between the infectiousness threshold value and the detection limit is large.

234 A limitation of this study is that the data used to calibrate the model refers to the original SARS-CoV-  
235 22 lineage. Previous studies suggest the viral dynamics are different between the original and the Delta variant  
236 (Li et al., 2021). Moreover, we do not have data to calibrate the model for vaccinated individuals, let alone  
237 with different vaccine types and number of doses, and previous studies have shown differences in the viral  
238 load of infected vaccinated vs. infected unvaccinated individuals (Chia et al.).

239 The COVID-19 pandemic is having an unprecedented impact on the lives of nearly every human being  
240 on the planet and is still causing interruptions in educational and economic activities. Isolating infected  
241 individuals is still a key component of the pandemic response and development of appropriate isolation  
242 guidelines is needed. Our study provides insights on the use of rapid antigen tests to minimize both the burden  
243 of isolation and the risk of releasing infectious individuals, and suggest that different guidelines may be  
244 warranted for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals.

## Acknowledgments

This study was supported in part by The Tokyo Foundation for Policy Research (to K.E. and K.S.); Grants-in-Aid for JSPS Scientific Research (KAKENHI) Scientific Research B 18KT0018 (to S.IWAMI), 18H01139 (to S.IWAMI), 16H04845 (to S.IWAMI), Scientific Research in Innovative Areas 20H05042 (to S.IWAMI), 19H04839 (to S.IWAMI), 18H05103 (to S.IWAMI); AMED CREST 19gm1310002 (to S.IWAMI); AMED Japan Program for Infectious Diseases Research and Infrastructure, 20wm0325007h0001, 20wm0325004s0201, 20wm0325012s0301, 20wm0325015s0301 (to S.IWAMI); AMED Research Program on HIV/AIDS 19fk0410023s0101 (to S.IWAMI); AMED Research Program on Emerging and Re-emerging Infectious Diseases 19fk0108156h0001, 20fk0108140s0801 and 20fk0108413s0301 (to S.IWAMI); AMED Program for Basic and Clinical Research on Hepatitis 19fk0210036h0502 (to S.IWAMI); AMED Program on the Innovative Development and the Application of New Drugs for Hepatitis B 19fk0310114h0103 (to S.IWAMI); Moonshot R&D Grant Number JPMJMS2021 (to S.IWAMI) and JPMJMS2025 (to S.IWAMI); JST MIRAI (to S.IWAMI); Mitsui Life Social Welfare Foundation (to S.IWAMI); Shin-Nihon of Advanced Medical Research (to S.IWAMI); Suzuken Memorial Foundation (to S.IWAMI); Life Science Foundation of Japan (to S.IWAMI); SECOM Science and Technology Foundation (to S.IWAMI); The Japan Prize Foundation (to S.IWAMI); Foundation for the Fusion of Science and Technology (to S.IWAMI); the MIDAS Coordination Center (MIDASSUGP2020-6) by a grant from the National Institute of General Medical Science (3U24GM132013-02S2) (to K.E. and M.A.). The study does not necessarily represent the views of the funding agencies listed above.

## References

- Aleta, A., Martin-Corral, D., Pastore Y Piontti, A., Ajelli, M., Litvinova, M., Chinazzi, M., . . . Moreno, Y. (2020). Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves of COVID-19. *Nat Hum Behav.*, *4*, 964-971. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0931-9
- Ash, T., Bento, A. M., Kaffine, D., Rao, A., & Bento, A. I. (2021). Disease-economy trade-offs under alternative pandemic control strategies. *medRxiv*, 2021.2002.2012.21251599. doi:10.1101/2021.02.12.21251599
- Baggett, T. P., Scott, J. A., Le, M. H., Shebl, F. M., Panella, C., Losina, E., . . . Freedberg, K. A. (2020). Clinical Outcomes, Costs, and Cost-effectiveness of Strategies for Adults Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Network Open*, *3*(12), e2028195-e2028195. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.28195
- Butler, D., Mozsary, C., Meydan, C., Foox, J., Rosiene, J., Shaiber, A., . . . Mason, C. E. (2021). Shotgun transcriptome, spatial omics, and isothermal profiling of SARS-CoV-2 infection reveals unique host responses, viral diversification, and drug interactions. *Nature Communications*, *12*(1), 1660. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21361-7
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). Discontinuation of Transmission-Based Precautions and Disposition of Patients with COVID-19 in Healthcare Settings (Interim Guidance). Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/disposition-hospitalized-patients.html>
- Chia, P. Y., Ong, S. W. X., Chiew, C. J., Ang, L. W., Chavatte, J.-M., Mak, T.-M., . . . Young, B. E. (2021). Virological and serological kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant vaccine breakthrough infections: a multicentre cohort study. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.010
- Dao Thi, V. L., Herbst, K., Boerner, K., Meurer, M., Kremer, L. P., Kirrmaier, D., . . . Anders, S. (2020). A colorimetric RT-LAMP assay and LAMP-sequencing for detecting SARS-CoV-2 RNA in clinical samples. *Science Translational Medicine*, *12*(556), eabc7075. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.abc7075
- Du, Z., Pandey, A., Bai, Y., Fitzpatrick, M. C., Chinazzi, M., Pastore y Piontti, A., . . . Meyers, L. A. (2021). Comparative cost-effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies in the USA: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*, *6*(3), e184-e191. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00002-5
- Fung, B., Gopez, A., Servellita, V., Arevalo, S., Ho, C., Deucher, A., . . . Miller, S. (2020). Direct Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 Analytical Limits of Detection across Seven Molecular Assays. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, *58*(9), e01535-01520. doi:10.1128/jcm.01535-20
- Giri, B., Pandey, S., Shrestha, R., Pokharel, K., Ligler, F. S., & Neupane, B. B. (2021). Review of analytical performance of COVID-19 detection methods. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, *413*(1), 35-48. doi:10.1007/s00216-020-02889-x
- Iwanami, S., Ejima, K., Kim, K. S., Noshita, K., Fujita, Y., Miyazaki, T., . . . Wakita, T. (2021). Detection of significant antiviral drug effects on COVID-19 with reasonable sample sizes in randomized controlled trials: A modeling study. *PLoS Medicine*, *18*(7), e1003660. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003660
- Jang, S., Rhee, J.-Y., Wi, Y. M., & Jung, B. K. (2021). Viral kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 over the preclinical, clinical, and postclinical period. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *102*, 561-565.
- Jeong, Y. D., Ejima, K., Kim, K. S., Iwanami, S., Bento, A. I., Fujita, Y., . . . Ajelli, M. (2021). Revisiting the guidelines for ending isolation for COVID-19 patients. *eLife*, *10*, e69340.
- Kam, K., Thoon, K. C., Maiwald, M., Chong, C. Y., Soong, H. Y., Loo, L. H., . . . Yung, C. F. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA load dynamics in the nasopharynx of infected children. *Epidemiology & Infection*, *149*.
- Kim, E. S., Chin, B. S., Kang, C. K., Kim, N. J., Kang, Y. M., Choi, J.-P., . . . Kim, S. E. (2020). Clinical course and outcomes of patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection: a preliminary report of the first 28 patients from the Korean cohort study on COVID-19. *Journal of Korean medical science*, *35*(13).
- Kim, S. E., Jeong, H. S., Yu, Y., Shin, S. U., Kim, S., Oh, T. H., . . . Jung, S.-I. (2020). Viral kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic carriers and presymptomatic patients. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *95*, 441-443.

- 317 Kissler, S. M., Fauver, J. R., Mack, C., Olesen, S. W., Tai, C., Shiue, K. Y., . . . Grad, Y. H. (2021). Viral  
318 dynamics of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and applications to diagnostic and public health strategies.  
319 *PLoS Biology*, 19(7), e3001333. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3001333
- 320 Kissler, S. M., Fauver, J. R., Mack, C., Tai, C. G., Breban, M. I., Watkins, A. E., . . . Metti, J. (2021).  
321 Densely sampled viral trajectories for SARS-CoV-2 variants alpha (B. 1.1. 7) and epsilon (B. 1.429).  
322 *medRxiv*, 2021.2002.2016.21251535.
- 323 Larremore, D. B., Wilder, B., Lester, E., Shehata, S., Burke, J. M., Hay, J. A., . . . Parker, R. (2021). Test  
324 sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Science*  
325 *Advances*, 7(1), eabd5393. doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd5393
- 326 Li, B., Deng, A., Li, K., Hu, Y., Li, Z., Xiong, Q., . . . Lu, J. (2021). Viral infection and transmission in a  
327 large, well-traced outbreak caused by the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant. *medRxiv*,  
328 2021.2007.2007.21260122. doi:10.1101/2021.07.07.21260122
- 329 Liu, Q.-H., Zhang, J., Peng, C., Litvinova, M., Huang, S., Poletti, P., . . . Ajelli, M. (2022). Model-based  
330 evaluation of alternative reactive class closure strategies against COVID-19. *Nature*  
331 *Communications*, 13(1), 1-10.
- 332 Mian, A., Al-Asad, S., & Khan, S. (2021). Mental health burden of COVID-19. *Family Practice*, 38(2), 195-  
333 197. doi:10.1093/fampra/cmaa100
- 334 Miyakawa, K., Funabashi, R., Yamaoka, Y., Jeremiah, S. S., Katada, J., Wada, A., . . . Ryo, A. (2021).  
335 SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid diagnostic test enhanced with silver amplification technology. *medRxiv*,  
336 2021.2001.2027.21250659. doi:10.1101/2021.01.27.21250659
- 337 Peiris, J. S. M., Chu, C.-M., Cheng, V. C.-C., Chan, K., Hung, I., Poon, L. L., . . . Chan, C. (2003). Clinical  
338 progression and viral load in a community outbreak of coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a  
339 prospective study. *The Lancet*, 361(9371), 1767-1772.
- 340 Quilty, B. J., Clifford, S., Hellewell, J., Russell, T. W., Kucharski, A. J., Flasche, S., . . . Davies, N. G.  
341 (2021). Quarantine and testing strategies in contact tracing for SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study. *The*  
342 *Lancet Public Health*. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30308-X
- 343 Sakurai, A., Sasaki, T., Kato, S., Hayashi, M., Tsuzuki, S.-i., Ishihara, T., . . . Doi, Y. (2020). Natural history  
344 of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(9), 885-886.
- 345 Sun, J., Tang, X., Bai, R., Liang, C., Zeng, L., Lin, H., . . . Ke, C. (2020). The kinetics of viral load and  
346 antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 26(12), 1690.e1691-1690.e1694.  
347 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.08.043
- 348 van Kampen, J. J. A., van de Vijver, D. A. M. C., Fraaij, P. L. A., Haagmans, B. L., Lamers, M. M., Okba,  
349 N., . . . van der Eijk, A. A. (2021). Duration and key determinants of infectious virus shedding in  
350 hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19). *Nature Communications*, 12(1),  
351 267. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-20568-4
- 352 van Kasteren, P. B., van der Veer, B., van den Brink, S., Wijsman, L., de Jonge, J., van den Brandt, A., . . .  
353 Meijer, A. (2020). Comparison of seven commercial RT-PCR diagnostic kits for COVID-19. *Journal*  
354 *of Clinical Virology*, 128, 104412. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104412
- 355 Wölfel, R., Corman, V. M., Guggemos, W., Seilmaier, M., Zange, S., Müller, M. A., . . . Wendtner, C.  
356 (2020). Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*, 581(7809), 465-  
357 469. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x
- 358 World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. Retrieved from  
359 <https://covid19.who.int/>
- 360 Yang, Q., Meyerson, N. R., Clark, S. K., Paige, C. L., Fattor, W. T., Gilchrist, A. R., . . . Sawyer, S. L.  
361 (2021). Saliva TwoStep for rapid detection of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 carriers. *medRxiv*,  
362 2020.2007.2016.20150250. doi:10.1101/2020.07.16.20150250
- 363 Young, B. E., Ong, S. W. X., Kalimuddin, S., Low, J. G., Tan, S. Y., Loh, J., . . . Mak, T. M. (2020).  
364 Epidemiologic features and clinical course of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore.  
365 *Jama*, 323(15), 1488-1494.
- 366 Zhang, X., Lu, S., Li, H., Wang, Y., Lu, Z., Liu, Z., . . . Hou, J. (2020). Viral and Antibody Kinetics of  
367 COVID-19 Patients with Different Disease Severities in Acute and Convalescent Phases: A 6-Month  
368 Follow-Up Study. *Virologica Sinica*, 35(6), 820-829. doi:10.1007/s12250-020-00329-9

- 369 Zheng, S., Fan, J., Yu, F., Feng, B., Lou, B., Zou, Q., . . . Liang, T. (2020). Viral load dynamics and disease  
370 severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020:  
371 retrospective cohort study. *BMJ*, 369, m1443. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1443
- 372 Zou, L., Ruan, F., Huang, M., Liang, L., Huang, H., Hong, Z., . . . Xia, J. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 viral load in  
373 upper respiratory specimens of infected patients. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(12), 1177-  
374 1179.
- 375
- 376



## Legend for figures and supplementary files

### Figure 1. Estimated viral load curves from the models for (A) symptomatic and (B) asymptomatic cases.

The solid lines are the estimated viral load curves for the best fit parameters. The shaded regions correspond to 95% predictive intervals. The 95% predictive interval was created using bootstrap approach.

### Figure 2. Optimal isolation guideline for symptomatic and asymptomatic cases using antigen test

(detection limit= $10^4$  copies/mL). **A.** Probability of prematurely ending isolation (upper panels) and mean length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation (lower panels) for different values of the interval between PCR tests and the number of consecutive negative results necessary to end isolation for each case; the infectiousness threshold value is set to  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL. The areas surrounded by sky-blue dotted lines and blue solid lines are those with 1% or 5% or lower of risk of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients, respectively, and the triangles and squares correspond to the conditions which realize the shortest prolonged isolation within each area. **B.** Same as **A**, but for an infectiousness threshold value of  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL. **C.** Same as **A**, but for an infectiousness threshold value of  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL. Color keys and symbols apply to all panels.

### Figure 3. Optimal isolation guideline for symptomatic and asymptomatic cases using antigen test

(detection limit= $10^6$  copies/mL). **A.** Probability of prematurely ending isolation (upper panels) and mean length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation (lower panels) for different values of the interval between PCR tests and the number of consecutive negative results necessary to end isolation for each case; the infectiousness threshold value is set to  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL. The areas surrounded by sky-blue dotted lines and blue solid lines are those with 1% or 5% or lower of risk of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients, respectively, and the triangles and squares correspond to the conditions which realize the shortest prolonged isolation within each area. **B.** Same as **A**, but for an infectiousness threshold value of  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL. **C.** Same as **A**, but for an infectiousness threshold value of  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL. Color keys and symbols apply to all panels.

### Figure 4. Comparison between the situations of high and low detection limits for symptomatic and asymptomatic cases. **A.** Mean length of prolonged isolation for different infectiousness threshold values and

404 for the two approaches when considering a 5% or lower risk of prematurely ending isolation. Note that the  
405 interval between antigen tests and the number of consecutive negative results necessary to end isolation were  
406 selected to minimize the duration of prolonged isolation. **B.** Same as **A**, but considering a 1% or lower risk of  
407 prematurely ending isolation.

408

409 **Supplementary File 1.** Estimated parameters of SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics model for symptomatic and  
410 asymptomatic cases.

411

412 **Figure 1-source data 1. Estimated viral load curves.** The numbers in parentheses are the 95% empirical CI.

413  
414 **Figure 2-source data 1. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
415 **guidelines for symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
416 **detection limit as  $10^4$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
417 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

418  
419 **Figure 2-source data 2. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
420 **symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as  $10^4$**   
421 **copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are the  
422 empirical 95%CI.

423  
424 **Figure 2-source data 3. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
425 **guidelines for symptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
426 **detection limit as  $10^4$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
427 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

428  
429 **Figure 2-source data 4. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
430 **symptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as  $10^4$**   
431 **copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are the  
432 empirical 95%CI.

433  
434 **Figure 2-source data 5. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
435 **guidelines for symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
436 **detection limit as  $10^4$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
437 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

439 **Figure 2-source data 6. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
440 **symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as  $10^4$**   
441 **copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are the  
442 empirical 95%CI.

443  
444 **Figure 2-source data 7. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
445 **guidelines for asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
446 **detection limit as  $10^4$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
447 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

448  
449 **Figure 2-source data 8. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
450 **asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as**  
451  **$10^4$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are  
452 the empirical 95%CI.

453  
454 **Figure 2-source data 9. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
455 **guidelines for asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
456 **detection limit as  $10^4$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
457 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

458  
459 **Figure 2-source data 10. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
460 **asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as**  
461  **$10^4$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are  
462 the empirical 95%CI.

463  
464 **Figure 2-source data 11. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
465 **guidelines for asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**

466 **detection limit as  $10^4$  copies/mL**). The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
467 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

468

469 **Figure 2-source data 12. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
470 **asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as**  
471  **$10^4$  copies/mL**). The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are  
472 the empirical 95%CI.

473

474 **Figure 3-source data 1. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
475 **guidelines for symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
476 **detection limit as  $10^6$  copies/mL**). The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
477 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

478

479 **Figure 3-source data 2. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
480 **symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as  $10^6$**   
481 **copies/mL**). The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are the  
482 empirical 95%CI.

483

484 **Figure 3-source data 3. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
485 **guidelines for symptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
486 **detection limit as  $10^6$  copies/mL**). The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
487 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

488

489 **Figure 3-source data 4. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
490 **symptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as  $10^6$**   
491 **copies/mL**). The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are the  
492 empirical 95%CI.

493

494 **Figure 3-source data 5. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
495 **guidelines for symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
496 **detection limit as  $10^6$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
497 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

498

499 **Figure 3-source data 6. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
500 **symptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as  $10^6$**   
501 **copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are the  
502 empirical 95%CI.

503

504 **Figure 3-source data 7. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
505 **guidelines for asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
506 **detection limit as  $10^6$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
507 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

508

509 **Figure 3-source data 8. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
510 **asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as**  
511  **$10^6$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are  
512 the empirical 95%CI.

513

514 **Figure 3-source data 9. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
515 **guidelines for asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
516 **detection limit as  $10^6$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
517 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

518

519 **Figure 3-source data 10. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
520 **asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as**  
521  **$10^6$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are  
522 the empirical 95%CI.

523

524 **Figure 3-source data 11. Probability of prematurely ending isolation of infectious patients with different**  
525 **guidelines for asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and**  
526 **detection limit as  $10^6$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers  
527 in parentheses are the 95%CI.

528

529 **Figure 3-source data 12. Length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation with different guidelines for**  
530 **asymptomatic cases (with  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL as an infectiousness threshold value and detection limit as**  
531  **$10^6$  copies/mL).** The cell with numbers in bold corresponds to the baseline. The numbers in parentheses are  
532 the empirical 95%CI.

533

534 **Figure 4-source data. Mean length of unnecessarily prolonged isolation (days) with different guidelines**  
535 **and infectiousness values controlling the risk of prematurely ending isolation  $\leq 5\%$  and  $\leq 1\%$  for**  
536 **symptomatic and asymptomatic cases.**

537

**Table 1. Summary of the viral load data used for modeling**

Country	Number of data	Reporting unit	Specimens for measuring viral load	Date of collection	Source
<b>Symptomatic</b>					
USA	33	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nares and oropharyngeal swabs	Nov 2020 to May 2021	(Stephen M Kissler et al., 2021)
USA	12	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nares and oropharyngeal swabs	Nov 2020 to May 2021	(Stephen M. Kissler et al., 2021)
Germany	8	viral load (copies/swab) <sup>&amp;</sup>	Pharyngeal swab	Jan 2020	(Wölfel et al., 2020)
Korea	34	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Oro/nasopharyngeal swabs	May 2020	(Jang, Rhee, Wi, & Jung, 2021)
Korea	2	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Oro/nasopharyngeal swab	Feb 2020	(E. S. Kim et al., 2020)
Singapore	12	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nasopharyngeal swab	Jan to Feb 2020	(Young et al., 2020)
China	8	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nasal swab	Jan 2020	(Zou et al., 2020)
<b>Asymptomatic</b>					
USA	44	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nares and oropharyngeal swabs	Nov 2020 to May 2021	(Stephen M Kissler et al., 2021)
USA	28	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nares and oropharyngeal swab	Nov 2020 to May 2021	(Stephen M. Kissler et al., 2021)
Japan	18	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nasopharyngeal or throat swab	Jan 2020	(Sakurai et al., 2020)
Korea	4	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nasal and throat swabs	Feb to Apr 2020	(S. E. Kim et al., 2020)
Singapore	7	cycle threshold <sup>#</sup>	Nasopharyngeal swab	Mar to Apr 2020	(Kam et al., 2021)

539

<sup>#</sup>Viral load was calculated from cycle threshold values using the conversion formula:  $\log_{10}(\text{Viral load [copies/mL]}) = -0.32 \times \text{Ct values [cycles]} + 14.11$

540


(Peiris et al., 2003)

541


<sup>&</sup>1 swab = 3 mL




## Symptomatic



## Asymptomatic







Symptomatic







Symptomatic





**A** Infectiousness threshold =  $10^{5.0}$  copies/mL





**B** Infectiousness threshold =  $10^{4.5}$  copies/mL



**C** Infectiousness threshold =  $10^{5.5}$  copies/mL



Asymptomatic

**A**Risk of prematurely ending isolation  $\leq 5\%$ **B**Risk of prematurely ending isolation  $\leq 1\%$ 

Symptomatic

Asymptomatic

